

Christopher Jon Bjerknes

THE MANUFACTURE AND SALE
OF
SAINT EINSTEIN

Copyright © 2006. All Rights Reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

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

[3.5.2 Reaction to the Unprecedented Einstein Promotion](#)

[3.5.3 The Berlin Philharmonic—The Response in Germany](#)

[3.5.4 Jewish Hypocrisy and Double Standards](#)

[3.6 The Messiah Rothschilds’ War on the Gentiles—and the Jews](#)

[4 EINSTEIN THE RACIST COWARD](#)

[4.1 Introduction](#)

[4.2 The Power of Jewish Tribalism Inhibits the Progress of Science and Deliberately Promotes “Racial” Discord](#)

[4.3 A Jew is Not Allowed to Speak Out Against a Jew](#)

[4.4 The Bad Nauheim Debate](#)

[4.4.1 Einstein Desires a “Race” War Which Will Exterminate the European Esau](#)

[4.4.2 Genocidal Judaism—Pruning the Branches of the Human Family Tree](#)

[4.4.3 Crypto-Jews](#)

[4.4.4 The Gentiles Must be Exterminated Lest God Cut Off the Jews](#)

[4.4.5 Jewish Dualism and Human Sacrifice—Evil is Good](#)

[4.4.6 Gentiles are Destined to Slave for the Jews, Then the Slaves Will be Exterminated](#)

[4.4.7 Lenard Sickens of Einstein’s Libels](#)

[4.4.8 Let the Debate Begin](#)

[4.4.8.1 Einstein Disappoints—“Albertus Maximus” is a Laughingstock](#)

[4.4.8.2 Contemporary Accounts of the Bad Nauheim Debate](#)

[4.5 Einstein the Genocidal Racist](#)

[4.6 Racist Jewish Hypocrisy, Intimidation and Censorship](#)

[4.7 Einstein’s Trip to America](#)

[4.7.1 Einstein Faces Criticism in America](#)

[4.7.1.1 Einstein Hides from Reuter dahl’s Challenge to Debate](#)

[4.7.1.2 Cowardly Einstein Caught in a Lie](#)

[4.7.1.3 Reuterdahl Pursues Einstein, Who Continues to Run](#)

[4.7.2 Einstein All Hype](#)

[4.8 Assassination Plots](#)

[4.9 Wolff Crying, Dirty Tricks, Censorship, Smear Campaigns and Anonymous Threats in the Name of Einstein](#)

5 THE PROTOCOLS OF THE LEARNED ELDERS OF ZION

[5.1 Introduction](#)

[5.2 *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*](#)

[5.3 Did Anyone Believe that the *Protocols* were Genuine?](#)

[5.3.1 Human Sacrifice and the Plan to Discredit Gentile Government—Fulfilled](#)

[5.3.2 The World Awakens to the “Jewish Peril”](#)

[5.3.3 America Becomes the “New Jerusalem”](#)

[5.3.4 “The Jewish Peril”](#)

[5.3.5 The Inhumanity of the Bolsheviks](#)

[5.4 International Zionist and Communist Intimidation](#)

[5.4.1 Suppression of Free Speech](#)

[5.4.2 Jewish Terrorism](#)

[5.5 Attempts to Prove the *Protocols* Inauthentic](#)

[5.5.1 Why Did Henry Ford Criticize the Jews?](#)

[5.5.2 Controlled Opposition and “The Trust”](#)

[5.5.3 The Sinking of the “Peace Ship”](#)

[5.5.4 Ford Comes Under Attack—The War Against Pacifism](#)

[5.5.5 Zionists Proscribe Free Speech](#)

[5.5.6 President Woodrow Wilson Becomes a Zionist Dictator](#)

[5.6 Why Did the Zionists Trouble the Jews?](#)

[5.6.1 The Zionist Myth of the Extinction of the “Jewish Race” Through Philo-Semitism and Assimilation](#)

[5.6.2 The Zionists Set the Stage for the Second World War. . . and the Third](#)

[5.7 Henry Ford for President](#)

[5.8 The “Jewish Mission”](#)

[5.9 Jewish Bankers Destroy Russia and Finance Adolf Hitler](#)

[5.10 The Holocaust as a Zionist Eugenics Program for the Jewish “Remnant”:
Zionist Nazis Use Natural and Artificial Selection to Strengthen the Genetic
Stock of Jews Destined for Forced Deportation to Palestine](#)

[5.11 Zionist Lies](#)

[5.12 Zionists Declare that Anti-Semitism is the Salvation of the “Jewish
Race”](#)

[5.13 Communist Jews in America](#)

[5.14 The Attempted Assassination of Henry Ford](#)

[5.15 How the Zionists Blackmailed President Wilson](#)

[5.15.1 Before the War, the Zionists Plan a Peace Conference After the
War—to be Led by a Zionist Like Woodrow Wilson](#)

[5.15.2 “Colonel” Edward Mandell House](#)

[5.15.3 The Balfour Declaration—*QUID PRO QUO*](#)

[5.16 A Newspaper History of Zionist Intrigues During the First World War,
which Proves that Jewish Bankers Betrayed Germany](#)

[5.17 The Germans’ Side of the First World War](#)

[6 ZIONISM IS RACISM](#)

[6.1 Introduction](#)

[6.2 Political Zionism is a Form of Racism](#)

[6.3 Most Jews Opposed Zionism](#)

[6.4 The Brotherhood of Anti-Semites and Zionists](#)

[6.5 Albert Einstein Becomes a Cheerleader for Racist Zionism](#)

[6.5.1 While Zionists and Sycophants Hailed Einstein, Most Scientists
Rejected Him and “His” Theories](#)

[6.5.2 Hypocritical and Cowardly Einstein Plays the “Race Card” and
Cripples Scientific Progress](#)

[6.5.3 What is Good for Goose is not Good for the Goyim](#)

[6.5.3.1 Supremacist and Segregationist Jewish “Neo-Messianism”](#) . . .

[6.5.3.2 It is Alright for Jews to Claim that “Einstein’s Theories” are “Jewish”, but Goyim Dare Not Say It](#)

[7 NAZISM IS ZIONISM](#)

[7.1 Introduction](#)

[7.2 *Blut und Boden*—A Jewish Ideal](#)

[7.3 Zionism is Built on Lies and Hatred](#)

[7.4 The Hypocritical Vilification of Caligula—Ancient Jewish Historians are not Credible](#)

[7.5 All the Best Zionists are Anti-Semites](#)

[7.5.1 Nazism is a Stalking Horse for Zionism and Communism](#)

[7.5.2 Hitler and Goebbels Reveal Their True Motives at War’s End](#)

[7.5.3 Zionists and Communists Delight in Massive Human Sacrifices to the Jewish Messianic Cause](#)

[7.5.4 Einstein Lulls Jews into Complacency—The Zionist Trap](#)

[7.5.4.1 Depressions Make for Fertile Ground for Anti-Semitic Zionist Dictators](#)

[7.5.4.2 Einstein a Subtle Hitler Apologist](#)

[7.5.5 Einstein’s Seething Racist Hatred and Rabid Nationalism](#)

[7.5.6 The Final Solution of the Jewish Question is Zionism, but the Final Solution of the German Question is Extermination](#)

[7.6 The Carrot and the Stick](#)

[7.7 British Zionists, in Collaboration with Nazi Zionists, in Collaboration with Palestinian Zionists, Ensured that the Jews of Continental Europe Would Find No Sanctuary Before the War Ended](#)

[7.8 Documented Collaboration Between the Palestinian Zionists and the Zionist Nazis](#)

[8 HOW THE JEWS MADE THE BRITISH INTO ZIONISTS](#)

- [8.1 Introduction](#)
- [8.2 The Rothschilds and Disraeli Lead the British Down the Garden Path to Palestine](#)
- [8.3 Jews Provoke Perpetual War](#)
- [8.4 Jewish World Government—A Prophetic Desire](#)
- [8.5 Puritans and Protestants Serve Jewish Interests](#)
- [8.6 The Planned Apocalypse](#)
- [8.7 Cabalistic Jews Calling Themselves Christian Condition the British to Assist in Their Own Demise—Rothschild Makes an Open Bid to Become the Messiah](#)
- [8.7.1 The “British-Israel” Deceit](#)
- [8.7.2 For Centuries, England is Flooded with Warmongering Zionist Propaganda](#)
- [8.7.3 As a Good Cabalist Jew, David Hartley Conditions Christians to Welcome Martyrdom for the Sake of the Jews](#)
- [8.7.3.1 Jewish Revolutionaries and Napoleon the Messiah Emancipate the Jews](#)
- [8.7.3.2 Hitler Accomplishes for the Zionists What Napoleon Could Not](#)
- [8.7.3.3 Zionists Develop a Strategy Which Culminates in the Nazis and the Holocaust as Means to Attain the “Jewish State”](#)

9 THE PRIORITY MYTH

- [9.1 Introduction](#)
- [9.2 Opinions of Einstein and “His” Work](#)
- [9.3 The Æther](#)
- [9.4 The So-Called “Lorentz Transformation”](#)
- [9.4.1 Woldemar Voigt’s Space-Time Transformation](#)
- [9.4.2 Length Contraction](#)
- [9.4.2.1 Dynamic Length Contraction](#)
- [9.4.2.2 Kinematic Length Contraction](#)

9.4.3	Time Dilatation
9.4.4	The Final Form of the Transformation
9.4.5	Einstein’s Fudge
9.4.6	Einstein Begged the Question
9.5	The “Two Postulates”
9.5.1	The “Principle of Relativity”
9.5.2	The “Light Postulate”
9.6	Relative Simultaneity
9.6.1	Isotropic Light Speed
9.6.2	The “Aarau Question”
9.6.3	Light Signals and Clock Synchronization
9.7	Conclusion
10	“SPACE-TIME” OR IS IT “TIME-SPACE”?
10.1	Introduction
10.2	The Ancients and “Space-Time”
10.3	Einstein and “Space-Time”
11	HILBERT’S PROOFS PROVE HILBERT’S PRIORITY
11.1	Introduction
11.2	Corry, Renn and Stachel’s Baseless Historical Revisionism
11.3	Historical Background and the Correspondence
11.4	Hilbert’s Proofs Prove Hilbert’s Priority
11.5	A Question of Character
11.6	A Question of Ability
11.7	Conclusion
12	GERBER’S FORMULA
12.1	Introduction
12.2	How Fast Does Gravity Go?

12.3 Gerber’s Formula was Well-Known
12.4 Einstein’s Fudge
12.5 Who Was Paul Gerber?
12.6 Conclusion
13 SOLDNER’S PREDICTION
13.1 Introduction
13.2 Soldner’s Hypothesis and Solution
13.3 Einstein Knew the Newtonian Prediction
13.4 Soldner’s Formulation
13.5 Conclusion
14 THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUIVALENCE, ETC.
14.1 Introduction
14.2 Eötvös’ Experimental Fact and Planck’s Proposition
14.3 Kinertia’s Elevator is Einstein’s Happiest Thought
14.4 Dynamism
14.5 Mach’s Principle
14.6 The Rubber Sheet Analogy
14.7 Reference Frames and Covariance
14.8 Conclusion
15 “THEORY OF RELATIVITY” OR “PSEUDORELATIVISM”?
15.1 Introduction
15.2 The “Theory of Relativity” is an Absolutist Theory
16 $E = m c^2$
16.1 Introduction
16.2 The “Quantity of Motion”—Momentum, <i>Vis Viva</i> and Kinetic Energy	..
16.3 The Atom as a Source of Energy and Explosive Force

<u>16.4 The Inertia of Energy</u>	
<u>16.5 The Einsteins' Energy Fudge</u>	
<u>16.6 Hero Worship</u>	
<u>16.7 Conclusion</u>	
<u>17 EINSTEIN'S <i>MODUS OPERANDI</i></u>	
<u>17.1 Introduction</u>	
<u>17.2 "Mach's" Principle of Logical Economy</u>	
<u>17.3 Einstein's Fallacies of <i>Petitio Principii</i></u>	
<u>17.4 Conclusion</u>	
<u>18 MILEVA EINSTEIN-MARITY</u>	
<u>18.1 Introduction</u>	
<u>18.2 Witness Accounts and the Evidence</u>	
<u>18.3 Prophets of the Prize</u>	
<u>18.4 Conclusion</u>	
<u>19 ALBERT EINSTEIN'S NOBEL PRIZE</u>	
<u>19.1 Introduction</u>	
<u>19.2 The Nobel Foundation Directorate Learns that Einstein is a Plagiarist</u> . . .	
<u>19.3 "The Thomson-Einstein Theory" Makes a Convenient Excuse</u>	
<u>19.4 The Origins of the Law of the Photo-Electric Effect</u>	
<u>19.5 Einstein's Nobel Prize was Undeserved</u>	
<u>19.6 Einstein Breaks the Rules</u>	
<u>19.7 Conclusion</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>NOTES</u>	<u>1</u>

1 EINSTEIN DISCOVERS HIS RACIST CALLING

In 1919, Albert Einstein rose to international fame for predicting that the gravitational field of the sun would deflect rays of light. Eclipse observations confirmed this prediction. Newspapers around the world covered the story and declared that Albert Einstein had surpassed the genius of Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo and Newton. It seemed that all was right with the world—but then everything went tragically wrong.

“Probably Professor Einstein does not realize how sensationally and cunningly he has been advertised. From the point of view of awakening popular curiosity, his press-notices could hardly have been improved. The newspapers first announced his discovery as revolutionizing science. This sounds well, but its meaning, after all, is rather vague. Then they printed a series of entertaining oddities, supposedly deducible from his hypothesis, although most of them could have been equally well deduced from the conclusions of Lorentz or Poincaré: for example, moving objects are shortened in the direction of their motion.”—GERTRUDE BESSE KING

“If anyone should ask how Einstein managed to get such vast publicity in the matter of relativity, we may observe that he has the habit of a promoter.”—THOMAS JEFFERSON JACKSON SEE¹

“While he lived in Germany, however, Einstein seems to have accepted the then-prevalent racist mode of thought, often invoking such concepts as ‘race’ and ‘instinct,’ and the idea that the Jews form a race.”—JOHN STACHEL²

1.1 Introduction

Racist physicist Albert Einstein became internationally famous in 1919 when newspapers around the world reported that he had correctly predicted that the gravitational field of the sun would deflect rays of light. The press promoted the virulently racist and segregationist Zionist, Albert Einstein, as if he were the world’s greatest mind, a mind that had surpassed the genius of Copernicus, Galileo and Newton.

In April of 1921, Albert Einstein took advantage of his newly found fame and traveled to America. He promoted racist Zionism to the Jews of America, while raising money for the Eastern European Zionists who had made him famous.

Einstein championed the racist doctrine of Theodor Herzl, that Jews were a distinct race of human beings, who could not assimilate into any Gentile society and therefore ought to segregate themselves and form a nation in Palestine. Einstein also believed that there ought to be a world government. However, Einstein thought that Israel ought to be a distinct nation. Though he described himself as non-religious, Einstein's racist views, and his concurrent call for a world government and a segregated "Jewish State" mirrored Jewish Messianic prophecies.

Einstein raised money in America for the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. He also tried to popularize the racist Zionist cause. The news media enthusiastically covered his trip to the United States. Mainstream news media claimed that all of Einstein's critics were anti-Semites, but did not criticize Einstein for his rabid racism or his segregationist politics.

Prof. Arvid Reuterdaahl of St. Thomas College, in St. Paul, Minnesota, responded to Einstein's aggressive self-promotion. With reference to the notorious circus promoter P. T. Barnum, Prof. Reuterdaahl dubbed Albert Einstein the "Barnum of the Scientific World". He publicly challenged Einstein to a debate over the merits of the theory of relativity and publicly accused Einstein of plagiarism.

Einstein refused to debate Reuterdaahl. Einstein stated that his sole purpose for coming to America was to raise money for the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and that he could not be bothered with issues related to "his" theories. Even before coming to America, Einstein had earned an international reputation for hiding from his critics. His favorite tactic to avoid debate was to accuse his critics of being "anti-Semites", while refusing to address their legitimate accusations of his, Einstein's, irrationality and plagiarism. Like most bullies by bluff, Einstein was a coward, who hid behind the power of the racist Jews who attempted to shield him from criticism through well-orchestrated smear campaigns in the international press.

In spite of this, or perhaps because of this, Einstein generally had a hard time in America. Due to his incompetence, and the tribalistic racism he and his Jewish friends exhibited, Einstein faced scandal after scandal. Though Einstein had arrived to a triumphant welcome in New York City, he left the United States an utter disgrace. Though Einstein had accepted many honors from American universities, he publicly ridiculed American scholars and Americans in general in a widely published interview he gave after he had returned to Europe. The grapes had turned to sour gripes.

1.2 The Manufacture and Sale of St. Einstein

Isaac Newton believed that light is composed of matter converted into tiny "corpuscles". Newton predicted that the gravitational attraction of other matter would attract light corpuscles, just as it attracted everything else made up of matter. Einstein repeated Newton's prediction that gravitational fields would deflect light.

Like countless others before him, Einstein had proposed a non-Newtonian law of gravity. In Einstein's gravitational theory the deflection of light rays was twice as great as in Newton's gravitational theory.

In 1918-1920, the British astronomers Frank Watson Dyson, Charles Davidson

and Arthur Stanley Eddington collaborated with Albert Einstein, and his friends Alexander Moszkowski, Max Born, Erwin Freundlich and Hendrik Antoon Lorentz to promote and sensationalize contrived reports that eclipse observations had confirmed Einstein's prediction. The astronomers had attempted to photograph stars which could be seen near the edge of the Sun during a full eclipse. The images of these stars might indicate that the path of the rays of light coming from stars behind the Sun had curved when passing near the Sun, thereby displacing the images of the stars from the position they would otherwise have had on the pictures, had not the gravitational field of the sun altered the path of light coming from the stars behind the Sun. Johann Georg von Soldner (in 1801) and Albert Einstein (in late 1915) predicted that the deflection would be twice the amount the Newtonian theory of gravitation predicted. This factor of two distinguished their theories from Newton's. Though it was Newton who first predicted the effect, and it was Soldner who first correctly predicted the amount of the deflection for light rays, it was Einstein who took credit for both predictions.

Dyson, Davidson, Eddington and Einstein misrepresented the photographic evidence, which was of poor quality and, therefore, inconclusive. They falsely claimed that the photographs taken during eclipse of the Sun proved not only that the deflection of light had occurred, but that it was twice the Newtonian value, in accord with Einsteinian (Soldnerian) theory. However, this is not what the photographs had shown, and it is doubtful that the photographs could in any case have been conclusive. The effect was exceedingly small and the equipment the astronomers employed was primitive and did not have the precision needed to accurately record the predicted effect.

The press promoted these falsified reports and told the general public that Newtonian theory had been overthrown and that Einstein was a great genius, who was at least the equal of Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo and Newton. Newspapers asserted that Einstein had introduced a new world view, one that was true no matter how strange it appeared to be, with its "warped space-time", "hundred foot poles in fifty foot barns", and other "paradoxes". The press reported that Einstein's unique insight was so sophisticated and enlightened that only twelve men in the world could understand it. Reporters told the people of the world that a dramatic revolution in science had taken place—though this magnificent and unprecedented revolution, so deserving of international attention and praise, had changed nothing in their lives and they had no need, nor reason, to try to understand it.

The sensational reports created a mass hysteria for Einstein in America, one which culminated in Einstein's visit to the United States in the spring of 1921. Einstein's trip came shortly after Einstein had endured a series of public humiliations in the scientific community in Germany in 1920. He was hiding from the German scientists who had informed the public that he was a fraud. Whenever Einstein faced overwhelming problems in Germany, he wisely traveled to other nations, in part for publicity purposes to promote Zionism—which gave him undeserved publicity and paid for his trips—and which gave him the means to hide from his many critics. Einstein went to Spain and to Japan, continually promoting himself by being seen in the company of royalty, heads of state and international celebrities.

In spite of all the humiliating defeats Einstein met in the scientific world, a pro-Einstein press stuck by him and unfairly smeared those who legitimately criticized him. Some of his critics were highly respected Nobel Prize winning physicists, but this did not inhibit the pro-Einstein press from attacking their reputations merely because they had dared to disagree with the racist Zionist Albert Einstein, on purely scientific matters.

1.2.1 Promoting the “Cult” of Einstein

In an epiphany of Saint Einstein, Jewish journalist Alexander Moszkowski wrote to Albert Einstein on 1 February 1917,

“Regardless of what happens, I would like to continue the ‘cult’; for you it is secondary, for me it is of paramount importance in life. Additionally, I have the encouraging feeling that, with my modest writing abilities, I may also serve the cause once in a while.”³

Moszkowski used his writing talents to make Einstein a superstar. In October of 1919, Moszkowski fulfilled his promise to Einstein to promote the “cult” of Einstein, and began the international “Einstein mania”, which peaked in November and December of 1919.

Einstein knew that the newspaper hype was disingenuous and distasteful, but he blamed the public for the hype his racist Jewish friends had manufactured. In mid-December, 1919, Einstein wrote to his friend and confidant Heinrich Zangger,

“The newspaper drivel about me is pathetic; this kind of exaggeration meets a certain need among the public. Really, a harmless ideology.”⁴

On 24 December 1919, Einstein wrote to Zangger and justified the lies as “harmless tomfoolery”,

“[T]his business reminds one of the tale of ‘The Emperor’s New Clothes,’ but it is harmless tomfoolery. [***] The disparity between what you are and what others believe, or at least, say about you, is far too great.”⁵

When Albert Einstein’s critic physicist Ernst Gehrcke made similar statements, Einstein called him “anti-Semitic”. Zangger received yet another letter from Albert Einstein dated 3 January 1920, in which Einstein stated, among other things,

“As for me, since the light deflection result became public, such a cult has been made out of me that I feel like a pagan idol.”⁶

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

The press claimed that Einstein was the greatest and most original thinker that

the world had ever seen. No one knew better than Einstein himself that the press was deliberately lying to the public. Albert Einstein wrote to Hendrik Antoon Lorentz on 19 January 1920,

“Nevertheless, unlike you, nature has not bestowed me with the ability to deliver lectures and dispense original ideas virtually effortlessly as meets your refined and versatile mind. [***] This awareness of my limitations pervades me all the more keenly in recent times since I see that my faculties are being quite particularly overrated after a few consequences of the general theory stood the test.”⁷

1.2.2 The “Jewish Press” Sanctifies a Fellow Jew

Adapting his title from a poem by Adelbert von Chamisso,⁸ Kurt Joël promoted Albert Einstein in the *Vossische Zeitung* morning edition on 29 May 1919.

“Die Sonne bringt es an den Tag?

Eine Himmelsentscheidung in der
Relativitätstheorie.

Von
Kurt Joël.

Sonnenfinsternisse sind sicherlich nichts Seltenes. Wiederholt sind in den letzten hundert Jahren wissenschaftliche Expeditionen ausgerüstet worden, um sie zu beobachten und die Ergebnisse dieser Beobachtung zu verarbeiten. Und doch sieht man der Verfinsterung unseres Zentralgestirns, die heute, am 29. Mai, eintritt und 3 Stunden 17 Minuten währt, mit besonderer Spannung entgegen. Nicht etwa wegen der langen Dauer dieser Finsternis, die mit der schmalen Zone ihrer Totalität das nördliche Brasilien und Mittelfrika durchschreitet und zu deren Erforschung von England aus zwei Unternehmungen — die eine mit dem Standort in S o b r a l (Brasilien), die andere nach der Insel I s l a d o P r i n c i p e, etwa 180 Kilometer von der afrikanischen Küste — ausgerüstet worden sind. Nicht bloß die Astronomen, auch Physiker, Mathematiker, selbst Philosophischen harren auf die endgültigen Ergebnisse dieser Himmelsbeobachtung, da sie mittelbar helfen sollen, eine der wichtigsten neueren physikalischen, ja erkenntnistheoretischen Fragen, die E i n s t e i n s c h e Gravitationstheorie, zu beantworten.

Nach der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie muß ein Strahl, der von einem Stern aus tangential zur Sonne verläuft, um $1,74''$ abgelenkt werden und die Ablenkung für andere Sterne umgekehrt proportional diesem Abstand vom Mittelpunkt der Sonne sein. Beeinflußt nun wirklich die Sonne den Lichtstahl

und damit die scheinbaren Oerter der Sterne? Diese Frage sollte bereits im August 1914, wo ebenfalls eine Sonnenfinsternis stattfand, entschieden werden, jedoch hat der Krieg die Arbeit der meisten Expeditionen gestört. Welche Entscheidung wird nun der Himmel für Einsteins Theorien bringen?

Schon einmal hat dieser Forscher den Himmel zum Zeugen für die Richtigkeit seiner Theorie angerufen. Es handelte sich um die Perihelbewegung des Merkur, die bis dahin den Erklärungsversuchen der Physiker und Astronomen getrotzt hatte. Das Perihel (der Punkt der Sonnennähe) erfährt im Sinne der Bewegung des Planeten eine sehr geringe, aber ganz sicher nachgewiesene Bewegung, die in hundert Jahren auf den freilich nicht übermäßigen Betrag von 43 Bogensekunden wächst, sich aber aus den Grundlagen der von Newton begründeten klassischen Mechanik nicht hat ableiten lassen. Der Astronom Leverrier hat durch Rechnung gezeigt, daß diese Abweichung der Beobachtung von der Rechnung bei Zugrundelegung der Newtonschen Mechanik nur durch die Annahme unbekannter Massen erklärt werden könne. Aber nach solchen Massen hat man bisher vergeblich gesucht. Da verband Albert Einstein die Gravitation mit seiner Relativitätstheorie; die gewonnenen Bewegungsgleichungen lieferten in ganz überraschender Weise für den Umlauf eines Planeten um die Sonne eine Bewegung des Perihels, die für den Merkur vollständig mit der beobachteten übereinstimmt, während sie bei den entfernteren Planeten einen so geringen Betrag ausmacht, daß sie auch da mit den nicht mit völliger Sicherheit ermittelten kleinen Bewegungen übereinstimmen würde.

Bevor wir uns der hohen wissenschaftlichen Bedeutung der heutigen Sonnenfinsternis zuwenden, wollen wir in wenigen Sätzen das Wesen des Relativitätsprinzips erläutern. Unstreitig sind alle Beobachtungen und Wahrnehmungen relativ, d. h. abhängig von den Bewegungs- und Geschwindigkeitsunterschieden, die zwischen dem beobachteten Vorgang und dem Beobachter bestehen. Betrachten wir z. B. den freien Fall eines Körpers auf der Erde und nehmen wir an, daß diesen Vorgang einmal jemand beobachtet, der ruhig auf der Erde steht, und das andere Mal jemand, der sich etwa mit 100 000 Kilometer in der Sekunde von der Erde fortbewegt. Dann ist es ohne weiteres klar, daß beide Beobachter verschiedene Fallzeiten und Räume feststellen würden. Einstein hat nun gezeigt, daß eine Zeitangabe niemals etwas Absolutes und für alle Orte in gleicher Weise Zutreffendes ist, sondern nur in Verbindung mit dem Bewegungszustande eines Körpers einen bestimmten Sinn haben kann.

Nachdem er so klargelegt hatte, daß man den Begriff der Zeit und der Länge relativieren, d. h. abhängig von dem Bezugssystem annehmen muß, ist er weiter dazu übergegangen, auf den Zusammenhang zwischen Gravitation und Trägheit im Lichte dieser Relativitätstheorie hinzuweisen. Er veranschaulicht das durch folgende Betrachtungen. Wenn ein irgendwo in der Welt in einem geschlossenen Kasten befindlicher Physiker beobachtete,

daß alle sich selbst überlassenen Gegenstände in eine bestimmte Beschleunigung geraten, etwa stets mit konstanter Beschleunigung auf den Boden des Kastens fallen, so könnte er diese Erscheinung auf zwei Arten erklären: Erstens könnte er annehmen, daß sein Kasten auf einem Himmelskörper ruhe, und den Fall der Gegenstände auf dessen Gravitationswirkung zurückführen. Zweitens aber könnte er auch annehmen, daß der Kasten sich mit konstanter Beschleunigung nach „oben“ bewegt; dann wäre das Verhalten der „fallenden“ Gegenstände durch ihre Trägheit erklärt. Beide Erklärungen sind genau gleich möglich, jener Physiker hat kein Mittel, zwischen ihnen zu entscheiden. Nimmt man an, daß alle Beschleunigungen relativ sind, daß also ein Unterscheidungsmittel prinzipiell fehlt, so läßt sich dies verallgemeinern: an jedem Punkt des Universums kann man die beobachtete Beschleunigung eines sich selbst überlassenen Körpers entweder als Trägheitswirkung auffassen oder als Gravitationswirkung, d. h. man kann entweder sagen: „das Bezugssystem, von dem aus ich den Vorgang beobachte, ist beschleunigt“ oder: „der Vorgang findet in einem Gravitationsfelde statt“. Die Identität der trägen und der gravitierenden Masse ist, wie M. Schlick in seinem Schriften „Raum und Zeit in der gegenwärtigen Physik“ ausführt, der eigentliche Erfahrungsgrund, der uns erst das Recht gibt zu der Annahme oder der Behauptung, daß die Trägheitswirkungen, die wir an einem Körper beobachten, auf den Einfluß zurückzuführen sind, den er von anderen Körpern erleidet. E i n s t e i n ist es nun wirklich gelungen, ein Grundgesetz aufzustellen, das Trägheits- und Gravitationserscheinungen in gleicher Weise umfaßt.

Denken wir wieder an den beschleunigten Kasten und nehmen an, daß er an seiner Seitenwand ein Loch habe. Welchen Weg legt nun ein Lichtstrahl, der senkrecht zur Bewegungsrichtung in den Kasten fällt, gegenüber dem Kasten zurück? In einem gleichförmig bewegten System läuft er geradlinig, in einem beschleunigten System wird ein quer zur Bewegungsrichtung laufender Lichtstrahl demnach zurückbleiben. Sind nun die Gesetze der Schwerefelder wie die bewegter Systeme, so muß auch im Schwerefelde der Lichtstrahl in der Richtung der Schwerkraft aus der geraden Bahn abgelenkt werden. Das folgt aus Einsteins Theorien, und diese Folgerung hat auch der Forscher gezogen. Auf der Erde selbst ist eine solche Messung nicht durchzuführen, da ihr Gravitationsfeld nicht stark genug ist. Wohl aber könnte das Gravitationsfeld der Sonne dazu ausreichen. Das Licht eines Sternes, das sehr nahe an der Sonne vorbeikommt, müßte durch ihr Gravitationsfeld um $1,74''$ aus seiner Bahn abgelenkt werden. Die Beobachtungen der Astronomen bei der heutigen Sonnenfinsternis — die Sonne ist infolgedessen genügend abgeblendet, um eine Beobachtung des reichen Feldes von Sternen in ihrer Nähe zuzulassen — sollen nun den Beweis erbringen, ob Einsteins Voraussage richtig ist. Damit wäre zugleich eine neue experimentelle Stütze für die Relativitätstheorie geschaffen, die

berufen ist, unsere bisherigen Raum- und Zeitbegriffe wesentlich zu beeinflussen.”

Carrying on the tradition of the literary tributes paid to Newton in Edmund Halley’s *Ode to Newton*,⁹ and Voltaire’s *Letters Concerning the English Nation*, Alexander Moszkowski promoted the cult of Einstein with a tribute to Albert Einstein in the *Berliner Tageblatt* (which Jewish racist Zionist Theodor Herzl called a “Jewish paper”¹⁰), Volume 48, Number 476, on 8 October 1919,

“Die Sonne bracht’ es an den Tag!

Von

Alexander Moszkowski.

Sie wurde befragt, sie hat Antwort gegeben, und das Echo ihres Orakels wird durch die Jahrhunderte klingen. Wir Menschen von heute stehen dem Ereignis selbst noch zu nahe, als daß wir dessen weitreichende Bedeutung vollkommen ermessen könnten. Aber wir erinnern uns der Ansage des Goetheschen *Ariel*:

Phöbus’ Räder rollen prasselnd,
Welch Getöse bringt das Licht!
Es trommet, es posaunet,
Auge blinzelt und Ohr erstaunet!

Es wird des Erstaunens kein Ende sein über diese Sonnenbotschaft, die sich an das Zentrum menschlichen Denkens wandte. Wir wollten wissen: Ist die Verfassung der Welt begreiflich? Und Phöbus sprach: Sie ist es, ist dem menschlichen Verstand zugänglich, wenn die neue allgemeine Relativitätslehre *Einstein’s* aller Betrachtung zugrunde gelegt wird.

Am 29. Mai dieses Jahres wurde die Sonne zur Zeit einer totalen Bedeckung befragt. Ihre Antwort bestand zunächst nur in einigen Lichtpunkten auf photographischen Platten. Aber in diesen Punkten lag die Erklärung des Geheimnisses beschlossen. Es bedurfte noch allerfeinster Messungen, um diese Punktierschrift in eine gültige physikalische Erklärung zu übersetzen. Zwei englische Expeditionen, nach Brasilien und nach Innerafrika, hatten es übernommen, dies zu entwickeln, zu messen und auszudeuten. Vor wenigen Tagen traf die Bestätigung ein: Die Lichtbotschaft steht in *vollstem Einklang* mit der Annahme jenes Weltsystems, wie es von *Einstein’s* Lehre gefordert wird. Und diese selbst, aus Gedankenexperimenten entsprossen, ist nunmehr auch durch das sinnlich erfäßbare, astronomische Experiment unerschütterlich bewiesen.

Nur mit wenigen Worten sei das Wesen dieses Experimentes andeutungsweise erläutert. Nach Einstein begeben sich die kosmischen Ereignisse in einer vierdimensionalen Raumzeitwelt, innerhalb deren die Newtonsche Bewegungslehre der Himmelskörper nur eine Annäherung darstellt. Zur Erfassung der allgemeinen Vorgänge bedarf es der Einführung

einer Ueber-Euklidischen Geometrie, deren Ermittlung von „Weltlinien“ im Raumzeitlichen und der Aufgabe jeder Fernwirkung, deren Annahme eigentlich dem menschlichen Denken widerspricht. Die zuerst so verwirrende, mathematisch verwickelte und deshalb überaus schwierige Lehre verwandelt sich, je mehr man in sie eindringt, in die denkbar lichtvollste *V e r e i n f a c h u n g* des gesamten Weltbildes, in eine wirklich restlose Erfassung der letzten kosmischen Fragen.

Schon einmal hatte diese Lehre in einem früheren Stadium ihrer Entwicklung eine sichtbare Kreuzprobe bestanden, damals, als es ihr gelang, gewisse, sonst ganz unerklärliche Anomalien in der Bahn des Planeten Merkur als durchaus normal und mit der Berechnung übereinstimmend zu erweisen. Aber hinter dieser Kreuzprobe stand eine zweite, die den Lichtstrahl selbst auf seiner Wanderung durch die Welt verfolgen sollte. Eine Ungeheuerlichkeit tat sich auf: Bestand diese Lehre zu Recht, dann mußte sich in sehr starken Gravitationsfeldern — also etwa beim Durchgang in Sonnennähe — eine merkliche *K r ü m m u n g* der Lichtstrahlen herausstellen. Und eben hierauf waren die Anstrengungen der beiden englischen Expeditionen gerichtet. Es galt die *Abbiegung* der Lichtstrahlen zu erweisen, die, von Fixsternen ausgesendet, an der verdunkelten Sonne vorbeistreichen, um unser Auge oder — experimentell sicherer — die photographische Platte zu erreichen. Fand diese Abbiegung wirklich statt, so mußte sich dies dadurch offenbaren, daß auf der Platte die Sterne weiter auseinanderstanden, als man nach ihrer wirklichen Position erwarten konnte.

Um wieviel wohl? Die Berechnung verlangte unglaubliche Feinheiten des Ausmaßes. Man stelle sich den ganzen Himmelsbogen vor, in Grade eingeteilt: dann ergibt eine Mondbreite etwa einen halben Grad. Hiervon der dreißigste Teil, eine Bogenminute, ist noch gut vorstellbar. Aber hiervon wiederum der sechzigste Teil, die Bogensekunde, entzieht sich nahezu aller sinnlichen Erfäßbarkeit. Und auf dieses Kleinmaß kam es an: denn die in reiner Gedankenarbeit entwickelte Theorie sagte eine Ablenkung von ein und sieben Zehntel Bogensekunde an. So stand diese Größenordnung auf dem Papier, vorläufig ohne Bewahrheitung durch astronomische Praxis, aber festverankert in einem System unheimlicher Gleichungen, die in ihrer Gesamtheit die wahre Ordnung des bewegten Universums verkündigen.

Wirklich, es war etwas viel verlangt von den fernen Welten, denen nunmehr ein blinkendes Zeugnis abverlangt wurde. Sie hatten sich zur Zeit einer totalen Sonnenfinsternis so rundum zu gruppieren, daß sie eben noch leuchtende Lichtpünktchen entwarfen, deren Stellung mit Ja und Nein für die vorausberechnete Größenordnung eintreten sollte. Und zwar mit einem Zeugnis, das im Bejahungsfall eine durch Jahrtausende überlieferte Grundanschauung des Menschenhirns überwältigte.

Wie denn? Ein Sternstrahl soll krumm werden können? Widerstreitet daß nicht dem Elementarbegriff der geraden, der kürzesten Linie, für die wir ja keine anschaulichere Vorstellung besitzen, als eben im Strahl? Hatte doch

Leonardo da Vinci die Gerade direkt so definiert, so benannt als die „*linea radiosa*“!

Aber für diese vermeintliche Selbstverständlichkeit ist in der vom Forschergeist Einsteins durchstrahlten Welt kein Platz mehr. Die am 29. Mai befragte Konstellation hat die Entscheidung geliefert. Mehr als ein Vierteljahr hat es gedauert, ehe die Punktrunen genügend entziffert waren. Jetzt ist die Bestätigung eingetroffen: die Sternstrahlen werden tatsächlich im Schwerefeld der Sonne abgelenkt, sie zeigen eine Krümmung mit der Hohlseite zur Sonne gewendet, so daß sich der scheinbare Abstand der geprüften Sterne vergrößert: und dies innerhalb gewisser Beobachtungsgrenzen, die Einsteins vorausgesagter Größenordnung entsprechen. Was nur dann möglich ist, wenn das Fundamentalgerüst Einsteins, die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie, als die wahre Verfassung des Universums angesprochen wird.

Galt dies dem mathematischen Denker, dem strengen Physiker schon vorher als Gewißheit, so wird fortan auch für den Erkenntnistheoretiker der letzte Zweifel die letzte Zuflucht zu räumen haben. Ja, man darf voraussagen, daß der größte Gewinn aus der jetzt völlig sichergestellten Einsicht dereinst dem Philosophen zufallen wird, der darauf ausgeht erkenntnistheoretisch das allereinfachste, mit allen Beobachtungstatsachen restlos harmonisierende Weltbild zu entwerfen. Er wird auf Kant fußend, aber über Kant hinauswachsend die Idealformen der Anschauung in Raum und Zeit erhöhen und emporläutern zum vierdimensionalen Ordnungsschema, in welchem der letzte Restsinnlicher Schlacke abzufallen hat vor der reinen Erkenntnis des wahren raum-zeitlichen Weltgefüges. Wenn dereinst ein bestimmter Augenblick bezeichnet werden soll als historisches Zeichen für die große Wandlung in menschlicher Anschauung gegenüber dem Universum, so wird manch einer den zuvor genannten Tag als das deutlichste Merkdatum wählen. Und wenn er ihn nennt, so wird er hinzufügen, daß eine letzte Wahrheit entschleierbar war über Galilei und Newton, über Kant hinaus, bestätigt durch einen Orakelspruch aus der Tiefe des Himmels, in lesbarer Strahlschrift. Das Uebereinstimmen einer Menschenforschung mit der Wirklichkeit des Weltgeschehens — „*Die Sonne bracht' es an den Tag!*““

Shortly after this article appeared, Heinrich Zangger wrote to Albert Einstein on 22 October 1919,

“I already filled the official's heads with the bent light, years ago.—Proclaimed Galileo-Newton-Einstein—so if you want the appointment, or keep it, resp., it would be a joy to all.”¹¹

Friedrich Karl Wiebe¹² alleged in 1939, that the press in post-World War One Germany, and with it public opinion, was largely controlled by traitorous Jews who cheapened the medium with sensationalism—by Jews who allegedly only cared about Jewish interests and who would pursue those perceived self-interests at the

expense of other Germans. Jews have long been noted for making judgments based on selfish interests to the exclusion of broader societal interests, or pure principles, or a sense of fairness, as is typified by the common racist Jewish expression, “Is it good for the Jews?”

Though Wiebe only incidentally mentions the publisher Julius Springer, a man who was very influential in promoting Einstein and who sought to discredit Einstein’s critics, Wiebe does name the publishing house of the Jewish brothers Ullstein, and the publishing house of the “Eastern Jew” Rudolf Mosse. Wiebe states that the *Berliner Morgenpost*, which he alleged had the largest circulation of any German newspaper, was controlled by Jews, as was the politically influential *Vossische Zeitung*, under editor-in-chief Geog Bernhard. The *Berliner Tageblatt*, which served as spokesman for Germany abroad and was often quoted in America and England, was led by editor-in-chief Theodor Wolff, and the *Acht-Uhr-Abendblatt* also had a Jewish chief editor. One might, together with Theodor Herzl,¹³ add the *Frankfurter Zeitung* to the list of “Jewish newspapers”. Many of these papers promoted Einstein and personally attacked his critics. Wiebe alleged that Jews ran the *Reichverband der Deutschen Presse* and the *Verein Berliner Presse*. Wiebe names Georg Bernhard, Theodor Wolff and Maximilian Harden as Jews who had “stabbed Germany in the back” following World War One. He noted that historian Friedrich Thimme dubbed Harden, “the Judas of the German people”.

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

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

manufacturers to produce weapons for both sides. The German-Jewish press, which had initially beat the war drums louder than anyone else, teamed up with leading Jews in the German Government at the end of the war and demanded that Germany submit to the demands of the Allies, give up vast territories and make the reparations payments. The German-Jewish press and Jews in the German Government, many of whom were the same persons who had most boisterously called upon the German People to go to war, insisted that the Germans accept responsibility for causing the war, though they had not caused it. Etc. Etc. Etc.

England was not immune to the same processes of Socialism which brought about the ruin of Germany and Russia at the hands of the Jewish bankers. Socialist had long attacked British industrialization and sought to undermine British society so that they could overthrow the British Government. On 17 March 1919, *The London Times* reported on page 18,

“AN ALBERT HALL SPEECH.
SOCIALIST’S DEFENCE.

At Bow-street Police Court on Saturday, before Sir John Dickinson, WILLIAM FORSTER WATSON, 37, turner’s engineer, of Enderwick-road, Hornsey, and Featherstone-buildings, Holborn, was charged, on remand, under the Defence of the Realm Regulations, with making seditious utterances at a meeting, convened by the British Socialist Party, held at the Albert Hall on February 8. In a speech the defendant, it was alleged, urged the audience to seize upon every little bit of industrial unrest, and to make demands upon the employers with which they could not comply.

Sir Archibald Bodkin conducted the case on behalf of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

Chief Inspector Parker, of the Special Branch at Scotland Yard, produced some documents found in the possession of the defendant, and in cross-examination said the fact that the defendant had recently started a paper had nothing whatever to do with this prosecution.

At the close of the case for the prosecution the defendant pointed to the few persons in the public part of the Court and asked that some of the large crowd waiting outside might be admitted. He gave an assurance that, so far as he had any influence, the untoward demonstration in Court last week would not be repeated.

The Magistrate said that such a demonstration would never be allowed again in any Court. He refused to permit the admission of any of the public other than a few persons whom the defendant had specially mentioned.

For the defence, Mr. Edward Charles Fairchild, Chairman of the Albert Hall meeting, said that the impression left upon his mind by the defendant’s speech was that if there should be continual encroachments upon liberty, the workers would be ultimately entitled to resist, but there was no specific call to workers to arm themselves for purposes of immediate violence.

The Rev. Cavendish Moxon, a curate of the Church of England, said that

he was not in favour of aggressive violence in any movement and was not an extreme pacifist. The defendant's speech, taken as a whole, did not impress him as being an incitement to violence. One of his phrases, 'Arm yourselves if necessary,' meant, in the witness's view, that if the worst came to the worst, the workers would have to arm themselves in self-defense.

The Magistrate quoted from the transcript of the defendant's speech, and asked the witness if he considered it right to make demands upon the employing class for such conditions as would make it impossible for them to carry on.

The witness replied that that was the Socialist view, and he agreed with it in the sense of substituting the control of the workers for the control of the masters.

Ex-Inspector John Syme, who said he was now engaged in 'Exposing the Home Office,' expressed the opinion that the defendant's speech was not meant to be taken literally. The defendant certainly did not create the impression that he was advocating the immediate purchase of revolvers, guns, and such things.

The defendant.—There are plenty doing that to-day without my advocating it.

Other evidence for the defence having been given, the defendant was again remanded on bail in two sureties of £100 each.

On leaving the Court the defendant was loudly cheered by a large crowd of sympathizers."

Infamous British Communist John Spargo admitted in 1929 that Socialists were always out to destroy society so as to leave it ripe for revolution, and one might add that they blamed the ills that they deliberately caused on those who were trying to prevent them—they covertly caused the People to suffer in the name of a new "Utopia" to come,

"[T]he sooner the process of degradation is effected the better, for the sooner will the agony be over and the glorious consummation of Socialism be realized. [***] Haters of All Social Reforms. That logic controlled the policy of British Socialism in the days of my youth. That is why we busied ourselves distributing leaflets bearing the significant title, 'To Hell With Trade Unionism!' and appropriately printed in red. That also is why we inveighed against life insurance in our propaganda with all the bitterness of which we were capable. Life insurance was a protective device against poverty, an ameliorative measure designed to avert the poverty and degradation without which our Utopia could not be reached. In the same spirit and under the compulsion of the same Marxian dogma we opposed every form of thrift, all philanthropy and social reforms calculated to lessen social misery and improve the conditions of life and labor. We regarded all these things with the hate and horror which religious fanatics might feel towards deliberate human thwarting of the clearly manifested design of

God.”¹⁴

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

In 1933, the Jews Abraham Myerson and Isaac Goldberg alleged many of the same facts Wiebe would later allege, though they offered an entirely different perspective on the same issues. Myerson and Goldberg wrote, in 1933, in their book, *The German Jew: His Share in Modern Culture*,

“The circles of criticism and of journalism in Germany were, up to the incursions of Hitler, predominantly Jewish. Julius Bab, Alfred Kerr, Fritz Engel, Felix Holländer, Felix Salten (author of *Bambi*), Siegmund Freund, Emil Faktor. . . the roster is long; nor have we mentioned critics from the professorial fold, such as Richard M. Meyer.

Publishing in Germany has largely been built up by a Jewish passion for commercial pursuits that parallels the passion of intellect so freely evidenced in the Jew. Through such powerful interests as those of the Lachmann-Mosse family and the estate of Leopold Ullstein, the largest publishing firm in Germany, the press and the magazine world have been controlled by German Jews. Before it was ‘coordinated’ into the Nationalist régime, the house of Ullstein employed almost eight thousand persons, and issued almost a hundred newspapers and periodicals. Ullstein (1826-99) passed the fast-growing business on to five industrious sons.

Rudolph Mosse (1843-1920) founded the *Berliner Tageblatt* in 1872. It was, until the descent of Hitler upon the Jews, one of the great newspapers of the world, known to all journalists as a palladium of liberalism. . . . Naturally, although these newspapers and their allied interests employed a host of Gentile workers, there were countless Jews in their offices. Among editors and journalistic powers were to be found such gifted paladins as Maximilian Harden and Theodor Wolff. The statistical fact is that the Jewish mind, for reasons that have impelled it to the other artistic and literary pursuits, engages naturally in journalism and criticism. Even so anti-Semitic a writer as Friedrich von Oppeln-Bronowski has been quoted as blaming, not the Jews, but the inertia of his fellow-Germans. ‘The outcry of the conservative press against the literary incursions of the Jew reminds me of the clamour raised by the inferior business man against his more clever, ‘unfair’ competitor. Instead of making complaint, it had better improve itself. If it is true that the Jews have assumed so disproportionate a role in journalism, we can undoubtedly connect the fact with their exclusion under the old régime from the higher governmental positions.’ [*Footnote*: See I. E. Poritzky: ‘The Jew in the Intellectual Life of Germany,’ *Menorah Journal*, Vol. XII, No. 6 (1926). I refer to this article those who are in search of many

Jewish names.]

In book-publishing the Jew has become a power in Germany since 1910. It is interesting to observe that at about this same time the Jew in the United States was entering upon a distinguished career in the publication of belles-lettres. In Germany the house of S. Fischer, founded in 1886, may stand for a quasi-hegemony that includes such important firms as Drei Masken, Bruno Cassirer, Kurt Wolff, Paul Zsolnay, Felix Bloch Erben, and Oesterheld & Company.

Incidentally, the famous Universal Edition, Vienna, publisher of modernist scores, though by no means confining itself to the musical advance guard, is presided over by Dr. Alfred Kalmus.

One can, therefore, understand the exaggerated outcry of Herr Bartels—though hardly sympathize with his bigoted implications—when, after descanting upon the prominence of Jews in the art and the business of letters, he is suddenly led to exclaim: ‘There is no doubt that on the eve of the war our entire German life was no longer German in temper.’ The situation, to him, appeared so critical that, instead of commending the universality of outlook displayed by all these Jewish publishers—can it be only a commercial accident that the Jewish firms in other countries display a like interest in publishing works of international spirit and origin?—Bartels hinted at some sort of apostasy on the part of those Gentile writers who allowed themselves to be published by Jews. These leading publishers were not only providers of books; at times they were the supporters of movements.

It is only half metaphorical to declare that, whether in the higher reaches of literature or in the forum of journalism, the German Jew has mingled his blood with printer’s ink in the service of German culture. The cruelty of a régime may hold the Jew at once excommunicated and incommunicado; not by fiat, not by a conflagration of books, can it exterminate the past. Books burn; men burn; passions and ideas are immortal.”¹⁵

With Einstein’s blessing, the Jewish litterateur Alexander Moszkowski published a sensationalistic and hagiographic book, which advertised Einstein to the public in an unprecedented and shameless way: *Einstein Einblicke in seine Gedankenwelt Gemeinverständliche Betrachtungen über die Relativitätstheorie und ein neues Weltsystem Entwickelt aus Gesprächen mit Einstein*, Hoffman und Campe, Hamburg, (1921); in English translation, *Einstein: The Searcher*, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1921). This self-aggrandizing book recorded Moszkowski’s conversations with Einstein, and presented Einstein to the public as if he were a god condescending to speak to mere mortals.

The public was vulnerable to such hype. Heike Kamerlingh Onnes wrote to Albert Einstein on 8 February 1920, as if Einstein were the law giver Moses,

“In my imagination I can already see you at our university’s venerable rostrum that was born of the struggle for freedom of conscience,^[2] smiling down at us and telling us about your communion with the gods and about the

fine interplay of harmony by which hints of Nature's laws are revealed, your kind eyes sparkling with delight!"¹⁶

Though Jewish litterateurs were infamous for overrating Spinoza's philosophy, Mendelssohn's music, Marx's and Lasalle's political philosophies, Theodor Lessing's *Nathan der Weise*, Bergson's philosophy, etc.; that shameless self-glorification did not begin to approach the magnitude and the absurdity of the promotion of the Jewish racist Albert Einstein. Many leading scientists found such unprecedented advertising for Einstein distasteful. In 1924, Ernst Gehrcke preserved conclusive evidence that Moszkowski's book was promoted in the daily newspapers as part of an overall plan to promote Albert Einstein to the gullible public through intensive advertising.¹⁷

As revealed in their letters to Albert Einstein,¹⁸ the Jewish physicist Max Born and his Jewish wife Hedwig knew that this unprecedented and tasteless self-promotion would occur and that it would vindicate Einstein's critics. The Borns, who were apostate Jews, went to the extremes of threatening Einstein in order to prevent the publication of Moszkowski's book. Max Born even requested permission from Einstein to sue Moszkowski in order to block the publication of his book. The Borns had experience with Moszkowski in the past, and they knew that he would shamelessly hype Einstein for personal profit—profits the Borns wanted all to themselves. The Borns knew that Moszkowski's book would serve as proof for the outspoken Einstein critics Paul Weyland, Ernst Gehrcke and Philipp Lenard that Einstein was advertising himself to the public. The Borns, who were peddling a book of their own, *Einstein's Theory of Relativity*,¹⁹ and who were themselves seeking to profiteer off of the Einstein brand, failed in their efforts to prevent the release of Moszkowski's work.

The press and elements of the Physics community did indeed create an "Einstein 'brand'" which has lasted. Peter Rogers, editor of *Physics World*, stated in his editorial in the August, 2004, issue of *Physics World*,

"His legacy as the greatest physicist of all time is guaranteed, despite the regular claims that 'Einstein was wrong' or that he stole his ideas from someone else. The real opportunity presented by 2005 is the chance to sell Einstein and physics to the young. Physicists have to realize that physics needs the 'outside world' more than it needs physics. [***] Physics as a subject is lucky in having Einstein as a 'brand' [.]"²⁰

Rodgers wrote, in September of 2003,

"[. . .]Einstein developed the special theory of relativity in 1905. This potted history is true, of course, but it overlooks the contributions of Poincare and Lorentz. However, if every article had to give full credit for every advance in the history of physics, there would be little room for what is going on today."²¹

Rodgers also stated, in November of 2003,

“Fabrication, plagiarism and a range of other offences—duplicate submissions, conflicts of interest and referee misconduct—were among the topics discussed at a recent workshop on scientific misconduct [***] Failure to cite the work of others adequately is also an offence [***] [J]ust one more major case of fabrication or plagiarism would be very bad news for our subject.”²²

The Einstein brand was already established and used to market products in January of 1920, shortly after the press hyped Einstein and the theory of relativity in November and December of 1919. Alexander Eliasberg, a Jew who wore his Jewishness on his sleeve, wrote to Albert Einstein on 27 January 1920,

“This new type of monthly, which will serve a very large readership, is characterized by its emphasis on the sciences—of which your illustrious name serves as a symbol[.]”²³

In letter to Albert Einstein, Paul Epstein described Alexander Eliasberg, who was Epstein’s cousin, in the following terms, in the hopes that it would impress the Jewish racist and segregationist Albert Einstein,

“Eliasberg is a Jew of nationalistic bent, who stresses his Jewishness at every opportunity that presents itself. His name is emblazoned on the cover of the Jewish monthly *Jüdische Monatshefte*; furthermore, he has published a library’s worth of translations from Yiddish.”²⁴

The Borns had a vested interest in maintaining the “Einstein myth”. Einstein, himself, wrote,

“There you [Max Born] are, giving relativity lectures to stave off bankruptcy of the institute[.]”²⁵

Hedwig Born’s father delighted in the attention paid to Einstein in the press, because it made him proud as a Jew and as a German to see the world’s scientists bow down to Einstein. Viktor G. Ehrenberg, Hedwig’s father, wrote to Einstein on 23 November 1919,

“So it uplifts the heart and strengthens one’s faith in the future of mankind when one sees the researchers of all nations prostrating themselves before a man of Jewish blood, who thinks and writes in the German language, in full recognition of his greatness.”²⁶

Paul Oppenheim also took pride in the fact that a Jew and a German was receiving a great deal of positive public attention. He wrote Albert Einstein,

“The purpose of these lines is to congratulate you from the bottom of my heart and to express quite artlessly the pure joy that we have such a man among ‘us’—in the double sense.”²⁷

Alexander Moszkowski was a Jewish litterateur and journalist. It had often been alleged that Jews were guilty of self-advertisement, sought to control professorships in Germany and dominate entire fields of research through corrupt means, and that there was alliance between literary and journalistic Jews—like Moszkowski—and professors—like Einstein—to market themselves to the public. For example, the primary exponent of the modern racial anti-Jewish sentiments that evolved among Hegelian revolutionaries, Zionists, Socialists and Communists in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries;²⁸ Eugen Karl Dühring wrote in the 1880's, decades before Moszkowski published his hagiographic book sanctifying Einstein:

“The harmony of professors and Jews is characteristic for both parts. Incidentally, the Jews also press industriously towards university professorships; for they know that there is in this sphere something corrupt to capitalise on. Ruin allures them here too, as everywhere. In turn, the professors make use of the Jews to let the rotten structure be displayed through bold advertisement as a most highly upright and strong one. They even flirt with the literary Jews and flatter them already so that the latter may, through their press and their journals, give to the little professorial authority the varnish which these people appointed to the lectern need very much indeed. The Jews for their part, however, make a business once again through this habilitation in society. In this way they exploit for themselves not only the parties but also one of the most important branches of administration in which they become most harmful, namely that of higher education. [***] But the Germans would, however, indeed not like to forget, in the long run, their ancient forests in which they settled affairs with the Romans, to dutifully let Sinai and the Jewish blood rule. They have too much organic politics of action, and the politics of the Jews consists always only of one thing, namely of the advertisement for their people. This has revealed itself even in Messieurs Gambetta and Disraeli. [***] If the Jews in the newspapers cannot push any longer for the bad products of their people and of their comrades into the advertisement-organs and, at the same time, silence the good and suppress it through distortion, the Jewish or judaised literature will no longer appear anywhere with its wretchedness. It must, as an artificial product of the Jewish advertisement, fall into nothing, if the support of this insolent Jewish advertisement is removed which, where it suits it, raises the most inadequate daily publication to the heavens. Such Jewish advertisement manages to proclaim a subordinate Jewish litterateur or parliamentarian as a great publicist or politician, who exercises a most decisive influence on the development of at least an entire field if not indeed of the entire culture. In general, all other advertisements are strongly affected if the newspaper Jews do not have them any longer in their hands. What sort

of advertisement has not been made by the latter in the newspapers, for example, for the most recent German legislation procedure of Jewish stamp, and how these press-Jews have glorified everything to the public before its introduction and, afterwards, when everybody could grasp tangibly its uselessnesses, extenuated it according to their ability! If the newspaper power remains a Jewish power, then in literature and politics, indeed even in the actual science, the most shameless advertisement is made for everything which emerges either from the Jews themselves or from those who side with the Jews, thus from actual Jewish comrades. On the contrary, the really preferable and in general everything good and honorable—to which the Jews already have an aversion from inherited instinct even when it does not have the least to do with pro or con in relation to the Jews—is basically and in an artificial way thrown aside. That however which produced from the character of the modern peoples and so is an especial honour for the nations is in every case devalued where it cannot be silenced. If the nations therefore wish that among them a public word may still be possible for the appropriate evaluation of their best people, they must free themselves from the Jewish press.”²⁹

Dühring gave his accounts credence by citing Jewish British Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli, who knew in 1844 that the European revolutions of 1848 were about to occur under Jewish leadership. Disraeli wrote,

““You never observe a great intellectual movement in Europe in which the Jews do not greatly participate. The first Jesuits were Jews; that mysterious Russian Diplomacy which so alarms Western Europe is organized and principally carried on by Jews; that mighty revolution which is at this moment preparing in Germany, and which will be, in fact, a second and greater Reformation, and of which so little is as yet known in England, is entirely developing under the auspices of Jews, who almost monopolize the professorial chairs of Germany. Neander the founder of Spiritual Christianity, and who is Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Berlin, is a Jew. Benary, equally famous, and in the same University, is a Jew. Wehl, the Arabic Professor of Heidelberg, is a Jew. Years ago, when I was in Palestine, I met a German student who was accumulating materials for the History of Christianity, and studying the genius of the place; a modest and learned man. It was Wehl; then unknown, since become the first Arabic scholar of the day, and the author of the life of Mahomet. But for the German professors of this race, their name is Legion. I think there are more than ten at Berlin alone.[’]”³⁰

Einstein’s correspondence is filled with discussions about professorships and other positions of influence—as one would expect from a very well-connected professor, regardless of his or her ethnic origin. However, Einstein, who was a racist Zionist, stated that he preferred Jews for his friends and he also stated that he

considered all Jews to be his brothers.³¹

In 1930, some German Jews recognized the danger of Zionist racism and demanded that Albert Einstein stop using his scientific fame to promote racism, disloyalty and “interracial” strife. *The New York Times* reported on 7 December 1930 on page 11,

“The National German-Jewish Union, a small group of extreme nationalist and anti-Zionist Jews, protested against Professor Einstein using his world-fame as a scientist for ‘propagating Zionism.’”

After the Second World War, Jews again criticized Einstein for his nationalistic Zionism. Einstein responded,

“In my opinion condemning the Zionist movement as ‘nationalistic’ is unjustified. [***] Thus already our precarious situation forces us to stand together irrespective of our citizenship.”³²

Einstein believed that “affirmative action” was needed and justified to balance the discrimination Jews faced in Europe. He was especially concerned that a “Jewish university” be founded in Palestine to provide an opportunity for higher education to the Jews of Eastern Europe. Einstein and his friends attempted to fill universities, and the editorial staff of publications, with Jewish professors and lecturers who would be agreeable to his personal scientific and political views. Einstein agreed with Dühring that “Jews” exercised an undue influence in the press and Einstein stated that relativity theory was advertised, or rejected, in the press based on political bias. Leading Jews in the press and at the universities had organized to silence Dühring and to destroy his career. They did the same to composer Richard Wagner. The campaign to muzzle Dühring only legitimized Dühring’s beliefs and fueled him on to publish several very influential works against Jews.

1.3 In a Racist Era

There was a panic in the western world following the violent Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in 1917. *The New York Times* in the late teens and early twenties published numerous articles warning of the dangers of Bolshevism. Many conservative German newspapers also tried to rouse public apprehensions over the dangers of the Communist revolution and Einstein was widely seen as an anarchist and a Communist.³³ Max Born wrote, “Einstein was well known to be politically left-wing, if not ‘red’.”³⁴ Einstein put his name to Communist and Socialist causes and both groups actively sought his support, with varying degrees of success.³⁵ When Einstein wanted to visit the United States in the early 1930's many protested against his admission into the country on the grounds that he was a Communist, an anarchist and a Socialist. *The New York Times*, on 4 December 1932, on the front page, stated,

“The board of the National Patriotic Council in a statement today termed Dr.

Einstein ‘a German Bolshevik’ and said his original theory ‘was of no scientific value or purpose, not understandable because there was nothing there to understand.’”

The Patriot of 22 December 1932 published an article “The Visa of Professor Einstein” detailing the objections raised to the granting of a visa to Albert Einstein,

“Professor Einstein has informed the world, through the Press, of his difficulty in getting an American visa in Berlin, owing to the U. S. Consul having been warned that he is an undesirable alien by the American Women’s Patriotic Association. In the end the professor got his visa, and chuckled over the fact that the sentries of America had not given heed to ‘the wise, patriotic ladies,’ but had forgotten the occasion when ‘the Capitol of mighty Rome was once saved by the cackling of its faithful geese.’ The fact is that the patriotic American women had as substantial a reason for giving warning as had the Roman geese. *The Patriot* has given many instances in which Americans had as much right to object to the meddling of Professor Einstein in revolutionary movements on his visits to the U. S. as we have to protest against the Bolshevik finger in the preparation of revolution by British Communists.”³⁶

The *Patriot* article continued with extracts from the law and from the charges, which proved that Einstein was a member of several Communist front organizations and encouraged illegal activities, and that he could not be lawfully admitted into the United States of America. Einstein had influential friends and his record was ignored. The protests that he should not be allowed a visa to come to the United States were ultimately unsuccessful.³⁷ Einstein expressed himself in Marxist terms and his friends as well as his foes recognized the Socialistic tones in his statements in the early 1920’s.³⁸ In 1949, Einstein published an article in the *Monthly Review* in which he advocated Socialism.³⁹ Since both world wars weakened the nations of the world, both wars created an atmosphere where Communism could flourish.

There were vocal advocates of anarchism, Communism, and Socialism in many Jewish communities. Many such individuals were romantic, very good-natured humanitarian people who sought social justice for the poor, and we today enjoy many benefits from their sacrifices. Others were mere opportunists who used Communism as a front to promote themselves into positions of dictatorial power. Perhaps most outside of Bolshevik dominated countries were not the murderous material that the genocidal tyrants Lenin and Stalin were. However, in many circles all Communists were seen as dangerous propagandists for imposed atheism, murderous revolution and a conspiracy to rule the world in a unified reign of tyranny led by the Jews.

There certainly were Communist elements in the world striving for the horrific goals of imposed atheism, murderous revolution and a conspiracy to rule the world by a “proletariat” which was in reality an obedient army of the subjugated. Mass murderers like Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, Béla Kun, Joseph Stalin and Mao Tse-Tung,

did the bidding of Jewish financiers who placed them in power to ruin Gentile nations, destroy Gentile religions and capture Gentile wealth. These assertions will be proven further on in this text. These were murderers whom Einstein admired for their political savvy, while disagreeing with some of their ideals.⁴⁰ Though the lower level Communists can be forgiven as deceived Utopian idealists, the upper levels Jews who financed and directed them were out to fulfill horrific Jewish prophecies, and the childish ideals of Communism were but bait in a vile trap. The worst of the Communists were those directly under the control of Jewish bankers, the openly genocidal Bolsheviks who had already slain tens of millions of Slavic Christians by the early 1920's. Einstein wrote to Hedwig and Max Born on 27 January 1920 that he found the Bolsheviks not unappealing.⁴¹

Bolshevik atrocities shocked the free world. The Bolsheviks mass murdered tens of millions of innocent people and criminalized Christianity. The Bolsheviks were conspicuously and predominantly led and financed by Jews. Many have tied the dogmatism and cruelty of Communism to the dogmatism and cruelty of Judaism. The primitive and dogmatic dictator cults of personality, which are common to Communist régimes, mirror obeisance to a vengeful and jealous Jewish God and the ascendance of the Jewish King as the Messiah.

Jews have been praying for thousands of years for a Jewish Messiah to arrive and wipe out the Gentile nations, religions, cultures, and, eventually, peoples. The fact that leading Jews were accomplishing these Jewish Messianic ends through Communism concerned many people around the world. Just as the Jewish religion asserts that there can only be one God to rule the universe, the Jews have chosen themselves to rule over mankind and to destroy it. The relevant religious passages which evince these facts will be quoted later on in this text. When responsible persons voiced their legitimate concerns about Jewish Bolshevik destruction, they were often smeared in the Jewish press around the world as if “anti-Semites”.

However, Jewish Bolshevik Zionist apologists were free to publicly identify the identities of Bolshevism, Christianity and their common source, genocidal Judaism, with its prophetic myths—as did “Mentor” in 1919. Like many other Zionists, Mentor forecast the Second World War shortly after the First had ended in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 28 March 1919 on pages 9 and 10,

“PEACE, WAR—
AND BOLSHEVISM.
By MENTOR.

SOON after the armistice was signed, a contribution appeared in this column to which the caption, ‘The Oath of the Peoples,’ was rendered. It depicted something of the horrors of modern warfare. Yet ghastly, terrible, as were the facts which it presented, it was manifest that only a tiny corner of the veil was lifted by it which hid from the average man the Jazz Dance of Hell that careered across so much of the world for upwards of four years. It was necessary, in a subsequent article, to declare that although the

war was suspended, it was not yet ended, and that, therefore, the prevailing condition of this and the other belligerent lands was still one of War—War suspended but not ended. It was a necessary reservation that was then made, because it was a reminder that circumstances still obtained which could be met by human beings by no other method than warfare; because, to human beings, there has until now been practically revealed no other. The reminder to which I have referred, if it was necessary—and it was—at the time was made, is even more important at this moment. For four-and-a-half months, representatives of the chief belligerent Powers and delegates of several neutral nations have been foregathering in conference at Paris. The war was constantly heralded as a war to end War. And now, as has been well said, the Peace Conference threatens to produce a peace that will end Peace.

THIS explains to some extent why the war went on as long as it did. Hateful as War must have been to those responsible for it in all the countries engaged in the struggle, they doubtless feared even more than War, once they engaged in it, the laying-down of arms because of the menace which Peace would bring to the future peace of the world. In the four-and-a-half months that have elapsed since the Peace Conference foregathered, the aspirations and ideals, the finely-spun purposes and the nobly-conceived objects which were to be compassed by the Conference, seem gradually to have crumbled like the Dead Sea fruit of the cities of Sin. The great French historian, Lavissee, in an address the other day, described to his pupils at the *Ecole Normale* what has happened. He declared:—

You are following the discussions of the Conference of all the world. The most different voices speak there. Ancient quarrels revive, and visions, egotisms, hatreds, legacies from the past obstruct the future. Yet we hope that the Conference will be able, despite all these difficulties, to secure some articles of the creed of a humanity which is still without doubt at a great distance.

‘Some articles!’ ‘the creed of a humanity, still at a great distance!’ The war which was to end War, is being followed—it is feared—by a peace that will end Peace.

EVERY one of us, even those in whom normally and naturally to them the vein of pessimism runs, hopes that from the *impasse* into which the Conference has been drawn by circumstances which they could not control, conditions which they did not foresee, and events which they could not overcome, may emerge somehow with a better message to mankind than M. Lavissee prognosticates. For the condition of affairs throughout the world to-day is unmatched by any of which, though we search through all history, we can find any parallel. There have been long and exhausting wars ere this, and the belligerents at the end of them have lain prone, under the burden which War entails. This is not the first time that at the end of a long and wearying struggle, in which hundreds and thousands of the world’s youth have been sacrificed to the demons which implant blood-lust in the hearts of men—this is not the first time when great nations have been crippled by war and at the

end found the result of it all so much less than the objects which they sought in beginning the enterprise. But in previous conflicts, there has been just this difference: it was the Dynasts, the Kings, the Emperors, the Tsars, who carried on the war. It was their armies which were employed as instruments of their sovereign will. To-day, all that is altered. When countries go to war now, it is the peoples of those countries that are involved. And there is all the difference in the world between a conflict of Dynasts and a conflict of peoples. War is not ended now at the will of Dynasts and diplomatists. Therein in truth lies the danger of the spirit which has been manifesting itself among the delegates at Paris, and of which M. Lavissee has spoken. Because that spirit is dictated by great popular feelings and passions which Conferences may interpret, but cannot control. There was much force, in the quotation from the great statesman Burke, which was printed in this week's *Jewish World* upon the same point. 'Nothing is more common,' said Burke, 'than for men to wish and call loudly too, for reformation, who, when it arrives, do by no means like the severity of its aspect. Reformation is one of those pieces which must be put at some distance in order to please. Its greatest favourers love it better in the abstract than in the substance.' This was said of individuals. It is proving true also of peoples, and the proceedings at the Conference in Paris are an exemplification of Burke's works,

WHATEVER the faults may be, whether they be in fundamental construction, in spirit, in temper, or merely in method and procedure, which have brought the Paris Conference to its present dilemma, it is perfectly clear that the wild rejoicings of Armistice Day were premature and misplaced, if those engaged in them imagined that the Armistice had brought Peace to the world and that the war had ended War. For we are even now face to face with a war the extent and seriousness of which no man can foresee, and the ultimate effect of which no man can foretell. Bolshevism is the aftermath of the war that has not yet ended though it is suspended; as that in its turn was the catastrophic harvest which the world reaped for generations of political, social, and economic iniquity. The ideas and the ideals of the Western world collided with those of which Tsarist Russia and the Prussia which Bismarck made, were the most conspicuous and the most awful examples. The world of liberalism revolted against the world of retrogression, the world of freedom against the world of oppression, the world of liberty against the world of militarism. That was the conflict for which the two main elements in the war took up arms, and for the prevalence, one way or another, of which, they determined to measure their respective strength; and the fact that Tsarist Russia was opposed to militarist Prussia was only a political accident which does not in the least modify the real meaning of the world-struggle. The instant that Russia joined the *Entente*, Tsarism was to all intents and purposes dead. If the *Entente* did not mean that Tsarism should die, as surely as it meant that Prussian militarism should, then the Russian alliance was an absurdity. But when Russian Tsarism died,

the *Entente* looked upon the fact as a defeat rather than a victory. Shortsightedly, it counted bayonets instead of hearts and machine guns instead of souls. It counted armies instead of principles, and measured battalions instead of the spirit that animates men. With this attitude of the *Entente* towards the Russian Revolution, another struggle for re-birth became inevitable. Bolshevism means the revolution of the people against itself—the revolution of the people against a system for which the people itself became responsible, when War ceased to be the concern merely of Dynasts and Kings and their armies, and became that of the whole of the belligerent peoples who engaged in it. That fact, it is to be feared, was not duly taken into account when the *personnel* of the Conference, which was to end War and initiate the reign of Peace, was chosen; and to that fact, it is probable, must be attributed much of the position in which the Conference now finds itself.

THERE is no need to descant upon the dangers of Bolshevism from many points of view or upon the ruinous upset which its prevalence must mean to society. There is no need to point to Bolshevism as a creed that is detestable, because it is the negation of democracy, meaning as it does the ruling by a single class instead of the government of the people by the people, for the people. But we do not get any nearer to understanding the phenomenon of Bolshevism by merely abusing it, not by calling down imprecations upon the outrageous conduct of those who are leading this strange, wild movement of the masses. It is, to be sure, a *bouleversement* of the ideas that have ruled hitherto, when Bolshevism declares that the man or woman who earns his or her bread by the sweat of his or her brow, is to have first consideration—that he who labours must have preferential treatment by the State. But is no more ridiculous than the system which gives first consideration to those who are idle because they are rich, to those who, however themselves incapable of work, live upon the sweat of the brows of others. It is, as I say, easy to denounce the cruelties, the wicked demoniacal cruelties, if half or quarter of what has been reported of Bolsheviks in Russia be true. But if what has been reported be the fact, is it all really any worse than—is it, to be frank, as bad as—the outrages in Russia for which Tsarism was responsible, the infamous wickedness of the Ochrana, or such abominations as the wholesale evacuation of a quarter of a million of our people under the guise of military necessity, to which, early in the war, it was my painful duty to call attention? The Conference at Paris seems disposed to try to stamp out Bolshevism by military force. But Bolshevism is precisely a protest against military force and all social and economic forces upon which militarism relies. It would seem therefore that the application of further military force is more likely to increase the hold of Bolshevism upon the minds of people rather than to eliminate it.

AND here I must break off—as they say in the House of Commons, I must Adjourn and ask leave to sit again. For Bolshevism has now, and will have increasingly in the future, a particular interest for us Jews, which it were

ridiculous and short-sighted for us to ignore. Because Bolshevism is rightly unpopular and because all men and women of right thinking loathe and abominate the outrage and the murder, the injustice and the terrorism associated with Bolshevism, it were absurd to suppose that we have said the last word about it as Jews by making some such declaration, as I observe Major Lionel de Rothschild ventured the other day, when he said he very much doubted whether any good Jews, any believing Jews, were Bolshevists. This, of course, is, in fact, mere moonshine. The gallant Major was evidently unaware that, to give only one instance, one of the men who stands and has stood as a great Jewish religious force, in America, a ‘believing’ Jew if ever there was one, an earnest high-minded man, although it may be somewhat *bizarre*, had declared publicly his sympathy with Bolshevism. It must be taken for granted that a man like Dr. J. L. Magnes [Magnes was a lecherous agent of Jacob Schiff—the Jewish banker behind the Russian Revolution.] before so proclaiming himself, was satisfied that Bolshevism and Judaism are not as entirely incompatible as Major de Rothschild evidently thinks. In any case we Jews cannot airily dissociate all Jews from Bolshevism by declaring that to be a Bolshevik is necessarily to be a bad Jew. The ranging himself of Dr. J. L. Magnes as a Bolshevik—to say nothing of the many excellent Jews who are Bolsheviks in Eastern Europe to-day—proves the futility of the Major’s observation. No folly could be greater than for us Jews to show the white feather of cowardice in pretending what is untrue, and to declare that the political creed of Bolshevism and the religious creed of Judaism are incompatible merely because the association of Jews with an unpopular movement may be awkward for us. The truth in the long run is our surest buckler. It will never in the end fail us. It were well, then, to examine what the exact meaning of the portent we call Bolshevism is, and why Jews have become associated with it. That I propose to attempt, as the novels say, in the next chapter.”

Note that Mentor sophistically blames the *Entente*, the Allies, for the conditions which precipitated the Second World War, which war Jewish leadership had planned before it began the First. Mentor blames the Czar for Bolshevik atrocities, atrocities which the Czar sought to prevent. Mentor—already in 1919—blamed the Allies for creating the Second World War by rejecting Bolshevism.

However, if the Allies had truly fought against Bolshevism over the objections of vocal and influential Jews like Mentor and Israel Zangwill who asked the Allies to leave Bolshevism to its work,⁴² there would have been no Second World War, and there would have been no Bolshevik Nazis and the lives of tens of millions of Slavs the Bolsheviks—Nazi and Soviet—mass murdered would have been spared. Note that Mentor focuses on abuses the Czar allegedly committed specifically against Jews, and Mentor makes it clear that Bolshevism was an act of retaliation by Jews against the Russian People—and ultimately against all non-Jews—“the people against itself”—the controlled self-destruction of the Gentile Peoples as an act of Jewish revenge. In the name of “peace”, Mentor petitioned the Allies to passively

allow Bolshevism to wage war against the world and mass murder innocent civilians—Gentile civilians.

Mentor wrote in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 4 April 1919 on page 7,

“PEACE, WAR—
AND BOLSHEVISM.

By MENTOR.

WHAT is written here is pendent to what appeared in this column last week. As I intimated, I propose to revert to the subject then referred to.

BOLSHEVISM is at once the most serious menace to, and the best hope of, Civilisation. Paradoxical as this may sound, but a little thought will show it to be abundantly true. The menace of Bolshevism is manifest. It pulls down what, until now, it has shown itself unable efficiently to replace. In the name of freedom, it imposes galling slavery. In the name of humanity, it inflicts the direst evil upon the men, women, and children who come under its sway. It protests against class domination and itself imposes the domination of class wherever it can obtain power. It knows no bounds either in justice or in liberty. It murders, imprisons and tortures with the ruthlessness of an autocracy drunk with new-found authority. It is ruthless, relentless, all-engulfing. It falls upon the country it infects like a dire pestilence which casts people prone. It is a political disease, an economic infliction, a social disaster.

YET, none the less, in Bolshevism there lies, to-day, the hope of Humanity. For in essence, it is the revolt of peoples against the social state, against the evil; the iniquities—and the inequalities—that were crowned by the cataclysm of the War under which the world groaned for upwards of four years. It is a revolution against a social state which suffered Tsarism to exist in Russia and militarism in Prussia and which still allows, alas, so many a crying wrong in countries that plume themselves on their freedom and boast of their liberty. Bolshevism is the signal to mankind to halt in its social, political, and economic ways of old; to stay and examine them in the light of the sacrifice of the millions of youth who have gone down to darkness eternal, of the millions of treasure which war has wasted, and to ponder them in the light of the incalculable, ineffable burden which the years of struggle have placed upon Society, and, heaviest of all, upon the poor—in light of the war which was proof in all surety that the old order was doomed if civilisation was to survive. That Bolshevism broke out first in the country most oppressed is nothing for wonder; it is merely natural. For centuries Russia had been the forcing ground of every infamy imposed by power and every wickedness done in the name of Government. That the creed has spread to a country whose national aspirations were for generations crushed, and where autocracy ruled, is nothing for wonder. Nor is the protest

of Bolshevism merely a matter for Russia and Hungary, or a menace only to bayonet-ridden Germany. It is a challenge to the world—not least to the nations of freedom and liberty. It is a challenge to all the nations including the peoples who nourish liberty and freedom as precious principles, but who have passively allowed a state of affairs to grow and putrefy into the infamies of Russian Tsarism, the iniquity of Hungary, and the wickedness of German militarism; to the world that has suffered Society to fester into these and to break out into the prurient, gaping, sloughing, agonising tumour of such a war as that which is not ended, though it is suspended. And the fact that this protest has been made is the world's best hope. It is a demand for another order of things, for a social state which will render humanity immune from the wickedness and such evil as resulted in the greatest war mankind has ever known. It asks for some guarantee against a system which dragged peoples innocent of any intention of killing, slaying, and slaughtering into the vortex of War—peacefully intentioned peoples who loathed and hated War (such as was England before that fateful day in August, 1914)—from which even the most innocent of belligerents, and even those who stood aside from the contest are suffering to-day; though none were wholly guiltless of it, because for generations all passively concurred in the system. If the world, as a result of the War, had received no such warning as Bolshevism, the evil would, in all probability have gone on, deepening in its wrong, becoming ever blacker. Bolshevism is a social fever which indicates a high blood temperature. It gives the warning of mischief that may be fatal. A wise doctor takes note of the fever and seeks to remove the cause. He does not call the fever ugly names or denounce it, nor is he so stupid as to confuse the patient's consequent delirium with his normal condition, as so many are confusing the delirium of Bolshevism with the normal state of the countries in which it is finding vogue.

ALL such indications on the part of the body politic that there is a disease that must be removed, else the patient must go under, are as unpleasant, as inimical, as is the delirium of the fever-stricken patient distressing. The French Revolution drowned Paris in blood. Its excesses were far greater than anything that even the most malicious has attributed to Bolshevism. It instituted a Reign of Terror. It massacred Royalty. It condemned men and women day by day to the tumbril; so commonly indeed, that the men and women walking in the streets of Paris hardly looked round when some victim of the Jacobins was being taken to the Guillotine. Nothing and nobody was safe from the raging, tearing fever of the Revolution. For years it inflicted upon France a series of infamies, of torture, of horror, of bloodshed almost unparalleled in history. Yet, at the end of it all, and notwithstanding its reaction in Napoleonism, a great English writer declared that there had been nothing greater and more glorious in all history than the French Revolution. By common consent what liberty, equality, and fraternity—liberty, equality, and fraternity which the French Revolution never gained, and which in seeking after it demeaned and disgraced—the rest of the world possesses to-

day, it draws in large measure from the days in which France was bathed in the anarchy of revolt. That is because the motive-spring which set the French Revolution into being was an ideal for the betterment of mankind, a protest against the social, political and economic infamies which will for ever be associated with the *régime* of the Bourbons, a striving for a social state that would not allow unbridled luxury, lascivious prodigality, selfish extravagance, inhuman carelessness, to thrive in the Court and to go on side by side with poverty, hunger, a life of groaning and moaning in the alleys hard by. And, even now, while the terror of Bolshevism is in full swing, a writer in an English Daily paper is brought to declare, as one did the other day, that at root Bolshevism in ideal has nothing comparable to it since the teachings which Jesus of Nazareth gave to the world. The writer had, there is little doubt, recollected the parable of the rich man, torn with suffering in Hell, pleading to Lazarus, the beggar whose sores the dogs licked, resting in the bosom of Abraham in Heaven. It is the parable of the ideals of Bolshevism.

IT is not difficult to see why a people which has managed to subsist through Tsardom, because of the religious ideals and ideas which it nourished throughout all its classes, and not least among its peasantry, has been attacked by the ideals of Bolshevism, and why, released from Tsardom, it has, pendulum-like, swung into the arms of Lenin, looking to the ideals of his creed, and not to its wickedness or its excesses. The same reason obtains for the number of Jews who are to be found in the Bolshevik ranks. The Jew is an idealist. He will give much for an ideal. He thirst for idealism as a goal of life. This may seem strange to those who associate the Jew with materialism. But the capacity of the Jew for idealism is such that he notoriously idealises even the material. The fact that there are so many of our people who have associated themselves with the ideals of Bolshevism, even although as Jews its excesses must be repugnant to them, has to be placed in conjunction with another fact. These men will be found for the most part unassociated with or dissociated from the Synagogue. In the ordinary way of speaking they are not observing Jews. Is it not patent that the Synagogue, having failed to attract them by its idealism, and no other ideal, not even a material ideal, having been provided for them—for they are not men of wealth and substance, such as are usually to be found among the *bourgeoisie*—they have ranged themselves on the side of Bolshevism, because here was no Jewish ideal to which these Jews could devote their sentiments and their energies? I cannot understand how people who for generations have, unprotesting, allowed the Jew, particularly in Eastern Europe, in Russia, to suffer pogroms, to be massacred and ill-treated, and tortured and murdered, and for two thousand years have kept our people outside the ambit of the most potent source of idealism that can appeal to men—that associated with National being—now have the hypocrisy, the soulless impertinence, to complain that so many of our people are Bolsheviks! That Jews have been chosen to the extent they have to take a leading part in the movement in Russia and in Hungary, is

merely because they are heavily endowed with intellectualism and capacity, as compared with the rest of the population. But the world must not be surprised that the Jew, who is an idealist or nothing, has turned to the idealism of Bolshevism, which a British writer has declared to be comparable to the idealism preached by the founder of Christianity. It were surprising, really, were it otherwise. You cannot keep a people out of their rightful place amid the nations of the world, and then complain because they take the leading part which their abilities entitle them to in the nations among whom you have scattered them. The fact that a timorous millionaire afraid, and doubtless with good cause, of Bolshevism, which he probably has never taken the trouble, or perhaps has not the capacity to appreciate in full measure, places a ban of religious excommunication upon those Jews who are Bolshevists, is a thing for the gods to laugh at!

THERE is much in the fact of Bolshevism itself, in the fact that so many Jews are Bolshevists, in the fact that the ideals of Bolshevism at many points are consonant with the finest ideals of Judaism, some of which went to form the basis of the best teachings of the founder of Christianity—these are things which the thoughtful Jew will examine carefully. It is the thoughtless one who looks upon Bolshevism only in the ugly repulsive aspects which all social revolutions assume and which make it so hateful to the freedom-loving Jew—when allowed to be free. It is the thoughtless one that thus partially examines the greatest problem the modern world has been set, and as his contribution to the solution dismisses it with some exclamation made in obedient deference to his own social position, and to what for the moment happens to be conventionally popular.”

Mentor falsely blamed the Czar for the hardships of the Russian People, which Jewish leaders had deliberately caused so as to make the Russian People clamor for a revolution—a revolution which would put Jews into power—if not on the throne, then behind it. Jewish leaders deliberately ruined the Russian economy by obstructing Russia’s access to investment capital, by provoking a war with Japan and funding the Japanese while cutting off Russia’s access to funds, by conducting massive strikes, by assassinations and attempted revolutions, by attempting to discredit the Russian Government in the press around the world, by instigating the First World War, etc. The reason why Russia was the first and the primary target of Jewish Bolshevism was that Russia had the world’s largest Jewish population and the Zionists wanted to export these Jews against their will to Palestine. The Czar, far from directing racism at the Jews, asked the Jews not to segregate and prohibited racist Zionist Nationalism in order to sponsor Jewish integration with the other Peoples of the Empire, in order that all Peoples in the Empire would live together in harmony and peace. For this act of kindness, Jewish leadership heaped ruin upon Russia and murdered the Czar and his family. Hungary also had a very large racist Jewish population and it, too, fell victim to Jewish Bolshevism and its murderous savagery, as did Poland, with its very large Jewish population. Will the United States be next?

The Ladies' Literary Cabinet, Being a Repository of Miscellaneous Literary Productions in Prose and in Verse, Volume 1, Number 4, (5 June 1819), p. 29, wrote,

“THE JEWS.

In the year 1290, in the reign of Edward I., the property of all the Jews in England was confiscated to the use of the crown; 280 of them were hanged in one day, charged with adulterating the coin. Above fifteen thousand of these unfortunate people, in that reign, were plundered of all their wealth, and banished the kingdom. In the year 1811, in the reign of George III. Mr. Rothschild, a celebrated Jew, was at the head of most of the loans to the European kings and emperors. How remarkably do these facts speak in favour of the progress of liberal and enlightened opinions in that country.”

Under the heading “Foreign Articles”, the following statement appeared in *Niles' Weekly Register*, Volume 17, Number 427, (13 November 1819), p. 169,

“Mr. Rothschild, the great London banker, indignant at the persecution of his Jewish brethren in Germany, has refused to take bills upon any of the cities in which they are persecuted; and great embarrassments to trade have been experienced in consequence of his determination. ☞It is intimated that the persecution of the Jews is in part owing to the fact, that Mr. Rothschild and his brethren were among the chief of those who furnished the ‘legitimates,’ with money to forge chains for the people of Europe.”

In an article entitled “The Jews”, *The Knickerbocker; or New York Monthly Magazine*, Volume 53, Number 1, (January, 1859), pp. 41-51, at 44-45, wrote,

“Yet the Jews of the Ottoman Empire, notwithstanding their degradation, exhibit a certain intellectual tendency. They live in an ideal world, frivolous and superstitious though it be. The Jew who fills the lowest offices, who deals out *raki* all day long to drunken Greeks, who trades in old nails, and to whose sordid soul the very piastres he bandies have imparted their copper haze, finds his chief delight in mental pursuits. Seated by a taper in his dingy cabin, he spends the long hours of the night in poring over the Zohar, the Chaldaic book of the magic Cabala, or, with enthusiastic delight, plunges into the mystical commentaries on the Talmud, seeking to unravel their quaint traditions and sophistries, and attempting, like the astrologers and alchemists, to divine the secrets and command the powers of Nature. ‘The humble dealer, who hawks some article of clothing or some old piece of furniture about the streets; the obsequious mass of animated filth and rags which approaches to obtrude offers of service on the passing traveller, is perhaps deeply versed in Talmudic lore, or aspiring, in nightly vigils, to read into futurity, to command the elements, and acquire invisibility.’ Thus wisdom is preferred to wealth, and a Rothschild would reject a family alliance with a Christian prince to

form one with the humblest of his tribe who is learned in Hebrew lore.

The Jew of the old world, has his revenge:

‘THE pound of flesh which I demand of him
Is dearly bought, is mine, and I will have it.’

Furnishing the hated Gentiles with the means of waging exterminating wars, he beholds, exultingly, in the fields of slaughtered victims a bloody satisfaction of his ‘lodged hate’ and ‘certain loathing,’ more gratifying even than the golden Four-per-cents on his princely loans. Of like significance is the fact that in many parts of the world the despised Jews claim as their own the possessions of the Gentiles, among whom they dwell. Thus the squalid *Yeslir*, living in the Jews’ quarter of Balata or Haskeni, and even more despised than the unbelieving dogs of Christians, traffics secretly in the estates, the palaces and the villages of the great Beys and Pachas, who would regard his touch as pollution. What, apparently, can be more absurd? Yet these assumed possessions, far more valuable, in fact, than the best ‘estates in Spain,’ are bought and sold for money, and inherited from generation to generation.”

A philo-Semitic article entitled “The Jews in the United States”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 11, Number 3, (January, 1906), pp. 7030-7031; stated,

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

Jewish bankers and their agents deliberately ruined the economies of target nations like Russia. They then used their disproportionate influence in the press to blame the current government for the hardships they themselves had deliberately caused, thereby creating resentment between the People and their government and preventing the People from realizing the true cause of their misery. Jewish leadership instigated: the English Revolution, which made their agent Oliver Cromwell a dictator; the French Revolution, which made their agents Robespierre and then Napoleon dictators; the “Young Turk” Revolution, which made their agent Attaturk a dictator; the Bolshevik Revolution, which made their agent Vladimir Ilyich Lenin a dictator; the Nazi Revolution, which made their agent Adolf Hitler a dictator; the Spanish Revolution, which made their agent Francisco Franco a dictator; etc. etc. etc.

In America today, Jewish propagandists are blaming George Bush for the problems Jewish leadership have caused America. They are also attempting to discredit the American system of government in general by pointing out that the Founding Fathers were Freemasons and were influenced by the ideas of the Illuminati, but without mentioning that these institutions were each subservient to the Jewish bankers and were a means used by them to obtain compromised Gentile

leaders who had divulged all their dark secrets in order to gain admission into these secret societies. However, the root problem is not the American system of government, but rather the deliberate corruption of that system by Jewish leaders, Jewish racism and Jewish tribalism. Changing the form of government will only worsen that problem, because the same Jews who are decrying the system—either directly or through their agents—are those who have corrupted it. If their calls for revolution and a gold based currency are heeded, they will take it over completely and deliberately ruin the nation. It is the Jewish bankers who own the gold and who want to sell it to the American Government—and to a large extent this is gold they first stole from the American People, which they desire to sell back to America at an immense profit, so that they can again steal it at a discount and leave America without its own independent money supply. In the name of “reform”, Jewish leaders will lead America into a Soviet-style nightmare and perpetual world war. In the name of defending American sovereignty, they will deliver America into a world government and war with America’s neighbors.

Jewish leaders are teaching Americans to distrust American leadership, without exposing the fact that Jewish leaders are deliberately causing America’s problems. Americans are being primed for a revolution which will put an anti-Semitic dictator into power who will then do the bidding of Jewish leadership, as happened in Germany when Hitler rose to power lifted up on golden strings held in the Jewish bankers’ hands, and the German economy grew as if by magic on the monies which poured in from Jewish bankers who were fattened on the American economy at the expense of the American People. Germany then collapsed when those monies mysteriously dried up and unnecessary war led into more unnecessary war—as Hitler and Stalin deliberately destroyed Germany and Eastern Europe, and Japan deliberately destroyed China as it had helped the Jewish bankers to destroy Russia.

These Jewish instigated revolutions and wars followed a common model. After actively provoking revolutions with the false premise that revolution was necessary to free the People from their government, the Cabalistic Jews deliberately collapsed the economy of the overthrown State, or otherwise deliberately brought chaos and general panic to the public. They then used their disproportionate influence in the press to promote the false message that only a dictator would be capable of restoring order to the land. The Cabalistic Jews thereby caused the People to enslave themselves with the trap of a revolution promising “liberty, equality and fraternity” that resulted instead in chaos and panic, only to offer up the promise of order and prosperity under a dictator of their choosing, who will supposedly restore order, then resign from office. Of course, it was the Jewish bankers who had deliberately made conditions unbearable in the first place, so as to create the necessary climate and needed conditions for revolution and war. They planned for dictatorship from the very beginning and their revolutions were based from the outset on deliberate lies and ill-intentions.

In the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, the Rothschild clan made a high art out of deliberately provoking wars and revolutions, which resulted in dictatorships of their manufacture and under their ultimate control. This furthered the Jewish Messianic goal of destroying the Gentile nations and supplanting them with universal

Jewish rule. It also enabled the Rothschilds to further the Jewish Messianic goal of concentrating the wealth of the world in Jewish hands. By the 1870's, the Rothschilds had accumulated at least \$3,400,000,000.00USD non-adjusted,⁴³ through wars and revolutions which they had fomented and financed, and from which they profited in perpetuity.

The Rothschilds openly sought to become King of the Jews in the Nineteenth Century. The King of the Jews is, by definition, the Messiah, or anointed, of the Jews. The Old Testament teaches the Jews that their Messiah will rule the world—that in the “end times”, after a terribly destructive world war, the Jewish King will lead a world government from Jerusalem (*Exodus* 34:11-17. *Psalms* 72. *Isaiah* 2:1-4; 9:6-7; 11:4, 9-10; 42:1; 61:6. *Jeremiah* 3:17. *Micah* 4:2-3. *Zechariah* 8:20-23; 14:9).

The Jewish bankers used the tactic of perpetual war as a trap to ensnare the Gentile nations into surrendering their national sovereignty and accepting Jewish world government. After making the world weary of wars the Rothschilds had intentionally caused and lengthened, Cabalistic Jews used their disproportionate influence in the press to promote the myth that a world government would herald the end of war, because there would be no nations left to fight wars against each other. The false assertion that a world government was necessary to prevent war was a common theme in Jewish Bolshevik propaganda. Jewish leaders deliberately caused the People of the world to suffer, and then offered themselves up as the resolution to the problems the Jewish leaders had deliberately caused, but which the Jewish leaders falsely blamed on Gentile government and religions.

If successful, the Jewish bankers' plan to fulfill Jewish Messianic prophecy through political means will ultimately result in universal tyranny, and then the extermination of non-Jews and assimilated Jews. The process of creating war to make the world weary of war, while promoting the myth that the loss of national sovereignty will mean the end of war, is a trap used by Cabalistic Jews to ensnare non-Jewish Peoples into fulfilling the Jewish Messianic prophecy that Jews will rule a world government in the Messianic Age. Jewish Messianic prophecy predicts that only “righteous Jews” will be left alive in the “end times”—that the Jewish Messiah will judge and then exterminate the “wicked”, all non-Jews and assimilated Jews (*Isaiah* 11. *Jeremiah* 3:17; 10:10-11; 23:5-8. *Sanhedrin* 105a. *Zohar*). *Psalms* 110 says of the murderous Jewish King, whom the Jews intend to anoint as “Messiah”,

“ The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. 2 The LORD shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. 3 Thy people *shall be* willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth. 4 The LORD hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. 5 The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath. 6 He shall judge among the heathen, he shall fill *the places with* the dead bodies; he shall wound the heads over many countries. 7 He shall drink of the brook in the way: therefore shall he lift up the head.”⁴⁴

The *Zohar* informs us of the beliefs of Cabalistic Jews and their racist genocidal hatred of non-Jews. The *Zohar*, I, 28b-29a, states,

“At that time the mixed multitude shall pass away from the world [***] The mixed multitude are the impurity which the serpent injected into Eve. From this impurity came forth Cain, who killed Abel. [***] for they are the seed of Amalek, of whom it is said, ‘thou shalt blot out the memory of Amalek’ [***] Various impurities are mingled in the composition of Israel, like animals among men. One kind is from the side of the serpent; another from the side of the Gentiles, who are compared to the beasts of the field; another from the *mazikin* (goblins), for the souls [29a] of the wicked are literally the *mazikin* (goblins) of the world; and there is an impurity from the side of the demons and evil spirits; and there is none so cursed among them as Amalek, who is the evil serpent, the ‘strange god’. He is the cause of all unchastity and murder, and his twin-soul is the poison of idolatry, the two together being called Samael (lit. poison-god). There is more than one Samael, and they are not all equal, but this side of the serpent is accursed above all of them.”⁴⁵

The *Zohar* I, 47a, states,

“**S**AID Rabbi Abba: ‘Nephesh hahaya’ (living soul) truly denote the souls of Israel. They are the children of the Holy One and holy in his sight, but the souls of the heathen and idolatrous nations whence come they?’

Said Rabbi Eleazar: ‘They emanate from the left side of the sephirotic tree of life, which is the side of impurity, and therefore they defile all that come into contact with them. It is written, ‘Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, and creeping thing and beast of the earth after his kind’ (Gen. 1-24). Wherefore does the word ‘lemina’ (after his kind) occur twice? It is to confirm what has just been stated, that the souls of Israel are pure and holy, but the souls of the heathen being impure and unholy are symbolized by the creeping thing and beast of the earth, and therefore, like the foresaken in circumcision, are cut off.”⁴⁶

The *Zohar*, II, 219b, states,

“So they went nearer and they heard him saying: ‘Crown, crown, two sons are kept outside, and there will be no peace or rest until the bird is thrown down in Cæsarea.’ R. Jose wept and said: ‘Verily the *Galuth* is drawn out, and therefore the birds of heaven will not depart until the dominion of the idolatrous nations is removed from the earth, which will not be till the day when God will bring the world to judgement.”⁴⁷

The *Zohar*, III, 19b, states,

“It is, however, as R. Abba has said: all the other days are given over to the angelic principalities of the nations, but there is *one* day which will be the day of the Holy One, blessed be He, in which He will judge the heathen nations, and when their principalities shall fall from their high estate.”⁴⁸

The *Zohar*, III, 43a, states,

“To these He appointed as ministers Samael and all his groups—these are like clouds to ride upon when He descends to earth: they are like horses. That the clouds are called ‘chariots’ is expressed in the words, ‘Behold the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt’ (Isa. XIX, 1). Thus the Egyptians saw their Chieftain like a horse bearing the chariot of the Holy One, and straightaway ‘the idols of Egypt were moved at His presence, and the heart of Egypt melted in the midst of it’ (*Ibid.*), i. e. they were ‘moved’ from their faith in their own Chieftain. AND EVERY FIRSTLING OF AN ASS THOU SHALT REDEEM WITH A LAMB, AND IF THOU WILT NOT REDEEM IT. . . THOU SHALT BREAK HIS NECK.”⁴⁹

The *Zohar*, III, 282a, states,

“From the side of idolatry Shabbethaj (Saturn) is called Lilith [*Footnote*: Lilith is a female demon, comp. Is. XXXIV. 14 and Weber, *Altsynagogale palästinische Theologie*, p. 246.], mixed dung, on account of the filth mixed from all kinds of dirt and worms, into which they throw dead dogs and dead asses, the sons of ‘Esau and Ishma‘el, and there (read ובה) Jesus and Mohammed, who are dead dogs, are buried among them. She (Lilith) is the grave of idolatry, where they bury the uncircumcised, (who are) dead dogs, abomination and bad smell, soiled and fetid, a bad family. She (Lilith) is the ligament [*Footnote*: מַדְכָּא is a fibre attached to the lungs] which holds fast the ‘mixed multitude’ (Ex. xii. 38), which is mixed among Israel, and which holds fast bone and flesh, that is, the sons of ‘Esau and Ishma‘el, dead bone and unclean flesh torn of beasts in the field, of which it is said (Ex. xxii. 31): ‘Ye shall cast it to the dogs.’”⁵⁰

Wanting for God’s intervention, the Jewish bankers played the rôle of the Jewish Messiah and used Old Testament prophecies, the Talmud and Cabalistic writings as a plan they set out to artificially fulfill by their own intentional actions without any help from God. They have been highly successful, much to the detriment of mankind. They have given us Bolshevism, Nazism, Zionism, etc., each as an artificial political means to place a Jewish King at the head of the world.

Cabalistic Jews set yet another trap for the Gentile nations. They deliberately caused specific economies to grow and accumulate the wealth of the world by increasing the money supply in a target nation, or empire. They then deliberately collapsed the economy of the target nation by restricting the money supply and by running the target nation or empire into debt through deliberately mismanaged

economic policy and perpetual war. Cabalistic Jews then used their disproportionate influence in the press to make the People clamor for banking reforms—usually a move toward the gold standard and a centralized privately owned bank, which operated under a fractional reserve system and a debt based issuance of currency, all of which profited the Jewish bankers who invariably and inevitably ran the system and profited from the debts of the nation the same Jewish bankers deliberately caused.

To summarize, there were three primary traps which Cabalistic Jews set for their non-Jewish neighbors in order to cause them to unwittingly fulfill Jewish Messianic prophecy by artificial political means. Jewish financiers used their agents to promote revolutions on the false promise that revolution would bring about freedom and democracy. After carrying out a revolution and deliberately creating a climate of fear and chaos, the Jewish financiers then installed a dictator of their choosing to subvert the freedoms of Gentile nations and bring them into perpetual war and perpetual debt. Jewish financiers deliberately caused perpetual wars to make the People of the world clamor for peace, and then proposed the false notion that world government was the only means to achieve an end to war—world government Jews have intended to lead from ancient times. Jewish financiers deliberately caused banking scandals in order to make Peoples clamor for banking reforms, but then subverted the reform process by instituting the very policies they had always sought—disastrous policies for the People, which syphoned off the wealth of the nation and the world into the coffers of the Jewish bankers.

Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh Sr. was very aware of the fact that the bankers had deliberately caused the panic in 1907 in order to make the public clamor for banking reforms, banking reforms the bankers would draft which would give them complete control over the money supply and wipe out the lower level, but numerous, competing banks,

“When the Aldrich-Vreeland Emergency Currency Bill was sprung on the House in its finished draft and ready for action to be taken, the debate was limited to three hours and Banker Vreeland placed in charge. It took so long for copies of the bill to be gotten that many members were unable to secure a copy until within a few minutes of the time to vote. No member who wished to present the people’s side of the case was given sufficient time to enable him to properly analyze the bill. I asked for time and was told that if I would vote for the bill it would be given me, but not otherwise. Others were treated in the same way.

Accordingly, on June 30, 1908, the Money Trust won the first fight and the Aldrich-Vreeland Emergency Law was placed on the statute books. Thus the first precedent was established for the people’s guarantee of the rich man’s watered securities, by making them a basis on which to issue currency. It was the entering wedge. We had already guaranteed the rich men’s money, and now, by this act, the way was opened, and it was intended that we should guarantee their watered stocks and bonds. Of course, they were too keen to attempt to complete, in a single act, such an enormous steal as it would have

been if they had included all they hoped ultimately to secure. They knew that they would be caught at it if they did, and so it was planned that the whole thing should be done by a succession of acts. The first three have taken place.

Act No. 1 was the manufacture, between 1896 and 1907, through stock gambling, speculation and other devious methods and devices, of tens of billions of watered stocks, bonds, and securities.

Act No. 2 was the panic of 1907, by which those not favorable to the Money Trust could be squeezed out of business and the people frightened into demanding changes in the banking and currency laws which the Money Trust would frame.

The Act No. 3 was the passage of the Aldrich-Vreeland Emergency Currency Bill, by which the Money Trust interests should have the privilege of securing from the Government currency on their watered bonds and securities. But while the act contained no authority to change the form of the bank notes, the U. S. Treasurer (in some way that I have been unable to find a reason for) implied authority and changed the form of bank notes which were issued for the banks on government bonds. These notes had hitherto had printed on them, 'This note is secured by bonds of the United States.' He changed it to read as follows: 'This note is secured by bonds of the United States or other securities.' 'Or other securities' is the addition that was secured by special interests. The infinite care the Money Trust exercises in regard to important detail work is easily seen in this piece of management. By that change it was enabled to have the form of the money issued in its favor on watered bonds and securities, the same as bank notes secured on government bonds, and, as a result, the people do not know whether they get one or the other. None of the \$500,000,000 printed and lying in the U. S. Treasury ready to float on watered bonds and securities has yet (April, 1913) been used. But it is there, maintained at a public charge, as a guarantee to the Money Trust that it may use it in case it crowds speculation beyond the point of its control. The banks may take it to prevent their own failures, but there is not even so much as a suggestion that it may be used to help keep the industries of the people in a state of prosperity.

The main thing, however, that the Money Trust accomplished as a result of the passing of this act was the appointment of the National Monetary Commission, the membership of which was chiefly made up of bankers, their agents and attorneys, who have generally been educated in favor of, and to have a community interest with, the Money Trust. The National Monetary Commission was placed in charge of the same Senator Nelson W. Aldrich and Congressman Edward B. Vreeland, who respectively had charge in the Senate and House during the passage of the act creating it.

The act authorized this commission to spend money without stint or account. It spent over \$300,000 in order to learn how to form a plan by which to create a greater money trust, and it afterwards recommended Congress to give this proposed trust a fifty-year charter by means of which it could rob and plunder all humanity. A bill for that purpose was introduced by members

of the Monetary Commission, and its passage planned to be the fourth and final act of the campaign to completely enslave the people.

The fourth act, however, is in process of incubation only, and it is hoped that by this time we realize the danger that all of us are in, for it is the final proposed legislation which, if it succeeds, will place us in the complete control of the moneyed interests. History records nothing so dramatic in design, nor so skillfully manipulated, as this attempt to create the National Reserve Association,—otherwise called the Aldrich plan,—and no fact nor occurrence contemplated for the gaining of selfish ends is recorded in the world's records which equals the beguiling methods of this colossal undertaking. Men, women, and children have been equally unconscious of how stealthily this greatest of all giant octopuses,—a greater Money Trust,—is reaching out its tentacles in its efforts to bind all humanity in perpetual servitude to the greedy will of this monster.

I was in Congress when the Panic of 1907 occurred, but I had previously familiarized myself with many of the ways of high financiers. As a result of what I discovered in that study, I set about to expose the Money Trust, the world's greatest financial giant. I knew that I could not succeed unless I could bring public sentiment to my aid. I had to secure that or fail. The Money Trust had laid its plans long before and was already executing them. It was then, and still is, training the people themselves to demand the enactment of the Aldrich Bill or a bill similar in effect. Hundreds of thousands of dollars had already been spent and millions were reserved to be used in the attempt to bring about a condition of public mind that would cause demand of the passage of the bill. If no other methods succeeded, it was planned to bring on a violent panic and to rush the bill through during the distress which would result from the panic. It was figured that the people would demand new banking and currency laws; that it would be impossible for them to get a definitely practical plan before Congress when they were in an excited state and that, as a result, the Aldrich plan would slip safely through. It was designed to pass that bill in the fall of 1911 or 1912.”⁵¹

Jewish bankers used their financial influence to ruin Gentile Peoples, then Jewish bankers used their political influence and controlled press to blame Gentile governments and religions for the ruin Jewish bankers had deliberately caused. Beware of the agents of Cabalistic Jews bearing the “gifts” of revolution, banking reform and world government. Remember that it is these same Jewish leaders who are deliberately causing the pains and poverty of the world and who intend to lead gullible non-Jews into such severe suffering that they will gladly hand over all their power to the Jews who are perpetual portraying themselves in the media as the worst victims of conflict and most moral people—people who can deliver us all from the problems of life—with a bullet to the back of the head. Beware of Utopian promises and easy schemes to unseat the powerful from power. Beware of revolutionaries, especially anti-Semitic revolutionaries. Beware of those who point out the corruption of Jewish leadership, but then offer up solutions which will ultimately serve the

interests of Jewish leadership. Jewish leaders have always used outrage against their outrages as a trap to put their own agents into power.

Of course, to solve the problems Jewish bankers were causing and blaming on their victims, the Peoples needed to know who was at fault and how to remedy the situation. This, too, proved to be an opportune situation for the Jewish bankers, who were highly racist and who desired to keep the “Holy Jews” segregated from the all the “inferior races”, while maintaining control over Gentile societies.

Jews have, like all human beings, tended to integrate into the societies where they have lived. Jewish leaders have always chastised and punished assimilatory Jewry with death. After ruining nations and cultures with large Jewish populations, Jewish leaders often put anti-Semitic leaders into power, who then falsely blamed all Jews for the actions of Jewish leadership, and who proposed highly destructive “solutions” to the problems Jewish leaders had caused. In this way, Jewish leaders maintained their control over both Jews and non-Jews, and forced assimilating Jews back into segregation, thereby preserving the “divine Jewish race” from the dissolution of good natured integration.

The Jewish bankers then forced the Jews to flee to another nation, taking with them the wealth of their previous homeland. The new target nation or empire then grew with the influx of investment capital, drawing unto itself the wealth of the world, which ultimately filtered into the hands of the Jewish bankers, who loaned it out at interest to finance wars they had caused and to pay for the disastrous economic policies they covertly implemented. It was not only important to Jewish leaders to accumulate the world’s wealth so that they would be wealthy, but also to oppress non-Jews and inhibit their progress so as to prevent any future challenges to Jewish power. The perpetual debt of the Gentile nations Jewish leaders caused became a perpetual source of revenue for Jewish bankers. As economies collapsed, Jewish leadership gained wealth and had the means to buy up politicians, royalty, churches, businesses, real estate, arms, valuables and manufacturing capital at reduced prices.

These Jews used all of the ancient corrupt tactics of organized crime. They burned down nations and offered the protection racket of “world government” as if a solution to the problem of war, war which they had covertly caused. They loaned out monies secured by nations’ taxes, then ensured that the borrowers could not repay the debts, then they took over entire economies. In prior times when the majority of the world’s citizens were farmers, they ensured that the farms would fail so that they could collectivize the farms and force the Peoples of the world into slavery on lands they had stolen from the farmers.

The best means to dissolve Jewish power is to welcome Jews into other communities. Anti-Semitism has always only increased Jewish power by increasing Jewish racism and tribalism and by providing Jewish leaders with a means to put their agents into power on a political platform centered on shallow and counterproductive Jew-baiting. These “anti-Semitic” Jewish agents then deliberately ruin the anti-Semitic nation they have created. Jew-baiting is trap that ensnares Gentile Peoples and increases the power of Jewish leadership. Racist political Zionist leader Theodor Herzl wrote in his book *The Jewish State*,

“Oppression and persecution cannot exterminate us. No nation on earth has survived such struggles and sufferings as we have gone through. Jew-baiting has merely stripped off our weaklings; the strong among us were invariably true to their race when persecution broke out against them. This attitude was most clearly apparent in the period immediately following the emancipation of the Jews. Later on, those who rose to a higher degree of intelligence and to a better worldly position lost their communal feeling to a very great extent. Wherever our political well-being has lasted for any length of time, we have assimilated with our surroundings. I think this is not discreditable. Hence, the statesman who would wish to see a Jewish strain in his nation would have to provide for the duration of our political well-being; and even Bismarck could not do that. [***] The Governments of all countries scourged by Anti-Semitism will serve their own interests in assisting us to obtain the sovereignty we want. [***] Great exertions will not be necessary to spur on the movement. Anti-Semites provide the requisite impetus. They need only do what they did before, and then they will create a love of emigration where it did not previously exist, and strengthen it where it existed before. [***] I imagine that Governments will, either voluntarily or under pressure from the Anti-Semites, pay certain attention to this scheme; and they may perhaps actually receive it here and there with a sympathy which they will also show to the Society of Jews.”⁵²

Adolf Hitler and Joseph Stalin were both agents of the Jewish bankers and both performed the valuable services of segregating the Jews and increasing Jewish hatred of non-Jews. Hitler and Stalin, who were both Bolshevik Zionists, brought the German People and the Russian People into war with each other, and helped the Jewish bankers to discredit and ruin Gentile government and to move the world towards a universal world government led by Jews—towards the “New World Order” or “Jewish Utopia” prophesied in *Isaiah* 65:17 and 66:22.

Jewish leaders deliberately caused Gentile Peoples to hate all Jews, then they used their controlled press and their disproportionate wealth to finance supposedly anti-Semitic leaders, who then deliberately destroyed the Gentile nations and caused war and famine by proposing the easy “solutions” of dictatorship, gold-backed currencies, “defensive” “preemptive”—truly aggressive—wars, and the segregation and expulsion of the Jews. Jewish leaders followed the example of Joseph found in *Genesis* 47, in which story the Jews steal the wealth of Egypt and take it with them on their way out; and the story of Esau and Jacob (*Genesis* 25:23; 27:38-41), where Jacob provokes Esau to “anti-Semitism”, which “anti-Semitism” causes Esau and his descendants to eternally slave and soldier for Jacob—anti-Semitism causes the Gentiles to become the slaves of the Jews. In the Hebrew Bible, Jews justify their theft and genocide of other Peoples based on the anti-Jewish feelings they have deliberately provoked. In the Old Testament, and throughout history, Jews justify their racism and segregationist tribalism by deliberately provoking other Peoples to hate them. They forever blame others for the problems they themselves have caused. The *Zohar*, II, 160a, states, and note that the “evil side” is the allegedly sub-human

Gentile world,

“R. Hizkiah said: ‘Assuredly it is so. Happy is he whose portion is firmly established on the good side, and who does not incline himself to the other side, but is delivered from them.’ Said R. Judah: ‘Assuredly it is so, and happy is he who is able to escape that side, and happy are those righteous who are able to wage war against that side.’ R. Hizkiah asked: ‘How?’ R. Judah, in reply, began to discourse on the verse: *For by wise guidance thou shalt make thy war, etc.* (Prov. xxiv, 6). ‘This war’, he said, ‘alludes to the war against the evil side, which man must combat and overcome, so as to be delivered from it. It was in this way that Jacob dealt with Esau, who was on the other side, so as to outwit him by craft, as was necessary in order to keep the upper hand of him from the beginning to the end, as befitted.’”

The process, by which Jewish leadership lead Gentile nations into self-destruction through artificial and controlled anti-Semitism and false promises of a Utopian society to come, is one of deliberate false diagnosis and contrived improper treatment. Jewish leaders covertly claim through their agents that all Jews are a cancer on the nation and the cure is the segregation of the Jews. But it is the patient—the non-Jews—who receive the fatal treatment of revolution, war, economic ruin and cultural degradation—a lethal dose of unneeded radiation. Racist Jewish leaders regularly sacrifice a few of their own and walk away with the wealth of other nations, and the contrived status of a blameless victim who must remain segregated for the sake of self-defense.

The solution to the problem is for non-Jews to recognize that the core problem is not Jewish people in general, but rather genocidal Judaism and corrupt Jewish leadership who view Jewish genocidal prophecy as a plan they must carry out at all costs, including the sacrifice of large numbers of innocent Jews. The solution is to welcome Jews in general into the broader community and to expose the methods and intentions of corrupt and racist Jewish leadership. Jews must in their turn abandon genocidal Judaism and abandon their virulent racism and corrupt tribalism. Jews must cease to hypocritically insist upon their own segregation, while demanding that the rest of the world integrate into a world government led by Jews.

Jewish Messianic prophecy is a plan too dangerous to ignore. It threatens to destroy human life on Earth. In the 1500's, Martin Luther wrote, among other things,

“Further, they presume to instruct God and prescribe the manner in which he is to redeem them. For the Jews, these very learned saints, look upon God as a poor cobbler equipped with only a left last for making shoes. This is to say that he is to kill and exterminate all of us Goyim through their Messiah, so that they can lay their hands on the land, the goods, and the government of the whole world. And now a storm breaks over us with curses, defamation, and derision that cannot be expressed with words. They wish that sword and war, distress and every misfortune may overtake us accursed Goyim. They vent their curses on us openly every Saturday in their synagogues and daily

in their homes. They teach, urge, and train their children from infancy to remain the bitter, virulent, and wrathful enemies of the Christians.”⁵³

Since Luther’s time, many Jews have stated that the Jewish People and politics are the Jews’ Messiah. Jewish Bolshevism accomplished, and sought to accomplish, many of the Jews’ Messianic goals.

Jüdische Rundschau, Number 82/83, (14 October 1921), pp. 595-596 (front page and second page of the issue), covered speeches by Zionist leaders in Berlin on Sunday, 9 October 1921, in Blüthner Hall welcoming back Nachum Sokolow, President of the Executive,

“Begrüßung für Sokolow

Zionistische Massendemonstration in Berlin

Wie bereits kurz gemeldet, fand am Sonntag, den 9. d. M. im überfüllten Blüthnersaal in Berlin ein großes Massenmeeting zur Begrüßung des Präsidenten der Exekutive, Herrn Nahum Sokolow, statt. Die Versammlung war ein lebendiger Beweis der Wertschätzung und Verehrung für den zionistischen Führer, der nach langjähriger Abwesenheit wieder zu kurzem Aufenthalt nach Berlin zurückgekehrt ist. Herr Sokolow war Gegenstand lebhafter Ovationen, die ein Ausdruck des Dankes für die große Arbeit waren, die Sokolow im Dienste des jüdischen Volkes mit hingebungsvoller Energie geleistet hat. Was dazu zu sagen ist, haben die Redner der Feier gesagt. Wir können uns daher auf die Wiedergabe ihrer Reden beschränken.

Die Versammlung wurde eröffnet vom Vorsitzenden der B. Z. V.,

Dr. Egon Rosenberg,

der es als glückliches Schicksal pries, daß dem jüdischen Volk in der schweren Zeit des Krieges zwei Männer vom politischen Ingenium und von der Tatkraft Weizmanns und Sokolows geschenkt wurden. Er begrüßt außer Sokolow noch die Herren Jabotinsky, Dr. Halpern und Dr. Scharja Levin, die lebhaft akklamiert wurden.

Als erster Redner spricht der Vorsitzende der Z. V. f. D.,

Feliz Rosenblüth,

der etwa folgendes ausführt:

Als der Zionismus zum ersten Male der Welt sein Programm verkündete, da hat man überall in der Welt und vielleicht nirgends lauter und hohnvoller als in Deutschland die Frage aufgeworfen, wie es möglich sein sollte, die zerstreuten Teile der Diasporajudenheit wieder zu einer nationalen Einheit als Staatsvolk zusammenzuschmieden. Man berief sich auf den jüdischen Individualismus, der jeder Einordnung und Führung spottet. Man hat dem jüdischen Volk die inneren Fähigkeiten abgesprochen, wieder ein nationales Gemeinwesen mit staatlich-sozialer Gleiderung aufzubauen. Man hat bei uns jene sozialen Tagenden verneint, die eben erst aus einer zusammenhanglosen

Masse von Menschen ein organisch verbundenes Volk machen. Wenn an diesem Vorwurf etwas richtig gewesen sein sollte, so können wir sagen, daß auch hier das Wort Theodor Herzls zutrifft, daß schon das Wandern auf dem Wege zum Ziele uns zu neuen, zu besseren Menschen gemacht hat. Wir haben alle schon oft erlebt, daß der Zionismus mit jener wunderbaren Kraft der Antizipation das Wunder einer inneren Wandlung an uns vollzogen hat, daß wir gelernt haben, uns ideell im Vorhinein als Bürger unseres werdenden Gemeinwesens zu empfinden, das heißt, als Menschen mit der Verantwortlichkeit und den Pflichten des einzelnen gegenüber der höheren Ordnung der Gemeinschaft. Es ist in diesem Jahrzehnt der Arbeit des politischen Zionismus in der Tat so etwas wie ein zionistisches Staatsvolk entstanden, ein Vortrupp des werdenden Palästastatsvolkes, eine Gemeinschaft mit eigentümlichen Kriterien der Ordnung und Gliederung, die sich beispielsweise im Zionistenkongreß eine parlamentarische Körperschaft mit eigenartiger gesetzgeberischer Kraft geschaffen hat. Dieser Prozeß der Staatsvolkswerdung aber, meine Damen und Herren, ist unlösbar verknüpft mit einem Phänomen, das auch erst durch den Zionismus wieder neu im jüdischen Volk geschaffen wurde, mit dem Phänomen des Führertums. Wir wollen hier nicht untersuchen, ob diese Wandlung vielleicht überhaupt erst möglich geworden ist dadurch, daß im Zionismus Führerpersönlichkeiten mit natürlicher Uebergeordnetheit entstanden sind, oder ob diese Menschen zu Führern einporgewachsen sind aus dem Drange dieses Umwandlungsprozesses. Aber wir wissen, daß erst der Zionismus dem jüdischen Volk wieder Führer geschenkt hat, und wir betrachten dieses Führertum als Symbol der Regenerationsbewegung, in der wir stehen. Erst in den Tagen des Zionismus ist es wieder möglich geworden, daß jüdische Männer überall in der Welt von dem gleichen Gruß aus jüdischen Herzen als Führer empfangen wurden, und wir erkennen diese Erscheinung als sichtbaren Beweis dafür, daß wir heute in einer Zeit leben, in der unser Volk neu erwacht ist und seine Kraft neu sammeln will. Der Zionismus hat uns wieder Führer und Repräsentanten gegeben, auf die das jüdische Volk alles überträgt, was an Hoffnungen und Zukunftswillen in ihm lebt. Diese Männer können stark sein, weil sie sich als Träger dieses Volkswillens fühlen. Der Zionismus hat uns wieder zentrale Persönlichkeiten gegeben, und das ist der hoffnungsvollste Beweis dafür, daß im jüdischen Volk zentripetale, aufbauende, sammelnde Kräfte leben. Deshalb wollen wir, wenn wir in diese Begrüßungsfeier eintreten, uns bewußt sein, daß diese Feier keine äußere Demonstration ist, sondern eine Manifestation des Lebenswillens der jüdischen Nation, der nach Konzentration und nach Vereinheitlichung strebt und für den zentrale Führerpersönlichkeiten ein Symbol oder vielleicht sogar ein Beweis sind. In diesem Sinne begrüßt die Zionistische Vereinigung für Deutschland am heutigen Tage Herrn Nahum Sokolow, den Präsidenten der Exekutive, als den Repräsentanten unserer Bewegung, als den Mann, der zusammen mit Weizmann das Recht des jüdischen Volkes auf Palästina verkündet und verteidigt hat und der im Kampf für unser Ideal unser

anerkannter Führer wurde. Wir grüßen in unserer Mitte Herrn Sokolow, und in diesem Gruß erleben wir unsere Uebereinstimmung mit der Judenheit der ganzen Welt, die Einheit der jüdischen Nation. (Lebh. Beifall.)

Dr. Schmarja Levin

sagt in seiner Rede u. a.: „Bei einer zionistischen Veranstaltung hat ein großer englischer Staatsmann, Sir Robert Cecil, gesagt, daß die einzigen Errungenschaften des Krieges die Balfour-Deklaration und die League of Nations sind. An der Balfour-Deklaration sind wir alle interessiert, der Bund der Nationen könnte uns aber als etwas Fernliegens und Fremdes erscheinen. Ich glaube aber, Robert Cecil hat den Zusammenhang zwischen diesen beiden Dingen tiefer erfaßt. Es ist nicht Uebertreibung noch Ueberhebung, wenn ich die These aufstelle, daß die Verwirklichung des Zionismus vom Siege der zweiten Idee bedingt ist. Denn in ihr liegt die Garantie der Dauerhaftigkeit. Noch vor dem Waffenstillstand hat sich in Amerika ein Mann gefunden, der Vertreter von 120 Millionen Menschen, der diese Idee aufnahm. Es ist keine neue Idee, es ist die alte jüdische Idee der Propheten. Wenn Sie die jüdische Psyche an den klassischen Denkmälern studieren, so werden Sie finden, daß kein Wort für den Begriff ‚Menschheit‘ vorhanden ist, sondern diese Werke sprechen immer von dem Verband aller Nationen. In einem Worte spiegelt sich eine Weltanschauung, und es ist kein Zufall, daß die hebräische Sprache, die bereits im Altertum ein solch hohe Entwicklung erreicht hat, kein besonderes Wort für den Begriff Menschheit geprägt hat. Denn sie haben den Sinn des historischen Prozesses tief begriffen, und es ist ihnen klar, daß die Nation das Höchste ist, was die Geschichte hervorbringt. Nicht das Verschwinden der Nationen, noch deren Verschmelzung zu einer Einheit hat ihnen vorgeschwebt, sondern das harmonische Leben sämtlicher Nationen und Völkerschaften. Sie waren zu ernst, um sich Illusionen hinzubringen und Phantomen zu dienen, deshalb galt ihre Predigt immer dem Bund der Nationen und nicht dem verschwommenen Begriff einer abstrakten Menschheit. Wilson, der diese Idee predigte, hatte kein Glück. Aber vielleicht ist es der Gang der Geschichte, daß die ‚erste Auflage‘ einer Idee zerbrochen wird und daß die zweite Auflage erscheinen muß, um zur Geltung zu kommen. Wir haben dafür ein krasses Beispiel in den zehn Geboten. Die ersten Gesetzestafeln wurden zerbrochen, und erst in der zweiten Auflage feierte die Idee, die ihnen zugrunde lag, ihre Auferstehung. Es ist unsere Sache, die Idee des Völkerbundes aufzunehmen, sie zu verbreiten, bis sie Wirklichkeit wird. Man kann sich nie auf eine einzelne Nation verlassen, mag sie auch die beste und edelste sein. Denn auch die besten und edelsten werden manchmal in ihren Handlungen von egoistischen Motiven geleitet. Das Gleichgewicht der Welt kann nur durch eine Körperschaft reguliert werden, die alle Nationen repräsentiert und den Interessen aller Rechnung trägt. Der Zionismus ist mit dieser großen Idee verknüpft, und es ist deshalb unsere Aufgabe, uns ihrer mit aller Energie anzunehmen. Wir können ihr in manchen Beziehungen zum Siege verhelfen,

denn wir haben schon manche Idee in der Welt populär gemacht. Es ist kein Zufall, daß gerade aus Palästina weltbefruchtende und weltbeherrschende Ideen ausgingen.

Es kann sein, daß unsere Unzufriedenheit, die uns nach Palästina treibt, gerade darin liegt, daß wir nach einem Platz für die Verwirklichung von neuen Ideen trachten. Denn das letzte Wort ist noch nicht gesprochen, und lange wird noch der mensch herumirren, bis er aus dem Labyrinth seinen Ausweg findet. Der richtige Ort für die Verwirklichung der einstweilen nur geahnten Idee ist weder in Genf noch in Haag zu suchen. Ein jüdischer Denker, der aber nicht nur strenger Logiker, wie mancher es glaubt, sondern auch ein großer Ahner unserer Zukunft ist, Achad Haam, hat von einem Tempel auf dem Berge Zion geträumt wo die Verteterschaft aller Nationen dem ewigen Frieden einen Tempel weihen wird. Und ich benutze gerade diese Gelegenheit, von der Idee der Völkerverbrüderung zu sprechen, weil sie mit der Persönlichkeit Sokolows verbunden ist. Sokolow hat es verstanden, den Zionismus in seiner Totalität aufzufassen, und deshalb war er ebenso energisch als Präsident der jüdischen Delegation wie in seiner rein zionistischen Tätigkeit, wobei er die glänzendste Gelegenheit hatte, mit den Vertretern der verschiedenen Nationen in beständigen Kontakt zu kommen und gar manchen vielleicht unbewußten Einfluß auf die Gestaltung solcher Beziehungen, die die Idee des Völkerbundes um einen Schritt weiterbringen, auszuüben.“

Kurt Blumenfeld

begrüßt darauf in kurzen Worten Herrn Sokolow. Er weist darauf hin, daß Herr Sokolow die Fülle des Wissens und die Fähigkeit, den Maßstab der Jahrhunderte anzulegen, mit der Kraft verbindet, dem Augenblick gerecht zu werden. Die zionistische Bewegung, die im Gegensatz zu dem kurzatmigen Revolutionen anderer Völker eine „Revolution mit langem Atem“ sei, brauche eine solche Persönlichkeit an führender Stelle. Nicht durch Tageserfolge sei die zionistische Sache zu fördern, sondern durch unverdrossene, stetige Arbeit. Die Energie, die im Augenblick erfordert wird, dürfe nicht aus einer Desperadostimmung kommen, sie brauche vielmehr die freudige Tat von Menschen, die von der Unzerstörbarkeit der zionistischen Sache überzeugt sind. Herr Blumenfeld sprach in diesem Zusammenhang über die Notwendigkeit, die Erkenntnis des wahren Zustandes der zionistischen Bewegung zur Grundlage unserer Arbeit zu machen.

Auf alle diese Reden antwortet sodann

Nahum Sokolow:

Herr Vorsitzender, meine Damen und Herren, der Zionistenkongreß liegt hinter uns. Wir gehen jetzt mit den Kongreßresolutionen in die Welt hinaus, um sie in die Tat umzusetzen. Schon einer der Herren Vorredner, Dr. Levin, bemerkte, daß Personenkultus keine jüdische Sache ist. Er hat Recht. Wenn diese Versammlung dazu bestimmt wäre, der Ausdruck eines persönlichen Kultus zu sein, so würde ich mit Dank ablehnen. Doch ich habe den

Eindruck, daß keiner unter Ihnen diese Versammlung als eine persönliche Ehrung für mich betrachtet. Ich bin für Sie in diesem Augenblick der Vertreter einer Idee, der Repräsentant einer Organisation. Sie ehren nicht mich, sondern Sie ehren die Idee, zu deren Wortführern ich zu gehören den Vorzug habe. Ich möchte hier ein gut jüdische Wort zitieren: Hilf ihm, wenn er unter der Last zusammenbricht. Ich breche schier zusammen unter der Last der Komplimente, der wohlgemeinten, der weit übertriebenen, die an meine Adresse gerichtet sind. Helfen Sie mir, mich unter dieser Last aufzurichten. Ich werde Ihnen Gleiches mit Gleichem vergelten. Es wäre weder mir noch meinen Kollegen möglich gewesen, irgend etwas zu erreichen, wäre nicht unserer Arbeit eine Arbeit vorausgegangen, die hier, von Euch gemacht worden ist, die von Euch noch immer gemacht wird, von Euch, Zionisten Berlins, von Euch, Zionisten Deutschlands, von Euch, der zionistischen Jugend Deutschlands, die wir in allen Ländern als Vorbild zitieren. Wäre diese Arbeit nicht gemacht und entwickelt worden, und würde diese Arbeit nicht jetzt einer großen Zukunft entgegengehen, so wäre unsere Arbeit nicht möglich. Ich beglückwünsche Sie zu Ihrer Arbeit, zu Ihrer Begeisterung und Opferfreudigkeit, von der wir, die Zionisten der Welt, viel Großes erwarten. Ich bin unter Euch, und es ist mir wie ein Traum. Noch vor drei, vier, fünf Jahren hätte ich es nicht gehant. Mir beweist dies, daß der Zionismus stärker ist als der Moloch des Weltkrieges, und daß wir jetzt enger vereinigt sind, als uns die äußeren Umstände trennen konnten. Es ist für mich ein Feiertag, daß ich hier unter Euch bin und von Euch empfangen werden kann. Das ist der Sieg der zionistischen Einheit.

Und nun ein Wort zu den Erfolgen. Wenn man Erfolge erzielt—und ich will nicht zu bescheiden sein und in Abrede stellen, daß wir politische Erfolge erzielt haben—so muß man immer darauf achten, welchen Methoden diese Erfolge zu verdanken sind. Dies ist nicht nur eine historische Betrachtung und soll nicht nur dazu dienen, irgendein Rätsel der Vergangenheit zu lösen, sondern sie soll auch als Anweisung für die weitere Tätigkeit dienen. Ein Wort zu den politischen Erfolgen. Sie bestehen, wie allen Zionisten bekannt ist, in dem, was wir im Laufe der Jahre angestrebt und was wir erreicht haben: Die internationale Anerkennung und die internationale Bestätigung unseres Ideals, der nationalen Heimstätte in Palästina. Hiermit stehen die Namen, unseres Präsidenten Dr. Chaim Weizmann und meine Wenigkeit, in Verbindung. Auch möchte ich bei dieser Gelegenheit eines teuren unvergeßlichen Namens gedenken, Dr. Tschlenow, der uns in der ersten Periode unserer Arbeit geholfen hat. Es sind keine Berufsdiplomaten, die diese Erfolge erzielt haben. Lange vor der Friedenskonferenz tauchten Juden auf, die versuchten, sich mit der Welt in Verbindung zu setzen, und in London, Paris, Rom und anderen politischen Zentren Propaganda zu machen. Wir sprachen mit den Machthabern der Welt die Sprache ehrlicher Leute. Es gibt in England Tausende von Juden, die einflußreicher und bekannter sind als Weizmann, der aus Pinsk gebürtig ist. In Paris, dem Zentrum aller

jüdischen Kapazitäten, war es meine Wenigkeit. Unter all diesen Leuten erscheint ein fremder Jude, der höchstens auf eine literarische Karriere in hebräischer Sprache im Osten Europas zurückschauen kann. Das ist alles, was ich in meinem Tornister trug, den Marschallstab eines europäischen Diplomaten trug ich nie in meinem Koffer. Wir sind die Schüler des ersten jüdischen Politikers, T h e o d o r H e r z l s . Ich könnte nicht sagen, daß ich zu seinen Füßen saß. Ich saß viel früher zu den Füßen so manchen Rabbiners in Polen. Aber ich bemühte mich in den wenigen Jahren, die uns vergönnt waren, neben Herzl zu arbeiten, in seinen Geist einzudringen. Wir sprachen zu den Diplomaten der Welt in Namen des jüdischen Volkes und der Zionistischen Organisation. Wir sprachen die Sprache des nationalen Zionismus, die Sprache der nationalen Idee. Die Welt war auch vor dem Kriege national eingerichtet, aber sie wollte sich während des Krieges noch viel nationaler einrichten. Sie wollte die politische Geographie mit den Grenzen der nationalen Ethnographie womöglich in Einklang bringen. Deshalb, als sich die Völker beim Aeropag der Mächte mit ihren Ansprüchen meldeten, sagten wir uns, daß auch für uns die Zeit gekommen sei. Wenn wir uns jetzt nicht melden, so werden unsere Ansprüche der Verjährung verfallen. Wir erhoben also unsere Ansprüche auf unsere alte Heimat. Da sagte man uns: Wir sind entschlossen, die nationale Selbständigkeit der Völker, die sie seit einem Jahrhundert eingebüßt haben, wieder herzustellen, aber Eure Sache ist viel zu alt. Euch ist vor 2000 Jahren Unrecht geschehen. So historisch kann man nicht sein. Darauf erwiderten wir: Wir haben ein stärkeres Recht als andere Nationen, die seit 100 Jahren unter dem Verlust ihrer Selbständigkeit leiden, denn wir leiden schon seit 2000 Jahren. Darauf sagte man uns, die Politik richtet sich nach Analogien und Tatsachen. Darauf wiesen wir hin auf die Analogie des griechischen Volkes. Man sagte uns: Die Juden sind ja gar nicht in Palästina. Wir erwiderten: Die Griechen waren ja in Griechenland auch nicht da. Oeffnen Sie das Buch der Geschichte, so werden Sie sehen, daß das Land, das jetzt von Griechen bewohnt ist, von allen möglichen Mischstämmen bevölkert war, die nach und nach begannen, sich zu den Griechen zu bekennen. So hängt die Frage des heimatlichen Palästina mit dem jüdischen Volk in der ganzen Welt zusammen. Einen großen Teil meiner Zeit mußte ich diesen Verhandlungen widmen. Wir verlangten M i n d e r h e i t s r e c h t e für die Juden in allen Ländern, wo sie in großen Massen leben. Diese Forderung ist vorläufig a u f d e m P a p i e r erfüllt worden. Auch den anderen Minderheiten sind Minderheitsrechte zugebilligt worden. Aber es existiert sonst keine einzige Minderheit, die nicht irgendwo in der Welt eine Mehrheit ist. Die Garantie der Minderheitsrechte hat nur insofern Wert, als zu gleicher Zeit dieses Volkselement in irgendeinem Lande in der Welt konzentriert ist und eine Mehrheit darstellt. Deshalb besteht ein tiefer logischer Zusammenhang zwischen der Diaspora und Palästina. Das jüdische Volk will nach Zion zurückkehren, das jüdische Volkstum wird sein Zentrum in Palästina haben. Große Teile des Judentums werden als jüdische Peripherien

in der Welt leben, es muß für sie gesorgt werden, ihre Würde und ihre nationalen Rechte müssen gesichert werden. Zwischen diesen beiden Postulaten besteht kein Widerspruch, ist kein Widerspruch in der politischen Welt gefunden worden, weil wir im Namen des jüdischen Volkes sprachen, weil wir die Romantik von Palästina für uns hatten, weil wir die Romantik eines alten Volkes für uns hatten, das wieder jung zu werden beginnt. Wir sagten offen und ehrlich, was wir für Palästina und was wir für die Diaspora beanspruchen, so daß es als einheitliches System der Vernunft der Staatsmänner erschien. Deshalb haben wir das erreicht, was zu erreichen war. Es ist Tatsache geworden: wir sind in das Stadium eines Volkslebens eingetreten, wir sind schon in der Welt das anerkannte jüdische Volk, für welches ein Heim in Palästina gebaut wird. Wir haben diesen Bau schon begonnen. Ich kann Ihnen nicht auskalkulieren, wie wir es errichten werden, wieviel es kosten wird. Wenn wir Monumente in der Welt sehen, uns an ihnen ergötzen und an ihnen lernen, sie weiter zu schaffen und wenn in diesem Augenblick ein Rechenmeister mich fragt, wieviel es gekostet hat und wo man das Geld hergenommen hat, so könnte ich diese Fragen nicht beantworten. Dafür werden wir Rechenmeister haben, denn ohne Rechenmeister geht es nicht. Wir dürfen uns aber nicht von vornherein nur auf diesen Rechenstandpunkt stellen. Man muß sehr oft die Zahlen vergessen und sich hineinstürzen in eine große Sache. Wir, das jüdische Volk, sind auf Leben und Tod in diese Sache eingetreten. Wir müssen für das jüdische Volk das Nationalheim bauen, und da gibt es kein Rechen mehr. Jeder Jude muß eintreten mit seiner ganzen Person, mit all seiner Kraft, das ist unser Reichtum. Das übrige wird sich von selbst ergeben. Wenn Sie von politischen Erfolgen gesprochen haben, dürfen Sie nicht vergessen, daß diese Erfolge nur der Anfang sind, der Anfang einer Arbeit, die jetzt mit noch größerer Energie geleistet werden muß. Das Mandat ist noch nicht ratifiziert. Ich gebe zu, daß es mangelhaft ist, aber wir müssen diese Lücken ausfüllen. Sie wissen selbst, welche Möglichkeiten einer Interpretation gegeben sind, und wir müssen dafür sorgen, daß es so interpretiert wird, wie es unserer Sache dienlich ist. Die freie, nicht Immigration, sondern Repatriierung, muß vor sich gehen. Das muß ruhig und maßvoll gemacht werden. Nicht in aufreizender, provokatorischer Form, sondern ruhig, Schritt für Schritt, so muß Palästina unser werden. Ich glaube daran, ich bin überzeugt davon, daß Palästina in wenigen Jahren unser wird, und ich will hoffen, daß wir alle, die wir hier anwesend sind, es noch erleben werden, daß in Palästina eine auferstandene Welt zu sehen ist. Die Pioniere, die wir jetzt dort sehen, das ist die Rückkehr des jüdischen Volkes nach Erez-Israel. So sind die Juden auch aus Babylon zurückgekehrt, in Gruppen, in Familien, deren Namen angegeben werden. Und so werden auch wir zurückkehren. Mit Arbeit werden wir Palästina gewinnen, nicht erobern, sondern gewinnen, nicht nur für uns, sondern für die ganze Menschheit, und wir werden das goldene Jerusalem wieder zur Leuchte der Welt machen.

Sokolow schloß mit folgenden Worten:

„Ich bitte Sie, tragen Sie, die Zionisten, die Botschaft hinaus in das jüdische Volk. Wir haben im Namen das jüdischen Volkes und für das jüdische Volk Palästina bewilligt bekommen, es liegt an uns, in Palästina die Heimstätte zu errichten. Was ich unter Euch sehen will, ist Begeisterung. Wir stehen vor Jom Kippur. Und da kommt mir in Erinnerung ein Wort, das ein Wunderrabbi geäußert haben soll, als er vor Kol Nidre die Schule betrat. Er kam und fand all Leute in großer Andacht. Die großen Wachskerzen brannten, und alles war regelrecht zu Kol Nidre eingerichtet. Aber er fühlte, daß etwas fehlte und da sagte er: ‚Das Feuer ist nicht da!‘ Und als er das sagte, verbreitete sich eine Wärme in der Schule und durchdrang die Herzen und die Gemüter aller Andächtigen. Werde ich ein solcher Wunderrabbi sein? . . .“

Nach der mit einem großen Beifallssturm aufgenommenen Rede Sokolows verlangte die Versammlung spontan unter stürmischen Kundgebungen, daß auch der anwesende.

Jabotinsky

spreche. Jabotinsky sprach hierauf einige anfeuernde Worte. Er sagte u. a.: „Die Begeisterung hat nur Wert, wenn sie imstande ist, sich in menschliche Energie umzusetzen, in eine Energie, die Tag für Tag einen Schritt vorwärts geht, und wenn dieser Schritt nicht gelingt, ihn am nächsten Morgen von neuem versucht, es muß eine Energie sein, die sich in schöpferische Tat verwandelt. Unsere Parole muß sein: Arbeit in Palästina, Gold im Galuth, Blut, wenn es gilt, letzte Opfer zu bringen. Das ist, glaube ich, der Sinn der heutigen Versammlung und die Anregung, mit der wir heute Berlin verlassen. Berlin war immer das Vorbild der guten Organisation, und die Organisation besteht darin, daß man Tatsachen schafft. Gehen Sie weiter auf diesem Wege, dann wird man das Recht haben zu sagen, daß diese Versammlung ein großer Schritt vorwärts war.“ (Stürmischer Beifall.)

Die Versammlung nahm zum Schluß die nachstehende Resolution an:

Resolution.

„Die in Berlin am 9. Oktober 1921 tagende zionistische Festversammlung spricht dem Präsidenten der zionistischen Exekutive, Herrn Nahum Sokolow, den tiefsten Dank aus für seine Arbeit, die zur Anerkennung des historischen Rechtes des jüdischen Volkes geführt hat. Sie erneuert mit dem Ausdruck des Dankes das Gelöbnis, alle Kräfte anzuspannen, um der zionistischen Leitung den Aufbau Erez-Israels auf der durch die politischen Erfolge geschaffenen Grundlage zu ermöglichen. In der Erkenntnis, daß der Aufbau Palästinas das zentrale Problem der jüdischen Gegenwart ist, fordert sie j e d e n J u d e n auf, sich opferbereit an dieser Aufgabe zu beteiligen.“

*

Montag, den 10. d. M., sprach Sokolow in einem Kreise geladener jüdischer Persönlichkeiten. Zu dieser Veranstaltung war die Einladung seitens eines Komitees ergangen, dem u. a. die Herren Prof. E i n s t e i n ,

Rabb. Dr. B a e c k , Generalkonsul L a n d a u , Dr. Alfred A p f e l , Prof. S o b e r n h e i m sowie mehrere Zionisten angehörten. Die Ausführungen Sokolows, der die Prinzipien zionistischer Politik und die Erfahrungen seiner Arbeit darlegte, fanden bei den zahlreichen Anwesenden aufmerksamstes Interesse.”

These Jewish Zionist leaders, who represented great power, but few Jews, revealed that the First World War was an act of human sacrifice to “Moloch”, a holocaust which had strengthened the Zionists and unified them, and which was intended to make the Peoples of the world clamor for small ethnically segregated nations. The Zionist Jews planned long before the First World War that if they could provoke a world war, then they could petition at the inevitable peace conferences they would control to steal Palestine from its indigenous populations on the false and racist basis that they were a pure race in need of a segregated land to call their own. The Jewish nationalism of the Balfour Declaration and the internationalism of the Zionist League of Nations—the loss of sovereignty of Gentile nations and concurrent creation of a Jewish sovereignty—were praised by Zionist leaders as the fulfillment of Jewish prophecy, which prophecy calls for the disappearance of Gentile government and the emergence of the Jewish nation as the exclusive ruler of the entire world. Though the Jewish bankers’ agent President Woodrow Wilson had failed to unite the nations in world government after the contrived holocaust of the First World War, Zionist Jews intended to try and try again until the Peoples of the world capitulated to the Judaic prophecies.

They planned more world wars and Bolshevik takeovers in order to soften the will of the Peoples to protect their own sovereignty, such that they would gladly surrender to Jewish power as a supposed means to end their suffering. As Jabotinsky said, “Arbeit in Palästina, Gold im Galuth, Blut, wenn es gilt, letzte Opfer zu bringen.” One of the most influential of Zionist Jews, Achad Ha’am, saw Zionism as the fulfillment of Jewish Messianic prophecy and believed Jerusalem would become the capital of the world, as was foretold and planned by Jewish “prophets” in antiquity—note that when these Jews speak of “eternal world peace” they are referring to the Jewish prophecy that the Jewish Messiah will obliterate the Gentile Peoples and rule the world—a world which will know no more war, because the Jewish Messiah will have killed off the enemies of the Jews—all Peoples but the Jews will have perished at the hands of the Jews. These Jews were deceiving the Gentiles into destroying themselves in the euphemistic name of “peace”, which to these Jews meant the extermination of non-Jews. Remember that “eternal peace” to Cabalistic Jews meant the death of the Gentiles and they deliberately tried to lead Gentiles into welcoming this fate, this Utopia of “eternal peace”—their own extinction.

World famous aviator Charles A. Lindbergh, Jr. warned that the Jews, the British, and the Roosevelt administration were planning a Pearl Harbor type event, in a speech Lindbergh delivered on 11 September 1941 in Des Moines, Iowa.⁵⁴ Lindbergh was viciously smeared in the press, so viciously, that few dared to defend him. After the Pearl Harbor attack, any who might otherwise have said, “I told you

so!” would have been branded a traitor and a Nazi. It is further interesting to note that Adolf Hitler declared war against America immediately after the United States declared war on Japan—this in the full knowledge that America’s entrance into the war had cost Germany victory in the First World War—then Hitler declared war on the Soviets, thereby ensuring the destruction of Germany.

On 2 April 1917, while petitioning the American Congress for war against Germany, President Woodrow Wilson, who was an agent of Zionist Jewish bankers, stated that he would be good to the Germans and attack them without provocation so that the First World War would accomplish world peace by means of world war—which happened to be an ancient Jewish plan, war in the name of peace, genocide for the benefit of the righteous Jew, tyranny and slavery in the name of democracy,

“We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretence about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included: for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them.”⁵⁵

According to Congressman Thorkelson, Lord Beaverbrook wrote an article entitled “A Military Alliance With England”, which appeared in the *American Mercury* long before the attack on Pearl Harbor, in August of 1939, and which Congressman Thorkelson entered into the Congressional Record on 11 October 1939. This article revealed that some hoped for another world war which would empower the League of Nations,

“An attack by the Japanese on the Pacific coast of the United States would certainly have to deal with a serious obstacle in Hawaii, although an assault on Pearl Harbor would not compare in danger with an assault on Singapore. [***] We have not got so far as that on this occasion. But we have had an English archbishop telling us that it may be necessary to have another great and horrible war to establish the efficacy of the League of Nations. ‘This generation or the next will probably have to be sacrificed,’ said the distinguished ecclesiastic. But there is good reason to suppose that this is a passing mood of the people, not a fixed attitude. It has sprung up swiftly during days of excitement, and generous, although misguided, emotion. The cause of ‘Little Abyssinia’ appealed very much as the cause of the Cuban rebels did to the people of the United States 40 years ago. And these storms of passion rarely, if ever, have an influence in shaping permanent policy. The

mood changes too swiftly. Certainly the change in viewpoint is very marked compared with the situation we had in 1922. At that time I was able to take part in a movement which brought down the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, and destroyed his government. And what was the charge against him? What was the crime he had committed in the eyes of the public? Simply that he had threatened to use military sanctions against the Turks for an offense against a peace treaty, and therefore against the League, every bit as glaring as the Italian invasion of Ethiopia.”⁵⁶

Jews have often duped Gentiles with contrived “Christian” Utopian beliefs like that of the “Rapture”. They have some Christians eagerly awaiting, and even deliberately seeking to provoke another world war and a nuclear holocaust, because Cabalistic Jews have led them to believe that the genocide of non-believers will bring back Christ. They are taught by Cabalist Jews, and these Jews’ agents, that they will be privileged by their faith in disaster, and will be whisked away to safety while the rest of us are mass murdered at their behest. These Jews have sophisticatedly tied fabricated and false Zionist propaganda to Christianity.

Jews have also duped many Gentiles with the Utopian lie of Communism. “Mentor” acknowledged that Bolshevism was a Jewish movement and Mentor saw Bolshevism and Zionism, which in tandem fulfill Jewish Messianic prophecy by political means, as the salvation of mankind—meaning the salvation of the Jews—to Cabalistic Jews, Gentiles are sub-human. When Mentor wrote, the world knew well the horrific nature of the Red Terror, which Mentor defended as a means to an end. Mentor wanted to defend the Bolsheviks from the Allies who were threatening to defend the Russian People from the Jewish bankers. *The World’s Work* published the following article in March of 1919, which cannot even begin to capture the horrors of the Jewish bankers’ Bolshevism,

“THE RED TERROR IN RUSSIA

An Eye-Witness’s Story of the Mass Murders in Petrograd Directed
by Lenine and Trotzky

BY

ARNO DOSCH-FLEUROT

I WAS passing before the Chinese Gate of the old Tartar city in Moscow one afternoon last summer when I got a mental snapshot of the red terror that has made a lasting impression on me. The incident was commonplace enough, but the composition of the picture seized the overwrought, terror-held imagination which I in common with everyone, even including the Bolsheviks, was suffering from in Russia.

The ancient Chinese Gate, ever remindful of the soft yielding of the Russians to outside, strange, particularly Oriental influences, was in the background. Before it, conspicuous among the lazy movements of the half-eastern, half-western crowd, passed a tall Mongolian soldier in the common Russian uniform, a bare automatic stuck in his belt flat on his stomach. He

walked with a masterly stride like the other Mongolians who passed in and out of that gate hundreds of years ago among the same motley crowd of Russian peasants. And well he might feel his power, for he was one of the executioners hired by the Bolsheviki to take their prisoners—officers, bourgeois, peasants who objected to their dictatorship, anybody they did not like—and, forcing them to kneel in dark corners, to put that same automatic behind their ears and blow their heads off.

Just as he passed a load of his victims came gliding by. A modern police van, smooth-running, its dark green paint barely scratched, the only neat-looking thing left in Moscow, slipped silently across the square into the picture—bound for the Kremlin. It held ordinarily perhaps thirty persons, but was so tightly crowded I could see several heads through the tiny grating at the rear. Among them I recognized a young officer, who was soldier and nothing more. He was arrested simply because he was an officer, taken as a ‘hostage,’ and, as he was on his way to the Extraordinary Commission Against Counter-revolution, Speculation, and Sabotage, I did not have the slightest expectation of ever seeing him again. I never even knew his fate, nor did his family. He took a ride in the Bolshevik ‘tumbrel,’ and that was all any one ever knew. That is one of the most terrible things about the red terror.

The next most terrible thing about the terror is that it was undertaken by the Bolsheviki as a political move. They put it into execution coldly, tried it out as an experiment on what the great Socialist newspaper, the *Vorwaerts*, referred to ‘as the living body of society.’ Recently in Copenhagen, I met a Bolshevik from Moscow and I asked him about the terror. ‘Most of us think now it was a mistake,’ he replied, calmly. ‘A fine time to discover your mistake,’ I replied, ‘after you have murdered between 25,000 and 50,000 people.’ It was in Copenhagen I made this bitter comment. In Moscow, I should not have dared.

The spirit of the red terror was obvious in Russia from the moment of the original revolution. The soldiers who killed their officers, the sailors who drowned their commanders, were terrorists. On the third and fourth day of the original revolution I expected any moment to hear the mass-slaughter of the civilians had begun. But the situation flattened out, and, except for the usual isolated killings of property owners by peasants, the amount of murder actuated by hatred in Russia was extraordinarily small during the spring and summer of 1917. It looked as if Russia might have something like permanent political freedom, and even the Jewish pogroms ceased.

The body which has been responsible for much of the red terror since the Revolutionary Tribunal, was organized immediately after the Bolshevik revolution and was anything but terrorist to begin with. For one thing it was then in the hands of Russian workmen, and not dominated by international adventurers. I remember well its first trial. Countess Panin, a kindly little woman known to all Russia as a philanthropist, had had charge of the hospitals and orphans under Kerensky, and, following the Bolshevik *coup*

d'état, refused to give her funds to the usurpers. I think the charge was high treason, but the charge was a mere matter of words. She had opposed the Bolsheviki; that was the real crime. The court, Petrograd workmen, a mixture of Slav ferocity and gentleness, listened sagely to the testimony, which, of course, was very biased, and decided to dismiss the little countess with public rebuke! The second trial was that of Pouriskkevitch, a violent monarchist and a fool. He was caught in some absurd monarchistic plot, and the evidence was good. The court sentenced him to four years' hard labor, and then, because he was sick, really because he was an ass, sent him on his way.

The Revolutionary Tribunal did not last very long in such hands. That was not the kind of court planned by Lenine and Trotzky. They Soon put it in the hands of their obedient lieutenant, the little Ukrainian, Krylenko, the sublieutenant who was commander-in-chief of the Russian Army in the days when it demobilized itself and ignored his orders. He is president of the Revolutionary Tribunal yet. It is easy enough to get hireling soldiers, whether Letts or Chinamen, to execute your political enemies.

The real terror did not begin until after the signing of the treaty of Brest-Litovsk, long after in fact. Up to that time the Boisheviki had things their own way. The demand for peace in Russia, any kind of peace, shameful if necessary, was so strong among the uneducated Russian masses, that counter revolution had no chance. There was a Chouan movement that never died, and never has died, among the Cossacks, but it was powerless. And, if there was any shame in the mass of the Russian army for deserting its Allies, Trotzky had plenty of sophisticated words to prove that the only possible shame was to fight another day.

So it was only after Russia felt herself out of the war that opposition worth mentioning began menacing the doctrinaire leaders of the Bolsheviki, who had proved from the start their inability to organize anything constructive. Opposition to them everywhere throughout the country had never ceased, and to combat it they organized the Extraordinary Commission against Counter-revolution, Speculation, and Sabotage. With a government based on usurped power, influential only until it got the country out of war, and from that time on backed by a very small minority of the population, this Extraordinary Commission had an opportunity to do as it liked. It had no laws whatsoever to check it, and as soon as it had been in the exercise of its power a short time, it was no longer even bound by the government.

During April and May, 1918, when the Extraordinary Commission began exercising its arbitrary power, I was in Sweden, but I returned to a Russia in June and remained until September, the period during which the red terror developed into a concrete movement. Meanwhile Petrograd, not liking the moving of the central government to Moscow, thus depriving the Petrograd workmen of the power to which they had become used, had formed the Commune of the North which pretended to govern northern Russia, but only succeeded in governing Petrograd with the terror inspired by its own Extraordinary Commission. Moscow had the chief Extraordinary

Commission which reached out its long arm into all parts of Russia not strong enough to combat it, but Petrograd maintained its independence of action.

When I left Petrograd two months previously the local government of Petrograd was in the hands of the Soviet, which governed badly but with a certain laziness only sporadically ferocious which made life possible for those who did not come directly under its displeasure. Its president, the Bolshevist Zinoviev, placed there by Lenine, was forever laying every ill at the door of the bourgeoisie and trying by every art of a mediocre demagogue to induce the people to rise against the bourgeoisie, but he could not succeed. It took the single-handed power of Ouritzky, the adventurer, who became president of Petrograd's Extraordinary Commission, to give the bourgeoisie and all other enemies of the Bolsheviki, among them by this time most of the peasants, a due fear of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Ouritzky was himself a mere adventurer, who openly led a riotous life in Petrograd, made a great fortune himself by bribes and speculation, got most of it into foreign banks, but was shot before he got away. His more recent accumulations, 4,500,000 rubles, were discovered after his death in Petrograd, and nationalized solemnly by the Petrograd Soviet, but the Petrograd Soviet was unable to give back the lives of the '512 bourgeois hostages' who were shot in vengeance for his death.

The red terror really began with Ouritzky's death, that is to say, began on a scale that attracted foreign attention. But from the moment the Extraordinary Commission came into being several months previously it began exercising an arbitrary rule and terrorized everyone who fell under its displeasure. It would be more correct to say the red terror began with the dictatorship of the proletariat, but that the mass murders began only when the Bolsheviki felt their power threatened after the Fifth All-Russian Soviet at Moscow, July 5th, when the fanatic little Maria Spiridonovo made Lenine quail before her stinging words by saying that the Bolsheviki had failed, that the peasants were all against them, only a small portion of the workmen were with them, and that they were backed by the hooligans and the worst elements in the population. For that little Spiridonovo has been in jail ever since, though the charge against her is that she was in the plot that resulted in the murder of the German Ambassador Mirbach.

As Spiridonovo was the leader of the Left Social Revolutionists who helped the Bolsheviki stabilize their power during the winter and joined with them in driving out the Constitutional Assembly, the disaffection of the mad little woman was a severe blow to them. It meant that eventually all the peasants would be against them, and some immediately. They could not count on remaining dictators of Russia more than a few weeks without extraordinary procedures. Then they adopted the terror programme. Trotzky, Zinoviev, Carl Radek, Svertloff, all with consciences as hard as nails, had, long been for it, and now they were able to talk down the rest whose consciences were no better but who were inclined to believe that those who

live by the sword are likely to die by the sword. I have often heard a distinction made in favor of Lenine in this respect, but it is undeserved. He supported all the decrees of the terror.

Incidents of actual terrorism are to me all intertwined with parallel examples of Bolshevist mentality, also explicative of the state of mind which could declare a terror. Zinoviev, President of the Petrograd Soviet, for instance, in the same days of July, when the mass arrests of 'bourgeois hostages' were taking place, began intensifying his campaign to rouse the workmen to go out and slaughter the rest of the citizens where found. He had been at it for months, but the Petrograd workmen, played upon as they had been for years by these furious fanatics, would not go out and kill the bourgeoisie in cold blood. Then, in July, came the cholera, intensified by the long, slow starvation to which Bolshevist disorganization had subjected the whole of Petrograd. It came violently, a thousand cases in one day, nearly half dying. The city was stricken, every doctor was in the hospitals or working night and day with the sick. That particular night I knew the Soviet was going to meet to take action and I was interested to go because I knew the burning question of free commerce to relieve the food situation and end the absurd unsuccessful food nationalization was bound to come up. But I could not go because my friend, with whom I lived, was attacked by the cholera. I knew a dozen doctors but could not get one. Finally by telephone I got one at a hospital and he authorized a drug store by telephone to sell me tincture of opium for him and with that we were able, by working all night, to save his life.

In the morning, relieved that the crisis was past, I walked out to quiet my nerves and bought a copy of the official newspaper, the *Communa*. In it was the report of the night's meeting. The food monopolization question had been raised, I found, but Zinoviev, seeing the danger of losing the Bolshevist grip, turned the thoughts of these simple men from the point at issue, as he had done a hundred times before, by delivering a passionate demagogic address, laying the cholera epidemic at the doors of the bourgeoisie, saying it was their doing. That was to be expected of him, but then he went on to say something for which this earth has no fitting punishment. He said that 'we,' the workmen, would put a stop to the epidemic, and if the bourgeois doctors did not do their duty, they would be shot on the spot. Emphasizing his point, evidently feeling he had nearly passed his political crisis, he said: 'Any workman who finds a doctor is not doing his duty right must kill him.' As the deaths were inevitable, this was a call to the assassination of every doctor in Petrograd. To the credit of the Petrograd workmen I must add I heard of no doctor being killed, but that does not let off Zinoviev. As if he did not know doctors always do their duty, especially in Russia where in times of epidemic their heroism is classic. In the country if the epidemic does not kill them, the peasants do. Politics knows nothing more contemptible than this effort to make political capital out of a common calamity.

I cannot write about the terror coldly because I lived it, my friends were

victims of it. Night after night I lay and waited for them to come and take me, too. For some reason, not quite clear though, they left us Americans alone. I have no idea what help or shelter they could have expected from the 'imperial American Government.'

Life under these conditions in Russia was not bearable, and individuals set about fighting terror with terror. One young man killed Ouritzky. A young woman tried to kill Lenine. 'The White Terror,' cried the Bolsheviki, 'we must fight it with the Red Terror.' The same old dishonest way of turning things. They had by this time a goodly number of hostages, not only in Moscow and Petrograd, but in the provincial cities and the small towns everywhere and killed hundreds in vengeance. Most of these murdered hostages had never seen or heard of the attempted assassination. The record of terrorism in the provinces of Russia never can be told.

THE BOURGEOIS HOSTAGES

As I am here in Berlin, with none of my documentary proofs, I cannot cite from the Bolshevist papers. But in the month of September, these official organs were full of the lists of hostages killed 'to fight the White Terror.' The Bolsheviki, blind with their own rage, set down in their own official organs, the *Pravda* and *Isvestia* of Moscow, and the *Communa*, and *Pravda* Petrograd, the records of their own killings. I can only give out of my memory the one definite figure, 512, shot to avenge the death of Ouritzky, the scoundrel, whose rascality they later discovered. But when they discovered it, there was no regret at the hostages slaughtered because they wanted to kill them as 'boorjooy' hostages anyhow. It was indifferent to them whether they killed them because Ouritzky, or Ouritzky's dog, was killed.

Then, in September, came the culminating act of the Bolshevist Government, the manifest of September, written by Carl Radek, the most terrible document of which the brain of man was ever guilty. I will not attempt to quote it as I have not the manifest before me, but the tense of it was that every workman or peasant was immediately to kill, without parley, any one whom he suspected of counter-revolutionary tendencies. This threw down every bar, laid the way wide open to personal vengeance, plunder, and anarchy. The death and suffering that has occurred in Russia on account of this sweeping manifest passes all possibility of reckoning. It ended the last bit of justice between man and man in Russia. It turned loose anarchy in a situation filled with hate. It turned every man against his neighbor, made every house a fortress, and assured the deaths of tens of thousands of the only people who could possibly reconstruct Russia.

The Extraordinary Commission did its best to reduce the capable portion of the Russian population. It set about it systematically, even arresting people by occupations. The Russian engineers, for instance, are essential to the carrying on of that vast, scattered country, so the Bolsheviki began in September arresting them on any flimsy excuse and executing them out of hand. There was little pretence of trial, the Tribunal under Krylenko, and the

Extraordinary Commission, presided during the worst of the Terror by a little Lett fanatic named Peters, divided up the work of signing death warrants, and were only occasionally interrupted in the orderly procedure of their assassinations by persistent pleaders for mercy, but the automatic pistols worked in the cellars of the Lubianka and the other prisons of Russia without ceasing. There is no use trying to give figures. The actual deaths from the Red Terror must surpass all estimates. By one kind of terrorism or another, the deaths in Russia in the autumn of 1918 must have averaged a thousand a day. As the total deaths of the French Revolution from the fall of the Bastille to the beheading of Robespierre was only about ten thousand, the difference is noticeable. Except for the affair of the Conciergerie, there was also in France some pretence at trial. Nor was there anything to match the manifest of September, the product of Radek, the Austrian.

But violent death was not enough. Fifty to a hundred thousand victims even is only a fraction of ten millions. So the Bolsheviki had to think of a more general terror, and they decided to starve people to death. By trying to run a food supply which they were incapable of organizing they had already practically starved the city populations of all classes, but now they set about finally to starve everyone except actual workmen. They had long had a system of cards by which the city populations were divided into four groups. Category No. 1 contained only men who worked hard with their hands. Category No. 2 contained those who worked less hard. Category No. 3 contained the liberal professions. I, as writer, had cards of the third category. The fourth category contained all who had an income from property or invested money. The plan was, and is, to make the third and fourth categories die of starvation. They cannot go to work with their hands, and thus get cards of first or second category. There is nothing for them to do, according to the plan, except to die. They are educated wrong, so they must die.

Of course, they did not all die off in a few days of starvation. They evaded the law and peasants, who were also openly disobeying the law, risked being shot by the Red Guard and came into the cities with their produce. So they live on, somehow, many dying slowly and all with their vitality and chances of recuperation greatly reduced. They are forbidden to buy anything, and the Red Guards are in the markets to see that the purchasers have only cards of the first and second categories. But the simple Russian people are themselves not so cruel as the Bolsheviki who are trying to lead them, somehow it is arranged, though with trouble. Since July 26th the fourth category has had only two herrings daily, and the third category was put on the same diet a few weeks later. I was supposed to be so nourished, but, in point of fact, I never ate a herring in Russia. I got food, illegally. But, as the first category gets from 50 to 100 grams of bread a day and the second category but 25 to 50 grams, there has not been much to choose between being a member of the bourgeoisie or of the proletariat. All have had to buy illegally or starve.

The Terror is having a certain success. It is gradually killing off all the

culture there was in Russia, and, if it could go on long enough, there would be simply an aggregation of villages, some at peace, others at war. The cities have steadily disintegrated, and, after a year in power, the Bolsheviki have not one constructive act to their credit. But they are still in power, late in November as I write, and while they remain in power the Red Terror will continue.”⁵⁷

On 30 October 1939, Congressman Thorkelson warned the American Congress that some Jews were out to destroy America with another world war and by seeding Mexico with Communist revolutionaries—an old Eighteenth Century Rothschild plan, which is still in the Communists’ works and is a real and present danger to America’s security,

“If House Joint Resolution 306, the present Neutrality Act, is passed as it is, it is my firm belief that such action on our part will bring about civil war in the United States, which may well terminate in the ultimate destruction of those in the invisible Government who sponsored this legislation and who are the silent promoters of the present war in Europe.

As the first step in consideration of this so-called Neutrality Act of 1939, please ask yourself, Who is it that wants war? It certainly is not the people that want war, and it is their wish that we must consider, as we are their Representatives in Congress.

Have any of your constituents asked you to vote for war, so that their children may be sent forth to drown in the Atlantic or die in the trenches of Europe? Are there any Members of Congress who want war? I do not believe so. Have you ever stopped to think, or have you tried to identify those whose greatest ambition is to aline this country in war on the side of England? I have not found anyone that wants war except those who harbor hatreds toward Hitler, and strange as it may seem, they are the same people who approved of Stalin.

Is it logical or reasonable that all Christian civilized nations, such as the United States, England, Canada, Australia, France, Germany, Austria, and other European nationalities, must engage in internecine conflict or war of extermination, so that this group of haters may get even with one man? Shall we sacrifice millions of our young men from 18 to 30 years of age to appease personal hatreds of a small group of international exploiters? I think not. I do not believe that there is any one person worth such sacrifice, whether he be king, prince, or dictator.

Let me now carry this argument a little further, for I want to call your attention to the fact that this same group that now hates Hitler was pro-German during the World War, and it is the same group that ruled and directed Germany’s military machine before and during the World War. It is the same group that brought about inflation and exploited the German people, and it is the same group that furnished the money that brought about revolution in Russia and eliminated the Russian Army when its aid was

needed to win the World War. This same group of internationalists paid and promoted the bloody invasion of Hungary, in which the invaders destroyed life and property with utter disregard for civilized warfare or even decency. It is this same group that has spread and nourished communism throughout the whole world and that sponsored the 'red' revolution in Spain. It is the same communistic group which is now concentrated south of us in Mexico, waiting to strike when the time is ripe.

Please ask yourselves if you are justified in giving the President the power set forth in this Neutrality Act, and are you justified in repealing the arms-embargo clause, when you know it is for no other reason except to aline the United States with Great Britain in another war as senseless as the World War. In considering this remember that there are no hatreds among the common people of the nations of the world, and for that reason no desire to destroy either life or property. Is it not true that we, the common people, learn a lesson—yes; a lesson in self-preservation instead of fighting for the 'invisible government'? Let us marshal this personnel into an army of their own and ship them some place to fight it out among themselves. It will be a blessing to civilization.

This contemplated war will not save the world for democracy because we have that now in the fullest measure; it is fully entrenched within the Government itself and in many organizations. We need no further evidence of that than the recent exposé of the League for Peace and Democracy, with its many members employed in strategic positions within the Federal Government, to further the cause of democracy and communism. No; this war will not be fought for so-called democracy or communism, for it is here, and is an evil that we will eventually be called upon to destroy or else be destroyed by it.

If the present agitation in Europe should terminate in an active war, its purpose will be to place all Christian civilized nations under the domination of an international government that expects to rule the world by the power of money and the control of fools who sit in the chairs of governments. I do not believe this will happen here, for the people are too well informed about this evil blight that is keeping the world at odds, and which is spreading dissension and hatreds by confusion and international intrigue. Let us shake off this evil, put our shoulders to the wheel, and push the carriage of state back on the road to sound constitutional government. Do not forget, if attack comes, it will be delivered by the Communists within the United States and next by the Communists who are waiting beyond our borders. Let us, therefore, give undivided attention to the Communists within our midst, for they have no place within a republican government. We should not tolerate foreign or hyphenated groups that, for reasons best known to themselves, cannot or will not assimilate to become Americans. For our own preservation we must get rid of those who cannot subscribe to the fundamental principles of this Republic, as set forth in the Constitution of the United States."⁵⁸

On 22 September 1922, when the Jewish bankers had succeeded in obtaining the Palestine Mandate, but the majority of Jews did not wish to go to Palestine, and in the bankers' minds, the Jews needed another world war and an anti-Semitic dictator to convince Jews in general of the wisdom of being racist and murderous Jews, a Jewish Bolshevik Zionist who published under the pseudonym "Mentor" offered the Trojan Horse of "peace" to the world as bait for the nations to surrender their sovereignty to Jewish bankers and perish from the Earth,

Mentor wrote in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 15 September 1922 on pages 9 and 10,

"Live Together or Die Together."

By MENTOR.

DAY by day, almost hour by hour, the claim that the Great War was a war to end war appears to leer at us with a grim grin of ever deepening ironical mockery. It seems clear that of all the vain and illusory estimates that were made of the horrible disaster which fell upon mankind in August, 1914, none was so vain and illusory as that it was a war that would end war. Day by day, and almost hour by hour, fresh evidences crop up showing that the spirit of combat is as deeply ingrained in the nations of the world as ever. There are signs which cannot be mistaken, indeed, that as a direct result of the war there were set going the intrigues of diplomats, the underhand workings of politicians, the selfish devices of statesmen, all of them forming a net-work of live wires, which, at some mere touch, may send once again into a great conflagration all the vile elements that go to constitute war. And this, notwithstanding the chorus of protestation that peace and concord, and only peace is the goal towards which all the nations are striving. There is as much truth in the protestation now as there was in like assurances during the fatal months before August, 1914, when Russia and Germany and France and Great Britain, the foremost combatants in the epic tragedy, vied with each other in their declaration of peace and good-will among men. To-day, as then, all the talk of peace and the prevention of war is in reality nothing more than a manœuvring for position, precisely in the manner of prize fighters about to enter into contest. There are strivings for alliances and *ententes* and understandings and interests, which those who do not forget the history of the world before the breaking out of the Great War, feel as sure are premonitions of another great catastrophe of a like sort, as are the Italian peasants that an earthquake is imminent when they hear the low rumbles of the tremulous earth. The other day, Mr. J. A. Spender published a striking article in the *Westminster Gazette*, the burden of which was the essential interdependence and unity not alone of England and France but of all the nations of Europe, and not alone, of all the nations of Europe but of all the continents of the world. He speaks of 'the next war,' and does not hesitate to say that as the world is going, though it may be uncertain which nations will be opposed to which in such a war, that any

nation will be out of it is scarcely to be thought of. And he concludes that the nations of the world have therefore now to make up their minds that they must all live together or die together.

Limiting Armaments.

Live together or die together! It is in very surety for humanity at large a case of life or death. If War and the spirit of War be not eliminated, and War be allowed to develop in the sense in which the *Westminster Gazette* article contemplates 'the next war,' then it is not merely a question of life or death, as all wars are to the combatants engaged in them. It is a question of life or death to the nations of the world, life or death to civilisation. As I write these words, the Assembly of the League of Nations is meeting at Geneva, and good men are making strenuous efforts to secure that nation shall not lift up sword against nation, and that they shall learn war no more [*Isaiah 2:4*]. Limitation of armaments seems to be the one practical means that hitherto has suggested itself for accomplishing the peace of the world. But I cannot help thinking that this method is open to the gravest illusion, and may in fact prove to be in itself fraught with much danger of War. Because people are likely to rely upon it and neglect every other method and means, while all the time it may after all be a mere curtain hiding an intensive cultivation, instead of a limitation of warlike material. A country, for instance, may limit its naval equipment, and by thus saving millions may be able to devote so much the larger sum to some far more deadly form of warfare. A few months ago the United States summoned a Conference at Washington for the purpose of limiting armaments, and certain resolutions were come to for the limiting of navies. The average man and woman, just because America has taken this foremost lead in disarmament, doubtless conclude that America is bent entirely upon ways of peace, and is devoting herself exclusively to a national life that is humane in its policy. Yet the reports of the American Chemical Warfare Service for the three years ending 1920 show how disarmament as a policy may be as deceptive and as fatal as the placing of the stumbling block before the eyes of the blind.

Poison Gas.

We learn from this document that before the last war had ended sixty-three kinds of poison gas were in use, and that the Warfare Service of the American Government was engaged in research problems comprising some eight or nine gases that were said to be far more deadly than any that had hitherto been employed. We read of one gas that is capable of making the soil upon which it is cast as barren as once was Pharaoh's Egypt, and for the like period as that during which the famine raged in his land. Another gas is so deadly that a few whiffs of it are sufficient to cause a tree to wither and become pulverised. Upwards of eight hundred tons of these gases are being turned out by the United States weekly, and the cost is stated to be 100,000,000 dollars *per annum*, requiring forty-eight thousand men in the service. So successful—save the mark!—is this abominable business of

wholesale slaughter, that it is being extended, and we hear of a kind of radio-activity whereby, at the finger touch of one man, death can be spread over a vast area. At the same time malignant disease germs are mentioned, which could be dropped from aeroplanes, or spread over an enemy's country by specially cultivated rats and fleas. What devilish work the aeroplane can do, God—if it be not blasphemous to use His name in such a connection—alone knows! This American report, for example, speaks of aeroplanes, one of which could poison in the course of a flight every living soul within an area some seven or eight miles long and a hundred feet wide! It needs no gift of imagination to think what a 'covey' of these dastardly productions could do if let loose upon an enemy country. The report acknowledges that a hundred of them could, in a single night, convert a great city into an necropolis, a huge Gomorrah of corpses.

The Next War.

But pray let me not be mistaken. I happen to have lighted, through reading these facts in a paper the other day, upon these particulars of what America is doing behind the screen of limitation of armaments. I do not suppose, however, that she is doing any worse, even if she is doing much more, in the direction of mass slaughter, than are other peoples. We read of wondrous air engines being made in this country, which are designed to be capable of annihilating the largest men-o'-war afloat, together with the whole of their crews by one fell swoop. If they can do that, the destruction that they could wreak on land can be better conceived than described. It is manifest that the air raids of the Great War, to give just one instance of the multiplying of this murder enterprise, compared with the air raids of the next war, will seem as a popgun compared with a rifle. Since the last war the problem of distance has been so modified that an aeroplane, carrying I know not how many tons of death-dealing bombs, can travel easily a mile in some three-quarters of a minute. The carrying capacity of the aeroplane has also enormously increased; while, weather and atmospheric conditions, which were so often a shield against invasion in the last war, will be no bar in the next. Nor is it only in the region of air engines of war that huge strides towards greater and more ruthless destruction have been made. Submarine instruments that proved so deadly in the last war, and so nearly came to crippling this country and defeating her, have been rendered many more times efficacious. So have the older instruments of warfare. Thus we learn of 'Big Berthas' that, planted at the Channel Ports of France, say, at Calais or Boulogne, could easily storm London, and might send their death-dealing contents far further into the land. Mr. Spender is right. The next war between the great nations of the world will mean that those nations will die together. It will be the alternative to their having refused to live together.

We see, then, how delusive limitation of armaments may be as a means of eliminating war, when America gathers together a Conference for the very purpose, agrees to a limitation of its navy, secures a limitation of the navies

of other countries, and yet proceeds with the demoniacal manufacture of poison to be utilised by aeroplanes against any who may become the enemies of the United States. We see the futility of relying upon disarmament when we know that every country that is crying out for disarmament, England included, is at the same time using (or rather misusing) its best brains for devising methods whereby men and women can be shuffled off to death, because two or three men in one State cannot agree with two or three men in another—for that in its origin is what war really means; the nation's part comes in afterwards. It seems to me that disarmament, to be of any value, should be consequential. I mean that the mere laying down of arms will not ensure peace, if the spirit of war be not first exorcised. Great Britain was to all intents and purposes 'disarmed'—she was, in fact, unarmed, speaking comparatively—when she entered into the Great War. But the spirit of War became strong within her, and it was not long before she had vast armaments under her control. It is quite conceivable that a country without armaments could yet take its part, and a very sanguinary part, in a war. For armaments are quickly improvised, and to-day are cheap, for aeroplanes or submarines are very cheap when compared with such armaments as wars needed some years ago. An aeroplanes and submarines would be potent weapons to go on with anyway, by any nation, engaged in modern warfare. Indeed, many experts declare that those engines of destruction alone will decide the next war.

No; limitation of armaments must come, as disarmament must come as a result of man's feeling of disgust, and horror, and detestation of war. Man's disgust and horror, and detestation of war, will not come as a result of disarmament; and so long as the feeling of war, the sentiment of its glory, the mirage of its beauty and grandeur are implanted in men's minds and souls, the possibility of war must be ever present and can always at very short notice overcome lack of arms. Perhaps, however, an even more potent guard against War would be the discovery of some means of national security, so that nations could be sure that others nations did not mean to attack them. Men do not go about armed in civilised society, not because arms are unobtainable nor so much because of their detestation and horror of killing or injuring a neighbour, who has insulted or annoyed or attacked them. It is because men feel that they are moderately safe. But, first and foremost, men must understand the reality of war, the meaning of it. For that reason it is perhaps not altogether to be deplored that war no longer is a matter only of the trained armies taking their part in it. When war is declared between two nations now, every man, woman and child of each of those nations is liable to be maimed and slaughtered and not only the fighting men who volunteer, or are compelled to do service. Indeed, as things are tending, it is not unduly paradoxical to suggest that the day may come when in war the safest place for the peoples engaged in it will be the battlefield. Soldiers who go out to fight will be dug in in trenches, or provided with elaborate security which it would be impossible to render to the whole of the population whom they

leave behind, and who will be at the tender mercy of such horrors as the American report I have quoted details. So that war is coming home much more narrowly to every individual than even did the last war. Thus, uniformed or not uniformed, the shirker as well as the man who goes to 'do his bit,' the man who sees war only as a means for profiteering, as well as the man who sees in war glory and a road to honor—all will be equally liable to suffer the hellish damnations which are now involved in war. And this certainly creates a possibility that nations will not be quite so ready to embark on war, and statesmen will not find it so easy to obtain the wherewithal, financial and human, for carrying on war in the future as in the past.

'The Paths of Glory.'

War, said a writer whom I was reading the other day, is a madness that seizes peoples, and they are unable to restrain themselves when the passion and craze overtake them. To set a prophylactic against that madness nothing, it seems to me, could be more effectual than an intensive campaign telling of the realities of war as it has been in the past, and picturing what a war in the future must be. As an aid to this, nothing that has been published, I think, could be more assistant than a collection of poems written during the Great War, mostly by soldiers and entitled 'The Paths of Glory.' It is edited by Mr. Bertram Lloyd and published by Messrs. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. It is really difficult to select out of such a collection (which includes, it is interesting to note, some contributions from the pens of Jews), and one which will the more surely convey to the reader something of War, as it appears to the man who has gone through it, of War stripped of its unreality, of what one contributor to this volume calls its gilded cozenings, its trappings, and its hideous jewels. And let me say, parenthetically, that the same writer has in this book a line that grips. 'Blood,' he says, 'will not build the new Jerusalem.' There is a world of admonition and teaching, of reproach and warning, in that line: 'Blood will not build the new Jerusalem.' But there is one poem in the book that, it seems to me, will appear remarkable, not only in itself, but because it was written by a German soldier, the product of German militarism and of a culture to which we applied, in the hate that was so carefully induced in so many of us, for nearly five years, the omnibus term of 'Hun.' It is a little poem called 'The Brothers,' and its translation reads thus:

Before our wire there lay for long a dead man full in view:
The sun burned down upon him, he was cooled by wind and dew.

Day after day upon his pallid face I used to stare,
And ever grew more certain: 'twas my brother lying there.

And often as I looked at him outstretched before my gaze,

I seemed to hear his merry voice from far-off peaceful days.

And in my dreams I heard him crying out and weeping sore,
'Ah, brother, dearest brother, do you love me then no more?'

At last I risked the bullets and the shrapnel-rain, and ran
And fetched him in, and buried. . . an unknown fellow-man.

My eyes deceived me, but my heart proclaimed the truth to me:
In every dead man's countenance a brother's face I see.

If we could comprehend that it is a brother's face with which nation by nation is confronted when international quarrels occur—well, fratricide is not unknown, but it is rare, and war would be all the rarer if men called it fratricide—the murder of brother by brother.

What Are Jews Doing?

The work before all right-thinking men to-day, the chief work, the work that is more urgent than any other—that is abundantly clear—is war against war. A campaign against wholesale murder, so that humanity may be spared 'the next war,' and civilisation may be saved from the utter ruin and damnation which a war of any extent must bring upon it. The nations of the world are now, I believe, manœuvring for position with all their talk of peace and disarmament, of *ententes* and alliances. It is the rumbling of the volcano, the premonition of yet another disaster, a crowning disaster for mankind. The King the other day declared that the only war worth waging to-day is a war against war. And this holy war, this really glorious campaign, this battle of honour, veritably of Right over Might, this war for Peace, for the ideal preached by the Jewish prophets of old, and nourished by every Jew throughout the ages, and prayed for in his most solemn moments of converse between him and his God—in *this* war what are Jews doing and what are they going to do? How are Jews going to play *their* part. For Jews, if they be true to everything that makes Judaism worthy of them and makes them worthy of Judaism, must play their part in a great endeavour, so that the nations of the world may live together and not die together."

In *The Jewish Chronicle* on 22 September 1922 on pages 13 and 14, Mentor continued the plea to a world made weary by war and Bolshevism instigated by Jewish bankers, that the nations must surrender their sovereignty in order to obtain "peace",

““What are the Jews Doing?”

By MENTOR.

WHEN I wrote in this column last week, I had no idea that the premonitions to which I alluded, of another great catastrophe of like sort to the war that began in 1914, would so soon be justified. Within a few hours of my words appearing in print a document was issued by the British Government, threatening the beginning of a war of which, once started, no man could foretell the end. Hardly was the last issue of the *Jewish Chronicle* published than we seemed whirled back in a sudden instant to the time eight years ago that precluded the terrible world-struggle that lasted through nearly five years. There were rumours of war; there were ominous movements of politicians from the four corners of the kingdom, which newspapers interpreted as meaning all sorts of things. The evil birds of Militarism were foregathering. Like vultures they flew to gather their prey. Stories were bruited abroad, craftily designed to work upon the sentiments and the emotions of the people. Reasons and excuses, arguments and assurances, were cleverly designed, so that when the dogs of war were unleashed, proof of the inevitability and the justification for starting wholesale murder, for man going out to kill his fellow man, might be prudently provided beforehand. As I write, the situation—as it is termed—seems, if anything, a good deal less dangerous than it did at the beginning of the week. That is because those who were for war, those who were willing if not anxious to resort to arms in order to fight about a dispute instead of adjusting it by negotiation, have not received the encouraging response from the country which they had evidently hoped would come to them. Once bit twice shy! All the conventional paraphernalia of diplomats and politicians were again employed by the men of war as they were used eight years ago. Then their assurances were accepted, and men believed they could by war accomplish a great deal. Now, some of the public at least are wiser, and recollect the fraud, the chicanery, the double-dealing, the falsity, and the two-facedness which were so largely responsible for the determination of this country to enter into war eight years ago. They know that the same people are up to the same dodges, that the like people are bent on the like wiles, and the country this time has put a large discount upon all the mongering for War. The experience of the Great War has thus not been wholly lost, and there seems a healthy disposition, in more than one quarter, to regard the Minister who leads this country into war as *ipso facto* unfitted to hold the trust he has dishonoured by muddlement. There is proved to be now a looking upon war as the crowning disaster of any nation, not as its glory, as a visitation and not as a proud happening.

Jewish Doctrine and Christian.

If war is averted, if those responsible for the Government of the country finding war ‘no go,’ because the people will have none of it, have to seek other means for adjusting international differences, then the incident which looked so grave at the beginning of the week will have been of advantage. For it will have shown at least one Government that the way of war is not the

easiest at hand for them for settling any disputes that may arise. So far, so good; and if that spirit of antagonism to and hatred and—if you will—fear of war be maintained, so that men, beginning by disliking it, will go on to loathe and detest it, then we shall have made a long stride to the abolition of war and the arbitrament of the sword, and towards that condition which is the Jewish ideal; when man shall no longer lift up sword against man, nor learn war any more. [*Isaiah 2:4*] I call that the Jewish ideal, but we Jews have not a monopoly of it. Peace is a Christian ideal, too. Indeed, Christianity goes much farther, and is a doctrine of non-resistance to evil. Judaism does not teach that; it is far more practical and far more human. But if Christianity were really practised and the Christian spirit were truly in the souls of those who profess Christianity, war would be impossible. But a Jew is here writing for Jews, and it is because peace is a Jewish ideal that I revert to this question here and now—now, because we are on the threshold of the most sacred days in the Jewish calendar, when the Jew, if ever, is brought into close contact with the Almighty, when, if ever, he feels strong upon him the duty which is his as a Jew.

The Jewish Mission.

And I ask: What are the Jews doing in the war against war, the war which the King himself the other day said is the only war worth while; the war for Civilisation, for salving Humanity, for making the life of men and women in the world tolerable and bearable; the war against one of the most fertile roots of poverty with its fruits of hunger, and vice, and disease—what are the Jews doing in the war for which the King of Kings long ago conscripted certainly every Jew? I suppose the answer will reach me that Jews ought not, as such and of themselves, to be expected to take any definite part in such a campaign. I shall be told that war is really a political matter, and that Jews have no politics of their own, they share in the politics of the nations of which they are citizens. But this argument, carried to its logical conclusion, would place the Jew in such a position that the whole of the claim which he has made concerning his place in the world, and in respect to the Judaism he professes, would have to be seriously overhauled. How can a Jew be true to Jewish teachings, to the teachings of the Prophets, to Rabbinical teaching, to all that Judaism connotes for the Jew, unless Peace on earth and Goodwill among men be believed in by him and hoped for by him? How can he pray, as he constantly prays, from year end to year end, and day by day, for peace, and yet not mean it and not wish it? And if he means it and wishes it, then how can he place even his duty to the State (if it is conceivable that his duty to the State can involve war as a principle) before his duty to his God? The Christian does it. He worships a Divinity that he hails as the emblem of peace. He invokes the one whom he regards as Messiah, the harbinger of peace. He subscribes to the doctrine of Peace enunciated by the great Founder of his faith, and yet he contrives instruments of violence, engines of slaughter, and all the hellish devices for maintaining War on earth and illwill

towards men. But that is a matter for Christians. That they do thus is no reason, and assuredly no justification for Jews doing likewise. Following the multitude to do evil is not Jewish work. And so I ask again, just as we are slipping into yet another New Year: What are the Jews doing so that war shall cease from the earth, so that peace may reign and goodwill prevail among the children of men?

Our Separateness.

What are the Jews doing? It is a pertinent and not an impertinent question; because it asks, though not in those words, how is the Jew justifying his existence? We elect to remain a separate people. In every country and in every land we segregate ourselves from our fellow-citizens, and throughout the ages we have obstinately (as our enemies term it), faithfully as we believe, kept ourselves apart as a separate people. For what? Some Jews will tell you that we have refused to assimilate in the sense of losing ourselves in the multitudes surrounding us, because we have all along been conscious of being a separate national entity. So we have maintained our separateness in the hope that some day our national being would be restored. This, put very broadly, is the attitude of Zionists and Jewish Nationalists. But all Jews are not one or the other. The majority are neither, or at least care not at all for either striving. Their idea of Jewish separateness is altogether another. They say that we Jews have kept apart in order to carry on, amid the nations of the world, a Jewish Mission. That mission, so it is claimed, comprises our weaning other peoples away from error of thought and sin of action to a true conception of God. It means that we have to urge the breaking up of all idols and securing allegiance alone to the Almighty Governor of the universe. Very well, let us accept, for the purpose of argument, the contention of these fellow Jews that their separateness is maintained alone for the Mission potentialities of our people. Then I would ask: What are they doing in the way of propagating that Mission? Some of them argue that although it is true they are not actively engaged in spreading the message of Israel, or in preaching its truths to those of other faiths, they are doing service to the mission passively in the living of their lives. Their example, they say, is even better than precept. Surely this is a paltering with the question; it is an excuse, a subterfuge, and it makes the whole idea of the Mission of Israel not alone the sham that it is with those who thus argue, but a ridiculous parody of every idea of the purpose and the object which any mission worthy of the name must have.

The Jew's Contribution.

This paltry excuse for neglect of the call of the Mission of Israel does not rob us of the right to ask: What is the Jew doing in pursuance of what he believes to be his mission to Mankind? The answer must be: precious little. We are standing at the dawn of a New Year. We are about to reach another milestone in our history. Is the Jew to go on year by year in the same meaningless, chaotic existence, just living, just existing without a worthy

purpose as Jew; for mere material selfish objects, as a people without an ideal, without an aspiration? Broadly speaking, there are only two possible ideals for Jews, the National ideal and the Mission of Israel ideal. They are not antagonistic or even mutually exclusive. For the Jewish Nationalist also believes—believes very strongly—in the Mission of Israel, but believes, too, that it is impossible of accomplishment without national existence in a Jewish land. But taking the Jewish position as it is, either aspiration, if the Jew be true to it, will justify his separateness among the nations of the world. But if he nourish neither of those ideals, as is the way with thousands and thousands of Jews, then the *raison d'être* of his existence is *nil*, the part he plays in the world is a mirage. He is a mere parasite, and he justifies nothing so much as the indictment that is made by some enemies of our people. They denounce us because we remain separate as a people, and yet take no count of any service which we should do as Jews for the common benefit of Mankind. Well, if there be any reality in the Mission of Israel ideal, then I ask again: What are the Jews doing? What part are they taking in the war against war, in leading men from violence and slaughter and murder in the wholesale, back or rather forward to ways of peace, to ways of goodwill and happiness among men. We are doing precious little, even as individual Jews. As a Jewish people, we are doing nothing.

Here surely, as I have more than once suggested, is a great and glorious opportunity for the Jewish People. They do not want to be a separate nation. They wish to be separate among the nations of the world. Very well, then let them justify that aspiration. All the trouble Jews encounter is traceable to nothing so surely as to the fact that they are despised. And they are despised, not as individuals—as individuals even anti-Semites respect Jews—but because, however commendable individual Jews may be, whatever service individual Jews may have done for the world and for civilisation—and Dr. Joseph Jacobs left a posthumous work showing how great had been the service of individual Jews in that respect—as a people Jews contribute nothing to the service of mankind. We do not cultivate a Jewish culture; we are not known for any great or enduring office which we perform. But suppose we carried on our mission, our God-given mission as the bringers and the promoters of peace, as the bearer of that great ideal, is it not palpable that there would be something we should be doing by which we should win the respect of mankind? Because sooner or later, after misunderstanding had passed away and misrepresentation and vituperation had evaporated, the world would come to acknowledge itself our debtors for the good we should have effected. It seems to me that in the times in which we live—with the constant menace and danger of war, with the ineffable wickedness which allows great talent and scientific attainment to be misused and misapplied, as they are being misused and misapplied in devising means for carnage, for bloodshed, for violence, for all the indescribable horror comprised in war—and particularly at this hour when we are entering into the most solemn moments of conclave—the Jew with his God—it is not inapt to ask: What are

the Jews doing in the war that alone matters, the war against war? I ask it here and now, because the hearts of my fellow-Jews, attuned at this season to higher thoughts and loftier aspirations, may bethink themselves that there is a great evil in the world, the greatest evil that mankind and civilisation have to contend against. And mayhap there will arise in their souls a determination, each one as he can and where he can, to do what he can—thus making it a Jewish mission—so as to roll away the menace of war from the path that humanity is treading.”

If the “Jewish Mission” were truly to convince the Peoples of the world that monotheism is the most rational choice among extant religions, then Jews would be applying themselves to this task, but they are not. Instead, it appears that where Jews involve themselves in religious questions, they are most often ridiculing other religions. Far from inviting other Peoples to join Judaism, Jewish leaders instead attempt through their disproportionate control of media and education to destroy all religious beliefs in other Peoples, including the monotheism of Christianity and Islam—save the false beliefs they have instilled in Dispensationalist Christian Zionists, who serve as their slavish and gleefully suicidal “Esau”, to their deceptive and deceitful “Jacob”. The true nature of the “Jewish Mission” is made obvious by the actions of Jewish leaders and is spelled out in Jewish religious literature. It is to destroy other cultures, religions, nations and “races”. It is not a mission of peace and tolerance, rather it is a mission of segregation, “race” hatred, Jewish supremacy, war and genocide. As the Jewish book of *Exodus* 34:11-17 states, the “Jewish Mission” is to:

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

And as the Jewish book of *Obadiah* states, and note that Edom and Esau signify Gentiles, and that Judah and Jacob signify the Jews, the “Jewish Mission” is to destroy the nations and exterminate the subhuman Gentile “cattle”:

“1 The vision of Obadiah. Thus saith the Lord GOD concerning Edom: We have heard a message from the LORD, and an ambassador is sent among the

nations: 'Arise ye, and let us rise up against her in battle.' 2 Behold, I make thee small among the nations; thou art greatly despised. 3 The pride of thy heart hath beguiled thee, O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, thy habitation on high; that sayest in thy heart: 'Who shall bring me down to the ground?' 4 Though thou make thy nest as high as the eagle, and though thou set it among the stars, I will bring thee down from thence, saith the LORD. 5 If thieves came to thee, if robbers by night—how art thou cut off!—would they not steal till they had enough? If grape-gatherers came to thee, would they not leave some gleaning grapes? 6 How is Esau searched out! How are his hidden places sought out! 7 All the men of thy confederacy have conducted thee to the border; the men that were at peace with thee have beguiled thee, and prevailed against thee; they that eat thy bread lay a snare under thee, in whom there is no discernment. 8 Shall I not in that day, saith the LORD, destroy the wise men out of Edom, and discernment out of the mount of Esau? 9 And thy mighty men, O Teman, shall be dismayed, to the end that every one may be cut off from the mount of Esau by slaughter. 10 For the violence done to thy brother Jacob shame shall cover thee, and thou shalt be cut off for ever. 11 In the day that thou didst stand aloof, in the day that strangers carried away his substance, and foreigners entered into his gates, and cast lots upon Jerusalem, even thou wast as one of them. 12 But thou shouldest not have gazed on the day of thy brother in the day of his disaster, neither shouldest thou have rejoiced over the children of Judah in the day of their destruction; neither shouldest thou have spoken proudly in the day of distress. 13 Thou shouldest not have entered into the gate of My people in the day of their calamity; yea, thou shouldest not have gazed on their affliction in the day of their calamity, nor have laid hands on their substance in the day of their calamity. 14 Neither shouldest thou have stood in the crossway, to cut off those of his that escape; neither shouldest thou have delivered up those of his that did remain in the day of distress. 15 For the day of the LORD is near upon all the nations; as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee; thy dealing shall return upon thine own head. 16 For as ye have drunk upon My holy mountain, so shall all the nations drink continually, yea, they shall drink, and swallow down, and shall be as though they had not been. 17 But in mount Zion there shall be those that escape, and it shall be holy; and the house of Jacob shall possess their possessions. 18 And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau for stubble, and they shall kindle in them, and devour them; and there shall not be any remaining of the house of Esau; for the LORD hath spoken. 19 And they of the South shall possess the mount of Esau, and they of the Lowland the Philistines; and they shall possess the field of Ephraim, and the field of Samaria; and Benjamin shall possess Gilead. 20 And the captivity of this host of the children of Israel, that are among the Canaanites, even unto Zarephath, and the captivity of Jerusalem, that is in Sepharad, shall possess the cities of the South. 21 And saviours shall come up on mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be the

LORD’S. [version of the Jewish Publication Society]”

Mentor refers to the other “ideal” of Judaism—other than the destruction of Gentile nations and peoples—and that other ideal is the establishment of Jewish State in Palestine. To the Jews, the establishment of the Jewish State heralds the appearance of the Jewish Messiah and the Jews’ prophesied complete dominance over all other Peoples followed by the other Peoples’ judgement and then extermination. Mentor is right to assert that for Jews there is no conflict in supremacist Judaism between these two Jewish “ideals” of Jewish Nationalism and the concurrent destruction of Gentile Nationalism. The establishment of a Jewish Kingdom to rule and ruin the Earth is the expressed purpose of Judaism and the attainment of these goals is the only reason that racist Jews have kept their people segregated from the rest of humanity for some two thousand five hundred years.

They remain separate so that they can eventually rule and utterly destroy every other group of human beings. It is their “divine” wish and sole purpose. And they believe that when they have accomplished these horrific goals, God will bless them with a “new earth” and a new spirit and a new heart and will cover their dry bones with a new flesh, as promised in the Jewish apocalyptic nightmares of *Isaiah* and *Ezekiel*. This “new earth” will not suffer Gentile life. These Cabalistic Jews, and their Christian dupes who have been schooled to believe in the “Rapture”, intend to destroy the world so as to provoke God to create the “new earth”. They do not fear the genetic harm they are deliberately causing humanity, nor do they fear the environmental harm they are causing, because they believe that these will hasten the arrival of the Jewish Messiah and the appearance of a “new earth”. The *Zohar*, I, 28a-b, states,

“At that time every Israelite will find his twin-soul, as it is written, ‘I shall give to you a new heart, and a new spirit I shall place within you’ (Ezek. xxxvi, 26), and again, ‘And your sons and your daughters shall prophesy’ (Joel III, 1); these are [28b] the new souls with which the Israelites are to be endowed, according to the dictum, ‘the son of David will not come until all the souls to be enclosed in bodies have been exhausted’, and then the new ones shall come.”⁵⁹

Mentor came like Greeks bearing gifts, gifts that would destroy those who received them. Recall that Mentor acknowledged that Bolshevism was a Jewish deception that enslaved whole Peoples in the name of freedom, and yet Mentor claimed that Bolshevism was the salvation of Mankind. In another Jewish deception, Mentor sought to destroy all Gentile nations in the name of “peace”, “goodwill and happiness among men” and to establish Israel as a lone nation to rule the world. Mentor knew that Jews had caused the First World War, though Mentor blamed Christians, Tsarism, and everyone but the Jews who were truly responsible. Mentor knew that there were no benefits to Gentiles under Jewish world rule. Mentor knew that Jewish world rule signaled an end to war, because it signaled the end of Gentile life. Mentor knew that it was deceitful to lure the Gentiles into surrendering their

sovereignty to Jewish world rule for the sake of “peace”, because Mentor knew that it would be a peace which meant the assured destruction of the Gentiles. The solution to war was to bring an end to the tribal Jewish corruption which created it, not to destroy the national sovereignty of all Gentile nations and concurrently and artificially create a “Jewish State” to rule over all and then mass murder all Gentiles.

As with all Jewish promises to the Gentiles of Utopia, Mentor’s offer was a trap set to lure the Gentile nations into destroying themselves. This wretched deceit should come as no surprise to the reader, because it is the central purpose of Judaism and Jewish tribalism to lure Gentiles into self-destruction with false promises of an Utopian society, which they promise will follow the end of the world. The reason Mentor was pleading with the Jews to petition for the “end times” peace prophesied in *Isaiah 2:4* following the devastating First World War, was that Mentor wanted the Jews to sponsor the power of the Zionist League of Nations, which had recently issued the Palestine Mandate, but which had not yet convinced masses of Jews to move from their homes in Europe and America to Palestine. Mentor’s plea for peace was in fact a plea for Jewish world rule and the formation of a Jewish State in Palestine following the prophesied World War that the Jews had brought about, in forced and artificial fulfillment of Jewish Messianic prophecy.

The Jewish bankers had largely succeeded in their plan to discredit Gentile government and inaugurate Jewish world rule through the Zionist League of Nations, which they had created. They had also succeeded in stealing Palestine from the Turkish Empire and its indigenous population. But they failed to convince the vast majority of Jews to ruin the Earth in the name of peace, and to follow their effort to fulfill the promises of the Jewish prophets through their own devilish intervention in world affairs.

Since the First World War failed to convince the Jews to go to Palestine, it could not have been the final most horrific war of prophecy, and the Jewish bankers would see to it that a yet worse world war would take place, and then again test the Jews to see if they would need a third and still worse war to convince them to flee to the “Promised Land” and stay. Since Israel is today falling apart, and since Jews in America and Russia are again turning toward assimilation, sanity and humanity; there are likely plans in the works for a still worse world war than the Second World War, which racist Zionists believe will finally fulfill Jewish genocidal “end times” prophecy by means of the nuclear incineration of Gentile nations beginning with the Iranians.

Zionist Jews have requisitioned the nuclear arsenal of the United States through the use of disloyal Jewish agents in America, and by deputizing millions of Dispensationalist Zionist Christian dupes who hope to sacrifice the world for the sake of the Jews and who will gladly and madly kill off humanity in the insane belief that God will whisk them away to safety. These highly dangerous Christian Zionist beliefs were created and promoted by Zionist Jews, and were yet another deceitful Jewish trap set for the Gentiles to lure them into destroying themselves, as will be shown further on in this text. Jacob has yet again tricked Esau.

Though in the period immediately after the First World War most Jews hated the crazed Zionists, there were, however, a minority of Jews who went along with the

Jewish bankers and called for the governments of the world to step aside and surrender their national sovereignty to the open the way to the universal and open rule of the Jewish bankers, who could then claim the throne of the Messiah. Jewish bankers created a devastating war in part to make the Gentile Peoples war weary. The Jewish bankers then spread the lie that world government alone could prevent war, knowing that world government would be run by them, at first covertly, and later openly. They would then kill off Esau. It must be stressed that the Jewish bankers covertly and deliberately caused war in order to make the world weary of war so that they could step in and offer themselves as the solution to war.

One such plea for the rule of the world by Jewish bankers and their coterie followed Mentor's column on the same page of *The Jewish Chronicle* on 22 September 1922 on page 14,

"The Remedy for War.

From Mr. JOSEPH FINN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE JEWISH CHRONICLE.

SIR,—‘Mentor,’ in his article ‘Live together or die together,’ has rendered a great service to the cause of peace by showing how the terrible war with its consequent peace (which is as bad as was the war), was the result of two or three men in one State disagreeing with two or three men in another. But, ‘Mentor,’ like the other writers on the same subject, stops short at the remedy.

To eliminate the spirit of war by preaching against, and pointing out the horrors of war, is impossible. The fighting instinct in man cannot be eradicated. Take away the causes which awaken that spirit, and the chances of war would become nil.

For the past twelve years I have tried to convince leading pacifists that mere preaching against the horrors of war will not stop them, so long as nations will have to compete against each other for material gain, like individuals within the nations. [Hebrew deleted.] If it were not for fear of the law, even individuals would war against each other, because of the pressure of the struggle for material gain. As there is no international law strong enough to keep nations in check, the result is war. My pacifist friends argue that whilst the material and economic elements have something to do with the case, the moral element is the chief factor. When the war broke out, not because the various nations wanted to fight, but because the intrigues of diplomats dragged the nations into it, then those very pacifists forgot in a moment all that they had preached against war, and became the most blood-thirsty patriots. The same thing will repeat itself when the diplomats and statesmen bring on another war.

If we are to live and not die together, we must first of all take the great problem of the world's peace, prosperity, and security out of the hands of politicians, statesmen, and diplomats. They are psychologically unfit to solve that problem. Anyone, however slightly acquainted with history, must admit

that governments and their agents can only destroy. Throughout history, capital, labour, science, and art have *built*, whilst statesmen and politicians have *destroyed*. That is not mere rhetoric; it is hard fact. Since we must have governments, we have to put up with politicians and statesmen; but when in the history of nations a state of conditions as at present prevailing is reached, when the more the statesmen and diplomats ostensibly try to drag us out of the mire, the more they push us into it, then it is high time for the various nations involved to ask these gentlemen to step aside for a time, and to let us help ourselves.

What then is to be done? As a first step, I suggest the calling of a world conference of all the nations—the delegates to such a conference to be sent from the following bodies: chambers of commerce, bankers' institutions, manufacturers' associations, traders' associations, universities, art institutions, churches, trade unions, co-operative societies, friendly societies, and hospitals. Politicians, statesmen, diplomats, and journalists should not be eligible as candidates. The 'Reconstruction of the world' should be the problem which such a conference should undertake to solve. Whilst that conference proceeds, the various governments should confine their activities to the administration of the common law and the performance of police duties. All international politics and diplomacy of any sort must cease during the sitting of that World Conference.

For the moment, I will say nothing about the programme. Suffice it to say for the present, that such a Conference would do more to reconstruct the world in one month, than the statesmen and diplomats could do in a century.

The war has shown that we Jews must always suffer more than other people when the world is in a state of upheaval. It behooves us, therefore, more than others, to strive for universal peace, security, and prosperity. We cannot find security in some corner in Palestine, while the nations are trying to destroy each other. Our welfare and happiness is dependent on the welfare of all the other nations. If we really believe that we have a mission in the world, then that mission can only be to help on—nay, to push on—the general advancement of the nations, even at the risk of temporary unpleasantness. Our true [Hebrew deleted.] will not be found in having our own politicians, statesmen, diplomats, generals, and soldiers. We will reach our [Hebrew deleted.] when all wars—military and commercial—shall cease, and in consequence thereof the nations become truly civilised and refined, when they begin to feel sorrow because of the wrongs they have done to us throughout the centuries. Then will *our* day come, when the nations will be eager to compensate us for the wrongs we are suffering and have suffered. Blessed be those who live to see that day!

Yours faithfully,

JOSEPH FINN.

10, Windsor Road, Forest Gate, E.7.”

Finn speaks of the revenge of the Jews upon the Gentiles for the “Controversy

of Zion”—of the prophesied Messianic Age when the Jews will enslave and then exterminate the Gentiles, after the Jewish Messiah passes judgment on non-Jews and assimilated Jews (*Isaiah* 11. *Jeremiah* 3:17; 10:10-11; 23:5-8). The Jewish book of *Zechariah* 8:23 promises the Jews that ten Gentiles will gladly slave for every Jew,

“Thus saith the LORD of hosts; In those days *it shall come to pass*, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard *that God is with you.*”

The Jewish book of *Genesis* 25:23; 27:38-41 promises the Gentiles to the Jews as their slaves and slave soldiers, and gives the Jews an incentive to exterminate the Gentiles, simply because the Gentiles dare to be angry at the Jews for deceiving them and using them as slaves,

“25:23 And the LORD said unto her, Two nations *are* in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and *the one* people shall be stronger than *the other* people; and the elder shall serve the younger. [***] 27:38 And Esau said unto his father, Hast thou but one blessing, my father? bless me, *even* me also, O my father. And Esau lifted up his voice, and wept. 27:39 And Isaac his father answered and said unto him, Behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above; 27:40 And by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck. 27:41 And Esau hated Jacob because of the blessing wherewith his father blessed him: and Esau said in his heart, The days of mourning for my father are at hand; then will I slay my brother Jacob.”

Some argue that Jews in general have an indoctrinated tendency to stifle progress and restrict disputes to dogmatism. This is an effect of Judaism, which demands obedience to an arbitrary and absolute law. One cannot speak out against, or argue with, the one true God, or with those chosen to represent him and chosen to kill off the unchosen. Some, including Eugen Karl Dühring, Friedrich Nietzsche and Houston Stewart Chamberlain, have argued that Judaism is a slavish religion which inhibits human creativity. The ancient religion has little respect for personal choice and places in its stead absolute obedience to God and to God’s laws, and to God’s chosen people. Since Judaism is more political than it is religious, the effects of this authoritarianism lingered even in the writings of many German Jews who were supposedly atheists, including Karl Marx, Moses Hess and Ferdinand Lasalle.

This same charge was also made by philo-Semites like the famous cultural Zionist Ha’am. Ha’am wrote of the Jews as a slavish “people of the book” who suffered under the “long-standing disease” of the “tyranny of the written word” which forbade individual thought for the sake of absolute obedience to arbitrary dogmatic laws.⁶⁰ Chaim Nachman Bialik’s speech at the opening of the “Hebrew

University” provides us with a good example of the religious zealotry and of the dogmatic and intolerant worship of the Torah and Talmud of some Jews—probably a very small percentage of Jews today.⁶¹ Jewish children learn Hebrew and Judaism through a process of mindless repetition, which inhibits their ability to reason and think independently. Jewish leaders are often arrogant, absolutist, intolerant and dogmatic. In 1944, David Ben-Gurion cried out “for absolute allegiance to the Jewish revolution”, which he defined in the Messianic terms of “*the complete ingathering of the exiles into a socialist Jewish state.*”⁶² Ben-Gurion believed that Jews should lead the Gentiles of the world to adopt Jewish religious mythologies and conduct “world revolution”. Violent revolution, and the dictatorships imposed under the illusion of Utopian dreams, have been longstanding Jewish traditions. Reality and science give way to religion and childish delusion.

Like many before him, Albert Einstein believed that Jews had lived in darkness while Gentile Europeans had born reborn.⁶³ Judaism had inhibited the progress of science among Jews, who attempted to stifle free thought among their own people. When the Jewish community marketed the new Jewish heroes Karl Marx, Albert Einstein and Sigmund Freud to the general public in the Twentieth Century, the old habits remained and a new international dogmatism, like that of the old lawgiver Moses, emerged. No one dare question the pseudo-Messiahs, who had allegedly found ultimate truths that were not open to debate. The old Jewish traditions of hero worship and dogmatism carried on in a new age of mass suggestion through intensive advertising and a controlled and propagandistic press. To question a Jewish hero was to question a Jewish God, and therefore to be anti-Semitic, *per se*.⁶⁴

This largely ended free and open debate, and with it normal scientific progress in these fields. Several nations were forced into the slavery of Communism under the false promise and childish premise of a Jewish Utopia to come. Physics degenerated into mysticism. Psychology reaped tremendous profits for its practitioners, while doing little for its patients that time alone would have otherwise accomplished. Each of these mythologies and advertised heroes could only survive in a climate where dissent was suppressed, and suppression and dogmatism were ancient traditions in the Jewish community. Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu wrote in the 1893,

“Far from emanating from the Synagogue, the new ideas had great difficulty in making their way into it. The Synagogue had, so to speak, stopped up all the chinks and crannies in its traditions; in Poland, Hungary, and even in Germany, in fact, almost everywhere it had proceeded after the fashion prevalent in cold countries, where at the beginning of winter the windows are fastened down with cement to keep the outer air from entering. Its most illustrious children were anathematised by the Synagogue; the *Herem*, with its awful imprecations, was hurled at whoever attempted innovations. Baruch Spinoza was excommunicated in the eighteenth century by the most enlightened community on earth; Moses Mendelssohn, who served as a model for Lessing’s *Nathan the Wise*, had in that same century to see his German Pentateuch and Psalms condemned by German and Polish rabbis. The synagogue of Berlin rejected books written in the vernacular; it

expelled one of its members for having read a German book. The bulk of Jews of both classes, the *Askenazim* and the *Sephardim*, abhorred the philosophers and their precepts. They held profane sciences in suspicion. [*Footnote*: See, especially, the autobiography of the rabbi-philosopher, Solomon Maimon, published in 1792-93, by R. P. Moritz, under the name: *Salomon Maimon's Lebensgeschichte*. Cf. Arvède Barine's *Un Juif Polonaise* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, of October 15, 1889).] While the salons of Paris were discussing the philosophy of Descartes, or the approaching regeneration of man, the Jewish communities of Eastern and Central Europe were dreaming of cabalistic utopias, yielding themselves up to the craze of Hassidism, and growing fanatical over the rival claims of false Messiahs, such as Franck and Sabbatai. [*Footnote*: The Seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were, in fact, the age of false Messiahs and also of the diffusion of Hassidism or neo-cabalism, still prevalent in a number of communities. See Graetz's *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. x., chap. vi.-xi.]

III.

Everywhere, in the East as well as the West, it was from the outside, and thanks only to the lamps of the *goim*, that the new ideas, 'the light,' penetrated into the alleys of the Ghetto and pierced the gloom of the *Judengasse*. Could it, indeed, have been otherwise, after centuries of sequestration and debasement! However great may be Israel's elasticity, her mainspring seemed to have been broken. She was weighed down by the double load of her heavy talmudic traditions, and the hatred of a hostile society."⁶⁵

Communists, Zionists and Nazis likewise have been notorious opponents of personal choice and viciously punished dissent and free speech. Each of these movements were led and financed by Jews and by crypto-Jews. The hero worship of figures like Einstein, Freud and Marx, which has led in many instances to a dogmatic stagnation of science and to fanatical personal attacks on dissenters, has been called a "Jewish trait"—the continuance of a persistent habit of intolerance after the abandonment of one religious Jewish creed for another, and the shameless perpetuation and proselytizing of a childish religious creed through the obstruction of open debate, and the self-aggrandizing advertising of Jewish cult figures.

On the other hand, many leading Jews have been very cosmopolitan and cultured people, who were eager to assimilate. They, too, fall victim to a fairly large contingent of racist Jews who wish to quash disagreement with their views by slandering and libeling anyone who brings the facts to the fore by calling them "anti-Semitic" for daring to argue with Jewish racists.⁶⁶ This is a highly vocal and well-organized minority in the Jewish community, which is mostly composed of racist Zionist Jews. Albert Einstein, who was himself a vocal racist, is a hero to other racist Jews. Racist Jews often have no regard for individual rights or democratic principles. They insist that everyone obey them, or face death. This charge is not made lightly or whimsically, and a good deal of evidence will be presented in this work to justify this accusation. Other Jews are by no means immune to the attacks of racist Jews, in

fact they are the most common target of racist Jewish intolerance, totalitarianism and violence.

Many of the early Communist and Socialist philosophers were proudly in the traditions of Plato, the early Christians, the American Revolution, and the French Revolution—a fact that troubled many critics of Judaism and Jews, who often saw the French Revolution as a Jewish Frankist-style plot to destroy the monarchies of the world in order to obtain Jewish emancipation and a Jewish nation, then to rule the world from Jerusalem as was prophesied in the Old Testament (*Exodus* 34:11-17. *Psalms* 72. *Isaiah* 2:1-4; 9:6-7; 11:4, 9-10; 42:1; 61:6. *Jeremiah* 3:17. *Micah* 4:2-3. *Zechariah* 8:20-23; 14:9). The French Revolution resulted in the “Terror” and many predicted that a “world revolution” would be yet more terrible. Indeed, the “Red Terror” of the Bolshevik Revolution was far more terrible than the Terror of the French Revolution. The Old Testament calls on Jews to commit still worse acts against humanity than the atrocities of the Bolshevik—and Nazi—revolutions.

Though centuries of Jewish propaganda have blinded many to these facts, the world public was acutely aware of them after the First World War. Though Jewish propaganda has largely erased this history from the consciousness of the American People and has misrepresented the facts so as to make it appear that there were no legitimate grounds to be suspicious of Judaism and Jewish racism in the era when Einstein faced his harshest criticism, there were many legitimate reasons why courageous individuals fought back against the destruction of their nations and their cultures. Many of these individuals were of Jewish descent and knew well the agenda of the Jewish financiers who fomented and funded the Jewish revolutionaries.

Some saw democracy as a very bad thing—a tyranny of the mediocre over the superior person, which inhibits progress and cheapens culture, science and the arts; allowing for collusive elements to commercialize and destroy culture by vulgarizing it for mass consumption. Some, including Aristotle, believed that democracy inevitably degenerates into plutocracy. Some of the critics of the Jews of Einstein’s day, in chorus with many proud Jews, pointed out the commonality of Bolshevism and Judaism. This promoted general prejudice against Jews, most of whom opposed Bolshevism.

There were, however, large numbers of Jewish Bolsheviks. Jews led and financed the international revolutionary movement and it must therefore be viewed as a Jewish movement. Though many good natured people were duped through romanticism and idealism into joining the world revolutionary movement, it became very clear after the Russian and Hungarian revolutions that the Bolsheviks were out to destroy the Gentile nations in fulfillment of horrific Judaic prophecies.

The Bolsheviks used Utopianism as a political platform to lure in recruits. After they succeeded in their revolution, they subverted the very ideals they had promoted as a means to place themselves into power. When this became widely known, they then themselves created anti-Bolshevik organizations, including the Nazi Party, as a means to place crypto-Bolsheviks into power, who would conduct a Bolshevik revolution in the name of fighting Bolshevism, in countries which had learned of the dangers of Bolshevism.

Though many early Socialists helped to organize labor unions, which developed

the middle class, and were pursuing their Utopian dreams before the genocidal purges of Lenin, Stalin, Kun, Mao and other “Communist revolutionaries” would forever stigmatize the political agenda and ideas of Socialism, Bolsheviks were rightfully seen as terribly dangerous in 1919 and Germany was one of their primary targets. Peter Michelmores wrote in his biography *Einstein: Profile of the Man*,

“But there was another, more sinister, reason. November 7[, 1919] was the second anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia and Communist Party agents all over the world had in their hands a secret manifesto saying that this was the day when workers should be incited to overthrow governments, assassinate public officials, bomb army barracks and establish dictatorships of the proletariat. Berlin was a prime target. The amateur republican government of former basketmakers and blacksmiths was in daily danger of collapse under pressure from both extreme left and extreme right.”⁶⁷

Einstein, himself, wrote to Emil Zürcher on 15 April 1919 that he knew for certain that Bolshevik leaders were stealing the wealth of the Russian Nation and were “systematically” mass murdering everyone who did “not belong to the lowest class.”⁶⁸

In the 1920's, there were many theories about Jewish people, even (one might say, *especially*) in the conservative academic community, who should have been more enlightened. Einstein happened to fulfill many stereotypes. One such stereotype was the belief that Jewish people were genetically incapable of profound intuitive thought, but could only think “logically”, *i. e.*, repetitively, deductively and mathematically. Philipp Frank wrote,

“The members of the Jewish community had often been compelled to hear and to read that while their race possessed a certain craftiness in business pursuits, in science it could only repeat and illuminate the work of others, and that truly creative talents were denied them.”⁶⁹

It might be possible, though it seems unlikely to your author, that Jews would selectively mate with persons who were obedient to authority and shunned original thought, and that Jewish society so strongly selects against the survival of strong and moral individuals that the Jews have created a clannish and ignoble breed. Anecdotally, your author has found that the opposite is the case, at least in the modern era. It seems more likely to your author that conditioned reactionary tribalism gives the false appearance of intellectual stupor and anti-social immorality. Jews would blindly support patently false notions and would deliberately lie in a nearly uniform chorus, not because they were truly blind, but rather because they were truly clannish. They were probably made so by social conditioning, not blood—though the possibility exists that they have bred themselves into an especially clannish, selfish and unethical type, as governed by the general standards of Western Civilization.

In the 1893, Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu wrote,

“There are two opinions current with regard to the Jew. One ascribes to him a spirit, if not a genius, foreign and antagonistic to our race, and calls it the ‘Semitic’ spirit. The other—often held by the very same persons—asserts that the Jew is utterly lacking in individual genius, in originality. According to this opinion he has never invented anything, and is in art and science, as everywhere else, capable only of adjusting and adapting. ‘Look at them,’ said one of my friends to me, ‘see how quickly and with what monkey- or squirrel-like agility they climb the first rungs of any ladder; sometimes they even succeed in scaling its top, but they never add to it a single round.’ Granted; but how many of us really add a single round to that mysterious ladder which we have set up in vacant space, and which reaches toward the Infinite?”

Men who consider the remnants of Israel as an ethnic element distinct from all others, insist that they have never displayed any originality, either in art, poetry, or philosophy. The Jew, in their opinion, is utterly lacking in creative power. It is this that is said to distinguish the Semitic, from the Aryan, spirit. The Semite is sterile; neither his brain nor his hands can produce anything new. He is content to appropriate the labour of others, in order to put it to use; he makes the most of ideas and inventions, as of dollars; he combines them and puts them into circulation; in short, he always subsists on others; one might almost say that he is the parasite of arts and sciences.

This is, approximately, the theory of Wagner [*Footnote: Wagner’s Das Judenthum in der Musik.*] with regard to music, the art most cultivated by the Jews; according to him, Jews like Mendelssohn, Meyerbeer, and Halévy, although indeed able to compose a German symphony or a French opera, have not been able to invent a new form in art. But, is it necessary to invent new forms in order to be an original artist? And does this lack necessarily imply that Jewish genius consists entirely in a faculty for combination? Absence of creative power, of spontaneity and of originality, is said to be the mark of the Jew everywhere. Israel, it is asserted, displays ill this respect something of a woman’s nature. The Semites are said to be a feminine race, possessing to a high degree the gift of receptivity, always lacking in virility and procreative power. From which it would seem to follow that they are, after all, an inferior race.

If this be indeed so, it suggests a reflection: If the Jew is merely an imitator, a copyist, a borrower, how can his race possibly denationalise our strong Aryan races? But, are we justified in regarding this lack of originality as a racial feature, the stamp impressed on Israel and the Semite by the hand of ages? As for myself, I must confess that if any of the ancient races seemed to possess originality, it was this race. Even those who have denied it a creative imagination [*Footnote: Renan’s Histoire Générale des Langues Sémitiques: ‘The eminently subjective character of Arabian and Hebrew*

poetry is due to another trait of the Semitic spirit, to its complete lack of creative imagination and to the consequent absence of fiction.] have agreed that it gave the world religion—an invention that holds its own with any other.”⁷⁰

Even some of Einstein’s staunchest supporters believed in this theory that Jews were genetically inferior to the creative intellect of Gentiles. Einstein tried to portray himself in opposition to intuition and against inductive reasoning, which unscientific stance fit the stereotype of the Jewish mind.⁷¹

The following letter to the editor, which appeared in *The New York Times* in 1919, captures the spirit of the times, both the commonplaces of the time and the prevailing influence of racist thought and nationalism in academic circles in the 1920’s:

“Einstein and His Theory.

To the Editor of The New York Times:

On the first day of the Autumn meeting of the National Academy of Sciences (New Haven, Nov. 10) Einstein’s relativity theory was discussed by two brilliant men from Massachusetts. Perhaps some of your readers may be interested in two remarks made by the speakers. The first speaker, a brilliant mathematician, came to the conclusion that Einstein’s theory is mere philosophy, which he explained by the fact that Einstein is a Jew. The second speaker, whom, as he said humorously, physicists look upon as a mathematician and mathematicians consider a physicist, had a good word to say for the theory of Einstein, namely, that he, the speaker, heard in Paris that Einstein, who was and still is a member of the Kaiser Wilhelm’s Academy in Berlin, expressed a laudable wish that the Germans should be beaten. Accordingly, Einstein’s theory may be unscientific because Einstein is a Jew; on the other hand, the theory ought to be correct because Einstein was an anti-Hun. Undoubtedly the mental rays of some of our scientists suffered a more or less perceptible deviation from the normal, brought about by the course of Mars in the last four years.

SAMUEL JAMES MELTZER.

New York, Nov. 11, 1919.”

Judaism, Jewish tribalism, and Jewish racism gave the Jews a bad name, and many confused these ethnic, cultural and religious traits with “racial” traits. However, Jews were often able to intimidate most scholars out of publicly condemning these behaviors, and from publishing examples of them, and conducting research into their causes. The tribalism itself provided racist Jews with a means to quash most public condemnation of Jewish racism and Jewish tribalism. Edward Alsworth Ross, a Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, wrote in his book, *The Old World in the New: The Significance of Past and Present Immigration to the American People*, The Century Co., New York, (1914), pp. 143-167, Chapter 7, “The East European Hebrews”,

“CHAPTER VII
THE EAST EUROPEAN HEBREWS

IN his defense of Flaccus, a Roman governor who had ‘squeezed’ his Jewish subjects, Cicero lowers his voice when he comes to speak of the Jews, for, as he explains to the judges, there are persons who might excite against him this numerous, clannish and powerful element. With much greater reason might an American lower his voice to-day in discussing two million Hebrew immigrants united by a strong race consciousness and already ably represented at every level of wealth, power, and influence in the United States.

At the time of the Revolution there were perhaps 700 Jewish families in the colonies. In 1826 the number of Jews in the United States was estimated at 6000; in 1840, at 15,000; in 1848, at 50,000. The immigration from Germany brought great numbers, and at the outbreak of the Civil War there were probably 150,000 Jews in this country. In 1888, after the first wave from Russia, they were estimated at 400,000. Since the beginning of 1899, one and one-third millions of Hebrews have settled in this country.

Easily one-fifth of the Hebrews in the world are with us, and the freshet shows no signs of subsidence. America is coming to be hailed as the ‘promised land,’ and Zionist dreams are yielding to the conviction that it will be much easier for the keen-witted Russian Jews to prosper here as a free component in a nation of a hundred millions than to grub a living out of the baked hillsides of Palestine. With Mr. Zangwill they exult that: ‘America has ample room for all the six millions of the Pale; any one of her fifty states could absorb them. And next to being in a country of their own, there could be no better fate for them than to be together in a land of civil and religious liberty, of whose Constitution Christianity forms no part and where their collective votes would practically guarantee them against future persecution.’

Hence the endeavor of the Jews to control the immigration policy of the United States. Although theirs is but a seventh of our net immigration, they led the fight on the Immigration Commission’s bill. The power of the million Jews in the metropolis lined up the Congressional delegation from New York in solid opposition to the literacy test. The systematic campaign in newspapers and magazines to break down all arguments for restriction and to calm nativist fears is waged by and for one race. Hebrew money is behind the National Liberal Immigration League and its numerous publications. From the paper before the commercial body or the scientific association to the heavy treatise produced with the aid of the Baron de Hirsch Fund, the literature that proves the blessings of immigration to all classes in America emanates from subtle Hebrew brains. In order to admit their brethren from the Pale the brightest of the Semites are keeping our doors open to the dullest of the Aryans!

Migrating as families the Hebrews from eastern Europe are pretty evenly divided between the sexes. Their literacy is 26 per cent., about the average.

Artisans and professional men are rather numerous among them. They come from cities and settle in cities—half of them in New York. Centuries of enforced Ghetto life seem to have bred in them a herding instinct. No other physiques can so well withstand the toxins of urban congestion. Save the Italians, more Jews will crowd upon a given space than any other nationality. As they prosper they do not proportionately enlarge their quarters. Of Boston tenement-house Jews Dr. Bushee testifies: ‘Their inborn love of money-making leads them to crowd into the smallest quarters. Families having very respectable bank accounts have been known to occupy cellar rooms where damp and cold streaked the walls.’ ‘There are actually streets in the West End where, while Jews are moving in, negro housewives are gathering up their skirts and seeking a more spotless environment.’

The first stream of Russo-Hebrew immigrants started flowing in 1882 in consequence of the reactionary policy of Alexander III. It contained many students and members of scholarly families, who stimulated intellectual activity among their fellows here and were leaders in radical thought. These idealists established newspapers in the Jewish-German Jargon and thus made Yiddish (*Jüdisch*) a literary language. The second stream reached us after 1890 and brought immigrants who were not steeped in modern ideas but held to Talmudic traditions and the learning of the rabbis. The more recent flow taps lower social strata and is prompted by economic motives. These later arrivals lack both the idealism of the first stream and the religious culture of the second.

Besides the Russian Jews we are receiving large numbers from Galicia, Hungary, and Roumania. The last are said to be of a high type, whereas the Galician Jews are the lowest. It is these whom Joseph Pennell, the illustrator, found to be ‘people who, despite their poverty, never work with their hands; whose town. . . is but a hideous nightmare of dirt, disease and poverty’ and its misery and ugliness ‘the outcome of their own habits and way of life and not, as is usually supposed, forced upon them by Christian persecutors.’

OCCUPATIONS

The Hebrew immigrants rarely lay hand to basic production. In tilling the soil, in food growing, in extracting minerals, in building, construction and transportation they have little part. Sometimes they direct these operations, often they finance them, but even in direst poverty they contrive to avoid hard muscular labor. Under pressure the Jew takes to the pack as the Italian to the pick.

In the '80's numerous rural colonies of Hebrews were planted, but, despite much help from outside, all except the colonies near Vineland, New Jersey, utterly failed. In New York and New England there are more than a thousand Hebrew farmers, but most of them speculate in real estate, keep summer boarders, or depend on some side enterprise—peddling, cattle trading or junk buying—for a material part of their income. The Hebrew farmers, said to number in all 6000, maintain a federation and are provided with a farmers' journal. New colonies are launched at brief intervals, and

Jewish city boys are being trained for country life. Still, not over one Hebrew family in a hundred is on the land and the rural trend is but a trickle compared with the huge flow.

Perhaps two-fifths of the Hebrew immigrants gain their living from garment-making. Naturally the greater part of the clothing and dry goods trade, the country over, is in their hands. They make eighty-five per cent. of the cigars and most of the domestic cigarettes. They purchase all but an insignificant part of the leaf tobacco from the farmers and sell it to the manufacturers. They are prominent in the retailing of spirits, and the Jewish distiller is almost as typical as the German brewer.

None can beat the Jew at a bargain, for through all the intricacies of commerce he can scent his profit. The peddler, junk dealer, or pawn broker is on the first rung of the ladder. The more capable rise in a few years to be theatrical managers, bankers or heads of department stores. Moreover great numbers are clerks and salesmen and thousands are municipal and building contractors. Many of the second generation enter the civil service and the professions. Already in several of the largest municipalities and in the Federal bureaus a large proportion of the positions are held by keen-witted Jews. Twenty years ago under the spoils system the Irish held most of the city jobs in New York. Now under the test system the Jews are driving them out. Among the school teachers of the city Jewesses outnumber the women of any other nationality. Owing to their aversion to 'blind-alley' occupations Jewish girls shun housework and crowd into the factories, while those who can get training become stenographers, bookkeepers, accountants and private secretaries. One-thirteenth of the students in our seventy-seven leading universities and colleges are of Hebrew parentage. The young Jews take eagerly to medicine and it is said that from seven hundred to nine hundred of the physicians in New York are of their race. More noticeable is the influx into dentistry and especially into pharmacy. Their trend into the legal profession has been pronounced, and of late there is a movement of Jewish students into engineering, agriculture and forestry.

MORALS

The Jewish immigrants cherish a pure, close-knit family life and the position of the woman in the home is one of dignity. More than any other immigrants they are ready to assume the support of distant needy relatives. They care for their own poor, and the spirit of coöperation among them is very noticeable. Their temper is sensitive and humane; very rarely is a Jew charged with any form of brutality. There is among them a fine *élite* which responds to the appeal of the ideal and is found in every kind of ameliorative work.

Nevertheless, fair-minded observers agree that certain bad qualities crop out all too often among these eastern Europeans. A school principal remarks that his Jewish pupils are more importunate to get a mark changed than his other pupils. A settlement warden who during the summer entertains hundreds of nursing slum mothers at a country 'home' says: 'The Jewish

mothers are always asking for *something extra* over the regular kit we provide each guest for her stay.' 'The last thing the son of Jacob wants,' observes an eminent sociologist, 'is a square deal.' A veteran New York social worker cannot forgive the Ghetto its littering and defiling of the parks. 'Look at Tompkins Square,' he exclaimed hotly, 'and compare it with what it was twenty-five years ago amid a German population!' As for the caretakers of the parks their comment on this matter is unprintable. Genial settlement residents, who never tire of praising Italian or Greeks, testify that no other immigrants are so noisy, pushing and disdainful of the rights of others as the Hebrews. That the worst exploiters of these immigrants are sweaters, landlords, employers and 'white slavers' of their own race no one gainsays.

The authorities complain that the East European Hebrews feel no reverence for law as such and are willing to break any ordinance they find in their way. The fact that pleasure-loving Jewish business men spare Jewesses but pursue Gentile girls excites bitter comment. The insurance companies scan a Jewish fire risk more closely than any other. Credit men say the Jewish merchant is often 'slippery' and will 'fail' in order to get rid of his debts. For lying the immigrant has a very bad reputation. In the North End of Boston 'the readiness of the Jews to commit perjury has passed into a proverb.' Conscientious immigration officials become very sore over the incessant fire of false accusations to which they are subjected by the Jewish press and societies. United States senators complain that during the close of the struggle over the immigration bill they were overwhelmed with a torrent of crooked statistics and misrepresentations by the Hebrews fighting the literacy test.

Graver yet is the charge that these East European immigrants lower standards wherever they enter. In the boot and shoe trade some Hebrew jobbers who, after sending in an order to the manufacturer, find the market taking an unexpected downward turn, will reject a consignment on some pretext in order to evade a loss. Says Dr. Bushee: 'The shame of a variety of underhanded methods in trade not easily punishable by law must be laid at the door of a certain type of Jew.' It is charged that for personal gains the Jewish dealer wilfully disregards the customs of the trade and thereby throws trade ethics into confusion. Physicians and lawyers complain that their Jewish colleagues tend to break down the ethics of their professions. It is certain that Jews have commercialized the social evil, commercialized the theatre, and done much to commercialize the newspaper.

The Jewish leaders admit much truth in the impeachment. One accounts for the bad reputation of his race in the legal profession by pointing out that they entered the tricky branches of it, viz., commercial law and criminal law. Says a high minded lawyer: 'If the average American entered law as we have to, without money, connections or adequate professional education, he would be a shyster too.' Another observes that the sharp practice of the Russo-Jewish lawyer belongs to the earlier part of his career when he must succeed

or starve. As he prospers his sense of responsibility grows. For example, some years ago the Bar Association of New York opposed the promotion of a certain Hebrew lawyer to the bench on the ground of his unprofessional practices. But this same lawyer made one of the best judges the city ever had, and when he retired he was banqueted by the Association.

The truth seems to be that the lower class of Jews of eastern Europe reach here moral cripples, their souls warped and dwarfed by iron circumstance. The experience of Russian repression has made them haters of government and corrupters of the police. Life amid a bigoted and hostile population has left them aloof and thick-skinned. A tribal spirit intensified by social isolation prompts them to rush to the rescue of the caught rascal of their own race. Pent within the Talmud and the Pale of Settlement, their interests have become few, and many of them have developed a monstrous and repulsive love of gain. When now, they use their Old World shove and wile and lie in a society like ours, as unprotected as a snail out of its shell, they rapidly push up into a position of prosperous parasitism, leaving scorn and curses in their wake.

Gradually, however, it dawns upon this twisted soul that here there is no need to be weazel or hedgehog. He finds himself in a new game, the rules of which are made by *all* the players. He himself is a part of the state that is weakened by his law-breaking, a member of the profession that is degraded by his sharp practices. So smirk and cringe and trick presently fall away from him, and he stands erect. This is why, in the same profession at the same time, those most active in breaking down standards are Jews and those most active in raising standards are Jews—of an earlier coming or a later generation. ‘On the average,’ says a Jewish leader, ‘only the third generation feels perfectly at home in American society.’ This explains the frequent statement that the Jews are ‘the limit’—among the worst of the worst and among the best of the best.

CRIME

The Hebrew immigrants usually commit their crimes for gain; and among gainful crimes they lean to gambling, larceny, and the receiving of stolen goods rather than to the more daring crimes of robbery and burglary. The fewness of the Hebrews in prison has been used to spread the impression that they are uncommonly law-abiding. The fact is it is harder to catch and convict criminals of cunning than criminals of violence. The chief of police of any large city will bear emphatic testimony as to the trouble Hebrew lawbreakers cause him. Most alarming is the great increase of criminality among Jewish young men and the growth of prostitution among Jewish girls. Says a Jewish ex-assistant attorney-general of the United States in an address before the B’nai B’rith: ‘Suddenly we find appearing in the life of the large cities the scarlet woman of Jewish birth.’ ‘In the women’s night court of New York City and on gilded Broadway the majority of street walkers bear Jewish names.’ ‘This sudden break in Jewish morality was not natural. It was a product of cold, calculating, mercenary methods, devised and handled by

men of Jewish birth.’ Says the president of the Conference of American Rabbis: ‘The Jewish world has been stirred from the center to circumference by the recent disclosures of the part Jews have played in the pursuance of the white slave traffic.’ On May 14, 1911, a Yiddish paper in New York said, editorially:

‘It is almost impossible to comprehend the indifference with which the large New York Jewish population hears and reads, day after day, about the thefts and murders that are perpetrated every day by Jewish gangs—real bands of robbers—and no one raises a voice of protest, and no demand is made for the protection of the reputation of the Jews of America and for the life and property of the Jewish citizens.’

‘A few years ago when Commissioner Bingham came out with a statement about Jewish thieves, the Jews raised a cry of protest that reached the heavens. The main cry was that Bingham exaggerated and overestimated the number of Jewish criminals. But when we hear of the murders, hold-ups and burglaries committed in the Jewish section by Jewish criminals, we must, with heartache, justify Mr. Bingham.’

Two weeks later the same paper said: ‘How much more will Jewish hearts bleed when the English press comes out with descriptions of gambling houses packed with Jewish gamblers, of the blind cigar stores where Jewish thieves and murderers are reared, of the gangs that work systematically and fasten like vampires upon the peaceable Jewish population, and of all the other nests of theft, robbery, murder, and lawlessness that have multiplied in our midst.’

This startling growth reflects the moral crisis through which many immigrants are passing. Enveloped in the husks of medievalism, the religion of many a Jew perishes in the American environment. The immigrant who loses his religion is worse than the religionless American because his early standards are dropped along with his faith. With his clear brain sharpened in the American school, the egoistic, conscienceless young Jew constitutes a menace. As a Jewish labor leader said to me, ‘the non-morality of the young Jewish business men is fearful. Socialism inspires an ethics in the heart of the Jewish workingman, but there are many without either the old religion or the new. I am aghast at the consciencelessness of the *Luft-proletariat* without feeling for place, community or nationality.’

RACE TRAITS

If the Hebrews are a race certainly one of their traits is *intellectuality*. In Boston the milk station nurse gets far more result from her explanations to Jewish mothers than from her talks to Irish or Italian mothers. The Jewish parent, however grasping, rarely exploits his children, for he appreciates how schooling will add to their earning capacity. The young Jews have the foresight to avoid ‘blind alley’ occupations. Between the years of fourteen and seventeen the Irish and Italian boys earn more than the Jewish lads; but after eighteen the Jewish boys will be earning more, for they have selected occupations in which you can work up. The Jew is the easiest man to sell life

insurance to, for he catches the idea sooner than any other immigrant. As philanthropist he is the first to appreciate scientific charity. As voter he is the first to repudiate the political leader and rise to a broad outlook. As exploited worker he is the first to find his way to a theory of his hard lot, viz. capitalism. As employer he is quick to respond to the idea of 'welfare work.' The Jewish patrons of the libraries welcome guidance in their reading and they want always the best; in fiction, Dickens, Tolstoi, Zola; in philosophy, Darwin, Spencer, Haeckel. No other readers are so ready to tackle the heavy-weights in economics and sociology.

From many school principals comes the observation that their Jewish pupils are either very bright or distinctly dull. Among the Russo-Jewish children many fall behind but some distinguish themselves in their studies. The proportion of backward pupils is about the average for school children of non-English-speaking parentage; but the brilliant pupils indicate the presence in Hebrew immigration of a gifted element which scarcely shows itself in other streams of immigration. Teachers report that their Jewish pupils 'seem to have hungry minds.' They 'grasp information as they do everything else, recognizing it as the requisite for success.' Says a principal: 'Their progress in studies is simply another manifestation of the acquisitiveness of the race.' Another thinks their school successes are won more by intense application than by natural superiority, and judges Irish pupils would do still better if only they would work as many hours.

The Jewish gift for mathematics and chess is well known. They have great imagination, but it is the 'combinative' imagination rather than the free poetic fancy of the Celt. They analyze out the factors of a process and mentally put them together in new ways. Their talent for anticipating the course of the market, making fresh combinations in business, diagnosing diseases, and suggesting scientific hypotheses is not questioned. On the other hand, an eminent savant thinks the best Jewish minds are not strong in generalization and deems them clever, acute and industrious rather than able in the highest sense. On the whole, the Russo-Jewish immigration is richer in gray matter than any other recent stream, and it may be richer than any other large inflow since the colonial era.

Perhaps *abstractness* is another trait of the Jewish mind. To the Hebrew things present themselves not softened by an atmosphere of sentiment, but with the sharp outlines of that desert landscape in which his ancestors wandered. As farmer he is slovenly and does not root in the soil like the German. As poet he shows little feeling for nature. Unlike the German artisan who becomes fond of what he creates, the Jew does not love the concrete for its own sake. What he cares for is the *value* in it. Hence he is rarely a good artisan, and perhaps the reason why he makes his craft a mere stepping-stone to business is that he does not relish his work. The Jew shines in literature, music and acting—the arts of expression—but not often is he an artist in the manipulation of materials. In theology, law and diplomacy—which involve the abstract—the Jewish mind has distinguished itself more than in

technology or the study of nature.

The Jew has *little feeling for the particular*. He cares little for pets. He loves man rather than men, and from Isaiah to Karl Marx he holds the record in projects of social amelioration. The Jew loves without romance and fights without hatred. He is loyal to his purposes rather than to persons. He finds general principles for whatever he wants to do. As circumstances change he will make up with his worst enemy or part company with his closest ally. Hence his wonderful adaptability. Flexible and rational the Jewish mind cannot be bound by conventions. The good will of a Southern gentleman takes set forms such as courtesy and attentions, while the kindly Jew is ready with any form of help that may be needed. So the South looked askance at the Jews as 'no gentlemen.' Nor have the Irish with their strong personal loyalty or hostility liked the Jews. On the other hand the Yankees have for the Jews a cousinly feeling. Puritanism was a kind of Hebraism and throve most in the parts of England where, centuries before, the Jews had been thickest. With his rationalism, his shrewdness, his inquisitiveness and acquisitiveness, the Yankee can meet the Jew on his own ground.

Like all races that survive the sepsis of civilization, the Hebrews show great *tenacity of purpose*. Their constancy has worn out their persecutors and won them the epithet of 'stiff-necked.' In their religious ideas our Jewish immigrants are so stubborn that the Protestant churches despair of making proselytes among them. The sky-rocket careers leading from the peddler's pack to the banker's desk or the professor's chair testify to rare singleness of purpose. Whatever his goal—money, scholarship, or recognition—the true Israelite never loses sight of it, cannot be distracted, presses steadily on, and in the end masters circumstance instead of being dominated by it. As strikers the Jewish wage earners will starve rather than yield. The Jewish reader in the libraries sticks indomitably to the course of reading he has entered on. No other policy holder is so reliable as the Jew in keeping up his premiums. The Jewish canvasser, bill collector, insurance solicitor, or commercial traveler takes no rebuff, returns brazenly again and again, and will risk being kicked down stairs rather than lose his man. During the Civil War General Grant wrote to the war department regarding the Jewish cotton traders who pressed into the South with the northern armies: 'I have instructed the commanding officer to refuse all permits to Jews to come South, and I have frequently had them expelled from the department, but they come in with their carpet sacks in spite of all that can be done to prevent it.' Charity agents say that although their Hebrew cases are few, they cost them more than other cases in the end because of the unblushing persistence of the applicant. Some chiefs of police will not tolerate the Hebrew prostitute in their city because they find it impossible to subject her to any regulations.

THE RACE LINE

In New York the line is drawn against the Jews in hotels, resorts, clubs, and private schools, and constantly this line hardens and extends. They cry 'Bigotry' but bigotry has little or nothing to do with it. What is disliked in the

Jews is not their religion but certain ways and manners. Moreover, the Gentile resents being obliged to engage in a humiliating and undignified scramble in order to keep his trade of his clients against the Jewish invader. The line is not yet rigid, for the genial editor of *Vorwaerts*, Mr. Abram Cahan, tells me that he and his literary brethren from the Pale have never encountered Anti-Semitism in the Americans they meet. Not the socialist Jews but the vulgar upstart parvenus are made to feel the discrimination.

This cruel prejudice—for all lump condemnations are cruel—is no importation, no hang-over from the past. It appears to spring out of contemporary experience and is invading circle after circle of broad-minded. People who give their lives to befriending immigrants shake their heads over the Galician Hebrews. It is astonishing how much of the sympathy that twenty years ago went out to the fugitives from Russian massacres has turned sour. Through fear of retaliation little criticism gets into print; in the open the Philo-semites have it all their way. The situation is: Honey above, gall beneath. If the Czar, by keeping up the pressure which has already rid him of two million undesired subjects, should succeed in driving the bulk of his six million Jews to the United States, we shall see the rise of the Jewish question here, perhaps riots and anti-Jewish legislation. No doubt thirty or forty thousand Hebrews from eastern Europe might be absorbed by this country each year without any marked growth of race prejudice; but when they come in two or three or even four times as fast, the lump outgrows the leaven, and there will be trouble.

America is probably the strongest solvent Jewish separatism has ever encountered. It is not only that here the Jew finds himself a free man and a citizen. That has occurred before, without causing the Jew to merge into the general population. It is that here more than anywhere else in the world *the future is expected to be in all respects better than the past*. No civilized people ever so belittled the past in the face of the future as we do. This is why tradition withers and dies in our air; and the dogma that the Jews are a 'peculiar people' and must shun intermarriage with the Gentiles is only a tradition. The Jewish dietary laws are rapidly going. In New York only one-fourth of the two hundred thousand Jewish workmen keep their Sabbath and only one-fifth of the Jews belong to the synagogue. The neglect of the synagogue is as marked as the falling away of non-Jews from the church. Mixed marriages, although by no means numerous in the centers, are on the increase, and in 1909 the Central Conference of Jewish Rabbis resolved that such marriages 'are contrary to the tradition of the Jewish religion and should therefore be discouraged by the American Rabbinate.' Certainly every mixed marriage is, as one rabbi puts it, 'a nail in the coffin of Judaism,' and free mixing would in time end the Jews as a distinct ethnic strain.

The 'hard shell' leaders are urging the Jews in America to cherish their distinctive traditions and to refrain from mingling their blood with Gentiles. But the liberal and radical leaders insist that in this new, ultra-modern environment nothing is gained by holding the Jews within the wall of

Orthodox Judaism. As a prominent Hebrew labor leader said to me: ‘By blending with the American the Jew will gain in physique, and this with its attendant participation in normal labor, sports, athletics, outdoor life, and the like, will lessen the hyper-sensibility and the sensuality of the Jew and make him less vain, unscrupulous and pleasure-loving.’

It is too soon yet to foretell whether or not this vast and growing body of Jews from eastern Europe is to melt and disappear in the American population just as numbers of Portuguese, Dutch, English, and French Jews in our early days became blent with the rest of the people. In any case the immigrant Jews are being assimilated outwardly. The long coat, side curls, beard and fringes, the ‘Wandering Jew’ figure, the furtive manner, the stoop, the hunted look, and the martyr air disappear as if by magic after a brief taste of American life. It would seem as if the experience of Russia and America in assimilating the Jews is happily illustrated by the old story of the rivalry of the wind and the sun in trying to strip the traveler of his cloak.”

Tragically, Einstein’s racism and tribalism provoked a “racial” debate over his personality and the theory of relativity. Counterattacks predictably followed Einstein’s ethnic slurs and Einstein’s reckless and racist defamations of his legitimate critics. For example,

“NOTES BRÈVES

Einstein, plagiaire.

Le **Juif** d’Allemagne Einstein est un plagiaire. La presse américaine en avait déjà (v. n° **225**) fourni la preuve. Le *Dearb. Independent*, 25.3, y revient avec de nouveaux documents.

Il montre les « découvertes » du Juif suivant pas à pas, et ses publications suivant volume par volume, les découvertes et les publications d’Arvid Reuterdaahl, Américain d’origine suédoise, doyen de l’Ecole d’architecture et de mécanique au collège Saint Thomas (St. Paul, Minn.). Le *Raum-Zeit-Kontinuum*, les *Raum-Zeit-Funktionen* et *Raum-Zeit-Koordinaten* du Juif ne sont que des démarquages du *Space-Time Potential* de l’Américain, grossièrement camouflés.

Les Juifs ne sont jamais que des plagiaires. Mais la stupidité des *goyim* leur permet de s’introduire dans la peau des hommes de génie à la manière de Chéri-Bibi. Et la presse de tous les pays, moyennant une poignée de dollars ou de *crasseux*, assassine de silence les vrais savants pour revêtir de leur gloire le gorille du Ghetto.”⁷²

THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT published an article on 30 July 1921, on page 14, (American Jews successfully organized many large fund raising drives, as represented in the pages of *The New York Times*, especially during the First World War) which ridicules Einstein’s anti-American interview upon his return to Europe:

“Relatively Unimportant, Extremely Typical

ALBERT EINSTEIN, who maintained a pose of dignified silence in the face of his scientific accusers while in the United States, has broken into most undignified speech immediately upon his return to Europe.

Knowledge of what he is and the traditional ill-manneredness of which he is an heir, this exhibition of boorishness was not unexpected.

Disgust with Einstein is somewhat an old thrill, because his plagiarism is so manifest and his fame is so directly the result of the circus-advertising instinct of his race. But a new emotion divides it now: What about those nose-led Americans who, in obedience to the swarthy New York ruling race, bowed down and worshipped Einstein and chanted loudest in the chorus of his praise?

Their position is most humiliated. And rightly so. Every white man, who bows down to the swarthy ruling race of New York and elsewhere, gets his nose rubbed into it sooner or later. It is the traditional repayment which that race—and all inferior races—renders when a superior race makes a fool of itself.

Mr. Einstein was gloriously received in the United States. Even the cold photographs retain the glow of passionate occasions. Literally over 150,000 persons by comptometer count, swarmed round him on his arrival. He had not done anything for science, for the easement of human pain nor for the solution of life’s pressing problems, yet he was received as a royalty of the realm of reason, while others who have found the way to healing or achievement for the common man have been allowed to enter and leave New York unheeded. Mr. Einstein, by the way, *left* New York unheeded—there were half a dozen persons on the piers—which should, perhaps, be borne in mind.

Mr. Einstein was given the freedom of New York, under protest, and was refused the freedom of Boston, but the universities received him gladly and decked him with their doctorates. The press, in response to swarthy local committees, shouted itself hoarse. Clothing lofts poured out their Red intellectuals by the thousand, and taking it all in all the publicity manager of Mr. Einstein’s stunt did a good job—until—scientists began to ask Einstein questions.

The only recorded answer which Einstein made to any but adulatory remarks while in the United States, was, ‘See my secretary.’ American collegians and scientists, philosophers and literary men besought him; others with the ‘goods on him’ openly challenged him; but surrounded by a swarthy ring that made everybody believe that a slight to Einstein was equal to sacrilege against the Holy of Holies on Mt. Zion, he maintained his silence and, supposedly, his dignity. That last, however, is not known. He left the United States rather unexpectedly.

THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT is glad to say that it was

one—perhaps not the only one—of the papers that were not taken in by the Einstein publicity managers. It is glad to remember also that it gave much-needed space to a scientific critic of Einstein's theory, who had been refused space elsewhere. A roster of the publications which were afraid of the swarthy crowd around Einstein gives much food for publication.

Therefore, perhaps, THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT is not so embarrassed as are the Einstein devotees by the attack upon America which the professor has made. Not so embarrassed as, say, the *Scientific American*.

Mr. Einstein's charges are as follows: (1) That America is too exaggerated in its enthusiasm. 'This exaggerated enthusiasm for me and my work struck me as being a genuinely and peculiarly American phenomenon'; (2) that Americans are bored; (3) that America suffers from poverty in intellectual things; (4) that most American men think of nothing but work; (5) that the rest of the men are mere lap dogs for indolent women; (6) 'that women dominate the entire life of America'; (7) that our excitement over the theory of relativity was 'comic'; (8) that the only real American scientist lives in Chicago and is a Jew!

As complete a slap in the face as the swarthy tribe has ever handed a white people!

Mr. Arthur Brisbane, pen-sentinel of the tribe, who held Mr. Einstein up as an example too lofty for Americans to emulate, yet to be worshipfully gazed upon as a distant and unattainable star, was plainly up against it.

Many people think that Mr. Brisbane is himself distantly connected by racial ties with people of Mr. Einstein's type, but others are assured that he is not. It is unfortunate, if he is not, because his admiration of the tribe is so great that assertion of his belonging to it would not be construed by him as an insult, but rather as a high compliment. Some people have commented on the name 'Brisbane,' saying that its Hebrew form is Brith Ben, or 'son of the covenant.' The name Einstein is not as Hebrew as is Brisbane; Einstein is German for 'one stone.'

It was rather hard, therefore, after standing sponsor for Einstein in all the Hearst papers and before the American public, to have Einstein hurl his insult across the sea. What did Mr. Brisbane do then, quoth the little bird? Did he turn to his ever-present Hebrew secretary for inspiration as he often has done before? History may never know.

But it is certain that something stirred within Mr. Brisbane's breast, something American, something angry and tipped with truth; and there hurtled through his mobile mind with the clarifying turbulence and light of an electric storm, this luminous thought: 'No wonder Einstein thinks thus of America; *all that Einstein saw of America was the Jews!*' (Wild shrieks of 'pogrom! pogrom!' ringing through the darker recesses of Brisbane's brain!) 'That's it—that's how to explain it; he didn't see America at all—he just saw Jews.'

Lest the reader should think that statement too great a strain on his credulity, we hasten to offer, what we always have on hand in these matters,

the evidence. Behold it!

Today

Einstein's Views.
What of the 5,000,000?
Valuable 'Devil's Finger.'
Hopeful Mr. Herrick.

—By ARTHUR BRISBANE—

Copyright. 1921.

Prof. Einstein, of the relativity theory, returned home, says:

First, he is amused by the wild enthusiasm of the entire American nation in greeting him. What Prof. Einstein saw, without knowing it, was the extremely enthusiastic welcome of his co-religionists. Our citizens of Jewish blood delight at another demonstration, in Einstein's person, of the ability of their race. It was Jewish enthusiasm that the professor witnessed, and there is no greater enthusiasm than that. It is a good explanation of the whole Einstein criticism.

It is a good explanation of the whole Einstein criticism.

Moreover, it is true. Outside an occasional university president and Senate, the white mayors and governors en route, once the President of the United States, the professor did not meet many Americans. He did not greatly want to meet Americans. Americans are inclined to sit in judgment first, and that spelled danger.

He has simply made the same error which others have made, in not properly distinguishing between racial strains of blood.

Einstein's charge about the comic enthusiasm is absolutely true; scores of photographs confirm the facts. But who furnished the enthusiasm? A little more candor on Einstein's part would have made that clear. As a long, long benefit of the doubt, it may be agreed that perhaps Mr. Einstein may have mentioned his co-nationalists in this respect, and it may have been changed to 'Americans.' But probably not. If it had been changed to 'Americans' from an original other, it would have made it rather difficult for certain newspapers who bow the knee to the tribe; especially in view of the tact that 75 per cent of the advertising in United States newspapers is paid for by the tribe. Jack Lait once said, 'The department store is the bulwark of free speech!' And he ought to know.

The tribe did make fools of themselves over Einstein. They made a fool of him, too. Now he makes a fool of both by describing the tribal defects and ascribing them to 'Americans.' What a plot for screaming farce by Morry

Gest!

Mr. Brisbane is right. He is wrong on nearly everything else he tries to say on the related subject, but he is right in his analysis of Mr. Einstein's sources: Mr. Einstein's opinion of America is the result of his having seen only Jews. Some foreign governments are suffering from the same mis-view of us.

The Brisbane explanation of the Einstein theory of Americans may be applied all down the line. 'The intellectual poverty' he noticed is also due to the fact that all he saw of American intellect was Jewish. The tribe does not originate ideas; it grabs them and exploits them. The tribe is not at home in the study, but on the stage. In art it simply steals ideas and elaborates them. In music it performs, but does not create. In law, it manipulates, but does not clarify great principles. In politics it is opportunist. Intellectual bankruptcy may coexist with a very pert knowledge of what the schools teach, and the tribe is quite expert at possessing itself of that—all white man's knowledge, by the way.

And so on through the charges. The Brisbane explanation is hereby unanimously adopted: Prof. Einstein thinks what he does and says what he did because what he saw was not America but Jews. He couldn't see America for the swarthy swarm that smothered him. And what is worse, hundreds of thousands—millions—of that swam have never seen America either, and never will, for the same reason.

The Jews are strangely silent on the criticism. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise—in the Yiddish papers they spell it correctly, Weisz—refuses to comment. The tribal elders of the New York Board of Aldermen who fought for the freedom of the city for Mr. Einstein just as boldly as they fight for legally imposed social equality where they are not wanted, don't like to discuss it either.

Prof. Rautenstrauch is rather gentle in his comment 'His visit to this country was of too brief duration and his contacts while here were too narrow.' Second half of answer is right. It doesn't take long to know Americans: 10 minutes is the average time for striking up a real human kind of acquaintance here, and Einstein was with us weeks and weeks—but—'his contacts while here were too narrow.' For reference, Mr. Brisbane's comment again.

Einstein's tribalists cannot answer; it is an outbreak of bad manners, rank contemptuousness and untruth which is indefensible. Einstein never was a great scientist; now we know he is not even an ordinarily passable individual.

What puzzles the *Washington Post* is the reason for Einstein staying on in the country after he had found what a detestable place it was; and why he went on accumulating university degrees and other academic honors when he had formed so low an opinion of our institutions, and when the only scholar he could find in the United States was a Jew out in Chicago.

It's a somewhat honest wail the *Post* puts forth:

'Why did Prof. Einstein not discover after a few days' stay in America his impressions and then make a speedy return to his haven? Why did he

accept the attentions and awards from municipalities and educational institutions if he questioned their sincerity?’

The answer is simple, but the *Post* doesn't give it.

The answer is given in 'blank' verse by a poet on this page.

Things One Cannot Print
(Obviously done in blank verse.)
in writing for the Editors

Telling funny news,
Omit from all you chance to say
Mention of the South Americans.

Whene'er you feel the writing urge
Why write whate'er you choose,
Except you must not write at all
About our friends the Italians.

If verses fill your soul with song
Turn fondly to your Muse,
But do not let her lead you far;
Sing not about the British.

If funny stories fill your head
And you would but amuse,
Why keep them laughing by all means,
But not about the Greeks.

Fill up the page with anecdotes,
Tell anything that's new
But let no story that you tell
Poke fun at any Syrian.

You'll only tire your massive brain.
Your time you'll surely lose,
If you submit to Editors
Stories on the French.

I'm greatly hampered in my work,
My stuff they all refuse,
Because the stories that I tell
Are often on the Swiss.

I should be paid for what I write,
My lawyer says to sue,
And that is what so puzzles me

For he, too, is a Belgian.
—New York Herald, July 3, 1921.

LATER BULLETIN—Word comes from Amsterdam that Prof. Einstein did not say it. He is still dazed by the good will of America, still has the glory of America in his eyes, and so on. The difference is that the first story came under the names of responsible correspondents and through the channels of responsible newspapers; while the second story comes orphaned—probably from the Jewish Telegraph Agency, which is the associated press of international Jewry. The agency has not been functioning very much of late, the principal reason being that it cannot send long and harrowing dispatches about ‘pogroms’ and be believed any more, because there are too many neutral observers in the ‘pogrom zone.’ There are no pogroms [*see*: “Pogroms in Poland”, *The New York Times*, (23 May 1919), p. 10; where the report claims that Germans may have fabricated myths, and spread rumors of Jewish pogroms in order to vilify their enemies.—**CJB**], but there is this: There is the sale for money of goods bought by the charity of the American people, mostly the American church people. The agency, however, doesn’t deal in facts of that kind.

It is rather singular that none of the tribe’s dailies doubted the first Einstein report. They knew how delightfully and characteristically racial it was, how perfectly natural. They took it for granted.

However, the Einstein matter is a mere speck on the racing river of events yet it shows something of the tendency of the river. No one has a license to feel badly over it, except the scientific publications that didn’t have the intestinal integrity to challenge the man in the name of science; the universities that did not dare keep him off their list of honors; the society people who fêted the rather mangy lion; and the plain and more honest members of the tribe who thought Einstein might generously reflect a little glory on them. He hasn’t.”

Einstein apparently did not respond directly to many of the genuinely race-based attacks made against him, such as those above, which were made in no uncertain terms. He preferred to mischaracterize some of the scientific objections to his theories, and the legitimate concerns raised about his plagiarism, as if they were “anti-Semitism” *per se*. When Einstein arrived at America’s shores, *The New York Times* emphasized the fact that theory of relativity was widely criticized,

“The man was Dr. Albert Einstein, propounder of the much-debated theory of relativity that has given the world a new conception of space, and time and the size of the universe.”⁷³

Before Einstein stepped off the ship, he lied and “played the race card” in order to smear anyone who would dare to criticize him in America,

“Professor Einstein was reluctant to talk about relativity, but when he did speak he said most of the opposition to his theories was the result of strong anti-Semitic feeling.”⁷⁴

The article continued,

“He was asked about those who oppose his theory, and said:

‘No man of culture or knowledge has any animosity toward my theories. Even the physicists opposed to the theory are animated by political motives.’

When asked what he meant, he said he referred to anti-Semitic feeling. He would not elaborate on this subject, but said the attacks in Berlin were entirely anti-Semitic.”⁷⁵

Among those highly knowledgeable and cultured physicists and philosophers who actively opposed relativity theory, as it was expressed by Einstein, many of whom were Jewish—who, according to Einstein’s assertions, must have been uncultured, ignorant anti-Semites—we find Hendrik Antoon Lorentz, Max Abraham, Alfred North Whitehead, Ernst Mach, Albert Abraham Michelson, Friedrich Adler, Henri Bergson, Oskar Kraus, Melchior Palágyi, [etc. etc. etc.]. Clearly, Einstein lied about a very serious matter, and, what is worse, Einstein was himself a racist instigator and a political agitator; and, therefore, a hypocrite and a deliberate inciter of “racial” discord.

Einstein and his friends’ (especially Max von Laue’s) wanton and reckless charges of anti-Semitism only served to intensify and provoke it, as evinced above, which was their goal. Einstein expressed the bizarre belief commonly held by racist Jews, that anti-Semitism was a positive thing because it kept Jews segregated from Gentiles. Einstein argued that Jews should not mix with Gentiles, due to “racial” differences. Responding to the truly race-based attacks would have tended to discredit anti-Semitism, and with it racist political Zionism. However, Einstein and Max von Laue’s tactic of mischaracterizing legitimate arguments about science and priorities issues as if “anti-Semitism” only inspired anti-Jewish sentiment—much to their delight.

Einstein was obviously scarred by childhood traumas.⁷⁶ Being a coward by nature, he hid behind reckless defamations in order to avoid legitimate criticism.

Hubert Goenner observed,

“Nevertheless, Kleinert (1979, 501-6) and Elton (1986, 95) documented that [*Albert Einstein*] was *first* in referring to anti-Semitism in public, well before any of his adversaries in the campaign against him [*Footnote: Einstein soon regretted his statement.*] [. . .]”⁷⁷

Einstein’s accusation that no one but an anti-Semite would disagree with him was a smear against dissent heard round the world—obviously meant to stifle the debate. It was an open threat to anyone who would challenge him on the facts—anyone who dared to tell the truth and expose him. These smears were accompanied by alarmist

(and shifting) misrepresentations of the audience's actions, and the proceedings, at the Berlin Philharmonic when Paul Weyland and Ernst Gehrcke lectured against the theory of relativity. This had a chilling effect on the debate over the facts, with some fearing to challenge Einstein, knowing full well that they would be accused of "anti-Semitism" in the international press no matter what they actually did, said or thought. Einstein's tactics served to provoke and intensify extant anti-Jewish feelings and to numb the ears of the world when the truly rabid and murderous NSDAP rose to power.

As was his habit, Einstein used alarmist tactics and sought to alienate anyone, including Jews, who dared to disagree with him. Most Jews felt a deep love for, and loyalty to, their present nationality, and wanted nothing of what they thought of as Einstein's archaic Zionist bigotry.⁷⁸ Einstein was a simplistic person and he sought to narrowly define people of diverse backgrounds and beliefs,⁷⁹ and he sought to intimidate everyone into following his course, by degrading Jews who sought to assimilate and intimating that they were somehow traitors to a religious cause—a religious cause which he, himself, truly found ridiculous. Einstein stated,

"I am neither a German citizen, nor is there in me anything that can be described as 'Jewish faith.' But I am happy to belong to the Jewish people, even though I don't regard them as the Chosen People. Why don't we just let the Goy keep his anti-Semitism, while we preserve our love for the likes of us?"⁸⁰

Einstein was reciting the Herzlian brand of racist Zionism he had embraced as a route to personal fame. Theodor Herzl revealed his core beliefs when recalling a conversation he had had with racist Zionist Max Nordau:

"Never before had I been in such perfect tune with Nordau. [***] This has nothing to do with religion. He even said that there was no such thing as a Jewish dogma. But we are of one race. [***] 'The Jews,' he says, 'will be compelled by anti-Semitism to destroy among all peoples the idea of a fatherland.' Or, I secretly thought to myself, to create a fatherland of their own."⁸¹

Herzl and Nordau's plans were carried out. The Zionists created the Nazi Party and funded it, in order to discredit Gentile government, and in order to segregate Jews and force them into Palestine against their will. Though racist Jews were behind the Nazis and guided their destiny, these same racist Jews then criticized Gentiles for the atrocities these same racist Jews had caused the Nazis to commit against non-Zionist Jews. Racist Jewish poseurs to this day claim the moral high ground over European Gentiles based on the actions the Nazis took at the behest of racist Jewish Zionist financiers.

This is part of a broader plan to fulfill Judaic prophecy by political action meant to discredit Gentile governments and religions and promote the myth that Judaism and Jews are innocent and highly moral. We see it today in the widespread attacks

on Islam and Moslem nations, which are fomented by racist and highly unethical Jews. Just as Zionist Jews subverted German society with crypto-Jewish leaders who rose to power on a platform of anti-Semitism, Zionist Jews are subverting Moslem nations with crypto-Jewish leaders and Jewish agents who rise to power on an anti-Zionist platform. Jews covertly commit acts of terrorism against other Jews, which they blame on non-Jews, in order to create a climate of antagonism and distrust, where Jewish racists can spuriously claim the moral high ground and utter their hateful and false defamations against other peoples with impunity and apparent justification.

The rabid nationalism Herzl and Einstein embraced, and the anti-Semitism they believed benefitted the Jews by uniting and segregating them, began to become very dangerous in the 1920's—much to the delight of the Zionists. Einstein's hypocrisy, his anti-Nationalism versus his Zionism, remained yet to be resolved in the minds of the naïve. For those who grasped the import of Judaic Messianic myth, Einstein was consistently obedient to the racist and genocidal Jewish prophets. In 1938, Einstein stated in his essay "Our Debt to Zionism",

"Rarely since the conquest of Jerusalem by Titus has the Jewish community experienced a period of greater oppression than prevails at the present time. [***] Yet we shall survive this period too, no matter how much sorrow, no matter how heavy a loss in life it may bring. A community like ours, which is a community purely by reason of tradition, can only be strengthened by pressure from without."⁸²

Einstein continues in his essay in an effort to justify the illogical and immoral conflicts in his political philosophy, but without success. Einstein also reveals that his early assertions of the racial purity of Jews were nonsense employed for political effect—the political effect of deliberately bringing the Nazis into power in order to herd up the Jews of Europe and chase them into Palestine—the political effect of discrediting Gentile nationalism, while justifying Jewish nationalism. Zionists are today using the same tactics to discredit Islamic nationalism and promote Jewish nationalism. They delight in the fact that they are killing off large numbers of innocent Gentiles in the process.

Einstein and the Zionist Fascists were carrying on a long tradition of European and Judaic ethnocentrism and racism spanning the middle ages and reaching far back into antiquity. The hatred was directed in both directions—much to the delight of racist Jews.

In Einstein's day, Jews and Gentiles were finally becoming integrated. Racist Einstein and his Zionist friends artificially created a rise in anti-Semitism and demanded segregation. Einstein thought that anti-Semitic attacks and segregation were the best means to preserve the "Jewish race" from the "fatal assimilation" brought on by better relations between Jews and non-Jews.

2 THE DESTRUCTIVE IMPACT OF RACIST JEWISH TRIBALISM

Jews have an ancient tradition of racism and of deliberately segregating themselves from all other peoples. Jews even segregate each other into separate subdivisions of Sephardim and Ashkenazim. Sephardim have traditionally considered themselves to be more “racially pure” than Ashkenazim, and, therefore, “racially” superior to Ashkenazim. Ashkenazim have traditionally viewed themselves as “racially” superior to Gentiles. Since they cannot claim “racial” superiority over the Sephardim, the Ashkenazim use tribalistic politics to kill them off.

“Jews have not troubled themselves to justify, on any rational ground, the tenacious fight of their race against the storms of nineteen centuries of persecution. The fight has been its own justification. Obviously, a race that has endured what theirs has withstood must have some glorious mission to perform; to define that mission would be an element of positive weakness, since their enemies would then have a chance to meet them on the ground of reason, where their peculiar virtues, tenacity, single-mindedness, and pliant heroism, would avail them nothing.”—RALPH PHILIP BOAS

“The position of the Jews is unique. For them race, religion, and country are interrelated, as they are interrelated in the case of no other race, no other religion, and no other country on earth. By a strange and most unhappy fate it is this people of all others which, retaining to the full its racial self-consciousness, has been severed from its home, has wandered into all lands and has nowhere been able to create for itself an organized social commonwealth. Only Zionism—so at least Zionists believe—can provide some mitigation of this great tragedy.”—ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR

2.1 Introduction

In the United States in the early 1920's, scholars became increasingly concerned by the invasion of racist and tribalistic “Russian or Polish Jews”, who had been pouring into America since the 1880's. These immigrants allegedly sought to take over American universities and to Judaize American society. Harvard University opened the question of whether or not it was in the best interests of American society to allow Jews from Poland to obtain majority control over highly influential American colleges and universities.

In 1917, Ralph Philip Boas, who was himself Jewish, discussed the tribalistic, segregationist and racist attitudes common among Jews of the era—and throughout history,

“DESPITE the fact that we are ceasing to persecute people who disagree with us in religion or politics, we only dimly realize that one of the greatest evils of persecution is the fact that it saves its victims the trouble of justifying themselves. Persecution begets martyrdom, a glory as lacking in reason as its progenitor. Whether Sir Roger Casement was right or not is now only an academic question; his execution, by enshrining him forever in the Pantheon of Irish martyrs, makes the heart rather than the mind his judge. So it is with the Jews. Jews have not troubled themselves to justify, on any rational ground, the tenacious fight of their race against the storms of nineteen centuries of persecution. The fight has been its own justification. Obviously, a race that has endured what theirs has withstood must have some glorious mission to perform; to define that mission would be an element of positive weakness, since their enemies would then have a chance to meet them on the ground of reason, where their peculiar virtues, tenacity, single-mindedness, and pliant heroism, would avail them nothing.

It is, therefore, a happy chance for the American Jew that his age-long persecution has either ended or has degenerated into petty social discrimination. For he must now realize that the day has gone when he could justify himself by recalling his heroic miseries. In other days and other countries he faced only the problems of existence. New ideas and opportunities could not pass the walls of the ghetto; custom made adherence to old ceremonies and beliefs not only easy but imperative. The Sabbath was the one day on which the Jew could be a man instead of a thing; the recurrent holidays gave him his one outlet for the emotions rigidly suppressed in daily life; the study and analysis of the Law and the Talmud furnished the intellectual exercise that his eager mind was denied in the schools and the learned circles of the country which tolerated him. The very fact that he was confined within a pale, therefore, made it easy for him to keep his race a distinct entity.

But now, if he is unable to find a rational ground for his religious and racial unity, he will meet a foe more insidious than persecution—the gradual disintegration of race and religious consciousness within the faith. Ironically enough, what pales, pogroms, and ghettos could not accomplish, freedom promises to bring to pass. So the time has come when the Jew in America must decide what he is going to do with and for himself; his enemies can no longer save him the effort of decision.

[***]

What is true of Europe is true also of the United States: the Jew occupies a position the importance of which is out of all proportion to his numbers. Hence the problem of Judaism is of real interest in America, because the influence which the Jew can have upon social life and the current political

and financial situation depends almost entirely upon his mode of life and manner of thought. [***] What the Jew is going to do with this self-consciousness may, to Christians, seem of little moment. It is not of that loyal kind which moves men to blow up munition factories, or to plant bombs in steamships. For others, doubtless, its implications are not of great importance. For himself, however, they are everything. His self-consciousness colors his whole point of view. It is not a simple thing. It is compounded of many factors. It is both racial and religious; it makes him both hopeful and despondent; it gives cause both for pride and for a feeling of inferiority; it makes him clannish, and it makes him long for a wider field of acquaintance. [***] Judaism is clannish. Jews undoubtedly hang together. The combination of persecution with its inevitable concomitant, self-justification, acts as a centripetal force in driving Jews upon themselves. Just as Jews have the almost grotesque notion that a man will make his philosophic and religious convictions 'jibe' with his birth, so they have the wholly grotesque notion that a man should choose his friends and his wife from the small group among whom he happens to be born, though later education and environment may move him a thousand miles away. The results of this clannishness are paradoxical. For instance, the average Jew is sure that the chief reason why Anti-Semitism is everywhere ready to show its ugly head, is jealousy of the splendid history and the extraordinary business ability of the race. At the same time he subconsciously assumes the inferiority which has long been attributed to him, covering his feelings, however, by uncalled-for justification and bitter opposition to all criticism. It is torture to him, for example, that *The Merchant of Venice* should be read in the public schools. Who can blame him? For Shylock, although undoubtedly an exaggerated character, nevertheless makes concrete those qualities the portrayal of which hurts because it bears the sting of truth.

The development of committees 'On Purity of the Press' in Jewish societies, and the extraordinary wire-pulling over the Russian treaty and the Immigration bill, show to what lengths this consciousness can go. It is impossible for the Jew to be entirely at ease in the world. He is introspective and suspicious, often unhappy, always sure that, for good or ill, he is a marked man among men.

There are three attitudes which Jews in this country take toward their problem—a few as a result of having thought it through, the majority as a result of the forces of inertia, environment, or chance, forces of which they themselves are perhaps not aware. Some Jews attempt to get rid of their self-consciousness by separating from the group. They deliberately set out to convince themselves that there is no difference between them and other men, and that they can act and live in all respects like other American citizens. A second group find their fellow Jews entirely satisfactory. They are conscious of a difference between themselves and others, but, living as they do in large cities where the Jewish community numbers hundreds of thousands, they feel no need of association with non-Jews other than that which they get in

business. They are rich, or at least well-to-do; they have all the comforts that money can buy; they occupy fine streets and build expensive synagogues. They are willing, not only to accept their group-consciousness, but to develop it to the fullest extent by means of societies and fraternal orders. In the third place, there is a small group of Jews keenly conscious of their race, who would like to make Judaism vital as a great religion and a great tradition. They differ from the second group in that they not only accept their individuality but try to justify it. It is not sufficient for them that there should be enough Jewish organizations and undertakings to make a respectable year-book: they are interested in showing why such organizations should exist. They not only *are* Jews, but they *want to be* Jews; they want to feel that Judaism really has a mission to fulfill and a message to carry to the questioning world.

The Jew who attempts to solve his problem by separating from his community must leave the great centres of Jewish life and go to some small town where he may make a fresh start. There he will find himself in an anomalous position. He will have neither the support that comes from rubbing elbows with one's own kind, nor the mental and moral stiffening that comes from active opposition. He will be simply an odd fish, and as such will be subject, not to antagonism, but to curiosity. What cordiality he meets with is the cordiality of curiosity. He is a strange creature, similar—on a far lower scale of interest—to a Chinese traveler or a Hindu student. He is engaged in conversation on the 'Jewish problem,' or Jewish customs and history, until he sickens with trading on the race-consciousness that he is striving to forget. With cruel kindness his friends impress upon him that his Judaism 'makes no difference,' with the result that he finds himself anticipating every imminent friendship by a clear statement of his race, lest the friendship be built upon the sands of prejudice. His social relations must be above reproach. A hasty word, an ill-considered action, in other men to be put down to idiosyncrasy, in him is attributed to his birth. Even when there exists the frankest and most open friendship, he is continually seeing difficulties. The fathers have eaten a sour grape and the children's teeth are set on edge. The self-consciousness that he learned in youth reappears in maturity. Whether he will or no, a Jew he remains.

If he finds his situation intolerable he may, of course, utterly and completely deny his Jewish affiliation. He may consort with Christians, join a Christian church, marry a Christian wife, and tread under foot the old associations that will occasionally cast a disagreeable shadow across his life. Unfortunately for such a solution, a cloud still hangs about the idea of apostasy. Such a refuge seems to a man of honor despicable. It is a cowardly procedure, surely, to deny one's birth and sail under false colors, the more so since, though it does no harm to others, it gains advantage for one's self. Why should it be treason for a Jew to abandon his religion and forget his birth any more than for a Frenchman or a Swede to do so? Probably for the reason that no one cares whether a man was born in France or not, whereas

in certain circles it makes a great deal of difference if a man was born in Jewry. Furthermore, Christians feel strongly that the Jew who forsakes the religion into which he was born, does so, not because his eyes have been opened upon the truth, but because he sees in apostasy definite material advantages. The Jew who would take this means of obtaining peace, therefore, would find himself cursed by an irrational idealism which can disturb while it cannot fortify and achieve.

If, however, he returns to some great centre of Jewish life and attempts to affiliate with his own people, he is in a perilous position. He is more than likely to meet with distrust where he seeks sympathy. Jews are so extremely sensitive to criticism and so keenly conscious of the social discrimination which they encounter from Christians, that they can hardly believe that a man who seems to have lived for several years on an equal footing with Christians has not either denied his birth, in which case he has been a traitor, or has not certain qualities of mind which, since they have been palatable to Christians, must be severely critical of Jews.

And, indeed, they have, perhaps, a measure of justice in their position. It is impossible for a Jew to live apart from his race for several years without looking upon his people with a new light. For one thing, distance has enabled him to focus. He has learned to sympathize more than a little with those hotel-keepers whose ban upon Jews is a terrible thorn in the flesh of the man whose money ought to take him anywhere. He has come to see that the clannishness of Jews serves only to intensify what social discrimination may exist, and to make present in the imagination much that does not. He has realized that persecution is not necessarily justification, and that because a Jew was blackballed at a fashionable club does not prove that he was a man of first-rate calibre. And finally, he has perceived that there is an arrogance of endurance as well as an arrogance of persecution, and that for a man to be continually assuming that people are taking the trouble to despise him for his birth, is to postulate an importance that does not exist.

On the other hand, he has, because of his distance, idealized Judaism. In his retirement he studied the history of his people; he thrilled with their martyrdom; he marveled at their tenacity and their fortitude. He built up for himself on the cobweb foundation of boyhood memories, visions of the simple nobility of Jewish ritual and ceremonies, and vague ideals of an inspiring religious faith. He may, perhaps, have met, far more frequently than ill-will, a sentimental and unbalanced adulation of Jews. The cult of the new is with us, and the history, the folk-lore, the literature, and the customs of Judaism have, for many people who pride themselves on their social liberality, the fascination of novelty. It is the easiest thing in the world for a Jew to yield to this sentimental tolerance, and to view his people in a rosy light.

It is, therefore, something of a shock to him when he reënters a great Jewish community, for he finds that the great mass of American Jews have sunk into a comfortable materialism. What persecution could not accomplish,

success in business has brought to pass. The innate qualities of the Jew could not save him from the fate of the Christian who has become rich in a hurry—grossness and self-conceit. That Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked is as true now as it ever was, and there is little reason to expect that the race which was hopelessly cankered by national prosperity in the days of Solomon can escape a similar fate in the twentieth century. [***] The sad result is that in prosperity the Jewish self-consciousness ceases to be religious and becomes merely racial.

[***]

The number of immigrants, or children of immigrants, from countries where for centuries they have been trained in an atmosphere of slavish cunning and worship of money, who become rich, is almost incredible. In Russia, Galicia, or Roumania, they cultivated a self-respect by rigid adherence to dignified and beautiful customs; in America the florid exuberance of newly acquired wealth cannot be dignified. Clannishness, exclusion from circles of good taste and good breeding, the infiltration of the parvenu East-European Jews, and imitation of the most obvious aspects of Americanism—its flamboyant and tasteless materialism—all combine to make the thoughtful Jew sadly question what hope lies in the bulk of the Jews who live in the great American cities.

[***]

[Zionism] is actuated by a spirit of helpfulness and by an ideal of racial unity. [***] Aided by persecution and poverty, [American Judaism] furnished admirable discipline to a race naturally stubborn and tenacious. Persecution, poverty, and discipline gone, what is left?—an indistinct monotheism joined to an ethical tradition never formulated into a system, and only vaguely defined. None of the great Jewish philosophers ever succeeded in establishing a Jewish creed; indeed, there was no need of one when common suffering wrought so effectual a bond. [***] At all events it must be remembered that, since the problem of Judaism comes from intense self-consciousness, persecution and sentimental tolerance are both bad for the Jew. The one saves him the trouble of seeking out his reason for existence; the other flatters him into a belief that there is no necessity for the search. If men will treat Jews like other people, instead of nourishing their age-long notions of peculiarity, they will make it easier for time to settle the Jewish problem as it settles all others.”⁸³

In 1845, an article appeared in *The North American Review*, which revealed that governments were concerned by Jewish Messianic aspirations and the resultant disloyalty of Jews,

“The Jews in Russian Poland have lately been subjected to military service; and to the soldier’s oath the government has added, for Israelitish recruits, the following clause: ‘I swear to be faithful to my standard, and never desert it, even should the Messiah come upon earth.’”⁸⁴

Frankist Jews in Poland asserted in the 1700's and throughout their later history that the Messiah had arrived in the person of Jacob Frank. They formed revolutionary and destructive bands, which tore apart Polish society. Frank began a dynasty of Messiahs, whose soul alleged migrated from one Messiah to the next through the process of Metempsychosis. It was the duty of the Messiah to utterly destroy the Gentile world.

2.2 Do Not Blaspheme the “Jewish Saint”

When Einstein arrived in America in early April of 1921, shortly after Einstein, himself, declared that anyone who disagreed with him must *ipso facto* be anti-Semitic, the Board of Aldermen of the City of New York met to vote on a proposal to grant Chaim Weizmann and Albert Einstein the “freedom of the city”. Alderman Bruce M. Falconer voted against the proposal and was immediately assaulted, threatened with severe retaliation and smeared as an “anti-Semite”—an accusation he emphatically denied. *The New York Times*, which was owned by a Jewish publisher named Adolph S. Ochs,⁸⁵ published Alderman Falconer’s name, occupation, and home address, on the front page together with the charges of anti-Semitism, a description of the assault against him, and a report of the threats to destroy him, as well as his denials of any prejudice.

Several stories describing the spectacle appeared in *The New York Times*, beginning with 6 April 1921,

“HOLDS UP FREEDOM OF CITY TO EINSTEIN

Alderman Falconer Blocks Move
to Grant Official Honors
to Two Scientists.

NEVER HEARD OF HIS THEORY

Alderman Friedman Shakes Fist
in Face of Opponent and
Calls Action an Insult.

There is at least one man in New York who never heard of Professor Albert Einstein, whose theory of relativity has been discussed for many months in newspapers and magazines. He is Alderman Bruce M. Falconer, whose lack of acquaintance with Professor Einstein's fame caused a row in the Board of Aldermen yesterday and resulted in the freedom of the city being temporarily refused to both Professor Einstein and Professor Chaim Weizmann, chemist and inventor of the high explosive trinitrotoluol.

At the request of Aldermanic President LaGuardia, Mayor Hylan has called a special meeting of the Board for next Friday at 1:30 P. M., to take action on the resolution.

'I am expressing the feeling of the entire Board when I ask you to call this meeting in order that the desires of the people of this city may be carried out in extending this call to these distinguished people,' he said to the Mayor.

Professor Weizmann is President of the International Zionist Organization, and, with Professor Einstein, M. M. Ussischkin and Dr. Benzion Mossinson, is here to confer with American Zionists. They were received at the City Hall yesterday by Mayor Hylan and a committee of citizens. More than 5,000 Zionists filled the plaza in front of the City Hall.

It was thought that the granting of the freedom of the city to the two visitors would be a mere formality. So it would have been but for Alderman Falconer, who is a lawyer and lives at 701 Madison Avenue. After the ceremony the Aldermen went to their Chamber and a resolution was introduced by Alderman Louis Zeltner, Moritz Graubard and Samuel R. Morris in honor of the visitors. Every one was ready to vote favorably when Alderman Falconer arose. He confessed that until yesterday he never had heard of either Professor Einstein or Professor Weizmann. He asked to be enlightened, but nobody offered to explain the theory of relativity. Mr. Falconer said that he thought the freedom of the city had been too often granted, and, although his objection had nothing to do with racial or religious prejudices, he believed that caution should be exercised.

A storm broke about Alderman Falconer's head. Laughter and protests came from every side, and several members tried to tell him the records of the two men, but their recital made little impression upon the Alderman.

Rules Committee Dodges.

A motion that the resolution be made a general order for next week when it could be passed over Alderman Falconer's protest precipitated a parliamentary row, and in a few minutes the board was tangled up in rulings. President LaGuardia came in and took the chair. He ruled that the point of order to make the resolution a general order was debatable, and about this time the Committee on Rules, led by Alderman Kenneally, slipped out of the room.

Alderman Falconer was obdurate, and at the end of the debate the Rules Committee came back and an attempt was made to get around his objection.

It was moved to suspend the rules, when the resolution could be passed over his objection. But Alderman Falconer suspected the purpose of the motion, and objected. Alderman Friedman then asked that the resolution be withdrawn.

After the incident was officially closed there were angry arguments in the boardroom. Alderman Friedman shook his fist under Mr. Falconer's nose and said that his action was an insult and that he would carry the issue into Mr. Falconer's district. Judge Gustave Hartmann tried unsuccessfully to tell Mr. Falconer what Professor Einstein had done in science.

After the adjournment of the meeting Judge Hartman charged Alderman Falconer with having made his objection to the resolution because of purely anti-Semitic motives. This brought a denial from the Alderman and when Judge Hartman repeated his charge Mr. Falconer said: 'You're a liar, I am most certainly not opposed to the Jewish people as a race.'

'I will not let this matter drop,' said Judge Hartman. 'Not only will I bring the matter before the people of the city and the intelligent Jewry, but I will also press this matter in the council of the Republican Party. I am firmly convinced that your attitude in this matter was prompted by anti-Semitism, and I will not be satisfied until you are retired from public life.'

When Professors Weizmann and Einstein arrived at the City Hall, accompanied by their wives and other members of the delegation, they were escorted to the Mayor's office by James F. Sinnott, Secretary to Mayor Hylan, and the Committee of Welcome led by Magistrate Rosenblatt.

'As Mayor of this city, which is the home of more than one-third of all the Jews in America,' said Mayor Hylan, 'I gladly join in felicitating those who have already accomplished so much toward the restoration of Palestine. The success thus far achieved may be regarded as a happy augury that continued endeavor will result in the final and complete attainment of the hope and aspiration of the Zionist organization.'

'May I say to Dr. Weizmann and Professor Einstein that in New York we point with pride to the courage and fidelity of our Jewish population, demonstrated so unmistakably in the World War.'

George W. Wickersham, former Attorney General, also spoke of the achievements of the two leaders of the delegation.

Professor Weizmann thanked the Mayor and Mr. Wickersham for their welcome, which he accepted as showing sympathy for the cause he represented.

Mrs. Einstein lost a gold lorgnette with a chain attached during the reception at the City Hall. It was an heirloom."

Intimidation, threats of retaliation and retaliatory actions are common practice among Einstein advocates. The judge threatening and smearing the attorney was and is not unique to the legal profession and political life. American Zionism was headed by United States Supreme Court Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis and represented by Judge Julian William Mack of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the

Seventh Circuit. There have been accusations of Jewish American judges allowing guilty Zionist criminals to go free and otherwise preventing justice.⁸⁶ The Talmud and other Judaic literature encourage Jews to favor one another at the expense of Gentiles and to forgive crimes Jews commit against Gentiles. For example, *Sanhedrin 58b* states that a Gentile who strikes a Jew must be killed, because striking a Jew is like striking God. Yet according to *Sanhedrin 57a*, a Jew who murders a Gentile without cause will not be put to death and is not civilly liable for the crime.⁸⁷ Furthermore, a Jew may steal from a Gentile and may keep the stolen goods with both criminal and civil immunity under some interpretations of Jewish law.

Numerous physicists of international renown have complained directly to your author that their works in opposition to relativity theory, and which expose Einstein's career of plagiarism, have been refused publication without grounds and are often met with angry personal attacks and threats of retaliation as well as reactionary and unjustified accusations of anti-Semitism. Some peer reviewed journals and scientific conferences regularly refuse to even consider works and lectures which question relativity theory, or Einstein's originality. Even Jewish opponents are attacked as if *ipso facto* anti-Semites for daring to utter a syllable of truth about Einstein's plagiarism and the fallibility of "his" theories. Helen Dukas (Einstein's secretary) and Bannesh Hoffmann wrote,

"Einstein had become a figure of enormous symbolic importance to Jews. In 1923, when he visited Mount Scopus, the site on which the Hebrew University was to rise, he was invited to speak from 'the lectern that has waited for you two thousand years.'"⁸⁸

Dennis Overbye tells the story of Ilse Einstein's letter to Georg Nicolai of 22 May 1918 in which she complains of Albert Einstein's perverse sexual advances towards her. Albert Einstein was conducting an incestuous and adulterous relationship with her mother, Else Einstein, at the time. Albert Einstein was related to his cousin Else through both his mother and his father. Einstein was perhaps dissuaded from his perverse wish to marry Ilse Einstein by his uncle Rudolf Einstein's (Rudolf Einstein was Elsa Einstein's father and Ilse Einstein's grandfather, as well as Albert Einstein's uncle and father-in-law) dowry of 100,000 Marks, which Albert Einstein accepted when he married his cousin Else—Albert thereby continued to have access to Ilse.⁸⁹ Albert Einstein was behaving like a Frankist Jew.

Overbye states that Wolf Zuelzer preserved the letter,

"despite pressure from Margot Einstein, Helen Dukas, and lawyers representing the Einstein estate to surrender it or destroy it. The tale, an example of the difficulties scholars have faced in telling the Einstein story, is preserved in Zuelzer's correspondence in the American Heritage archive at the University of Wyoming."⁹⁰

It is rather embarrassing for an ethnic "Saint" and national hero to be exposed as

a pervert and a plagiarist, and Einstein had become both an ethnic saint and a national hero for Jews. Bruno Thüring used these facts to characterize Einstein as a rabid nationalist, who used his pacifistic preaching as a front to promote his Zionist agenda. Thüring recounted that the *Jüdische Rundschau* quoted the Zionist David Yellin's welcoming address to Einstein in the name of Jerusalem on 15 March 1929 and Einstein's response:

„Du hast den Namen ‚Gaon‘ verdient, den das jüdische Volk seinen erwählten geistigen Führern gibt — dies aber nicht nur wegen deiner genialen Leistungen in der Wissenschaft, wiewohl wir sie recht zu schätzen wissen — noch mehr aber bist du uns ein Gaon, weil du die Fahne der nationalen Wiedergeburt hoch in der Hand hältst und die hebräische Universität in Jerusalem gefordert hast.“

Und Einstein antwortete darauf:

„Der heutige Tag ist der größte meines Lebens. Heute ist das wichtigste Ereignis in meiner Lebensgeschichte geschehen. Im Laufe meines Lebens lernte ich die Verirrung der jüdischen Seele, die Sünde der Selbstverleugnung des Volks-Jüdischen kennen. Und so freue ich mich, daß Israel seine Bedeutung in der Welt wieder zu erkennen beginnt. Diese Tat, die Befreiung der jüdischen Seele, wurde von der zionistischen Bewegung vollbracht.“⁹¹

Einstein wrote to Paul Ehrenfest on 12 April 1926,

“I do believe that in time this endeavor will grow into something splendid; and, Jewish Saint that I am, my heart rejoices.”⁹²

The German Consul General in New York reported on 21 March 1931,

“Es ist ein Charakteristikum für die New Yorker Volkspsyche, daß die Persönlichkeit Einsteins, ohne daß deutlich erkennbare Gründe dafür anzuführen wären, Ausbrüche einer Art Massenhysterie auslöste, und zwar nicht nur bei den hierfür besonders veranlagten Gruppen von „Friedensfreunden“ und den schwärmerischen Phantasten neu entstandener mystischer Religionsgesellschaften, sondern auch in relativ so kühlen Kreisen, wie z. B. bei den amerikanischen Förderern des Palästinaerkes. Inwieweit hierbei der Umstand eine Rolle spielte, daß sich unter den sieben Millionen Einwohnern New Yorks annähernd zwei Millionen Juden befinden, und ob in der Wechselwirkung zwischen Presse und Publikum erstere ihre zahllosen Spezialartikel über Einstein brachte, weil die Leser sich beehrten, oder ob letztere sich hierfür interessierten, weil die Zeitungen dieses Interesse schon vor Einsteins Ankunft erweckten und alsdann wachhielten, wird schwer zu entscheiden sein. Nicht ganz belanglos erscheint in letzterer Beziehung aber vielleicht das Scherzwort eines Rundfunkredners zur Zeit des Höhepunktes der Einstein-Begeisterung, daß wohl nicht 50

Personen wüßten, warum der Gelehrte überhaupt hier sei . . . Einsteins Ausführungen brachten die Anwesenden in einen Begeisterungstaukel, der sich auch darin äußerte, daß zahlreiche Personen Einsteins Hände und Kleidungsstücke küßten.”⁹³

Philipp Frank wrote,

“The Jewish population of America itself regarded Einstein’s visit as the visit of a spiritual leader, which filled them with pride and joy. The Jews felt that their prestige among their fellow citizens was raised by the fact that a man of Einstein’s generally recognized intellectual greatness publicly acknowledged his membership in the Jewish community and made their interests his own.”⁹⁴

Chaim Weizmann recalled his visit with Einstein to New York in 1921,

“We had reckoned—literally—without our host, which was, or seemed to be, the whole of New York Jewry. Long before the afternoon ended, delegations began to assemble on the quay and even the docks.”⁹⁵

The ethnic, racial and religious prejudice of Einstein and his followers, even if in the understandable and forgivable form of misguided pride, has no place in science. Many unscrupulous individuals have dishonored the victims of the Holocaust and Pogroms by disingenuously smearing any person who dares to question Einstein or the theory of relativity as an “anti-Semite”, in order to change the subject from the critic’s legitimate arguments, to a disingenuous personal attack against the legitimate critic, which evokes powerful emotions. They not only dishonor those who were murdered, by invoking the memory of the dead to distract from Einstein’s errors and misdeeds, they inhibit the progress of science and the accurate portrayal of history, in the names of those who were murdered at the behest of racist Zionist Jews.

The saga of Alderman Falconer’s exercising of his rights to oppose the award of the “Freedom of the City” to Weizmann and Einstein continued across the pages of *The New York Times* and newspapers around the world. *The New York Times* reported 7 April 1921,

“RELATIVITY AT CITY HALL.

Alderman FALCONER wants everybody to understand that when he said he had never heard of Professor ALBERT EINSTEIN he didn’t know it was the famous EINSTEIN, the destroyer of time and space. The Alderman’s reasoning is intelligible even if its result was rather unhappy. Two gentlemen were coming up to be formally endowed with such freedom as can still be granted in this well regulated city. Who were they? Mr. EINSTEIN and Mr. WEIZMANN. And how was any one to know—unless he had read the

papers—that this EINSTEIN was the celebrated EINSTEIN? He was coming to New York not as a scientist but as a Zionist, in which capacity he hasn't been working long enough to become celebrated. Any nobody would have suspected that a Mayor hostile to art artists would be asking the freedom of the city for a couple of mere science scientists.

So Alderman FALCONER was led into the blunder in which he is now trying to justify himself. He says EINSTEIN is a German. True, he is German-born, and recently he spent a year or two in Berlin. But genuine blown-in-the-glass Germans of the Reventlow type would fling their hands and howl if they heard EINSTEIN called a German. One of the reasons for his leaving Berlin, apparently, was the attacks made on him by some of the reactionary monarchist organs. They had three counts against EINSTEIN—he is a Swiss citizen, a Jew and a democrat. Nobody but the Staats-Zeitung can seriously believe that 'hatred of the Germans' is behind this opposition to EINSTEIN.

But the professor probably felt quite at home in the City Hall, with or without freedom. Relativity was being practiced in those quarters long before EINSTEIN discovered it as a theory. The rays of logic emanating from the Mayor's office are bent as badly as EINSTEIN'S rays of light. EINSTEIN proved that things are not where they seem to be, but that is no news to gentlemen elected on a program of economy who have raised the city budget to unheard-of figures. And a man who has annihilated space may be able to provide our municipal Government with some happy thoughts on the rapid-transit problem.

And perhaps Alderman FALCONER has done no real harm. Mrs. EINSTEIN, emerging from the crowd which had gathered for the reception at the City Hall, missed a valuable gold locket; so no doubt she and her husband are vividly impressed, already, with the freedom of our city."

Einstein and his advocates would sometimes flip-flop on the issue of Einstein's citizenship over the course of many years, often to avoid fulfilling national or political duties, or purely to allege bigotry, arbitrarily changing Einstein's status to fit the accusation and to emphasize and aggravate social divides for political profit.⁹⁶ Einstein was also dishonest about his religious status and misrepresented it to suit the occasion and encouraged his friend Paul Ehrenfest to do the same. Ehrenfest had more character than Einstein and Ehrenfest stood by his convictions.⁹⁷ The political Zionists had successfully vilified Germans, and America's participation in the war which resulted from this deliberate vilification intensified the ill-will.

Political Zionists have, from the very beginnings of their movement, employed smear tactic as their preferred response to legitimate criticism. Nachman Syrkin stated in 1898,

"Only cowards and spiritual degenerates will term Zionism a utopian movement."⁹⁸

At the Sixth Zionist Congress in 1903, Max Nordau stated,

“After barely [*sic*] than a year’s activity it called this Congress into being, a body to which none, but a few crazy Jewish opponents, denies the quality of legitimately representing the Jewish people. All serious people recognise that we are the executive and deliberate representatives of the Jewish people.”⁹⁹

The New York Times reported on 16 January 1917 on page 3,

“‘We protagonists of universalism,’ said Dr. Philipson, ‘are being laughed to scorn. Our claim that Israel is an international religious community is being held up to ridicule. We are told that Israel can only survive by stressing its separatistic nationalism; that only by drawing ourselves off from our fellow inhabitants in the lands in which we live as a separate nationalistic group can we perpetuate Jewish life.’”

The New York Times published a statement by Professor Ralph Philip Boas on 16 December 1917, Section 4, page 4—not long after the Balfour Declaration. Boas stated, *inter alia*,

“Moreover, Zionism is continually emphasizing the breach between Jew and Christian which most of us are trying to bridge. As the child of anti-Semitism, it thrives on persecution. Its central argument is that Jews can never be at home in a ‘foreign’ land. It makes capital of every instance of petty intolerance and nourishes itself upon the ill-will which Jews are prone to fancy even when it is not present. The chip which many Jews bear more or less ostentatiously now that the yellow badge has been removed, some Zionists magnify into a veritable Pilgrim’s burden which can drop from the bent back only upon the soil of Palestine. Zionists are continually heaping abuse upon the non-separatist, upon the man who has no desire to be different from other human beings and is very grateful that he does not have to be a marked man among men.”

The truth is that the vast majority of Jews rejected the political Zionists. Political Zionist smear tactic was routine for Einstein supporters. *The New York Times* reported,

“EINSTEIN TO HAVE FREEDOM OF STATE

*Senate Passes Resolution Honoring
Visiting Scientist—Measure
Before Assembly Today.*

Special to The New York Times.

ALBANY, April 6.—The Board of Alderman having failed yesterday to extend to Drs. Albert Einstein and Chaim Weizmann, the Zionist emissaries, the freedom of the City of New York, the Senate today, by unanimous vote, extended to the distinguished visitors the freedom of the entire State of New York.

The resolution on which action was taken was sponsored by Senator Nathan Straus Jr. of New York, who characterized the failure of the Alderman to act on the Zeltner resolution as ‘a disgrace.’

The text of the Straus resolution follows:

‘Whereas Albert Einstein of Switzerland and Chaim Wezmann of Great Britain are now visiting our State; and

‘Whereas the purpose of their visit is to cement the bonds of unity between the United States and her neighbors abroad in the great struggle for human progress and happiness, and especially to unite the old world and the new in establishing a cultural centre for the Jews of the World in Palestine; and

‘Whereas the achievements of Dr. Einstein in the spheres of physics and astronomy have commanded the attention and the admiration of the entire civilized world, and the record of Dr. Weizmann as a chemist during the World War has made the people of the allied and associated powers his debtors, and,

‘Whereas it the desire of the Commonwealth of New York to make these distinguished visitors feel that every true American heart goes out to them in cordial welcome; therefore,

‘Be it resolved that (if the Assembly concurs) the people of the State of New York extend to Dr. Einstein and Dr. Chaim Weizmann and their associates the handclasp of fellowship and a heartfelt welcome.’

Senator Bernard Downing, another Democrat member from New York City, warmly eulogized the two Zionists and extolled their services to science and to mankind.

The Assembly had adjourned for the day when the Straus resolution was adopted, but upon reconvening tomorrow will have the measure before it for concurrent action.

FALCONER IS DENOUNCED.

Owasco Club Condemns Alderman
for Blocking Welcome to Einstein.

Resolutions denouncing Alderman Bruce Falconer for his action in blocking the resolution in the Board of Aldermen offering the freedom of the city to Professor Albert Einstein and his colleagues were passed at a meeting of the Owasco Club, the Democratic organization of the Seventeenth Assembly District, yesterday.

‘The conduct of Alderman Falconer manifests a spirit of bigotry, narrow-mindedness and intolerance, and displays him as a champion of anti-Semitism, which is only a stepchild of anti-Americanism,’ said the resolution.”

The Judge found political opportunists who sought to make good on his threats and repeat his smears. One can only conclude that such hysteria in New York, such vicious and highly publicized smears and vindictive opportunistic attacks, must have had a chilling effect on the debate over relativity theory and Einstein’s alleged originality. Such was the ignoble birth of the modern myth of St. Einstein’s infallibility and originality—opposition was too often shouted down by smear tactic and intimidation—even by formal decree.

Falconer tried to calm and reassure the hysterical mob, who defamed him and sought to destroy his life. *The New York Times* reported on 9 April 1921

“FREEDOM OF CITY GIVEN TO EINSTEIN

Alderman Honor Relativity Discoverer
and Prof. Weizmann
Despite Falconer’s Protest.

HE DEFENDS ADVERSE VOTE

Cites Courtesies to Dr. Cook, De
Valera, Mannix and Mrs.
MacSwiney as Mistakes.

Professor Albert Einstein, the noted mathematician and discoverer of relativity, and Professor Chaim Weizmann, British chemist now have the freedom of New York City. It was voted to them yesterday at a special meeting of the Board of Aldermen, made necessary by the refusal of Alderman Bruce Falconer to consent to the passage of the resolution when

it first came up on Tuesday, when the two scientists were welcomed by Mayor Hylan at City Hall.

Alderman Falconer cast the only negative vote yesterday, and in so doing said he was not actuated by race prejudice, but that he had in mind the dignity of the honor which has been given to some of the greatest Americans, and thought it should not be conferred on any one unless he were known to every person in the city. He said his first ancestor in this country came as secretary to Lord Cornbury, the first person to receive the freedom of the city, in 1702.

Alderman William T. Collins, leader of the Democrats, seized upon the mention of Alderman Falconer's ancestors with avidity and ridiculed it.

'We on this board are just as proud of our city and of the conferring of the freedom of the city on guests as is Alderman Falconer,' he said. 'It was only narrowness and bigotry that made the one member of this board object to granting the freedom of the city to Dr. Weizmann and Professor Einstein.'

Alderman Falconer said that Alderman Friedman did him a great injustice in saying that his objection was based on race prejudice, and said that his private physician is a Jew and that many of his friends are Jews.

'In 1909,' he said, 'the keys of the city were unfortunately given by the Board of Alderman to Dr. Cook, who pretended to have discovered the North Pole, but were afterward officially withdrawn from him. After that the freedom of the city was not again extended for ten years, until the second year of the Hylan Administration, when it was given to Eamon de Valera, at a meeting which occurred when I happened to be away from the city.'

'Since that time it has been extended to Cardinal Mercier, King Albert of Belgium, the Prince of Wales, Archbishop Mannix and Mrs. MacSwiney. At the time the resolution was suddenly proposed in connection with Archbishop Mannix, I did not vote in favor of conferring the honor upon him.'

'The next and last individual upon whom this honor was conferred was Mrs. MacSwiney. I did not vote for it, and if I had had a proper chance would have objected.'

'I have been assured,' he said, 'that Professor Einstein was born in Germany and was taken to Switzerland, but returned to Germany prior to the war. He is consequently a citizen of Germany, of an enemy country, and might be regarded as an alien enemy.'

Alderman Friedman told Alderman Falconer that Professor Einstein was not a citizen of Germany, but of Switzerland, and Alderman Vladeck, leader of the Socialists, also said that Professor Einstein was far from being a German citizen.

Alderman Ferrand, the Republican leader, in moving the question, said:

'For what has occurred I make no apology to this board or to the citizens of the city. It can be charged to no party. It can only be charged to an individual who is arrogant and ignorant. We will have to take it from whence it comes.'

Professor Einstein visited the College of the City of New York yesterday, and attended a class in mathematics and physics, where he listened to an explanation of his theory by Prof. Edward Kasner of Columbia University. President Sidney Mezes, of the City College, and a number of advanced students were present. Prof. Einstein, who understands English, although he does not speak it well, complimented Prof. Kasner on his presentation of the subject, and later made a twenty minute talk.

It was announced at Princeton University yesterday that Professor Einstein would be the guest of the University from May 9 to 15 and would give five lectures in that time on relativity.”

On 11 April 1921, *The New York Times* began to see that Falconer had made a good point,

**“A Ceremony
in Need
of Revision.**

Now that the implacable FALCONER has been beaten and Dr. EINSTEIN possesses formally and officially the ‘freedom of the city’ that actually is granted to anybody from almost anywhere, it might be well to abandon the use of a phrase that long since ceased to have any meaning even remotely related to the words composing it. Then the ground would be cleared for its replacement by a designation indicative of a special municipal welcome, accorded to visitors made worthy of it by great achievements or honorable services.

With the ancient ceremony thus revised and brought into accord with modern conditions, Dr. EINSTEIN certainly would be among those thus honored by an appreciation not less honorable to those who manifested it, and at least it is to be hoped that the honor less often would be cheapened, as ‘the freedom of the city’ has been cheapened several times in recent years, by giving it to persons who—well, to persons whose claims for admiration and respect, unlike his, were not firmly founded on the unanimous opinion of competent judges.”

It is noteworthy that the same newspaper which had called Einstein’s theory “much-debated” on the front page on 3 April 1921, claimed one week later that there was unanimous support for it.

When Einstein visited Boston, they refused to award him the freedom of the city. *The New York Times Index* does not name any stories covering this event under “Einstein”. All they list were their articles of May 18th and 19th of 1921. From 18 May 1921:

“EINSTEIN SEES BOSTON;

FAILS ON EDISON TEST

Asked to Tell Speed of Sound He
Refers Questioner to Text
Books.

Special to The New York Times.

BOSTON, May 17.—There was a large crowd at the South Station this morning to greet Professor Einstein of relativity fame and his party. From the station the visitors made an unexpected automobile tour through the north and west ends, Boston's Jewish quarters, and then proceeded to the Copley Plaza Hotel, where they sat down to breakfast with Governor Cox, Mayor Peters and some 75 distinguished guests.

Mrs. Weisemann, wife of Dr. Chaim Weisemann, of the visiting party, surprised the party when it came time to pass around the cigars by calmly producing a cigarette and lighting it. Her action was welcomed by the men. They wanted to smoke but hesitated to do so in the presence of Mrs. Weisemann and Mrs. Einstein, the only women present. Mrs. Weisemann's action in 'lighting up' paved the way and the men lit their cigars.

Professor Einstein gave out through his secretary the following message for Bostonians:

'I am happy to be in Boston. I have heard of Boston as one of the most famous cities of the world and the centre of education. I am happy to be here and expect to enjoy my visit to this city and Harvard.'

Of course the famous visitor had run into the ever-present Edison questionnaire controversy. He did not tackle the whole proposition but so far as he went failed and thereby became one of us. He was asked through his secretary, 'What is the speed of sound?' He could not say off-hand, he replied. He did not carry such information in his mind but it was readily available in text books.

Professor Einstein took issue with the famous inventor's contention that a college education is of little value. Professor Einstein said he believed education was a good thing. If a man had ability, he thought, a college education helped him to develop it. He stated he had not had an opportunity to study the Edison list of questions. He had heard of the American inventor in connection with the invention of the phonograph and electrical appliances.

Mrs. Einstein said that while Edison was an inventor who dealt with practical and material things, her husband was a theorist who dealt with problems of space and of the universe."

Einstein's "secretary" was Simon Ginsburg (a. k. a. "Salomon Ginzberg" and "Schlomo Ginossar"), who was the son of "Usher Ginsburg" (a. k. a. "Asher

Ginberg” and “Ahad Ha’am”), who published under the *nom de plume* “Achad Ha-am”. Ginsburg the elder was the secretary for the Odessa Committee for Palestine. On 19 May 1921, *The New York Times* reported,

“Einstein Honored at Boston.

BOSTON, May 18.—Professor Albert Einstein, the scientist, and his associate, Professor Chaim Weizmann, were guests of Governor Cox at luncheon today. Professor Einstein had spent the forenoon at Harvard University, where he was received informally by President Lowell and members of the faculty. At his request he was escorted through the various college laboratories and museums.”

In marked contrast to the long front page story *The New York Times* published upon Einstein’s arrival to America, the notices of his departure were far more humble. On 30 May 1921, *The New York Times* wrote on page 8,

“EINSTEIN SAILS TODAY.

**Dr. Weizmann Will Remain In
Interests of Zionism.**

Professor and Mrs. Einstein will sail for Europe today on the Celtic, leaving behind them some puzzled academic minds. Since he came to this country several weeks ago in the interests of the proposed University of Jerusalem Professor Einstein has been the centre of attraction for scientists who have heard him lecture on his famous theory of relativity. He has spoken at several universities and had the order of Doctor of Science conferred on him by Princeton University.

Dr. Chaim Weizmann of the World Zionist Organization and other members of the commission will remain here for a short time. Mrs. Weizmann, who is President of the Women’s International Zionist Organization, which is trying to raise \$5,000,000 for welfare work among Jewish women and children in Palestine, appealed yesterday for Jewish women to contribute their jewels and treasure, ‘gold and silver, new and old,’ to the fund.”

and buried back on page 14 of the *The New York Times* of 31 May 1921 was,

“Prof. EINSTEIN SAILS.

**Says Relativity Theory Is Receiving
‘Sympathetic Dealing’ Here.**

Professor Albert Einstein, who has been lecturing in the United States for several weeks on his theory of relativity, sailed for Liverpool yesterday on the Celtic. In lieu of an interview, he gave out a formal statement in which he said:

‘I would like to add that the respect and admiration that I always felt for American scientists have been greatly increased as a result of my personal contact with them. I have seen a sympathetic dealing with the theory of relativity and a truly detached scientific interest in it.’

Professor Einstein announced that he had refused to accept an invitation to be the guest of Lord Haldane in London, but gave no reason for his action. Mrs. Clara Louise Weizmann, wife of Chaim Weizmann, President of the World Zionist Organization, also was a passenger. Others who sailed were P. S. Hill, President of the Universal Leaf Tobacco Company; Martin Vogel, formerly Assistant United States Treasurer; Toscha Seidel, violinist; Karonongse, Siamese Minister to the United States; M. Ussichkin, Secretary of the World Zionist Organization, and Dr. George E. Vincent, head of the Rockefeller Foundation.”

The joke was on those who made such a show of defending Einstein’s “honor” and who went to such extraordinary lengths to cater to Einstein during his visit to America. Instead of exhibiting due gratitude, Albert Einstein ridiculed them and slandered America upon his return to Europe. He specifically attacked the American scientists whom he had earlier praised in his apparently scripted press statement quoted immediately above.

This spectacle did not go unnoticed in the foreign press.

While it is true that some of Einstein’s critics were closet (unknown to Einstein) or public anti-Semites, it is also true that many were proud Jews, or Gentiles without any anti-Semitic feelings. While anti-Semitism, which was common in Europe and America in the 1920’s—even Einstein was an anti-Semite, was likely to bias its adherents and foster resentment in them of Einstein’s public success, it did not in and of itself render legitimate scientific and philosophical non-race related arguments wrong, nor should it render such legitimate arguments taboo. The very bias of “race” prejudice provided an incentive for some to expose Einstein and the exposure of Einstein’s plagiarism and irrationality is a good thing, even though “race” prejudice is not.

Einstein should not be pardoned and science should not be stagnated merely because Einstein was criticized by some who may have had more than one motive for exposing him. If the racism of important historical figures, in word or deed, should make it impossible for present day scholars to rely upon their non-race related arguments, we must burn the Bible, the Constitution of the United States of America, the Declaration of Independence, as well as the other writings of many of the Founding Fathers of America, and the works of Aristotle, Herbert Spencer, Albert Einstein, and countless others. Any “race” prejudice some of Einstein’s critics may have had did not grant Einstein the license to plagiarize and deceive the public. Nor

did it grant him the privilege to hide from debate over the merits of the theory of relativity. Prejudice did not convert Einstein's plagiarism into non-plagiarism, nor did it turn Einstein's irrationality into rationality. In addition, nothing prevents a person who has expressed a racist bias on one occasion, from making a true statement on another occasion. Einstein, who was himself an anti-Jewish and anti-"Gojisch" racist and a complete hypocrite, took the coward's way out to cover up his misdeeds, but that does not mean that it was untrue when he claimed to have been descended from Jewish parents. It is certainly true that Einstein had no integrity as a scientist, as a man, or as a Jew.

While racist bias is a factor to be considered when weighing the value of an opinion expressed by an individual, it by no means excludes the possibility that a given expression of opinion or fact is legitimate, logical and factually correct. To pretend otherwise is to supplant logic and truth with reactionary and irrational emotion. To pretend otherwise is to be biased against reason and fact, and amounts to the irrational assertion that dislike of the messenger gives one a right to discount the truth when it is convenient to do so. A debtor might as easily and irrationally pretend that her dislike of a creditor gives her a right to refuse to pay off a legitimate debt. A true fact becomes no less of a true fact merely because it is iterated by someone with a bias or an ulterior motive for expressing it. A debt legitimately due is not paid back by a mere expression of dislike, even if the dislike is warranted.

Some well meaning individuals have been duped into believing that it is a good thing to suppress a legitimate criticism made by any person who has ever uttered an untoward word towards a "race", and to bar every other person from repeating the same legitimate criticism, or to ridicule the criticism itself as a matter of course, even if made before adopted by a person with a known bias. No doubt most of these dupes are rather selective in their sanctions, privileging and excusing some racists like Einstein, while exaggerating the degree and the impact of the statements of others. That aside, such dupes ought recognize the proven danger of excusing corrupt Jews from criticism by any method, including the method of pointing out that a given critic of corrupt Jews has iterated a generally anti-Jewish sentiment. This practice provides corrupt Jews with an incentive to create and sponsor anti-Semitism and to create a class of professional anti-Semites, whose pronouncements shield corrupt Jews from criticism. Ultimately, the practice of inhibiting the criticism of corrupt Jews, or any Jewish icon, or even any Jew, sponsors Jewish corruption and will inevitably lead to a severe and unjust backlash against all Jews.

It is not surprising that Jewish critics criticize obvious examples of corruption by Jews. That does not place Jews above criticism. Nor does it mean that a non-racist person becomes a racist by noticing and commenting upon the same corruption by a corrupt Jew, which a known anti-Semite has criticized. Nor does it mean that a non-racist criticism of a corrupt Jew becomes racist if noticed and encouraged by a racist. If such were the case, a corrupt Jew could hire another person to pose as an anti-Semite and criticize the corrupt Jew, and then be shielded for life from criticism. More broadly, corrupt Jewish leaders and corrupt Jewish organizations could hire stooges and *agents provocateur* to pose as anti-Semites and make ridiculous anti-Semitic statements, together with legitimate statements of fact, and thereby

stigmatize legitimate expressions of criticism as if the expression of “race hatred”, *per se*. Such things have happened. Corrupt Jewish financiers paid Hitler’s way,¹⁰⁰ and many who have legitimately criticized corruption by Jewish financiers have been likened to Hitler, who was paid by those same corrupt Jewish financiers to criticize them. Are we forbidden to criticize the financing of Adolf Hitler?

2.3 Harvard University Asks a Forbidden Question

In 1921, Ralph Philip Boas discussed a proposed quota system meant to prevent Jews, a small minority in America, from obtaining majority control over leading American universities. Boas employed racist apartheid arguments favoring Jewish domination of the universities, by attributing Jewish success in the colleges and universities to the alleged superiority of the Jewish “race”. Boas largely ignored the controlling effects of circumstance, religion and culture. Limiting Jewish enrollment to proportional numbers would have opened the door to more representation by Blacks and other minorities—whether or not those doors would have remained open is a separate issue. Boas wrote in his article, “Who Shall Go to College?”, *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 130, Number 4, (October, 1922), pp. 441-448, at 443-448:

“Such methods of admission have been in use in many of the larger colleges during the last few years, quietly and effectively; there is little reason to believe that they would have roused public discussion, had not Harvard, with candor worthy of her motto, thrown her cards upon the table and invited the country to discuss openly the question, Who shall go to college?

[***]

III

With the later immigration, however, the case was different. The great Jewish immigration, which began in the eighteen-eighties and still continues to the limit of the law, settled chiefly in the Eastern cities, especially, as it chanced, in or near the very cities where were the largest colleges: Philadelphia, New York, New Haven, and Boston. They brought with them an inherited tradition of education, intellects trained for centuries in the sharpest analysis and dialectic, a natural bent toward the professions, and—what, perhaps, is most important—the repression for years of their attempts to give these desires and characteristics free play. In time they acquired the economic independence necessary to send their children to college; where financial independence was lacking, those children undertook the burden of self-support with the tenacity of the race. There were no Jewish colleges founded for Jewish boys and girls, as with the Catholics, because there was no organized religious body to undertake their founding, and also because Jews have no desire for separation in anything except race and religion.

Now, it happened that Jews began to flock to the colleges at precisely the time when the colleges began to grow unwieldy in numbers and ill-assorted in membership. With the turn of the century, the old college simplicity began

to disappear. Old buildings were supplemented by costly modern edifices. The fraternity house and the private dormitory were established to ease the pressure upon the college building funds. Athletics began to develop their present overwhelming importance. Fraternities established hundreds of new chapters. It became necessary to harmonize the differences between rich and poor, between the yearning for scholarship and the cultivation of useful leisure. It was the time when the colleges were violently criticized for their organization, their curricula, and their student life.

Added, therefore, to a burden of cares, came the problem of racial equilibrium. The number of Jews in the eastern colleges gradually increased, until to-day Jews would, were they permitted, in many cases form as much as fifty per cent of the students. The problem of what to do with other groups—negroes, Armenians, Italians—is as nothing when compared with the problem of the Jews.

In the first place, other groups have not the Jewish desire for education. At one remove from the immigrant quarter, other groups do not go to college. Success does not come to them with great rapidity, nor have they the same racial background of learning and scholarship which is, in some degree, in every Jew's blood. Then, too, other groups have not the Jew's adaptability. The Ethiopian cannot change his skin; but Jewish boys and girls differ from their Gentile companions often only in a racial tie so faint that insistence upon it is but a galling reminder of a difference that seems almost academic. Moreover, Jews themselves are the most incoherent of racial groups, varying from the most cultivated, who have acquired the most conservative traditions of Americanism, to the most blatant, who know no traditions except those of oppression. And the urban environment of Eastern colleges has a full case of Jewish types, with the more noticeable, as always, setting the standard of judgment of the race as a whole. Finally, the Jew is the most successful of the newer groups in college. The success of Jews in scholarship is a byword. Rarely a list of honors appears which does not contain Jewish names. When a Jew puts his mind upon achievement, he usually secures what he aims for. He pursues success in scholarship with an intensity and a singleness of purpose which make him at least noticeable. What his hand finds to do, he does with all his might. Fatal gift! If only Jews would be content with mediocrity, the 'Jewish problem' might automatically disappear.

It is not the mere number of Jews, nor their undoubted prominence in scholarship, which complicates the problem. The American college is not, and never has been, an institution primarily for the acquisition of knowledge or the attainment of degrees. It is a social organization, with a very highly organized social structure. In most colleges this structure rests upon a basis of fraternities and clubs, with unwritten rules more rigid than those which govern the most exclusive society, administered with all the relentlessness of youth. It is hard to believe that young men have any inherent objection to their Jewish fellow students as individuals. But the organizations to which they belong have an inherent objection to Jews in the mass. In the admission

of Jews they see the subtle undermining of a social prestige which they must preserve, or perish. So far as the classroom is concerned, Jewish students are one thing; but at the 'prom,' or the class-day tea, the presence of Jews and their relatives ruins the tone which must be maintained if social standing is not to collapse. The result of the presence of a large number of students who are themselves not any too welcome at college affairs, and whose relatives are positively impossible, is necessarily disunion and strife within the social life of the college. Jews are naturally clannish, and the social discrimination which they constantly feel makes them doubly so. Isolated as they are, at a time of life and in an environment where isolation is poison, they create a group always sore, always aloof, always a thorn in the side of deans and presidents, who want unity above everything. Where Jewish fraternities and clubs are permitted, the situation becomes worse. Discontent, the gnawing sense of being unjustly treated, the rancor of a brilliant mind forced into social inferiority—these things become articulate and even vociferous; a sense of injustice crystallizes. Then too, the Jewish fraternities necessarily exclude some Jews, and there is left a poor, struggling, often unpleasant remnant, suffering from an aggravated inferiority complex, which makes them mere hangers-on of the collegiate society; men who are using the college for the financial gain of a college degree, men who make neither useful citizens of the college community nor alumni of whom the college can be proud.

The thought which comes into the mind of every right-thinking person is the essential injustice of the situation. In most cases Jewish students are men of good character and fair scholarship. As far as can be learned, they give no trouble to the disciplinary officers. Being what they are, they are despised and rejected; and, being despised and rejected, they develop all their worst traits instead of their best. Were charity, friendliness, forbearance, and kindness the outstanding characteristics of college men, students of unpleasant personality could be made better college men and better citizens. But these characteristics are no more true of college men than of any group of people. Rather less so, indeed, for young people are notoriously snobbish, hero-worshipping, and intolerant of eccentricity. College authorities, however good their will may be, have not the power to reform the social prejudices of college students. Hence arises a dilemma: either the social nature of a college body must be changed and a new point of view adopted—which seems impossible; or the groups of students who interfere with the harmonious functioning of this social nature must be limited—which rouses a storm of protest.

Those who know the colleges of the East will have little doubt of the outcome: it is easier to endure a storm of protest than to change a point of view. It must be remembered that the point of view has been the slow development of years, and is held alike by trustees, faculties, and alumni.

IV

If the American college were an institution which aimed to find the

sharpest brains of the country and to cultivate them, the problem of the limitation of enrollment would be simple. Jews would have nothing to fear from such a system. The bright minds would be admitted; the dull minds would be rejected; and among the successful would unquestionably be the high percentage of Jews who always succeed in an open competition where brains count most.

But, for good or ill, the endowed colleges are not looking for the sharpest brains. In general they would probably like to think of themselves as worthy of Hilaire Behloc's praise:—

Here is a House that armours a man

With the eyes of a boy and the heart of a
ranger,

And a laughing way in the teeth of the world

And a holy hunger and thirst for danger:

Balliol made me, Balliol fed me

Whatever I had she gave me again:

And the best of Balliol loved and led me,—

God be with you, Balliol men.

It is obvious that such a conception of college means a careful selection of students to form a type. It means scholarship, to be sure; but it means also, as the presidents of Brown and Bates have stated publicly, that scholarship shall be only one qualification for candidates. Character, personality, the chances of the student's being a header in life, social adaptability, the power to make friends, eligibility to social circles, conformity to discipline and to accepted thoughts and usages—these formally become the important criteria of admission, as they have been informally, in many cases, for several years. It is needless to say that such a conception of educational eligibility would exclude a large proportion of Jewish students, all negroes, and most members of other immigrant groups; and, with an ever increasing number of candidates for admission, would put a premium upon training in the great private schools.

Once accepted, this idea marks an epoch in American education, the full significance of which most people can hardly recognize, especially when it is remembered that, as the college is, so are large numbers of schools. It means the abandonment of scholastic achievement as the criterion of collegiate success; it means the creation of 'gentlemen's' colleges, as we have had, for a long time, 'gentlemen's' schools; it means the establishment of state universities which will be consciously for the masses, as opposed to 'aristocratic' groups; and it means that the colleges which, though perhaps grudgingly and even unconsciously, have been a powerful agent in Americanization, will now give up that work.

The matter of justice does not enter into this discussion, provided state and municipal colleges are called into existence to give the education which is the right of every qualified youth in a democracy. It is education which counts as a right, not education in any specific college. If Harvard, Yale,

Princeton, Columbia, and other endowed colleges feel that social homogeneity is the most important thing in the world for them, they have the right to secure that homogeneity, so long as they maintain no monopoly of college education. It may matter intensely to the alumnus of a great college that his son should go to that college in the same environment which he enjoyed; the young man of immigrant stock, to whom that environment means nothing, ought not make the gratification of that desire impossible, so long as he personally can get his education elsewhere, and so long as the great graduate schools are free to all comers who are properly qualified. It is the thing which matters, not the place in which the thing is obtained. If, for good or ill, colleges wish to stand apart from the incoherencies and the clashings of our changing social life, they have a right to do so, as long as they encourage the founding and maintenance of new institutions which will provide an education for all qualified candidates. It is well to remember, however, that in the past the endowed colleges have opposed the establishment of state universities, and that some of them have already undertaken a policy of exclusion of Jews without informing the public, and without giving a thought, apparently, to the question where the rejected students are to be educated. One of the bad features of the present discussion is the reticence of most college authorities, who permit rumors and sensational news reports to take the place of frank and open discussion, so that the public mind is befogged and confused by anybody who chooses to start a sensational story.

Though the question of justice may be put aside, the question of wisdom may properly enter into the discussion. The important thing is, after all, not what charters permit colleges to do, but what their self-respect, their desire to serve their students and their community, and their best interests in the future tell them they ought to do. Under a policy of exclusion of certain racial groups, of preferring the development of social qualities to active scholastic competition, the colleges are bound to lose more than they will gain. They may be pleasanter places to live in, but they will no longer really represent the eager, heterogeneous, varied amalgam which is America. Young men will be protected from the presence of new Americans at the very age when they ought to be making contacts which will give them real knowledge of actual civic life. There is something disquieting, too, in the thought that their enthusiasm for democracy is so slight that they demand shelter from its perplexities and from its dangers. American college life, surely, ought to be more than a pleasant interlude; it ought to be a stirring achievement.

Most disquieting of all, however, is the feeling that, in the perpetual fight against bigotry, superstition, racial intolerance, and inverted nationalism, the colleges seem to be abandoning the side of the angels. It may be hard to see one's college harboring strange men with alien ways, to see the happy spirit of youthful friendship weakening beneath the fierce and relentless pursuit of knowledge which, to these strangers, is the whole of college life; but it is harder to see one's college the fostering mother of hates and racial

dissensions, the parent of bitterness which for years will be a canker in the minds of men. Colleges will doubtless say that, in selecting their students in their own way, they have no such purpose. However, what usually matters is not the purpose of an act, but its result.”

2.4 Americans React to the Invasion of Eastern European Jews

The effects of the Eastern European Jews’ influence on American society appeared not only in the universities, but in the motion picture industry, which Jews monopolized in the Teens of the Twentieth Century—a fact which is widely acknowledged and celebrated by Jews today.¹⁰¹ They did not use their monopolization of that industry, which was largely built by Thomas Edison, then stolen from him, to promote strong moral values and collegiate aspirations in their Gentile neighbors in America. They did not promote the dignity of Black Americans and encourage them to pursue higher education. On the contrary, the Eastern European Jews glorified crime, violence, perpetual war, and vice in the form of tobacco and alcohol consumption—industries dominated by Jews. Eastern European Jews created an intensely anti-intellectual spirit in American Gentile culture, which impacted most strongly and negatively upon American Blacks. Their apartheid anti-Black mythologies became self-fulfilling prophecies.

The Jewish movie moguls degraded Blacks,¹⁰² while stealing their cultural achievements in dance and music. The Jewish movie moguls sexually exploited actors and actresses and prompted their use of drugs, and promoted cultural decadence in general. In addition, some Jews corruptly kept Blacks from reaping the profits of their own labors and talents in the music industry. Jews, long engaged in the slave trade,¹⁰³ were the first racists to fabricate religious racial myths which relegated Blacks specifically, and Gentiles in general, to a sub-human slave status. These movie moguls, who were mostly Eastern European Jews, taught American Gentiles to loathe wealth accumulation and promoted the Communist myth of the “working-class hero” as an ideal aspiration for American youth. They also promoted the Communist ideal of “race” mixing. Jews generally taught their own children to segregate and pursue higher education and the professions.

Frederick T. Gates used Rockefeller’s money to finance institutions of higher learning which benefitted Jews, while promoting the idea that Gentile students should be readied for factory work and work as field hands and farmers.¹⁰⁴ Charlotte Thomson Iserbyt wrote in her book *The Deliberate Dumbing Down of America: A Chronological Paper Trail*, Conscience Press, Ravenna, Ohio, (1999), p. 9, which is available online: <http://deliberatedumbingdown.com/MomsPDFs/DDDoA.pdf>,

“1913

JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, JR.’S DIRECTOR OF CHARITY FOR THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION, Frederick T. Gates, set up the Southern Education Board (SEB), which was later incorporated into the General Education Board (GEB) in 1913, setting in motion ‘the deliberate dumbing down of America.’

The Country School of Tomorrow: Occasional Papers No. 1 (General Education Board: New York, 1913) written by Frederick T. Gates contained a section entitled 'A Vision of the Remedy' in which he wrote the following:

Is there aught of remedy for this neglect of rural life? Let us, at least, yield ourselves to the gratifications of a beautiful dream that there is. In our dream, we have limitless resources, and the people yield themselves with perfect docility to our molding hand. The present educational conventions fade from our minds; and, unhampered by tradition, we work our own good will upon a grateful and responsive rural folk. We shall not try to make these people or any of their children into philosophers or men of learning or of science. We are not to raise up from among them authors, orators, poets, or men of letters. We shall not search for embryo great artists, painters, musicians. Nor will we cherish even the humbler ambition to raise up from among them lawyers, doctors, preachers, politicians, statesmen, of whom we now have ample supply."

The book of *Obadiah* verse 8 teaches the Jews to destroy the intellectual class of non-Jews and deprive the Gentiles of knowledge,

"Shall I not in that day, saith the LORD, even destroy the wise *men* out of Edom, and understanding out of the mount of Esau?"

Through their disproportionate wealth and their ownership of the mass media, as well as through disproportionate representation in colleges and universities, Eastern European Jews corrupted American culture to suit their own ends and to degenerate American Gentile society. Neal Gabler boasted in the film documentary *Hollywood: An Empire of Their Own*, Video Documentary by A&E, directed by Simcha Jacobovici, which originally aired as *Hollywoodism: Jews, Movies and the American Dream*, in 1997,

"They created their own America. An America which is not the real America, it's their own version of the real America. But ultimately this shadow America becomes so popular and so widely disseminated, that its images and its values come to devour the real America. And so the grand irony of all of Hollywood is that Americans come to define themselves by the shadow America that was created by Eastern European Jewish immigrants, who weren't admitted to the precincts of the real America."

The corruption of American culture by Eastern European Jews in the motion picture industry was already apparent in 1921, a few short years after it had begun. In the Nineteenth Century, composer Richard Wagner had criticized the Jewish monopolization and corruption of the opera. In 1921, Ralph Philip Boas, a Jew, criticized the Jewish monopolization of the motion picture and clothing

industries—as did *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT*.

German Jews owned sweat shops in Chicago and New York. German Jews exploited Eastern European Jewish labor in these clothing factories. The Eastern European Jews, descendants of the Frankists, took the opportunity to infiltrate American society with Communism and Anarchism by means of the labor unions, which they attempted to subvert—in many instances did subvert. Americans were leery of murderous Jewish Bolshevism, having witnessed the mass murders of millions of Russian Christians. Boas wrote in 1921,

“And of all non-Saxon groups Jews are the most obvious, because of their temperament, their appearance, their ability, and, above all, their fatal gift of complete absorption in the game of life. They have never acquired the habit of nonchalance. Every Jew has in him the making of a thoroughgoing fanatic. It is his greatness and his doom. It has placed him in the front rank of greatness and it has made him a marked man, the prey of a complex of repressions and of fears. He cannot hide himself if he would; and wherever he is, he must live with the eyes of the world upon him.

Jews are not accustomed to take stock of their own shortcomings. Persecution has saved them the trouble. To be alive at all after twenty centuries is in itself a triumph, which can excuse a few faults. Moreover, Judaism as a religion has been but little given to spiritual introspection. The consciousness of a guilty soul, the dread of eternal punishment, the longing to be one with God, the search for salvation, all the yearning mysticism which, to the Christian, is the very life and essence of religion, means comparatively little to the religious Jew. The Jewish religion is a stately monotheism, with a dignified and noble system of ethics and a theology and code of laws which lie at the basis of modern civilization. But this religion is an intellectual possession—it is not a haven for perturbed spirits, a beacon for the troubled wayfarer, a life-giving draught for parched souls. Jews, when attacked, do not rally to the defense of their religion: they rally to the defense of their good name as a social group. It is but rarely that Jews talk of religion: they take it for granted. But they talk vehemently of their rights as an oppressed people, or of social justice, or of their contributions to civilization. The triumph of prophetic Judaism over the Judaism of the Psalmist explains the shortcomings of Jews in the very points that are made most of by their critics. The greatest Orthodox rabbis are interpreters of the law; the greatest Reform rabbis are prophets of social righteousness. There are few to preach that teaching which Jews most need—personal consecration to righteousness, humility in success, a gentleman’s regard for the sensitiveness of others, a willingness to yield one’s legal rights before the quality of mercy. And yet it is this very preaching that thoughtful Jews the country over are craving, hardly conscious of what they crave. The time is ripe for the coming of a personality who will interpret in his life and his teaching the spirit that is dimly conscious in the hearts of many Jews.

These shortcomings of the Jews explain the concrete criticisms that Americans constantly make, not as conscious anti-Semites, but in all friendliness and good-will. They see that Jews form large settlements in our great cities. Are the cities better for their presence? They see that Jews virtually control certain businesses—for example, the clothing trade, the theatre, and the department store. They ask themselves if these businesses are the better because of Jewish control. Has Jewish domination of the theatre improved theatrical art and morals? Has Jewish domination of the clothing trade shown an example of the progress that can be made toward industrial peace? And these questions are asked, not by foolish theorists, who shrink at the spectacle of Jewish world-domination, not by anti-Semites, who are impervious to ideas of justice and fair play, but by thoughtful and fair-minded Americans, whose memories are long enough to recall a day when Jews were refugees from persecution, craving sanctuary in a land of freedom.

And it is these questions which Jews proud of their heritage and jealous of their good name would gladly avoid answering; for the truth is painful and disillusioning. There is but one answer. Theatres and clothing trade alike are controlled by two passions: a passion for wealth and a passion for power. Thoughtful Jews have no defense for the condition in which the theatre finds itself to-day: the drama gone, driven out by salacious and gaudy spectacle; the moving picture keeping just within the law, seemingly ignorant of any artistic responsibility, and as carefully devised for the extraction of dollars as a window-display of women's finery. It is the bald commercialism of the whole business that is so discouraging—its utter lack of moral and artistic altruism, its cultivation of a background of triviality and immorality. That the American public has allowed itself to be artistically debauched is no excuse for the men who have served up the poisonous fare. They have betrayed their heritage and their race; they have been worse than a wilderness of anti-Semites. For they have created a condition in which their success has furnished a fuel for racial attack that no amount of regulation anti-Semitic propaganda could have furnished; they have made the great refusal. A chance that no theatrical producers in the world have ever had was theirs, and they have, with deliberate cynicism, thrown it away. Their argument that they were merely giving the public what it wanted is worthless, for they have created their public. Nor is their other defense any better. What they have done, it is maintained, they have done, not as Jews, but as other Americans. Yet they remain Jews to themselves and to the world. And they are not as other Americans. They are marked men, heirs of the noble ideals of a race which gave Western civilization religion and morals. And they have betrayed their race for twenty pieces of silver.

In a lesser degree, the same is true of the clothing trade. Sweating of labor, cutthroat competition, an utter inability to coöperate and compromise, chicanery, pettiness, reaction—all these have characterized this industry. And although, fortunately, some of the great clothing manufacturers have shown a wisely progressive spirit in their relations with their employees, and have

set a standard that others would do well to follow, yet it is certainly true that in one of the greatest sections of the clothing-trade, obstinacy, an exaggerated individualism, and stubborn reaction characterize the employers; fanaticism and doctrinaire social theories characterize the employees. The sobering fact for the Jewish apologist is that, in too many cases, when Jews control an industry, they do not improve it: they merely make it more lucrative.

All this is, of course, only to say that Jews, being highly imitative and adaptable, have thoroughly mastered one kind of American business method, the method of driving and selfish efficiency. What the Steel Corporation has done on a large scale, the clothing manufacturers have done on a small scale. Jews have learned well the lesson of American industrial exploitation. But the defense, true as it is, will bear little weight with the public; for the Jews have the misfortune to control enterprises that are constantly before the public. Christian control of steel mills and copper mines may be even worse than Jewish control of clothing shops and motion picture theatres, but the steel mills and the mines are beyond the view of the great American public, while everyone comes in daily contact with the theatre and the clothing shop. Jews in their business life have a fatal obviousness—all the world reads their names on the signs of Fifth Avenue and Broadway; who visits the steel mills of Bethlehem, or the mines of Anaconda?”¹⁰⁵

Perhaps the examples Jews had set in the motion picture and clothing trades were among the reasons why Americans were reluctant to hand over influential American universities to “Eastern Jews”. *The World’s Work* published the following article in August of 1922,

“The Jews and the Colleges

THE ever-increasing importance which the Jewish question is assuming in American life is apparent in the way that it is agitating the colleges. Like every problem affecting Jewish immigration this one is primarily a city problem. It is only the colleges and universities located in or near large cities that feel the necessity of restricting their Jewish students. Again this particular phase of a daily increasing perplexity affects only one element among the Jewish citizenry—and that is the Russian or Polish Jews.

If the public can only get this latter fact clearly in mind the so-called Jewish question will appear in a clearer light. The large Jewish communities which are now found in most American cities are of comparatively recent growth. Jewish immigration to the United States has three well defined phases. At the time of the American Revolution there were only about 2,000 Jews in this country. Practically all of these were Spanish or Portuguese Jews, or their descendants; they had for centuries represented, as they do at the present time, the aristocracy of their race. They lived on the terms of the utmost friendship and respect with their Gentile compatriots; they occupy an

important position in Jewish history, for the new American Constitution completely freed and enfranchised them; they were thus the first Jews since the fall of Jerusalem that had ever been admitted as citizens of a free state on terms of exact equality with all other citizens.

The second phase of Jewish immigration came from Germany and was part of the general German immigration that began in the 'forties. These German Jews had for centuries lived in an environment which, while cruelly intolerant and discriminating on the social side, had still opened to them most of the economic and educational advantages that go with a superior civilization. These German Jews represented a comparatively small group; they were intelligent and industrious and for the most part prosperous; their habits and tastes were not materially different from those of the people among whom they lived; their children attended the public schools and the higher institutions and mingled, frequently on terms of intimacy, always on terms of good feeling and tolerance, with the offspring of the old established breed. More often than not they were 'unorthodox' in religion; most of them had long since abandoned the dietary practices that cause the Jews to be regarded as a peculiar people. Among them had originated the so-called 'reform' movement in religion; this was fundamentally an attempt to make their religious services lose something of their exotic flavor and correspond somewhat to that of their Christian brethren. The question of the assimilation of the German Jews was hardly ever discussed; their capacity for citizenship was taken for granted and the high position that they frequently attained in the arts, in education, science, and the professions certainly indicated that they had qualities that would be useful in our common American life.

About 1881, however, the systematic persecution of the Jews began in Russia, and from that time dates that enormous influx of Russian Jews which only the recent immigration laws have temporarily checked. The coming of the Russian and Polish Jews—a better term is Eastern Jews—forms the third chapter in the story of Jewish immigration. These Jews were almost as alien to our Spanish and German Jewish population as they were to the native American stock. They came from a country where even the Christian population had for centuries lived in ignorance, uncleanness, and squalor; their lives had always been an almost hopeless struggle against disease and poverty; to them the old proverb, 'as rich as a Jew' certainly was a cruel misnomer, for as a mass they were extremely poor—as they are still. These representatives of their race presented far greater problems in assimilation than did their predecessors. A greater proportion were orthodox in religion; their racial consciousness had been sharpened by especially atrocious segregation and ill treatment; and as a mass they had had little training in the amenities and delicacies of civilized existence. In their struggles in the new country they developed a competitive zeal that usually made them the conquerors of the occupations in which they specialized. Their competition was especially directed against their own co-religionists. Before they came, the German Jew had been the master of the clothing trades; but the Russian

Jew eventually supplanted him; and so it was in other lines.

The second generation of this immigrant body has now reached college age; the Jews have always shown a great aptitude for education, and it is to be expected that they would enter the universities in great numbers. It is only the universities located in large cities that especially feel this pressure. In New York the City College has long been almost exclusively a Jewish institution; New York University is probably seventy-five per cent. Jewish; at one time Columbia had a quota of forty per cent. though the proportion is now believed not to be so large. Yale has a comparatively small number—perhaps 10 per cent.; such places as Dartmouth, Princeton, Williams, and Amherst have practically none; the reason is that the first is located in a comparatively small city, and thus has a smaller Russian Jewish colony to draw upon, while the others are located in the country. The point is that nearly all this Jewish influx comes from the university town itself. Harvard, being near a large urban community, naturally has a larger proportion. The newspaper reports place this at 20 per cent. and President Lowell, in a recent letter, apparently foresees the early day when this will amount to 40.

Such a proportion means more than that Harvard would become, to a great extent, a Jewish institution. It means that its character would be completely changed. Like Yale and Princeton, the Cambridge University is national in scope; it draws its students from all parts of the United States. But the Eastern Jews who are hammering for admission come almost entirely from the Boston community. Most of them live at their own homes and thus do not become part and parcel of the college life. If they number 40 per cent.—and this proportion is likely to increase as time goes on—Harvard will lose its national character to that extent, and be a place given up largely to educating the sons of a particular racial element living in Boston. That is the present function of the City College of New York and New York University, though at the beginning they too were educational institutions of wider scope. There is therefore every reason why the Harvard authorities should deal frankly with this situation.”¹⁰⁶

2.4.1 Jewish Disloyalty

Whereas the prejudice Eastern European Jews faced from Western Jews was principally racism, the “anti-Semitism” the Jews of Eastern Europe faced from Gentiles was primarily political and economic. It resulted from the Jews’ harboring loyalty only to the chosen “race” of the “House of Israel”, while being openly disloyal to the Nation States in which they resided.

For example, in Poland the Jews segregated themselves into Ghettoes, and sought to take Polish land and turn it into a Jewish nation. In 1914, Israel Zangwill wrote in his booklet *The Problem of the Jewish Race*,

“But if from the Gentile point of view the Jewish problem is an artificial

creation, there is a very real Jewish problem from the Jewish point of view—a problem which grows in exact proportion to the diminution of the artificial problem. Orthodox Judaism in the diaspora cannot exist except in a Ghetto, whether imposed from without or evolved from within.”¹⁰⁷

Paul Scott Mowrer wrote in 1921,

“The Ghetto, which the Jews had formed of their own free will, was now imposed on them by force.”¹⁰⁸

In 1923, Burton J. Hendrick wrote in his article, “The Jews in America: III. The ‘Menace’ of the Polish Jew”,

“The orthodox Jew in Poland not only lives, by preference, in crowded ghettos in the cities, but he dresses in a way—a long gabardine of black cloth reaching to his ankles and a skull cap trimmed with fur—which emphasizes his Jewish particularism.”¹⁰⁹

Burton J. Hendrick also wrote in 1923,

“[Polish Jews] always resented—as they do to-day—the idea that they were Poles or a part of the Polish State; they insisted on being Jews and nothing else. Nor does it seem to be the case that the Jews in Poland were compelled to lead a distinct existence by the Government as a part of an anti-Jewish policy; the Ghetto was their own creation and their own choice; the fact that they were able to enjoy this privilege and many others, was what made their sojourn in Poland so agreeable and so free from the persecutions to which they were subject in other countries.”¹¹⁰

Jan Drohojowski wrote in 1937,

“Let’s nevertheless consider the origins of the ‘ghetto’. To many it may seem that Jews have been mercilessly sequestered in ‘ghettos’ by cruel Poles or other Christians. The truth is that the ‘ghetto’ is a purely Jewish arrangement. The ‘erub ha-azaroth’, a chain or wire joining two, or more, homes permits the Jew to obviate some prescription regarding the Sabbath. Gradually entire Jewish districts were wired. In such manner Jews separated themselves from Christians.”¹¹¹

Adolf Eichmann stated in 1960,

“ I would not say I originated the ghetto system. That would be to claim too great a distinction. The father of the ghetto system was the orthodox Jew, who wanted to remain by himself. In 1939, when we marched into Poland, we had found a system of ghettos already in existence, begun and maintained

by the Jews. We merely regulated those, sealed them off with walls and barbed wire and included even more Jews than were already dwelling in them. The assimilated Jew was of course very unhappy about being moved to a ghetto. But the Orthodox were pleased with the arrangement, as were the Zionists. The latter found ghettos a wonderful device for accustoming Jews to community living. Dr. Epstein from Berlin once said to me that Jewry was grateful for the chance I gave it to learn community life at the ghetto I founded at Theresienstadt, 40 miles from Prague. He said it made an excellent school for the future in Israel. The assimilated Jews found ghetto life degrading, and non-Jews may have seen an unpleasant element of force in it. But basically most Jews feel well and happy in their ghetto life, which cultivates their peculiar sense of unity.”¹¹²

Polish Jews strongly resented any assertion that they ought to become Poles, and saw themselves only as Jews—Jews who spoke Yiddish, not Polish. Jewish apologists were obliged to recognize that modern anti-Semitism was largely a political reaction by Gentiles to anti-Gentile Jewish racism and Jewish supremacism. Racist Zionist Theodor Herzl believed that religious anti-Semitism was a thing of the past, and that political anti-Semitism is fully justified. In an article entitled, “The Jewish State Idea”, in *The New York Times*, 15 August 1897, on page 9, it states,

“Dr. Herzl says that anti-Semitism is economic and social, not religious—and the cure, therefore, is the establishment of the Jewish State. [***] In answer to his critics, Dr. Herzl reasserts his claims, and adds that the resettlement of Palestine by Jews would avoid European complications as to national interests there; that it would come to the aid of shattered Turkish finances by paying a tribute of \$500,000 per annum, guaranteeing a loan of \$10,000,000, and that this tribute should be increased in proportion to the increasing population.”

Paul Scott Mowrer wrote in 1921,

“This cause [of popular sentiment against the Jews] is neither religious, as is often averred, nor economic, as many believe; it is political. It is based on the observation that the Jews, through innumerable transmutations of time and place, not only have kept their identity as a people, but have opposed a vigorous, if passive, resistance to most attempts at assimilation. The Jew, in short, is regarded as a foreigner, whose ‘laws are diverse from all people’; and as such, he is considered to be an enemy to the state.

The underlying reason for Jewish exclusiveness is, perhaps, the law of Moses. The sole object of life, according to the teachings of the rabbis, is the knowledge and the practice of the law, for ‘without the law, without Israel to practise it, the world would not be. God would resolve it into chaos. And the world will know happiness only when it submits to the universal empire of the law, that is to say, to the empire of the Jews. In consequence, the

Jewish people is the people chosen by God as the depository of his will and his desires.’ This strong and narrow spirit, instead of diminishing with the lapse of time, seemed only to increase; until, with the victory of the rabbis over the more liberal Jewish schismatists, in the fourteenth century, the doctors of the synagogue, says Bernard Lazare, ‘had reached their end. They had cut off Israel from the community of peoples; they had made of it a being fierce and solitary, rebellious to all law, hostile to all fraternity, closed to all beautiful, noble or generous ideas; they had made of it a nation small and miserable, soured by isolation, stupefied by a narrow education, demoralized and corrupted by an unjustifiable pride.’ [***] The Ghetto, which the Jews had formed of their own free will, was now imposed on them by force. [***] But though many Western European Jews have been more or less assimilated during the last hundred years, there are still many others who, though emancipated so far as external restrictions are concerned, have not desired, or have been unable, to shake off the clannishness, the peculiar mentality, inbred by twenty or thirty centuries of almost unbroken tradition; they may not go to synagogue, or even to the reformed tabernacle, but they would be repelled at the idea of marrying outside the race, and they preserve a special and seemingly ineradicable tenderness for their fellow Israelites, of no matter what social stratum, or what geographical subdivision. [***] The restrictive measures of the prevailing governments have merely served to accentuate a distinction ardently desired by the Jews themselves, whose devotion to both the civil and religious aspects of the Jewish Law is here as fervent as it is complete. The net result is that the typical Polish Jew, like the Lithuanian, Bessarabian, and Ukranian Jew, is a being absolutely apart from his Christian neighbors. [***] We are thus, in the end, brought squarely back again to the surmise from which we started, namely, that the Jewish question is, above all, political, and may indeed be reduced to this one inquiry: Is it, or is it not, possible to assimilate the Jews?’¹¹³

In an article entitled, “Mr. Balfour on Zionism”, *The London Times* wrote on 12 February 1919 on page 9, that Arthur James Balfour, who had signed the “Balfour Declaration” and issued it to the Jewish financier Rothschild, stated that the Jews of Eastern Europe were racists and were disloyal to their home States,

“MR. BALFOUR ON ZIONISM. THE CASE FOR A NATIONAL HOME.

Mr. Balfour, in whose hands has been placed the interests of Palestinian Jewry at the Peace Conference, has written a preface to the History of Zionism, shortly to be published from the pen of M. Sokolow, one of the four leaders of the Zionist Executive Committee.

Mr. Balfour says that convinced by conversations with Dr. Weizmann in

January, 1906, that if a home was to be found for the Jewish people, homeless now for nearly 1900 years, it was vain to seek it anywhere but in Palestine. Answering the question why local sentiment is to be more considered in the case of the Jew than (say) in that of the Christian or the Buddhist, Mr. Balfour says:—‘The answer is, that the cases are not parallel. The position of the Jews is unique. For them race, religion, and country are interrelated, as they are interrelated in the case of no other race, no other religion, and no other country on earth. By a strange and most unhappy fate it is this people of all others which, retaining to the full its racial self-consciousness, has been severed from its home, has wandered into all lands and has nowhere been able to create for itself an organized social commonwealth. Only Zionism—so at least Zionists believe—can provide some mitigation of this great tragedy.

‘Doubtless there are difficulties, doubtless there are objections—great difficulties, very real objections. . . . Yet no one can reasonably doubt that if, as I believe, Zionism can be developed into a working scheme, the benefit it would bring to the Jewish people, especially perhaps to that section of it which most deserves our pity, would be great and lasting.’

The criticism that the Jews use their gifts to exploit for personal ends a civilization which they have not created, in communities they do little to maintain, Mr. Balfour declares to be false. He admits, however, that in large parts of Europe their loyalty to the State in which they dwell is (to put it mildly) feeble compared with their loyalty to their religion and their race. How, indeed, could it be otherwise? he asks. ‘In none of the regions of which I speak have they been given the advantages of equal citizenship; in some they have been given no right of citizenship at all.’

‘It seems evident that Zionism will mitigate the lot and elevate the status of no negligible fraction of the Jewish race. Those who go to Palestine will not be like those who now migrate to London or New York. . . . They will go in order to join a civil community which completely harmonizes with their historical and religious sentiments; a community bound to the land it inhabits by something deeper even than custom; a community whose members will suffer from no divided loyalty nor any temptation to hate the laws under which they are forced to live. To them the material gain should be great; but surely the spiritual gain will be greater still.’

Mr. Balfour goes on to consider the position of those, though Jews by descent, and often by religion, who desire wholly to identify themselves with the life of the country wherein they have made their home, many of them distinguished in art, medicine, politics, and law. ‘Many of this class,’ he says, ‘look with a certain measure of suspicion and even dislike upon the Zionist movement. They fear that it will adversely affect their position in the country of their adoption. The great majority of them have no desire to settle in Palestine. Even supposing a Zionist community were established, they would not join it. . . .

‘I cannot share these fears. I do not deny that, in some countries where

legal equality is firmly established, Jews may still be regarded with a certain measure of prejudice. But this prejudice, where it exists, is not due to Zionism, nor will Zionism embitter it. The tendency should surely be the other way. Everything which assimilates the national and international status of the Jews to that of other races ought to mitigate what remains of ancient antipathies; and evidently this assimilation would be promoted by giving them that which all other nations possess—a local habitation and a national home.”

While Balfour and other segregationist racists tried to lay the blame for “anti-Semitism” on the Czar and the Gentile governments of the East, those governments often tried to welcome the Jews to assimilate and become genuine and loyal citizens. Racist Jews did not want to assimilate and it was largely the racist Jews who created—insisted upon, the Jewish Ghettos of the East.

When the Czar tried to integrate the Jews into society and combat racist Zionism in 1903, the racist Zionist Jews attacked him and his Government and incited strikes and a bankers’ boycott of the nation, which crippled Russia’s economy. The racist Zionist Jews fomented a revolution against the Czar on a massive scale in the period of 1903-1905, and the Jewish bankers made the people of Russia starve. Jewish bankers also created the Russo-Japanese war in this period and financed Japan and Russian Revolutionary Jews against Russia, while concurrently blocking Russia’s access to international finance. The Jewish bankers did this, not to free the Jews from segregation, but rather to ensure that the Jews remained segregated and form a disloyal and subversive Jewish nation within the Gentile nations of the East. The Jewish bankers did this, not to free the workers of Russia from their chains, but rather to starve and enslave them, and to turn them against the Czar who was trying to save them.

While, due to the lies spread in the Jewish press, the striking workers blamed the Czar for their pain, their dire situation was caused by Jewish bankers who deliberately bankrupted the country. Jewish Communists deliberately tore down society in order to herd the hurting masses toward the cliff of revolutionary suicide. Though the press around the world blamed the Czar for the woes of the Russian people, the Czar tried to save his people from this foreign influence of Jewish bankers, which ruined the Russian People. Though the press, under the influence of Jewish financiers, told the world that the Czar was segregating the Jews and starving the people of Russia, the Czar was in fact trying to integrate the Jews into Russian society and rescue the Russian economy from the Jewish bankers who were deliberately burying it. A bit of truth did, however, filter out in the press.

The London Times reported on 2 September 1903 on page 3,

“THE RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT AND ZIONISM.

(FROM OUR RUSSIAN CORRESPONDENTS.)

A secret circular against Zionism issued by the Russian Minister of the

Interior to the Governors, Prefects, and other authorities is published by the Jewish Labour League. It begins with an explanation of the motives for the change in the Government policy towards Zionism which M. de Plehve hinted at in his letter to Dr. Herzl. The Zionists have, it is alleged, departed from their original purpose of creating a Jewish State in Palestine, and now endeavour to develop and strengthen the Jewish national idea, which encourages racial differences. This is inimical to the assimilation of the Jews with the other subjects of the Tsar and contrary, therefore, to the Russian Imperial idea. The circular then prescribes to Governors and others to take the following measures:—

(1) To prohibit the action of the ‘Mahids,’ or travelling agitators, who make speeches in the synagogues and at public meetings; (2) not to allow public meetings or assemblies of any kind; (3) to forbid conferences of delegates and members of the Zionist organizations; (4) to stop the collection of money for the Jewish National Fund and the circulation of shares issued abroad in connexion with that fund; (5) to compel the Zionist leaders to sign a document not to collect any more funds, to transfer all the funds which are at present in their hands to the Odessa Society for Helping Jewish Farmers and Artisans in Syria and Palestine, and to confiscate all the shares of the Jewish National Fund now in circulation in Russia; (6) to keep a close watch over schools, libraries for adults, and other institutions in which old Hebrew is taught, and which tend to keep the Jews as a race apart; (7) to report as to the Zionist inclinations of all candidates for the position of Rabbi and other offices.”

On 11 September 1903, on page 3, *The London Times* reported on the anti-racist, integrationist policies of the Czar, which racist segregationist Jews loathed,

“M. DE PLEHVE AND ZIONISM.

The *Jewish World* of to-day publishes the text of the secret circular to which allusion was made in a despatch from our Russian Correspondents in *The Times* of September 2:—

Strictly confidential.

Ministry of the Interior, Special Police Department.

To the Governors, City Prefects, and Chiefs of Police.

According to information at the disposal of the Police Department, regarding the so-called Zionist societies, they originally set themselves the task of furthering the emigration of Jews to Palestine in order to establish there an independent Jewish State. Now the realization of this idea is being put into the distant future and activity directed to the development and strengthening of the national Jewish idea by the endeavour to form an inner organization of Jews in their present place of domicile.

This tendency, which is hostile to the assimilation of the Jews with the other races, and which widens the national gulf between the former and the

latter, is against the fundamental principles of the State, and cannot, therefore, be tolerated. Consequently, I consider it necessary to make the following decision in regard to the Zionist organization.

You will please let me have immediately detailed information on the Zionist groups and gatherings in your district, as well as on their significance from Government and national points of view. But as I regard it as urgent to take measures for the checking and stopping the Zionist organization, which had at first been permitted, and to hinder its further development in that harmful tendency, I consider it my duty, even before a definite decision can be come to on the whole question, to give you the following instructions:—

1. The propaganda of the Zionist idea in public places, as well as in assemblies bearing a public character, is to be forbidden. In this respect it is necessary to stop the activity of the special agitators, the so-called Maggidim, who travel about preaching in synagogues and at general meetings in order to make their audiences, particularly those from the lower classes, become adherents of Zionism.

2. In the same way, so far as they extend their activity to public meetings and gatherings, all existing Zionist organizations, which are spread all over Russia, including Siberia, the kingdom of Poland and Russian Central Asia, must be suppressed and prohibited.

3. Congresses and conferences of members of Zionist organizations, no matter the purpose for which they be held, are always to be prohibited.

4. All collections not authorized by the Government for the shares and coupons of the London Jewish Colonial Trust, whose entrance into Russia was permitted according to No. 92, section I. of the Code of Laws for 1902; the collections for the Jewish National Fund; as also the general collections in some towns, among the general body of the Jews, all are, at the first information obtained, to be at once suppressed. The persons standing at the head of the Zionist organizations have to bind themselves in writing to withdraw from the management and not to institute any collection. The moneys in their possession are, as collections not authorized by the Government, to be handed over to a Jewish benevolent institution, such as, for instance, the Odessa Society for Assisting Jewish Agriculturalists and Artisans in Palestine and Syria. Shares and coupons of the Jewish Colonial Trust, and the stamps of the Jewish National Fund, are liable to confiscation, and the persons who have concerned themselves in their sale have to bind themselves in writing to stop their activity. The latter is the more harmful, as the persons contributing to the Zionist funds are mostly recruited from those who are least able to afford it.

5. The lectures delivered in the Jewish Chedarim, libraries, reading-rooms, and Saturday schools are to be constantly watched.

6. At the elections of Rabbis, assistant Rabbis, and communal officials it is necessary to be informed as to the measure of their participation in the Zionist organizations.

(Signed) PLEHVE.

LOPUKHIN.”

Racist Zionist Jews combated the Czar’s progressive anti-racist and integrationist policies. Jews bankrupted and eventually overthrew the Russian Government—mass murdering tens of millions of Gentiles. Far from protecting Jews from racism directed against Jews, racist Jews cheered Hitler’s racist policies, financed Hitler and anti-Semitic propaganda, and then put the Nazi Party into power—mass murdering tens of millions of Gentiles, in order to ensure that the Jews become and remain segregated and form a racist apartheid “Jewish State”.

Racist Jews were determined to not let holy Jewish blood mix with Slavic blood which they considered sub-human. Racist Jews were determined to ruin Russia in order to prevent the desecration of divine Jewish blood. Racist Zionist Israel Zangwill wrote in his book, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), pp. 20-21,

“Moreover, while as already pointed out the Jewish upper classes are, if anything, inferior to the classes into which they are absorbed, the marked superiority of the Jewish masses to their environment, especially in Russia, would render *their* absorption a tragic degeneration. But if dissolution would bring degeneracy and emancipation dissolution, the only issue from this delimita is the creation of a Jewish State or at least a Jewish land of refuge upon a basis of local autonomy to which in the course of the centuries all that was truly Jewish would drift.”

Racist Jews blamed the ruin of the Russian people on those who tried to prevent it. The racist and intolerant Jews, who deliberately caused the famine, unemployment and slaughter, pretended that they were the innocent victims of racism and religious intolerance. Racist Jews even promoted anti-Semitism in order to keep the holy blood of Jews segregated from the Slavic “cattle”. The Zionists caused two World Wars and the genocide of the Russian people by the Bolsheviks, which cost the Russians many tens of millions of innocent lives, in order to fulfill the Zionists’ dreams of a “World Ghetto”¹¹⁴ for Jews in Palestine.

In 1922, Henry Morgenthau, a highly influential American Jew, reported on a Commission to Poland ordered by the Zionist President of the United States Woodrow Wilson,¹¹⁵ which Commission Morgenthau had led in 1919, and which revealed to Morgenthau, among other things, the duplicitous nature of the Zionist Jews of Poland,

“‘Mr. Dmowski,’ I said, ‘I understand that you are an anti-Semite, and so I want to know how you feel toward our Commission.’

Instantly he relaxed his severity. He replied in an almost propitiating manner:

‘My anti-Semitism isn’t religious: it is political. And it is not political outside of Poland. It is entirely a matter of Polish party-politics. It is only from that point of view that I regard it or your Mission. Against a non-Polish

Jew I have no prejudice, political or otherwise. I'll be glad to give you any information that I possess.'

He then sketched, with vigor, the arguments against Jewish Nationalism and touched on the Socialist activities of one section of the Polish Jews. He also said: 'There never was a pogrom in Poland. Lithuanian Jews, fleeing Russian persecution in 1908, spoke Russian obtrusively and banded together to employ only Jewish lawyers and doctors; they started boycotting; the Poles' boycott was a necessary retaliation. On the other hand, the Posen Jews speak either German or Yiddish, which is based on German: we want the Polish language in Poland.

[***]

'Pogroms?' Pilsudski had thundered when I first called on him. It was in the Czar's Summer Palace near Warsaw that he was living, and he received me in the 'library' where there was not a book to be seen. 'There have been no pogroms in Poland! Nothing but unavoidable accidents.'

I asked the difference.

'A pogrom,' he explained, 'is a massacre ordered by the Government, or not prevented by it when prevention is possible. Among us no wholesale killings of Jews have been permitted. Our trouble isn't religious; it is economic. Our petty dealers are Jews. Many of them have been war-profiteers, some have had dealings with the Germans or the Bolsheviki, or both, and this has created a prejudice against Jews in general.'"¹¹⁶

In 1921, Henry Morgenthau, one of the most prominent Jews in American history, clarified the fact that Zionist Jews were out to fulfill Jewish Messianic prophesies, which would make the Jews the exclusive rulers over the entire Earth,

"Zionism is a surrender, not a solution. It is a retrogression into the blackest error, and not progress toward the light. I will go further, and say that it is a betrayal; it is an eastern European proposal, fathered in this country by American Jews, which, if it were to succeed, would cost the Jews of America most that they have gained of liberty, equality, and fraternity. [***] Zionism is based upon a literal acceptance of the promises made to the Jews by their prophets in the Old Testament, that Zion should be restored to them, and that they should resume their once glorious place as a peculiar people, singled out by God for His especial favor, exercising dominion over their neighbors in His name, and enjoying all the freedom and blessings of a race under the unique protection of the Almighty. Of course, the prophets meant these things symbolically, and were dealing only with the spiritual life. They did not mean earthly power, or materialistic blessings. But most Jews accepted them in the physical sense; and they fed upon this glowing dream of earthly grandeur as a relief from the sordid realities of the daily life which they were compelled to lead."¹¹⁷

In its article "Jews", the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia: A Translation of the Third*

Edition, Volume 9, Macmillan, New York, (1975), pp. 292-293, at 293, wrote,

“After World War II, chauvinist tendencies and Zionist ideology, with its antiscientific assertion of the ‘messianic’ role of the Jews and the idea of the ‘chosen people,’ were artificially revived among Jews in the developed capitalist countries. Zionism has become an ideology of militant chauvinism and anticommunism, acting in the interests of international imperialism.”

In its article “Judaism”, the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia: A Translation of the Third Edition*, Volume 11, Macmillan, New York, (1976), pp. 311-313, at 312, wrote,

“Attempting to win over the masses of working Jews and to divert them from the world revolutionary labor and national liberation movements as well as to justify Israel’s expansionist policies, Zionism began to use the tenets of Judaism for its political aims (for example, messianism, which proposes the creation of a new, ‘ideal’ Israel, with Jerusalem as its center, that would include the whole of Palestine). Since the second quarter of the 20th century Zionism has found support among the most reactionary Jews, especially in the USA. In its chauvinist and annexationist policy Zionism makes use of Judaic dogma that the Jews are god’s chosen people and employs Judaism to substantiate the concept of a ‘worldwide Jewish nation’ and other reactionary positions.”

See also: N. S. Alent’eva, Editor, *Tseli i metody voinstvuiushchego sionizma*, Izd-vo polit. lit-ry, Moskva, (1971). Н. С. Алентьева, Редактор, Цели и методы воинствующего сионизма, Издательство Политической Литературы, Москва, (1971).

2.4.2 In Answer to the “Jewish Question”

Burton J. Hendrick, Associate Editor, published a series of articles in *The World’s Work* in 1922-1923, in which he launched a two-pronged attack, one against Henry Ford’s alleged anti-Semitism, the other against the segregationist tribalism of “Polish Jews”—the Jews of Eastern Europe who were migrating by the millions through Germany to England and eventually to the United States. Hendrick extolled the virtues of the Sephardic and German Jews who had emigrated to America long before, but obviously sought to curb the influx of Russian Jews into the United States. Hendrick’s articles are particularly noteworthy, because they evince the common view in Germany, England and America; that Eastern Jews were too often the dregs of society. Russian Jews were commonly seen as prostitutes, liquor and tobacco peddlers—the promoters and exploiters of vice, gangsters (such as Meyer Lansky, a Polish Jew from Grodno, born Majer Suchowlinski; and “Bugsy” Siegel, born Benjamin Hymen Siegelbaum, who was popular among the powerful Jews of Hollywood—organized crime has always been, and continues to be run behind the

scenes by Jews, many of whom are Israelis and Russian Jews, who deal in drugs, weapons and the white slave trade in women and children), revolutionary assassins, shyster lawyers, corrupt stock traders, corrupt politicians who sought to destroy America, and other despicable sorts. On the other hand, while acknowledging the stereotypes that were already pervasive in 1902, Dr. Maurice Fishberg wrote more enthusiastically about the Russian Jew in “The Russian Jew in America”, *The American Monthly Review of Reviews*, Volume 26, Number 3, (September, 1902), pp. 315-318; however, this journal was created by William T. Stead to promote the views of Cecil Rhodes, who was himself a Rothschild agent.¹¹⁸

The strongest prejudice Eastern Jews faced came not from Gentiles, but from their Western Jewish co-religionists who knew them best. Western Jews were often as intolerant and tribalistic as were their Eastern co-religionists. Ironically, both groups suffered from the intolerance they had passed on to the Gentiles in the forms of Christianity and Islam, and from the Gentiles’ reaction to Jewish tribalism and criminal behavior.

The North American Review, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, published an article, “The Modern Jews”, which revealed at pages 329-330, and 351, that the Jews were trying to catch up after lagging behind the Gentiles in the Enlightenment, and that some Jews believed that they bore the prophesied burden of telling Gentiles how they ought to think and to learn, as well as how to run their governments. Note the important, though spurious, linkage of Jewish persecution with the Messianic aspirations of some Western Jews (especially the Rothschilds and their agent Montefiore). These incompressibly wealthy Jewish racists also bought the services of merciless Christians and Moslems, who had been corrupted and cajoled behind the scenes by Western Zionist Jews (especially the Rothschilds and their agent Montefiore) and instructed to persecute Jews in order to force them into accepting segregation and ultimately Zionism—most anti-Semitism was artificially manufactured by Jewish leadership,

“A NEW and rapidly increasing interest in the affairs of the Jewish people has of late years pervaded Protestant Christendom. Among the Jews themselves, too, our day reveals new elements of life, struggling to break the stupor of centuries. Some strange changes are taking place, also, in the external condition of this people. In one country, we behold revived against them a persecuting popish inquisition; in another, an imperial edict is even now sending them, by hundreds of thousands, into exile; in a third,—a Protestant country, too,— the long established policy of excluding them from political privileges altogether has withstood a bold onset from the liberal spirit of the age, and triumphed. Our own land has recently witnessed the singular spectacle of Jews dictating to a Christian people, how the children of that people should be educated; and forbidding to teach, or even name, Jesus Christ in the public schools. Meanwhile, the Protestant church, especially in Great Britain, is putting forth fresh energies, in widely extended missionary enterprises, to win Israel to the acknowledgment of her Messiah, still looked for, though long since come,—perseveringly rejected, yet the object of her

fondest hopes. [***] The rank and power which many European Jews have acquired by their learning, or more frequently by their wealth, have been at times an important safeguard to their poor, despised countrymen. None can estimate the influence, in this respect, of the Rothschilds, who, a few years ago, were five in number, with houses at London, Frankfort, Paris, Vienna, and Berlin; guiding the commercial, and sometimes almost the political, destinies of Europe; ‘holding in their hands the purse-strings of the civilized world.’ One of the brothers was presented to the pope in 1838; and his brethren in Rome profited by his presence to obtain permission to work at their trades. The pope not only granted this request, but also distributed alms among the poor Jews. Sir Moses Montefiori, a princely Israelite of London, was one of the deputation to the Turkish Sultan to obtain relief for the persecuted Jews of Damascus and Rhodes, and was the chief agent in procuring the firman already mentioned. He profited by this occasion to visit Palestine, and manifested a lively interest in the condition of his brethren in that land. A Jewish banker of Antwerp, M. Cohen, has lately received a knighthood of the order of Isabella from Spain!”

The expulsion of the Jews from Spain and the Inquisition were a means by which racist Jews prevented the assimilation of Sephardic Jews into Catholic Spanish society and Moorish Islamic society. They were a means to maintain the “purity” of the “Jewish race” and were the product of Jewish racism, not Catholic intolerance. *The North American Review* wrote in 1845 (note that crypto-Jews, for example the Marranos of Spain and the Dönme in Turkey, were often the most observant members of their feigned religions—the most deceptive and subversive members of their societies, just as the crypto-Jews Reinhard Heydrich, Joseph Goebbels and Julius Streicher were the most vitriolic anti-Semites in Nazi Germany and deliberately brought about the downfall of Germany),

“No estimate can be formed of the number of Jews residing in Roman Catholic countries, particularly in Spain and Portugal, who conceal their religion under a Christian garb; probably, there are several hundred thousand of them. [***] Ferdinand and Isabella, after vanquishing the Moors, commanded all the Jews of Spain either to embrace Christianity, or to leave the kingdom within four months. Eight hundred thousand, according to the Spanish accounts,—according to the Jews, a million,—preferred exile, and suffered inconceivably in their emigration. Some of them took refuge in Portugal, whence, however, with all other Jews, they were soon expelled. Hundreds of thousands in both countries submitted to baptism in preference to exile; but in secret they still practised the rites of Judaism; some carrying dissimulation so far as even to take orders in the Roman Catholic church, and to become judges of the Inquisition, which, it is well known, was originally established in Spain about this time, principally to deal with relapsing Jews and Moors, who had preferred an outward profession of Christianity to banishment, and who were called ‘New Christians.’ In Spain, the Jews have

never since been openly tolerated. To Portugal they were readmitted by John the Sixth about the year 1817, because some Jews had imported large cargoes of corn during a scarcity; and, at the request of the pope, they were allowed the same privileges that were accorded to them in the Roman States. Previously, in that kingdom, the name of Jew was so odious, that a law was passed, giving impunity to any one so called, who should slay the offender on the spot; and there, as well as in Spain, the descendants of the 'New Christians,' who still are Jews at heart, maintain the deception; though in Portugal, where some degree of liberty of conscience has for a few years been enjoyed, these will probably, it is said, soon return to the synagogue. Most of the avowed Jews in that country, at present, are recent immigrants. No longer ago than 1827, a person was put to death in Spain for the heresy of Judaism. The dissemblers there, to make the deception complete, often affect unusual Christian zeal. If a Spanish dwelling superabounds with religious ornaments and utensils, there is good reason for believing the family to be dissembling Jews."¹¹⁹

Eastern Jewish emigrants to America sought to continue the noble ancient Jewish tradition of higher education, which had given the Western Jews great advantages in the world. The 1845 article in *The North American Review* continued (note the racism of Sephardic Jews directed against Ashkenazi Jews):

“The rank and power which many European Jews have acquired by their learning, or more frequently by their wealth, have been at times an important safeguard to their poor, despised countrymen. None can estimate the influence, in this respect, of the Rothschilds, who, a few years ago, were five in number, with houses at London, Frankfort, Paris, Vienna, and Berlin; guiding the commercial, and sometimes almost the political, destinies of Europe; ‘holding in their hands the purse-strings of the civilized world.’ One of the brothers was presented to the pope in 1838; and his brethren in Rome profited by his presence to obtain permission to work at their trades. The pope not only granted this request, but also distributed alms among the poor Jews. Sir Moses Montefiori, a princely Israelite of London, was one of the deputation to the Turkish Sultan to obtain relief for the persecuted Jews of Damascus and Rhodes, and was the chief agent in procuring the firman already mentioned. He profited by this occasion to visit Palestine, and manifested a lively interest in the condition of his brethren in that land. A Jewish banker of Antwerp, M. Cohen, has lately received a knighthood of the order of Isabella from Spain!

The Jews have nowhere preserved faithful genealogical records, but almost always have abundant traditions of their descent, which, of course, are unworthy of credit. Yet supposing that the twelve tribes are now generally amalgamated, some portions of the mass, taken separately, must be less mixed than others. There are, no doubt, among them, though the distinction cannot certainly be traced, not a few pure descendants of some tribes; and

none were so likely to keep themselves distinct as the tribe of Judah, claiming, as they did, preëminence. The Spanish and Portuguese Jews have always asserted a superiority in this respect; some said, that they were of the united tribes of Judah and Benjamin, including the Levites; others, that they were of pure descent from Judah; and others, still more arrogantly, that they were of David's royal line [which would make them the self-anointed bearers of the royal Messianic line—**CJB**]. Since they probably came from Judea about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, they may undoubtedly be considered among the purest representatives of the two tribes. The German and Polish Jews, who were reinforced from the East, in the tenth century and subsequently, are of more heterogeneous elements. The latter are denominated Ashkenazim, from Ashkenaz, grandson of Japhet; [*Footnote*: Genesis, x. 3.] the former, Sephardim, from Sepharad, [*Footnote*: Obadiah, 20.] a name which the modern Jews have given to Spain. These are found interspersed with each other in most parts of the world; but in general, it may be said, that the Sephardim belong to the different countries, European, Asiatic, and African, upon the Mediterranean sea. Thus, the forefathers of most of the present native Jews in Constantinople and Palestine came, as exiles, from Spain and Portugal, at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century. They have everywhere separate synagogues, and refuse intermarriage with the Ashkenazim. If any of their number marries one of the inferior race, excommunication immediately follows. Early in the present century, the daughter of a Portuguese Jewish physician, at Berlin, married a German Jew, and her family went into mourning for her, as for one dead. In this country, the same distinctions and pretensions are found, gradually wearing away, however, under the combined influences of Jewish neology and American democracy. 'The Hebrew Portuguese Congregation' of Philadelphia has already been mentioned in another connection; this title itself indicates the still existing distinction. The Sephardim are generally more polished than the Ashkenazim; and in Europe, for the most part, are superior to them also in moral and religious principle. Along the shores of the Mediterranean, they have a dialect of their own, originally Spanish, but now modified by Hebrew words, phrases, and idioms, and called Judæo-Spanish. The Jews of Russia and Poland are represented as the worst to be found in any country; some would make them out to be little better than hordes of robbers; this, however, is an exaggeration. Bad as they may be, it is believed they are superior in morals to their Gentile neighbours: 'He lives like a Christian,' is with them an accusation of the grossest immorality."¹²⁰

Herbert N. Casson wrote in 1906, in his article, "The Jew in America",

"The Russian Jew, who was the last to discover America, but who will soon outnumber all the rest, has little education when he arrives. But he is hungrier for knowledge than for money. Scholarship—that is what he worships. He will live five in a room to let little Jacob go to college. And the young

Russian Jew will at any time prefer an Idea to a meal. On several occasions, in the North End of Boston and the East Side of New York, I have heard boys of nineteen discussing the poetry of Heine, the music of Mendelssohn, the philosophy of Spinoza, the revolutionism of Marx, as though they had no personal problem to solve in the slum and the sweat-shop.”¹²¹

The otherwise virtuous love of education often became a destructive force in the hands of tribalistic and racist Jews, who were obsessed with self-glorification and clannishly demanded obedience to their Jewish heroes of the arts and sciences. In so doing, these racist Jews stifled progress and discouraged reasonable persons from pursuing fields they otherwise would have entered. It was important to racist Jews that they not only accumulate disproportionate wealth, but also that they prevented others from accumulating enough wealth to pose an organized opposition to the Messianic goals of racist Jews. It was important to them to keep Gentiles comparatively poor and uneducated.

Note that Marx, Spinoza, Mendelssohn and Heine were not only second rate philosophers and artists, but that each was Jewish and a hero to these young Jews, who would impose their hero worship on all of humanity and who would dogmatically and vociferously resist any challenges to their adolescent cults of personality—apparently exclusively Jewish personalities. Seemingly, in their minds one would have to be an anti-Semite not to recognize the vast superiority of their mediocre heroes, who were largely plagiarists.

3 ROTHSCHILD, REX IVDÆORVM

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

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

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

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

3.1 Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

at *Baba Kamma* 38a,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Obadiah states,

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.2 Jewish Messianic Supremacism

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

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

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

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

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

[***]

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

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

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

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

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

[***]

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

3.3 The “Eastern Question” and the World Wars

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

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

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

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

“RUSSIA AND TURKEY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.3.1 Dönme Crypto-Jews, The Turkish Empire and Palestine

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“THE TURKISH CHAMBER AND ZIONISM.

(FROM OUR CORRESPONDENT.)

CONSTANTINOPLE, MARCH 1.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CONSTANTINOPLE, APRIL 9.

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

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

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

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

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

“ZIONISM AND TURKEY.

(FROM A CORRESPONDENT.)

COLOGNE, MAY 4.

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

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

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

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

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

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

“THE YOUNG TURKS AND ZIONISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours obediently,

D. WOLFFSOHN,

President of the Zionist Organization.

Cologne, May 1.”

+

3.3.2 The World Wars—A Jewish Antidote to Jewish Assimilation

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

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

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

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

“ZIONISM

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

By COUNT LEO TOLSTOY

(Translated from the Russian by Herman Bernstein.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And God says to them:

‘Try to do My work.’

And He turns away from them.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“ZIONIST CONGRESS IN BASEL.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4 Rothschild Warmongering

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

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

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

**“TROTSKY LEADS
RADICAL CREW**

TO WORLD RULE

Bolshevism Only a Tool for His Scheme

BY JOHN CLAYTON.

(Chicago Tribune Foreign News Service.)

(By Special Cable.)

(Copyright: 1920: By the Tribune Company.)

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

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

Use Local Hatreds.

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

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

Trotsky at Head.

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

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

Out to Grab Trade Routes.

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

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

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

3.4.1 Inter-Jewish Racism

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Menachos 43b states:

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

Time Magazine wrote in the issue of 3 March 1923,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4.1.1 Rothschild Power and Influence Leads to Unbearable Jewish Arrogance

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

“Disraeli and the Jews.

London Correspondence of the Cincinnati Commercial.

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

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

Towering to the skies,

Like a tall bully lifts its head and lies.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Einstein also stated,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4.1.2 Jewish Intolerance and Mass Murder of Gentiles

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

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

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

BY JOHN CLAYTON

(Chicago Tribune Foreign News Service.)

(By Special Cable.)

(Copyright: 1920: By the Tribune Company.)

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

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

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

Emma: ‘Bolshevism is Rotten.’

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

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

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

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

More Freedom in United States.

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

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

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

Expects to Go to Jail.

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

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

Emma: ‘Hit Hard.’

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

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

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

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

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

“BEACONSFIELD’S LUCK.

Bismarck’s Hand Disclosed in the

Workings of the Congress
at Berlin.

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

Correspondence New York Graphic.

LONDON, July 6.—All hail, Beaconsfield!

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

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

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

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

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

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

What does this mean?

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

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

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

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

This foe was the most powerful element in Continental Europe.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The answer is—Kaiser William.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“TROTZKY LEADS RADICAL CREW TO WORLD RULE

Bolshevism Only a Tool for His Scheme

BY JOHN CLAYTON.

(Chicago Tribune Foreign News Service.)

(By Special Cable.)

(Copyright: 1920: By the Tribune Company.)

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

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

Use Local Hatreds.

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

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

Trotzky at Head.

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

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

Out to Grab Trade Routes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4.2 The Messiah Myth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Active Faith in Ability

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

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

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

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

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

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

2 Forms of Redemption

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

David Ben-Gurion stated,

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

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

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

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

and boasted,

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

Christopher Sykes wrote,

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

David Ben-Gurion stated in 1932,

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

Ben-Gurion also stated,

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

and,

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

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

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

Ben-Gurion stated to the General Staff,

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

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

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

Menachem Begin stated in 1948,

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

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

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

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

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

Isaiah 65 states,

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

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

Isaiah 66:22-24 states,

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

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

Ezekiel 36:24-38 states,

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

Ezekiel 37 states:

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

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

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

Ezekiel 38 states:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

be a mortal crisis. I am against it totally.

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

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

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

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

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

3.5 Jewish Dogmatism and Control of the Press Stifles Debate

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

but undoubtedly very important, was to blaze forth.

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

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

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

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

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

misguided idealists.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“Zuschriften an die Herausgeber.

Prüfung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie.

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

Berlin, den 9. Oktober 1919.

A. Einstein.”

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

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

“Das Weltbild des Physikers.

Professor Einstein über die Motive des Forschens.

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

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

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

“Grundgedanken der Relativitätstheorie.

Professor Einstein am Vortragstisch.

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

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

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

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

On 13 May 1919, *Vossische Zeitung* reported,

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

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

On 21 July 1919, *Vossische Zeitung* reported,

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

On 15 October 1919, *Vossische Zeitung* reported,

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

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

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

On 18 November 1919, *Vossische Zeitung* reported,

“Einstein und Newton.

Die Ergebnisse der Sonnenfinsternis vom Mai 1919.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

R. S. Shankland stated,

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

Albert Einstein stated on 27 April 1948,

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

Albert Einstein told Peter A. Bucky,

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

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

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

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

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

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

Paul Ehrenfest wrote to Albert Einstein on 9 December 1919,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“Albert Einstein. Zum Siege seiner Relativitätstheorie.

Von
Erwin Feundlich, Neubabelsberg.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“Raum, Zeit und Schwerkraft.

Von Professor Dr. M. Born.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ist.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Literary Digest wrote in April of 1921,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Berlin, or even to the North Pole.”²⁴³

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

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

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

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

Born did indeed profiteer from the Einstein name,

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

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

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

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

3.5.1 Advertising Einstein in the English Speaking World

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

The London Times wrote on 7 November 1919,

**“REVOLUTION IN
SCIENCE.**

NEW THEORY OF THE

UNIVERSE.

NEWTONIAN IDEAS OVERTHROWN.

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

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

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

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

‘MOMENTOUS PRONOUNCEMENT.’

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

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

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

SPACE ‘WARPED.’

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

The London Times wrote on 8 November 1919,

“THE REVOLUTION IN SCIENCE.

EINSTEIN v. NEWTON.

VIEWS OF EMINENT PHYSICISTS.

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

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

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

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

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

THE ETHER OF SPACE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

original prediction.

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

DR. ALBERT EINSTEIN.

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

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

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

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

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

“ECLIPSE SHOWED GRAVITY VARIATION

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

HAILED AS EPOCHMAKING

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

Copyright 1919, by The New York Times Company.

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sir Joseph Thomson, summing up the discussion, said:

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

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

“LIGHTS ALL ASKEW IN THE HEAVENS

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

EINSTEIN THEORY TRIUMPHS

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

A BOOK FOR 12 WISE MEN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“ACCEPTS EINSTEIN GRAVITATION THEORY

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

SOME SCIENTISTS CAUTIOUS

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

Special to The New York Times.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Special to The New York Times.

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

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

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

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

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

Special to The New York Times.

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

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

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

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

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

3.5.2 Reaction to the Unprecedented Einstein Promotion

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

**“A NEW PHYSICS,
BASED ON EINSTEIN**

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

SPACE OF FOUR DIMENSIONS

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

ATTEMPT TO MEASURE IT

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

Copyright. 1919, by the New York Times Company.
Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

More Details Made Known.

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

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

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

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

The results, reduced to the sun's limb, were 2.08 and 1.94 seconds respectively. The combined result was 1.98 seconds, with a probable error of about 6 per cent. This was a strong confirmation of Einstein's theory, which gave a shift at the limb of 1.75 *seconds*. The results from the individual stars were consistent, and incidentally they confirmed the theoretical law that the shift ought to vary inversely as the distance from the sun's centre. If the shift were due to refraction produced by a gaseous envelope round the sun, it would vary according to a less simple law. The second camera used at Sobral was the object-glass of the Greenwich astrographic equatorial, of aperture 13 inches (which was reduced to 8 inches, as it was found to improve the definition), and focal length 11¼ feet, mounted in a steel tube, and supplied with light from a 13-inch coelostat. The focus was obtained by photographs of Arcturus. Unfortunately the images secured were not good, evidently owing to the coelostat mirror not being flat, for the quality of the object-glass was known to be very good.

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

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

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

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

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

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

“Bad Times for the Learned.

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

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

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

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

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

“Obviously a Rash Prophecy.

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

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

Curved Space Before Einstein.

To the Editor of The New York Times:

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

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

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

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

GEO: H. HADLEY.

Fairfield, Conn. Dec. 12, 1919.”

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

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

“JAZZ IN SCIENTIFIC WORLD

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

Theories.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.5.3 The Berlin Philharmonic—The Response in Germany

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

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

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

Nicolai about Albert Einstein's sexual advances toward her,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Paul Weyland's brochure:

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

Betrachtungen
über
Einsteins Relativitätstheorie
und die Art ihrer Einführung

von

Paul Weyland

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

Berlin 1920

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Die Relativitäts-Theorie.

Von Dr. V. Engelhardt (Berlin-Friedenau)

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

Es folgt nun ein Einstein-Artikel.

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

Die Offensive gegen Einstein.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Der Kampf gegen Einstein.

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

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

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

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

K. J.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

K. M.

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

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

Ich lasse meinen Vortrag folgen:

Meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren!

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

„Zusammenfassend kann man sagen:

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

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

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

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

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

[*19*]

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

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

[*20*]

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

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

[*21*]

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

Einsteins Relativitätstheorie—eine wissenschaftliche Massensuggestion.

Von P a u l W e y l a n d.

Wir leben in einem Zeitalter des Amerikanismus. Die Geschäftswut Englands ist in Dollarika zur Potenz erhoben, führte dort auf allen Gebieten des wirtschaftlichen und geistigen Lebens zu Rekordleistungen, die rein technischer, zivilisatorischer Art waren, hinter denen kulturelle Bestrebungen zurückstehen mußten. Die Rekordjägerei endigte im Bluff, und wir stehen vor der traurigen Tatsache, daß auch diese Bluffmacherei vor der reinen Wissenschaft nicht Halt machte, so daß die Sache neben der Person verschwand.

Ich erinnere an den bekanntesten Fall dieser Art, an den Entdeckerstreit Cook-Pearry, der in der Öffentlichkeit am besten bekannt wurde. In Deutschland erlebte man, nach dem der Amerikanismus hier Eingang fand, gegenüber diesen Reisenbluffs bislang nur Sensatiönchen, die aber so lebhaft von dem Geist Zeugnis ablegten, der gewisse wissenschaftliche Kreise auch unseres Vaterlandes ergriffen hat. Ich erinnere an Friedmanns Tuberkulin, an die Herstellung von Mehl aus Stroh usw., um an diesen Beispielen zu zeigen, daß man es in gewissen Kreisen nicht mehr für nötig hält, die Bestätigung eines Laboratoriumversuches in der Praxis abzuwarten, sondern mit Hilfe einer gefügigen Presse sich mit seiner halbfertigen Sache dem Publikum vorstellt, den wertigen Namen nebst Photographie in alle Windrichtungen hinausbläst, um einige Zeit später, wenn — wie fast stets — die Hinfälligkeit der Entdeckung durch ernste Forscher bewiesen wird, beharrlich zu schweigen. Davon aber erfährt das Publikum natürlich nichts, und die Masse schwört blindlings auf die „großen“ Namen.

Mittlerweile hat sich Deutschland — endlich — neben solchen Sensatiönchen auch eine richtige Sensation geleistet. Herr Albertus Magnus ist neu erstanden, guckte in die ernstesten Arbeiten stiller Denker wie Riemann, Minkowsky, Lorentz, Mach, Gerber, Palagyi u. a. m., räusperte sich und sprach ein großes Wort gelassen aus. [*Footnote:* Um endlose Wiederholungen zu vermeiden, wird das Relativitätsprinzip beim Leser als bekannt vorausgesetzt.] Die Wissenschaft staunte.

Die Öffentlichkeit war starr. Alles [*22*] brach zusammen. Herr Einstein spielte mit der Welt Fangball. Er brauchte nur zu denken, und flugs relativierte sich alles Geschehen und Werden.

Einsteins Methode war nun so bewußt abstrakt, daß es dem Fachmann ernstliche Schwierigkeiten bereitete, sich hindurchzuarbeiten. Zunächst verquickte er mehrere wissenschaftliche Disziplinen miteinander, ja er errichtete für seine Zwecke ein ganz neues mathematisches Gebäude, so daß der nachprüfende Naturforscher vor lauter Nebensachen zunächst gar nicht an den Kern der Sache heran kam, weil diese Nebensächlichkeiten, die erst geprüft werden mußten, ja den Aufbau seines Theorems bedeuteten. Dieses Drum und Dran ist von Forschern wie P. Lenard, Gehrcke, Kraus u. a. geprüft worden, es stellte sich heraus, daß nicht einmal das Skelett einer kritischen Betrachtung standhielt. Was soll da aber erst aus dem Hauptteil werden?

So bemängelt z. B. P. Lenard mit unbedingtem Recht, daß bei Einstein der einfachsten Logik Hohn gesprochen wird. Ich zitiere Lenard wörtlich: [*Footnote*: P. Lenard, Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation. Verlag S. Hirzel, Leipzig 1920.]

„Man lasse den bekannten Eisenbahn eine deutlich ungleichförmige Bewegung machen. Während hier durch Trägheitswirkung im Zuge alles in Trümmer geht, während draußen alles unbeschädigt bleibt, so wird, meine ich, kein gesunder Verstand einen anderen Schluß ziehen wollen als den, daß es eben der Zug war, der mit Ruck seine Bewegung geändert hat und nicht die Umgebung. Das verallgemeinerte Relativitätsprinzip verlangt es, seinem einfachen Sinne nach, auch in diesem Falle, zuzugeben, daß es möglicherweise doch die Umgebung sei, welche die Geschwindigkeitsänderung erfahren habe und daß dann das ganze Unglück im Zuge nur Folge dieses Rucks der Außenwelt sei, vermittelt durch eine „Gravitationswirkung“ der Außenwelt auf das Innere des Zuges. Für die naheliegende Frage, warum denn der Kirchturm neben dem Zuge nicht umgefallen sei, wenn er mit der Umgebung den Ruck gemacht habe — warum solche Folgen des Rucks so einseitig nur im Zuge sich zeigen, während dennoch kein einseitiger Schluß auf den Sitz der Bewegungsänderung möglich sein sollte — hat das Prinzip anscheinend keine den einfachen Verstand befriedigende Antwort.“

Hier hat Lenard mit wenigen klar verständlichen, an den Verstand gerichteten Worten den mathematischen Unfug getroffen, der sich aus dem Theorem entwickelte. Was nützt alle hochgelahrte Mathematik, aller verwickelter Formelkram, wenn er — verkehrt aufgebaut wird? Zu obigem Einwand, den Lenard bereits 1918 in dem Jahrbuch für Radioaktivität und Elektronik erhob, hat sich Einstein bis heute nicht geäußert. Mit diesem Einwand oder seiner Widerlegung fällt und steht aber das ganze Prinzip.

Doch sehen wir weiter zu. Einsteins Theorie verlangt, daß infolge der Gravitationswirkung der Sonne ihr Gravitationsfeld passierende Lichtstrahlen [*23*] eine Verzögerung, eine zeitliche Abbremsung erfahren müssen. Die Theorie berechnet eine Verschiebung nach dem roten Teil des Spektrums um 0.01 Angström-Einheiten, d. h. den zehntausendmillionsten Teil eines Millimeters, eine fast unvorstellbare Kleinheit, die aber mit unseren feinen Gitterspektrographen sehr gut zu messen ist. St. Juhn hat („Astrophysik. Journ.“ 46, S. 249, „Nature“ 100, S. 433) an 43 Linien in der Sonnenmitte I 0.00 A.—E., also ein negatives Resultat erzielt, für die Sonnenkorona + 0.0018 A.—E. Ferner hat Schwarzschild (Berl. Ber.

1914 S. 1201) ein ebenfalls negatives Ergebnis festgestellt. Auch andere Forscher von Ruf haben diese Einsteinsche Hauptbedingung nicht bestätigt gefunden. Grebe und Bachem, ausgesprochene „Relativisten“, glauben nun, die gefundenen Werte + 0.0018 für Einstein deuten zu können und ziehen mit einer Kompensationserklärung vom Leder. Einem jungen Forscher, Glaser, ist es aber gelungen, den Nachweis zu führen, daß das Grebe und Bachemsche Ergebnis lediglich auf Beobachtung mit einem fehlerhaften Rowlandschen Gitter zurückzuführen ist. Das Material hierüber wird dem Naturforschertag in Nauheim im September vorgelegt werden. Mit der Verschiebung der Spektrallinien nach Rot ist es also auch nichts. Bleibt somit nur noch die berühmte Ablenkung der Perihelbewegung des Merkur um 41 Sekunden übrig.

Es ist auch hier wieder das Verdienst von Prof. Gehrcke (Berlin), der festgestellt hat, daß Einstein für seine Zwecke eine äußerst schwer zugängliche Arbeit von Gerber benutzte, die bereits vor achtzehn Jahren erschien. Hier gestattete er sich die Abschrift einer Formel, verwendete diese für sich und ließ den wahren Entdecker unerwähnt. Prof. Gehrcke sorgte flugs für zugänglichen Neudruck der seltenen Gerberschen Arbeit, und jedermann kann heute feststellen, wer der Autor dieser Erklärung der Perihel-Abweichung des Merkur ist und ob es nötig ist, dafür ein Relativitätsprinzip zu erfinden.

Unzählige andere Beispiele können noch angeführt werden. Diese wenigen mögen hier genügen. Ein großer Teil deutscher Forscher, der sich zuerst zu Einstein bekannte, sieht den Irrtum ein. Mancher hat schon widerrufen in der richtigen Erkenntnis, daß es ruhmvoller ist, einen Irrtum ehrlich zu bekennen, als in ihm hartnäckig zu verharren. Diese Forscher stellen sich ein ehrenvolles Zeugnis aus, daß sie der Sache, der Wahrheit die Ehre geben und die Person zurückstellen. Noch einige taktische Bemerkungen seien angeführt.

Da, wie gesagt, Einstein eine gewisse Presse, eine gewisse Gemeinde hat, so wird von dieser immer wieder die Öffentlichkeit im Einsteinschen Sinne beeinflusst. So hielt z. B. vor vierzehn Tagen Herr Archenhold im Blüthner-Saal einen Vortrag über dieses Thema. Kundige haben den Kopf geschüttelt, daß Herr Archenhold gar nichts von den Gegengründen erwähnte, sondern sie stillschweigend überging, dagegen die unbedingt strittige Ablenkung des Lichtes um $1.7''$ im Gravitationsfeld der Sonne postulierte. Herrn Archenhold sei erwidert, daß solche Stellungnahme vor einem Publikum, das in der großen Mehrzahl seine Ausführungen nicht beurteilen [*24*] konnte, entschieden zu verurteilen ist daß Parteinahme wohl politisch gerechtfertigt, wissenschaftlich aber verwerflich ist. Es dürfte Herrn Archenhold als Fachmann und „Sonnenforscher“ wohl nicht unbekannt sein, daß die Sonne eine Atmosphäre besitzt und daß diese für die Ablenkung des Lichtstrahles mit mindestens demselben Recht in Frage kommt wie die sehr hypothetische Wirkung des Gravitationsfeldes, wie das schon Lindemann 1918 festgestellt hat. Daß Einstein den Aether durch ein Dekret abschaffte, ihn aber durch einen anderen Begriff mit gleichen Funktionen wieder einführte, sei hier nur, um mit Einstein selbst zu reden, der „Drolligkeit“ halber erwähnt.

Schließlich sie noch der unzulässigen Art der Propaganda kurz gedacht, die Einstein zum ersten Male in die deutsche Universität einführte. Welcher Mittel sich Einstein zur Verbreitung seiner Ideen bedient, ist an dem Wust von Referaten zu erkennen, von denen die meisten ihn nicht einmal verstehen. Der entzückendste

Witz dieser Art ist eine Schrift von Max Hasse, A. Einsteins Relativitätslehre (Magdeburg 1920, Selbstverlag des Verfassers), wo es im Vorwort heißt: „Der Verfasser gesteht freimütig ein, nicht mehr einen Lehrsatz euklidischer Geometrie beweisen zu können — die Zeit hat früher Gelerntes verwischt.“ Und solch ein Mensch wagt es, über die tollste mathematische Abstraktion, die es je gegeben, zu berichten! Und was sagt Einstein dazu? Es heißt nämlich im Vorwort weiter: „Der Verfasser nahm sich die Freiheit, die Druckbogen Prof. Dr. A. Einstein einzusenden, der ihn mit folgender Antwort erfreute: „Ihre populäre Darstellung scheint mir in der Tat dem Geiste des Nicht-Physikers in glücklicher Weise entgegenzukommen. Ich sende Ihnen die Korrekturbogen mit einigen Randbemerkungen zurück, damit Sie einige kleine Böcke daraus entfernen können.“

Das ungefähr kennzeichnet Einsteins Methodik. Wenn aber die deutsche Wissenschaft demnächst geschlossen gegen Einstein auftreten wird und mit ihm zu Gericht geht, dann hat er sich diese Wirkung seiner, sagen wir ungewöhnlichen Kampfweise selbst zuzuschreiben.

[*25*]

Abdruck aus: „Tägliche Rundschau“, Mittwoch, 11. August, Abendausgabe.

Zur Erörterung über die Relativitätstheorie.

Entgegnung an Herrn Paul Weyland. Von M. v. L a u e.

In Nr. 171 dieses Blattes ereifert sich Herr Weyland gegen Einsteins allgemeine Relativitätstheorie; gegen die Art ihrer Verbreitung in der größeren Öffentlichkeit sowie gegen ihren Inhalt. Es liegt mir durchaus ferne, alles das decken zu wollen, was kleinere Geister bei der Verbreitung der neuen Lehre durch Ungenauigkeiten, Übertreibungen und Geschmacklosigkeiten gelegentlich gesündigt haben, und die im besonderen herangezogenen Äußerungen von Archenhold und Max Hasse kann ich nicht beurteilen, weil ich sie nicht kenne. Zu einem solchen Angriff auf Einsteins Persönlichkeit, wie ihn Herr Weyland macht, bieten diese Dinge aber doch nicht den mindesten Anlaß.

Welche Einwände richtet aber Weyland gegen den Inhalt? Daß hier reines Denken eine neue Naturauffassung begründet, scheint ihm, wenn ich recht verstehe, gegen die Begründung der Physik in der Erfahrung zu verstoßen. Ist ihm aber nicht bekannt daß Einstein von einer Tatsache ausgeht, die, längst bekannt, noch in den letzten Jahren durch besonders gute Messungen auf das genaueste festgestellt ist? Daß nämlich alle Körper unter der Wirkung der Schwere gleich rasch fallen? Oder fehlt ihm das Verständnis für die Größe einer Leistung, welche uns bei einer so alten Tatsache endlich etwas zu denken lehrt? Bisher galt es doch stets als der größte dem menschlichen Geiste in einer Naturwissenschaft mögliche Triumph, wenn in Umkehrung des gewöhnlichen Ganges die Theorie der Beobachtung erfolgreich voranschritt.

Nun kann man ja freilich noch bestreiten, daß die Folgerungen aus der Theorie, wie die Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien und die Lichtablenkung an der Sonne durch die Erfahrung endgültig bestätigt sind. Darüber ist in der Tat das letzte Wort nicht gesprochen. Wenn aber Herr Weyland entgegen den sonstigen Gepflogenheiten in wissenschaftlichen Erörterungen andeutet, es könne Voreingenommenheit die Ergebnisse mancher Forscher beeinflußt haben, so möchten wir ihm mitteilen, daß die Engländer, denen wir die

Lichtablenkungsmessungen [*26*] verdanken, vorher durchaus nicht Anhänger des Relativitätsgedankens in Einsteinscher Prägung waren. [Footnote: Hätte Herr v. Laue die englische Literatur etwas aufmerksamer verfolgt, so hätte er diese Behauptung sicher nicht aufgestellt. Die Tagespresse, wohl meist der Niederschlag der inspirierten öffentlichen Meinung schreibt z. B. darüber: Westminster-Gazette: 14. August 1920: „Obwohl die Exped. nach Sobral und Principe in Bezug auf die Bestätigung der Theorie erfolgreich waren, wurde der damals erlangte, etwas dürftige Beweis (*somewhat meagre evidence*) in einem gewissen Grade durch das Versagen des astrographischen Fernrohres in Sobral beeinträchtigt. Aus diesem Grunde sollen eben bei der Sonnenfinsternis am 20. IX. 22 neue Prüfungen vorgenommen werden.“

Hieraus geht z. B. auch hervor, daß die unter atmosphärischen Beeinträchtigungen behinderte Beobachtung auf Principe nicht für einwandfrei betrachtet wird. Im Übrigen verweise ich auf die schon erwähnte Arbeit von Glaser in Heft 3 dieser Sammlung.]

Unbestreitbar gibt die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie jene minimalen, aber sicher festgestellten Abweichungen der Merkurbahn von der nach der älteren Theorie der Schwere errechneten Form zahlenmäßig richtig wieder. Man mag dies Zusammentreffen als einen Zufall ohne besondere Beweiskraft abtun. Aber man darf Einsteins Ableitung, welche eine entfernte Folgerung einer großen, aus ganz anderen Gesichtspunkten entsprungenen Theorie darstellt, denn doch nicht in einem Atem nennen mit der Arbeit von Gerber, welche nach einer Fülle von Unklarheiten, Mißverständnissen und Ungenauigkeiten die Perihelbewegung aus einem eigens zu diesem Zweck ersonnenen, sonst zu nichts brauchbaren, aus der Geschichte der Wissenschaft nur zu gut verständlichen mathematischen Ansatz errechnet. Hat sich doch auch der Münchener Astronom H. v. Seeliger, ein entschiedener Gegner der Relativitätstheorie, scharf gegen dies Machwerk gewandt. Wie Herr Weyland hier gegen Einstein den Vorwurf erheben konnte, die Gerbersche Formel „abgeschrieben“ zu haben, darüber mag er sich einmal selbst Rechenschaft zu geben versuchen.

Etwas näher wollen wir eingehen auf P. Lenards, von Herrn Weyland angeführten Einwand. Einstein hat in der Tat nie auf ihn geantwortet. Man tritt eben einem verdienten Fachgenossen nicht immer entgegen, wenn ihm einmal eine weniger richtige Äußerung entschlüpft; zumal in einem Falle, in welchem der Sachverhalt so leicht zu durchschauen ist, wie hier. Wie steht es denn? Um den Grundgedanken seiner Lehre klarzumachen, knüpft Einstein an das alltägliche Erlebnis einer Eisenbahnfahrt an. Fährt mein Zug auf idealen, stoßfreien Schienen mit unveränderter Geschwindigkeit immer in derselben Richtung a , so sind es zwei physikalisch gleichwertige Annahmen, ob ich mein Abteil als bewegt und die Umgebung als ruhend bezeichne oder umgekehrt verfare. Das war die Meinung schon seit jeher. Nun aber sagt Einstein, man könne, [*27*] auch wenn der Zug bremst und alle Körper im Abteil das Streben zeigen, sich gegen dessen vordere Wand zu bewegen, die Auffassung in allen ihren physikalischen Folgerungen vertreten, das Abteil bleibe in Ruhe, während die Umgebung, die mir bisher mit konstanter Geschwindigkeit entgegenkam, jetzt in ihrer Bewegung aufgehalten wird. Nur muß dann in dem Bezugssystem, in welchem mein Abteil dauernd ruht, ein Schwerfeld in der Richtung a neu entstanden sein, welches die Umgebung aufhält. Im Innern des ruhenden Abteils bemerke ich das Feld an der erwähnten Bewegungstendenz der Körper. In der Umgebung ruft es außer der gemeinsamen

Geschwindigkeitsverminderung aller Gegenstände keine Wirkungen hervor, eben weil alle Körper gleich schnell fallen. Geschieht doch auch in einem Aufzug, der sich von der Aufhängung gelöst hat, kein Unheil, solange er frei fällt; erst beim Aufschlagen auf den Erdboden wird das anders. Herr Lenard übersieht, daß infolge des gleich raschen Falls aller Körper das neue Schwerefeld im Außenraum keine Lageänderungen der Gegenstände gegeneinander hervorruft, wohl aber im Innenraum die Dinge gegen die ruhenden Wände des Abteils in Bewegung setzt.

Soviel gegen P. Lenard. Herrn Weyland aber möchte ich zum Schluß einen Rat geben, dessen Befolgung in seinem eigensten Interesse liegen dürfte: sollte er sich nämlich noch einmal gegen Einstein wenden, sich über diesen Mann mit etwas mehr Achtung zu äußern. Die Relativitätstheorie mag man für richtig oder falsch halten, es äußert sich auf jeden Fall in ihr eine Genialität, die auf anderen Gebieten der Physik schon zu den schönsten Ergebnissen geführt und ihm verdienstermaßen Weltruhm verschafft hat. Die stolze Wissenschaft ist stolz darauf, ihn zu den Ihrigen zählen zu dürfen!

Wir haben Herrn Weyland, wie üblich, von dieser Entgegnung Kenntnis gegeben und erhalten darauf von ihm folgende Zuschrift:

Raumangel verbietet mir, an dieser Stelle eine Erwiderung zu geben, wie sie eine Persönlichkeit wie Herr v. Laue erfordert. Ich werde mich am 24. August im großen Saal der Philharmonie mit Herrn E. Gehrcke zunächst allgemein zur Sache äußern, späterhin im besonderen. Ich bitte Herrn v. Laue, zu diesem Abend anwesend zu sein. Des weiteren werden Herr Kraus (Prag) und Herr Glaser (Berlin) am 2. September im gleichen Saale zum Thema sprechen.

Hier nur soviel: Ich wende mich nicht gegen eine Theorie, sondern gegen mathematische Fiktionen und maßlose Übertreibungen. Daß die Frage der Rotverschiebung für Herrn v. Laue nunmehr ebenfalls keine absolute Tatsache ist, freut mich. Früher, als keine Kritiker, die es kontrollieren konnten, (ich erinnere an Herrn Freundlichs Märzvortrag), da waren, las man's anders. Ferner ist Herr v. Laue anscheinend über den neuesten Stand der englischen und amerikanischen Forschung nicht ganz im Bilde. Anders kann ich seine Bemerkung nicht verstehen. Näheres im Vortrag. Hinsichtlich der Gerberschen [*28*] Formel verweise ich auf die Arbeiten von E. Gehrcke (Verhandlg. d. Deutschen Physikal. Gesellschaft 1918 S. 165, Ann. d. Physik, 4. Folge, Band 51, 1916, S. 119.) Die Sache ist ja für Herrn Einstein sehr peinlich, aber nicht zu ändern. Es wundert mich nur, daß man die ganze Gerbersche Arbeit verdonnert — Schwächen seien zugegeben, aber: wo sind keine? — und gerade das Ergebnis so schön findet, daß man es, sagen wir, verwendet. Hier hilft kein Drehen und Deuteln. Oder soll ich noch deutlicher werden? Ich erinnere an Palagyi, Mach! Weiß Herr v. Laue nicht, wie sich Herr Einstein hinsichtlich der Verwendung, Machscher Gedanken herausgeredet hat?

Zu dem Einwand gegen Herrn L. Lenard äußere ich mich nicht. Dieser hervorragende Heidelberger Gelehrte wird seinerzeit selbst das Wort gegen Einstein ergreifen. [Footnote: Herr Lenard teilt mir seine Antwort brieflich mit, die ich hier wiedergeben möchte: „Herrn v. Laues Äußerungen zu meiner Schrift haben mich stark befremdet, insofern sie mir die Sachlage nicht zu treffen scheinen. 1. Trifft es nicht zu, daß Herr Einstein auf meine Einwände nie geantwortet habe. Vielmehr wird seine Antwort in der soeben erschienenen 2. Auflage meiner Schrift „Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation“ nicht nur genau zitiert, sondern auch

besprochen, aber nicht als befriedigend befunden (siehe meine Fußnote auf S. 31) und es wird sogar angegeben, wo Herr Einstein oder einer der Verteidiger der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie einsetzen müßten, um den Beweis — oder genügenden Hinweis — für die Berechtigung der Verallgemeinerung zu liefern, wobei ich garnicht zweifle, daß es nicht nur mir allein gegenüber lohnend wäre, dies wirklich zu tun, — falls es möglich ist. Es scheint mir hiernach, daß Herr v. Laue die neue Auflage meiner Schrift noch garnicht, die alte aber auch nur unvollkommen kennt, beziehlich überlegt hat. Denn 2. trifft es außerdem auch nicht zu, daß ich das Nichtauftreten von Trägheitswirkungen infolge gleichschnellen Fallens aller Körper bei Wirkung von Gravitation übersehen hätte. Sondern ich finde nur große Schwierigkeiten gegen die Annahme der Einsteinschen Gravitationsfelder und erörtere diese Schwierigkeiten — die sofort auftreten, sobald man einfache Beispielfälle zu Ende zu überlegen versucht — ausführlich mit dem Resultate, daß eine Einschränkung des verallgemeinerten Relativitätsprinzips notwendig sei, um es von seinen gegen den Verstand gerichteten Härten zu befreien. — Eine selbst bei Zutreffen der von Herrn Einstein gemachten, experimentell kontrollierbaren Voraussagen irgendwie gesicherte Allgemeingiltigkeit des Relativitätsprinzips kann bisher nicht behauptet werden, womit aber auch jede Betonung einer philosophischen auf die Grundauffassung des Naturgeschehens gerichteten Bedeutung zunächst wegfallen sollte. Gerade weil solche Betonung zu oft zu auffallend vor die Allgemeinheit gebraucht worden ist, schien es und scheint es nun eben nötig, neben den Vorzügen auch die der gegenwärtigen Erfahrung entsprechenden Grenzen des Relativitätsprinzips, oder die Übertreibungen, die man sich mit demselben gestattet hat, hervorzuheben. Wer hierüber im Einzelnen orientiert sein will, wie es meiner Auffassung nach dem wirklichen Stand der Kenntnis entspricht, muß für jetzt auf die erwähnte 2. Auflage meiner Schrift verwiesen werden.] Herr v. Laues Einwand werde ich ihm übermitteln.

[*29*]

Für den mir erteilten Rat danke ich bestens. Ich bin mit anderen Herren so frei, über die Relativitätstheorie meine besondere Meinung zu haben. Die Beweise werden in einer Vortragsreihe, an der erste Physiker und Astronomen teilnehmen, dargelegt werden.

P. Weyland

Tägliche Rundschau Nr. 180.

Zur Erörterung über die Relativitätstheorie.

Entgegnung an Herrn Professor Dr. M. v. Laue.

Von Dr.-Ing. L. C. Glaser (Berlin).

In Nummer 175 dieses Blattes sagt M. v. Laue, daß man Einsteins Erklärung für die Abweichung der Perihelbewegung der Planetenbahnen, insonderheit des Merkurs, nicht in einem Atem mit der Arbeit von Gerber nennen darf, welcher nach seiner Meinung nach einer Fülle von Unklarheiten, Mißverständnissen und Ungenauigkeiten die Perihelbewegung aus einem eigens zu diesem Zweck ersonnenen, sonst zu nichts brauchbaren, aus der Geschichte der Wissenschaft nur zu gut verständlichen, mathematischen Ansatz errechnet. Man ist, wie von P. Lenard bereits schon bemerkt ist, mit der Arbeit des verstorbenen Oberlehrers Paul Gerber besonders scharf ins Gericht gegangen. Im Hinblick

darauf, daß M. v. Laue sich schützend vor Einstein stellt, ist es Pflicht der Menschlichkeit, das Ergebnis dieser Arbeit des verstorbenen Oberlehrers Paul Gerber gegen die Bezeichnung „Machwerk“ in Schutz zu nehmen. Die Ereiferung M. v. Laues über die Arbeit von Gerber ist unverständlich, zumal diese Arbeit im Auslande auf Grund des Wiederabdruckes in den „Annalen für Physik“ von Herrn L. Silberstein, der ja bekanntlich gegen die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie Einsteins eine durchaus ablehnende Stellung einnimmt, gelegentlich einer Arbeit „über die Perihelbewegung des [*30*] Merkurs, abgeleitet nach der klassischen Theorie der Relativität“ in den „Monthly Notices“ der *Roy. Astr. Soc.* 1917, 503-610, als Gerbers Formel aufgeführt und anerkannt wird. Daß nun den Anhängern der Relativitätstheorie das Bestehen der Gerberschen Formel, über deren Ansatz man im einzelnen denken kann, wie man will, recht unbequem ist, ist ja sehr leicht verständlich, zumal die Forderungen und sogenannten Bestätigungen der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie im ganzen äußerst beweisbedürftig sind. Da die Arbeit Gerbers der Geschichte angehört, das Einsteinsche Ergebnis vorwegnimmt, aber gern totgeschwiegen wird, ist es besonders erfreulich, festzustellen, daß diese bereits Aufnahme in der zweiten Auflage des Lehrbuches der Physik von Riecke, herausgeben von Lecher, gefunden hat.

Tägliche Rundschau Nr. 175, Abendausgabe.

Zur Erörterung über die Relativitätstheorie.

Von M. v. L a u e.

Auf meinem Aufsatz in Nr. 176 dieses Blattes hin haben mich verschiedene Fachgenossen auf Einsteins „Dialog über die Einwände gegen die Relativitätstheorie“. [*Footnote*: Diese Arbeit war mir bekannt. Als Einwand habe ich sie nicht gelten lassen. Herr Leonard ist lt. seinem Briefe genau derselben Ansicht.] (Naturwissenschaften, 6. Jahrgang, Seite 6-697, 1918) aufmerksam gemacht, in welchem Einstein selbst zu dem Lenardschen Einwand Stellung nimmt. Was dort steht, deckt sich zwar nicht mit dem, was ich neulich an dieser Stelle — übrigens als die Ansicht sehr vieler — darüber sagte, doch besteht auch kein Widerspruch; ich gebe diesen Hinweis hiermit weiter.

Ein wenig ausführlicher aber möchte ich in Hinblick auf Herrn Glasers Entgegnung in Nr. 178 auf die Gerbersche Erklärung der Perihelbewegung beim Merkur eingehen. Zwar kann man eine sozusagen philosophische Kritik dieser Arbeit und ihrer Schlußformel nur einem fachmännischen Publikum verständlich machen, so daß ich hier darauf verzichten muß. Aber ich möchte doch einmal fragen, was diese Arbeit denn eigentlich leistet.

Eine Tatsache physikalisch erklären, heißt doch, sie in Beziehung zu anderen physikalischen Tatsachen setzen. Darin bin ich hoffentlich mit den Gegnern der Relativitätstheorie einig. Mit welcher anderen Tatsache setzt nun Gerber die Perihelbewegung in Beziehung? Die Überschrift seiner Veröffentlichung könnte die Antwort nahelegen: Mit der (zwar nie unmittelbar beobachteten, [*31*] aber doch sehr wahrscheinlichen) Ausbreitung der Schwere mit endlicher, und zwar mit Lichtgeschwindigkeit. [*Footnote*: Diese sehr interessante Einschränkung eines der wichtigsten Einstein'schen Postulate werde ich an anderer spezieller Stelle entsprechend würdigen. Daß v. L a u e das Einsteinsche

Postulat von der Lichtgeschwindigkeit als äußerste Grenze aller Geschwindigkeiten so einschränkend behandelt, ist aus der Feder diese bedeutendsten Relativisten von außerordentlicher Wichtigkeit.] Aber diese Antwort wäre nicht richtig. Unmittelbar nach dem Wiederabdruck in den Annalen der Physik habe ich an derselben Stelle (Band 53, Seite 214) darauf hingewiesen, daß Gerbers Formeln die Schwere als eine unvermittelte Fernwirkung hinstellen. Einen Widerspruch gegen diesen Nachweis habe ich bisher weder öffentlich noch privatim vernommen. Und welche andere Tatsache ließe sich hier erwähnen? Ich wüßte keine.

Nun lege wir einmal denselben Maßstab an Einsteins Erklärung. Sie bringt die Perihelbewegung in Zusammenhang mit der Äquivalenz der trägen und der schweren Masse, die der Versuch mit einer seltenen Schärfe bewiesen hat; natürlich auch mit der Lichtablenkung und der Verschiebung der Spektrallinien an der Sonne — doch diese Tatsachen sind ja noch bestritten. Sicher aber ist, daß die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie die beschränkte (ich vermeide gern das Fremdwort „spezielle“) als fast stets brauchbare Näherung einschließt. Sie setzt damit die Perihelbewegung in Beziehung zu allen den berühmten Versuchen, welche durch Beobachtung auf der Erde deren Bewegung um die Sonne vergeblich nachzuweisen suchten; ferner zu den vielen sicher festgestellten Tatsachen der Elektrodynamik und Optik der bewegten Körper. Weiter: Die beschränkte Relativitätstheorie steht — ich glaube unbestritten — im Einklang zur gesamten mechanischen Erfahrung, einschließlich der verhältnismäßig neuen Beobachtungen über die Dynamik schnell bewegter Elektronen. Kurz: Einsteins Erklärung reiht die Perihelbewegung in den großen Zusammenhang von Tatsachen ein, den wir als das physikalische Weltbild bezeichnen.

Der Weg, auf dem das erreicht wird, mag manchem nicht gefallen. Dafür habe ich durchaus Verständnis. Aber man soll die relativistische Theorie der Perihelbewegung wirklich nicht auf eine Stufe stellen mit der Gerberschen Erklärung, die, abgesehen davon, was sonst über sie zu sagen wäre, überhaupt keine Erklärung ist.”

Ernst Gehrcke addressed Albert Einstein to his face in the Berlin Philharmonic on 24 August 1920. Ernst Gehrcke was the second and last speaker at the event. Gehrcke stated, as recorded in a the published transcript of his talk: *Die Relativitätstheorie. Eine Wissenschaftliche Massensuggestion, gemeinverständlich dargestellt*, Volume 1 of the Press of the Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher zur Erhaltung reiner Wissenschaft e. V., Köhler, Berlin, (1920); which was reprinted in Gehrcke's booklet *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 54-68:

“Was ist eigentlich die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie? Diese Frage wird heute nicht nur in gelehrten Kreisen erörtert, sondern sie beschäftigt sehr viele, denen akademische und gelehrte Dinge sonst fern liegen. Das Thema der Relativitätstheorie, der Streit über ihre Bedeutung und Richtigkeit ist heute bis in die Tagespresse aller möglichen Richtungen gedrungen. Aber um was es sich eigentlich dreht, das dürfte trotz aller Zeitungsartikel und populären Broschüren, die wie Pilze aus der Erde schießen, nur sehr wenigen klar sein. Dem soll im Folgenden abgeholfen werden.

Es wird dabei zu beachten sein, daß die Relativitätstheorie nicht wie ein *deus ex machina* plötzlich eines Tages da war, sondern dass sie, wie alle geistigen Strömungen, eine längere Entwicklung gehabt hat und schrittweise und allmählich gewachsen ist. Daß die Relativitätstheorie eine geistige Strömung darstellt, kann niemand bezweifeln, nur darüber wird man verschiedener Meinung sein können, ob diese Strömung eine gesunde, verheißungsvolle ist, ob sie, kurz gesagt, einen *Fortschritt* darstellt, oder ob das Gegenteil der Fall ist, ob sie ungesund, unfruchtbar und falsch, also kurz gesagt ein Irrlicht der geistigen Entwicklung war. Die Meinungen hierüber sind sehr geteilte. Der Gemeinde der Relativitätsgläubigen steht eine Schar von Zweiflern und Kritikern gegenüber, hüben und drüben haben anerkannte Autoritäten Partei ergriffen, und wie die Dinge liegen, werden nicht allein wissenschaftliche, sondern auch politische und andere Gesichtspunkte in die Debatte hineingetragen. In dieses Chaos der durcheinander wogenden Behauptungen und Interessen soll hier also hineingeleuchtet werden. Nur unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Entwicklung wird es aber möglich sein, das Durcheinander zu verstehen und sich über das Gewirr der Meinungen ein Urteil zu bilden. Wir fragen im Folgenden nicht, was ist die Relativitätstheorie? sondern: wie hat sie sich entwickelt? und beginnen mit demjenigen Punkte, welcher der Relativitätstheorie den Namen gegeben hat, mit dem

Relativitätsprinzip.

Gemäß dem Obigen werden wir nicht fragen, was ist das Relativitätsprinzip? sondern: wie hat sich das Relativitätsprinzip entwickelt? Erst die Darlegung dieser Entwicklung wird uns zu einem Standpunkt gegenüber dem Relativitätsprinzip führen, der von dem augenblicklichen Tagesurteil frei ist.

Das Relativitätsprinzip ist in der Tat kein erst in unsern Tagen aufgestellter Grundsatz, sondern es hat eine lange Geschichte, die bis in das griechische Altertum und möglicherweise noch weiter zurückreicht. Die vollständige Darstellung seines Werdeganges wäre eine umfangreiche, historisch-kritische Studie, die hier nicht auf kurzem Raum gegeben werden kann und hier auch nicht behandelt zu werden braucht. Es wird genügen, wenn wir deutlich machen, daß das Relativitätsprinzip an sehr einfache, alltägliche Erfahrungen, die schon mancher gemacht hat, anknüpft.

Stellen wir uns etwa vor, daß wir in einem Eisenbahnzuge sitzen, der auf dem Bahnhof hält. Auf der andern Seite des Bahnsteigs soll ebenfalls ein Zug stehen. Wir warten ungeduldig auf Abfahrt, endlich geht es los, der Zug setzt sich in Bewegung, und wir sehen durch das Fenster, wie wir am jenseitigen Zuge uns vorbeibewegen. Aber mit einem Mal entdecken wir, daß wir uns geirrt haben: wir halten immer noch auf dem Bahnhof, aber der andere Zug fährt! Dieses unliebsame Erlebnis in seiner Alltäglichkeit und Einfachheit ist geeignet, uns dem Relativitätsprinzip näher zu führen: Wir konnten nicht feststellen, ob wir fahren oder der andere Zug, ob wir in Ruhe blieben oder der andere Zug, das einzige, das wir beobachten konnten,

war, daß die beiden Züge *r e l a t i v* zueinander in Bewegung waren. Man nennt dies die *R e l a t i v i t ä t d e r B e w e g u n g e n*. Alle Bewegung ist *r e l a t i v*, d. h. bezogen auf irgend etwas, außerhalb des Bewegten Befindliches. Alle Naturkörper in unserer Umgebung, auf der Erde, alle Gestirne am Himmel bewegen sich *r e l a t i v* zueinander. Man drückt sich auch so aus, daß man sagt, der Bewegungsbegriff sei ein Relationsbegriff, d. h. ein Begriff, der ohne Bezugnahme auf etwas, *g e g e n ü b e r w e l c h e m* das Bewegte sich bewegt, nicht gedacht werden kann. Aber die Relativität der Bewegungen ist noch nicht das *P r i n z i p* der Relativität. Hierüber ein anderes, alltägliches Beispiel.

Es soll ein Stück Holz mit einer Säge durchgesägt werden. Das kann auf zweierlei Weisen geschehen: erstens so, daß das Stück Holz *f e s t g e h a l t e n* wird, z. B. indem man es auf einen Sägebock legt und die Säge hin und her *b e w e g t*, zweitens so, daß die Säge festgehalten, z. B. zwischen die Knie geklemmt wird, und nun das Stück Holz quer zur Säge hin und her bewegt wird. In beiden Fällen wird das gleiche Ergebnis erzielt: das Holz wird durchgesägt. Ob ich also die Säge bewege und das Holz festhalte, oder umgekehrt die Säge festhalte und das Holz bewege, kommt auf dasselbe hinaus. Die beiden Bewegungsvorgänge: Holz fest, Säge bewegt und: Säge fest, Holz bewegt, sind aber in *r e l a t i v e r* Hinsicht gleich; es bewegt sich in *b e i d e n* Fällen das eine *i n b e z u g a u f* das andere in gleicher Weise. Dieser Spezialfall läßt sich sogleich verallgemeinern, wenn man behauptet, daß bei irgend zwei Bewegungsvorgängen, die *r e l a t i v* zueinander gleich sind, immer das gleiche Ergebnis herauskommt. Damit wird ein Satz aufgestellt, der durch Beobachtung nahegelegt ist und den man in seiner Allgemeinheit versuchsweise auf *a l l e* Bewegungsvorgänge in der Natur erstreckt. Die Behauptung, *w e n n s i e r i c h t i g i s t*, wird damit zu einem allgemeinen Naturprinzip, und man nennt ein solches Naturprinzip das Relativitätsprinzip.

So weit ist die Sache also gar nicht schwierig, und jedermann, der über Beobachtungen an relativ zueinander bewegten Körpern verfügt oder der Holz gesägt hat, kann begreifen, was man unter dem Relativitätsprinzip versteht. Man wird auch begreifen, daß die Gedankengänge, die zum Relativitätsprinzip geführt haben, nicht erst im 20. Jahrhundert von der Menschheit eingeschlagen wurden, sondern erheblich älteren Datums sind. Sonderlich originell ist also das Prinzip *n i c h t*, das der Relativitätstheorie den Namen gegeben hat. Es taucht nun aber sogleich die Frage auf: ist denn das Prinzip überhaupt richtig?

Diese Frage zu beantworten ist viel verwickelter, als begrifflich zu machen, was man unter dem Relativitätsprinzip versteht. In der sogenannten klassischen Mechanik, die von Galilei und Newton begründet ist, wird das Relativitätsprinzip als in aller Strenge gültig angesehen für gewisse Bewegungen von Naturkörpern, nämlich solche, die derartig verlaufen, daß die *r e l a t i v e n* Bewegungen *g r a d l i n i g* sind und mit *g l e i c h b l e i b e n d e r* Geschwindigkeit erfolgen, sofern dabei

keine andern als rein mechanische Erscheinungen hervortreten.

Ob das Relativitätsprinzip auch über diesen engen Bereich hinaus noch im Rahmen der alten klassischen Mechanik tatsächlich gültig ist, darüber sind sich nicht einmal heute die Gelehrten einig. Namhafte Forscher nehmen an, daß alle Bewegungen in der klassischen Mechanik, in denen die Geschwindigkeiten nicht gleichbleiben, in denen also sogenannte Beschleunigungen auftreten, das Relativitätsprinzip durchbrechen, andere nehmen an, daß das Relativitätsprinzip auch für ungleichförmige Bewegungsvorgänge gültig bleibt, sofern dabei Drehbewegungen (Rotationen) ausgeschlossen werden. Für Drehbewegungen jedenfalls gilt das Relativitätsprinzip der klassischen Mechanik nicht. Wer sich näher für diesen Gegenstand interessiert, mag dies in der Fachliteratur nachlesen. [*Footnote*: Vergl. E. Gehrcke. Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft **15** S. 260. 1913.]

Wir werden nun weiter gehen und fragen, ob denn das Relativitätsprinzip auch für solche Naturerscheinungen gilt, welche nicht nur hinsichtlich ihrer Bewegung (z. B. wie zwei relativ zueinander bewegte Eisenbahnzüge) oder mechanisch, wie das Zersägen von Holz, betrachtet werden, sondern ob es auch für elektrische, magnetische, optische und andere Erscheinungen gültig bleibt. Auch hierüber besteht keine Einigkeit unter den Forschern. Besonders trennen sich hier die Parteien nach dem Gesichtspunkt, ob die elektrischen, magnetischen, optischen u. a. Erscheinungen in einem unsichtbaren, untastbaren, unwägbaren, aber doch tatsächlich vorhandenen Medium, genannt Weltäther, vor sich gehen oder nicht. Diejenigen Forscher, welche an den Äther glauben — und zu diesen gehören die bedeutendsten Gelehrten der Vergangenheit und der Gegenwart — müssen das Relativitätsprinzip, wie es oben für wägbare Naturkörper eingeführt wurde, allgemein ablehnen, auch für völlig gradlinige Bewegungen mit völlig gleichförmiger Geschwindigkeit (sogenannte gleichförmige Translationen). Diejenigen aber, welche nicht an den Äther glauben, haben die Freiheit, die Gültigkeit des Relativitätsprinzips in den verschiedensten Erweiterungen probeweise anzunehmen. Welchen Gültigkeitsbereich nehmen nun die Anhänger der sogenannten Relativitätstheorien für das Relativitätsprinzip an?

Auch diese Frage ist nicht einfach zu beantworten, weil die Meinungen sehr geteilte sind. Der Erfinder der Relativitätstheorie, Einstein, hat hierüber im Laufe der Zeit sehr verschiedene Ansichten gehabt und seinen Standpunkt mehrfach gewechselt. Er hat zunächst behauptet [*Footnote*: A. Einstein, Annalen der Physik **17**, S. 891, 1905. Vgl. ferner die Zusammenstellung von Gehrcke: Die Naturwissenschaften **1**, S. 62, 170, 338, 1913; ebenda 1919, S. 147.], daß das Prinzip auch für optische, elektrische usw. Erscheinungen an wägbaren Körpern gültig sei wobei stillschweigend vorausgesetzt war, daß die oben von der klassischen Mechanik für mechanische Erscheinungen zugelassene Bedingung der geradlinigen, gleichbleibenden Geschwindigkeit (gleichförmiger Translation) zutrifft; dann hat er sich zwei Jahre später merkwürdigerweise dahin geäußert, daß das Relativitätsprinzip

nur auf beschleunigungs freie (relative) Bewegungen angewandt worden sei, und überlegt, ob das Prinzip auch für beschleunigte Bewegungen gelte. Er kommt zu dem Schluß, daß dies so ist und glaubt, das Prinzip auf den speziellen Fall gleichförmiger Beschleunigung erweitern zu dürfen. Später hat Einstein in einer mehrere Monate nach meinen Einwänden erschienenen Schrift das Relativitätsprinzip wieder beschränkt auf gleichförmige Translationen. Ferner hat Einstein das Relativitätsprinzip ganz allgemein erweitern zu können geglaubt, und es auf sämtliche, auch ungleichförmige Translationen, und sogar auf Rotationen ausdehnen wollen. Er nannte die auf diese Ansicht gegründete Theorie „allgemeine Relativitätstheorie“. Schließlich hat Einstein noch einen etwas anderen Standpunkt eingenommen, er hat nämlich das Relativitätsprinzip ersetzt durch ein modifiziertes Prinzip, das sogenannte „Äquivalenzprinzip“ [*Footnote*: A. Einstein, Annalen der Physik, Bd. 35, S. 898, 1911.], und wir stehen vor dem bemerkenswerten Ergebnis, daß dasjenige Prinzip, welches der Relativitätstheorie den Namen gegeben hat, in der neueren Theorie Einsteins einem anderen Prinzip Platz gemacht hat. Einstein hat sich übrigens in der Verteidigung des Relativitätsprinzips nicht glücklich geäußert; dies trifft besonders für seine Polemik mit Lenard [*Footnote*: P. Lenard, Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation. Verlag von Hirzel, Leipzig 1920. P. Lenard, Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation. Verlag von Hirzel, Leipzig 1920. Hier findet man viele zugehörige Literaturhinweise.] zu, den er sachlich gar nicht widerlegen kann und an dessen Gegenrunden er einfach vorbeiredet.

Es hätten die Schwankungen in der Auffassung Einsteins über eine so grundlegende Frage wie das Relativitätsprinzip eigentlich schon genügen können, um die Fachwelt stutzig zu machen und mit Skepsis gegen die Relativitätstheorie zu erfüllen. Wenn diese Skepsis nicht in dem Maße zutage trat, wie es unter gewöhnlichen Umständen zu erwarten gewesen wäre, so werden hierfür Gründe da sein. Darüber soll später im Zusammenhang mit anderen Dingen einiges gesagt werden. Hier sei noch folgendes zum Relativitätsprinzip bemerkt:

Das Relativitätsprinzip, das in der Relativitätstheorie eine Rolle spielt, betrifft die Relativität von Bewegungsvorgängen. Sachlich gar nichts zu tun hat mit dieser Relativität der Bewegungen alles das, was in der Presse und auch zuweilen in Fachblättern sonst noch mit dem Wort Relativität gemeint wird. Daß „alles relativ“ ist, worunter man sich, je nach dem individuellen Bildungsgrad, das Verschiedenste denken kann, mag auch bei den Anhängern der Relativitätstheorie eine wichtige Rolle, möglicherweise zuweilen nur im Unterbewußtsein, spielen, aber mit der theoretischen Relativitätstheorie als solcher haben derartige Allgemeinheiten sachlich nichts zu schaffen. Als Schlagwort, das auf die Massen wirkt, bei dem jeder glaubt, etwas ihm einigermaßen Bekanntes zu hören und bei dem auch kaum zwei an dasselbe denken, ist aber das „Relative“ zur Einführung und zur Empfehlung der Relativitätstheorie vorzüglich geeignet. Das

„Äquivalenzprinzip“ wird niemals so populär werden können wie das „Relativitätsprinzip“. Es liegt eine gewisse Tragik darin, daß die Relativitätstheorie in ihrer allmählichen Entwicklung ihr Hauptschlagwort in den Hintergrund geschoben hat; statt dessen wird, je länger je mehr, der Hauptnachdruck auf ein anderes Gebiet der Relativitätstheorie gelegt: auf die sogenannte

Relativierung von Raum und Zeit.

Die „Relativierung von Raum und Zeit“ bildet heute die stolzeste Errungenschaft der Relativitätstheorie, deren Erwähnung die Brust des Relativisten schwellen läßt und durch die die philosophisch-erkenntnistheoretische Umwälzung unserer ganzen Weltauffassung gegeben sein soll. Die Relativierung von Raum und Zeit soll eine geistige Erneuerung und einen Wendepunkt in der menschlichen Denkweise bedeuten, demgegenüber die Taten von Kopernikus, Kepler und Newton verblassen.

Die Relativierung von Raum und Zeit wird in den bekannten Darstellungen der Relativitätstheorie als eine grundgelehrte Sache mathematisch eingekleidet vorgetragen, sodaß vielfach der Nichtmathematiker den Eindruck erhalten hat, er werde nie imstande sein, die Tiefe dieser weltstürzenden Gedanken je zu ermessen und zu begreifen. Und dabei ist kaum ein Gegenstand der ganzen Relativitätstheorie mit so wenig Aufwand an gelehrten Ausdrücken und Formeln klar zu machen, als gerade dieser. Das ist eigentlich von vornherein klar. Denn über Dinge, die so grundlegend sind wie Raum und Zeit, auf denen sich so vieles, Mathematisches und Nichtmathematisches, aufbaut, muß sich der Verstand mit einem Minimum an künstlichem, mathematischen Handwerkszeug klar werden können — wenn er dazu überhaupt imstande ist. Die mathematischen Formeln geben uns ja auch nur Aufschluß darüber, wie groß im einzelnen die errechneten Effekte sind, sie sagen jedoch nichts aus über den ihnen zugrunde liegenden Standpunkt. Aber die Anhänger der Relativitätstheorie sind anderer Meinung. Ihnen ist der mathematische Aufbau offenbar unlösbar verknüpft mit den allgemeinen, erkenntnistheoretischen Grundauffassungen, vor denen sie staunen. An keiner Stelle liegt aber die Wurzel der Relativitätstheorie klarer, als bei der ihr eigentümlichen Auffassung von Raum and Zeit, und an keinem Punkte wird die Lage für die Zukunft der Relativitätstheorie bedenklicher als beim Raum und bei der Zeit.

Einstein hat, wenn auch nicht seine Grundauffassung, so doch seine Folgerungen hinsichtlich des raumzeitlichen Geschehens durch allgemein verständliche Bilder zu erläutern gesucht. Hier nur eine Probe.

Einstein erörterte gelegentlich eines Vortrages in Zürich [*Footnote*: A. Einstein, Vierteljahrsschrift der Naturforschenden Gesellschaft Zürich **56**, S. 11 und folgende.] die Vorgänge, die sich nach seiner Theorie in einer hin and her bewegten Uhr angeblich abspielen sollen. Eine solche hin and herbewegte Uhr soll nach Einstein gegenüber einer ruhenden Uhr nach gehen. Er äußert sich dann, um recht deutlich and populär zu sein, folgendermaßen: „Wenn wir z. B. einen lebenden Organismus in eine

Schachtel hineinbrächten und ihn dieselbe Hin- und Herbewegung ausführen ließen wie vorher die Uhr, so könnte man es erreichen, daß dieser Organismus nach einem beliebig langen Fluge beliebig wenig geändert wieder an seinen ursprünglichen Ort zurückkehrt, während ganz entsprechend beschaffene Organismen, welche an dem ursprünglichen Orte ruhend geblieben sind, bereits längst neuen Generationen Platz gemacht haben. Für den bewegten Organismus war die lange Zeit der Reise nur ein Augenblick, falls die Bewegung annähernd mit Lichtgeschwindigkeit erfolgte! Das ist eine unabweisable Konsequenz der von uns zugrunde gelegten Prinzipien, die die Erfahrung uns aufdrängt.“

Also kurz gesagt: Die Zeitfolge aller Ereignisse auf einem Naturkörper soll nach Einsteins Theorie abhängig sein vom Bewegungszustand des Körpers, derart, daß die Bewegung des Naturkörpers alle auf ihm sich abspielenden Vorgänge *v e r l a n g s a m t*: es soll hiernach z. B. ein lebender Organismus durch Schütteln, wegen der dadurch bedingten Verzögerung aller an ihm und in ihm sich abspielenden Prozesse, *j u n g e r h a l t e n* werden können. Diese Geschichte hat Einstein und ebenso seine Anhänger als „unabweisable Konsequenz“ der Relativitätstheorie einem staunenden Publikum erzählt! Sie ist von den Relativisten mannigfach variiert and weiter ausgebaut worden: Von zwei Zwillingen wird der eine gleich nach seiner Geburt auf eine lange Reise geschickt, von welcher er als Schuljunge zurückkehrt; er findet dann seinen Bruder als Greis mit weißen Haaren vor! Solche and ähnliche Betrachtungen sind, um es noch einmal hervorzuheben, nicht etwa Märchen oder Witze, sondern „unabweisable Konsequenzen“ der Relativitätstheorie! Die genannten Konsequenzen muß man mitmachen, wenn man an die Relativitätstheorie glaubt.

Statt auf mathematische Formeln einzugehen, können wir an den genannten Bildern das Wesen der erkenntnistheoretischen Grundlagen der Theorie erfassen. Wir wollen uns fragen: 1. Welche Grundansicht über die Zeit liegt diesen Betrachtungen zugrunde? 2. Was folgt weiter daraus?

Fassen wir jetzt also irgendeine den Folgerungen ins Auge, die den relativistischen Zeitablauf kennzeichnen, z. B. das obige, Einsteinsche Beispiel der gegeneinander bewegten Organismen. Wir wollen tatsächlich annehmen, es wäre experimentell gefunden, daß der *b e w e g t e* Organismus *j ü n g e r* geblieben ist als der ruhende; über die Unwahrscheinlichkeit und die technischen Schwierigkeiten einer solchen Feststellung wollen wir uns hinwegsetzen. Dann wäre alles, so sonderlich es wäre, immerhin verständlich, wenn Bewegung als solche die Eigenschaft haben würde, eine Verlangsamung aller auf dem bewegten Körper vor sich gehenden chemischen und physikalischen Prozesse hervorzubringen. Gerade die Bewegung als solche, auch genannt „absolute Bewegung“, wird aber von Einstein geleugnet, und er muß daher die gegebene Erklärung für das merkwürdige Jungbleiben des bewegten Organismus von sich weisen. Statt dessen nimmt er eine „Relativierung der Zeit“ an; das bedeutet, daß der bewegte Organismus *n u r v o m S t a n d p u n k t d e s r u h e n d e n*

Organismus aus der jüngere ist, daß aber andererseits auch vom Standpunkt des andern Organismus aus der erste Organismus der bewegte und daher der jüngere ist. Nach der Relativitätslehre soll jeder Standpunkt dem andern gleichberechtigt, keiner von dem andern bevorzugt sein. Ein solcher Ausweg führt nun aber zu höchst bedenklichen Folgerungen. Dies ist unschwer einzusehen, wenn wir die beiden Organismen miteinander reden lassen, nachdem die Reise beendet ist und sie beide wieder relativ zueinander ruhen. Der e i n e Organismus wird z. B. behaupten: i c h habe weiße Haare, and Du bist jung geblieben; der a n d e r e Organismus wird ebenfalls behaupten: i c h habe weiße Haare and Du bist jung geblieben, denn i c h bin ja von m e i n e m Standpunkt aus der ruhende, und D u der bewegte! Also die beiden Organismen wenden sich g e g e n s e i t i g für jung und jeder sich selbst für gealtert erklären!

Die beiden kommen also zueinander in Widerspruch. Man könnte auf den Einfall kommen, daß der Widerspruch beseitigt wäre, wenn in der Unterhaltung der eine immer das Gegenteil von dem h ö r e n würde, was der andere s a g t, aber auch das rettet nicht aus der Schwierigkeit. Denn wenn die Reise des bewegten Organismus lange genug gedauert hat, ist der ruhende Organismus tot (vgl. oben Einsteins Worte). Dann ist es aber eine „unabweisbare Konsequenz“, wenn der jung gebliebene Organismus zum Toten spricht: N i c h t D u bist tot, sondern i c h! Denn vom Standpunkt des jungen Organismus aus war j a e r s e l b s t d e r r u h e n d e, der andere der bewegte [*Footnote*: Der empirische Einwand, daß ein Toter nicht sprechen kann, steht dem Relativisten nicht zu, der selbst als Begründung für seine Behauptungen über Zeit und Raum nichts anderes anzuführen weiß, als daß sich „a priori“ nichts gegen sie einwenden ließe.]. Es ist zu bedauern, daß die Relativitätstheoretiker das Einsteinsche Organismenbeispiel nicht gründlich weiter gedacht haben. Vielleicht wären ihnen dann noch einige Zweifel aufgestiegen, ob die Vertauschbarkeit den Standpunkte, die sie hinsichtlich des zeitlichen Geschehens unter der Bezeichnung „Relativierung der Zeit“ eingeführt haben, sich durchführen läßt.

Es ist nur eine einzige Möglichkeit ersichtlich, aus den Widersprüchen, zu denen die „Relativierung den Zeit“ führt, herauszukommen, wenn man nämlich dazu übergeht, jedem Standpunkt, Organismus, Beobachter, Subjekt oder „Monade“ eine e i g e n e Welt zuzuordnen, die mit den Welten anderer, bewegter Monaden nichts zu tun hat. Der „Relativierung der Zeit“ fügt man so eine „Relativierung des Seins“ hinzu, d. h. mit anderen Worten: die E i n d e u t i g k e i t des Naturgeschehens für alle bewegten Monaden wird aufgehoben. Man kann auch so sagen: es wird der Standpunkt eines physikalischen Solipsismus eingenommen. Es weist kein Anzeichen darauf hin, daß die in den erkenntnistheoretischen Fragen sehr unklaren Relativitätstheoretiker einen solchen Ausweg beabsichtigt oder überhaupt nur erwogen haben. Auch Minkowski, der von seiner eigenen „Verwegenheit mathematischer Kultur“ spricht, scheint diese Verwegenheit der Relativierung des Seins, zu der er bei konsequentem Festhalten an dem

einmal beschrittenen Wege gedrängt wird, nicht im Auge gehabt zu haben. Wie denn überhaupt die Denkrichtung den Relativitätstheoretiker auf den mathematischen Ausbau und die formalistische Struktur der Theorie gerichtet ist, und nicht in die erkenntnistheoretische Vertiefung und Klarstellung.

Immerhin deuten manche Äußerungen Einsteins, gerade in seinen sogenannten „allgemeinverständlichen“ Darlegungen, darauf hin, daß ihm die inneren Schwierigkeiten seiner Lehre nicht ganz fremd waren. Wenn er z. B. gelegentlich behauptet hat, daß der Begriff der Gleichzeitigkeit zweier Ereignisse keinen Sinn habe, so läßt diese zunächst mystische Ausdrucksweise vermuten, daß Einstein gefühlt hat, etwas Besonderes erfinden zu müssen, um innere Widersprüche zu vermeiden. Bei Klarlegung des erkenntnistheoretischen Standpunkts der Relativitätstheorie als eines Solipsismus erscheint allerdings das Sinnlose der Gleichzeitigkeit als eine zulässige Selbstverständlichkeit. Es ist aber keine Kunst, einen Widerspruch dadurch zu vermeiden, daß man implicite den Grundsatz einführt: es bezieht sich die eine Aussage, die einer zweiten Aussage widerspricht, auf eine ganz andere Welt als die zweite. Die Sonderbarkeiten der Relativitätstheorie, ihre angebliche Reform der Erkenntnistheorie mündet immer wieder in den oben gekennzeichneten Standpunkt aus, den man physikalischen Solipsismus nennen kann. Dieser Standpunkt ist der eines Menschen, welcher in die äußerste Enge getrieben ist, der seine Sache bis aufs letzte verfehlt, und schließlich, um sich zu retten, die Erklärung abgibt: ich habe nicht, denn Du hast auch recht, weil wir beide verschiedenen Welten angehören und deshalb unsere Aussagen gar nicht miteinander vergleichen können! Wenn man den „Zeitbegriff relativiert“, so zerstört man die Idee der einen, allgemeinen, objektiven Natur; wenn die eine Monade ihre Eigenzeit, von den Relativisten t genannt, die andere ihre Eigenzeit, t' genannt, hat, so muß auch jede Monade ganz für sich ihre eigene Welt oder Natur haben, und so wenig man den Zeiten t und t' „gleichzeitige“ Augenblicke erlaubt, ebensowenig sind auch in den Welten der beiden Monaden ein und dieselben Dinge vorhanden, höchstens können beide Welten miteinander gewisse Ähnlichkeiten aufweisen. Die Relativitätstheorie führt also nur zu einem alten, abgelebten, skeptischen Standpunkt. Das ist die „neue Revolution des modernen Denkens“, die die Relativitätstheorie enzeugt hat!

Wir werden es uns versagen können, nach dem Obigen noch die Relativierung des Raumes in der Relativitätstheorie näher zu erörtern. Wenn Minkowski von sich sagt, er habe Einsteins „Hinweschreiten über die Zeit“ durch ein „Hinweschreiten über den Raum“ vervollständigt, so hat er damit eine Folgerung gezogen, die ihm nur deshalb bewundernswürdig erschienen ist, weil er selbst sich prinzipiell so unklar war.

Relativitätstheorie und Gravitation.

Die erste Relativitätstheorie Einsteins, welche er später „die spezielle“ genannt hat, wurde von ihm ersetzt durch eine zweite „allgemeine“ Relativitätstheorie, die die ursprünglichen Mängel der ersten Theorie nicht

haben sollte. Nun ist aber das Verhältnis der beiden Theorien zueinander nur in formaler Hinsicht das des Speziellen zum Allgemeinen, während in grundsätzlichen Fragen ein erheblicher, bis zum Widerspruch gesteigerter Unterschied besteht. Die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie ist dadurch gekennzeichnet, daß in ihr die allgemeine Schwere (Gravitation) eine besondere Rolle spielt, ferner ist besonders bezeichnend für sie ein allgemeines Relativitätsprinzip, d. h. die Behauptung der Relativität aller Bewegungen, auch die der Rotationen.

Abgesehen von den mit den „Relativierung von Zeit und Raum“ verbundenen, oben erwähnten Schwierigkeiten sind es auch Bedenken mehr empirischer Natur, die die allgemeine Form der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie als undurchführbar erscheinen lassen. Ein Beispiel wird dies deutlich machen können. Angenommen, wir setzen uns auf den in manchen Vergnügungsstätten sehr beliebten Apparat, genannt Drehscheibe, oder wir setzen uns auf eins der altmodischen Karussells, so soll es nach der Relativitätstheorie ebensogut möglich sein zu behaupten, daß das Karussell fährt, als daß das Karussell still steht und die ganze Außenwelt sich um das Karussell dreht. Also der Auffassung des gewöhnlichen Menschen: das Karussell fährt: soll die Behauptung des Relativisten gleichwertig sein: die ganze Welt fährt um das stillstehende Karussell im Kreise herum! Hierbei kommt der Relativist nicht nur zu der von seinem eigenen, theoretischen Standpunkt aus störenden Folgerung, daß er den in großen Abständen vom Karussell stehenden Naturkörpern, wie z. B. allen Fixsternen, ungeheure Geschwindigkeiten beilegen muß, welche die auch der Theorie höchst zulässige Geschwindigkeit, die Lichtgeschwindigkeit, erheblich übersteigen, er muß auch noch besondere, seltsame Naturerscheinungen hinzudichten, um den Ablauf der Erscheinungen, wie er sich abspielt, beschreiben zu können. Er muß nämlich annehmen, daß die bei der Rotation der Welt auftretenden Zentrifugalkräfte durch eine Schwerkraft kompensiert werden, welche proportional dem Abstand von der Drehungsachse des Karussells zunimmt und welche im Raume des Karussells selbst ihr Vorzeichen umkehrt. Für ein solches Schwerkraftfeld ist aber keine Veranlassung erkennbar, abgesehen davon, daß sich auch mathematisch überhaupt keine Massenordnung ersinnen läßt, die ein Schwerefeld erzeugen können, welches den mathematischen Bedingungen des Problems zu genügen vermöchte. In der Tat ist das Vorgehen des Relativisten, der die ganze Welt in Rotation, um ein Karussell versetzt und der zu diesem Zweck ein physikalisch unmögliches Gravitationsfeld voraussetzt, rein fiktiv, physikalisch unzulässig. Der Standpunkt des Relativisten gleicht dem eines Menschen, welchem ein Geldstück gestohlen worden ist und der behauptet: ich kann entweder annehmen daß der Dieb das Geldstück gestohlen hat, oder ich kann annehmen, daß der Dieb die ganze Welt gestohlen hat, nur nicht das Geldstück. Die zweite „Denkmöglichkeit“ scheidet aus Gründen der Erfahrung, „a posteriori“, aus, und es ist deshalb nicht möglich, hier eine „Relativität“ der Standpunkte einzunehmen. Genau so ist es auch mit dem

Standpunkt des Relativitätstheoretikers gegenüber der Rotation eines Karussells, er widerspricht aller Erfahrung. Wer sich über diese Seite der Gegnerschaft gegen die Relativitätstheorie näher unterrichten will, dem seien die Schriften von Lenard angelegentlichst empfohlen, besonders die Broschüre: Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation. Verlag von S. Hirzel, Leipzig 1920, von der ausgehend man auch den Weg zu der übrigen Literatur über den Gegenstand findet.

Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie leidet auch an dem Mangel, keinen *i n n e r e* Grund für die Annahme eines *S c h w e r e* feldes für die zur Durchführung der Theorie benötigten Beschleunigungsfelder erkennen zu lassen. Man kann nicht einsehen, warum gerade die *G r a v i t a t i o n* berufen ist, als Ursache für Beschleunigungen angesehen zu werden, wo doch auch *a n d e r e* Ursachen für Beschleunigungen denkbar sind, wie Kräfte im Äther, Kapillaritätskräfte usw. Durch die Einführung der Gravitation, also einer empirischen, physikalischen Erscheinung in die Grundgleichungen der Relativitätstheorie, wird jedenfalls der Boden der reinen, mathematischen Konstruktion verlassen und ein physikalisches, empirisches Element hineingezogen. Der Relativist kann sich daher nicht mehr in der Rolle des abstrakten Mathematikers allein verhalten, sondern er muß es sich gefallen lassen, daß der Physiker die Theorie als eine empirisch richtig sein sollende objektiv prüft. Fällt diese Prüfung zu Ungunsten des Relativisten aus, so muß dieser seine Theorie aufgeben und kann eventuell eine neue ersinnen. Es geht aber nicht an, daß der Relativist *d e s h a l b* an seiner Theorie festhält, weil er sie mathematisch schön findet. Abgesehen von allen logischen und erkenntnistheoretischen Erwägungen bleibt die Erfahrung der Hauptprüfstein jeder physikalischen Theorie, und so auch der Relativitätstheorie.

Die experimentelle Prüfung der Theorie.

Wer sich im praktischen Leben oder als Naturforscher betätigt, wird dem theoretischen Unterfangen, *e i n e* für alle Beobachter gleiche, objektive Natur in ihrer *e i n e n* Zeit und ihrem *e i n e n* Raume aufzugeben, wenig Vertrauen entgegenbringen.

Er wird daher auch nicht sonderlich erstaunt sein, wenn sich herausstellt, daß einzelne praktische Folgerungen einer solchen Theorie mit der Erfahrung in Widerspruch geraten. So wenig einerseits die Bestätigung einer *F o l g e r u n g* die Richtigkeit der *T h e o r i e b e w e i s e n* würde, — kann man doch häufig von ganz verschiedenen Grundlagen aus zu derselben, sich als richtig erweisenden Folgerung kommen, ohne damit etwas über die Richtigkeit der Grundlagen sagen zu können, — so sicher beweist andererseits eine als falsch sich herausstellende Folgerung, daß auch die Grundlage, aus der sie abgeleitet war, falsch sein muß. Die Relativitätstheorie hat die Prüfung an der Erfahrung schlecht bestanden. Dies soll im Folgenden kurz dargestellt werden.

Zunächst sei bemerkt, daß alle Folgerungen der Relativitätstheorie immer auf so winzige Effekte führen, daß es nicht einfach ist, die

experimentelle Prüfung vorzunehmen. Das war bisher in gewissem Sinne ein Glück für die Theorie, die ja dadurch in die Lage versetzt ist, auf die Schwierigkeit des Experiments, die Ungenauigkeit den Beobachtungen hinzuweisen, wenn sich ein vorausgesagter Effekt nicht findet. Es gibt aber heute Beobachtungen, die so genau sind, daß man diesen Schluß nicht mehr ziehen kann.

In ersten Linie ist hier die sogenannte Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien zu erwähnen. Eine Spektrallinie wird durch gewisse Schwingungen in einem Gase erzeugt, das leuchtet. Auch auf unserer Sonne, welche nach den Ergebnissen der Astronomie und Astrophysik ein sehr hoch erhitzter Gasball ist, werden Spektrallinien beobachtet. Nur soll nach der Relativitätstheorie die Zeitdauer irgend eines Vorgangs vom Schwerkraft-(Gravitations-)felde abhängig sein, also sollten auch die Schwingungsvorgänge aller Spektrallinien auf der Sonne vom Gravitationsfeld der Sonne abhängen. Dieses letztere ist aber erheblich stärker als das Gravitationsfeld der Erde, so daß die Spektrallinien eines Gases auf der Sonne gegenüber den Spektrallinien derselben Gasart auf der Erde einen Unterschied zeigen sollten — behauptet die Relativitätstheorie. Für die Größe dieses Unterschiedes und sein Vorzeichen sind Formeln aufgestellt worden. Sie besagen, daß die Spektrallinien der Sonne eine geringe Verschiebung nach der roten Seite des Spektrums erleiden müssen, im Betrage von 0,01 sogenannten Angström-Einheiten. Die Kleinheit dieses Betrages ist für jeden ersichtlich, wenn man ihn in Millimeter ausdrückt: er beträgt ein Milliardstel eines Millimeters. Dieser kleine Effekt, dessen Bestehen die Relativitätstheorie prophezeit hat und fordert, kann aber heutzutage mit den hochentwickelten Meßeinrichtungen gesucht werden und würde den modernen Instrumenten nicht entgehen, wenn er da wäre. Der Effekt ist sorgfältig gesucht worden, hat sich aber nicht finden lassen:

Zuerst ist die relativistische Rotverschiebung an Stickstofflinien der Sonne auf dem astrophysikalischen Institut in Potsdam gesucht worden; Schwarzschild [*Footnote*: Sitzungsbericht der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaft 1914, S. 1201-1213.], der verstorbene Direktor des Instituts, hat das Ergebnis im Jahre 1914 veröffentlicht; er findet keine Rotverschiebung. Dann hat der bekannte amerikanische Astrophysiker St. John nach der Rotverschiebung gesucht und sie ebenfalls nicht gefunden. St. John sagt in seinem Bericht vom Jahre 1917 über das Ergebnis seiner Versuche [*Footnote*: St. John, Carnegie Institution of Washington, Mount Wilson Solar Observatory Communications to the National Academy of Sciences No. 46. Vol. 3, 450-452, July 1917.]: „Das allgemeine Ergebnis der Untersuchung ist, daß innerhalb der Beobachtungsfehler die Messungen kein Anzeichen eines Effektes von der Größenordnung ergeben, die aus dem Relativitätsprinzip abgeleitet wird.“ Die Beobachtungsfehler St. Johns waren nur ein Bruchteil von dem geforderten, nicht vorhandenen Einstein-Effekt. Hale, der bekannte Sonnenforscher und Direktor der Mount-Wilson-Sternwarte, hat sich für die Richtigkeit St. Johns Beobachtungen

ausgesprochen [*Footnote*: Z. B. im Annual Report of the Direktor of the Mount Wilson Solar-Observatory, Yearbook, Nr. 16, S. 200, 1917.]. Diese Untersuchungen auf Mount Wilson, mit den besten Instrumenten unter den günstigsten Arbeits- und Beobachtungsbedingungen, wie sie zurzeit kein anderes astrophysikalisches Institut auf der Erde aufweisen kann, hätten den Einstein-Effekt unzweifelhaft feststellen müssen, wenn er existierte. Demgegenüber will es wenig heißen, wenn neuerdings ein Mitarbeiter von Einstein, Herr Freundlich, mit der Behauptung aufgetreten ist, daß die Amerikaner eine Fehlerquelle in ihren Messungen gehabt haben; die Zusammenstellung und kritische Würdigung dieses gesamten Materials wird in einer demnächst von fachmännischer Seite in Aussicht gestellten Druckschrift von L. C. Glaser gegeben werden, auf die hier verwiesen sei.

Die Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien auf der Sonne stellt bisher den Haupteffekt der Relativitätstheorie dar, er ist entschieden die wichtigste, weil am genauesten zu prüfende Folgerung, deren Nichtvorhandensein als eine experimentelle Widerlegung der Relativitätstheorie anzusehen ist — wenn es einer solchen überhaupt noch bedurft hätte. Andere Folgerungen der Relativitätstheorie sind für die Theorie weniger charakteristisch, weil sich sofort verschiedene andere Erklärungsmöglichkeiten darbieten. Da ist z. B. die sogenannte Perihelstörung des Planeten Merkur zu nennen. Nach den Beobachtungen der Astronomen dreht sich die Bahnellipse des Merkur um einen sehr kleinen Betrag von 43 Bogensekunden in 100 Jahren. Auch dies ist eine ungeheuer kleine Größe, aber sie ist dank der Feinheit der astronomischen Beobachtungsmethoden feststellbar. Es sind schon seit vielen Jahren Erklärungen für diese Bahnstörung des Merkur gegeben worden, insbesondere muß hier die Formel des Oberlehrers Gerber vom Jahre 1898 genannt werden [*Footnote*: Die schwer zugängliche Veröffentlichung Gerbers ist in den Annalen der Physik Bd. 52, Seite 415, 1917 im Neuabdruck erschienen.], die dieser aufgestellt hat, als es noch gar keine Relativitätstheorie gab und die völlig mit der aus der Relativitätstheorie von Einstein abgeleiteten Formel übereinstimmt. Hier könnte die Relativitätstheorie nur dann als eine gewisse, und zwar die zuletzt gegebene, Erklärungsmöglichkeit für eine an sich bekannte Sache angesehen werden, wenn sie im übrigen einwandfrei wäre.

Endlich ist noch ein, neuerdings in der Tagespresse mit besonderer Breite behandelter Effekt zu nennen: die Ablenkung der Sternorte in der Nähe der Sonne. Auch hier ist die Sache durchaus nicht so neu, als es auf den ersten Blick den Anschein hat, denn man kennt in der Astronomie schon lange gewisse systematische Abweichungen der Sternorte in Abhängigkeit von der Stellung des Sterns zur Sonne. Diese Erscheinung, die als jährliche Refraktion bezeichnet wird, ist bisher noch nicht erklärt, obschon ein erhebliches Tatsachenmaterial über den Gegenstand vorliegt, das bis in die Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts zurückreicht; man kann sich hierüber z. B. aus einer Abhandlung von L. Courvoisier, Beobachtungsergebnisse der Kgl. Sternwarte zu Berlin Nr. 15 vom Jahre 1913 unterrichten. Einstein hat nun

ebenfalls eine Abhängigkeit der Sternorte in Abhängigkeit von der Sonne aus seiner Relativitätstheorie gefolgert und es sind Messungen darüber von englischen Expeditionen gelegentlich der Sonnenfinsternis des Jahres 1919 angestellt worden. Die Beurteilung dieser Beobachtungen ist schwierig, da die Originalberichte noch nicht alle gedruckt vorliegen und die Angaben über die in der englischen Akademie in London vorgelegten Mitteilungen der verschiedenen Forscher nicht einheitlich sind. Jedenfalls steht fest, daß die deutsche Fachwelt und Presse bisher in einseitiger, für Einsteins Theorie zu günstiger Weise unterrichtet worden ist. Dies geht z. B. aus Äußerungen des Londoner Astronomen Silberstein hervor, der darauf aufmerksam macht [*Footnote*: Abgedruckt in: Die Naturwissenschaften **8**, 390, 1920.], daß das in der physikalischen Gesellschaft in Berlin erstattete Referat in wesentlichen Punkten Irrtümer enthielt, deren Berichtigung das Ergebnis den Messungen zu Ungunsten von Einsteins Theorie verschiebt. Über den Effekt der Sternorte in der Nähe der Sonne läßt sich also zurzeit nichts Sicheres aussagen. Aber er ist für die Theorie gar nicht so wichtig, da er, selbst wenn die von Einstein angegebene Verschiebung der Sternorte um $1\frac{3}{4}$ Bogensekunden am Sonnenrande tatsächlich sicher beobachtet wäre, noch eine ganze Reihe anderer Erklärungsversuche, die physikalisch viel verständlicher sind als die Deutung durch die Relativitätstheorie, gegeben werden können. Es ist übrigens hier die Kleinheit des Betrages von nur $1\frac{3}{4}$ Bogensekunden ein erhebliches Hindernis für das Experiment; um von diesem Betrage eine Vorstellung zu geben, sei erwähnt, daß der kleine Winkel $1\frac{3}{4}$ Bogensekunden diejenige Größe hat, unter der dem Auge eine Kirsche in 2 Kilometer Entfernung erscheint.

Welches Urteil wird man sich über die Relativitätstheorie zu bilden haben?

Das ist die Frage, die nunmehr zu beantworten ist.

Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie nimmt ihren Ursprung aus einer Theorie des holländischen Physikers Lorentz. Die Übereinstimmung mit der Lorentzschen Theorie geht so weit, daß die *m a t h e m a t i s c h e* Form der Einsteinschen Theorie vom Jahre 1905 wesentlich dieselbe ist, wie die von Lorentz, die Gleichungen dieser Einsteinschen Theorie sind die Gleichungen von Lorentz. Neuartig erschien die *D e u t u n g* der Theorie, die *I n t e r p r e t a t i o n* der Grundbegriffe Zeit und Raum. Einstein hat mit dieser Interpretation etwas getan, von dem seine Bewunderer gesagt haben, es stelle alles bisher Dagewesene in den Schatten. Die Interpretation Einsteins war aber gleichfalls weit weniger neu, als es den Anschein hatte. Schon im Jahre 1901 hat der ungarische Philosoph Melchior Palágyi in Engelmanns Verlag in Leipzig eine Schrift in deutscher Sprache [*Footnote*: Neue Theorie des Raumes und der Zeit. Von Dr. Melchior Palágyi. Verlag Engelmann, Leipzig 1901.] erscheinen lassen, die wesentliche Gedanken Einsteins und Minkowskis, des begeisterten, mathematischen Anhängers Einsteins, vorwegnahm: so besonders die Idee der „Union zwischen Zeit und Raum“, die Auffassung der „Welt“ in 4 Koordinaten, von denen die eine,

die Zeit, mit der imagären Einheit $\sqrt{-1}$ multipliziert auftritt usw. Den Physikern waren diese Vorgänge — zum Teil heute noch—unbekannt, sie nahmen die Relativitätslehre Einsteins teils kopfschüttenld, teils abwartend auf. Als aber anerkannte Autoritäten sich begeistert für die Relativitätstheorie einsetzten, trat auch im Publikum Begeisterung auf, und nun nahm die Entwicklung ihren unaufhaltsamen Gang. Bei der Verknüpfung mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Gedanken in der Relativitätstheorie war es den Fachleuten in unserer Zeit des hochgesteigerten, wissenschaftlichen Spezialistentums sehr schwer gemacht, zu einem selbständigen Urteil über die Theorie zu gelangen, zumal Einstein sein Werk mit Geschicklichkeit zu verteidigen wußte und den Physikern ihre Bedenken mit mathematischen und philosophischen, den Mathematikern ihre Bedenken mit physikalischen und philosophischen, den Philosophen ihre Bedenken mit mathematischen und physikalischen Gegengründen zerstreute: jeder Fachmann beugte sich vor der Autorität des Kollegen im andern Fach, jeder glaubte das, was er nach andern Fachautoritäten als für bewiesen halten zu sollen vermeinte. **Niemand wollte sich dem Vorwurf aussetzen, er verstünde nichts von der Sache!** Und so wurde eine Lage geschaffen, ähnlich der von Andersen geschilderten in seinem Märchen „Des Kaisers neue Kleider“: hier sieht ein Kaiser mit seinen Ministern und Untertanen dem Weben eines Gewandes zu, das die Eigenart hat, von denjenigen Menschen nicht gesehen zu werden, die dazu nicht klug genug sind, und schließlich stehen alle staunend vor den leeren Webstühlen, weil niemand sich getraut zu bekennen, daß er nichts sieht. So hat auch die Relativitätstheorie die Geister gefesselt, sie ist zur Massensuggestion geworden. Aber eine Massensuggestion ist an sich nichts Verwerfliches, die Ausschaltung des klaren Verstandes braucht durchaus kein Beweis dafür zu sein, daß das Streben der Masse ein törichtes ist. Alles hing bei der Relativitätstheorie davon ab, ob sie in ein erkenntnistheoretisch annehmbares Fahrwasser geleitet werden konnte.

Einstein hat die Schwächen seiner Theorie öfters zu verbessern und den Einwänden auszuweichen gesucht, er hat z. B. das Relativitätsprinzip hin und hergeworfen (s. oben S. 57 ff.), er hat schließlich geglaubt, den sicheren Hafen erreicht zu haben und im Jahre 1915 erklärt [*Footnote*: Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie 1915, S. 847.], daß endlich die Relativitätstheorie als logisches Gebäude abgeschlossen sei. Ein Punkt bei all diesen Wandlungen ist noch besonders wichtig, hervorgehoben zu werden: so wenig neuartig die mathematische Form der ersten Relativitätstheorie Einsteins ist, die mit der älteren Lorentzschen Theorie übereinstimmt, so wenig ist auch die im weiteren Verlauf der Entwicklung durch Einstein vollzogene *V e r ä n d e r u n g* des mathematischen Gewandes der Theorie besonders neuartig gewesen: daß die Relativitätstheorie in die Formeln der nichteuklidischen Geometrie hineinführt, zeigte zuerst der Mathematiker Varicak; daß die mathematische Komplikation der nichteuklidischen Kontinua von den Mathematikern formal bereits seit

langem gelöst war, erkennt sogar Einstein an. Inwieweit Einstein die neueste von Weyl u. a. eingeschlagene, relativitätstheoretische Richtung überhaupt noch mitmacht, ist nicht recht klar. Jedenfalls verbreiten Anhänger von Einstein Nachrichten, die für die Weylschen Arbeiten ungünstig lauten.

Wenn es also feststeht, daß Einstein in seiner Relativitätstheorie keine mathematisch ungewöhnlichen Formen entdeckt hat, wenn die philosophisch-erkenntnistheoretische Grundlage des ganzen Gebäudes unbefriedigend ist, wenn endlich die Experimente der Physiker und Astronomen die Theorie nicht beweisen können, so wird man fragen, was denn überhaupt noch übrig bleibt, um in der Relativitätstheorie ein Werk zu erblicken, das über die Taten von Kopernikus, Kepler und Newton hinausgeht. Diese Frage werden die heutigen Anhänger und Gegner der Theorie, je nach ihrem persönlichen Gefühl, verschieden beantworten. Eine Antwort, die alle befriedigt, wird sich erst erzielen lassen, wenn die Suggestion der Reklame und der Druckerschwärze, mit welcher die „revolutionäre Relativitätstheorie“ arbeitet, von allen als solche erkannt ist. Zu dieser Aufklärung beitragen zu helfen mögen die obigen Zeilen dienen.”

Gehrcke effectively accused Einstein of plagiarizing the mathematical formalisms of Lorentz, the space-time concepts of Palágyi,²⁶³ and the non-Euclidean Geometry of Varičak.²⁶⁴ Albert Einstein’s first wife Mileva Marić would have been able to have read *all* of Varičak’s works. She also would have been able to have understood all of Smoluchowski’s lectures. She could also read English, making her the likely source of many of the works Albert Einstein plagiarized from English-speaking authors.²⁶⁵ Gehrcke also accused Albert Einstein of masking his plagiarism and the weaknesses of the theory of relativity with irrational Metaphysics. Gehrcke stood up and declared that, “the Emperor has no clothes!”—an admission Einstein had already privately made to Heinrich Zangger on Christmas Eve of 1919.²⁶⁶ Gehrcke said that people were often afraid to admit that they did not understand the theory of relativity, and were in stupefied awe of that which they did not understand, not in informed appreciation of the theory. Einstein had made the exact same statements in his private correspondence, but shamelessly called Gehrcke anti-Semitic when he reiterated Einstein’s own beliefs.

Einstein’s only response came days later in a frantic, inappropriately emotional and irrational “hand-waving” *ad hominem* attack against Lenard, Weyland and Gehrcke. Einstein simply appealed to authority—his hangers-on, and those from whom he had plagiarized the theory of relativity. Einstein’s response appeared in the *Berliner Tageblatt* on pages 1 and 2 on 27 August 1920.

Nobel Prize laureate Philipp Lenard had had no involvement in the Berlin Philharmonic lectures. Even Einstein’s friends condemned Einstein’s flippant, inaccurate and racially-charged response. Sommerfeld wrote to Lenard and pleaded with Lenard to forgive Einstein, who had misrepresented Lenard’s involvement in the event. Lenard must have been outraged that Sommerfeld should be the one to write to him, not Einstein, and Lenard must have been outraged that Einstein apologized not only through a proxy, but privately.

Nobel Prize laureate Philipp Lenard demanded a personal public apology from Albert Einstein to be attended with as much publicity as Einstein's (and Max von Laue's) cowardly and unscrupulous personal attacks against Lenard. Einstein's apology was not forthcoming.²⁶⁷ After the Bad Nauheim debate, where Lenard destroyed Einstein in a debate, Max Planck and Franz Himstedt stated to the press that Einstein had regretted including Lenard in his personal attack, because Lenard had not granted Weyland leave to place his name on the list of speakers at the Berlin Philharmonic lectures. The *Berliner Tageblatt* morning edition 25 September 1920 ran this story. This was obviously not an adequate apology for Einstein's vicious and deceitful smears.²⁶⁸

Einstein could not defend himself or his position other than to change the subject to a personal attack against his opponents. He pouted and whined like a spoiled brat in order to avoid the bulk of accusations made against him and the theory of relativity. Instead of arguing the issues, Einstein wanted to wait for others to speak on his behalf in defense of the theory. He was not competent to defend the theory himself. Einstein, who was himself a racist who believed that anti-Semitism was justified and proper and helpful to Jews, hypocritically tried to change the subject to race in order to attack his opponents as if racists. Albert Einstein wrote in the *Berliner Tageblatt*, Morgen Ausgabe, 27 August 1920, pp. 1-2:

“Meine Antwort

Ueber die anti-relativitätstheoretische G. m. b. H.

Von

Albert Einstein.

Unter dem anspruchsvollen Namen „Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher“ hat sich eine bunte Gesellschaft zusammengetan, deren vorläufiger Daseinszweck es ist, die Relativitätstheorie und mich als deren Urheber in den Augen der Nichtphysiker herabzusetzen. Neulich haben die Herren Weyland und Gehrke in der Philharmonie einen ersten Vortrag in diesem Sinne gehalten, bei dem ich selber zugegen war. Ich bin mir sehr wohl des Umstandes bewußt, daß die beiden Sprecher einer Antwort aus meiner Feder unwürdig sind; denn ich habe guten Grund zu glauben, daß andere Motive als das Streben nach Wahrheit diesem Unternehmen zugrunde liegen. (Wäre ich Deutschnationaler mit oder ohne Hakenkreuz statt Jude von freiheitlicher, internationaler Gesinnung, so . . .) Ich antworte nur deshalb, weil dies von wohlwollender Seite wiederholt gewünscht worden ist, damit meine Auffassung bekannt werde.

Zuerst bemerke ich, daß es heute meines Wissens kaum einen Forscher gibt, der in der theoretischen Physik etwas Erhebliches geleistet hat und nicht zugäbe, daß die ganze Relativitätstheorie in sich logisch aufgebaut und mit den bisher sicher ermittelten Erfahrungstatsachen im Einklang ist. Die bedeutendsten theoretischen Physiker — ich nenne H. A. Lorentz, M. Planck, Sommerfeld, Laue, Born, Larmor, Eddington, Debye, Langevin, Levi-Civita

— stehen auf dem Boden der Theorie und haben meist wertvolle Beiträge zu derselben geleistet. Als ausgesprochenen Gegner der Relativitätstheorie wüßte ich unter den Physikern von internationaler Bedeutung nur Lenard zu nennen. Ich bewundere Lenard als Meister der Experimentalphysik; in der theoretischen Physik aber hat er noch nichts geleistet, und seine Einwände gegen die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie sind von solcher Oberflächlichkeit, daß ich es bis jetzt nicht für nötig erachtet habe, ausführlich auf dieselben zu antworten. Ich gedenke es nachzuholen.

Es wird mir vorgeworfen, daß ich für die Relativitätstheorie eine geschmacklose Reklame betreibe. Ich kann wohl sagen, daß ich zeitlebens ein Freund des wohlerwogenen, nüchternen Wortes und der knappen Darstellung gewesen bin. Vor hochtönenden Phrasen und Worten bekomme ich eine Gänsehaut, mögen sie von sonst etwas oder von Relativitätstheorie handeln. Ich habe mich oft lustig gemacht über Ergüsse, die nun zuguterletzt mir aufs Konto gesetzt werden. Uebrigens lasse ich den Herren von der G. m. b. H. gerne das Vergnügen.

Nun zu den Vorträgen. Herr *W e y l a n d*, der gar kein Fachmann zu sein scheint (Arzt? Ingenieur? Politiker? Ich konnt's nicht erfahren), hat gar nichts Sachliches vorgebracht. Er erging sich in plumpen Grobheiten und niedrigen Anschuldigungen. Der zweite Redner, Herr Gehrke, hat teils direkte Unrichtigkeiten vorgebracht, teils hat er durch einseitige Auswahl des Materials und Entstellung beim unwissenden Laien einen falschen Eindruck hervorzurufen versucht. Folgende Beispiele mögen das zeigen:

Herr *G e h r k e* behauptet, daß die Relativitätstheorie zum — Solipsismus führe, eine Behauptung, die jeder Kenner als Witz begrüßen wird. Er stützt sich dabei auf das bekannte Beispiel von den beiden Uhren (oder Zwillingen), deren *e i n e* in bezug auf das Inertialsystem eine Rundreise durchmacht, die andere nicht. Er behauptet — trotzdem ihm dies von den besten Kennern der Theorie schon oft mündlich und schriftlich widerlegt worden ist —, die Theorie führe in diesem Falle zu dem wirklich unsinnigen Resultat, daß von zwei nebeneinander ruhenden Uhren jede der anderen gegenüber nachgehe. Ich kann dies nur als einen Versuch absichtlicher Irreführung des Laienpublikums auffassen.

Herr Gehrke spielt ferner auf Herrn Lenards Einwände an, die viele auf Beispiele der Mechanik aus dem alltäglichen Leben beziehen. Diese sind schon hinfällig auf Grund meines allgemeinen Beweises, daß die Aussagen der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie in erster Näherung mit denen der klassischen Mechanik übereinstimmen.

Was Herr Gehrke über die experimentelle Bestätigung der Theorie gesagt hat, ist mir aber der schlagendste Beweis dafür, daß es ihm nicht um die Enthüllung des wahren Sachverhalts zu tun war.

Herr Gehrke will glauben machen, daß die Perihelbewegung des Merkur auch ohne Relativitätstheorie zu erklären sei. Es gibt da zwei Möglichkeiten. Entweder man erfindet besondere interplanetare Massen, die so groß und so verteilt sind, daß sie eine Perihelbewegung von dem wahrgenommenen

Beträge ergeben; dies ist natürlich ein höchst unbefriedigender Ausweg gegenüber dem von der Relativitätstheorie gegebenen, welche die Perihelbewegung des Merkur ohne irgendwelche besondere Annahme liefert. Oder aber man beruft sich auf eine Arbeit von Gerber, der die richtige Formel für die Perihelbewegung des Merkur bereits vor mir angegeben hat. Aber die Fachleute sind nicht nur darüber einig, daß Gerbers Ableitung durch und durch unrichtig ist, sondern die Formel ist als Konsequenz der von Gerber an die Spitze gestellten Annahmen überhaupt nicht zu gewinnen. Herrn Gerbers Arbeit ist daher völlig wertlos, ein mißglückter und irreparabler theoretischer Versuch. Ich konstatiere, daß die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie die erste wirkliche Erklärung für die Perihelbewegung des Merkur geliefert hat. Ich habe die Gerbersche Arbeit ursprünglich schon deshalb nicht erwähnt, weil ich sie nicht kannte, als ich meine Arbeit über die Perihelbewegung des Merkur schrieb; ich hätte aber auch keinen Anlaß gehabt, sie zu erwähnen, wenn ich von ihr Kenntnis gehabt hätte. Der diesbezügliche persönliche Angriff, welchen die Herren Gehrke und Lenard auf Grund dieses Umstandes gegen mich gerichtet haben, ist von den wirklichen Fachleuten allgemein als unfair betrachtet worden; ich hielt es bisher für unter meiner Würde, darüber ein Wort zu verlieren.

Herr Gehrke hat die Zuverlässigkeit der meisterhaft durchgeführten englischen Messungen über die Ablenkung der Lichtstrahlen an der Sonne in seinem Vortrage dadurch in einem schiefen Lichte erscheinen lassen, daß er von den drei unabhängigen Aufnahmegruppen nur eine erwähnte, welche infolge Verzerrung des Heliostatenspiegels fehlerhafte Resultate ergeben mußte. Er hat verschwiegen, daß die englischen Astronomen selbst in ihrem offiziellen Berichte ihre Ergebnisse als eine glänzende Bestätigung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie gedeutet haben.

Herr Gehrke hat bezüglich der Frage der Rotverschiebung die Spektrallinien verschwiegen, daß die bisherigen Bestimmungen noch einander widersprechen, und daß eine endgültige Entscheidung dieser Angelegenheit noch aussteht. Er hat nur die Zeugen gegen das Bestehen der von der Relativitätstheorie vorhergesagten Linienverschiebung angeführt, hat aber verschwiegen, daß durch die neuesten Untersuchungen von Grebe und Buchem und von Perot jene früheren Ergebnisse ihre Beweiskraft eingebüßt haben.

Endlich bemerke ich, daß auf meine Anregung hin in Neuheim auf der Naturforscherversammlung eine Diskussion über die Relativitätstheorie veranstaltet wird. Da kann jeder, der sich vor ein wissenschaftliches Forum wagen darf, seine Einwände vorbringen.

Es wird im Auslande, besonders auf meine holländischen und englischen Fachgenossen H. A. Lorentz und Eddington, die sich beide eingehend mit Relativitätstheorie beschäftigt und darüber wiederholt gelesen haben, einen sonderbaren Eindruck machen, wenn sie sehen, daß die Theorie sowie deren Urheber in Deutschland selbst derart verunglimpft wird.”

Einstein knew that he had been very publicly exposed as a fraud. He decided to flee Germany. It was obvious to him that all of German science would stand against him for what he had done. Pro-Einstein newspapers came to his rescue and published alarmist nonsense and personal attacks by Einstein's friends. It came as a surprise to Einstein that Laue, Nernst and Rubens would campaign by personal attack in the newspapers to rescue Einstein's reputation.²⁶⁹

It was only reluctantly that Einstein then chose to put up any kind of a fight with his undignified rant in the *Berliner Tageblatt*. If his friends had not rescued him, Einstein would have left Germany in total defeat without having spoken a word in his defense. The *Berliner Tageblatt* reported on 27 August 1920, parroting (as opposed to mocking) the nationalistic tone von Laue and Einstein had condemned as "anti-Semitic", and cried out that the sky was falling, and spoke of Einstein as if of a god,

“Albert Einstein will Berlin verlassen! Die persönlichen Angriffe, die gegen Dr. Albert Einstein in der an dieser Stelle bereits gekennzeichneten Versammlung der „Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher“ vorgebracht wurden, haben einen Erfolg gehabt, der für Berlin tief Beschämend ist: Albert Einstein, angewidert von den altdeutschen Anrempelungen und den pseudowissenschaftlichen Methoden seiner Gegner will der Reichshauptstadt den Rücken kehren. So also steht es im Jahre 1920 um die geistige Kultur Berlins! Ein deutscher Gelehrter von Weltruf, den die Holländer als Ehrenprofessor nach Leiden berufen, dem die amerikanische Columbia-Universität die Große goldene Medaille verleiht, den schwedische und norwegische Gesellschaften zu ihrem Ehrenmitglied ernennen, dessen Werk über die Relativitätstheorie als eines der ersten deutschen Bücher nach dem Kriege in englischer Sprache erscheint: ein solcher Mann wird aus der Stadt, die sich für das Zentrum deutscher Geistesbildung hält, herausgeekelt. Eine Schande!

Wir können es noch nicht glauben, daß in dieser Angelegenheit, die nicht nur für die Welt der Wissenschaft von Bedeutung ist, das letzte Wort gesprochen sein soll. Die Berliner Universität hat die Pflicht, alles zu tun, um diesen hervorragenden Lehrer und Gelehrten sich und Berlin zu erhalten. Und Albert Einstein, der über niedrigen Anwürfen steht, wird hoffentlich nach ruhigerer Ueberlegung seinen Feinden nicht den Gefallen erweisen, vor ihrem sinnlosen Geschrei den Platz zu räumen. Wer die Ehre deutscher Wissenschaft auch in Zukunft hochhalten will, muß jetzt zu diesem Manne stehen.”

The report in the *Berliner Tageblatt*, adopting and improving upon Lenard's tactics, sought to make it appear unpatriotic for Germans to enter into a scientific dispute with Einstein—the archangel of Berlin. Einstein had called the *Berliner Tageblatt* a hypocritical newspaper in the context of Socialism.²⁷⁰ The *Berliner Tageblatt* turned Einstein's cowardly flight from the exposure of his plagiarism, the self-contradictions in relativity theory, and the uncertain evidence used to promote

the man and his theory, into the crucifixion of the Messiah by a cabal of ungodly anti-German nationalistic Germans. More effective—more boldly dishonest—propaganda than that used to promote and sell Einstein to the public is hard to find.

Einstein had made his *ad hominem* attacks against the Berlin Philharmonic gathering with the cooperation of some members of the international press not only in an effort to smear his outspoken critics, but also to threaten anyone who dared side with them. The press orchestrated an overwhelming international defamation against Einstein's critics.

Einstein believed the majority of physicists sided with Lenard and Gehrcke and sought to suppress any public sympathy for their position. After the terrible hype of the 1919 eclipse observations, the press used Einstein and Einstein used the press. Einstein wrote to Sommerfeld in this context,

“It is a bad thing that every utterance of mine is made use of by journalists as a matter of business.”²⁷¹

Ad hominem attack and smear campaigns were Einstein's and his followers' preferred method of response to challenges to Einstein's priority and to relativity theory, as even Einstein's advocates were forced to concede in 1931,

“Even individual fanatic scientific advocates of the Einsteinian theory seem to have finally abandoned their tactic of cutting off any discussion about it with the threat that every criticism, even the most moderate and scrupulous ones, must be discredited as an obvious effluence of stupidity and malice. But even if these monstrous products of the ‘Einstein frenzy’ [*Einstein-Taumel*] now belong to history and are thus eliminated from consideration, thoroughly respectable reasons for a certain discomfort with relativity theory still do remain[.]”²⁷²

This was a response to the charge of such *ad hominem* attacks made in *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein (100 Authors Against Einstein)*,

“It is the aim of this publication to confront the terror of the Einsteinians with an overview of the quality and quantity of the opponents and opposing arguments.”²⁷³

Ernst Gehrcke decided to fight propaganda with thoroughly documented fact, but initially came up on the losing side. Einstein's persona, as depicted in the corrupt press, was perhaps too endearing to be successfully countered by the facts. The press also largely made it impossible for Einstein's critics to argue their side to the public. Einstein often opted to hide from criticism, as even his advocates were forced to admit,

“Although Einstein himself, by nature a pure scientist, is uninterested in such

academic disputes!”²⁷⁴

After decades of misrepresentations which promote Einstein as if he were an angelic figure, it is necessary to show that he was not only capable of plagiarism, but that we know for a fact that he committed far worse moral offenses—Einstein’s plagiarism is among the least of his many sins. It is also helpful to know Einstein’s habits. Einstein clearly plagiarized the special theory of relativity, as well as many important aspects of the general theory of relativity, from Jules Henri Poincaré and Hendrik Antoon Lorentz. In fact, Einstein evinced a career-long pattern of plagiarism and was often accused of appropriating the work of others. He tried to avoid these accusations and never refuted them.²⁷⁵ For example, Einstein wrote to Willy Wien in 1916 when Ernst Gehrcke²⁷⁶ effectively accused Einstein of plagiarizing Paul Gerber’s formula for the perihelion motion of Mercury,

“[. . .]I am not going to respond to Gehrcke’s tasteless and superficial attacks, because any informed reader can do this himself.”²⁷⁷

It was clear that Einstein had an ethical obligation to acknowledge Gerber’s priority. Einstein’s close friends Friedrich Adler and Michele Besso wrote to him and pointed out that Einstein had repeated Gerber’s formula.²⁷⁸ It was terribly unfair, unethical and unprofessional of Einstein to respond to Gehrcke in the manner in which he did. Einstein had an ethical obligation to acknowledge Gerber’s priority and explain why he had repeated his formula without an attribution. Einstein instead ridiculed Gerber and Gehrcke and asserted that he had no obligation to cite Gerber’s work.

In another instance where Einstein took the coward’s way out, a meeting was arranged to discuss Hans Vaihinger’s²⁷⁹ theory of fictions in 1920. Einstein pledged that he would attend this meeting. Knowing that Einstein would be devoured in a debate over his mathematical fictions, which confused induction with deduction, Wertheimer and Ehrenfest helped Einstein to fabricate an excuse to miss the meeting he had agreed to attend. Einstein was proven a liar.²⁸⁰ He also hid from many other criticisms, and Einstein refused to answer T. J. J. See’s many charges of plagiarism,²⁸¹ and refused to debate Arvid Reuterdaahl or to answer his many charges of plagiarism.²⁸² When Robert Drill²⁸³ criticized the theory of relativity, Einstein tried to persuade Max Born and Moritz Schlick to not respond to the critique, but if they did so, to hide from his arguments and merely ridicule Drill with insults.²⁸⁴ Einstein hid from the French Academy of Sciences.²⁸⁵ Einstein hid from Cardinal O’Connell.²⁸⁶ Einstein hid from Cartmel.²⁸⁷ Einstein hid from Dayton C. Miller’s falsification of the special theory of relativity.²⁸⁸ Miller challenged Einstein in the press over the course of many years. *The New York Times Index* lists several articles in which Miller’s and William B. Cartmel’s falsifications of the special theory of relativity are discussed.²⁸⁹ Einstein and Lorentz were very worried by Miller’s results and could not find fault with them.²⁹⁰ Einstein told R. S. Shankland not to perform an experiment which might falsify the special theory of relativity,

“[Einstein] again said that more experiments were not necessary, and results

such as Synge might find would be ‘irrelevant.’ [Einstein] told me not to do any experiments of this kind.”²⁹¹

Einstein knew he was caught at the Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher meeting in the Berlin Philharmonic, and wanted to run away from Germany. Einstein desired to hide from the Bad Nauheim debate, in which he had threatened to devour his opponents,²⁹² then Einstein—after being talked into appearing and after much hype promoting the event which attracted thousand of visitors—then Einstein, when losing the debate, ran away during the lunch break and again wanted to run away from Germany.²⁹³

Einstein prospered from hype. Einstein never exhibited his legendary genius in public. Instead, Einstein either appeared like a childish madman in public, or rattled off a script he had been told to recite. The press rescued him again and again, while he and they hid from, and suppressed, legitimate criticism. Einstein was unable to defend “his” theories.

3.5.4 Jewish Hypocrisy and Double Standards

Einstein’s plagiarism became an international scandal in the early 1920's and many newspapers owned and/or edited by Jews avoided the legitimate criticisms leveled at Einstein and instead resorted to *ad hominem* attacks against his critics calling anyone who dared speak a word against Einstein *ipso facto* an anti-Semite. The intolerance of criticism in the “Jewish liberal press” had long struck many in Germany as hypocritical. During the *Kulturkampf* (the struggle between Catholics and Protestants in the German Empire in the Nineteenth Century) elements of the “Jewish liberal press” in Vienna and in Berlin relentlessly attacked Catholicism, Catholics and the Gospels, but were intolerant of any criticism directed at them, or Judaism. Ernst Lieber, while defending Jews against discriminatory legislation, stated to the Reichstag in 1895,

“Those of us in particular who bore the brunt of the *Kulturkampf* will never forget how viciously and brutally Jewish pens attacked, dragged into the mud, reviled, ridiculed and insulted all that is sacred to us and that we were called on to defend so strenuously and painstakingly.”²⁹⁴

Adolf Stoecker brought attention to this fact in an attempt to justify his call for discriminatory legislation against Jews in 1879. Stoecker stated,

“It is strange indeed that the Jewish liberal press does not have the courage to answer the charges of its attackers. Usually it invents a scandal, even if there is none. It sharpens its poisonous pen by writing about the sermons in our churches and the discussions in our church meetings; but it hushes up the Jewish question and does everything to prevent its readers from hearing even a whisper from these unpleasant voices. It pretends to despise its enemies and to consider them unworthy of an answer. It would be better to learn from the

enemy, to recognize one's own defects, and work together toward the social reconciliation which we need so badly. It is in this light that I intend to deal with the Jewish question, in the spirit of Christian love, but also with complete social truthfulness. [***] People who are in the habit of pouring out the most biting criticism of State and Church, men and events, become highly incensed when anyone takes the liberty of directing even so much as a searching glance at Jewry. They themselves hatefully and sneeringly assail any non-Jewish endeavor. But as soon as a mild word of truth is uttered about them and their doings, they put on an act of injured innocence, of outraged tolerance, of being the martyrs of world history. Nevertheless I shall dare to speak up openly and candidly about modern Jewry tonight. And I am quite prepared for the distorted reports that will come back."²⁹⁵

Wilhelm Marr also alleged in 1879,

"The *Kulturkampf* breaks out. Since 1848, if we Germans so much as criticized any little thing Jewish, it was enough to have us entirely outlawed from the press. Jewry, on the other hand, not only mixes in our religious controversies and in the *Kulturkampf* against Ultramontanism but has the most to say about it in our press. In their humor magazines, which are anxiously on the lookout for anything that can be satirized as 'Jew baiting,' they pour boiling oil on Ultramontanism. Why, of course. Ultramontanism was Jewry's competitor for world hegemony! While a sense of delicacy is wholly absent among the Jews, it is demanded of us that we handle them like fine glassware or extremely sensitive plants.

Indeed, there were great newspapers in which we Germans could not even get a hearing. Why not? Because in order to criticize Romish fanaticism, it would have been necessary to show that it was the outcome of Old Testament, Jehovah fanaticism. Even the Ultramontanes suppressed hostile representations from their newspapers as soon as Israel was even lightly grazed!!

Just once try to comment upon Jewish rituals and observances. You will see that no pope is more infallible and unassailable than these doctrines. You would be accused of religious hatred. But when Jews hold forth and have the final say on our church-state matters, that is something quite different! While we embroil ourselves in church-state conflicts, Jewry shouts 'Vae Victis! Woe unto the vanquished!'

I and several of my friends tried, at the outbreak of the *Kulturkampf*, to participate and contribute from a higher cultural and historical point of view. But in vain. We were only permitted to speak without theoretical premises or when, out of the blue, we wished to disparage the clericals. None of our letters to the editor were ever printed in the Jewish press. Thus has Jewry monopolized the free expression of opinion in the daily press."²⁹⁶

Hermann Bielohlawek expressed his outrage at the defamations issuing from the

“Viennese Jewish press beasts” against Mayor Karl Lueger, and the “muzzling and terrorism” of the Social Democrats who prevented fair and open debate, before the Vienna City Council in 1902.²⁹⁷ Long before Stoecker and Marr, Bruno Bauer argued that “the Jews” hypocritically insulated themselves from criticism, while attacking Christians.²⁹⁸

Those elements in the Jewish press of Vienna and Berlin who participated in the *Kulturkampf*, and relentlessly and viciously attacked the Catholics, ultimately incurred the wrath of both Catholic and Protestant, both Frenchman and German, and provoked much of the anti-Semitism that manifested itself the Dreyfus Affair, where Jews were seen as agents of German Protestants attacking the French Catholics, or that German Protestants were the dupes of those Jews out to destroy Catholicism. French Catholics had been under attack since the early days of the French Revolution—French Catholics gave the Pope the majority of his funding and the Revolution sought to destroy French Catholicism and with it all Catholicism. In the 1893, Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu wrote,

“CHRISTIANS who belong to the educated classes do not share the antiquated popular prejudices against the Jew. Even in Eastern Europe, in Hungary, Roumania, and Russia, the thin stratum of the cultured, ‘the intelligent,’ as the Russians call them, are well aware that the Jew does not steal children to give them up to the knife of the *schochet* and that the Synagogue needs no Christian blood to celebrate the Hebrew Passover. The Catholics, Protestants, and members of the Greek church have another grievance against the Jews, a less crude and childish one. They accuse them of being the born enemy of what they style ‘Christian civilisation.’ The very vagueness of this charge makes it one of the most serious brought against Israel.

If it be not true that, in his secret rites, the talmudic Jew takes delight in spilling Christian blood, the Jews, it is asserted, especially the progressive Jews, do what is still worse: they are bent upon destroying Christian faith, morals, and civilisation. Not satisfied with the toleration accorded to them, they endeavour, openly or secretly, to ‘de-christianise’ Europe and modern society. Thus considered, Judaism is a disintegrating force, both from the moral and the religious, as well as from the economic and the national, point of view; it is a solvent of our old Christian institutions.

In Evangelical Germany, in Orthodox Russia, in Catholic France and Austria, the Jew is denounced as the most zealous destroyer of what one is pleased to call the Christian state and Christian civilisation. In assailing the Jews and Judaism, Christians of every sect assert, with Pastor Stoecker, that their attack on the Jew is only an act of self-defence. There are men who strive to find hidden springs in every historical event, who believe in prolonged designs, mysteriously followed up through centuries; such persons go so far as to look upon the ‘princes of Judah’ as the eternal instigators of the secular war waged against Christ, the Church, and the Christian spirit. [Footnote: Thus, for instance, *Les Juifs nos Maîtres*, by Chabaudy, Paris,

1882.] To them the ancient, chosen people, having rebelled against the Messiah, has become the enemy of the city of God, the foundations of which it is noiselessly sapping, and on the ruins of which it hopes to establish the site of Israel's dominion. The Jews are the originators and the apostles of the great 'Anticrusade' waged in our times against Christian traditions and institutions. In this sense, Antisemitism is, after a fashion, the counterpart of Anticlericalism; it is a second *Kulturkampf*, a *Kulturkampf* that has recoiled against the secret or avowed enemies of Christian civilisation.

Here we have, indeed, one of the real causes of the Antisemitic movement. It may be recognised by the country and the period in which it first appeared. The fact that it originated in the Germany of Bismarck, in the very heart of the struggle between the new Empire and the Catholic hierarchy, is not due to mere chance. Whilst the liberal German press, partly led by the Jews, was assailing the Church, the besieged party, trying to find the weak spots in the lines of attack, made a sally in the direction of the Synagogue, where the troops commanded by the Jew Lasker were encamped. That was good strategy. Such a digression had been suggested by the composition of the opposing armies. In fact, it is in a fair way of coming to be considered as one of the classical manœuvres of modern clerical campaigns. The Jew, who was apparently to have been the gainer, thus runs the risk of being the victim in the warfare against Christianity. This incident proves that he does not invariably play a safe game when he incites, or takes part in, religious struggles. Imprudent being! He will get nothing but blows for his pains. The shafts hurled by him, or by his people, against the Clericals, are in danger of rebounding against Israel. It is an unfortunate situation for the Jew when the question is put whose eyes can be offended by the harmless shadow of the Cross, whose hands are interested in effacing from our old countries the noble and precious emblems of the religion of our fathers?

'Why,' said a Silesian German to me, 'should you try to prevent us from returning to the Talmud the blows aimed at the Gospel? When an appeal is made to the state against our clergy and our Christian associations, have we not a right to appeal in our turn to the state and the people against the rabbis and the Jewish associations? Let the toleration which the Jews claim for themselves, who are in the minority, be shown to us, who are in the majority. Otherwise they will again have to listen to the cries of 'Hep! hep!' [*Footnote: Hep! Hep!* the traditional cry against the Jews in Germany. Many explications, almost all imaginary, have been given of it. Some have found in it the initials of the three words: *Hierusalem est perdita*.²⁹⁹ It is, perhaps, according to the hypothesis of Isidore Loeb, nothing more than a corruption of the word *Hebe! heb!* 'Stop! hold him!' still used, in this sense, in Alsace and the Rhenish lands.] from millions of Christians who persist in believing that the best gifts they can make to their children are the New Testament and the Crucifix.' And such language is used not only by believers; I have heard it from the lips of sceptical or indifferent people, who, in the presence of a

Jew, all of a sudden remembered that they were Christians.

Anticlericalism has thus been, by the revulsion it has occasioned, one of the main abettors of Antisemitism. In more than one country its effects have been felt by the Jews even more keenly than by the Catholics. To those who denounced the Church as a foreign body, obedient to a foreign master, the Catholics were naturally led to reply with a denunciation of the Jews as intruders of an alien race, without country, or love of country. To those who in Germany, for instance, accused the spiritual subjects of the pope of being thorough-going Ultramontanes, rebellious to the Teutonic spirit, the Catholics were, of course, ready to retaliate with an attack on the Semites, as persons obstinately set against the German spirit and *deutsche Kultur*. 'Make front against Rome,' was said one day, in 1879, in the thick of the *Kulturkampf*, by one of the Berlin journals, managed or edited by Jews. This war-cry was answered by another from the *Germania*, the organ of the *Ultramontane Centre*: 'Make front against New Jerusalem.' Thus, from time immemorial, has intolerance bred intolerance: *abyssus, abyssum*.

'The eyes of the German nation are opened at last,' continued the *Germania*; 'it sees that the struggle for civilisation is the struggle against the ascendancy of the Jewish spirit and of Jewish wealth. In every political movement, it is the Jew who plays the most radical and revolutionary part, waging war to the death against all that has remained legitimate, historical and Christian in national life.' [*Footnote: Germania*, September 10, 1879. In Germany and in Austria this has become the habitual theme of a number of newspapers. Cf., in our country, *La France Juive*, of M. Drumont.]

And this awful charge against Israel was not advanced only by the Catholics, who had to face Prince Bismarck and his short-sighted allies, the national Liberals; Protestant Germany echoed the words of Catholic Germany. The Russian priests, uneasy at seeing that the missiles aimed at the Roman hierarchy, flew higher than the mitres of their bishops and reached the Gospel and the Cross, were themselves perhaps the most ardent preachers of the new crusade. [*Footnote: I could cite, as an example, the speech of Pastor Stoecker in the Landtag, March 22, 1880. Cf. the writings of Professor von Treitschke.*] The *Kreuz-Zeitung* exceeded the *Germania* in zeal; and, outside of Germany, in states where such a movement seemed out of place, Russian writers took it up, in their turn. The *Rous*, edited by the Moscovite Aksakof, formed the Slav component of the cosmopolitan quartette which was composed of the Evangelical *Kreuz-Zeitung*, the Ultramontane *Germania*, and the Roman *Civiltà Cattolica*. Thus, for the Prussian Protestant, for the Austrian and French Catholic, for the Russian Orthodox, the war against Israel was merely a *Kulturkampf*. It meant nothing less than the preservation to modern nations of the benefits of Christian civilisation, by putting an end to what is called the judaising of European society. To one and all, Slav, Latin, German, and Magyar, the Jew, that odious parasite, was the deadly microbe, the infectious bacteria, that poisoned the blood of modern states and societies."³⁰⁰

The active involvement of persons guided by Cabalistic Jews,³⁰¹ persons such as Weishaupt, Nicholai, Bahrtdt, Voltaire, Diderot, etc., in the destruction of the Catholic religion in the period preceding the French Revolution is covered by John Robison in his book *Proofs of a Conspiracy Against All the Religions and Governments of Europe: Carried on in the Secret Meetings of Free Masons, Illuminati, and Reading Societies*, Printed for William Creech, and T. Cadell, Junior, and W. Davies, Edinburgh, London, (1797); see especially the fourth edition of 1798, to which Robison added a postscript. Robison stated in the introduction to his book,

“I have been able to trace these attempts, made, through a course of fifty years, under the specious pretext of enlightening the world by the torch of philosophy, and of dispelling the clouds of civil and religious superstition which keep the nations of Europe in darkness and slavery. I have observed these doctrines gradually diffusing and mixing with all the different systems of Free Masonry; till, at last, AN ASSOCIATION HAS BEEN FORMED for the express purpose of ROOTING OUT ALL THE RELIGIOUS ESTABLISHMENTS, AND OVERTURNING ALL THE EXISTING GOVERNMENTS OF EUROPE. I have seen this Association exerting itself zealously and systematically, till it has become almost irresistible: And I have seen that the most active leaders in the French Revolution were members of this Association, and conducted their first movements according to its principles, and by means of its instructions and assistance, *formerly requested and obtained*: And, lastly, I have seen that this Association still exists, still works in secret, and that not only several appearances among ourselves show that its emissaries are endeavoring to propagate their detestable doctrines among us, but that the Association has Lodges in Britain corresponding with the mother Lodge at Munich ever since 1784.

If all this were a matter of mere curiosity, and susceptible of no good use, it would have been better to have kept it to myself, than to disturb my neighbours with the knowledge of a state of things which they cannot amend. But if it shall appear that the minds of my countrymen are misled in the very same manner as were those of our continental neighbours—if I can show that the reasonings which make a very strong impression on some persons in this country are the same which actually produced the dangerous association in Germany; and that they had this unhappy influence solely because they were thought to be sincere, and the expressions of the sentiments of the speakers—if I can show that this was all a cheat, and that the Leaders of this Association disbelieved *every word* that they uttered, and every doctrine that they taught; and that their real intention was to abolish *all* religion, overturn every government, and make the world a general plunder and a wreck—if I can show, that the principles which the Founder and Leaders of this Association held forth as the perfection of human virtue, and the most powerful and efficacious for forming the minds of men, and making them good and happy, had no influence on the Founder and Leaders themselves,

and that they were, almost without exception, the most insignificant, worthless, and profligate of men; I cannot but think, that such information will make my countrymen hesitate a little, and receive with caution, and even distrust, addresses and instructions which flatter our self-conceit, and which, by buoying us up with the gay prospect of what is perhaps attainable by a change, may make us discontented with our present condition, and forget that there never was a government on earth where the people of a great and luxurious nation enjoyed so much freedom and security in the possession of every thing that is dear and valuable.

When we see that these boasted principles had not that effect on the leaders which they assert to be their native, certain, and inevitable consequences, we will distrust the fine descriptions of the happiness that should result from such a change. And when we see that the methods which were practised by this Association for the express purpose of breaking all the bands of society, were employed solely in order that the leaders might rule the world with uncontrollable power, while all the rest, even of the associated, will be degraded in their own estimation, corrupted in their principles, and employed as mere tools of the ambition of their *unknown superiors*; surely a free-born Briton will not hesitate to reject at once; and without any farther examination, a plan so big with mischief, so disgraceful to its underling adherents, and so uncertain in its issue.

These hopes have induced me to lay before the public a short abstract of the information which I think I have received. It will be short, but I hope sufficient for establishing the fact, *that this detestable Association exists, and its emissaries are busy among ourselves.*³⁰²

Like Robison and many others including Pope Leo XIII,³⁰³ George Goyau argued that Freemasonry sought to establish a world government—a Jewish Messianic goal.³⁰⁴ Denis Fahey argued that the Jews, armed with their Cabalistic and Talmudic doctrines and symbolism, were the guiding force behind Freemasonry.³⁰⁵ Freemasonry became truly tigerish under the direction of Adam Weishaupt.

It is interesting to note that the charges made against Jews of corrosive materialism and of leading revolutionary movements to overthrow European civilization and with it Christendom were also made by the racist Zionist Jews: Moses Hess, Benjamin Disraeli, Bernard Lazare and Theodor Herzl. The Frankist Jews and their progeny wanted to “Judaize Europe” and destroy Christendom. There are many instances in the Bible where Jews are told to destroy other religions and that Judaism will become the only religion on Earth (*Exodus 34:11-17. Psalm 72. Isaiah 2:1-4; 9:6-7; 11:4, 9-10; 42:1; 61:6. Jeremiah 3:17. Micah 4:2-3. Zechariah 8:20-23; 14:9*). In addition, Jews must have feared that should they anoint a Messiah, Christians would attack them for worshiping the anti-Christ. The same obstacle also confronted Jews who would “restore” the Jews to Palestine. Should a Jewish State be formed in Palestine, that Jewish State would be obliged to obey Mosaic Law and chase out the Christians and Moslems.

Knowledgeable Christians, Moslems and Orthodox Jews, were likely to oppose

the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine on the grounds that it would lead to: the reconstruction of the Temple in Jerusalem—the destruction of the Dome of the Rock and Al Aqsa Mosque; the reestablishment of the Priests of Aaron and the Levitical ministrations, together with the re-institution of the animal sacrifices of lambs, bulls and goats as David had done and as Jews are required to do for atonement (*Leviticus* 17:11. *I Samuel* 7:9. *II Samuel* 6; 24:22-25. *Ezra* 3. *Jeremiah* 33:18. *Daniel* 12:11); the need to honor the year of release, the *Shemmitah* and perhaps even the Jubilee, as well as proscriptions against usury to fellow Jews (*Exodus* 23:10-11. *Leviticus* 25. *Deuteronomy* 15; 23:20; 31:10-13. *II Chronicles* 36:20-21. *Jeremiah* 33:15); and the anointment of the Jewish Messiah, who will signify the “anti-Christ” to Christians. These were probably the reasons why Herzl laid emphasis on his assertion that political Zionism was an atheistical movement, so as not to worry Christians and Moslems that he was the anti-Christ and would destroy Moslem Mosques.

A. Kisch wrote a letter to Editor of *The Jewish Chronicle* which was published on 1 December 1911 on pages 20-21, in which Kisch tried to reassure Christians who were leery of Zionist motives that the Zionists did not want a state and that their Zionism did not herald the appearance of the Jewish Messiah, a. k. a. the anti-Christ,

“Like the Professor, Mr. Chamberlain contends that religious Jews feel the attraction towards Zion so overpowering a force that should it at any time involve a course of action opposed to the interests of the British Empire, those interests were, he considered, in danger of being disregarded to the peril of the State. Having regard to the recognised ability of the Hebrew race he thinks this supposed possibility a serious matter, but he did not show why the possession of political rights by naturalized foreigners coming from other nations was not open to the like objection. It, therefore, seems clear that his attitude is based on prejudice, not on reason. It is but fair to recognise that he confessed to some ignorance of the Jewish position, and it is only such ignorance that can excuse his attitude. Thinking that he might be under some misapprehension about the meaning and aims of the movement known as Zionism, I rose with the intention of reassuring him that it makes no pretension to herald the approach of the Messiah, or the formation of an independent Jewish State.”

Many Zionists pushed this false message in 1911, at a time when they were trying to convince the Turks that they had no reason to fear the Zionists, who had been out to destroy the Turkish Empire for centuries (recall D. Wolffsohn’s letter to the Editor of the *The London Times* published on 10 May 1911, on page 8, entitled, “The Young Turks and Zionism”). The Zionists have since founded their “Jewish State” and the Lubavitchers are trying to condition the world to accept the appearance of the Jewish Messiah, whom they are about to anoint. It is good lesson not to trust the assurances of Zionists.

Other Zionists were less guarded in their public statements. In the 8 December 1911 edition of *The Jewish Chronicle*, a letter to the Editor by B. Felz appeared on

page 38,

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE ‘JEWISH CHRONICLE.’

SIR,—It is not in the least surprising that Mr. Chesterton’s lecture to the West End Jewish Literary Society should have proved so unpalatable to the members of that body in general and to your correspondent, Mr. Kisch, in particular.

There are quite a number of ladies and gentlemen with a weathercock cast of mind—the sort of person who though he has never read a single one of M. Bergson’s books, can never say anything just now without mentioning his name—who, at prize distributions of Sabbath classes, boys’ and girls’ clubs, and other functions of the kind, makes it a constant burden of all his speeches, that Jews besides being good Jews should always be good Englishmen. This is the message that the West is repeatedly flashing to the East. When, therefore, a gentleman of Mr. Chesterton’s logical cast of mind comes along and very flatly tells them that good Jews cannot be patriotic Englishmen, it is not unnatural that the ladies and gentlemen in question should kick. The patriotism of the Jew is simply a cloak he assumes to please the Englishman and so when Mr. Chesterton is shrewd enough to detect the Jew beneath the Englishman’s clothing, the masqueraders become exceedingly angry. They had hoped to placate the Englishman by saying that they loved him and agreed with him. Judge then of their dismay when he turns round and says: I can only accept your love when you hate me and differ from me. The Jew is suspect and he knows it; and in the hope that the suspicion will be drowned in the noise, he becomes most vulgarly loud in his profession of patriotism. This atmosphere of suspicion in which the Jew lives from the moment of his birth, makes him so horribly fidgety, that when he meets a Gentile, the fact that he is a Jew is either the very first or the very last thing he wants to tell him. The Jew never takes the fact that he is one as a matter of course, which shows that he is never sure of himself, since it is only the things we are sure of and easy about that we take as matters of course.

Mr. Kisch seems to think that because some thirty years ago, two eminent men had a quarrel about the question whether good Jews could be patriotic Englishmen that, therefore, the matter has been disposed of at once and for all. To the Jews of this generation, the question is more acute and insistent than ever. We Jews of the younger generation are simply being coerced and intimidated, not through the compulsion of physical force but through the more subtle and insidious compulsion of a tyrannous public opinion, into a profession of patriotism, which, in the nature of things, must always be viewed with distrust and suspicion. I think it can be laid down as a general law, that the more Jews become Englishmen the less they become Jews. That does not imply any moral censure; it is simply a statement of fact, and Jews who pretend that they can at once be patriotic Englishmen and good Jews are simply living lies.

Yours obediently,

B. FELZ.”

While Christians were more easily duped, contemporary Orthodox Jews, who were close to the Zionists, remained very worried about the Zionists’ intentions. Rabbi Isaac M. Wise was quoted in *The New York Times* on 5 September 1897 on page 14,

“A Jewish State in Palestine and Impossibility.

Rabbi Isaac M. Wise in American Israelite.

Sept. 2.

Dr. Herzl does not profess to be a religious Jew. With most of his followers he maintains only to be a Jew by nationality or race. He has not the least intention to benefit Judaism. He is a politician, loyal and patriotic, no doubt, as so many politicians profess to be, and works to set up a Judenstadt [*sic*], not a religious congregation at all. Religion is at present out of the question altogether. Some zealous Zionists want the return to Palestine as a revival of Judaism, and hold also to Dr. Herzl’s project. Romantic zealots cannot possibly do without a number of contradictions in their creed, religious or political. The establishing of a Jewish State in Palestine is an impossibility in itself, and with the state laws of Moses unimaginable. The years of release and Shemittah (Sabbatical years) can not well be re-introduced, but the genuine Zionists must do it, as they have proved a few years ago. The sacrificial cult with the Aaronitic priesthood and the Levitical ministration, so much the zealous Zionist must admit, cannot be restored, nor can it in Palestine be abolished according to the dogmas of the strict Zionists and the whole orthodoxy. You would not stone to death the Sabbath breaker, the adulterer, the blasphemer, the false prophet. But in the Judenstadt [*sic*] in Palestine the laws of Moses would be in force and you cannot get over it as orthodox Jews. The contradictions between Dr. Herzl and the orthodox Zionists are as numerous as they are in every rationalistic Lover of Zion. None can leap over two thousand years of history and commence anew where all things were left then.”

For Christians, Christ was the ultimate sacrifice (*Isaiah 53:5-7*). Christ foretold the destruction of the Temple in 70 A. D., which ended Jewish animal sacrifices—at least until very recently. The fear that Christians would stand in the way of the formation of a Jewish State and the anointment of a Jewish Messiah gave the Jews an enormous incentive to destroy Christianity and Christians. Zionist Jews also felt obligated to destroy Islam, for they could not rebuild the Temple without destroying the Dome of the Rock and the Al Aqsa Mosque, which would inflame the Moslem world against them. This is one reason the Israelis seek to destroy the Moslem nations of the world today, and in so doing render their armies impotent and unable to oppose, with military force, the destruction of Moslem holy sites and building of the Jewish Temple. It should be noted that most religious Jews today follow the ancient tradition of Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai (*Berakoth 55a. Midrash Avot de*

Rabbi Natan), who felt that kindness and obedience to God, not animal sacrifices, atoned for sins (I *Samuel* 15:22. *Isaiah* 1:11-15. *Hosea* 6:6. *Amos* 5:22-24. *Micah* 6:6-8).

Moses Mendelssohn was on a “Jewish Mission” to supplant the religions of the world with a modern (and in some senses a more ancient) reformed Judaism, which would make political revolution the Jewish Messiah.³⁰⁶ However, this mission was the same old Jewish mission of subjugating the world to the Jewish faith, a Jewish world-government, and world-wide obedience to Jewish dogma. Like Karl Marx,³⁰⁷ Mendelssohn was a strict Talmudist. Like the Frankist revolutionaries, Mendelssohn attacked Rabbinical Judaism in order to promote himself and gain inroads into Gentile society. Mendelssohn set the stage for Communism, political Zionism and the Jewish revolutions which spread like wildfire around the globe. Like the Frankists, Mendelssohnians sought to keep their true objectives hidden behind a veil of “modernism”. Like the Frankists, the Marxists are known for loose morals and sexual incontinence, and engaged in orgies and other deviant behavior associated with the Frankists.³⁰⁸ Einstein also engaged in this deviant Frankist lifestyle. Frankist Jews believed that they could hasten the coming of the Messianic Era by making the majority of Jews infidels or Christians, thereby angering God, who would slaughter masses of Jews and give the “remnant” of “righteous Jews” both Israel and command over the Gentiles.³⁰⁹ In 1845, shortly before the revolutions of in Europe of 1848, which largely accomplished the emancipation of the Jews across Western Europe, *The North American Review* wrote,

“We might confidently look for reformers under such a system as Rabbinism; and, even without the name of reformation, for wide departures from the Talmud, either towards the ‘old paths,’ or to infidelity. The man who in modern times exerted the most commanding influence on Judaism was Moses Mendelssohn. He was born at Dessau, in 1729, was carefully educated in the Bible and Talmud, but was thrown upon Hebrew charity in Berlin, at the age of thirteen. Following the bent of his own genius, and stimulated by various associations, he left the dreary paths of tradition, to pursue the intricate but flowery ways of Gentile philosophy. He even improved the German language, in which he wrote with great taste. The influence of his works and his example was soon manifest. An enthusiasm for German literature and science was awakened among the Jewish people, when they beheld their kinsman ranking with the first scholars of the age. ‘Parents wished to see their children like Mendelssohn. Rashi and Kimchi, the Shulchan, Aruch, and Josaphoth, were laid on the shelf. Schiller and Wieland, Wolff and Kant, were the favorite books of the holy nation.’ Mendelssohn was very strict in Talmudical observances, and did not in his works directly oppose them; yet he certainly intended to undermine Rabbinism, and covertly labored to obliterate superstitions and prejudices, and to render his religion consistent with free intercourse between Jew and Gentile, and with the palpable benefits of modern progress in letters and refinement in manners. After all, he was probably at best but a deist; and he

certainly lacked that directness, candor, and earnestness of purpose, which true-hearted reformers have usually manifested. Christians must deny to Judaism that vitality which is essential to its maintenance upon the true basis even of a pure pre-Messianic creed. As a system, though not indeed strictly in each individual, it must ever oscillate between Rabbinism, or the like, and rationalism,—finding no stable, middle, spiritual ground.

Mendelssohn died in 1786; but others arose to carry out his innovations. A Jewish literary and philosophical society was formed at Königsberg, in 1783, which supported the first Jewish periodical ever published,—a journal devoted to the cause of reform. The ‘new light’ rapidly spread; and now Mendelssohnism, in different varieties, inclined more or less to the Talmud, or to infidelity, is the religion of a great majority of the Jews in all Europe west of Poland, into which country itself, especially Austrian Poland, the revolution has in some degree extended. The ‘Jews of the New Temple,’ or ‘Rational’ or ‘Reformed Jews,’ as they are called, where their numbers have not secured peaceable ascendancy, have generally seceded from the Talmudists; who, on their own part, where the so-called reformation has made good progress, adhere to the Talmud scarcely even in name.

The creed of the new sect has never appeared in an authoritative shape, but may be gathered from their writings and practices. The believers in it agree, that the Jews are no longer a chosen people, in the sense hitherto commonly received. They reject the Talmud, professing to receive the Hebrew Scriptures as the true basis of religious belief, and as a divine revelation; though after explaining away their inspiration, and the miracles recorded in them, on rationalistic principles. Regarding the Mosaic institutions as never abrogated, they consider, however, that most of their requirements are applicable only to a state of national establishment in Palestine; and therefore hold, that, until the unknown period of the Messiah’s advent, and Israel’s restoration, such laws only are to be observed as are necessary to preserve the essence of religion, or useful to form pious ecclesiastical communities, and which do not interfere with Gentile governments, with any of the existing relations of life, or with intellectual culture. The synagogue service has been remodelled; and the modern languages have been generally substituted for the Hebrew. A weekly lecture has taken the place of the semi-annual sermons of the Rabbinites. Contrary to the precept of the Talmud, instrumental music is introduced into public worship. ‘The question of organ or no organ,’ says a late journal devoted to the Jews, ‘divides Judaism on both sides of the Atlantic.’

Before long, the latitudinarian views of the leaders in this movement clearly discovered themselves; and there was a temporary reaction in favor of Rabbinism, to which the more devout among their converts receded. Yet the new system has signally prevailed and flourished. It is in France, perhaps, that the Jews have thrown off most completely the trammels of Judaism,—indeed, of all religion. They now style themselves *French Israelites*, or *Israelitish Frenchmen*, according to the doctrine of Napoleon’s

Sanhedrim; and seem anxious to amalgamate themselves more and more with the nation at large. Most of their leaders are infidels, undisguisedly aiming to obliterate all the common notions about a Messiah, as utterly superstitious; referring the prophecies of his advent—which they still nominally treat as prophecies—to the political emancipation of the Jews in the various lands of their sojourn. ‘The Regeneration,’ a journal published at Paris by some of their most learned and influential men, has represented the French Revolution as the coming of the Messiah, bringing, first, judgment, then, liberty and peace. The grand rabbi of Metz, a few years ago, in addressing the Jews of his district, spoke thus:—

‘God has permitted different religions, according to the different necessities of men, in the same way as he has created different plants, different animals, and men of different characters, genius, constitutions, physiognomies, and colors. Consequently, all religions are salutary for those who are born in these religions; consequently, we must respect all religions. All men, without distinction of religion, will be partakers of eternal beatitude, provided they have practised virtue in this life.’

On the 12th of June last, a voluntary Jewish synod met at Brunswick, composed of twenty-five eminent rabbins, from various parts of the continent. It was the first of a proposed succession of annual synods, to deliberate on Jewish affairs. They sat eight days, passed various resolutions proposing important changes, and declared their concurrence in all the decisions of Napoleon’s Sanhedrim. The Jews of England, though visibly influenced by residence in so enlightened a kingdom, were all nominally Rabbinites, until, within the last four or five years, a reforming party seceded in London whence their principles and denomination—‘British Jews’—have since gradually spread. Even among those who remained, great difference of opinion prevails as to Talmudical observances. Both there and in this country, the Portuguese Jews seem most active in the work of revolution. The tide of Jewish emigration to the United States is rapidly swelling; and as it comes from many lands, it exhibits a variety of hue. But the voluntary emigrant is ever and characteristically a lover of change; and here the Talmud has little sway, and that rapidly declining. Mr. Leeser represents the Bible alone as the basis of the Jewish faith and in the whole article already referred to, does not so much as mention the Talmud. He edits, at Philadelphia, ‘The Occident and American Jewish Advocate,’ the first Jewish periodical established in this country. Soon after its establishment, ‘The Israelite,’ a weekly German paper, devoted to the same cause, and also published in Philadelphia, was announced; whether this still survives, we know not. Mr. Leeser expects a literal Messiah, —not God, or a son of God, but a mere man, eminently endowed, like Moses, to accomplish all that is foretold of him. He protests against some of the decisions of the late Brunswick synod, particularly the one reaffirming the *dictum* of the French Sanhedrim, that Jews might intermarry with Gentiles. He has long had in his congregation a Sabbath school, or a school for religious instruction, held, not

on the seventh day, but on the Christian Sabbath, which Christian observance makes necessarily a day of convenient leisure for the purpose.

Among the stricter Jews, all over the world, the expectation of Messiah's advent is becoming more and more anxious. They not unfrequently talk, though without serious purpose, of embracing Christianity, should he not appear within a certain time. Migration to the Holy Land is visibly increasing. Multitudes from all parts of the world would hasten thither, could they become possessors of the dear soil, and enjoy reasonable protection. Mr. Noah proposes, that Christian societies and governments interested in the welfare of the Jews should exert their influence to procure these advantages for them in their native land of promise. The suggestion deserves notice.

Of modern efforts for the conversion of Israel to Christianity we can speak but briefly. The chief extraordinary obstacles which have hitherto opposed such efforts have been, a bigotry which treated the bare thought of investigating Christianity as a heinous sin, and which was ever prepared to stifle free inquiry by persecution; the character of Talmudical education, which disqualified the pupil for independent judgment; and accumulated prejudices against a religion too often exemplified only by profligate persecutors. But all these obstacles are gradually sinking away; nor does growing infidelity appear so formidable as the superstition and fanaticism which have given place to it. Moreover, the spirit of inquiry, and the dissensions kindled by the progress of the revolution which Mendelssohn commenced, are favorable to Christian effort. We shall speak only of what Protestants have done."³¹⁰

Protestantism, Puritanism and the *Kulturkampf* were instigated by Cabalistic Jews seeking to create a schism in the Church of Rome in order to end its hegemony and desires on Jerusalem, as well as to lead Christianity back to its Jewish roots and then destroy it. Jews were largely left alone when the Christians began to fight each other at the instigation of Jews. When searching for the true forces behind the Reformation and the French Revolution, one should ask, *qui bono?* or who benefits? The *North American Review* wrote in 1845,

“The darkest pages of history are those which exhibit Christianity, so called, as a persecuting religion. Before the epoch of the Reformation, bigotry, clothed with ecclesiastical power, was generally leagued with political tyranny and popular malice to oppress and destroy the Jews. To attempt to convert them to the Christian faith without violence was considered by most Roman Catholics as a wholly chimerical scheme, and the undoubted fact of their rejection by God, even more than the dreaded anathemas of the Church, seemed to place them beyond the pale of human sympathies. Better prospects than at any period of their dispersion brightened before them with the dawn of the Reformation. The principles of that mighty change extended to all the interests of humanity, temporal as well as eternal; and planted the seeds both of religious and political regeneration. The hearts of the Reformers were

moved with compassion towards the ancient people of God; and they advocated milder plans than those which had usually been adopted, to bring them over to the Christian faith. They discountenanced and condemned the system of wholesale plunder, from which, under the garb of zeal for the Catholic church, princes and prelates had for ages drawn a bloody revenue. But a period of lethargy among Christians in regard both to the civil and religious state of this people—a period of returning gloom—soon succeeded; and the French Revolution, itself one of the mighty effects of a reformation which necessarily emancipated human error and passion, at the same time with truth and reason, brought the first blessings of permanent civil freedom to any of the Jews of Europe.”³¹¹

Paul Scott Mowrer wrote in 1921,

“But the religious wars had now fairly begun, and in the heat of the struggle between Catholic and Protestant, the Jews, greatly to their good, were well-nigh forgotten. For them, the worst was over.”³¹²

In 1914, Edward Alsworth Ross, a Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, wrote in his book, *The Old World in the New: The Significance of Past and Present Immigration to the American People*, The Century Co., New York, (1914), pages 160 and 163,

“The good will of a Southern gentleman takes set forms such as courtesy and attentions, while the kindly Jew is ready with any form of help that may be needed. So the South looked askance at the Jews as ‘no gentlemen.’ Nor have the Irish with their strong personal loyalty or hostility liked the Jews. On the other hand the Yankees have for the Jews a cousinly feeling. Puritanism was a kind of Hebraism and throve most in the parts of England where, centuries before, the Jews had been thickest. With his rationalism, his shrewdness, his inquisitiveness and acquisitiveness, the Yankee can meet the Jew on his own ground.”

The *Kulturkampf* followed the anti-Catholic English and French Revolutions, which had emancipated the Jews of many nations. The Old Testament led Jews to believe that Jews would rule the world through their Messiah, who would dwell with the Lord in Jerusalem, which city would serve as the sacred and the profane capital of the world. *Deuteronomy* 18:14-18:

“14 For these nations, which thou shalt possess, hearkened unto observers of times, and unto diviners: but *as for* thee, the LORD thy God hath not suffered thee so *to do*. 15 The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken; 16 According to all that thou desiredst of the LORD thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the LORD

my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. 17 And the LORD said unto me, They have well *spoken that* which they have spoken. 18 I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. 19 And it shall come to pass, *that* whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require *it* of him. 20 But the prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die. 21 And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the LORD hath not spoken? 22 When a prophet speaketh in the name of the LORD, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that *is* the thing which the LORD hath not spoken, *but* the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.”

Psalm 72:1-20,

“Give the king thy judgments, O God, and thy righteous’ness unto the king’s son. 2 He shall judge thy people with righteousness, and thy poor with judgment. 3 The mountains shall bring peace to the people, and the little hills, by righteousness. 4 He shall judge the poor of the people, he shall save the children of the needy, and shall break in pieces the oppressor. 5 They shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations. 6 He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass: as showers that water the earth. 7 In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth. 8 He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. 9 They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him; and his enemies shall lick the dust. 10 The kings of Tarshish and *of* the isles shall bring presents: the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. 11 Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him. 12 For he shall deliver the needy when he crieth; the poor also, and *him* that hath no helper. 13 He shall spare the poor and needy, and shall save the souls of the needy. 14 He shall redeem their soul from deceit and violence: and precious shall their blood be in his sight. 15 And he shall live, and to him shall be given of the gold of Sheba: prayer also shall be made for him continually; *and* daily shall he be praised. 16 There shall be an handful of corn in the earth upon the top of the mountains; the fruit thereof shall shake like Lebanon: and *they* of the city shall flourish like grass of the earth. 17 His name shall endure for ever: his name shall be continued as long as the sun: and *men* shall be blessed in him: all nations shall call him blessed. 18 Blessed *be* the LORD God, the God of Israel, who only doeth wondrous *things*. 19 And blessed *be* his glorious name for ever: and let the whole earth be filled *with* his glory; Amen, and Amen. 20 The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended.”

Isaiah 9:6-7,

“6 For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. 7 Of the increase of *his* government and peace *there shall be* no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this.”

Jeremiah 3:17,

“At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the LORD; and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of the LORD, to Jerusalem: neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil heart.”

Zechariah 8:20-23; 14:9

“20 Thus saith the LORD of hosts; *It shall yet come to pass*, that there shall come people, and the inhabitants of many cities: 21 And the inhabitants of one *city* shall go to another, saying, Let us go speedily to pray before the LORD, and to seek the LORD of hosts: I will go also. 22 Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the LORD of hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the LORD. 23 Thus saith the LORD of hosts; In those days *it shall come to pass*, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard *that God is* with you. [***] 14:9 And the LORD shall be King over all the earth: in that day there shall be one LORD, and his name one.”

In 1862, racist Zionist Moses Hess expressed the motives of the Jews who participated in the *Kulturkampf* as a means to destroy Catholicism in order to end German anti-Semitism and as revenge for Catholic persecutions (as opposed to their other motivations of ending Catholic hegemony and Catholic designs on Jerusalem, which they believed were Jewish provinces),

“FROM the time that Innocent III evolved the diabolical plan to destroy the moral stamina of the Jews, the bearers of Spanish culture to the world of Christendom, by forcing them to wear a badge of shame on their garments, until the audacious kidnapping of a Jewish child from the house of his parents, which occurred under the government of Cardinal Antonelli, Papal Rome symbolizes to the Jews an inexhaustible well of poison. It is only with the drying-up of this source that Christian German Anti-Semitism will die from lack of nourishment.

With the disappearance of the hostility of Christianity to culture, there ceases also its animosity to Judaism; with the liberation of the Eternal City on the banks of the Tiber, begins the liberation of the Eternal City on the

slopes of Moriah; the renaissance of Italy heralds the rise of Judah. The orphaned children of Jerusalem will also participate in the great regeneration of nations, in their awakening from the lethargy of the Middle Ages, with its terrible nightmares.

Springtime in the life of nations began with the French Revolution. The year 1789 marks the Spring equinox in the life of historical peoples. Resurrection of nations becomes a natural phenomenon at a time when Greece and Rome are being regenerated. Poland breathes the air of liberty anew and Hungary is preparing itself for the final struggle of liberation. Simultaneously, there is a movement of unrest among the other subjected nations, which will ultimately culminate in the rise of all the peoples oppressed both by Asiatic barbarism and European civilization against their masters, and, in the name of a higher right, they will challenge the right of the master nations to rule.

Among the nations believed to be dead and which, when they become conscious of their historic mission, will struggle for their national rights, is also Israel—the nation which for two thousand years has defied the storms of time, and in spite of having been tossed by the currents of history to every part of the globe, has always cast yearning glances toward Jerusalem and is still directing its gaze thither. Fortified by its racial instinct and by its cultural and historical mission to unite all humanity in the name of the Eternal Creator, this people has conserved its nationality, in the form of its religion and united both inseparably with the memories of its ancestral land. No modern people, struggling for its own fatherland, can deny the right of the Jewish people to its former land, without at the same time undermining the justice of its own strivings. [***] No nation can be indifferent to the fact that in the coming European struggle for liberty it may have another people as its friend or foe. [***] The general history of social and political life, as well as the national movement of modern nations, will be drawn upon, so as to throw light upon the undischarged function of Judaism. These sources will be utilized, furthermore, to demonstrate that the present political situation demands the establishment of Jewish colonies at the Suez Canal and on the banks of the Jordan. And, finally, these illustrations will be employed to point out the hitherto neglected fact, that behind the problems of nationality and freedom there is a still deeper problem which cannot be solved by mere phrases, namely, the race question, which is as old as history itself and which must be solved before attempting the solution of the political and social problems.”³¹³

These revolutions; and the wars fought over the “Eastern Question”—the battles between the Holy Roman, Russian, Turkish, Hungarian, French, German and British Empires; favored Zionism, as did the national unifications of Italy and Germany; though the Papacy remained sovereign in Rome, to the dismay of the Zionists. Jewish enmity towards Christianity continues to this day, most especially in Israel, as Israel Shahak has proven.³¹⁴

The Rothschilds used their incalculable wealth in an attempt to act as Messiah and destroy the economies of Egypt, Russia, and Turkey, so as to leave these nations no choice but to sell Palestine to the Rothschild family. They created wars throughout the world to generate profits for themselves, and to liberate Jews; as well as to open the gates to Palestine. However, they could not persuade large numbers of Jews to emigrate to Palestine, until Jewish financiers put Adolf Hitler into power in order to scare the Jews into emigration.

3.6 The Messiah Rothschilds' War on the Gentiles—and the Jews

It is an ancient trick of the loan shark, and the extortionist criminal, to run a victim into debt, then force the victim to obtain a loan secured by property the loan shark wishes to own, and then to ensure that the victim has no means to repay the loan, such that the loan shark becomes the inevitable owner of said property. Shakespeare told such a tale of a Jewish Shylock in his *Merchant of Venice*. An article appeared in *The Religious Intelligencer*, Volume 9, Number 26, (27 November 1824), page 411, which stated,

“PROPOSED RESTORATION OF THE JEWS.

The Gazette of Spire, assures its readers, that the house of Rothschilds [an immensely rich Jewish banking house in London] has recently received proposals from the Turkish government, for a loan to a considerable amount, and an offer of the entire of Palestine as a security for the payment. In consequence, adds the paper, a confidential agent has been despatched by that house to Constantinople, to examine into the validity of the pledge offered by the Turkish Cabinet.

The N. Y. Advocate says, that the Jews will be restored to their former country, and possess it in full sovereignty cannot be doubted.

Our country must be an asylum to the ancient people of God. Here they must reside; here, in calm retirement, study laws, governments, sciences, become familiarly known to their brethren of other religious denominations; cultivate the useful arts; acquire a knowledge of legislation, and become liberal and free. So, that appreciating the blessings of just and salutary laws, they be prepared to possess permanently their ancient land, and govern righteously.”

Baron Rothschild wanted to beat Jesus Christ to the second coming, by becoming the first Jewish Messiah to wreck the Gentile nations and restore the Jews to Palestine. He tried to justify the theft of Palestine from its indigenous population with the same argument Zionists employed after the Holocaust—that the Jews need a nation in order to be safe from Gentiles—again, note the incentive that Jewish financiers had to create the Holocaust in order to “justify” the theft of the

Palestinians' land. However, the vast majority of Jews did not want a Jewish nation. Most Jews did not believe Palestine would be a sanctuary, and certainly did not want to live in Palestine. It was the Zionists who perpetrated the Holocaust in order to force the reluctant Jews into moving to an undemocratic, segregated and racist "Jewish" State. Bear in mind that the word "Holocaust" means burnt sacrifice, and the slain and humiliated Jews of Europe were such a sacrifice to the ambitions of the Zionists.

It is important to note that the sophistical premise for the creation of the "Jewish State" of Israel was asserted more than one hundred years before the Holocaust began, and the Holocaust was created in order to justify the formation of an apartheid and racist "Jewish" State. Jews who want to be safe from further persecution should investigate and prosecute the Zionists and disassemble the State of Israel. The ultimate source of their suffering was, is, and will continue to be the racist Zionists.

The Episcopal Watchman, Volume 3, Number 38, (5 December 1829), p. 304; published the following article:

"ROTHSCHILD AND JERUSALEM.—Without vouching for its authenticity, we copy below, from the London Court Journal, an account of a project which it is said that the great banker Rothschild entertains of purchasing the sovereignty of Jerusalem, and the territory of ancient Palestine. If any credit is to be attached to this statement, the sublime Porte will not find the difficulty which the London journalists anticipate, in complying with the pecuniary demands of Russia. Whether, however, this letter from Smyrna is entitled to any belief or not, it is quite certain that there have been some curious notions propagated of late among the Israelites in Great Britain, and we have seen it mentioned that a number of enthusiastic men—Irving, Cunningham, Drummond, &c. have openly maintained that the Jews will ere long be restored to Palestine, where it is prophesied that Christ will re-appear, in person, and establish a political kingdom. Mr. Wolff, the Christian missionary, is said to have embraced this doctrine, and the following paragraph which has found its way into the newspapers, is alleged to be an extract of a letter from him, dated in Jerusalem in April last.—*N. Y. Eve. Post.*

'I proclaimed for two months to the Jews the great truth—first, that Jesus of Nazareth came the first time to the earth despised and rejected of men to die for poor sinners; and secondly, that he will come again with glory and majesty, and glorious in his apparel, and travelling in the greatness of his strength, he will come the SON OF MAN, in the year 1847, in the clouds of Heaven, and gather all the tribes of Israel, and govern in person as man and God, in the literal city of Jerusalem, with his saints, and be adored in the Temple, which will be rebuilt, and thus he shall govern 1000 years; and I, Joseph Wolf, shall see with my own eyes, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in their bodies, in their glorified bodies! and I shall see thee, Elijah, and thee, Isaiah, and thee, Jeremiah, and thee, David, whose songs have guided me to *Jesus of Nazareth*. I shall see you all here at Jerusalem, where I am now writing

these lines! There were the topics upon which I spoke, not only with Jews, but likewise with some Mussulmans.’

The following is the extract of a letter, published in the Court Journal on the subject of the purchase of Jerusalem by Baron Rothschild:—

King Rothschild.—The following curious extract is from a private letter from Smyrna. We give it without note or comment.

The confidence of the children of Israel in the words of the Prophet has not been in vain: the temple of Solomon will be restored in all its splendor. Baron Rothschild, who was accused in having gone to Rome to abjure the faith of his fathers, has merely passed through that city on his way to Constantinople, where he is about to negotiate a loan with the Porte. It is stated, on good authority, that Baron Rothschild has engaged to furnish to the Sultan the enormous sum of 350,000,000 piastres, at three installments, without interest, on condition of the Sultan’s engaging, for himself and his successors, to yield to Baron Rothschild for ever, the sovereignty of Jerusalem, and the territory of ancient Palestine, which was occupied by the twelve tribes. The Baron’s intention is, to grant to the rich Israelites who are scattered about in different parts of the world, portions of that fine country, where he proposes to establish seigniories, and to give them, as far as possible, their ancient and sacred laws.

Thus the descendants of the Hebrews will at length have a country, and every friend of humanity must rejoice at the happy event. The poor Jews will cease to be the victims of oppression and injustice. Glory to the great Baron Rothschild, who makes so noble a use of his ingots.

A little army being judged necessary for the restored kingdom, measures have been taken for recruiting out of the wrecks of the Jewish battalion raised in Holland by Louis Bonaparte. All the Israelites who were employed in the various departments of the Dutch Administration, are to obtain superior posts under the Government of Jerusalem, and the expenses of their journey are to be paid them in advance.”

The New-Yorker, Volume 9, Number 13, Whole Number 221, (13 June 1840), pp. 196-197; wrote of Rothschild’s desire to be King of the Jews, and by the implications of Jewish prophecy, King of the World—and by the implications of Christian prophecy, the anti-Christ:

“RESTORATION OF THE JEWS.—On more than one occasion we have called attention to the signs, of one kind or another, by which the exiles of Israel are beginning to express their impatience for the accomplishment of the prophecies that point to their restoration; and the changes, physical and moral, which are gradually breaking down the barriers to the final fulfilment of the promise. These are curious and worth attention; and more significant in their aggregation, and with reference to the character of the people in question, than those of our readers who have looked at them hastily and separately, may have been prepared to suspect. The Malta letters brings

accounts from Syria, in which some curious particulars are given of Sir Moses Montefiore's proceedings, during his late visit to the Holy Land. We remember rumors, which had currency some years ago, of the Jewish capitalist's (Rothschild's) design to employ his wealth in the purchase of Jerusalem, as the seat of a kingdom, and bring back the tribes under his own guidance and sovereignty. If the scheme, amid its sublimity, savored sufficiently of the romantic to make the rumor suspicious, the positive acts of Sir Moses, at least, exhibit an anxiety to gather together the wanderers in the neighborhood of their ancient home and future hopes; that they may await events on the ground where they can best be made available to the fulfilment of the promise. During his pilgrimage he sought his way to the hearts of his countrymen, by giving a *talaris* (we believe about fifteen piastres) to every Israelite; and having instituted strict inquiries respecting the various biblical antiquities on his way, and ascertained the amount of duty which the sacred places and villages paid to the Egyptian Government to be about 64,000 purses (a purse being equal to fifteen talaris,) he proposed to the Viceroy of Egypt, that he (Sir Moses) should pay this revenue out of his own pocket, as the price of that prince's permission to him to colonize all those places with the Children of Israel. The offer has been, it is said, accepted, subject to the condition that the colony shall be considered national, and not under European protection. Athenæum."

The *Scientific American* wrote in 1846 of the man who would be King of the Jews, Rothschild, and revealed that orthodox religious fanaticism and a racist desire to keep the Jews segregated from the *Goyim* were the main motives of Messiah Rothschild,

"THE ISRAELITES IN GERMANY are in great commotion. At Berlin and Frankfort two-thirds of them have separated from the synagogues, to form new societies, and it is thought that their example will be generally followed. The new school are supported by the government; they celebrate the Sabbath of the Christians, and worship with chaunts, the music of the organ, and sermons. Sir Moses Montefiore, backed by the Rothschilds, is about establishing a Jewish colony in Palestine, and has obtained an ukase from the Emperor Nicholas, authorising the emigration thither of ten thousand Russian Jews."³¹⁵

On 2 October 1866, on page 2, *The Chicago Tribune* reported that Rothschild wanted to rule the Jews and fulfill Messianic prophecy,

"REGENERATION OF THE HOLY LAND.

An important society has been formed in Europe called the 'International Society of the Orient,' to prevent the grave complications arising out of the Eastern question, and to regenerate the East by infusing therein the spirit of Western civilization. To accomplish this great result the Society, which

enrolls among its members such men as Napoleon, the Rothschilds and Montefiore, propose to favor the development of agriculture, industry, commerce and public works in the East, especially in Palestine; to obtain from the Turkish Government certain privileges and monopolies, chief of which is the gradual concession and advancement of the lands of Palestine; to distribute at cash prices such of those lands as the company receives, and to effect the colonization of the more fertile villages of the Holy Land.

The Society, after having established its commercial bureau at Constantinople and other cities of the Turkish Empire, will construct a port at Joppa, and a good road or railroad from that city to Jerusalem. Upon the north of this road the Society expect land to be conceded by Turkey, which they will sell to Israelitish families. These in their turn will create new colonies, aided by their Oriental co-religionists, and it is expected special committees will send thither Jews of Morocco, Poland, Moldavia, Wallachia, from the East, and from Africa. The Society claim that this plan will reconstruct the Holy places of Jerusalem in a Christian manner; put an end to the constant conflict between the great powers in reference to them; transform the ancient Jerusalem into a new and great city; create European colonies which will become in time the centres whence occidental civilization will spread in Turkey and penetrate to the remote Orient.

The Society is being rapidly formed, with the strongest influences, financial and political, at its back. The Rothschilds, Sir Moses Montefiore, and other great capitalists among the Jews, are actively in sympathy with the undertaking. The plan has also the favor of more than one crowned head in Europe, among them Napoleon, of whose especial theory of nationalities it is a development. Several prominent noblemen of England, and the leading names of the Faubourg St. Germain, are also among its friends.”

Mayer Anselm (Bauer), the founder of the Rothschild destiny, was a highly religious Jew and his father urged him to become a rabbi.³¹⁶ Mayer aimed higher and sought to become the Messiah, himself, a goal which he passed on to his descendants. On 8 April 1878, *The Chicago Tribune* reported, among other things, in an article “The House of Rothschild” on page 2,

“There is a popular idea that the Rothschilds dream of yet restoring the Temple and the City of Jerusalem. If so, events may even now be working to meet their views. They are all earnest in the faith of their fathers, and proved their Jewish convictions by breaking off all relations with the Roman Government after the abduction of the little Moriara.”

The Rothschild’s used prominent figures in the “Gentile” community, either “Shabbas Goys” or crypto-Jews, to spread the myth that the Jews were morally and intellectually superior to Gentiles, but were kind enough to condescend to lead the Gentiles. Meanwhile, the Rothschilds accumulated the wealth of the Gentile nations while deliberately destroying their culture, their countries and their genetics. Many

have alleged that there is a clear pattern in history, where one can observe that for two thousand years, Jews had preached liberalism to Gentiles as a means to remove barriers against Jewish access to immigration, then government, commerce, higher education and the media. Once in control of those organs of society, Jews have historically instituted the most tyrannical and illiberal of régimes. In a society in which the majority act morally, socially responsibly, and largely independently; a corrupt minority which acts immorally or amorally, considering only their perceived self-interests, and which works collusively—tribalistically to accumulate the wealth of nation and corrupt its media, government and universities, such a deceitful minority can easily overwhelm a society. When the success of Jewish tribalism led to Jewish assimilation, the Rothschilds promoted anti-Semitism as a means to segregate Jews from Gentiles and force the Jews to emigrate to another region, taking with them the wealth of the nation they had overwhelmed, and in some instances brought to ruins.

In 1883, Ernest Renan gave a philo-Semitic lecture. He was introduced by “Baron” Alphonse de Rothschild. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported on 25 June 1883 on page 7,

“THE FUTURE OF JUDAISM.

M. Renan Delivers a Panegyric of the Jews and Predicts a Realization of the Religion of Isaiah.

At a recent meeting of the society of Jewish Studies in Paris M. Ernest Renan, presented by the Baron Alphonse de Rothschild, delivered a remarkable lecture on the subject of the original identity and gradual separation of Judaism and Christianity. M. Renan predicted a great future for the Society of Jewish Studies, one clause of whose studies permits Gentiles to form part of the society. Doubtless Jewish studies belonged of right to the Jews; but they belonged also to humanity. Researches relative to the Israelite past interest all the world. All beliefs find in Jewish books the secret of their formation. The Bible has become the intellectual and moral nutriment of civilized humanity. The Jews have this incomparable privilege, that their book has become a book of the whole world—a privilege of universality which they share with the Greeks, a race which has imposed its literature on all centuries and all countries. M. Renan thanked the members of the Society of Jewish Studies for having admitted the Gentiles, like good Samaritans, to work along with them in a work that interests us all equally. Proceeding then to speak of the subject of his life’s study, the origins of Christianity, M. Renan said that those origins ought to be placed at least 750 years before Christ, at the epoch of the great prophets, who created an entirely new idea of religion, and under whose influence was definitively accomplished the passage from primitive religion full of unwholesome superstitions to pure religion. After the captivity, in the sixth century B. C., the dream of the prophet of Israel is a worship that might suit all humanity, a worship consisting in the pure ideal of morality and virtue—in short, the reign of

justice. This idea constitutes the great originality of the prophets; and the true founders of Christianity, according to M. Renan, were these great prophets, who announced pure religion, freed from all coarse material practices and observances, and residing in the disposition of the mind and heart—a religion, consequently, which can and ought to be common to all, an ideal religion, consisting in the proclamation of the kingdom of God upon the earth and in the hope of an era of justice for poor humanity.

M. Renan next proceeded to show that the first Christian generation is essentially Jewish. The epistles of St. James and St. Jude, representing the spirit of the first church, are altogether Jewish; St. Paul never thought of separating himself from the Jewish Church. The Apocalypse of St. John, composed about A. D. 68 or 69, is a Jewish book and the author is a passionate Jewish patriot. After the capture of Jerusalem comes the composition of the synoptical Gospels. Here there is a division, and yet Luke, the least Jewish of the evangelists, insists upon the fact that Jesus observed all the ceremonies of the law. Toward 75 or 80 A. D. many books were written inspired by Jewish patriotism, such the book of Judith, the Apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch, and even the book of Tobias. There is nothing more Jewish than the book of Judith, for instance, and yet these books are lost among the Jews and preserved only among the Christians, so true is it that the bond between the church and synagog was not yet broken when they appeared. In the epistles and Gospels attributed to St. John and written about A. D. 125, the case is altogether different. In them Judaism is treated as an enemy, and they contain symptoms of the approach of the systems that will lead the Christians to deny their Jewish origin, such gnosticism, for instance, which represents Christianity as being a reaction against Judaism and utterly opposed to it, while Marcion goes still further, and declares Judaism to be a bad religion which Jesus came to abolish.

M. Renan remarked the singularity of such an error having been able to manifest itself only a century after the death of Christ, but insisted on the fact that in the Christian church gnosticism was like a lateral stream to a river. In the second century the orthodox church always considered itself bound in the most intimate manner to the synagog. In the third century the schism becomes more pronounced under the influence of the school of Alexandria. Clement and Origen speak with much injustice of Judaism, and the separation becomes complete when, under Constantine, Christianity becomes a state religion and official, while Judaism remains free. And yet Chrysostom was obliged to rebuke his congregation for going to the synagog. Nevertheless, the separation really grows more and more profound; we enter the middle ages; the barbarians arrive, and then begins that deplorable ingratitude of humanity, become Christian toward Judaism. The crusades give the signal for the massacres of the Jews, while scholastic philosophy largely contributed to embitter the hostility against them.

Reviewing rapidly the condition of the Jews in France in the Middle Ages and subsequently, M. Renan arrived at 'a more consoling epoch, that

eighteenth century which proclaimed at length the rights of reason, the rights of man, the true theory of human society—that is to say, the State without official dogma, the State neutral in the midst of metaphysical and theological opinions. It is from that day that equality of rights began for the Jews. It was the revolution that proclaimed the equality of the Jews with the other citizens of the State. The revolution found here the true solution with a sentiment of absolute justice, and everybody will come around to this opinion.’ In point of fact, continued M. Renan, the Jews had themselves prepared this solution; they had prepared it by their past, by their prophets, the great religious creators of Israel. The founders of the movement were Isaiah and his successors, then the Essenians, these poetical ascetics who announced an ideal of peace, of right, and of fraternity. Christianity, too, has powerfully contributed to the progress of civilization, but Christianity was only the continuation of the Jewish prophets, and the glory of Christianity and the glory of Judaism are one. And now that these great things are accomplished, let us say with assurance, continued the speaker, that Judaism, which has done so much service in the past will serve in future. It will serve the true cause—the cause of liberalism of the modern spirit.”

The cause of Jewish “Liberalism” created the tyranny of the French, Russian, Chinese, Cambodian, Israeli, etc., Terrors. The cause of Jewish Liberalism slaughtered countless Europeans and Americans in the Nineteenth Century, and many millions more human beings in the Twentieth Century. It brought the world to world wars and to genocide. It is interesting to note, however, that when the Jews began to convert the Northern Europeans and the British to Judaism, which is to say, when the Jews began the Protestant cults, the racist Jewish concept of the “Elect” found in *Isaiah 65* and in the *Book of Enoch* and in the Jewish myth of the “chosen”—in contradiction to the “Universal” or Catholic Church—as well as the Jewish practices of wealth accumulation and sober studies, led the Puritans and Protestants to surpass their philosophical masters. This benefitted the Jews by spreading monotheism around the world and opening up markets and trade routes, but some Jews ultimately sought to eliminate the threat of Gentile world domination by reintroducing Jewish “Liberalism” in the form of Communism, which taught the Gentiles to self-destruct by degrading the practice of wealth accumulation and by degrading the Nationalistic pride inherent in the mythology of the “Elect” (*Isaiah 65*); both of which had worked so well for the Jews for thousands of years. They hoped that this Jewish Liberalism, imposed on the Gentiles, though not on the Jews, would have the same destructive effects on Gentile empires in the modern world, that it had on the Roman Empire in the ancient world.

One need only take a cursory look at the immensely destructive antisocial behavior of the Rothschilds to see that they were not a friendly guiding spirit to the Gentile nations. They caused the stock markets to crash in the “Black Fridays” of Wall Street in New York, as well as other financial calamities, in 1869, 1873, 1879, 1893, 1907, and 1929; in Prussia in the 1870's; in the “Black Friday” of Vienna in 1873; and in London after the battle of Waterloo—an event that began the large scale

emigration of German Jews to America, which increased after the Jewish-led revolutions of 1848. While tragic for the nations and for the world at large, these crashes netted the Rothschilds and their agents immense profits—profits made by destruction, not production—profits made without labor. The Rothschilds also deliberately caused wars and revolutions towards the same ends.

The Jewish bankers caused wars to make the peoples of the world clamor for world government, which they alleged could secure peace. Wars also made the Jewish bankers enormous profits and weakened the nations. The Jewish bankers deliberately caused chaos after the revolutions they instigated, in order to make peoples clamor for dictatorships, which the Jewish bankers argued would restore order—dictatorships the Jewish bankers covertly controlled—dictatorships which brought on wars and enabled the Jewish bankers to rob the wealth of the nation and ruin the people. The Jewish bankers deliberately caused depressions in America to make the people clamor for banking reforms which would enable the Jewish bankers to install a privately held central bank in control of the money supply. Depressions also made for wonderful buying opportunities for Jewish bankers.

On 2 June 1873, *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported on the front page in an article entitled “Vienna’s Black Friday”,

“Reading off the names of brokers and firms that failed to meet their engagements was like the call of the death-roll in the Reign of Terror. Many of the lighter stocks were swept out of the market. Austrian loans, railroad shares of the best companies, dropped 5, 10, 20, even 50 per cent. On Friday afternoon it seemed impossible to raise a loan on any security. The bears had things their own way. The branch house of Rothschild was accused of ‘bearing’ without mercy, and two of the firm narrowly escaped being lynched.”

Wherever a corrupt cabal controlled the disproportionate wealth the Rothschilds controlled, there was no chance for any individual, or even any government, or even any coalition of governments, to compete with them on a level playing field. The Rothschilds enjoyed a rigged system in which they could steal the wealth of nations at will, and could demand that nations engage in wars, win wars, and even lose wars, or face utter annihilation and death by starvation. Their fortunes eclipsed the wealth of any nation on Earth. Their fortunes eclipsed the wealth of many nations combined.

The Chicago Tribune made a point of pointing out that the Rothschilds had been war profiteers from the beginning of their financial empire, which was built in part on elicited profits gained by spreading the false rumor that the British had lost at Waterloo in order to buy shares at reduced prices, only to sell the next day at inflated prices, which netted the Rothschilds \$5,000,000 in one day, while throwing the British Nation into turmoil. The *Tribune* proved that the Rothschilds profited from the havoc they caused in the United States during the Civil War through the American representative of the Rothschild family,³¹⁷ Auguste Belmont—a crypto-Jew whose real name was August Schoenberg—the name “Schoenberg” becomes “Belmont” when translated into French, which sounds more *gentil* and Gentile.³¹⁸

While Schoenberg financed the South, the Seligmans (a. k. a. the “American Rothschilds”)³¹⁹ financed the North, and the country fought its bloodiest and most profitable war to date—against itself. The Rothschilds desired to divide America up between France and Great Britain.³²⁰ The North would join with Canada and return to the British Empire. The South would go to Mexico, which would in turn serve as a colony of France. The Rothschilds would then have a profitable division between Latin and French Catholics in the South, and Anglo-Saxon Protestants in the North. The Rothschilds could then use the model they had so successfully employed in Europe to create perpetual wars³²¹ between the North and South which would earn the Rothschilds immense profits, place both Empires further in the Rothschilds’ debt, and destroy the competitive threat that American finance posed. Bismarck, who had close contacts with Jewish finance, stated,

“The division of the United States into federations of equal force was decided long before the Civil War by the high financial powers of Europe. These bankers were afraid that the United States, if they remained in one block and was one nation, would attain economic and financial independence, which would upset their financial domination over Europe and the world. Of course, in the ‘inner circle’ of Finance, the voice of the Rothschilds prevailed. They saw an opportunity for prodigious booty if they could substitute two feeble democracies burdened with debt to the financiers, . . . in place of a vigorous Republic sufficient unto herself. Therefore, they sent their emissaries into the field to exploit the question of slavery and to drive a wedge between the two parts of the Union. . . . The rupture between the North and the South became inevitable; the masters of European finance employed all their forces to bring it about and to turn it to their advantage.”³²²

The Attorney General, then Secretary of War, then Secretary of State of the Confederacy—“the brains of the Confederacy”³²³—was a Jew named Judah Philip Benjamin, who was a close and enduring friend of Jefferson Davis.³²⁴ President Lincoln was assassinated by a Jewish actor named John Wilkes Booth—some say because Lincoln dared to oppose the desires of the Rothschilds to control American banking.³²⁵ Before Belmont (Schoenberg) helped the Rothschilds to foment the Civil War, the Bohemian Jew Isaac Phillips represented the Rothschilds’ interests in America.³²⁶ Later, John Pierpont Morgan, John Davison Rockefeller and “Colonel” Edward Mandell House served as the Rothschilds’ agents in America.³²⁷ Though their plan to divide America between North and South largely failed, after the Civil War the Rothschilds and their agents drew a steady profit from the American financial system. In an article entitled “Review of the Stock and Money Market for 1879”, *The Bankers’ Magazine and Statistical Register*, Volume 14, Number 8, (February, 1880), p. 635; reported,

“The great event of the year was, of course, the resumption of coin payments on the first day of January. It occurred without a jar or ripple and would have been unobserved if the public had not been constantly reminded of it by the

newspapers. The parity of paper and coin having been restored several weeks previously, no demand was made for coin. All anxiety on the subject was over in a day, and it was instinctively felt that an era of prosperity was ushered in. The sales of four per cents., under the offer for popular subscriptions, became so large that from January 1 to January 18, both inclusive, calls were issued for the redemption of \$90,000,000 of outstanding bonds at a higher rate of interest. On the 21st of January, the Treasury made an arrangement with a syndicate consisting of the following banking firms in London, viz.: Messrs. Rothschild, J. S. Morgan & Co., Morton, Rose & Co., and J. and W. Seligman & Co., for the exclusive sale in Europe of the United States four per cents. They took \$10,000,000 on that day, with the option, provided they took \$5,000,000 more monthly until July 1, of then having the entire balance (if any) of the loan, which, however, was to remain open until July 1 to popular subscription. The arrangement with this syndicate was regarded as settling the question of the ability of the Government to obtain all the money it might desire at four-per-cent. interest. The success of resumption, the large and continuous popular subscriptions to the four-per-cent. loan, and the syndicate arrangement of January 21, naturally caused a very buoyant feeling and a general upward tendency in the prices of bonds and shares dealt in at the Stock Exchange.”

On 29 March 1861, at the beginning of the Civil War, *The Chicago Tribune* reported on page 2, that Baron Rothschild had arrived in New Orleans,

“Arrival of Baron Rothschild at New Orleans.

The New Orleans *Picayune* of the 22d says:

Among the arrivals in this city yesterday by the steamship Cahawba, from Havana, was Baron Rothschild, of the distinguished family of that name in Paris, who is a guest of the St. Charles. Baron R. has been spending some weeks in Havana, where he was the object of many attentions on the part of the Captain General and other distinguished gentlemen of that city.”

The Rothschilds had been working toward a “race war” between Latin Catholics and Anglo-Saxon Protestants centered in Mexico and spreading to the United States, Canada, France, Great Britain, Austria and North Germany, at least since the time of the Civil War. The Rothschilds sought to weaken the United States by dividing it up. They funded both sides of the Civil War. McClellan needlessly prolonged the war, by refusing to attack and pursue the Confederates. The Rothschilds did not desire to end slavery, rather they desired to enslave Mexico and America, and to return the Americas to a colonial status and to embroil the Americas in perpetual war for the sake of Rothschild profits. On 10 June 1862, on page 3, *The Chicago Tribune* reported,

“FRANCE AND MEXICO.

THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE
EXPEDITION.
THE ACTUAL ATTITUDE OF THE
FRENCH GOVERNMENT.

New Mutterings of Intervention.

[New York Times Correspondent.]

PARIS, May 23, 1862.

The Mexican affair has assumed all at once at Paris a most serious aspect. Never before has the Emperor been attacked by the liberal press with such violence, or rather, with such an outspoken energy, as within the last few days, on this unfortunate Mexican expedition. It is the all-absorbing topic of the moment, and I cannot do better than to give you an *aperçu* of the situation, as we understand it here.

It so happens that, so far as regards the Press, the three papers which have thus far defended the cause of the rebellion in the United States, are exactly those which sustain the Almonte-Maximilian programme for Mexico; while the rest of the journals, with the exception of the Catholics, defend the cause of the Union in the United States, and combat the monarchical programme in Mexico. This striking concurrence in the division of views on the two subjects, indicates, beyond any question, that for the French there is an important connection between the two. It is this connection which gives the question its gravity.

For a long time the Emperor has dreamed of two things:

First—The acquisition of Sonora, with its gold and silver mines.

Second—The reconstruction of the Latin race, and the pitting of this race and Catholicism against the Anglo Saxon race and Protestantism.

The two governments of France and England, and no doubt of Spain also, did not believe till lately that there was any possibility of the suppression of the rebellion in the United States and the reconstruction of the Union. When, therefore, the treaty of London, of last year, in regard to the expedition to Mexico, was drawn up, it was drawn up with an almost complete indifference as to what the United States might think or do about it, and there is now every reason to believe that each of the contracting parties had ulterior views, which were not only concealed from the world, but from each other. The treaty was therefore drawn up in a loose and vague manner, so as to admit of deviations at will, so that each might seize upon whatever advantages offered themselves. And here I ought to recall, for its historical value, an observation made by Mr. Dayton nine months ago, and put upon record at the time in this correspondence, to the effect that, although the French government was full of kind and frank expressions towards the United States in connection with this Mexican expedition, yet that there seemed to be a vagueness and a confusion in their own understanding of the objects and the details of the expedition which foreboded no good to the future relations between France and the United States.

At the time of the arrival of the Soledad Convention at Paris there had been nothing done toward changing the belief of the French Government that a final dissolution of the Union was inevitable, and Napoleon is known at that time to have given Gen. Lorencez hasty and imperative orders to hurry on to the City of Mexico, without regard to consequences. Why? Because, the Government papers here now say, it was recognized as impossible to gain the objects of the expedition without displacing Jaurez from power and establishing in his stead a stable government, capable of offering, besides indemnity for the present, security for the future. And here is where the English and Spaniards deserted Napoleon, and where the great majority of Napoleon's own subjects also deserted him. They divided on the question of an interference in the internal affairs of Mexico, after having obtained satisfaction for the first objects of the expedition. It came out all at once that Napoleon had been serious in his secret transactions with Almonte at Paris, and that the plan of erecting a throne for an Austrian Prince was not an illusion. Knowing the mind of the Mexican people, the Allies and the Liberals of Paris naturally and legitimately jumped to the conclusion that the Emperor was bent on a conquest of the country, for that was the only condition on which he could maintain a foreign Prince in power, and that sooner or later it would terminate with an acquisition of territory and a war with the United States.

The news of the breaking up of the alliance at Orizaba arrived in Europe with that of the capture of New Orleans, and it is hard to tell which event caused most consternation at the Palace. For the first time the fact that the Southern Confederacy might possibly prove a failure, penetrated the short vision of the French Government; and now we believe that under the influence of these two events, the French Government has modified its intentions, and that it has sent to Mexico orders not to push matters to the extreme point at first designed.

The opposition press here has said to the Emperor: Your Mexican expedition, under the present aspect of the case, (that is to say, as an agent of the monarchial party,) is either an aberration or a scheme for the ransom of Venetia. If it be the first, comment is unnecessary—there is but one course to follow: withdraw as quickly as possible after securing what Mexico owes us; if it be the ransom of Venetia that is intended, permit us to suggest that a war with Austria in the quadrilateral will cost us infinitely less in time; men, money, and especially in honor, than a war with the United States.

The opposition press also points out with telling effect on the public mind the analogy which exists between the entrance of the allies into France in 1815, bringing with them the exiles who were selling their country in order to gain power for a minority. For whatever may be the faults of Juarez, he is fighting for his native country against the foreigner, which constitutes his patriotism—quite another thing to that of Almonte, Miramon and company.

As we understand the question then, to-day, Napoleon, at the moment he heard of the treaty of Soledad, gave to Gen. Lorencez instructions which

conveyed with them the perspective of a monarchy, a more or less permanent occupation, an acquisition of territory, and a strengthening of the Latin race in America. But the late Union victories have changed the programme, and by this time we have every reason to believe Gen. Lorencez has received a modification to his previous orders. But how far this modification extends no one knows or pretends even to conjecture. That the Emperor will renounce the monarchical programme is, however, generally believed, but whether, when his troops arrive at the capital, they will treat with Juarez or insist on putting Almonte into the Presidential chair before treating, is all in doubt. If Almonte is put into the chair provisionally, every one can see that then the reign of anarchy will only have commenced, and that the French will be obliged to remain to carry out their unfortunate programme by force. And yet, up to the present moment, the Ministerial papers here declare that it will be degrading to the dignity of France to treat with such a man as Juarez, and that such a thing cannot be thought of for a moment. But who can see the end if they go beyond Juarez? One step beyond him and everything is darkness and confusion. Every one in France seems to understand that, if the power of the Federal Government is again consolidated by the suppression of the rebellion, Mexico will at once occupy the attention of the United States, and that France cannot afford, for the benefit of an Austrian Duke and a score of Mexican exiles, to bring upon herself a war with the United States.

The Republicans in France, in view of this war with the United States, declare that it will bring with it the downfall of the Bonaparte dynasty, and they are quite elated at the prospect.

Among the persons who have been indicated as having used their influence with the Emperor since the commencement of the rebellion, in urging on the Sonora programme, are Messrs. Michel-Chevalier, Fould, Rouher, and De Rothschild. These gentlemen do not see why France should not make an acquisition of valuable gold mines—which, by the way, she much needs—as well as the United States.

As regards the more utopian scheme of reconstructing and strengthening the Latin and Catholic elements in America, some of the most influential imperialist writers of France have long been urging it. To these must be added a demented party not far removed from the Emperor's person, who dream of nothing less than setting up in America what has been repudiated in Europe—a nobility system, based upon the divine right, and which shall give an asylum and an occupation to the castoff kings and princes of Europe. They would have the Grand Duke Maxamilian or Ferdinand II., of Naples, placed on the throne of Mexico, surrounded by the European rejected princes, and this try to gain a new foothold for a system which is here growing weaker every day.

But the Emperor has generally shown great judgment in seizing the right side of questions as they pass before him, and great wisdom in retreating from mistaken positions, into which, like the ablest of men, he has sometimes fallen; and we have great confidence that he will yet, with the new light

which has broken in upon him from the United States, retire from Mexico before he has become so far entangled in the meshes that await him.

A new secession pamphlet is also just out, to which M. Marc de Haut, advocate at the Imperial Court, has put his name. It is entitled: *The American Crisis: its causes, probable results, and connection with France and Europe*. The pamphlet is but a repetition of several of those which have preceded it, and appears to prove that the secessionists think it necessary to keep certain arguments continually, in one form or another, before the public. The following are the stereotyped heads of arguments found in this book: Republics, when they grow too large, must divide. The Americans of the North are ancient English Puritans, sombre, intolerant, taciturn and commercial. The Southerners are descendants of the Cavaliers, grand, historical *seigneurs*, who love a large and free existence, who don't build workshops or counters, but furnish orators, statesmen and presidents. The sole cause of the dissolution of the Union is the tariff—slavery was only the pretext. The Yankees abandoned slavery in the Northern States, not from principle, but because free labor was more profitable in their climate. The proof of this is found in their well known antipathy to the person of the negro. The present struggle is one of free trade against protection. A reunion can never take place. And then the writer terminates with that funny appeal for the sympathy of the French—that the South is French. 'Does not,' he exclaims, 'the General-in-Chief of the Southern forces bear a French name—Beauregard? And what souvenirs do the following names of *Southern* towns recall to the French hear—Louisburg, Montmorency, St. Louis, Vincennes, Duquesne, New Orleans?'

Thus you will see that the French secessionists demand sympathy for the South because it is French, while, the other day, the London *Times* demanded the sympathy of the English for the South because it is English! We hope they will settle the question between them.

MALAKOFF."

This 1862 article is given credence by the fact that the French, under Rothschild's puppet Napoleon III, drove out Juárez in 1864 and made the Austrian Hapsburg Archduke Ferdinand Maximilian Joseph the Emperor of Mexico. Maximilian sought to improve Mexico for Mexicans and to improve Confederate-Mexican relations. This did not promote the race war that the Rothschilds wanted to foment between Mexico and America. The Rothschilds bankrupted Maximilian, and Mexico, and then reinstalled Juárez, who murdered Maximilian. It should be noted that in 1861 Juárez had provided the Rothschilds with the pretext for the initial French and British invasion of Mexico by failing to pay interest on Mexico's debts.

President Lincoln opposed the Rothschilds' designs on the American banking system. A Jewish actor named John Wilkes Booth assassinated Lincoln, and some claim the assassination was instigated by international bankers.³²⁸ After sponsoring a seemingly endless series of dictators and revolutions in Mexico, the Rothschilds, through their agent "Colonel" Edward Mandell House, again sought a major war

between Mexico and the United States in the Twentieth Century, which plan was spelled out in House's apocalyptic book *Philip Dru: Administrator*, B. W. Huebsch, New York, (1912).

On 30 October 1939, Congressman Thorkelson warned the American Congress that some Jews were out to destroy America with another world war and by seeding Mexico with Communist revolutionaries—an old Rothschild plan, which is still in the works and is a real and present danger to America's security,

“If House Joint Resolution 306, the present Neutrality Act, is passed as it is, it is my firm belief that such action on our part will bring about civil war in the United States, which may well terminate in the ultimate destruction of those in the invisible Government who sponsored this legislation and who are the silent promoters of the present war in Europe.

As the first step in consideration of this so-called Neutrality Act of 1939, please ask yourself, Who is it that wants war? It certainly is not the people that want war, and it is their wish that we must consider, as we are their Representatives in Congress.

Have any of your constituents asked you to vote for war, so that their children may be sent forth to drown in the Atlantic or die in the trenches of Europe? Are there any Members of Congress who want war? I do not believe so. Have you ever stopped to think, or have you tried to identify those whose greatest ambition is to aline this country in war on the side of England? I have not found anyone that wants war except those who harbor hatreds toward Hitler, and strange as it may seem, they are the same people who approved of Stalin.

Is it logical or reasonable that all Christian civilized nations, such as the United States, England, Canada, Australia, France, Germany, Austria, and other European nationalities, must engage in internecine conflict or war of extermination, so that this group of haters may get even with one man? Shall we sacrifice millions of our young men from 18 to 30 years of age to appease personal hatreds of a small group of international exploiters? I think not. I do not believe that there is any one person worth such sacrifice, whether he be king, prince, or dictator.

Let me now carry this argument a little further, for I want to call your attention to the fact that this same group that now hates Hitler was pro-German during the World War, and it is the same group that ruled and directed Germany's military machine before and during the World War. It is the same group that brought about inflation and exploited the German people, and it is the same group that furnished the money that brought about revolution in Russia and eliminated the Russian Army when its aid was needed to win the World War. This same group of internationalists paid and promoted the bloody invasion of Hungary, in which the invaders destroyed life and property with utter disregard for civilized warfare or even decency. It is this same group that has spread and nourished communism throughout the whole world and that sponsored the 'red' revolution in Spain. It is the

same communistic group which is now concentrated south of us in Mexico, waiting to strike when the time is ripe.

Please ask yourselves if you are justified in giving the President the power set forth in this Neutrality Act, and are you justified in repealing the arms-embargo clause, when you know it is for no other reason except to aline the United States with Gr€at Britain in another war as senseless as the World War. In considering this remember that there are no hatreds among the common people of the nations of the world, and for that reason no desire to destroy either life or property. Is it not tinie that we, the common people, learn a lesson—yes; a lesson in self-preservation instead of fighting for the ‘invisible government’? Let us marshal this personnel into an army of their own and ship them some place to fight it out among themselves. It will be a blessing to civilization.

This contemplated war will not save the world for democracy because we have that now in the fullest measure; it is fully entrenched within the Government itself and in many organizations. We need no further evidence of that than the recent exposé of the League for Peace and Democracy, with its many members employed in strategic positions within the Federal Government, to further the cause of democracy and communism. No; this war will not be fought for so-called democracy or communism, for it is here, and is an evil that we will eventually be called upon to destroy or else be destroyed by it.

If the present agitation in Europe should terminate in an active war, its purpose will be to place all Christian civilized nations under the domination of an international government that expects to rule the world by the power of money and the control of fools who sit in the chairs of governments. I do not believe this will happen here, for the people are too well informed about this evil blight that is keeping the world at odds, and which is spreading dissension and hatreds by confusion and international intrigue. Let us shake off this evil, put our shoulders to the wheel, and push the carriage of state back on the road to sound constitutional government. Do not forget, if attack comes, it will be delivered by the Communists within the United States and next by the Communists who are waiting beyond our borders. Let us, therefore, give undivided attention to the Communists within our midst, for they have no place within a republican government. We should not tolerate foreign or hyphenated groups that, for reasons best known to themselves, cannot or will not assimilate to become Americans. For our own preservation we must get rid of those who cannot subscribe to the fundamental principles of this Republic, as set forth in the Constitution of the United States.”³²⁹

Today, we again see the powerful forces of finance attempting to foment a war between Mexico and America. Some Mexicans are being duped into claiming the Southeastern United States as their national territory and agents of the warmongers are making outrageous statements so as to provoke Americans into an artificial animosity towards their Southern neighbors. It has always been in Americas best

interest to have a thriving and friendly southern neighbor, just as it has always profited America to have a stable and successful neighbor to the North, but Jewish interests have always oppressed the Mexican People and desire to stir up war and “racial” divisions on the North American Continent. Hardworking and good natured Mexicans are being blamed for all of America’s ills, as if they had such power to bite the hand that meagerly feeds them.

The American media are teaching Americans to hate, instead of help, the long suffering Mexican People. It would be far better for America to have Mexico as an industrious and well-educated ally, than as a Communist satellite of a Red China controlled by Jewish financiers. The issue of illegal Mexican immigration to the United States is also being promoted as a rallying cry for an American revolution, which would only result in further oppression of the American People and the destruction of the America economy. It is a trap created by Jewish bankers to ruin the North American Continent. Many of the same persons calling for war with Mexico and revolution in the United States of America are also calling for a return to the gold standard, which would earn the Jewish bankers incredible profits on their gold reserves, and ultimately yield them all the gold in the Americas and eventually the world. These people are wittingly or wittingly baiting the trap with the promise of an American Utopia if only the Mexicans could be chased out, the American Government destroyed and a gold standard instituted. There are no Utopias, and the solution to Americas problems, which are still slight compared to those of the rest of humanity, are education, industry and responsible nationalism.

The roots of Jewish finance in America reach back into the prehistory of the United States. The Polish-Jewish Masonic-Frankist Haym Solomon (*also*: Salomon) was one of the financiers of the American Revolution. Other Jewish Freemasons of the Revolutionary Period include one of the founders of the Scottish Rite in American Freemasonry in the 1760's, Moses Michael Hays (*also*: Hayes), as well as Stephen Morin, Isaac da Costa, Rabbi Moses Sexias, Joseph Myers, Abraham Forst and Solomon Bush.³³⁰ Many of these Jews, who brought with them the Frankist and Illuminati movements, were Bohemians. They were quite successful in America, and their descendants sponsored a wave of Jewish immigration to the United States in the European revolutionary period of 1848.³³¹ The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* writes in its article “Freemasons”,

“In the U.S. Jewish names appear among the founders of Freemasonry in colonial America, and in fact it is probable that Jews were the first to introduce the movement into the country. Tradition connects Mordecai Campanall, of Newport, Rhode Island, with the supposed establishment of a lodge there in 1658. In Georgia four Jews appear to have been among the founders of the first lodge, organized in Savannah in 1734. Moses Michael *Hays, identified with the introduction of the Scottish Rite into the United States, was appointed deputy inspector general of Masonry for North America in about 1768. In 1769 Hays organized the King David’s Lodge in New York, moving it to Newport in 1780. He was Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts from 1788 to 1792. Moses *Seixas was

prominent among those who established the Grand Lodge of Rhode Island, and was Grand Master from 1802 to 1809. A contemporary of Hays, Solomon *Bush, was deputy inspector general of Masonry for Pennsylvania, and in 1781 Jews were influential in the Sublime Lodge of Perfection in Philadelphia which played an important part in the early history of Freemasonry in America. Other early leaders of the movement included: Isaac da *Costa (d. 1783), whose name is found among the members of King Solomon's Lodge, Charleston, in 1753; Abraham Forst, of Philadelphia, deputy inspector general for Virginia in 1781; and Joseph Myers, who held the same office, first for Maryland, and later for South Carolina. In 1793 the cornerstone ceremony for the new synagogue in Charleston, South Carolina, was conducted according to the rites of Freemasonry."³³²

The Rothschilds made so much money from spreading war around the world, that by 1875 their wealth had eclipsed that of most nations, as *The Chicago Tribune* reported on 27 December 1875 on page 8,

“The Rothschilds.

New York Sun.

The combined capital of the Rothschilds is stated by Emile Burnouf, the well-known publicist, to have attained in the present year to the almost incalculable sum of seventeen billions of francs, or \$3,400,000,000. The significance of these stupendous figures may be rudely conceived by comparison, but there is nothing in the history of private wealth with which they can be compared. The capital of the Barings, the estates of Lord Dudley, the Marquis of Bute, and the head of the family of Grosvenor, belong relatively to a humble category, to which the City of New York has contributed the fortunes of Astor, Vanderbilt, and Stewart. The financial resources attributed to the Rothschilds can best be measured by contrasting them with the funded debts of the richest countries on the globe. The capital of this house, as estimated by M. Burnouf, is about equal to the whole funded debt of Great Britain, or that of France, and considerably exceeds the National debt of the United States. A single century, or the possible span of one man's life, has sufficed for the accumulation of this fortune, and the rise of its authors from a shabby rookery in Frankfort to the financial domination of Europe. At the period of Rothschild's first decisive triumph on the London Exchange—the day after Waterloo, just sixty years ago—John Jacob Astor was already a rich man. The great fortune which the latter bequeathed is not believed to exceed \$50,000,000, while the inheritance of his Hebrew contemporary has been swollen to more than sixty times that sum. Although its territories are not to be found on any map, and the names of its representatives are set off with no princely dignities, nevertheless the House of Rothschild must be reckoned among the foremost war-sustaining and world-compelling powers of the earth.”

The following article appeared in the “Foreign Affairs” section of the *National Repository, Devoted to General and Religious Literature, Criticism, and Art*, Volume 7, (February, 1880), pp. 168ff.,

“WHAT BARON ROTHSCHILD DOES FOR HIS FAVORITE HORSE.—It is not the fate of many to be a Rothschild. But there is many a poor man who will envy not only the rich bankers by that name, but even the horse the Baron Rothschild, of Vienna, has come to regard as his favorite. For the accommodation of this dumb, though attractive, animal he has had a special loose box built at the cost of twelve thousand dollars. This elegant room forms a part of a new stable which cost only eighty thousand dollars. It has marble floors, encaustic tiles painted by distinguished artists, rings, chains, and drain-traps of silver, and walls frescoed with splendid hunting scenes from the pencils of eminent animal painters. Fortunately, however, the baron’s annual income is \$1,600,000.”

The Rothschilds were loan sharks to the nations. They would run a nation into debt by provoking wars, or destroying economies, or talking leaders into self-ruin, then they would foreclose on the nations by demanding more wars—race wars, religious wars, economic wars, trade wars, vendetta wars, utterly senseless wars, etc. Many have alleged that the wars of Napoleon and most since, including both world wars, were brought about by the bankers to reap profits, and more significantly to fulfill Jewish prophecies and create a Jewish State in Palestine. Even France’s involvement in Algiers may have begun at the instigation of Jewish interests, on the pretext of an insult on the French Consul by the Dey in 1830. *The North American Review* wrote in 1845,

“The Moors seem to consider the Jews born to serve them and bear their wanton insults. The Moorish boys torment the Jewish children for pastime; and the men, with impunity, maltreat the male adults, and take the grossest liberties with the females. In 1804, many of them were subjected to horrible tortures in Algiers, merely because they had unsuspectingly lent money to certain political conspirators; and they were not released till they had paid an exorbitant ransom. In 1827, the Dey extorted from a rich Jew, by throwing him on some pretence into prison, 500,000 Spanish dollars. But the French occupation of Algiers has greatly improved the condition of this people in that country; and, in consequence, their numbers have increased by immigration.”³³³

Those Christian leaders who were traitors to their Gentile followers, encouraged their Christian believers to accept destruction and death as the fulfillment of prophecy, Jewish prophecy deliberately fulfilled by heartless and cruel Jewish leaders. These traitors instructed their gullible followers to see their own demise, for the sake of Jewish profits, as a beautiful and supernatural event. This has been going on in England at least since the time Cabalists brought Jews and Judaism to England

with the aid of “Christian” leaders including Oliver Cromwell and “Christian” propagandists including Isaac Newton and Samuel Clarke, who were Cabalist religious Jews who denied the Trinity, and who called on Christians to welcome the end of the world in apocalyptic horrors as if it would be a joyous event, an event which would enslave them to the Jews, destroy their nations, and give all of their wealth and power to a Jewish King under the false promise that a new world would emerge, a false promise on which they would never have to make good. This madness of self-destruction imposed on Christians by Jewish Zionists and their agents has culminated in the apocalyptic desires of Dispensationalist Christians, who slavishly promote the evils of Israel and eagerly await a nuclear holocaust which will destroy human life on Earth.³³⁴

Jews sought to be readmitted to England in order to profit from English wealth and trade, but also, as Menassah Ben Israel declared, to fulfill the prophecy that Jews would occupy the ends of the Earth (*Genesis* 12:3; 28:14. *Deuteronomy* 28:64-66. *Isaiah* 27:6; 49:6. *Jeremiah* 24:9). Jews felt they had to be readmitted to England before the Messiah could come, and that their readmission to England would herald the coming of the Messiah. Zionist Joachim Prinz wrote in his book *The Secret Jews*,

“After a year in London, ben Israel was granted an annual stipend of one hundred pounds. Although his mission had succeeded and his petition had provided Cromwell with the excuse he wanted to admit the Jews to England, ben Israel was disappointed. He had wanted a solemn declaration by the Lord Protector, or at least a meeting of Parliament, which would have recognized the religious, Messiah-oriented reasons why this should be done. He wanted a proclamation heralding the coming of the Messiah now that the prophecy of Daniel had been fulfilled.”³³⁵

A virtual confession of the Rothschild’s corruption, corruption that would spill oceans of blood in the Twentieth Century, appeared in *The Chicago Daily Tribune* on 27 June 1880 on page 9, where a plan is laid out for the First and Second World Wars:

“MODERN PALESTINE.

ANCIENT JUDEA TO BE CONVERTED INTO A JEWISH COLONY.

The Cologne *Gazette* of a recent date says that among the Orthodox Israelites and Christians unfriendly to the Israelites this has always been a favorite cry: ‘Palestine for the Jews!’ and has gained strength in proportion as the power of the present political ruler over the ‘beloved land’ wanes away. The English preacher, Nugee, who has interested himself in this matter, expounded on the 14th of the month, in a public lecture, a plan which of late has assumed a practical shape. The Englishman, Oliphant, has laid the plan before the Sultan. It is that the land of Gilead and Moab, embracing the whole territory of the Israelitish tribes of Gad, Reuben, and Mannasseh, shall be converted into a Jewish colony, the Sultan being paid in cash for the

territory, a proposition which the Sultan has already favorably entertained. Still more, Goschen, the recently-appointed Ambassador Extraordinary of England, at Constantinople, has expressed himself as well disposed toward the furtherance of the plan. The territory in question embraces about 1,500,000 English acres, and is at present inhabited only by nomadic tribes. The colony is to remain subject to the Turkish power, while yet its immediate Governor is to be an Israelite. In this manner Judaism is to regain a firmer foothold in its own land, and the colony itself ultimately become a rallying point for the scattered people of Israel, around which it is hoped an ever-broadening girdle of new settlements will form itself. The purchase money for the territory of the new colony is to be contributed by the freewill offerings of patriotic Israelites. Two railroads or highways are to be built, the one ascending from Jaffa to Jerusalem, the other extending from Haifa to the further side of the Jordan. Sir Moses Montefiore has already interested himself in these significant enterprises, furnishing material aid for the same. For the construction of the road to Jaffa the Turkish Government has already made a concession, with the proviso that work shall be commenced upon it by next January at the farthest. Still further, the construction of a ship canal from the Mediterranean to the Gulf of Akabe and the Red Sea is contemplated. Palestine is again to be reopened, under the influence of the ideas of the nineteenth century, if only the Jews themselves are ready with their contributions and their settlements for their own land.'

Another paper, also, the London *Times*, has the following: 'A negotiation is said to be on foot between the members of the house of Rothschild and the venerable Sir Moses Montefiore on the one hand, and the Ottoman Government on the other, for the cession, under certain conditions, of the Holy Land. The Ottoman Government is already at its last gasp, for want of ready money. The Jewish race wish a '*habitat*' of their own. As the Greeks, though a scattered people, living for the most part in Turkey, have a Greek Kingdom, so the Jews wish to have a Hebrew Kingdom. This, it will be remembered, is the leading idea of George Eliot's *Daniel Deronda*.' Few persons, and probably the gifted authoress herself not more than others, imagined that the dream of the Mordecai of those pages was in the least degree likely so soon to be realized. Information as to the nature of the new Jewish State, whether it is to be theocratic or royal, is uncertain, but the arrangements in reference to it are in progress. Prophecies have a way of fulfilling themselves, more especially when those who believe in them are possessed of the sinews of Government. The day when 'the Dispersed of Israel' are to be gathered into one is confidently looked forward to, not only by Hebrews, but by multitudes of Christians. The author of '*Alroy*' would be gathered to his fathers in greater peace, were he permitted under his Administration to see this day and be glad. Superstitious persons, who think that the end of the world is to be preceded by the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, will be inclined to lend serious belief to Mother Shipton's prophecy that this earth is to see its last days in 1881.'

These extracts are significant, and specimens of long articles that have appeared of late in the European press, secular as well as religious. Whatever some people may think of prophecy, it is clear that a grand movement is on foot for the regeneration of Palestine. The 'Holy Land' looms up with every agitation of the Eastern question, and is, in fact, its central point. As to population, Jerusalem has now 20,000 Jews, a larger number than the Turks and Christians combined, not to name the Russian colony outside. Forty years ago, the population was only 300, and only within ten years was it allowed outside the Ghetto. The Jewish population of Palestine is greater today than ever since the Roman expulsion. Andree and Pescher's 'Statistical Atlas' puts the sum total of Jews in the world at 7,000,000, the number in Solomon's time. In Europe the Latin group of Jews is 89,000; the Teutonic 842,000; the Slavonic, 4,047,000; in all 4,978,000. In Asia there are 800,000. In Africa, 600,000. The figures 150,000 for the United States are far too low.

The interest in Palestine is shown by the International Exploration Society. Its 'Great Map of Palestine,' drawn on a scale of one inch to a mile, will surpass all others, and, under the direction of the British Ordnance Survey Department, will show 'every detail of ruin and village, ancient and modern, aqueducts, plantations, roads, dells, synagogues, tombs, temples, castles, forts, Crusading and Saracenic, wadies, fountains, seas, mountains, rivers, plains, springs, and wells.' The preparation is extensive, and the progress has already begun. Jewish synagogues and hospitals are multiplied. The German Jews have already sixteen charity institutions and twenty-eight congregations. The tide of immigration is setting in strongly, and the appointment of Midhat Pasha as Syrian Governor gives promise of brighter days for Palestine. A Venetian Jew has given 60,000 francs for the establishment of an agricultural school in the Plain of Sharon, and Baron Albert de Rothschild has just guaranteed to the ex-Mayor of Jerusalem a large pecuniary contribution for the construction of the Jaffa-Jerusalem Railroad. The *South German Wochenblatt* reminds its readers that the great banking-house of the Rothschilds, at the time of the last loan of 20,000,000 francs to Turkey, accepted as security a mortgage on Palestine, and adds that 'as it is impossible for a bankrupt State, like Turkey, to pay back the money, the Israelites may now count upon their return to the Land of Promise as a certainty.'

A proposition is now under discussion, since a concession has been made to the French for the Euphrates Valley Road, to make a junction between the latter from the old provinces of Assyria to Jerusalem the plan of Gen. Sir Frederick Goldsmid, a Jew whose munificence to the Turkish Jews is so well known, and whose distinguished relative, Francis Goldsmid, a few years ago acted as reference in the question of the Persia and Afghanistan boundary. The interpreters of prophecy in reference to Israel's future have quoted Isaiah, chapter xix., 23, as a prediction whose fulfillment this enterprise seems to favor in some way. The text is this: 'In that day there shall be a highway out of Egypt to Assyria, and the Assyrian shall come into Egypt,

and the Egyptian into Assyria, and the Egyptians shall serve with the Assyrians.' It is thought to foreshadow a tripartite alliance between Israel, Egypt, and Assyria, in the future of the Hebrew races, when converted. Then the next verses are quoted: 'In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land, whom the Lord will bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel my inheritance.' It is agreed that no alliance has ever yet taken place.

The usual objection that Palestine is incapable of supporting a dense population is set aside by the testimony of the late United States Consul-General, who writes from Jaffa: 'An abundant supply of water could be brought to the city from the pools of Solomon, were it not that all efforts are thwarted by the Moslem rulers. The land of Palestine is extremely productive, and were colonies planted here, as they are in Australia, New Zealand, and the United States, there is no reason to doubt their success.' Arnold, the celebrated historian, who traveled over it, says, 'The old abundance is still sleeping in the soil of Palestine, and it needs not any miracle, but industry, to bring back the wealth and beauty of the early ages of the Hebrew Monarchy.'

What adds interest to the Jewish question is the discoveries made by scholars of the whereabouts of the lost 'Ten Tribes,' or the tribes of the Northern Kingdom, carried away by Shalmaneser, a century before the Babylonian exile of Judah, the Southern Kingdom. It seems to be established that the Jews in Afghanistan and in the Caucasus, and those in China, with the 200,000 Falashas in Abyssinia, are all descendants from the Ten Tribes. The wonderful increase, too, of Mohammedanism, outstripping Christianity the last ten years as a proselyting religion, and the growing belief of orthodox Moslems that the decay of the Ottoman power is a sign of the end of the world and the judgment day, attract attention. The special interest Englishmen take in the whole question is very marked. Politically, what England wants is a strong power in Syria to protect the Alexandrian Road and Suez Canal from Russian assault. Jewish nationality would solve that problem, provided England had the protectorate. This involves the dispossession of the Turks and overthrow of their Government, and a conflict of nations for the possession of Palestine and dominion of the East and the world. That means a general Asiatic, European, and African struggle, with Jerusalem the objective. This, too, is interesting. With Egypt and Greece already existing, if diplomacy erects Syria and Thrace into two separate Kingdoms, then modern history reproduces the four Kingdoms into which Alexander's Empire was broken up, and points to Syria as the spot where the last enemy of the Jews appear in the last struggle. Out of Syria, Antiochus Epiphanes came, and it is thought that out of Syria, again, according to the prophecy of Daniel, in his eleventh chapter, the last Anti-christ will arise. The discussions in the press and magazines are many and full of interest. One of England's Bishops has just said: 'If ever the question is raised, and it may

be raised very soon, Shall the Jews be inducted into their patrimonial land as tenants at will? no matter by whom the proposition is made, or for what purpose,—even hostile to England,—it will be England’s duty not to oppose but to assist, or at least permit Israel to be restored, unconverted.’ This is the general tone of Christendom. The ‘Reformed Jews’—i. e., the Rationalists—are laughing, or mocking.”

The Rothschilds owned the Pope and Rome. The question naturally arises whether the Pope was simply reckless with the finances of the Church, or if he was an agent of Rothschilds, who intentionally ran up the debts of the Church. The Jews had always believed that the Kings, Queens, Princes and Princesses of the Gentiles, in other words, all Gentile leaders are destined to be the Jews’ obedient slaves. *Psalm* 18:40-50 states,

“40 Thou hast also given me the necks of mine enemies; that I might destroy them that hate me. 41 They cried, but *there was* none to save *them: even* unto the LORD, but he answered them not. 42 Then did I beat them small as the dust before the wind: I did cast them out as the dirt in the streets. 43 Thou hast delivered me from the strivings of the people; *and* thou hast made me the head of the heathen: a people *whom* I have not known shall serve me. 44 As soon as they hear *of me*, they shall obey me: the strangers shall submit themselves unto me. 45 The strangers shall fade away, and be afraid out of their close places. 46 The LORD liveth; and blessed *be* my rock; and let the God of my salvation be exalted. 47 *It is* God that avengeth me, and subdueth the people under me. 48 He delivereth me from mine enemies: yea, thou liftest me up above those that rise up against me: thou hast delivered me from the violent man. 49 Therefore will I give thanks unto thee, O LORD, among the heathen, and sing *praises* unto thy name. 50 Great deliverance giveth he to his king; and sheweth mercy to his anointed, to David, and to his seed for evermore.”

Psalm 72:8-11,

“8 He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. 9 They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him; and his enemies shall lick the dust. 10 The kings of Tarshish and *of* the isles shall bring presents: the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. 11 Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him.”

Isaiah 49:23 states,

“And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee *with their face toward* the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet; and thou shalt know that *I am* the LORD: for they shall not be ashamed that wait for me.”

Micah 17:16-17,

“The nations shall see and be confounded at all their might: they shall lay *their* hand upon *their* mouth, their ears shall be deaf. 17 They shall lick the dust like a serpent, they shall move out of their holes like worms of the earth: they shall be afraid of the LORD our God, and shall fear because of thee.”

One can imagine how quickly the Rothschilds could seize power over Europe and the world if they placed monarchs, heads of state, and church leaders in power, who were their agents, and who intentionally ran up their nations’ debts and deliberately brought their nations into wars, and into ruin. There are various means to gain control over a leader: threats, blackmail, bribery, flattery, fame, megalomania, messiah complex, etc. A leader may also be placed in power who already has allegiance to a specific cause due to his or her ethnicity, family history, etc. Once a sovereign of one sort or another is controlled and creates debts which are not paid by the wealthy, but by the comparatively poor, those poor must slave forever to pay off those debts. Not only do the immensely wealthy earn the interest on the debt, that interest accrues to monies which were never truly taxed—this while the immensely wealthy disproportionately reap the benefits of citizenry. It was important to the Rothschilds to not only accrue wealth, but also to prevent Gentiles from accruing wealth and thereby gaining control over their own destinies.

The Chicago Tribune reported on 27 February 1867 on page 2,

“The Rothschilds of Rome.

[Rome Correspondence of the London News.]

Who, whether he has set foot in the Eternal City or no, has not heard of the Torlonias—the Rothschilds of Rome? In the course of last summer, when the monetary crisis here was at its height, Don Alessandro Torlonia—the acting head of the house—won extraordinary popularity by writing a letter to the Pope, in which he offered to buy up the unconvertible Government paper, and substituting a metal currency in its place, providing that the existing managers of the Roman Bank, with Cardinal Antonelli’s brother at their head, were sent about their business, and the direction confided to himself. At that time it was quite impossible to get notes converted into coin at any price for the simple reason that there was no coin in the bank. Even now, when things have improved somewhat, it is with the utmost difficulty that you can get change for a scudi note, even at shops in the Corso, and there is not a hotel keeper or a tradesman in Rome who would even look at a five scudi note if you were sufficiently ignorant of the state of things here to present it in payment in the expectation of getting any change out. Of the small pieces of silver, which you obtain with no little difficulty, many are so worn and thin that they seem in a sort of transition state between silver and paper, and have long since lost all trace of any image or superscription whatever.

So rolling in wealth is Don Alessandro Torlonia that his riches are

admitted to be literally untold, and only this much is known certain, that everything in Rome worth having, except the Pope and St. Peter's, already belongs to him. No wonder then that at the Vatican Don Alessandro should be looked upon as a hardly less dangerous character than Victor Emanuel himself, and that the insulting offer which he made last summer to buy up the Holy Father, and add him so his possessions, should have been decidedly rejected, though it had not entailed the removal of an Antonelli from a lucrative place. On his first appearance in public after making the above mentioned patriotic offer, Don Alessandro received such an ovation as has not been witnessed in Rome since those of which Pius IX. was himself the object, when he gave the first impulse to the Italian Revolution in 1846. This Don Alessandro is the same Torlonia who risked his whole fortune on the gigantic enterprise of draining the Fucine Lake, the issue of which struggle with nature was so long doubtful that it became a common saying in Rome, 'Either Torlonia will drain the Fucine Lake, or the Fucine will drain Torlonia.' In the end, however, Torlonia got the better of the lake, and redeemed about one hundred thousand acres of land for cultivation. Over what was a few years ago a barren waste of waters, flourishing crops may now be seen waving every harvest time, and with last year's produce Don Alessandro had a scheme of feeding the now almost starving Roman people by selling them bread of his own baking at a reduced rate. Such, at least, was the account of the story given me by a patriotic and exceedingly liberal Roman, who made a severe case against the Government out of the stoppage of Torlonia's extensive bread baking-by-machinery works, which threw some two hundred workmen out of employment just a fortnight ago. I am bound, however, to add that, on proceeding to the spot and making inquiries, I learned quite a different version of the affair, entirely exculpating the Government from any direct interference in the matter. Only this much is certain, that the works are stopped, and that the Roman people stand little chance, at present, of getting their bread at reduced rates."

On 2 June 1867, *The Chicago Tribune* reported on page 3,

"THE ROTHSCHILDS AND THE POPE.

For fifteen centuries the Jews have been cursed by the Pope, and persecuted by the Roman Church. There is no more revolting chapter of horrors in history than that of the treatment of the Jews at the hands of the Pontiffs. In all lands where the Roman religion is dominant the children of Israel have been treated with barbaric rigor—allowed few privileges, denied all rights, looked upon as a people accursed of God, and set apart by divine ordination to be trampled upon by the church. In Rome, at the present day, the Jews are confined to the Ghetto; they are not allowed to set up a shop in any other part of the city; they cannot leave the city without a permit; they can engage only in certain trades; they are compelled to pay enormous taxes into the Papal treasury; they are subject to a stringent code of laws established

by the Pope for their special government; they are imprisoned and fined for the most trivial of offences. They cannot own any real estate in the city; cannot build or tear down or remodel any dwelling or change their place of business, without Papal permission. They are in abject slavery, with no right whatever, and entitled to no privileges, and receive none, except upon the gracious condescension of the Pope. In former times they were unmercifully whipped and compelled to listen once a week to the *Christian* doctrine of the priests. But time is bringing changes. The Pope is in want of money; and the house of the red shield has money to lend on good security. The house is always ready to accommodate Governments. Italy wants money, so she sells her fine system of railroads to the Rothschilds. The Pope wants money, and he sends his Nuncio to the wealthy house of the despised race, offers them security on the property of the church, the Compagna, and receives ten million dollars to maintain his army and Imperial State. That was in 1865. A year passes, and the Pontifical expenditures are five million more than the income, and the deficit is made up by the Rothschilds, who take a second security at a higher rate of interest. Another year has passed and there is a third great annual vacuum in the Papal treasury of six million, which quite likely will be filled by the same house. The firm can do it with as much ease as your readers can pay their yearly subscription to the weekly *Journal*. When will the Pope redeem his loan at the rate he is going? Never. Manifestly the day is not far distant when these representatives of the persecuted race will have all the available property of the Church in their possession. Surely time works wonders.”

On 24 December 1893, *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported, on page 6,

“INCOME AND EXPENSES OF THE POPE.

**Economy Necessary Because of the Continual
Decrease in the Revenues.**

Since the heavy losses made by the Pope a year or more ago the finances of the Vatican have been superintended with great care. ‘It is known,’ says a Paris paper, ‘that a committee of prelates and several Cardinals exists at Rome whose duty it is to regulate the use of the sums of money which flow into the treasury of the Vatican. These sums come principally from two sources: The revenues of the property possessed by the Pope and the gifts of the faithful, known as Peter’s Pence. The property of the Vatican is of various kinds, but the greater part of it consists of money or bonds, placed in England and France, under control of the Paris house of Rothschild. Peter’s Pence is an annual revenue which far from being fixed. In good years the total of the sum received from all countries of the world reaches 8,000,000 francs. Sometimes it is as low as 6,000,000 and even 5,000,000. This has been the case for the last five years. This diminution is due, in great part, to the discord between the Royalists and the French Catholics produced by the republican policy of the Pope. France alone furnished two-thirds and often

three-quarters of Peter's Pence. And in France it is the royalists who prove themselves most generous. But since the adhesion of Leo XIII. to the republic many of them, more Royalist than Catholic, have closed their purses to the Pope. However, despite all this, French Bishops still forward the largest sums to his Holiness. Thus, the Bishop of Nante sent a few days ago 100,000 francs from his flock as their gift to the Vatican treasury.

'Italy,' adds the *Journal*, 'contributes only a small part of the revenue—a few hundred thousand francs a year. The Romans show themselves in this regard less generous than other Italians. On the other hand, the Anglo-Saxon countries—England, Ireland, Australia, and the United States—begin to send important sums. If Catholicism continues to grow in these countries, it is easy to see that in time the Vatican will draw considerable sums from them.

'Again, there are the royal courts, such as that of Austria, which send annually rich presents to the Pope. This is even true of princes of ancient Italian families. Francis II., ex-King of Naples, and Maria Theresa, formerly Grand-Duchess of Tuscany, never fail to send their offerings, which consist of several thousands of francs. The Comte de Chambord was accustomed to give annually 50,000 francs; the Count of Paris sends the same sum.

'The expenses of the Vatican,' continues the writer, 'amount annually to more than 7,000,000 francs. They are regulated as follows: for the personal wants of the Pope, 500,000 francs; for the Cardinals, 700,000; for poor dioceses, 400,000; administration of the Vatican, 1,800,000; Secretary of State, 1,000,000; employés and ablegates, 1,500,000; support of schools and poor, 1,200,000.

'The Cardinals at Rome live at the expense of the Pope. The income of each from this source is at least 22,000 francs. The Secretary of State is charged with upholding relations with foreign governments by the mediation of nuncios. The four most important—Paris, Vienna, Madrid, and Lisbon—each receive an allowance of 60,000 francs a year.

'The last jubilee of Pope Leo XIII. brought to the Vatican 3,000,000 francs. At the first, celebrated five years ago, 12,000,000 francs were received. In the course of years the Pope has introduced a number of economies in the different branches of the Vatican service, and for that reason he has been called miserly. This accusation is not merited; the economies became necessary in a State whose expenses are considerable and whose revenues continue to diminish. Leo XIII. has many reasons to follow the example of his illustrious predecessor, Sixtus, as it is difficult in the present time to count on the generosity of the faithful.'"

There was even talk of making the Pope, who was owned by the Rothschilds, the King of Palestine, thereby making Rothschild King of Palestine by proxy; and, in the minds of Protestants, making the Pope the anti-Christ. This would have enabled the Rothschilds to take Palestine from the Turkish Empire, install the Pope as King, and then unseat him as the "anti-Christ" and replace him with the allegedly "neutral" Jewish Kingdom of the Rothschild dynasty. *The Chicago Tribune* reported on 4 June

1887 on page 5,

“The Pope for King of Palestine.

VIENNA, June 3.—The *Algemeine Zeitung* mentions that a project is hinted at to make the Pope the King of Palestine under a guarantee of protection on the throne by all the Catholic Powers.”

The Catholics gave their money to the Popes, who gave it the Catholics’ enemies, the Rothschilds to finance the destruction of Catholicism via Christians who had been essentially converted to Judaism *viz.* Protestantism, and the anti-Catholic Jewish press. Numerous European nations ran themselves into debt fighting wars and the only beneficiaries were the bankers and arms manufacturers—the Rothschilds gave the monarchies some wealth to flatter them and control them, then the Rothschilds betrayed them and destroyed them. Continually, the ultimate progress of European nations, and their colonies, and their former colonies, was impeded in ways that profited rich Jews, rich Jews who quietly pretended to the throne of Israel in the diaspora, while doing little for their “subjects”, the millions of impoverished Jews struggling in *Schtetels*.

It should, however, be noted that Jews often concealed their wealth and had a love for jewels and gold, because, among other reasons, they were easy to transport at a moment’s notice. Many of the Jews who appeared impoverished were in fact wealthy, and the numerous accounts of Jews miraculously becoming wealthy in America are doubtful. In 1845, *The North American Review* wrote,

“Indeed, throughout the East, the Jews are obliged to affect poverty, in order to conceal their wealth; what is exposed to view is never safe from Mohammedan rapacity. Though the great majority of those in Palestine are poor and dependent, some may be found there in comfortable circumstances, or even rich; but their wealth appears to those only who gain their intimacy. Dr. Richardson, an English traveller, says, ‘In going to visit a respectable Jew in the Holy City, it is a common thing to pass to his house over a ruined foreground, and up an awkward outside stair, constructed of rough, unpolished stones, that totter under the foot; but it improves as you ascend, and at the top has a respectable appearance, as it ends in an agreeable platform in front of the house. On entering the house itself, it is found to be clean and well furnished the sofas are covered with Persian carpets, and the people seem happy to see you.’ The synagogues in Jerusalem are, from prudential motives, both small and mean. A Jew dares not set foot within the Holy Sepulchre. When, in 1832, the Egyptian troops occupied Palestine, the Jews did not find their condition in the least improved. The common soldier made the best Jew sweep the streets, or perform any menial office.”³³⁶

In an article entitled “The Jews”, *The Knickerbocker; or New York Monthly Magazine*, Volume 53, Number 1, (January, 1859), pp. 41-51, at 44-45, 48, wrote,

“Yet the Jews of the Ottoman Empire, notwithstanding their degradation, exhibit a certain intellectual tendency. They live in an ideal world, frivolous and superstitious though it be. The Jew who fills the lowest offices, who deals out *raki* all day long to drunken Greeks, who trades in old nails, and to whose sordid soul the very piastres he bandies have imparted their copper haze, finds his chief delight in mental pursuits. Seated by a taper in his dingy cabin, he spends the long hours of the night in poring over the Zohar, the Chaldaic book of the magic Cabala, or, with enthusiastic delight, plunges into the mystical commentaries on the Talmud, seeking to unravel their quaint traditions and sophistries, and attempting, like the astrologers and alchymists, to divine the secrets and command the powers of Nature. ‘The humble dealer, who hawks some article of clothing or some old piece of furniture about the streets; the obsequious mass of animated filth and rags which approaches to obtrude offers of service on the passing traveller, is perhaps deeply versed in Talmudic lore, or aspiring, in nightly vigils, to read into futurity, to command the elements, and acquire invisibility.’ Thus wisdom is preferred to wealth, and a Rothschild would reject a family alliance with a Christian prince to form one with the humblest of his tribe who is learned in Hebrew lore.

The Jew of the old world, has his revenge:

‘THE pound of flesh which I demand of him
Is dearly bought, is mine, and I will have it.’

Furnishing the hated Gentiles with the means of waging exterminating wars, he beholds, exultingly, in the fields of slaughtered victims a bloody satisfaction of his ‘lodged hate’ and ‘certain loathing,’ more gratifying even than the golden Four-per-cents on his Princely loans. Of like significance is the fact that in many parts of the world the despised Jews claim as their own the possessions of the Gentiles, among whom they dwell. Thus the squalid *Yeshir*, living in the Jews’ quarter of Balata or Haskeni, and even more despised than the unbelieving dogs of Christians, traffics secretly in the estates, the palaces and the villages of the great Beys and Pachas, who would regard his touch as pollution. What, apparently, can be more absurd? Yet these assumed possessions, far more valuable, in fact, than the best ‘estates in Spain,’ are bought and sold for money, and inherited from generation to generation.

The Jewish population of Egypt numbers not more than ten thousand souls, of whom nearly seven thousand live in Grand Cairo. Though now undisturbed in the practice of their faith, the oppressive exactions of the Government, and the fear of renewing the persecutions of former times, have taught them to dissimulate. Dressing in filthy rags, and living in houses of the meanest external appearance, they strive to seem even more wretched than they are in reality, so as not to invite taxation.”

Jews boasted of their power in terms that Jewish racists would call “anti-Semitic” when stated by Gentiles. Jewish influence circumvented any democratic hopes that Europeans had in the Nineteenth Century and hindered the Continent with endless wars that ultimately only served the perceived self-interests of Jews. Rich Jews beat the drums for war in their newspapers, profited from wars in the markets, and brought about wars through their corrupt influence over politicians, church leaders and monarchs. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported on 13 May 1877 on page 3,

“Jews in European Politics.

London Public Leader (Jewish Organ).

The London *Examiner* last week announced that a Berlin firm of publishers intended issuing next winter a work entitled ‘The Political Influence of the Jewish Race in Europe.’ Our contemporary observes that, ‘leaving out of consideration the power of Lord Beaconsfield (Disraeli) in English, and of M. Gambetta in French, politics, and the growing Hebraic dominance in Russia, particularly in cities like Odessa, Germany itself would hardly have been the Germany of to-day but for the exertions with pen and tongue of such Liberal politicians as Jacoby, Sonneman, and, above all, Edward Lasker, the ‘natural leader,’ of the National Liberals.’ This is a poor summary of the political influence of the Jews in Europe, especially the production of M. Gambetta as an example of their influence in French politics. There are many more Jewish politicians in France of much greater importance, prominent amongst them are MM. Cremieux and Jules Simon. Austria has been entirely forgotten by our contemporary, notwithstanding that the revolution which necessitated the flight of Metternich was organized and led by Jews, and that amongst the most popular members of the Austrian Parliament are such Jewish statesmen as Hirsch and Kuranda. Then again the Italian Assembly contains several Jewish members, whose opinions are of great weight, and the city of Rome itself—the stronghold of that power which, throughout long ages, attempted the extermination of the Jews—numbers amongst its legislative representatives a Jew born and partly reared in the Roman Ghetto. Whilst we are on this subject, we cannot help remembering the enormous political power wielded by the Jews through the medium of the continental press. In Germany and Austria the majority of papers belong to Jews, and the most brilliant journalists are Children of Israel: and then—finis coronat opus—where in the *Examiner*’s short summary is a mention of the influence of the Rothschilds? The political power of this family can hardly be estimated. It reminds us of an anecdote told of the wife of old Meyer Anselm Rothschild, which is sufficient to illustrate it. To her dying day she lived in the Ghetto of her forefathers in Frankfort, and attained such an age that she saw her sons rise to the position of the greatest financiers in the world. She never renounced her old gossips, and one day, in 1830, one of her friends came to her and told her that her son was ordered to join the military and might be killed in the impending war. ‘Be comforted,’ answered Madame Rothschild, in the homely patois of her

district, 'I will tell my sons not to give the Princess money, and then they will not be able to go to war.'"

War and the revenge of the Jews against the Christians were common themes when discussing the Rothschilds in the Nineteenth Century. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported on 28 December 1873 on page 16,

“Character of the Rothschilds.

The four original houses remain, though they have agencies and interests in all the leading cities of Europe, Asia, and Africa, as well as North and South America. They have belted the globe with their operations, and are in the fullest sense universal and cosmopolitan bankers. For generations they have been Barons, and the title is hereditary in their family. Since the death of old Mayer Anselm, they have added the distinguishing *de* and *von* to their names, and are as far removed from democratic affiliations and sympathies as if it were a thousand instead of a hundred years since their ancestors counted kreutzers and old [???] in the Judengasse of Frankfort. They have always been devoted to their theological [???], and strict in observing all the forms of the synagogue. They are not without superstition in their creed, believing that much of their good fortune has come from their unswerving fidelity to Judaism. Their charities to their coreligionists have been many and liberal. They have endowed schools, built hospitals, and funded almshouses. Their attachment to their ancient form of worship is noble and commendable. They cannot help remembering how bitterly their people were persecuted for ages, and how very recent it is that they have been allowed to enjoy either political or civil rights. Long after Mayer Anselm had grown rich, he and his fellow-Hebrews were locked into the Jews' quarter of Frankfort after nightfall, and forbidden to depart thence until the iron gates were thrown open in the morning. If the great bankers have forgiven the inhuman wrongs done through centuries to their race, they are singularly magnanimous. They have reason to feel as *Shylock* felt to *Antonio* toward the fawning Christians who go to them for money. Their negative revenge cannot be without sweetness when they think that the once despised and hunted Jew has had the proudest nobles begging for his gold, and even Kings soliciting his aid. It has been their boast that monarchs could not go to war without the consent of the Rothschilds. Like most boasts, this was not strictly true; but they who furnish the sinews of battle are the most desirable of allies, not less than the most formidable of foes. The Rothschilds, save at rare intervals, continue to intermarry, and are likely to while the powerful family holds together. If the common theory respecting the union of blood-relatives were true, the banking brotherhood would be reduced by this time to hopeless imbecility; and they are in the opposite extreme.—*Harper's Weekly*.”

Others believed that inbreeding had indeed degraded the Rothschild family. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported on 15 February 1874 on page 7,

“There is no question that, with the death of Baron James, the genius of the house of Rothschild has departed. Constant intermarriage with cousins and the absence of that intellectual vigor which the infusion of fresh, new blood imparts, has its effect on men as on animals, and the younger branches of the family are far inferior to the elder.”

Wars helped the Rothschilds destroy competing banks, including national banks, and consolidate their power, while weakening the European nations—which had been a prophetic wish of Judaism for thousands of years. It is important to note that the effect, and perhaps the desire, is to prevent an entire society, even humanity at large, from becoming powerful and wealthy; which would enable Gentiles to resist Messianic Jewish world domination. *The Chicago Press and Tribune* reported on 6 June 1859,

**“The War Revulsion in European Finance—First
Effects of the Storm.**

[From the New York Herald.]

The monetary disasters which are likely to follow from the effects of the present war in Europe, and the necessary destruction it will entail upon the financial and banking system of several of the most powerful of the European governments, are so entirely different in their character and in the laws that govern them from the revulsions known to the present generation, that few persons now engaged in the active transactions of life comprehend or consider them.

The experience of the present age is limited to a small number of commercial revulsions which have grown out of the exaggeration of the healthy elements of trade. Few recollect the ruin that swept through the commercial world on the commencement of Pitt’s war, and the consequent suspension of specie payments by the Bank of England, or the vast fortunes made by a horde of army contractors during its twenty-one years’ continuance, while commerce flagged, looms were stopped, ships rotted at the wharves, merchants went into bankruptcy or prison, and the army was the only refuge of the people from starvation. The beginning of a great war, and the short continuance of any strictly local conflict, acts as a stimulus upon trade and industry, because its effects are as yet felt only in their demand for the elements of destruction. But when its true work comes to bear—when the circulating medium is turned from its wonted channels, and the force of destruction without production and exchange begins to be felt—the longing for peace sets in, and continues to increase in intensity till its arrival is celebrated with bonfires and enthusiastic shouts that far exceed any manifestations of joy at the declaration of war. This simple truth marks the real effect of war upon the common weal. Let us now group together a few of the facts that have marked the progress of the present contest.

In the foreground stands the fact that the several governments of Europe, since the 1st of the January, have either come into the market, or are

preparing to come in, for loans to the amount of three hundred and fifty millions of dollars. England raised thirty-five for her Indian wants, and immediately sent one-half of it in silver to Calcutta. Austria asked for a hundred millions; but all the power and credit of the Rothschilds could not raise it for her, and she seized the metallic reserve of the Bank of Vienna, suspended specie payments, borrowed two-thirds of the sum in paper, and assessed a forced loan of fifteen millions more on Lombardo-Venetia. Russia sought for sixty millions; but she, too, failed to obtain it, and has adopted a system of financial expedients at home. Sardinia asked for six millions, failed to get it, and suspended specie payments also, borrowing the amount in paper from the Bank of Turin. France has called upon her people to contribute one hundred millions of dollars, and they offer five hundred millions. Turkey borrowed a short time since twenty-five millions. Prussia, Holland, Belgium and the German Confederation are now preparing to come into the money market for large amounts.

The first effects of these extraordinary borrowings is to cause the people to look at the financial condition of several governments. They find that for years past all have exhibited deficits in their budgets. Since 1851 France has borrowed and spent six hundred millions of dollars more than her revenue. Austria has done the same to the extent of four hundred millions. England had to borrow nearly one hundred millions to prosecute the Crimean war; and if she goes into the present one, there is no possibility of estimating how much she must borrow. Russia, Sardinia, Spain, Germany, Prussia—all have exhibited deficits for some time past; and the revolution that now threatens to sweep over commerce gives no hope of a different state of things.

As a result of these movements we find specie disappearing from the vaults of trade, and seeking the hoards of fear or the war chests of the army. In fifteen days New York has sent off ten millions of dollars. The last returns of the Banks of England and France show that in one month they had lost ten millions of bullion. In the two months preceding the declaration of war in 1854, the bullion in the Bank of England alone ran down eight millions, and in the two succeeding months ten millions more. To endeavor to stop this drain, the rate of interest has already been raised in London one per cent., on the 6th of May, and will no doubt be further advanced. This stops commerce from using money. But war does not care for per centages; its first step is to suspend specie payments, which, when taken by a government, is nothing more nor less than a direct robbery of its own subjects.

Already the consequences of these extraordinary movements are beginning to be felt. Although the promised rate of interest has not been refused, an immense depreciation has been caused in the value of government securities and public stocks. It is calculated that the depreciation in British consols is already equal to three hundred and fifty millions of dollars, and that of the stocks of public companies three hundred and fifty millions more. On the Continent the effect has been much greater, and we may safely estimate the fall in the value of funded property in Europe at four

thousand millions of dollars. From these causes will follow the ruin of the bankers; and they have already begun to fail. In April Lutteroth failed for a large amount in Trieste. On the 2d of May, Wolf & Co., Berlin bankers, failed; on the 5th, Lloyd, Belby & Co. failed in London; on the 6th, Arnstein & Eckles, Vienna bankers, failed for ten millions of dollars; and up to the 12th of May, nearly one hundred failures were announced on the Stock Exchange and trade in London. At Constantinople a sudden advance in the value of sterling exchange from 143 to 156 piastres had caused the bankers to gather in council in the beginning of May; and in Holland, where large amounts of Austrian and other Continental securities are held, the depreciation of securities had been so severely felt that numerous distressing suicides had taken place.

The cause of these dire results may be reduced to a simple expression. The governing class in Europe—a class that has no connection with commerce and little sympathy with industry—is seizing upon the wealth of the world, perverting it from the arteries and veins of trade, and pouring it into their own pockets and the pockets of a hoard of army contractors, and squandering it in destructive dynastic wars. Let not our merchants flatter themselves that these things are going to be good for them. They will be good for a new class of speculators; men who will run great risks for the chance of great profits—men who connect themselves with the quartermasters and supply contractors of Europe, and who will resort to all kinds of expedients to win a purse or break a neck in the race for fortune. But a general war in Europe will break down all its existing financial and commercial circles, and the effects cannot but be severely felt in one way or another here.”

As the Civil War grew nearer, Americans grew suspicious of the Rothschilds’ destruction of European economies. Americans noted the new phenomenon whereby governments passed debt on to future generations, who were undemocratically forced to give up their treasure to the repressive Rothschilds. These intrigues, which had the effect of fulfilling Jewish prophecy, were among the reasons why Jews were looked upon with suspicion, especially in Europe. Another major reason was the fact that Jews were prominent in the revolutionary movements. It is important here to note that the debts the Rothschilds manufactured promoted the conditions which enabled the Marxists to overthrow governments and ruin societies, and these Jewish forces covertly worked in collusion. *The Chicago Press and Tribune* reported on 22 December 1859 on page 3,

“Baron Rothschild’s Visit to America.

We see announced as among the arrivals by the Persia, one of the celebrated house of Rothschild. Thus far the business of that house with this country and its securities has been comparatively small. They have estimated our government loans too insecure, and our railroad stocks too small, or too speculative and fluctuating. They have negotiated the loans of crowned heads

to the amount of millions, resting on no more solid basis than the honor of some bankrupt government. For England, with its debt of eight hundred millions of pounds sterling, they have been the chief government agents at most important and critical times. For France they have at times done much in this way, under half a dozen dynasties, just to keep stocks up and what they had from being swept away. In Austria they have been everything more potent than sovereigns—yet themselves compelled to sustain tottering governments by taking loans to keep things going. Meantime they have despised the growing wealth of this country, which has not exhibited itself in crown jewels or costly palaces, or immense retinues of servants, or of soldiers, but in careful re-investments, railroads, telegraphs and broad acres, subdued by the hand of industry, to supply the world with cotton and with grain.

No Rothschild that we know of has visited this country before, and their doing so now may have a significance in history difficult to calculate. Of course, they do not tell their purposes and their plans. They do not even herald their approach, or intimate it by any ostentatious display. But it is not impossible that such an arrival may indicate at a future period the gradual transfer of large portions of their countless wealth to this country. If such should be the case, it would be perfectly certain that the wealth of thousands of others would follow in the same direction, and our stocks of every kind would rise, and enterprise be pushed in ten thousand channels; so that the next fifty years would produce an expansion and growth from the capital of the old world, united with the industry of the new, compared with which, all the past progress of the last fifty years would be as nothing.

This country *must* afford the best field for the employment of capital. The Rothschilds began with nothing. They made their money mainly by the rise of government securities, consequent on the re-establishment of order and of confidence, after the wild and sweeping ruin of the first French Revolution. The peace of 1815 made them indisputably the first house in the world for capital vested in government securities. But, since the Revolutions of 1848, the loss of confidence in the government securities of Europe has been gradually becoming more and more marked among the most sagacious. Austrian finances have been proverbially rotten for years, and each year has not only added to the deficit, but displayed some new government fraud, until, within the last year, things have come to light showing the over-issue of stock, in such ways and to such an extent that would destroy the character and the credit of any mercantile house, or of anything, in fact, that had any character or credit to lose, except a European government.

The debt of France has been enormously increased, and that of England also. Not a country in Europe is diminishing its debts in peace, and all its wars and preparation have to be carried on by taxing posterity. How long can all this last? If peace were the order of the day, things might go on without getting worse. But peace is not the order of the day, and war is getting to be more and more a question of finance and credit on an unheard of scale of

cost. Some nation like Austria will one of these days come to a halt—will run down—and then the rest will follow, like a row of dominoes; and then the capitalists will have stocks and government bonds, but the coupons will be unpaid, and the whole worth only so much waste paper.

The last century taught the civilized world a new act, that of borrowing without the least prospect of ever repaying, by simply paying the interest and throwing the rest upon posterity. So long as posterity obtains something better than the interest in return—peace, order, credit and wealth—they may go on and meet the drafts of their predecessors upon them; but, directly the cost becomes greater than the advantage, and war and insecurity return, a new generation will arise and sweep away the whole debt as unjust. In this country we have *lands*, and railroads, and solid products at the bottoms of our stocks, and into these things the capital of the old world is finding its way and will find it.”

The Rothschilds defended Jewish interests. There are indications that they believed that this brought them good luck. It also generated distrust and conflict. Cabalist Jews believed that committing both good acts and evil acts could hasten the coming of the Messiah, and Rothschild wanted to be the Messiah. On 5 September 1874, *The Chicago Daily Tribune* published an obituary for Anselm De Rothschild, which evinces the undemocratic and repressive power of the Rothschild family, as well as their use of their power to promote Jewish interests,

“Baron Anselm De Rothschild.

The death of the lamented Baron Anselm De Rothschild, says *Jewish Chronicle*, has produced a deep impression throughout Vienna. The Baron died at Döbling, near that town. He had attained the age of 71. He was born on the 29th of January, 1803, at Frankfort-on-the-Main. He was a son of Baron Solomon De Rothschild, who was a grandson of the founder of this distinguished commercial dynasty, Anselm Meyer. He spent his youth at Frankfort, and passed some time during his young manhood at Berlin, where he attended the university of that city. His career as a university student imbued him with a lively interest in science. He attached to scientific pursuits and held communion with scientific men throughout his whole life, and he invariably endeavored to keep up with the stream of scientific progress. It is said that he had a special acquaintance with history, but he principally acquired renown as an enthusiastic friend of the fine arts and a profound connoisseur in painting and archæology. In 1855 he took up his residence in Vienna, and rarely quitted it excepting during the hot weather, when he usually went to his estate at Schillersdorf, in Silesia. He married his cousin Charlotte, daughter of his uncle, Baron Nathan Mayer De Rothschild, the well-known head of the London branch (father of Baron Lionel and Sir Anthony Rothschild). He lost his wife in 1859. He had seven children, viz.: three sons, Nathaniel, Ferdinand, and Alfred; and four daughters, Julia, the wife of Adolphe Charles De Rothschild; Matilda, who married William

Charles De Rothschild; Louisa, who married Baron Franchetti, and Alice, who is still unmarried. His sons have no children; Baron Ferdinand is a widower. In 1861 Baron Anselm De Rothschild was appointed a member of the Upper House, or House of Lords, of the Austrian Imperial Parliament, in which he always voted with the Liberal party. Not having been endowed with oratorical talents he did not attempt to shine as a speaker, but he enjoyed the highest esteem of his illustrious senatorial colleagues by the firmness of his character and the unshakable consistency of his principles. Indeed, it is difficult in Austria for a political personage to acquire a reputation for consistency, but this reputation he deservedly obtained. Baron Anselm De Rothschild invariably evinced a strongly pious adherence to the orthodox principles of the religion of his fathers. In 1866 he gave a notable proof of the intensity with which he felt any blow directed against the honor of his coreligionists. In that year the war broke out between Austria and Prussia. At that time Count Beleredi was at the head of the Austrian Government; he was a man of Ultramontane Catholic principles, and he had very little sympathy with the Jews. Under an assertion of patriotism he put forth the notion of requiring the Jewish congregations to organize several battalions of volunteers at their own expense. Now, as the Jews necessarily undertook the obligations of military service in common with other citizens, Count Beleredi's plan was neither more nor less than an extraordinary tax levied on the Jews, a disguised renewal of the special Jews' tax, that had been abolished since the emancipation of the Jews. Naturally the Jews protested on all sides against this injustice, and on this occasion Baron Anselm de Rothschild wrote to the Imperial Minister that he would close his offices, break off all financial negotiations with the Government, and leave Austria if the Minister persisted in carrying out a project which would be so injurious to the Jews. His letter had the desired effect, and the Minister abandoned the tax. He spent his last days at a villa at Döbling, a village near Vienna. He had suffered much, and was obliged to submit to a painful operation. For some days before his death this catastrophe was regarded as inevitable. According to the last wish of the deceased, his body was taken, with the greatest simplicity, to Frankfort. With the exception of the two preachers of the Synagogue, the functionaries of the burial society, and his most intimate friends, very few persons were at the ceremony. Immediately on hearing of the death of the Baron, the Emperor sent his adjutant to offer his condolence to the family, as did also the German Emperor, the Czar of Russia, and the King of Italy by their respective Ambassadors. Prince Bismark and Count Andrassy, Primo Minister of the Austro-Hungarian realm, sent telegrams of sympathy."

Though the Rothschilds felt justified in using their power to promote Jewish interests, they did not hesitate to use unscrupulous means to fleece entire Gentile societies of their wealth. The callous elitism and arrogant inhumanity of the Rothschilds was revealed in an article that appeared in *The Chicago Tribune* on 24

December 1867 on page 2,

**“The Career of the Great Rothschild, of
London, as Narrated by Himself.**

Extract of a Letter from Sir Thomas Powell
Buxton to Miss Buxton.

DEVONSHIRE STREET, Feb. 11, 1834.

We yesterday dined at Ham House, to meet the Rothschilds, and very amusing it was. He (Rothschild) told us his life and adventures. He was the third son of the banker at Frankfort. ‘There was not,’ he said, room enough for us all in the city. I dealt in English goods. One great trader came there who had the market to himself; he was quite the great man, and did us a favor if he sold us goods. Somehow I offended him, and he refused to show us his patterns. This was on Tuesday. I said to my father, ‘I will go to England.’ I could speak nothing but German. On Tuesday I started. The nearer I got to England the cheaper goods were.

As soon as I got to Manchester I laid out all my money, things were so cheap and made good profit. I soon found that there were three profits—on the raw material, the dyeing and the manufacturing. I said to the manufacturer, ‘I will supply you with material and dye, and you supply me with manufactured goods.’ So I got three profits instead of one, and could sell goods cheaper than anybody. In a short time I made my £20,000 into £60,000. My success all turned on one maxim. I can do what another man can, and so I am a match for the man with the patterns, and all the rest of them! Another advantage I had; I was a off-hand man; I made a bargain at once. When I was settled in London, the East India Company had \$800,000 of gold to sell. I went to the sale and bought it all. I knew the Duke of Wellington must have it for the pay of his army in the Peninsula; I had bought a great many of his bills at a discount. The government sent for me, and said they must have it. When they got it they did not know how to get it to Portugal. I undertook all that, and I sent it through France, and that was the best business I ever did. Another maxim on which he seemed to place great reliance was never to have anything to do with an unlucky place or an unlucky man. ‘I have seen,’ said he ‘many clever men, very clever men, who had not shoes to their feet! I never act with them. Their advice sounds very well, but fate is against them; they cannot get on themselves; and if they can not do good to themselves, how can they do good to me?’ By aid of these maxims he has acquired three millions of money.

‘I hope,’ said -----, ‘that your children are not too fond of money and business, to the exclusion of more important things. I am sure you would not wish that.’ Rothschild: ‘I am sure I should wish that. I wish them to give mind and soul, and heart and body, and every thing to business. This is the way to be happy. It requires a great deal of caution to make a large fortune, and when you have got it, it requires ten times as much wit to keep it. If I

were to listen to all the projects proposed to me I should ruin myself very soon. 'Stick to one business, young man,' said he to Edward: 'stick to your brewery, and you may be the great brewer of London. Be a brewer, and a banker, and a merchant, and a manufacturer, and you will soon be in the *Gazette*. One of my neighbors is a very ill-tempered man; he tries to vex me, and has built a great large place for swine close to my walk. So when I go out I hear first grunt, grunt, squeak, squeak: but this does me no harm. I am always in good humor. Sometimes to amuse myself, I give a beggar a guinea. He thinks it is a mistake and for fear I should find it out, off he runs as hard as he can. I advise you to give a beggar a guinea sometimes; it is very amusing.'

The daughters are very pleasing. The second son is a mighty hunter, and the father lets him buy any horses he likes. He lately applied to the Emperor of Morocco for a first-rate Arab horse. The Emperor sent him a magnificent one, but he died as he landed in England. The poor youth said, very feelingly, 'that was the greatest misfortune he had ever suffered.' And I felt strong sympathy with him. I forgot to say that as soon as Mr. Rothschild came here, Bonaparte came here. 'The Prince of Hesse Cassel,' said Rothschild, 'gave my father his money; there was no time to be lost; he sent it to me. I had £600,000 arrive unexpectedly by the post, and I put it to such good use that the Prince made me a present of all wines and linen.'"

The Chicago Daily Tribune reported on 8 June 1873 on page 10 in an article entitled "Great Fortunes",

"The rise of the great House of Rothschild belongs to the eighteenth century. Meyer Anselm, a Jew, was born in 1743, and was established as a money-lender, etc., in Frankfort, in 1772. From his poor shop bearing the sign of the Red Shield, he acquired the name Rothschild. He found a good friend in William, Landgrave of Hesse; and when the Landgrave, in 1806, had to flee from Napoleon, he intrusted the banker with about £250,000 to take care of. The careful Jew traded with this; so that, in 1812, when he died, he left about a million sterling to his six sons, Anselm, Solomon, Nathan, Meyer, Charles, and James. Knowing the truth of the old motto, 'Union is strength,' he charged his sons that they should conduct their financial operations together. The third son, Nathan, was the cleverest of the family, and had settled in England, coming to Manchester in 1797, and London in 1803. Twelve years after, we see him at Waterloo, watching the battle, and posting to England as soon as he knew the issue, and spreading everywhere the defeat of the English. The clever but unscrupulous speculator thus depressed the funds, and his agents were enabled to buy at a cheap rate; and it is said that he made a *million* by this transaction. He died in 1836; but the real amount of his wealth never transpired. It has been said; 'Nothing seemed too gigantic for his grasp, nothing too minute for his notice. His mind was as capable of contracting a loan for millions as of calculating the lowest possible amount

on which a clerk could exist.’ (*Chronicles and Characters of the Stock Exchange.*)”

The Rothschilds had insider information and used it to drain the nations of their wealth. Some speculate that they had improved upon George-Louis Le Sage’s telegraph and could transmit messages over great distances effectively instantaneously, or that they had a system of speedy horses like the pony express, or that they had the swiftest vessels with which to cross the English Channel. Much of the knowledge that must have appeared to have been the result of speedy communications, may instead have been planned in advance. The Rothschilds had agents in banking and government and knew far in advance of others what was about to occur in government, business and war. Many nations depended upon the Rothschilds’ wealth for loans. The Rothschilds had no need of personal genius, because they had several advantages which made it impossible for anyone to compete with them. It also appears that they had corrupted many heads of state, and the leaders of many churches, and persuaded them to betray the Peoples whom they represented in order to enrich the Rothschilds and put the wealth of the world into Jewish coffers. Many of these leaders were likely crypto-Jews on a mission to subvert Gentile societies and bring them into debt, largely through wars and manipulation of the currencies and gold markets. Much of the royalty of Europe was of Jewish descent, or thought that they were of Jewish descent. That which Rothschild sycophants attributed to good fortune and acumen was instead the product of foreknowledge and corruption. Whoever controls the press, the banks, the preachers and the State has foreknowledge of just about everything and can profit from it. For example, anyone with a news story must first bring it to the press, which makes them the most powerful spy apparatus in the world. They not only know things in advance, they regulate the flow and timing of information. Another example is the banks. Any major project requires financing and a business plan before it can begin. This gives the bankers inside information. In addition, the Rothschilds could incite wars, recessions, depressions and concentrate wealth and economic growth in any nation or empire of their choosing. With a corrupt head of state, or church leader, who worked for them, the Rothschilds could quickly run a nation into debt and syphon off its gold reserves and tax its People in perpetuity. *The American Farmer, Containing Original Essays and Selections on Rural Economy and Internal Improvements, with Illustrative Engravings and Prices Current of Country Produce* (Baltimore), Volume 5, Number 29, (10 October 1823), p. 229, wrote,

“MEMOIRS OF MR. ROTHSCHILD.

Mr. N. M. Rothschild is descended from a German lineage. Mr. R. sought to establish his fortune in England. Various were his vicissitudes in early life; by his industry and prudential conduct, he acquired considerable property in the linen trade at Manchester, vast quantities of which article, were exported during the last war to the Continent, where Mr. Rothschild availed himself of the peculiar advantage of his brother’s agency in that quarter of Europe.

Previously to the close of the late war, Mr. Rothschild transferred the scene of commercial operations from Manchester to London. He then became a considerable speculator in the Foreign and British Securities on the Stock Exchange; and after the melancholy death of Mr. Goldsmidt, assumed a very prominent station in the money market. But the principal accident which contributed to the rapid elevation of our Modern Cræsus, was the escape of Buonaparte from Elba, in 1814.—In consequence of Mr. R.'s superior means of information on the Continent, this important occurrence was known to him nearly forty-eight hours before it was in the possession of any other person in this country. He did not fail to avail himself of every advantage which this priority of intelligence presented. His agents went into the market and sold prodigious quantities of stock. The consternation was dreadful! Every one suspected danger, none knew where to look for it. The panic was epidemic! On the disclosure of the fact, the general cry was *sauve qui feuit*; and the object of our present article bore off the immense sum, gained by his success on this great and extraordinary occasion.

Mr. Rothschild, thus fortified in wealth, and enjoying at this time the almost exclusive means of acquiring the first intelligence from the Continent, soon established for himself a reputation and importance, the maturity of which can scarcely be said to have been accomplished at the present moment. He availed himself of a conjunction with his brothers, (who are also great capitalists on the Continent,) of the opportunity of administering to the wants of the King of Prussia, the Emperor of Russia, the Kings of Naples and Spain; the Republic of Columbia and other States, who negotiated loans on terms highly profitable to him; and which have, with the advantages of the courses of exchange, and other incidental benefits, realized immense sums in addition to his fortunate speculations in British Stock. But the great *coup de main* of Mr. R. consisted in his out-generalling the Gallic Financiers in the recent French Loan. In that transaction he is supposed to have cleared upwards of £100,000, by the commission alone, independent of the advantages of the courses of Exchange!

By the fortuitous occurrence of favourable circumstances, Mr. R. has been enabled to amass greater wealth, than any man that ever existed in England. It would be impossible for others to estimate his property, when Mr. R. has declared that he could not do it himself. It has been asserted, however, that he can command upwards of Fifteen Millions sterling at any time, if required! When it is considered that 'money, the sinew of war,' is in its amount illimitable, and in its control so much at the mere volition of Mr. R. it ceases to surprise the reader, that such a man should be necessary to the Potentates of Europe, and that his friendship and assistance should be no less anxiously sought, than promptly and powerfully afforded.

Mr. Rothschild is a Baron of the German empire, to the Emperor of which, he has rendered some essential services. He is about 43 years of age, and possesses a family of nine children. His mode of life is remarkable for its retired description. Unlike his great predecessor, (Goldsmidt,) he does not

boast of his choice and exquisite wines, or herald his hospitality towards the Princes of the blood. His appearance is unostentatious; his deportment familiar; and his manners unaffected and affable. His conversational style on 'Change is rapid, acute, and discriminating. He carries about him no aristocratical feeling; neither does he affect a singularity, the common concomitant of extraordinary genius, and the impotence of mental pecuniary plenitude. His face is distinguished by a lack of that piercing intelligence, which lights up and animates the expressions of those proverbial for their acuteness; but there is a quickness in the eye, which denotes a lively and unremitting watchfulness of the mind, on every subject of general interest.

When engaged in conversation, Mr. R. usually dangles a bunch of keys in his right hand, and indulges a habit of abruptly turning from the object to whom he is speaking, and suddenly renewing the colloquy. He possesses a memory so remarkably retentive, and the powers of mental addition so copiously strong, that he effects all his immense calculations without the agency of pen or paper: and often at those times, when the din of business 'gives note of preparation' for a 'rise or fall.' His genius is of that order, which often enables him to perceive the benefit or disadvantage of a proposition, before the parties have fully viewed the surface. His movements are characterized by profound judgment: his attack is no less able, than his retreat judicious.

Mr. Rothschild's private character is, we believe, as amiable as his public life is important. He diffuses his benevolence with judgment and liberality. When solicited to countenance an Institution with his name, he answers, 'You know I never take a public part; if you want (as I suppose you do,) money; name the sum, and you shall have it; but don't make me look ostentatious or mean, by naming too large or too small a sum.' His eleemosynary contributions are chiefly distributed amongst objects of the Jewish persuasion; who have in many instances arrived at a state of opulence through his instrumentality. Such a liberality of disposition, and philanthropy of character, has divested envy of her deadly influence; and created for Mr. Rothschild, an imperishable reputation, which will descend with advantage to his family in after ages."

The *Saturday Evening Post*, Volume 3, Number 42, (16 October 1824), p. 2, reported under the heading, "European Affairs. Late from England":

"Mr. N. M. Rothschild has contracted for a loan to the Napolitan Government to the amount of £2,500,000."

The stories which assert that the Rothschilds built their fortune on funds entrusted to them by the Prince of Hesse and from the profits they netted from the false rumor they spread that the English had lost at Waterloo do not appear to account for their vast wealth. They may have come into the great wealth Jewish bankers had accumulated from the times of the de Medicis and even earlier. They put

this wealth to the purpose of fulfilling Jewish Messianic prophecies of the destruction of the Gentile world through perpetual war³³⁷ and sought to make one of their own the King of the Jews, and King of the World through the world government they sought to impose on Gentile humanity. The machinations which brought them into this position remain a mystery. It is not known who chose them or why. One could speculate that the Jews have for a very long perpetuated the myth that certain families carry with them the Royal blood of King David. Wealthy families would have an easy time creating this myth for themselves. Since there never was a King David, it is difficult to challenge them, though realistically speaking Ashkenazi Jews would a far more difficult time linking their lineage to Judah, let alone to a King David who never existed, than would Sephardic Jews, who carry with them a stronger genetic tie to the Judeans.

Judaism has always operated under a double standard and considered Gentiles to be mere animals undeserving of moral treatment. Just as the Jewish story of the flight from Egypt taught Jews it was alright to appropriate the gold of other peoples by unscrupulous means, many Jewish financiers delighted in cheating Gentiles, though in the process they also cheated other Jews. Rothschild published his “Memorial of the Jews in England to the Czar of Russia” in 1882. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* quoted Rothschild on 19 February 1882 on page 5 in an article entitled “The Judenhetze”,

“Here in England, where perfect civil and religious equality has been granted us, we English Jews can bear testimony to the happy results effected by such complete emancipation. Here all those restrictions—civil, commercial, and educational—which formerly oppressed us have happily been removed, and, as a result, Jew and Christian here live and work side by side on terms of mutual respect and good fellowship, engaged in friendly rivalry, which stimulates public industry and adds to the common weel.”

The Chicago Press and Tribune reported on 13 September 1859 on page 2,

“ROTHSCHILD’S INGENUITY.—An eminent Parisian [???], of the Jewish faith, knew the secret of the recent armistice several days before it was actually concluded, and he was desirous of communicating intelligence of the coming event to the house at Berlin. But how was it to be done? The electric wire is by no means a safe confidant for a secret. The banker hit upon a device. He wrote a telegram and concluded it in the following terms: ‘Herr Scholem will shortly arrive.’ Scholem is a Hebrew word signifying peace. In the Berlin house, where the Hebrew language was understood, the true meaning of the announcement of Herr Scholem’s expected arrival was readily interpreted.”

It was obvious to many that a democratic society could not exist while wealth remained concentrated in corrupt hands. It became increasingly obvious in the mid-Eighteenth Century that national sovereignty meant little more than the ability to go

to war in order to profit the “Moneyocracy”, which was more interested in fulfilling the prophecies of Judaism than benefitting the societies over which it ruled. *The Chicago Tribune* reported on 4 April 1866 on page 2,

“A SPEECH BY JULES FAVRE.

The Emperor Napoleon having risen to power by perjury and by the connivance of the moneyocracy and of the principal debauchees of Paris, his reign has become the signal of a reign of lust, luxury and money to such an extent as to make all cultivated men and virtuous women blush for shame, and to cause the people to tremble with indignation as they read the recent speech of Jules Favre in denunciation of these crying evils. In fact Rothschild, Pereire and Fould are, under the second empire, what the ancient nobles were under the rule of the elder Bourbons, and since the moneyocracy of 1866 is not even endowed with the accomplishments which constituted the redeeming but unavailing graces of the aristocracy of 1766, it is not only as hateful as the last were, but still more despicable. The battle cry of the old nobility was monopoly in land, that of the new moneyocracy is monopoly in cash, in railways, in bank, in insurance, and joint stock companies. In fact they assume to be the lords of modern society as the ancient nobles were those of the feudal era, but since their power is not as venerable as that of entailed estates, it is more easily withstood, while its lack of all noble tendencies withholds from it the prestige which clustered round the gallant bearing and emblazoned glories of the old nobility.

Money, and nothing but money, is the great end of all the exertions of this Bonaparte moneyocracy, and not, as it ought to be, whenever honorably obtained as a means for the more liberal fulfilment of all the manifold domestic, social, patriotic, humanitarian and religious duties of life. Wherever the mere possession of money opens, as it does under Napoleon’s rule, the door to society, to influence, to every brute, and to every licentious man and bedizened woman, that society is doomed to destruction as surely as was that of the harlot and spendthrift era of Louis XIV and XV. No wonder that the late Baron Dupin animadverted upon this demoralization before he descended to the grave. No wonder that books are published showing that the state of society in Pagan Rome was not a whit worse in its worst period, than at the present time, in Paris. No wonder that Jules Favre, the great jurist, orator and parliamentarian makes the tribune ring with his eloquent vindication of the virtue, the culture, the art, the intellect of France against the fearful supremacy of brutes, bloated with ill-gotten wealth, and of a society reeking with lust and abomination. The following is the concluding extract of the remarkable speech delivered by this gentleman, who is the leader of the opposition in the legislative body, on the 15th inst.:

‘In regard to the exterior policy, if the country had been master of its destinies, we should never have witnessed these distant expeditions which have so greatly compromised our interests. We should not have sent to die on the other side of the Atlantic so many young men whose arms would have enriched our soil. We should

not have seen millions wasted in Mexico in behalf of an enterprise the least fault of which is that it is impossible. These millions would have been usefully employed in benefitting France and her colonies.

‘As to the interior *regime* we are sometimes told that the passions are completely appeased. Sometimes that they are still fermenting, that parties are always armed, and that our liberties should still be refused us. Public morals are spoken of. If you would have good morals you must make good citizens; to make citizens you must have institutions which can form them. France is saturated with military glory. *She has need of moral dignity and grandeur.* If you will interrogate the literature of the present day, which is the expression of public morals, you will be driven to some unfortunate conclusions.

‘You have decreed the liberty of theatres, and with the censorship you do what you please upon the public scene, and what do you show us there? Great God! you force a man with any sense of decency to keep away from this privileged temple in launching at him this sort of insult. ‘I desired to speak of virtue and devotion. These are no longer actualities, and I am driven from the temple consecrated to them.’

‘What do you make of the French scene? You have made it a scene of libertinage and shamelessness; you expose upon it disgusting nudities. You have in your hands a law made to prevent children from working in manufactories, and you begrime the child upon the scene of a privileged theatre, in making him represent the type and model of degradation and cynicism, to the scandal of all respectable people. And then you open *bais masques*, and you say, ‘Come and amuse yourselves, and drink from the cup which I put to your lips.’ As for me, I say to you, *France wants something else. She wishes to have the power of exercising her liberties. We are nothing if we cannot raise our eyes toward Heaven, and we cannot do that if we are not free.*’

No description, however graphic, could do justice to the effect produced by this oration. It fairly electrified the Chambers, and on the next day it was perused with enthusiasm by millions of noble women and worthy men, whose sentiments it embodies more emphatically than any speech ever delivered since the days of the Girondins and of Mirabeau.”

Under the heading “Foreign Gossip”, *The Chicago Tribune* reported on 14 March 1869 on page 3,

“The leaders of the French Opposition, Jules Favre, Thiers, Picard, Eugene Pelletan, Glais Bizoin, Marie and Bethmond, are all wealthy men. Only Garnier Pages is poor.”

During the Civil War, the Rothschilds gained power on the American Continent by corrupting politics with their wealth and by running up the nations’ debts. After the war, the Rothschilds floated huge loans to the United States, which netted the Rothschilds immense profits and enormous influence over America. Other European bankers, like Erlanger, fleeced investors and profited immensely during the war.

The Chicago Daily Tribune reported an accusation on 3 February 1873 on page 2, that the Rothschilds had gained control over a political party in order to sabotage it and secure victory for their candidate,

“In a paper on Federalism, read before the Liberal Club last night by Mr. Delmar, the following remarkable passage made some sensation: ‘The people have tacitly committed their entire interests and fortunes to the keeping of two political parties, whose leaders and managers, instead of Congress, as was intended, sway their destinies. It is charged that, knowing this, the Rothschilds, through their American agent, obtained control of one of these parties in the general election of 1868, and threw it into confusion by abandoning its Presidential candidate on the eve of election, so as to afford victory to its opponent, whose financial views more nearly accorded with the interests of that great house.’”

Henry Morgenthau reported that in 1919 the Zionist Jews in Poland used unscrupulous tactics to subvert Polish democracy and attain Jewish control over the Polish Government,

“They admitted that their fifty-six could sway legislation only in case of close divisions among the other parties. It became clear that their hope must be to encourage such divisions.”³³⁸

Most Polish Jews hated the Zionists and considered them to be demonic³³⁹ and correctly predicted that the Zionist Jews would cause terrible havoc around the world. Morgenthau reported that,

“Space will not permit the reproduction here of all that these leaders said, but one or two sentences should be repeated, and in considering them it should be kept in mind that the Orthodox Jews number about eighty per cent. of the Jewish population of Poland.

‘Our principal conflict,’ said Rabbi Alter, ‘is with Jews; our chief opponents at every step are the Zionists. The Orthodox are satisfied to live side by side with people of different religions. . . . The Zionists side-track religion.’

‘We are exiled,’ said Rabbi Lewin; ‘we cannot be freed from our banishment, nor do we wish to be. We cannot redeem ourselves. . . We will abide by our religion (in Poland) until God Almighty frees us.’

And again: ‘We would rather be beaten and suffer for our religion than discard the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Judaism, such as not cutting the beard, etc. . . . The Orthodox love Palestine far more than others, but they want it as a Holy Land for a holy race.’”³⁴⁰

In 1921, the Rothschilds were still the principal force behind Zionism and acted against the will of the vast majority of the Jews, whom the Rothschilds wanted to force to Palestine, so that the Rothschild dynasty could be Messiah, meet God, and rule the world from Jerusalem. Note that the Balfour Declaration was written directly to Lord Rothschild. Note further that Polish Orthodox Jews were the primary target, and the hardest hit victims, of the Holocaust the Zionists perpetrated against them

by means of the Nazi Party, which the Zionists put into power in Germany in order to persecute their brethren. Morgenthau stated,

“We have learned the folly of persisting in a distinctive style of clothing, beard, and locks (imposed upon the Jews extraneously as a badge of slavery and oppression), and of ascribing a spiritual significance to such a costume in this age when saints like Montefiore and Baron Edmond de Rothschild, the great patron of Palestine, find sanctity not incompatible with the ordinary dress of those about them.”³⁴¹

Frankist Jews had been worming their way into positions of authority in Poland since the 1700's, and by the 1900's crypto-Jewish Frankists dominated the aristocracy, government and Catholic Church of Poland. Zionist Jews were the cause of the majority of the problems the Polish Jews faced, which were many, though it is true that the pogroms had been greatly exaggerated by the Jewish press around the world. Zionist Jews openly sought to form a foreign and adversarial government within Poland, making Jews the sworn enemy of the Polish People. Morgenthau wrote,

“The Zionists were our first callers and were also our most constant ones. We were soon in close contact with all their leaders; we attended their meetings, and they rarely left us. Some were pro-Russian, all were practically non-Polish, and the Zionism of most of them was simply advocacy of Jewish Nationalism within the Polish state. Thus, when the committee of the Djem, or Polish Constitutional Assembly, called on us, led by Grynbaum, Farbstein, and Thon—all men who had discarded the dress and beard of the Orthodox Jew—and when I discovered that they were really authorized to represent that section of the Jews that had complained to the world of the alleged pogroms, I notified them that we were willing to give them several hours a day until they had completed the presentation of their case to their entire satisfaction. That programme was adhered to, and it constantly cropped out that their aim was the securing of Jewish Nationalism within Poland. [***] There was no question whatever but that the Jews had suffered; there had been shocking outrages, of a sporadic character at least, resulting in many deaths and still more woundings and robberies, and there was a general disposition, not to say plot, of long standing, the purpose of which was to make the Jews uncomfortable in many ways: there was a deliberate conspiracy to boycott them economically and socially. Yet there was also no question but that the reports of some of the Jewish leaders had exaggerated these evils.

We found that, among the Jews, there was a thoughtful, ambitious minority who, sincere in their original motives, intensified the trouble by believing that its solution lay only in official recognition of the Jew as a separate nationality. They had seized on Zionism as a means to establish the Jewish nation. To them, Zionism was national, not religious; when

questioned, they admitted that it was a name with which to capture the imagination of their brothers whose tradition bade them pray thrice daily for their return to the Holy Land.

Pilsudski, in a moment of diplomatic aberration, had said that the Jews made a serious error in forcing Article 93; quoting that utterance, these Jewish Nationalists now asserted that neither the Polish Government, nor the Roumanian for that matter, ever would carry out the spirit of the Treaty concessions, and so they aimed at nothing short of an autonomous government and a place in the family of nations. Meanwhile they wanted to join the Polish nation in a federation having a joint parliament where both Yiddish and Polish should be spoken: their favorite way of expressing it was to say that they wanted something like Switzerland, where French, German, and Italian cantons work together in harmony.

Unfortunately, they disregarded the facts. In Switzerland, generally speaking, the citizens of French language live in one section, those of German language in another, and so on, whereas these aspiring Nationals, of course, wanted the Jews to continue scattered throughout Poland. They wanted this, and yet wanted them to have a percentage of representation in Parliament equal to their percentage in the entire Polish nation! Finally, they took no account of the desires of the Orthodox Jews, who form about 80 per cent. of their number, who were content to remain in Poland and suffer for their religion if necessary, and whom the Polish politicians were already coddling and beginning to organize politically as a vote against the Nationalist-Zionists.

The leaders of these Nationalist-Zionists were capable and adroit, but they were like walking-delegates in the Labor Unions, who had to continue to agitate in order to maintain their leadership, and their advocacy of a state within-the-state was naturally resented by all. It was quite evident that one of the deep and obscure causes of the Jewish troubles in Poland was this Nationalist-Zionist leadership that exploited the Old Testament prophecies to capture converts to the Nationalist scheme.

Here, then, was Zionism in action. We had seen it at first hand in Poland. I returned home fearful that, owing to the extensive propaganda of the Zionists, the American people might obtain the erroneous impression that a vast majority of the Jews—and not, as it really was, only a portion of the 150,000 Zionists in the United States—had ceased considering Judaism as a religion and were in danger of conversion to Nationalism.³⁴²

On 10 October 1864 on page 2, *The Chicago Tribune* reported,

**“ENCOURAGEMENT—NOT FOR THE
‘ROTHSCHILD’S’**

The fact that the Chairman of the National Democratic Committee is the agent of the Rothschilds gives the Copperheads an immense advantage in receiving an unlimited amount of funds from the money kings of the old

rotten despotisms of Europe in order to secure the election of McClellan and the destruction of the Government. That Copperhead Democracy and European despotism are working for the same end, there cannot be a particle of doubt. The hand of Belmont is most directly seen in the second plank of the Copperhead platform, and in fact it is demonstrable from the language of it, that it was all made in the interest of Jeff. Davis and his alies, the aristocrats and despots of Europe. Shrewd, far-seeing men on the other side of the Atlantic understand this matter perfectly. One of our citizens who has been making an extensive tour in Europe, writes to the Treasurer of the Union State Central Committee as follows:

‘Enclosed is an order on -----, for three hundred dollars, to aid the Union party in publishing and disseminating that proper information in order to secure the re-election of Abraham Lincoln to the office of President of the United States, and to aid in the election of the nominees of that party in the State of Illinois. * * * I have written to ----- to pay this order for me, and to respond to any calls of years to the extent of two hundred dollars more if you think it will be wanted. I feel that the future interests of our beloved country depend much on the re-election of Mr. Lincoln and the success of the Union party, and though absent, I wish to do what I can to secure that result. I hope to be home in time to vote for the Union candidates, both State and National, in November.’

Our shrewd patriotic citizen takes a wise and enlarged view of his duties, and of his interests as well; for if the Copperhead party succeed in the election, his ample fortune would not be worth the cost of a month’s sojourn in Europe or elsewhere. The destruction of the Government—the sure result of a Copperhead triumph—would destroy all values, and all personal and public safety for the next generation.”

On 16 October 1864 on page 2, *The Chicago Tribune* reported,

“BELMONT’S CONFEDERATE BONDS.

The Chicago rebel organ is annoyed by the publication of the fact that a controlling share in the stock of the Copperheads machine has been bought up by Auguste Belmont, the American member of the Rothschilds family and firm, well known everywhere to be controlling owners not only in the British debt and the London *Times*, which together control the British aristocracy and oppress the Irish people, but also of the Maximillian debt, (which fact accounts for the striking out of the Monroe doctrine from the Chicago Platform,) and finally of the rebel debt, (which accounts for Belmont spending two millions dollars to nominate a war man on a peace platform.) These facts are a little inconvenient to the Copperheads. They were never intended by them for publication. They are decidedly embarrassing. It is perhaps somewhat flattering to our national pride to know that the Rothschilds, who hold up every despotism in Europe, have concluded that it would be cheaper to buy up one of our political parties, and in that way

secure the dissolution of the Union, than to have their agents in England and France interfere and fight us. But Irishmen and Germans have a something, which for brevity we will call a 'crop,' and this fact sticks in their crop, that the oppressors of Ireland and Germany, the money kings of Europe, not daring to carry out their first pet project of breaking down this Government by the armed intervention, of England and France, for the rebels, which would shake the bourse, lower the rates of consols and take away the ducats of the Rothschilds, have adopted the cheaper and easier mode of accomplishing the same object, by buying up the Copperhead leaders and running the Democratic machine. The Rothschilds want ducats, but to make their ducats they want votes. Votes for the Peace party will send stocks up and so the Rothschilds make their ducats. Votes for McClellan send the Union stock, which the money kings have no share, down, and so the Rothschilds make their ducats. Votes for the dissolution of the Union relatively strengthen England and France and send consols up—and so the Rothschilds make their ducats. The Union dissolved and Maximilian will not be overthrown, nor will England have to pay for her rebel privateering, nor will Ireland, backed by our Government, rebel and be free, nor will British America unite with us, by all which the Rothschilds and Belmont, chairman of the Democratic party, make ducats. The Rothschilds will fish with a silver hook for votes which net them so good a profit, but even the silver hook must be baited, and the *Chicago Times* is authorized to adjust the bait. It is 'authorized to say that Belmont owns no Confederate stock, and that he knows that the Rothschilds do not.' Now, we are authorized to say that all Europe have known for months and years that they do. We know that a banker may, by the scratch of his pen, own nothing but Confederate stock one minute and nothing but five-twenties the next. We happen to have heard of some Copperhead bankers who own little besides five-twenties on the day the Assessors calls. But the financial community know in what stocks financiers are interested, in spite of anything true or false which rebel papers may be 'authorized to state.' Let Belmont state over his own signature, if he can that he and Rothschilds have not, directly or indirectly, in their own name, or in that of others, operated in Confederate stocks during this rebellion. Until he can face the music in that style it matters little what tune any of the Copperhead penny whistles may be authorized to blow, as they are very seldom authorized to state anything that is true."

What the Rothschilds lacked in their efforts to build a Jewish nation in Palestine was any real support from the Jewish community. They could bankrupt Egypt and Turkey. They could bring Russia to ruins. They could buy Jewish neer-do-wells. They could even buy the Pope, but the only way to force Jews in large numbers to Palestine was to put Hitler and Stalin into power and persecute Jews on a massive and unprecedented scale. On 28 January 1877 on page 12, *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported,

“THE NEW EXODUS.
THE IDEA RIDICULED IN NEW YORK.

New York World.

There is a report ‘that the Jews are again crowding back to Palestine.’ A writer in the Cincinnati *Commercial* says there are ‘many closed Jewish houses in London. The whole region from Dan to Beersheba is crowded with immigrant Jews from all parts of the world.’ Conversations with the leading Jewish ministers and professional men of this city show that there is no truth whatever in these reports, except in this, that the Jewish population of Palestine has in recent years, been composed altogether of ‘immigrants from all parts of the world,’ who have settled in Palestine so as to benefit by the numerous charities which enable them to live there in idleness and pauperism. The wholesale and indiscriminate alms-giving for the relief of ‘the poor of Jerusalem’ has added to the population, which, as a class, is thoroughly lazy and good-for-nothing. As to the idea of a general return of the Jews to Palestine, it is scouted as absurd and improbable in the highest degree. With the exception of a very few orthodox people, the Jews, as a religious sect, have long since given up all expectation of ever returning to the Holy Land, and the thought of returning now and founding a Jewish state has, it is said, never existed, save in the imagination of some very visionary people.

Mr. Lewis May, the senior member of the banking firm of May & King, and President of the Temple Emmanuel, the largest and richest Jewish congregation in the country, said yesterday to the writer: ‘The Jews are more apt to invest in Fifth avenue lots than in Jerusalem real estate. I should advise you to sell short any Jordan River front lots you may happen to have. I think the general feeling of the Jews is that New York is good enough for them, and that Bloomingdale is good enough for the authors of these perennial rumors of a return of the Jewish people to Palestine.’

Another well-known Jewish banker ridiculed the report in a very humorous vein. He said: ‘I have not yet prepared to start for Jerusalem, nor shall I until the weather is milder.’

A prominent member of the Stock Exchange said: ‘Just fancy what a stir it would make if this absurd report were true. We should have Seligman, Hallgarten, and Netter all shutting up their banking offices; Rothschild would no doubt limit his financial operations to the Holy Land; Ald. Lewis and Phillips would leave two vacancies in the City Government, to which Coroner Ellinger would add another; then what would become of Anti-Tammany without Emanuel B. Hart and Judge Koch, Gershom Cohen, and Adolph Sanger; what bench in Jerusalem would Judge Joachimsen fill? Assemblyman Stein, William H. Stiner, and Judge Dittenhoefer would vanish, too. Solomon would move his furniture place and his Fifth Avenue mansion to the banks of the Jordan; and a host of lesser lights would vanish. What a time there would be ‘on ’Change,’ too, to miss our Seligmans, De Cordovas, Josephs, Sternbergers, and Bernheimers; what would the theatres

do on Saturday nights; who would patronize the balls? With the stores of the Vogels, Stadlers, Rosenfelds, Solomons, Lagowitzes, Adlers, Lauters, and others, shut up, Broadway would be indeed deserted. The handsome Harmonie Club on Forty-second street would, of course, be removed to the Holy Land, and the Standard Club would follow suit. There would be a big falling-off in the membership of the Manhattan, Union League, Lotos, and Palette. Ferdinand Myer would close his 'Newport' flat, Lewis May his 'Albany' flat, and Dore Lyon would sell his real estate. The Temple Emmanuel, on Fifth avenue, all the handsome temples in other parts of the city, the elegant mansions of the Hendrickses, Myers, Kings, Nathans, and Pikes, all to vanish to the stony streets of Jerusalem. Oh, no; never.”

4 EINSTEIN THE RACIST COWARD

Albert Einstein was a genocidal racist Zionist. He was appalled by the fact that most German Jews did not share his racist and segregationist views. Einstein ridiculed Jews who assimilated into German society. Einstein hypocritically and disingenuously dubbed all of his critics “anti-Semites”. He was a coward who hid from criticism by smearing his critics. When he was finally forced to debate in Bad Nauheim, he made a fool of himself and ran away in the middle of the argument.

“*The General Assembly, [***] Determines that Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination.*”—UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NUMBER 3379³⁴³

“I get most joy from the emergence of the Jewish state in Palestine. It does seem to me that our kinfolk really are more sympathetic (at least less brutal) than these horrid Europeans. Perhaps things can only improve if only the Chinese are left, who refer to all Europeans with the collective noun ‘bandits.’”—ALBERT EINSTEIN³⁴⁴

4.1 Introduction

The massive emigration of Eastern European Jews, coupled with the financial might of the Rothschild family and their lesser branches, and with the disproportionate Jewish domination of the press, resulted in tremendous power for the Jewish community, especially in America, England and Germany. Einstein used this organized Jewish power in a cowardly fashion to suppress open debate on the theory of relativity and his career of plagiarism. Einstein, himself a racist, hypocritically and disingenuously accused his critics of racism for saying the same things that Einstein himself had said both publicly and privately. Einstein counted on fellow racist Jews to rush to his defense simply because he was a Jew. His expectations were rewarded.

4.2 The Power of Jewish Tribalism Inhibits the Progress of Science and Deliberately Promotes “Racial” Discord

Just as the “Jewish press” refused to entertain criticism of Judaism in the *Kulturkampf* while they relentlessly ridiculed Catholicism specifically and Christianity generally, they refused to entertain criticism of their Jewish Messiah, Albert Einstein. However, Einstein’s Nobel Prize was not awarded for the theory of relativity, because so many were aware of the fact that Albert Einstein had plagiarized the theory. Ernst Gehrcke³⁴⁵ demonstrated that Paul Gerber had anticipated the general theory of relativity, as had Johann Georg von Soldner,

making a Nobel Prize for that theory impossible. It was long known that Einstein had plagiarized the special theory of relativity from Lorentz and Poincaré. Instead of exposing the public to these facts, the Jewish dominated press smeared Einstein's critics, obstructed their access to the public, and shamelessly hyped Albert Einstein and the theory of relativity.

Reassured that corrupt elements in the press would rescue him, Einstein decided to stay in Berlin after the Berlin Philharmonic meeting where he had been publicly humiliated. On 3 September 1920, the *Berliner Tageblatt* proudly reported that Einstein would not run away:

“**Prof. Albert Einstein** wird, wie wir erfahren, einer Berufung ins Ausland nicht Folge leisten, sondern in Berlin bleiben. Dieser erfreuliche Entschluß des Gelehrten ist mit die Folge der zustimmenden Briefe, die infolge der Aktion der sogenannten Gesellschaft der Naturforscher an Einstein gelangt sind. Prof. Einstein wird, ehe er seine Gastvorlesungen an der Universität L e i d e n hält, noch auf der K i e l e r Woche für Kunst und Wissenschaft über die Relativitätstheorie sprechen und auf der Naturforscherversammlung in B a d N a u h e i m seine Theorie zur Diskussion stellen. Ob er im kommenden Wintersemester die angekündigten Vorlesungen an der Berliner Universität halten wird, ist noch nicht sicher.”

Einstein recorded his fears and his sudden courage upon learning that he would not have to defend himself, but would instead be defended by sycophants who were more competent than he was, which emboldened him to publish his response in the *Berliner Tageblatt*. Albert Einstein wrote to Arnold Sommerfeld on 6 September 1920:

“Ich hatte in der That jenem Unternehmen gegen mich zu viel Bedeutung zugeschrieben, indem ich glaubte, dass ein grosser Teil unserer Physiker dabei beteiligt sei. So dachte ich wirklich zwei Tage lang an «Fahnenflucht», wie Sie das nennen. Bald aber kam die Besinnung und die Erkenntnis, dass es falsch wäre, den Kreis meiner bewährten Freunde zu verlassen. Den Artikel hätte ich vielleicht nicht schreiben sollen. Aber ich wollte verhindern, dass mein dauerndes Schweigen zu den Einwänden und Beschuldigungen, welche systematisch wiederholt werden, als Zustimmung gedeutet werden. Schlimm ist, dass jede Äusserung von mir von Journalisten geschäftlich verwertet wird. Ich muss mich eben sehr abschliessen.”³⁴⁶

[4.3 A Jew is Not Allowed to Speak Out Against a Jew](#)

The second meeting of the *Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher zur Erhaltung reiner Wissenschaft* took place on 2 September 1920. The famous Jewish philosopher Oskar Kraus of Prague was scheduled to deliver a lecture stating his objections to the special theory of relativity. The Czechoslovakian government refused Kraus a visa for “political reasons” thereby preventing his appearance at the

meeting and actively obstructing a public expression of anti-relativism by a famous intellectual figure of Jewish descent. Kraus had known Einstein while Einstein lived in Prague. Kraus believed that Einstein was nothing more than an amateurish Metaphysician. Einstein told Leopold Infeld, “I am really more of a philosopher than a physicist.”³⁴⁷ Einstein was a poor philosopher, as well. He argued in redundancies based on unproven assertions.

The pro-Einstein forces—forces so powerful that they were able to deny a man’s right to speak and to corrupt the workings of a nation’s government—prevented Kraus’ speech, which would have been far more interesting and readily understood by a crowd of laymen and news correspondents than was Glaser’s technical lecture which replaced it. Kraus’ arguments³⁴⁸ against the metaphysical absurdities in relativity theory make a powerful impression on the lay public—one Einstein’s advocates were frantic to prevent. Einstein did not grasp the distinction between Metaphysics and science. He stated in 1930, “Science itself is metaphysics.”³⁴⁹

This maneuver enabled pro-Einstein newspapers and Max von Laue to:

1. Criticize Weyland for being too popular and allegedly racist. Leopold Infeld stated that Weyland was a, “handsome dark-haired man of about thirty who wore a frockcoat and spoke with enthusiasm about interesting things[. . .] He said that uproar about the theory of relativity was hostile to the German spirit.”³⁵⁰ Weyland denied that his opposition to Einstein was anti-Semitic.

2. Attack Gehrcke’s credibility in handwaving personal attacks which would sound impressive to the lay public. Philipp Frank attacked Gehrcke as, “a competent experimental physicist of Berlin, who criticized the theory from a point of view of a man who, while making no mistakes in his experiments, simply lacks the acute understanding and flight of imagination to pass from individual facts to a synthesis.”³⁵¹ Frank also stated that Gehrcke was, “a hardworking observer in the laboratory”.³⁵² Shortly before Max von Laue joined the dishonest campaign to smear Gehrcke, Laue wrote to Einstein on 18 October 1919 that Gehrcke was, “a very seasoned optics specialist with a genuine interest in moving bodies.”³⁵³ Philipp Lenard, himself a Nobel Prize laureate, nominated Gehrcke for the Nobel Prize. Einstein and his friends tried to destroy Gehrcke’s career and censored him on numerous occasions.

3. Attack Lenard as an alleged racist (Arnold Sommerfeld praised Lenard’s book in a letter to Einstein,

“In seiner neu aufgelegten Broschüre «Rel[ativität], Äther, Grav[it]ation» hat [Lenard] sich sehr anständig über Sie [Einstein] geäußert.”³⁵⁴

Lenard, while expressing his patriotism and the dignity and integrity he demanded of German science, did not publicly express racial sentiments until after Einstein had attacked him and smeared his name without grounds around

the world.

4. Avoid Glaser's objections as dry and uninteresting pedantic gobbledygook.
5. Prevent Kraus' dramatic public exposition of the fatal flaws in the theory of relativity, which could not be misconstrued as if "anti-Semitic" even by the shameless pro-Einstein press.

All of this was done to change the subject from Einstein's plagiarism, Einstein's self-promotion and gross exaggeration of the significance of his theories, the relativists' corrupt misrepresentation of the available evidence to the public, and the absurdities of the theory of relativity—all of this was done to change the subject to the irrelevant issue of anti-Semitism. Einstein and his friends were completely unethical. They inhibited the progress of science and took away fundamental human liberties.

Max von Laue reported in the evening edition of *Vossische Zeitung* on 4 September 1920 that the Czechoslovakian government denied Kraus, of Prag, the right to leave the country "for political reasons". Laue, racist Zionist Albert Einstein's "Shabbas Goy", again tried to change the subject to racial issues in a cowardly effort to avoid the relevant facts,

“Der Einstein-Effekt im Spektrum.

Von
Max von Laue.

Professor Max von Laue, Ordinarius für theoretische Physik an der Berliner Universität, Träger des Nobelpreises für Physik im Jahre 1914, stellt uns folgende Ausführungen zur Verfügung:

Die Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher für Rassereinheit der Wissenschaft veranstaltete am 2. 9. ihren zweiten Vortragsabend in der Philharmonie. Zunächst mußte ihr geistiges Haupt, Herr Paul Weyland, das Ausbleiben von Prof. Kraus aus Prag mitteilen, dem die tschecho-slowakische Regierung aus politischen Gründen die Ausreise verweigert hat.

Sodann ergriff Herr Dr.-Ing. Glaser das Wort zu dem angekündigten Vortrage, der sich nach ein paar einleitenden Bemerkungen über die Lichtablenkung bei der Sonnenfinsternis 1919 ausführlich mit der Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien auf der Sonne beschäftigte, deren Dasein die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie notwendig fordern muß. Hier sprach nun ein gescheiter Mann über eine Sache, von der er etwas versteht — ganz im Gegensatz zum ersten Vortragsabend. Schon daraus geht hervor, daß der Physiker viel dabei lernen konnte. Ob auch der Laie? Manchmal schien uns das zweifelhaft.

Der Redner zeigte zunächst in wohlgelungenen-Projektionsbildern die sogenannten Cyanbanden im Sonnenspektrum, an denen die wichtigsten

Beobachtungen gemacht sind, und deren Auflösung in einzelne Linien. Er ging dann aus von den Messungen Schwarzschilds, bei denen er selbst mitgearbeitet hat. Deren Ergebnis sprach eher gegen als für den Einsteineffekt. Er führte weiter die langen Messungsreihen vor, die sich in Arbeiten von St. John, Evershed und Royds sowie Hale befinden. Letztere sind in Deutschland zurzeit schwer zugänglich, und die Mühe, mit der der Vortragende sie sich zu verschaffen gewußt hat, muß sehr anerkannt werden. Mit vollster Bewunderung und einem gewissen Neid muß es erfüllen, wenn man von den großartigen Hilfsmitteln hört, welche die Sternwarte des Mount Wilson für solche Versuche bietet, und dazu die Projektionsbilder sieht. Alle diese Forscher finden Verschiebungen der Spektrallinien, doch welchen diese meist in der Größe, manchmal auch in der Richtung vom Einsteineffekt an, auch lassen sich noch manche andere Erklärungen dafür ersinnen, so daß ein einheitliches Bild nicht entsteht.

Sodann ging der Vortragende zu den kurzen Veröffentlichungen zweier Deutscher über. Grebe und Bachem haben nämlich seit 1919 in Bonn mit weit bescheideneren Mitteln dieselben Untersuchungen angestellt. Und sie kommen zu dem Ergebnis, daß man nicht wahllos jede Linie im Spektrum zur Entscheidung der Frage heranziehen dürfe. Unsymmetrien im Linienbau sowie die unvermeidbaren Unterschiede zwischen Absorptionsspektren, wie wir sie im Sonnenlicht haben, und den irdischen Emissionsspektren, mit denen man sie vergleicht, können nach ihnen das Ergebnis einer genauen Messung vollständig fälschen. Beschränkt man die Untersuchung auf acht Linien, die von solchen Uebelständen frei sind, so findet man aus ihren eigenen Messungen, sowie aus denen ihrer Vorgänger eine Rotverschiebung, welche mit dem von Einstein verlangten Effekt recht gut übereinstimmt.

Hiergegen wandte sich der Redner. Das wesentlichste Instrument der Bonner Untersuchung ist ein Gitter, und die bisherigen Gitter sind nicht hinreichend fehlerfrei, um diese Untersuchung zu ermöglichen. Er zeigte im Bild vortreffliche photographische Aufnahmen von Gittern und stellte dabei sein eigenes Licht etwas unter den Scheffel, indem er verschwie, daß solche Aufnahme niemandem vor ihm selbst gesungen sind. Die dabei zutage tretenden Fehler verursachen Schleier um die Spektralanalyse; diese beim Bonner Apparat auftretenden, bei geeigneteren Anordnungen aber fehlenden Schleier sind es nach Glaser, welche Grebe und Bachem zur Ausscheidung der Mehrzahl der bisher untersuchten Linien veranlaßt haben. Glaser hält demgegenüber die älteren Untersuchungen für maßgebend und schloß mit den Worten, er glaube auch die Anhänger der Relativitätstheorie überzeugt zu haben, daß sie von der Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien nichts mehr zu hoffen hätten.

Darin zeigt sich nun wieder die einseitige Parteinahme dieses sonst nicht schlechten Vortrages. Warum verschwie der Redner, daß, selbst wenn die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie sich an der Erfahrung nicht

bestätigen sollte, doch dann immer noch die beschränkte Relativitätstheorie, welche uns Einstein 1905 beschert hat, bestehen bleibt? Warum erwähnte er nicht, daß Schwarzschild, auch nachdem er die theoretische Rotverschiebung nicht hatte finden können, noch kurz vor seinem Tode in zwei höchst wertvollen Untersuchungen an dem mathematischen Ausbau der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie mitgearbeitet hat? Er muß diese doch wohl noch nicht für ganz erledigt gehalten haben. Ferner haben die Bonner Gelehrten gewiß nicht mit den Mitteln Hales arbeiten können. Aber sie haben dafür einen sehr beachtenswerten Gedanken in die Erörterung geworfen, den ihre englischen und amerikanischen Vorgänger nicht gehabt und deswegen auch nicht mit ihren besseren Mitteln geprüft hatten. Wie denn nun, wenn diese Forscher die Grebe-Bachemsche Prüfung der Spektrallinien auf ihre Braucharbeit wiederholen — was sehr zu wünschen ist — und dabei vielleicht deren Ergebnis bestätigen? Kann man denn diese Möglichkeit von vornherein ausschließen? Der richtige Schluß aus dem vorliegenden Beobachtungsmaterial wäre für einen sehr skeptischen Beurteiler doch wohl der gewesen: Die älteren Untersuchungen sind durch Grebe und Bachem in ihrer Bedeutung zweifelhaft gemacht. Deren eigene Untersuchungen sind bisher von anderer Seite nicht nachgeprüft. Also ist die ganze Frage noch in der Schwebe.

Und noch ein paar allgemeinere Bemerkungen seien hier gestattet: Hört man die Vorträge der „Arbeitsgemeinschaft“, so muß man glauben, mit der Relativitätstheorie wäre der ganze Einstein erledigt. Und dabei ist unter denen, die da gesprochen haben und sprechen wollen, höchstens einer — zur Vorsicht wollen wir sagen, daß wir nicht Herrn Weyland meinen — dessen Leistungen für die Physik sich mit dem messen können, was Einstein außer der Relativitätstheorie getan hat. Sein Nachweis der Elektronenbewegung in den Magneten, seine Theorie der Temperaturabhängigkeit der spezifischen Wärme und so manches andere auf dem Gebiete der Quantentheorie sind unvergängliche Ruhmesblätter in der Geschichte der Wissenschaft. Gelänge es der Arbeitsgemeinschaft, was sie — nach der Art ihrer Mittel zu urteilen — anstrebt, nämlich diesen Mann aus Berlin zu vertreiben, so hätte sie damit — ebenfalls unvergängliche Berühmtheit erworben.”

Johannes Riem stated that Oskar Kraus had wired him a telegram on 2 September 1920, which informed him that Kraus, “was refused a visa for political reasons.”³⁵⁵ Riem complained that,

“In such a way relativity theory is protected by the immigration service.”³⁵⁶

The *Berliner Tageblatt* reported in the morning edition of 3 September 1920,

“Im großen Saal der Berliner Philharmonie sollte gestern abend der Vortrag von Professor Dr. Kraus-Prag, der von der „Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher

Naturforscher“ angekündigt war, stattfinden. Der Beginn des Vortrags war auf $\frac{1}{2}$ 8 Uhr festgesetzt, um $\frac{1}{4}$ 9 Uhr aber erst wurde dem erschienenen Publikum mitgeteilt, daß Professor Dr. Kraus, der über „Relativitätstheorie und Erkenntnistheorie“ sprechen sollte, nicht erscheinen werde.”

In the evening edition of 3 September 1920, the *Berliner Tageblatt* wrote,

“**E. V. Die Einstein-Kampagne.** Bei den Einstein-Gegnern scheint jetzt doch die Erkenntnis Platz zu greifen, daß die Art, wie die „Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher“ den Kampf gegen Einstein in dem ersten Vortrag eingeleitet hatte, nicht der richtige ist. Professor Kraus (Prag), der zur Relativitätstheorie vom erkenntnistheoretischen Standpunkt Stellung nehmen wollte, hatte, wie schon im Morgenblatt kurz gemeldet, telegraphisch abgesagt; er verzichtet darauf, sich als Philosoph in den Straßenkampf der allzu persönlich erhitzten Tagesmeinungen zu stellen. Es blieb als Redner des gestrigen Abends in der Philharmonie nur der Physiker Dr. Ing. Glaser, ein Gehilfe Schwarzschilds bei dessen früheren experimentellen Studien zur Relativitätstheorie. Und es muß gesagt werden, daß er sich nüchternster Sachlichkeit, man könnte beinahe sagen, Trockenheit, befleißigte. Jedenfalls, wer aus dem Publikum in diesen Vortrag gekommen war, um ein paar billige und tönende Schlagworte für seine Anti- oder Sympathie nach Hause zu tragen, ist Gott sei Dank enttäuscht worden, er saß in einem experimentalphysikalischen Seminar. Glaser begnügte sich damit, die Beobachtungsergebnisse der aus der Relativitätstheorie gefolgerten und von Einstein errechneten Effekte der **Lichtablenkung** und der **Rotverschiebung** zu untersuchen, um an Hand von Lichtbildern darzutun, das erstens die beobachteten Effekte hinter den errechneten zurückbleiben, und zweitens die beobachteten Phänomene nicht die restlos zwingende Beweiskraft als Relativitätseffekte haben, sondern, zum Beispiel die Differenz in der Verschiebung am Nordrand und am Südrand der Sonne, wie Evershed schon zeigt, sich vorläufig schwer mit dieser Erklärung vereinigen lassen. Glaser untersuchte sehr kritisch die Mittel der Beobachtung und die Möglichkeit, mit den bei den letzten Finsternissen angewandten Apparaten und Methoden ganz einwandfreie Resultate zu erzielen. Wobei zu bedenken ist, daß die Unklarheit der erzielten Bilder doch nicht ohne weiteres zuungunsten der Einsteinschen Effekte ausgelegt werden darf. Es kann auch ein Beobachtungsfehler der unzulänglichen Mittel sein, wenn die beobachteten Effekte hinter den errechneten zurückgeblieben sind.

Es wird uns wohl nichts weiter übrigbleiben, als in Geduld abzuwarten, was am 22. September 1922 die verfinsterte Sonne an den Tag bringen wird, ob die Einsteinsche Sonne aus den kritischen Nebeln, die jetzt mit etwas allzuviel Dunst darum gemacht werden, siegreich hervorgehen wird.”

Many years later, Philipp Frank spun things this way and that, and even Max

Born felt obliged to state that in the context of the history of the special theory of relativity, Philipp Frank was dishonest and distorted the facts. Frank wrote,

“An invitation had also been extended to a representative of philosophy who was to prove that Einstein’s theory was not ‘truth,’ but only a ‘fiction.’ He was of Jewish descent and was intended to be the climax of the meeting. Despite his political innocence and urgent telegrams, he declined at the last moment because some friends had explained the purpose of the meeting to him. As a result the first attack took place without the blessing of philosophy.”³⁵⁷

Max Born said of Frank,

“EINSTEIN’S work was the keystone to an arch which LORENTZ, POINCARÉ and others had built and which was to carry the structure erected by MINKOWSKI. I think it wrong to forget these other men, as it can be found in many books. Even PHILIPP FRANK’S excellent biography *Einstein, Sein Leben und seine Zeit*, cannot be acquitted of this reproach, e.g., when he says (in Chap. 3, No. 6 of the German edition) that nobody before EINSTEIN had ever considered a new type of mechanical law in which the velocity of light plays a prominent part. Both POINCARÉ and LORENTZ have been aware of this, and the relativistic expression for the mass (which contains c) has rightly been called LORENTZ’ formula.”³⁵⁸

Oskar Kraus was an outspoken critic of the theory of relativity before the Berlin Philharmonic lectures and for many years thereafter. Frank’s account does not agree with that of Paul Weyland, Max von Laue and Johannes Riem, who recorded that Kraus wished to attend the meeting, but was refused a visa for political reasons. Einstein’s advocates have always relied upon clannish Jewish racism and disproportionate Jewish influence in government, the press and in the universities to prevent a fair and open discussion of the merits of the theory of relativity and of Einstein’s career plagiarism. This is but one of many instances of Jewish censorship in the modern world. Jewish organizations have successfully criminalized opinions which deviate from their own. It is today illegal in many countries to offend or obstruct Jewish racists by revealing their destructive lies and dangerous Messianic aspirations.

4.4 The Bad Nauheim Debate

Nobel Prize winning Physicist Philipp Lenard took great offense at Einstein’s defamatory comments. Lenard had said nothing anti-Semitic in public, but instead, in the wake of Germany’s defeat in World War I, had simply asserted his national pride and declared that German science stood for high ethical standards and sound scientific practices—as opposed to the wild speculations of the British eclipse observations and the immoderate and self-glorifying advertising of Albert Einstein.

Lenard's reaction came at a time when the British and French had openly attempted to destroy German science, with Albert Einstein's help.

In the winter of 1914, Lenard criticized J. J. Thomson and England in a 16 page pamphlet³⁵⁹ in a nationalistic—not anti-Semitic—tone. Lenard, himself, may have been of Jewish descent and had a classically Jewish appearance.³⁶⁰ It was common at the time to speak of “German science” and many of Einstein's friends and supporters, many of whom were Jewish, proudly spoke in those exact terms. Lenard supported German efforts in the war, and, like Max Planck, Walter Nernst, Fritz Haber, and many others, signed the pro-German statement of 4 October 1914, as amended, with the signatories broken down by profession, by Goerg Nicolai:

“The Manifesto to the Civilized World

As representatives of German science and art we protest before the whole civilized world against the calumnies and lies with which our enemies are striving to besmirch Germany's undefiled cause in the severe struggle for existence which has been forced upon her. The course of events has mercilessly disproved the reports of fictitious German defeats. All the more vigorous are the efforts now being made to distort truth and disseminate suspicion. It is against these that we are raising our voices, and those voices shall make the truth known.

1.—IT IS NOT TRUE THAT GERMANY WAS GUILTY OF THIS WAR

Neither the nation nor the Government nor the emperor wanted it. The Germans did everything possible to avert it, documentary evidence of which is before all the world. In the twenty-six years of his reign William II has frequently shown himself the defender of the world's peace, as has frequently been acknowledged even by our enemies. Indeed, this same emperor, whom they are now presuming to call an Attila, was ridiculed for twenty years and more because of his unswerving devotion to peace. Not until our people was attacked from three sides by superior forces, which had long been lying in wait at the frontier, did it rise as one man.

2.—IT IS NOT TRUE THAT WE CRIMINALLY VIOLATED BELGIAN
NEUTRALITY

It can be proved that France and England had resolved to violate it, and it can be proved that Belgium had agreed to this. It would have been suicidal not to have anticipated them.

3.—IT IS NOT TRUE THAT THE LIFE AND PROPERTY OF A SINGLE
BELGIAN SUBJECT WERE INTERFERED WITH BY OUR SOLDIERS
EXCEPT UNDER THE DIREST NECESSITY

Again and again, despite all warnings, did the population lie in ambush and fire on them, mutilating wounded men, and murdering doctors even while actually engaged in their noble ministrations. There could be no baser misrepresentation than to say nothing about the crime of these assassins and then to call the Germans criminals because of their having administered a just punishment to them.

4.—IT IS NOT TRUE THAT OUR TROOPS BEHAVED BRUTALLY IN

REGARD TO LOUVAIN

They were forced to exercise reprisals with a heavy heart on the furious population, which treacherously attacked them in their quarters, by firing upon a portion of the town. The greater portion of Louvain is still standing, and the famous town hall is quite uninjured. It was saved from the flames owing to the self-sacrifice of our soldiers. Every German would regret works of art having been destroyed in this war or their being destroyed in the future. But just as we decline to admit that any one loves art more than we do, even so do we refuse no less decidedly to pay the price of a German defeat for the preservation of a work of art.

5.—IT IS NOT TRUE THAT WE DISREGARD THE PRECEPTS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW IN OUR METHODS OF WARFARE, IN WHICH THERE IS NO UNBRIDLED CRUELTY

But in the East the ground is soaked with the blood of women and children slain by Russian hordes, and in the West the breasts of our soldiers are lacerated with Dumdum bullets. No one has less right to pretend to be defending European civilization than those who are the allies of Russians and Serbians, and are not ashamed to incite Mongolians and negroes to fight against white men.

6.—IT IS NOT TRUE THAT FIGHTING OUR SO-CALLED MILITARISM IS NOT FIGHTING AGAINST OUR CIVILIZATION, AS OUR ENEMIES HYPOCRITICALLY ALLEGE

Without German militarism German civilization would be wiped off the face of the earth. The former arose out of and for the protection of the latter in a country which for centuries had suffered from invasion as no other has done. The German Army and the German people are one, and the consciousness of this makes seventy millions of Germans brothers to-day, without regard to education, rank, or party.

We cannot deprive our enemies of the poisoned weapons of falsehood. All we can do is to cry aloud to the whole world that they are bearing false witness against us. To you who know us, who, together with us, have hitherto been the guardians of man's highest possessions—to you we cry aloud, 'Believe us; believe that to the last we will fight as a civilized nation, to whom the legacy of a Goethe, a Beethoven, and a Kant is no less sacred than hearth and home.'

This we vouchsafe to you on the faith of our name and our honor.

The manifesto was signed by the following seventeen artists actually practising their profession: Peter Behrens, Franz von Defregger, Wilhelm Dörpfeld, Eduard von Gebhardt, Adolf von Hildebrand, Ludwig Hoffmann, Leopold Graf Kalkreuth, Arthur Kampf, Fritz Aug. von Kaulbach, Max Klinger, Max Liebermann, Ludwig Manzel, Bruno Paul, Fritz Schaper, Franz von Stuck, Hans Thoma, Wilh. Trübner.

By these fifteen natural scientists: Adolf von Beyer, Karl Engler, Emil Fischer, Wilhelm Foerster, Fritz Haber, Ernst Haeckel, Gustav Hellmann, Felix Klein, Philipp Lenard, Walter Nernst, Wilhelm Ostwald, Max Planck,

Wilhelm Röntgen, Wilhelm Wien, Richard Willstätter.

By these twelve theologians: Adolf Deissmann, Albert Ehrhard, Gerhard Esser, Adolf von Harnack, Wilhelm Herrmann, Alois Knöpfler, Anton Koch, Josef Mausbach, Sebastian Merkle, Adolf von Schlatter, August Schmidlin, and Reinhold Seeberg.

By these nine poets: Richard Dehmel, Herbert Eulenberg, Ludwig Fulda, Max Halbe, Gerhard and Karl Hauptmann, Hermann Sudermann, Karl Vollmöller, and Richard Voss.

By these seven jurists: Lujo Brentano, Johannes Conrad, Theodor Kipp, Paul Laband, Franz von Liszt, Georg von Mayr, and Gustav von Schmoller.

By these seven medical men: Emil von Behring, Paul Ehrlich, Albert Neisser, Albert Plehn, Max Rubner, Wilhelm Waldeyer, and August von Wassermann.

By these seven historians: Heinrich Finke, J. J. de Groot, Karl Lamprecht, Maximilian Lenz, Eduard Meyer, Karl Robert, and Martin Spahn.

By these five art critics: Wilhelm von Bode, Alois Brandt, Justus Brinkmann, Friedrich von Duhn, and Theodor Wiegand.

By these four philosophers: Rudolf Eucken, Alois Riehl, Wilhelm Windelband, and Wilh. Wundt.

By these four philologists: Andreas Heusler, Heinrich Morf, Karl Vossler, Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff.

By these three musicians: Engelbert Humperdinck, Siegfried Wagner, and Felix von Weingartner.

By these two politicians: Friedrich Naumann and Georg Reicke.

By this theatrical manager: Max Reinhardt."³⁶¹

Einstein covertly supported the Allies throughout the war. Though he lived in Germany—Einstein was a disloyal agent of Germany's enemies. Einstein became a symbol to many Germans of the Jew who had "stabbed Germany in the back". Many Germans believed that Jewish leaders in the press, the English, and Jewish world finance, had conspired to destroy pan-Germany as it tried to defend Europe from pan-Slavism, and that after the war the Jewish press in Germany sided with the Allies when they sought to punish Germany and break it apart in violation of President Wilson's directives that no nation would lose territory at war's end, which promise had led Germany to surrender in the good faith of that promise.³⁶² The Allies, and some leading German Jews, betrayed Germany's good faith.

Albert Einstein, together with Wilhelm Förster and Georg Friedrich Nicolai³⁶³ (born Lewinstein)—a crypto-Jew who tried to persuade young Ilse Einstein to accept Albert Einstein's proposal of marriage in 1918, while Albert Einstein was sleeping with her mother, who was Albert Einstein's cousin, Elsa Einstein³⁶⁴—drafted their "Call to the Europeans", which anticipated the European Union by calling for peace talks that would destroy the German and Austro-Hungarian Empires and replace them with a yet more universal European block, a Soviet style block that would eliminate personal property and unite the workers in their struggle against the ruling class. This came at a time when Germans were rightly concerned by the attempted

takeovers of revolutionary Jewish Communists like Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht and Kurt Eisner, which had shaken the German Nation. It was well known that the Bolsheviks under Jewish leadership had mass murdered millions of Christians and had destroyed the Russian Nation. It was also widely known that Jewish financiers had caused the First World War in order to profiteer from it, promote Zionist interests, and to destroy the Europeans' will to fight back against Bolshevism. The Jewish bankers believed that the war would tire the Europeans and leave susceptible to the Jewish propaganda that internationalism and Bolshevism were the solution to war. However, most Europeans realized that these same forces were behind the war and were terrified at the prospect of a Bolshevik Europe.

Raymond Recouly contrasted the French and Russian revolutions, in an article published in 1922, which stated, *inter alia*,

“Since the Bolshevik revolution, the produce of Russia has diminished from 50 to 75 per cent. Famine and the deaths of millions of people have been the consequences of that Russian expropriation.

We have now reached a subject in which a great many people seem to find the chief points of comparison between the two revolutions, namely the question of massacres.

Nothing can excuse a massacre, either in France or in Russia.

The massacres which went on in some of the Paris prisons and certain provincial towns, such as Lyons, Nantes, etc., have branded the French Revolution with bloodstains impossible to wash out.

As to the condemnations pronounced by the revolutionary tribunals during the most active period of the Terror, the very composition of those tribunals, their expeditive and summary manner of delivering the sentence, the wholesale trials and condemnations pronounced by them, were the merest parody of justice.

But between those massacres of the French Revolution and the massacres of the Russian Revolution, there are, however, some capital differences.

First, the number of the victims was in France greatly smaller than it has been in Russia.

About 1,300 people were buried at the cemetery of Picpus in Paris, where the greatest majority of the victims of the guillotine had their sepulchers. Those few thousand victims of the French Revolution seem nearly nothing as compared with the enormous number of people exterminated in Russia.

The Terror in France did not last very long. There came soon a strong reaction and the whole thing was definitely stopped.

Even at the most frightful period of the Terror, the exterior forms of justice were, to a certain extent, observed. If one wished to find extenuating circumstances, they could be found in the violence of the political struggle, especially in the fact of France being invaded, that enemy armies were marching on the capital, that a terrible revolt had broken out in the Vendée province, and insurrections were taking place in the centre and south of France.

In France, the executions were always conducted openly. When Louis XVI and the Queen were beheaded, it was in the middle of the Place de la Concorde in daylight, after they had been publicly judged and condemned.

In the Russian Revolution, on the contrary, no exterior form of justice was even observed. The executions have always taken place secretly. You have only to remember the monstrous manner in which the Czar and all his family were murdered in Ekaterinburg. It was in the middle of the night, in a cellar, by revolver shots, without any judgment whatever.

It has been nearly the same with all the Russian executions.

And what about the Tcheka, that disgusting network of police spies of all kinds, which has something Asiatic, Chinese, in the way of arresting people, of torturing them and putting them to death?

Those Bolshevik massacres have already been going on for several years. There is unfortunately no sign that they are going to decrease.

I have said enough to show you the fundamental differences existing between the two revolutions. The few points of comparison that exist do so only in appearance. They are due to the fact that most of the Russian revolutionaries were wrapped up in the superficialities of the French Revolution.

Their one aim was to imitate, to copy it as much as they could. In spite of that, the two revolutions differ as much as night from day. Nearly all the men at the head of the French Revolution were men of great energy—patriotic, and disinterested; they boldly risked their lives in the struggle; most of them forfeited them.

The French Revolution endowed the country with a far better system of organization, and a far more equitable system of justice than had hitherto existed. It raised the standard of human dignity. The higher material and moral well-being that was its direct creation were immense. The whole of France, and one may truly say a great part of Europe, owes all to those reforms. It abolished all the old privileges, did away with serfdom and feudal rights, founding the liberty and dignity of the human being. It reorganized education, justice, the administering of public affairs, gave a great impulse to the education of the masses, introduced a new system of weights and measures which has been adopted by nearly every country in Europe; it instituted higher education.

That positive, constructive work of the Revolution was, as you can see, immense. When one recalls the conditions under which all those reforms were brought about, when one attempts to conjure up visions of the troubled times rife with political strife, in which the great men of the Revolutionary Assemblies did all that creative work, one cannot help being filled with admiration for their energy and their audacity.

Their virtues far outweighed their old vices.

The Russian Revolution, on the contrary, has produced nothing, it has destroyed everything.

It has not even developed the communist theories. For Lenin, after having

wildly proclaimed their inviolability, was forced to abandon them for the greater part.

Bolshevism has for many years laid waste the material, intellectual, and moral forces of Russia.

To draw the conclusion of this article, one could say that while the French Revolution was all the time directed and strongly kept in hand, the Russian Revolution was left without any direction whatever.

Now we must not forget that the leading class in Russia formed a very small minority, that they were, in some manner, lost in the immensity of that country. The geographical, ethical, historical conditions of Russia were so different from Germany, France, and England that it was very difficult, almost impossible, for the leaders to lead effectively such a big country.”³⁶⁵

Bolshevik atrocities made the Germans very leery of Jewish Communists—even of Jews in general, especially those calling for the world government foretold in Jewish Messianic prophecies—Jewish Messianic prophecies which called for the overthrow of Kings and Queens, Princes and Princesses; as well as for a world government run by Jews, and the “restoration of the Jews to Palestine”; and for the destruction of Gentile culture, Gentile religions, Gentile nations, and ultimately the extermination of the Gentiles, themselves—all this mass murder justified on the false premise that it was necessary to achieve an era of “peace” and a new world ruled by Jews. The persona of Albert Einstein epitomized these ancient racist and genocidal Jewish objectives and made him a focal point for the legitimate concerns Germans had for their survival, grave concerns that were proven correct by the rise of the Zionist Nazis who destroyed Germany at the behest of Jewish financiers, and the further partition and loss of sovereignty of Germany after the Second World War, when a large section of Germany and Eastern Europe were taken over by the Communists, while Western Zionists who led the Western governments permitted it to happen. Many Germans were disgusted by the Jews who had stabbed Germany in the back in the First World War.

The appeal of Einstein, Förster and Nicolai follows:

“A Manifesto to Europeans

Technical science and intercommunication are clearly tending to force us to recognize the fact that international relations exist, and consequently that a world-embracing civilization exists. Yet never has any previous war caused so complete an interruption of that coöperation which should exist between civilized nations. It may, of course, be that the reason why we are so profoundly impressed by this is only that we were already united by so many ties the severing of which is painful.

That such a state of things should exist must not astonish us. Nevertheless, those who care in the slightest degree for this universal world civilization are under a twofold obligation to strive for the maintenance of these principles. Those who might have been expected to care for such things, in particular men of science and art, have hitherto almost invariably

confined their utterances to a hint that the present suspension of direct relations coincided with the cessation of any desire for their continuance.

Such feelings are not to be excused by any national passions. They are unworthy of what every one has hitherto understood by civilization, and it would be a misfortune indeed were they generally to prevail among persons of culture; and not only a misfortune for civilization, but, we are firmly convinced, a misfortune for the very purpose for which, after all, in the last resort all the present hell was let loose—the national existence of the different countries.

Technical achievement has made the world smaller, and to-day the countries of that large peninsula Europe seem brought as near to one another as the cities of each individual small Mediterranean peninsula used to be; and Europe—it might almost be said the world—is already one and indivisible, owing to its multitudinous associations.

Hence it must be the duty of educated and philanthropic Europeans to make, at any rate, an effort lest Europe, owing to her not being sufficiently strongly welded together, should suffer the same tragic fate as ancient Greece. Is Europe gradually to be exhausted by fratricidal war and perish?

The war raging at present will scarcely end in a victory for any one, but probably only in defeat. Consequently, it would seem that educated men in all countries not only should, but absolutely must, exert all their influence to prevent the conditions of peace being the source of future wars, and this no matter what the present uncertain issue of the conflict may be. Above all must they direct their efforts to seeing that advantage is taken of the fact that this war has thrown all European conditions, as it were, into a melting-pot, to mold Europe into one organic whole, for which both technical and intellectual conditions are ripe.

This is not the place to discuss how this new European order is to be brought about. We desire only to assert in principle that we are firmly convinced of the time having come for all Europe to be united together, in order to protect her soil, her inhabitants, and her civilization.

Believing as we do that the desire for such a state of things is latent in many minds, we are anxious that it should everywhere find expression and thus become a force; and with this end in view it seems to us before all else necessary that there should be a union of all in any way attached to European civilization; that is to say, who are what Goethe once almost prophetically called ‘good Europeans.’ We must never abandon hope that their collective pronouncement may be heard by some one even amidst the clash of arms, most especially if the ‘good Europeans’ of to-morrow include all those who are esteemed and considered as authorities by their fellow-men.

To begin with, however, it is needful that Europeans should unite, and if, as we hope, there are enough Europeans in Europe,—in other words, enough persons to whom Europe is no mere geographical term, but something which they have profoundly at heart,—then we mean to attempt to found such a union of Europeans. We ourselves wish only to give the first impulse to such

a union; wherefore we ask you, should you be in agreement with us, and, like us, bent upon making the determination of Europe as widely known as possible, to send us your signature.”³⁶⁶

Adolphe Isaac Crémieux, friend to Rothschild and Marx, purportedly stated before the Alliance Israélite Universelle,

“A new Messianic empire, a new Jerusalem, must arise in place of the emperors and popes.”³⁶⁷

Talmudist Jews, like Karl Marx and the Rothschilds, had always borne a deep-seated hatred of Gentiles. Racist Zionists, like Albert Einstein, also hated Gentiles and wished them dead. Outspoken Zionist Dr. Josef Samuel Bloch was famous for answering August Rohling’s criticisms of the Talmud and of anti-Christian rabbinical Talmudic culture.³⁶⁸ The Talmud and Cabalist literature have been censored to conceal anti-Christian and anti-Gentile passages.³⁶⁹ Therefore, when discussing Talmudic passages, one must at times make use of very old and difficult to obtain sources and rely upon secondary Christian sources who were highly knowledgeable, such as Martin Luther and Johannes Buxtorf.

Like Einstein, Bloch later advocated a Continental European union. The Socialist Eduard Bernstein wrote of Bloch,

“With regard to the circle around the *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, one must first speak of the periodical’s editor, Dr. Josef Bloch. He is an exceptionally gifted East Prussian of Jewish origin. He is so Prussian-minded that at times he may be mistaken for a German nationalist. Before the war, he favored the defense and colonial policies of the German empire. To him, England was the power which German foreign policy must strive to conquer. During the war he was one of the most enthusiastic defenders of the war credits; today he is the guiding spirit among the socialist proponents of the so-called continental policy, that is, a policy which would tie together Germany, Russia, and France against England and, if necessary, also against the United States. This is not as a result of dislike of the English but because he believes that such a policy is necessary in the interest of Germany’s world mission. As a Socialist he is a revisionist and as a Jew he is close to the Zionists.”³⁷⁰

Though *The Manifesto to the Civilized World* managed to attract 93 signatories, *A Manifesto to Europeans* attracted only one other signatory, Otto Buek. Though Nicolai³⁷¹ spoke out against racism and nationalism in the common language of pacifists of the day, Einstein mixed his pacifistic rhetoric with contradictory racist and nationalistic Zionist rhetoric reminiscent of the Talmud. It is odd that Einstein contradicted his Socialistic and Pacifistic leanings with racist Zionist nationalism; and it is unusual that Einstein took such a strong public stance in support of Jews in the East, while most Western Jews—and he was a Western Jew—wanted to assimilate and distance themselves from segregationist Eastern Jews. Einstein was

an incestuous sexual deviant like many of the Frankist Jews of the East. Einstein's fame came soon after he became a public spokesman for Eastern Jewish Zionism, which was not a coincidence.

4.4.1 Einstein Desires a "Race" War Which Will Exterminate the European Esau

The proposed union of Europe was perhaps intended by Jews like Nicolai and Einstein to consume itself in a struggle against a united Asia. Einstein often spoke in genocidal and racist terms against Germany, while promoting Jews and England. Einstein had consistently betrayed Germany before, during and after the war. For example, Albert Einstein wrote to Paul Ehrenfest on 22 March 1919,

“[The Allied Powers] whose victory during the war I had felt would be by far the lesser evil are now proving to be *only slightly* the lesser evil. [***] I get most joy from the emergence of the Jewish state in Palestine. It does seem to me that our kinfolk really are more sympathetic (at least less brutal) than these horrid Europeans. Perhaps things can only improve if only the Chinese are left, who refer to all Europeans with the collective noun ‘bandits.’”³⁷²

At the time Einstein made this statement, he likely knew that Bolshevik mass murderers were recruiting large numbers of Chinese.³⁷³ Jews were commonly referred to as Asiatics or Orientals (as opposed to Europeans) at that time, and the context of Einstein's statement was his hope that a Jewish state was about to be formed in Palestine. Einstein differentiates Jews from the Europeans he, like many other Jews, would exterminate.

In an article entitled “The Jews”, *The Knickerbocker; or New York Monthly Magazine*, Volume 53, Number 1, (January, 1859), pp. 41-51, at 44-45, wrote,

“Yet the Jews of the Ottoman Empire, notwithstanding their degradation, exhibit a certain intellectual tendency. They live in an ideal world, frivolous and superstitious though it be. The Jew who fills the lowest offices, who deals out *raki* all day long to drunken Greeks, who trades in old nails, and to whose sordid soul the very piastres he bandies have imparted their copper haze, finds his chief delight in mental pursuits. Seated by a taper in his dingy cabin, he spends the long hours of the night in poring over the Zohar, the Chaldaic book of the magic Cabala, or, with enthusiastic delight, plunges into the mystical commentaries on the Talmud, seeking to unravel their quaint traditions and sophistries, and attempting, like the astrologers and alchemists, to divine the secrets and command the powers of Nature. ‘The humble dealer, who hawks some article of clothing or some old piece of furniture about the streets; the obsequious mass of animated filth and rags which approaches to obtrude offers of service on the passing traveller, is perhaps deeply versed in Talmudic lore, or aspiring, in nightly vigils, to read into futurity, to command the elements, and acquire invisibility.’ Thus wisdom is preferred to wealth,

and a Rothschild would reject a family alliance with a Christian prince to form one with the humblest of his tribe who is learned in Hebrew lore.

The Jew of the old world, has his revenge:

‘THE pound of flesh which I demand of him
Is dearly bought, is mine, and I will have it.’

Furnishing the hated Gentiles with the means of waging exterminating wars, he beholds, exultingly, in the fields of slaughtered victims a bloody satisfaction of his ‘lodged hate’ and ‘certain loathing,’ more gratifying even than the golden Four-per-cents on his Princely loans. Of like significance is the fact that in many parts of the world the despised Jews claim as their own the possessions of the Gentiles, among whom they dwell. Thus the squalid *Yeslir*, living in the Jews’ quarter of Balata or Haskeni, and even more despised than the unbelieving dogs of Christians, traffics secretly in the estates, the palaces and the villages of the great Beys and Pachas, who would regard his touch as pollution. What, apparently, can be more absurd? Yet these assumed possessions, far more valuable, in fact, than the best ‘estates in Spain,’ are bought and sold for money, and inherited from generation to generation.”

Einstein’s statements attain their full genocidal context in the writings of his friend and political cohort, the crypto-Jew Georg Friedrich Nicolai (Lewinstein), who, together with Einstein called for the “European race” to unite in their *Manifesto to Europeans*—perhaps in Nicolai’s mind to fight a preemptive race war of extermination against the “superior race” of Mongols—perhaps in Einstein’s mind for the “Mongoloid race” to exterminate the “horrid Europeans”—the “Esau” of Rome.

Nicolai saw Jews as members of the “European race”, or he at least pretended to see them as such in his efforts to draw the Europeans into a “race” war with the Asians. Einstein saw Jews as racially distinct from Europeans. Nicolai (Lewinstein) wrote in 1917,

“§ 34.—*What a War of Extermination Means*

Thus to-day the original conception of war is distorted until it has become completely reversed, simply because there is no longer anything natural about war; it is now merely a romantic reminiscence. Now, it might be, and has been said, that the benefits of war come afterward. It might be thought, however, that any one thus contemplating the remote effects of war ought seriously to reflect upon its inevitable results. That is, he ought to think out his ideas to their logical conclusions, which seems easy, but is often very difficult.

The idea of war as a factor likely to favor the selection of the fittest, and thus promote human evolution, is simple enough. War is here looked upon as representing that relentless, or rather that disinterested, justice which

allows the fit to survive and destroys the unfit. Those who consider this right should act accordingly, and proceed to draw up rules accordingly. They ought to adopt the usages of war of which we read in ancient history, rules by which old men were killed and also unborn children, but not the seemingly humane (!) rules of modern times—rules which make war a farce in the sense in which a natural scientist uses the word; that is to say, cause it to promote negative selection, and thus convert it into a means of deterioration.

The gulf which apparently separates the selfish human being of to-day from the humane promoter of civilization is merely apparent; and here I would recall what I have already said about struggle between animals and struggle between man and man. Both are justifiable in themselves and both *can* be carried on logically. Difficulties do not arise until we begin to imagine that it is allowable to carry on an animal struggle against human beings and by human methods. This is senseless, and therefore criminal; for war as waged at present can be considered only a justifiable form of struggle for existence if the nations against whom we are waging war are not looked upon as human beings, at any rate not as human beings on a level with ourselves; that is, if it is desired to carry on a war of extermination against barbarians so as to enable true humanity to find room upon and spread over the earth. No European will feel that he is justified in considering another European as a barbarian. The utmost which might be asked is whether we are not entitled to consider ourselves a superior race in comparison with certain undeveloped races, such as the Andamans or Tierra del Fuegians. What will undoubtedly occur is that these people will gradually be exterminated by the white race, though it has long been clear that it would be extremely foolish to make war upon them. They die out of themselves wherever they come in contact with whites, bloodless warfare being always more effectual than bloody.

There is only *one* race for which this question of racial superiority might be profoundly important—the Mongolian. I do not know who are the superior, the Mongolians or we ourselves, but I can quite understand our looking on the Mongolian race as enemies, and that, for instance, Europeans on the highest plane would not easily be induced to have a child by a Mongolian woman, at any rate not to own it. I can therefore also fully understand that we or the Mongolians might say, ‘Only one of us two races can rule over the world, and we want that race to be ours.’

In this case the biologically *weaker* race—that is, the one which may rest assured that in ordinary course it would fall a victim to natural selection—might *perhaps* be justified in saying, ‘As there is no chance of our getting the upper hand by natural and lawful means, we will try to take by force what nature withholds from us.’ This shows very plainly that for the really strong war is superfluous; and as obviously it is generally folly for the weak, it is self-evident that, save in the rarest instances, there can be no possible object whatever in it.

Now, it is possible that one such rare instance may be afforded by the

Mongolians, for, unlike all the other colored races, they seem to be in certain respects fitter than Europeans, although it is impossible to know exactly how they will be affected when once they are drawn into the vortex of modern civilization. Meantime, however, the sons of Heaven have the enormous advantage of being able to work equally well under all heavens, whether in the icy wastes of the tundras or under the burning sun of Sumatra. Apparently this is a special Mongolian peculiarity, for even primitive Teutonic peoples simply melted away under the Southern sun to which their impulse led them, and negro races get consumption if transferred to colder climates.

If all this is really the case, then the greater part of the habitable world belongs to the Mongols, and likewise the overlordship thereof; for it seems out of the question, seeing how much going to and fro there already is and how much more there is certain to be in the near future, that two races should live side by side and yet apart. They will mix, and one will prevail over the other.

But perhaps even the most humane of us all would not desire this, and therefore I can imagine our pointing with pardonable pride to our civilization, and saying that we are ready to take up arms in defense of it. You Mongols may be better than we are, we would say, but you are different. We do not want to know anything about your civilization, even supposing it to be superior; we mean to keep our own. From this point of view I can imagine a war, but then it must be really a relentless, merciless war.

There are now in the world five hundred millions of us Europeans or white men originally from Europe, and a thousand millions of various colored races. I believe we have even now the technical means at our disposal for exterminating these thousand millions in the course of the next twenty years. After twenty years, however, we shall no longer be in a position to do this, as soon, that is, as China has armed her whole population, constructs her own dreadnoughts, and manufactures her own cannon and shells, as Japan is already doing.

In the ensuing twenty years, therefore, it is possible that the fate of the world will be decided once and for all, and the responsibility for this decision rests with the five hundred millions of Europeans. The Mongolians need do nothing but wait, for time and space are on their side.

At a time when the fate of so many men is hanging in the balance, Europeans may, perhaps must, be asked whether on careful consideration they mean to declare all colored races barbarians, and then begin a struggle for existence, in other, words a war of extermination, and not a ridiculous war for power, against everything non-European. When once so terrible a conception as that of such a war is grasped, then, if anything save senseless cruelty is to be the result, it also must be thought out to the end, and there would have to be a war *sans trêve et sans relâche*.

We must not spare even the child in its mother's womb, and must tolerate no bastards. Such a war would be ghastly, but there would be some object in it. It is useless to talk of the justice of a war, but in a sense this ghastliest of

wars is the justest because, at any rate, 'it serves its own particular purpose.'

To me it seems at least conceivable that some such war might succeed, although I certainly do not believe this. History, indeed, proves over and over that the despair of nations fighting for their lives gives rise to strength which enables them to triumph over all technical expedients. Here, again, any attempt to interfere with the justice of history by such brutal methods might only too easily hasten the downfall of Europe. European nations, as I think, would do better to concentrate all their economic, technical, and scientific resources on increasing their internal vital energy, that is, on promoting race hygiene in every respect, and thus endeavor to become the equals and even the superiors of the Mongols.

This opens up vistas of victories not purchased with blood—victories which I am profoundly convinced are within the bounds of possibility. This inextinguishable hope is due to my proud European racial instinct. I will not, and I refuse to, admit that the Mongols have in the long run greater vitality than I. I trust that the majority of Europeans think as I do, and that never shall we show the Asiatics such a sign of weakness as to draw the sword against them. Even if the European nations were faint-hearted, even if they were doubtful of ultimate peaceful victory, and if nothing seemed to stand in the way of their extermination by force, even, then I would shrink from resort to force, and I am convinced that the majority of mankind agree with me.

Every one, however, must compound with his own conscience, and should any one be anxious to proceed to victory by way of force, I will go a step further to please him. I feel that all Europeans belong to the same race, and I am proud of this. But others certainly feel this less keenly than I do, and they let their wholesome race instinct run to waste in all manner of fantastic and useless notions, such as the supposed existence of a Teutonic race.[*Footnote: Cf. §§ 90-105, about race patriotism.*]

But there are those who believe in the Teutons, Germans, or Prussians having a right to predominate. I shall not here discuss the justification for such ideas, but those who would fain lead such small aggregates of human beings to victory must at any rate ask themselves whether they are *able* and, if able, also *willing*, to fight out this fight in the only way in which it can answer its purpose.

As for Teutonism, the question is as follows: take the one hundred million Germans or, properly speaking, the twenty millions more or less pure Teutons living in various parts of Europe, most of whom will have nothing whatever to do with the conception of Teutonism. Do they believe that they *can* with any prospect of success embark upon a struggle against forces from fifteen to a hundred times more numerous, and do they really *mean* to destroy these? If they have made up their minds to this, then let them make the attempt, and they will be fighting for an idea, and for an object which is at least conceivable.

We are therefore faced with the following alternative: we must either resolve to live in peace with the French, Russians, English, and whatever all

their names may be, or we must wage a war of extermination upon them, a war whose purpose it is not to leave one of them alive.

Whoever, therefore, decides for war is, at any rate, no fool, and has logic on his side. Nevertheless, I hope and believe that even those who most delight in war will incline toward peace when once they realize what is the inevitable alternative. But this senseless playing at war which is now devastating Europe must be the last of its kind.³⁷⁴

The Bolsheviks in Russia had a strong and growing Chinese contingent very early on in the movement. These Chinese Bolsheviks brutally slaughtered Slavic Christians. Jewish leadership had long since scheduled China to become a Communist nation. Zionist Jews sought to establish a “Jewish State” in the far Eastern regions of the Soviet Union, the Jewish Autonomous Oblast in Khabarovsk Krai in the districts of Birobidzhansky, Leninsky, Obluchensky, Oktyabrsky and Smidovichsky.³⁷⁵ This plan failed, in part, due to the interference of some Zionist Socialists, who insisted that Palestine was the Jews’ national home. An even earlier attempt to found a Jewish State in Russia in the districts of Homel, Witebsk and Minsk,³⁷⁶ also failed, largely due to a lack of Jewish interest. The Zionists insisted that anti-Semitism alone could force the Jews to segregate. When the Zionists put Hitler in power, they had the needed impetus to force Jews to flee Europe and the Zionists attempted to steal Chinese territory for a “Jewish homeland” with the help of the Imperial Japanese under the “Fugu Plan”. Zionist Jews sought to establish a “Jewish State” in China, which had been taken over by the Imperial Japanese whom the Jews had been financing since the days when Jacob Schiff loaned them \$200,000,000.00 in the Russo-Japanese War. The Zionists used the Imperial Japanese to destroy the Chinese government in preparation for the formation of a Jewish nation in China under the “Fugu Plan” in Manchuria or Shanghai. The Jews even promoted the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* to the Japanese as evidence as to how powerful they were. The “Fugu Plan” failed to attract enough Jews, even under Nazi pressure, and die hard Zionists wanted Palestine. The Zionists then arranged for war between the United States and Japan. When America declared war on Japan, Hitler, seemingly inexplicably, declared war on the United States ensuring the ultimate defeat of Germany. Hitler also went to war with the Soviets, which gave him access to large numbers of Jews the Zionists could then segregate and ready for deportation to Palestine.

It is interesting to note that the famous pilot Charles A. Lindbergh warned that the Jews, the British, and the Roosevelt administration were planning a Pearl Harbor type event, in a speech Lindbergh delivered on 11 September 1941 in Des Moines, Iowa.³⁷⁷ Lindbergh was viciously smeared in the press, so viciously, that few dared to defend him. After the Pearl Harbor attack, any who might otherwise have said, “I told you so!” would have been branded a traitor and a Nazi. It is further interesting to note that Adolf Hitler declared war against America immediately after the United States declared war on Japan—this in the full knowledge that America’s entrance into the war had cost Germany victory in the First World War—then Hitler declared war on the Soviets, thereby ensuring the destruction of Germany. Zbigniew

Brzezinski wrote in his book *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*, Basic Books, New York, (1997), pp. 24-25,

“The attitude of the American public toward the external projection of American power has been much more ambivalent. The public supported America’s engagement in World War II largely because of the shock effect of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.”

Project for the New American Century published a report entitled *REBUILDING AMERICA’S DEFENSES: Strategy, Forces and Resources For a New Century*, Project for the New American Century, Washington, D.C., (September, 2000); which states on page 51,

“Further, the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event—like a new Pearl Harbor.”³⁷⁸

There is evidence that Zionists of Einstein’s Era planned to use the Chinese and Japanese to destroy the Europeans, and as a slave populace to protect and provide for Israel, in conformity with Jewish Messianic myth. China is likely slated to become the new America for Zionist interests. Racist Jews have long considered themselves to be “Orientals” and have felt closer to Asia than to Europe.

Nicolai wrote his statement while in prison, much like Hitler would later write *Mein Kampf* while incarcerated. One has a right to ask if agents provocateur like Nicolai were behind Hitler, or if Hitler himself was merely another Nicolai forwarding the interests of genocidal Judaism and racist Zionism. Nicolai (Lewinstein) further indulged in Jewish self-glorification when he wrote, ironically criticizing anti-Semitism, and under the false assumption that Jews were “racially” pure,

“Europe, at all events, is an absolute national medley, and any one who does not consider the Jews the flower of the human race should not make such foolish assertions as that concerning the superiority of unmixed races.”³⁷⁹

Nicolai’s venture into genocidal fantasies was not an anomaly among politically minded persons in the West. Theodore Roosevelt was a racist who worried that the Occidental American “race” was menaced by the superior Oriental “race”. Roosevelt, like Nicolai, wrote, in the context of the disappearance of “races”, that “The military supremacy of the whites”³⁸⁰ could by no means be taken for granted and that Asians must be prevented from emigrating to America and Australia. Roosevelt and many others were concerned by the growing industrial might of the Japanese and dreaded the day when the Chinese might likewise grow their military strength. Zionist Napoleon Bonaparte is said to have called China a “sleeping giant”.

The infamous Hungarian Jew Moses Pinkeles, a. k. a. Ignatius Trebitsch-Lincoln, a. k. a. Chao Kung; who was a Methodist preacher, a pretend spy, a real spy, a Tory

member of the British Parliament, one of the early financiers of Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party, and a very early political activist for the German right wing who argued that genetic mutation had rendered him an Aryan; became a Buddhist monk who claimed to be the Dalai Lama and the Tashi Lama in 1937 and worked with the Imperial Japanese to subjugate the Chinese and create a Jewish Nation near Shanghai—where the Nazis’ allies, the Imperial Japanese, had brutalized the Chinese, though the 20,000 Jewish colonizers³⁸¹ remained in comfort.³⁸²

Like the Frankist Jews, Schopenhauer, Wagner, and Rudolf Glandeck Freiherr von Sebottendorf (b. Adam Alfred Rudolf Glauer), Trebitsch-Lincoln preached Metempsychosis.³⁸³ The Lurian Cabalah of Isaac Ben Solomon Luria taught Metempsychosis,³⁸⁴ and it was the spiritual guide which influenced the Jewish Messianic movement of Shabbatai Zevi and Jacob Frank. The Lurian Cabalah provided the dogma for the Frankists’ belief that the Messiahship would pass from one Jewish king to another Jewish king, either as a dynasty, or through Metempsychosis from one person to another person not genetically related to the previous “Messiah”.

This belief system has survived among the Lubavitchers, who today proclaim the advent of the Jewish Messiah. Luria was born of an Ashkenazi father and a Sephardic mother. Some believe that the Lurian Cabalah is expressive of the mysticism of the Hasidic Ashkenazi and forms the basis of much of modern Hasidism, who represent the descendants of the Shabbataians and the Frankists. Others dispute these assertions. It is important to note the differences between the various Jewish conceptions of the Messiah[s], and the Christian story of a loving Jesus. According to the Old Testament and various Cabalistic writings, the Jewish Messiah will ruin the nations and exterminate the Gentiles. The Cabalist Jews hold sacred another rabidly anti-Gentile, anti-Christian, and anti-Moslem racist religious tract, the Cabalist *Zohar*.

Lubavitch Hasidim continue a tradition of Frankist Jewish Dualism, which sees evil as good, and which practices evil as if it were observance to God and a means of summoning forth the Messiah. Many suspect that the Lubavitchers, who are very well-connected in politics and in the media and who have pronounced that the Messiah is among us, plan to rule the world and fulfill Jewish Messianic prophecy.

Frankist Jews intentionally caused the persecution of Rabbinical Jews by calling the attention of Catholics to the horrifically anti-Christian and anti-Gentile teachings of the Talmud. The Frankists delighted in the deaths and sufferings of Jews, because they believed it would bring on the Messianic Era; and because it provided them with a means to worm their way into Gentile government and the Church so as to subvert them as crypto-Jews. *The North American Review* wrote as early as 1845,

“The common expectation of a Messiah has given a wide scope for enthusiasm and fanaticism. About the year 1666, when the whole nation were looking for some remarkable event, there appeared in the East one of the most notable of the many, who, in different ages, have claimed to be Messiahs. Banished from Aleppo, his birth-place, and subsequently from Salonichi, this man, Zabathai Tzevi, travelled much, and then took up his

residence at Smyrna. Great multitudes followed him; and when, to save his life, he professed the Mohammedan faith, though without renouncing his pretensions to the Messiahship, many imitated his example. His followers, denominated Zabathaites, are still found at Salonichi, outwardly professing Islamism, but Jews at heart, —a separate community, all living in the same quarter of the city, and mingling with the Turks only at the mosques and in business. He had many adherents in Poland, Holland, England, and other parts of Europe, some of whose descendants are said still to revere his memory; and would, perhaps, agree with a class of Jews, which the chief rabbi of Cairo told Dr. Wolff was numerous, and who, without being avowed followers of Tzevi, declare, when embarrassed by passages of Scripture which speak of a suffering Messiah, that they think Tzevi may have been he. Tzevi and some of his followers pretended to work miracles, and to have visions and prophetic raptures.

In 1750, a Polish Jew named Frank, or Frenk, formed a new congregation in Podolia, sometimes called that of the Zoharites, after the much earlier admirers of the celebrated mystical book Zohar; and these are improperly regarded by some persons as followers of Tzevi [Shabbatai Zevi]. These Frankists, as they are also denominated, were undoubtedly tainted with mysticism; but their chief distinction seems to have been the rejection of the Talmud, which brought upon them the persecuting hate of the Rabbinists. Their faith, indeed, approximated to Christianity, which many of them embraced. They were once numerous, and are still found in Hungary and Poland.

The sect called at the present day *Chasidim*, the *Holy*, or *Pious*, who are not to be confounded with a party bearing the same name in the time of the Maccabees, date from about the year 1760; when, at Miedzyvorz in the Ukraine, a rabbi named Israel, taking the surname of Baalshem, 'possessor of the name of God,' by means of outward sanctity, and the pretended power of exorcism and working miracles, gained great multitudes of adherents. He obtained ten thousand followers within ten years, and before his death, which took place five years afterwards, forty thousand. The doctrines of the Chasidim are said to be of most pernicious tendency, promising the faithful absolution from the vilest enormities, and supernatural protection from the hostility of all earthly powers; and the sect has been reproached for every species of immorality and crime. Probably, however, these accounts are exaggerated; and the Chasidim have doubtless improved since the age of their founder. Though they receive the traditions, they are at enmity with all other Jews; and are especially bigoted in their hatred of Christianity. Their number seems to have been increasing ever since Baalshem's day, and now to be very large. Dr. Jost, a Jew opposed to them, declares, nevertheless, that their religion is at present that of nine tenths of all the Jews in Galicia, South Hungary, Wallachia, and West and South Russia; and of great numbers in Bohemia, Moravia, Moldavia, and Poland. Their worship is marked by many extravagances; they have been called 'Jewish Jumpers.' Working themselves

into ecstasies, they laugh hysterically, clap their hands, and leap with frantic zeal about the synagogue, turning their faces and raising their clenched fists towards heaven, as if daring the Almighty to refuse their requests.

Rabbinism is the Catholic faith, from which all these sects are, in modern phrase, dissenters. It is the lineal descendant of Pharisaism, and distinguished by its blind adherence to the Talmud. The estimation in which strict Rabbinists hold this book is unbounded. 'He that has learned the Scripture, and not the Mishna,' says the Gemara, 'is a blockhead.' Isaac, a distinguished rabbi, says, 'Do not imagine that the written law is the foundation of our religion, which is really founded on the oral law.' The Rabbinical doctrine is, 'The Bible is like water, the Mishna like wine, and the Gemara like spiced wine.' Some even say, that 'to study the Bible is but a waste of time.' For strict Rabbinism, a melancholy compound of superstition and fanaticism, we must look to Poland, Russia, Hungary, and Palestine, of which we speak, in describing the system. In those countries, the Rabbinists, or Talmudists, discountenance as profane all other study than that of the Bible and Talmud, but are very careful to educate their sons in their religious lore."³⁸⁵

In 1933, Moses Pinkeles, a. k. a. Trebitsch-Lincoln, tried to spread Buddhism in Europe. In 1939, he made a Frankist appeal to the combatant governments to disband under the threat that he would otherwise unleash "Tibetan Buddhist Supreme Masters" who would destroy them—which harkens back to the Theosophic myths surrounding the Messianic Cabalist Comte de Saint Germain and the "White Lodge of the Himalayas" and the "lost secrets of Atlantis".³⁸⁶ When Trebitsch-Lincoln died, Nazi Party ideologist, and Editor-in-Chief, Alfred Rosenberg published an obituary to honor Pinkeles, a Jew, on the front page of the official Nazi Party organ the *Völkische Beobachter*. Pinkeles, a Hungarian Zionist Jew, had given Adolf Hitler the money to buy the newspaper *Völkische Beobachter*. Trebitsch-Lincoln was remembered in a somewhat different fashion by *The New York Times* on 9 October 1943 on page 13. Trebitsch-Lincoln asserted that Jews are Orientals, which he apparently considered a superior "race" to Europeans. While a member of the British Parliament, he responded on 13 June 1910 to the assertion that the allegedly superior white "race" must subjugate the allegedly inferior "races",

"I submit that if the white man cannot rule races which we call inferior races save by resort to arms, then his prestige is already gone. I speak, I confess, as an Oriental myself. I have Oriental blood in my veins, and I cannot but laugh at the doctrine of hon. Members opposite that Orientals must receive treatment in some way different from that given to other peoples. May I be permitted to point out that one of the greatest men who ever lived, Jesus Christ, was an Oriental, and did He differentiate His treatment when dealing with Orientals?"³⁸⁷

The Nazis launched a major effort to turn the Indians of India against the British, which they directed through Tibet, in which effort Trebitsch-Lincoln sought to lend

his influence among Buddhists and the Imperial Japanese.

The British obstructed the Nazis' efforts to send Jews to Palestine. Moses Pinkeles sought to remove British influence from Asia and supplant it with Nazi and Imperial Japanese influence.³⁸⁸ He no doubt wanted to forward the "Fugu Plan" for a Jewish State in Manchuria or Shanghai.

It is interesting to note that Communist China is the largest nation on Earth, in terms of population, but is rarely in the news in the United States. Israel, with its vastly smaller population, dominates the news, though the Palestinian viewpoint is largely ignored. Very little effort is made by United States politicians and by the American press to reform China and free its two billion citizens from tyranny, and enormous sums of money are given to Israel to help the Jews to oppress the Palestinians. Neo-Conservatives and Israeli spies have been accused of providing the Red Chinese with top secret American military secrets and materials. As China's financial power increases, it will come to play a major rôle, if not the dominant rôle, in world politics.

4.4.2 Genocidal Judaism—Pruning the Branches of the Human Family Tree

There are many Jewish traditions of human sacrifice and of the genocide of their own people, as well as of their enemies. A Jew named Saul carried these traditions over into Christianity (*Romans* 11). Jewish mythology begins with Baal worship, a Canaanite religion in which fathers burn their own firstborn children as a sacrifice to God.

The Jewish mythology of Abraham states that Abraham believed in and feared God. As a reward, God made a covenant with Abraham and gave the land that was to become Israel to the seed of Abraham. *Genesis* 15:18-21 states (*see also: Deuteronomy* 11:24-28, and *Joshua* 1:3-4. These passages—which promise the Jews an enormous domain—in some minds the entire world—are troubling because the Kahanists are pursuing these lands³⁸⁹ and the Neo-Conservative Zionists in America are assisting Israel to obtain hegemony over the Middle East):

“18 In the same day the LORD made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt [the Nile] unto the great river, the river Euphrates: 19 The Kenites, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites, 20 And the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaims, 21 And the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites.”

Genesis 17:8 states:

“8 And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.”

Ari Shavit wrote in his article, “White Man's Burden”, in the Israeli news source

Haaretz,

“The war in Iraq was conceived by 25 neoconservative intellectuals, most of them Jewish, who are pushing President Bush to change the course of history.”³⁹⁰

In an article entitled, “Top White House Posts Go to Jews” published in *The Jerusalem Post* on 25 April 2006, Nathan Guttman named some of the Jews in the Clinton and Bush Administrations and in the State Department: Joshua Bolten, Joel Kaplan, Michael Chertoff, Elliott Abrams, Jay Lefkowitz, Paul Wolfowitz, Doug Feith, Lewis “Scooter” Libby, Ken Mehlman, Robert Reich, Robert Rubin, Sandy Berger, Lawrence Summers, Madeline Albright, Dennis Ross, Martin Indyk, and Aaron Miller. Guttman wrote,

“One tradition likely to go on is the reading of the Purim megilla led by Chabad Rabbi Levi Shemtov, which attracts many of the Jewish staffers.”³⁹¹

In addition to the United States Government, the American news media are in predominantly Zionist hands. Against the best interests of the American People, the United States has literally fought for Israel to obtain its goal of hegemony in the Middle East, and a Greater Israel whose borders will extend from the Nile to the Euphrates. Many American lives have been sacrificed to Israel.

In one of the early instances of human sacrifice in the history of the Hebrews, God asked Abraham to make a burnt offering of his only and beloved son Isaac to God as a human sacrifice (*Genesis* 22:2). This story reveals that Judaism is an outgrowth of Canaanite Baal worship. Baal worship required parents to sacrifice their firstborn children by burning them to ashes, by “passing them through the flame”. Note that the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth was another of countless human sacrifices in the Jewish tradition, in which Baal or God sacrifices His own firstborn child Jesus, as Jews so often did in the Old Testament.³⁹² Since Abraham was willing to murder his child by burning him as a sacrifice to God, an obvious instance of Baal worship, God spared Isaac and blessed Abraham by multiplying his seed (*Genesis* 22). Abraham’s son Isaac came to fear God and so inherited the blessing.

An alternative explanation is that the entire story is a Jewish fabrication of self-aggrandizement meant to justify the theft of the land of other peoples. It might be that someone in the history of the Canaanites was so traumatized by the action of burning his only and beloved son alive, that he hallucinated God, or invented a story to excuse himself from sacrilege and so founded a new form of the worship of Baal, which became Judaism. Yet another alternative explanation, and this is perhaps the most plausible explanation, is that the Judeans fabricated the story in order to hide their Baal worshiping practice of human sacrifice from, among others, the Greeks and Egyptians, who often criticized them for it; and took the opportunity to give themselves their neighbor’s land.

In point of fact, in the story Abraham’s firstborn child was not Isaac, but Ishmael.

Abraham's wife was named Sarah. She was also Abraham's sister and perhaps prostituted herself, as was customary among Hebrew Baal worshipers, and slept with the Pharaoh (*Genesis* 12:10-20), and with Abimelech, who was perhaps the true father of Isaac in the earliest traditions which preceded the Torah (*Genesis* 20; 21:22-34). Mary, mother of Jesus of Nazareth, was also said by the Jews to have been a prostitute and the mother of the son of the new covenant. Jesus was said by the Jews to have been the bastard child of a whore, whose reputation was improved by the legend of royal descent through his father Joseph, though it was contradictorily claimed that he was the son of God through virgin birth to Mary (*Matthew* 1. *Luke* 3:23-38). The stories of Abraham and Jesus were conceived in comparatively close timing to one another, despite the dates claimed for them, and they were fabricated under similar circumstances and towards the same ends (*Matthew* 1:21-23).

One should note that the Jews of the First Century and before had a myth which exists to this day, that there would be two Messiahs, one descended from David, (II *Samuel* 7; 22:44-51; 23:1-5. *Isaiah* 9:6-7. *Jeremiah* 23:5; 33:15, 17. *Ezekiel* 37:24-25); and another from Joseph (through the tribe of Ephraim: *Exodus* 40. *Isaiah* 53). Perhaps this explains why two different lineages emerged, perhaps not. It should be noted that King David is a fictional character, and that the ten northern tribes of Israel and the Temple of Solomon probably never existed. Even those who believe in the existence of King David as a matter of faith, may wish to consider that his descendants can not be traced, as the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* states in its article "Messiah",

"The Davidic origin of the kingly Messiah was supposed; but, as it seems, the Messianic pretender had to prove his authenticity by his deeds—in the period of the Second Temple Davidic descendants were not traceable."³⁹³

Since Sarah was barren, Abraham slept with Sarah's maidservant Hagar, an Egyptian, who bore him Ishmael (*Genesis* 16) who grew into a "wild man" at perpetual war with other men. Examining the story from the perspective of Baal worshiping Hebrews, Baal required the Hebrews to sacrifice the firstborn child of each family to God.

Why should we consider the Jews to have been Baal worshipers? The book of *Ezekiel* and other places in the Old Testament make clear that the practices of Baal worship of cutting one's self with a knife to the point of covering one's self with one's own blood, of prostitution in the Temple in celebration of fertility, of homosexuality in the Temple as an expression of devotion to the male fertility god, of immolating one's firstborn child by incineration, were all widely practiced by the Jews for very long periods of time. Abraham's father, Terah, worshiped idols (*Joshua* 24:2). Abraham violated the law that he must burn his firstborn child, Ishmael. Perhaps he did so at the insistence of Ishmael's Egyptian mother, Hagar. More likely is the alternative explanation that "Hagar" (like "Moses") is a symbol of the Egyptian proselytizers who converted the Judeans to Egyptian monotheism—the two religions intertwining in a new genocidal form of *Baal* worship called Judaism, which had to reconcile its past history and recent present of

human sacrifice with the need to improve its image in the then-modern ancient world, where such barbarities were frowned upon.

The Biblical myth of the sacrificial mass murder of the firstborn of Egypt, for the sake of Zionism, probably relates to a lost traditional myth of the human sacrifice of the firstborn of the Egyptian Hagar and Abraham. Their firstborn son was Ishmael. There may well have been a tradition which claimed that he was sacrificed for the sake of Zionism, and that Abraham and Sarah's son Isaac became heir to the covenant, and had twin sons Esau and Jacob. These mythological characters were symbols of entire peoples—peoples meant for world domination (Jacob=Jews) and peoples destined for extermination (Esau=Gentiles). The Jews pruned off entire "races" from the human family in their religious and political mythologies, often cutting off some of their own blood lines. Ishmael is to this day made a human sacrifice made for the sake of Zionism. Zionist Jews today ascribe "Esau" to the Iranians, Iraqis, Palestinians, Syrians, Lebanese, etc. And "Esau", the Christian United States and Great Britain, are the sword and the servant of Jacob, the Zionist State, the sword and the servant who slays "Esau" and "Ishmael" the Moslems (*Genesis 25:23; 27:38-41*). The reader is advised that these inconsistencies are due to the mythologies of opportunistic Jewish racists, not your humble author. At any rate, it seems clear that the story of the murder of the firstborn of Egypt is the story of a Canaanite sacrifice to Baal made as an offering for the land of Greater Israel.

Perhaps, to a Baal worshiper, Ishmael, the son of Abraham and Hagar, should have been sacrificed to God through the fire; and Hagar, an Egyptian, intervened and would not let her child Ishmael be sacrificed to Baal. It was Ishmael, not Isaac, who was the eldest son of Abraham and he, not Isaac, should have inherited the Covenant with God. It is likely that the Egyptian Hagar would have her son Ishmael circumcised, given that circumcision was an Egyptian custom, and the Covenant was given to the circumcised, Abraham and Ishmael (*Genesis 17*—indeed, the prophet Mohammed taught that the Covenant was with Abraham and Ishmael, not Isaac), but because Ishmael should have been sacrificed to God, rights to the Covenant instead passed to a prophesied second child, Isaac born of Sarah; and, apparently, Abimelech, King of Gerar. Ishmael is demonized as a wild man of a foreign inferior race, so as to justify the unjustifiable wrongs done to him by the descendants of the Jews. In the mythology the Judeans composed to glorify themselves, Isaac inherits Abraham's blessings and the Judeans eventually steal the lands of Abimelech.

As Thomas Jefferson admonished us to do, we should eliminate the supernatural superstition in the Bible. A clearer picture of the story emerges if we eliminate the myth of the Covenant with God for the land of Canaan, and substitute the more realistic picture presented in the story of the covenant between Abraham and King Abimelech. *Genesis 21:22-33* states:

“22 And it came to pass at that time, that Abimelech and Phicol the chief captain of his host spake unto Abraham, saying, God *is* with thee in all that thou doest: 23 Now therefore swear unto me here by God that thou wilt not deal falsely with me, nor with my son, nor with my son's son: *but* according to the kindness that I have done unto thee, thou shalt do unto me, and to the

land wherein thou hast sojourned. 24 And Abraham said, I will swear. 25 And Abraham reproved Abimelech because of a well of water, which Abimelech's servants had violently taken away. 26 And Abimelech said, I wot not who hath done this thing: neither didst thou tell me, neither yet heard I of *it*, but to day. 27 And Abraham took sheep and oxen, and gave them unto Abimelech; and both of them made a covenant. 28 And Abraham set seven ewe lambs of the flock by themselves. 29 And Abimelech said unto Abraham, What *mean* these seven ewe lambs which thou hast set by themselves? 30 And he said, For these *seven* ewe lambs shalt thou take of my hand, that they may be a witness unto me, that I have digged this well. 31 Wherefore he called that place Beer-sheba; because there they sware both of them. 32 Thus they made a covenant at Beer-sheba: then Abimelech rose up, and Phichol the chief captain of his host, and they returned into the land of the Philistines. 33 And *Abraham* planted a grove in Beer-sheba, and called there on the name of the LORD, the everlasting God.”

Your author proposes that, given the many identities, we should assume that the stories of: Sarah and the Pharaoh, Sarah and Abimelech, Sarah and Og, Rebekah and Abimelech; are all the same story told in various traditions. Also assume that the stories of: Adam and Eve; Abraham, Abimelech, Hagar and Sarah; Isaac, Abimelech and Rebekah; and perhaps even Aaron and Moses; are all the same story told in various traditions—quite likely Egyptian traditions stemming from the life of Egyptian Pharaoh Akhenaton IV, who pioneered Egyptian monotheism. Still further assume that: Cain and Abel, Ishmael and Isaac, Esau and Jacob, Aaron and Moses; are the same story told in different traditions. All of these fabricated and racist stories are awkwardly threaded together in the Bible, as if different stories, and are linked together by a fabricated genealogy which places Israel at perpetual war with other peoples, so as to explain away the fact that the same story is told over and over again with different characters.

A predominant racist element repeated again and again in the Old Testament is the story that a leader's family is led into corruption by a foreign wife or servant; and, conversely, that Jewish women are sent to corrupt foreign leaders—a practice practiced and lauded by prominent Jews, such as Josephus, who wrote of the alleged corruption of Nero by his Jewish wife Poppæa.³⁹⁴ We know that the more modern Frankist Jews, among many other Jews, carried on this tradition, whether the ancient stories are in fact true, or not. Stalin feared that the Jewish wives of members of the government were seeking to undermine his authority, or so he claimed, and Stalin proscribed intermarriage between Jews and Gentiles,³⁹⁵ though he himself loved Jewish women.³⁹⁶ These proscriptions against intermarriage had the benefit of helping to preserve the Jewish religion and the Jewish race, in the minds of Jewish bigots (*Exodus* 34:16. *Deuteronomy* 7:2-3. *Ezra* 9. *Nehemiah* 9:2; 13:3, 23-30). The Jewish faith is traditionally passed down through the mother, which ensures that the blood of the child is at least half the blood of the tribe, because a woman may sleep with many men but carries her own eggs.

The covenant for land for the Jews in Judah is then strictly a deal struck between

Abimelech and Abraham, not God and Abraham, and was made to give Abimelech's offspring through Sarah a kingdom and secure peace, not to create a Holy contract that must be obeyed forever by all the world. The supposed "tribes" were ruled by the descendants of Abimelech and his wives, including Sarah, Abraham's sister—not by the descendants of Abraham. Abraham is merely the guardian of Abimelech and Sarah's child, Isaac/Jacob; and Abraham promotes him over his own son, Ishmael/Esau—in effect sacrifices his firstborn Ishmael/Esau, whose seed (all Gentiles) then becomes a perpetual human sacrifice to God for the sake of Jacob (all Jews), in fulfilment of the Canaanites'/Jews' worship of Baal. Note that Ishmael is said to sire twelve Princes and to be the father of a great nation (*Genesis* 17:20). Note further that the union of Sarah and Pharaoh is said to have caused plagues on Egypt—which is quite similar to the stories of Aaron, Moses and the Pharaoh (*Genesis* 12:17).

The same story transfers to Moses and Aaron, where Moses and Aaron must convince those Egyptians who would follow them to give up their bondage to the worship of Pharaoh and adopt the worship of Baal—historically perhaps a group of Egyptian lepers oppressed by the Hyksos—perhaps even ostracized Hyksos lepers, who migrated to Judah and taught the Judeans Egyptian monotheism. Moses and Aaron bring plagues on the Egyptians, which is perhaps symbolic of the diseases the Hyksos brought to Egypt. In an act of Baal worship, Moses sacrifices the firstborn of the Egyptians among his people, and so hopes to transfer the loyalty of the Egyptians from Pharaoh and the Sun, to Baal, and the loyalty of Baal to the Egyptian converts. Moses and Aaron eventually succeed and the people worship Baal, though, perhaps, Moses then seeks to convert them to an Egyptian sect of Monotheism and Eleatic Monism—which is the same story as the inexplicable break in religion between Terah and his son Abraham.

Jewish authors may have added this break from pure Baalism while under the influence of the Greeks, or an Egyptian sect in Alexandria. There might well have been a sect that sought to convert Jews from Baalism which incorporated other gods, to a strict Baalism that worshiped only jealous Baal; and so fabricated the stories and legends of Monotheism from Eleatic Monism, and Egyptian and Socratic Monotheism. The sect of Dualist Judaism took from Heraclitean and Platonic dialectics to invent Christianity, which was probably intended as a stumbling block for the Romans and means to preserve the Jewish Nation.

Had Gnostic Christianity succeeded, it would have exterminated the Romans. Epiphanius wrote of the Gnostics,

“For all the sects have gathered their imposture from Greek mythology, and altered it for themselves by revising it for another and worse purpose.”³⁹⁷

There are also elements of Hindu Metempsychosis in Dualist Judaism, especially as it reached the Frankists *viz.* the Lurian Cabala. The Jews were exposed to Metempsychosis through Origen, Pathagoras, and many ancient Greek philosophers; then through the Schoolmen. The Cabala adopts many of the beliefs of the Stoics and Eleatics, such as the Eleatic notions of pantheism and space-time—the belief that all

space and all time is one, that everything *is*, and God is *all*. This found its way into the Old Testament, which was fabricated and modified in the era of the Eleatics and of Heraclitus, then further modified by the Alexandrian Jews in the *Septuagint* and by Philo, who heavily Hellenized Judaism and set the stage for the early Christian apologists, who were in many instances Jewish apologists and Jewish nationalists—as was Philo of Alexandria. Ultimately, these beliefs are Hindu in origin and many Jewish Cabalists have succeeded in infusing them into modern Physics. The modern notions of the “big bang”, space-time, pantheism, etc. were passed down to Giordano Bruno, Isaac Newton, etc. by Cabalist Jews, who adopted the ideas of the Hindus via the Eleatics, Heraclitus, Plato, Aristotle, Origen of Alexandria, the Schoolmen, etc.

An important aspect of the Abraham myth, which weeds off certain races (the Old Testament is filled with mythologies whereby individuals symbolize entire peoples), is the declaration that God would shield Abraham (*Genesis* 15:1). Jews promoted the myth that God would annihilate anyone who challenged Israel. Jews celebrated the genocide of the Egyptian army in *Exodus* 14:15-15:1. *Deuteronomy* 11:24-28 states,

“24 Every place whereon the soles of your feet shall tread shall be yours: from the wilderness and Lebanon, from the river, the river Euphrates, even unto the uttermost sea shall your coast be. 25 There shall no man be able to stand before you: *for* the LORD your God shall lay the fear of you and the dread of you upon all the land that ye shall tread upon, as he hath said unto you. 26 Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; 27 A blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the LORD your God, which I command you this day: 28 And a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the LORD your God, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods, which ye have not known.”

As a threat against the nations, Jews sought to promote the myth of their invincibility and tried desperately to preserve the Gentiles’ “fear of the inaccessibility of Israel”. Frederick the Great is reputed to have stated, “to oppress the Jews never brought prosperity to any Government”.³⁹⁸ In 1906, Herbert N. Casson tried to intimidate Americans into welcoming the massive influx of Eastern European Jews,

“It seems as if the American plan of giving the Jews fair play was succeeding. At any rate, all the other plans failed. ‘No nations prospers that persecutes the Jews,’ said Frederick the Great. Egypt tried persecution, and the Jews went to its funeral. Assyria made the same blunder. So did Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome, Spain. Say the Jew is not a fighter!”³⁹⁹

This prompts the question if America will share the sorry fate of those nations which had a significantly large number of racist Jews in its midst. *Jeremiah* 24:9 states,

“And I will deliver them to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth for *their* hurt, to be a reproach and a proverb, a taunt and a curse, in all places whither I shall drive them.”

Malachi 1:14 states,

“[. . .]I am a great King, saith the LORD of hosts, and my name is dreadful among the heathen.”

Cyprian exposted upon the ancient practice of threatening one’s enemies with one’s gods, and asserted that a single God, whose power was undiluted and universal, posed the greatest threat of all to one’s enemies. Consider Cyprian’s doctrine *circa* A.D. 247,

“TREATISE VI.

ON THE VANITY OF IDOLS: SHOWING THAT THE IDOLS ARE NOT GODS, AND THAT GOD IS ONE, AND THAT THROUGH CHRIST SALVATION IS GIVEN TO BELIEVERS.

ARGUMNET.—THIS HEADING EMBRACES THE THREE LEADING DIVISIONS OF THIS TREATISE. THE WRITER FIRST OF ALL SHOWS THAT THEY IN WHOSE HONOUR TEMPLES WERE FOUNDED, STATUES MODELLED, VICTIMS SACRIFICED, AND FESTAL DAYS CELEBRATED, WERE KINGS AND MEN AND NOT GODS; AND THEREFORE THAT THEIR WORSHIP COULD BE OF NO AVAIL EITHER TO STRANGERS OR TO ROMANS, AND THAT THE POWER OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE WAS TO ATTRIBUTED TO FATE RATHER THAN TO THEM, INASMUCH AS IT HAD ARISEN BY A CERTAIN GOOD FORTUNE, AND WAS ASHAMED OF ITS OWN ORIGIN.

1. That those are no gods whom the common people worship, is known from this. They were formerly kings, who on account of their royal memory subsequently began to be adored by their people even in death. Thence temples were founded to them; thence images were sculptured to retain the countenances of the deceased by the likeness; and men sacrificed victims, and celebrated festal days, by way of giving them honour. Thence to posterity those rites became sacred which at first had been adopted as a consolation. And now let us see whether this truth is confirmed in individual instances.

2. Melicertes and Leucothea are precipitated into the sea, and subsequently become sea-divinities. The Castors die by turns, that they may live. Æsculapius is struck by lightning, that he may rise into a god. Hercules, that he may put off the man, is burnt up in the fires of Oeta. Apollo fed the

flocks of Admetus; Neptune founded walls for Laomedon, and received—unfortunate builder—no wages for his work. The cave of Jupiter is to be seen in Crete, and his sepulchre is shown; and it is manifest that Saturn was driven away by him, and that from him Latium received its name, as being his lurking-place. He was the first that taught to print letters; he was the first that taught to stamp money in Italy, and thence the treasury is called the treasury of Saturn. And he also was the cultivator of the rustic life, whence he is painted as an old man carrying a sickle. Janus had received him to hospitality when he was driven away, from whose name the Janiculum is so called, and the month of January is appointed. He himself is portrayed with two faces, because, placed in the middle, he seems to look equally towards the commencing and the closing year. The Mauri, indeed, manifestly worship kings, and do not conceal their name by any disguise.

3. From this the religion of the gods is variously changed among individual nations and provinces, inasmuch as no one god is worshipped by all, but by each one the worship of its own ancestors is kept peculiar. Proving that this is so, Alexander the Great writes in the remarkable volume addressed to his mother, that through fear of his power the doctrine of the gods being men, which was kept secret, had been disclosed to him by a priest, that it was the memory of ancestors and kings that was (really) kept up, and that from this the rites of worship and sacrifice have grown up. But if gods were born at any time, why are they not born in these days also?—unless, indeed, Jupiter possibly has grown too old, or the faculty of bearing has failed Juno.

4. But why do you think that the gods can avail on behalf of the Romans, when you see that they can do nothing for their own worshipers in opposition to the Roman arms? For we know that the gods of the Romans are indigenous. Romulus was made a god by the perjury of Proculus, and Picus, and Tiberinus, and Pilumnus, and Consus, whom as a god of treachery Romulus would have to be worshipped, just as if he had been a god of counsels, when his perfidy resulted in the rape of the Sabines. Tatius also both invented and worshipped the goddess Cloacina; Hostilius, Fear and Paleness. By and by, I know not by whom, Fever was dedicated, and Acca and Flora the harlots. These are the Roman gods. But Mars is a Thracian, and Jupiter a Cretan, and Juno either Argive or Samian or Carthaginian, and Diana of Taurus, and the mother of the gods of Ida; and there are Egyptian monsters, not deities, who assuredly, if they had had any power, would have preserved their own and their people's kingdoms. Certainly there are also among the Romans the conquered Penates whom the fugitive Æneas introduced thither. There is also Venus the bald,—far more dishonoured by the fact of her baldness in Rome than by her having been wounded in Homer.

5. Kingdoms do not rise to supremacy through merit, but are varied by chance. Empire was formerly held by both Assyrians and Medes and Persians; and we know, too, that both Greeks and Egyptians have had dominion. Thus, in the varying vicissitudes of power, the period of empire

has also come to the Romans as to the others. But if you recur to its origin, you must needs blush. A people is collected together from profligates and criminals, and by founding an asylum, impunity for crimes makes the number great; and that their king himself may have a superiority in crime, Romulus becomes a fratricide; and in order to promote marriage, he makes a beginning of that affair of concord by discords. They steal, they do violence, they deceive in order to increase the population of the state; their marriage consists of the broken covenants of hospitality and cruel wars with their fathers-in-law. The consulship, moreover, is the highest degree in Roman honours, yet we see that the consulship began even as did the kingdom. Brutus puts his sons to death, that the commendation of his dignity may increase by the approval of his wickedness. The Roman kingdom, therefore, did not grow from the sanctities of religion, nor from auspices and auguries, but it keeps its appointed time within a definite limit. Moreover, Regulus observed the auspices, yet was taken prisoner; and Mancinus observed their religious obligation, yet was sent under the yoke. Paulus had chickens that fed, and yet he was slain at Cannæ. Caius Cæsar despised the auguries and auspices that were opposed to his sending ships before the winter to Africa; yet so much the more easily he both sailed and conquered.

6. Of all these, however, the principle is the same, which misleads and deceives, and with tricks which darken the truth, leads away a credulous and foolish rabble. They are impure and wandering spirits, who, after having been steeped in earthly vices, have departed from their celestial vigour by the contagion of earth, and do not cease, when ruined themselves, to seek the ruin of others; and when degraded themselves, to infuse into others the error of their own degradation. These demons the poets also acknowledge, and Socrates declared that he was instructed and ruled at the will of a demon; and thence the Magi have a power either for mischief or for mockery, of whom, however, the chief Hostanes both says that the form of the true God cannot be seen, and declares that true angels stand round about His throne. Wherein Plato also on the same principle concurs, and, maintaining one God, calls the rest angels or demons. Moreover, Hermes Trismegistus speaks of one God, and confesses that He is incomprehensible, and beyond our estimation.

7. These spirits, therefore, are lurking under the statues and consecrated images: these inspire the breasts of their prophets with their afflatus, animate the fibres of the entrails, direct the flights of birds, rule the lots, give efficiency to oracles, are always mixing up falsehood with truth, for they are both deceived and they deceive; they disturb their life, they disquiet their slumbers; their spirits creeping also into their bodies, secretly terrify their minds, distort their limbs, break their health, excite diseases to force them to worship of themselves, so that when glutted with the steam of the altars and the piles of cattle, they may unloose what they had bound, and so appear to have effected a cure. The only remedy from them is when their own mischief ceases; nor have they any other desire than to call men away from God, and to turn them from the understanding of the true religion, to superstition with

respect to themselves; and since they themselves are under punishment, (they wish) to seek for themselves companions in punishment whom they may by their misguidance make sharers in their crime. These, however, when adjured by us through the true God, at once yield and confess, and are constrained to go out from the bodies possessed. You may see them at our voice, and by the operation of the hidden majesty, smitten with stripes, burnt with fire, stretched out with the increase of a growing punishment, howling, groaning, entreating, confessing whence they came and when depart, even in the hearing of those very persons who worship them, and either springing forth at once or vanishing gradually, even as the faith of the sufferer comes in aid, or the grace of the healer effects. Hence they urge the common people to detest our name, so that men begin to hate us before they know us, lest they should either imitate us if known, or not be able to condemn us.

8. Therefore the one Lord of all is God. For that sublimity cannot possibly have any compeer, since it alone possesses all power. Moreover, let us borrow an illustration for the divine government from the earth. When ever did an alliance in royalty either begin with good faith or end without bloodshed? Thus the brotherhood of the Thebans was broken, and discord endured even in death in their disunited ashes. And one kingdom could not contain the Roman twins, although the shelter of one womb had held them. Pompey and Cæsar were kinsmen, and yet they did not maintain the bond of their relationship in their envious power. Neither should you marvel at this in respect of man, since herein all nature consents. The bees have one king, and in the flocks there is one leader, and in the herds one ruler. Much rather is the Ruler of the world one; who commands all things, whatsoever they are, with His word, disposes them by His wisdom, and accomplishes them by His power.

9. He cannot be seen—He is too bright for vision; nor comprehended—He is too pure for our discernment; nor estimated—He is too great for our perception; and therefore we are only worthily estimating Him when we say that He is inconceivable. But what temple can God have, whose temple is the whole world? And while man dwells far and wide, shall I shut up the power of such great majesty within one small building? He must be dedicated in our mind; in our breast He must be consecrated. Neither must you ask the name of God. God is His name. Among those there is need of names where a multitude is to be distinguished by the appropriate characteristics of appellations. To God who alone is, belongs the whole name of God; therefore He is one, and He in His entirety is everywhere diffused. For even the common people in many things naturally confess God, when their mind and soul are admonished of their author and origin. We frequently hear it said, ‘O God,’ and ‘God sees,’ and ‘I commend to God,’ and ‘God give you,’ and ‘as God will,’ and ‘if God should grant;’ and this is the very height of sinfulness, to refuse to acknowledge Him whom you cannot but know.”⁴⁰⁰

The *Midrash Bereshit Rabbah* 38:13 tells that Abraham's father worshiped and sold idols. One day, Abraham smashed all of the idols but the largest idol and then placed a stick in its hand. He told his father that the largest god had destroyed the others. Note the lesson that the Jewish monotheistic God is dominant and will destroy the gods of other peoples. The myth of Abraham differs from the myth of Cyprian, in that Christianity is taught as a universal religion, and the story of Abraham is a racist myth, which elects the Judeans as a unique and chosen race descended through Jacob to Abraham, a race who have an exclusive contract with God which makes them divine.

Jews have long sought to provoke superstitious fear of their God. The Judeans fabricated a history of persecution in Egypt, which never occurred, in order to defame the Egyptians and to blame the Egyptians for Jewish ethnocentrism, as well as to justify their claim that their God was stronger than the Pharaoh. The "Lost Tribes" of Israelites, the "ten northern tribes" allegedly taken captive by Assyrian King Shalmaneser V, and corralled by the river Sambatyon in Syria and Iraq (II *Kings* 17), never existed beyond the imagination of the "southern tribes" of Judeans and supposedly "Benjamin", who were allegedly taken captive in exile in Assyria (II *Kings* 18:13) and in Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar (II *Kings* 24:3-16; 25), and who wanted to steal the land of the indigenous peoples from the Nile to the Euphrates. The myth of the Egyptian captivity, and of the ten northern tribes, was fabricated by the Judeans in an attempt to justify their desires on lands and religious beliefs which were not originally theirs. They created the "prophecy" of these "events" in order to admonish their tribe to obey their racist and tribalistic leaders out of fear (*Leviticus* 26. *Deuteronomy* 4:24-27; 28:15-68; 30:1-3. II *Chronicles* 7:19-22. *Jeremiah* 29:1-7). Many argue that the prophecies of the Old Testament must have been written after the events they "foretold" and were merely a means for Jewish leaders to subjugate their followers. Præterist Christians believe that the Apocalyptic "prophecies" have all been fulfilled by the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D. and the Diaspora of 135 A.D., and that the story of Gog and Magog in *Ezekiel* 38 is post-Millennial. They see Christian Zionists as dangerous dupes, who are serving the "Beast".

The process continues in the modern world. David Ben-Gurion stated to the General Staff,

"I proposed that, as soon as we received the equipment on the ship, we should prepare to go over to the offensive with the aim of smashing Lebanon, Transjordan and Syria. [***] The weak point in the Arab coalition is Lebanon [for] the Moslem regime is artificial and easy to undermine. A Christian state should be established, with its southern border on the Litani River. We will make an alliance with it. When we smash the [Arab] Legion's strength and bomb Amman, we will eliminate Transjordan, too, and then Syria will fall. If Egypt still dares to fight on, we shall bomb Port Said, Alexandria, and Cairo. [***] And in this fashion, we will end the war and settle our forefathers' accounts with Egypt, Assyria, and Aram."⁴⁰¹

Judaism, Christianity and Islam are among the most dogmatic and intolerant of religions, in part due to the superstitious fear they would impose on humanity in order to preserve and promote their own power. They threaten their critics with damnation and ruin, as if it were a self-evident truth that ruin will befall non-believers and enemies of the faith. British Zionist Winston Churchill promoted the myth of Jewish invincibility and the necessarily sorry fate of any who would oppose the Jews.⁴⁰² Zionist Reverend Scofield annotated the *Scofield Reference Bible*, published by Oxford University Press, with threats against any who would oppose the Jews. In reference to *Genesis* 12:1-3, which states:

“Now the LORD had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father’s house, unto a land that I will shew thee: 2 And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: 3 And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.”

Scofield wrote in the 1909 edition of the *Scofield Reference Bible*, in oddly Zionistic terms,

“(6) ‘And curse him that curseth thee.’ Wonderfully fulfilled in the history of the dispersion. It has invariably fared ill with the people who have persecuted the Jew—well with those who have protected him. The future will still more remarkably prove this principle.”⁴⁰³

It is noteworthy that Scofield, though annotating a Christian Bible, did not repeat the Christian dogma, which transferred this blessing and curse to the Christians *viz.* *Matthew* 12:30; 21:43-45. *Romans* 4; 9; 11:7-8. *Galatians* 3:16, 28-29; 4 and *Hebrews* 8:6-10.

Scofield’s intentional corruption of Christian doctrines to favor Zionist interests was not a new phenomenon. *The North American Review* published the following statement in 1845,

“But religious belief—the Jewish, even, and much more the Christian—heightens immeasurably the importance and the attractiveness of this wonderful theme. To the confiding student of the Bible, the Jews assume high dignity, and challenge earnest attention, as God’s chosen, covenant people; as the descendants of holy patriarchs, to whom Jehovah spake ‘face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend’; as a nation long visibly led and governed, upheld, protected, and punished, by an almighty hand; as a people whose ancient history, recorded by inspiration, expressly and clearly shows—what all uninspired annals leave to be faintly and uncertainly traced out by the dim light of human reason—the connection between every outward event and an unseen Providence; as the special depositaries of divine communications intended for all times and every people; as that race, ‘of

whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came,' and who, although they rejected and crucified the Saviour of the world, are themselves rejected and outcast, 'scattered among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other,' 'to be a reproach and a proverb, a taunt and a curse, in all places' of their sojourn ; as still beloved of God in his covenant faithfulness, and 'for the fathers' sake'; as still inheriting the prophetic benediction, 'Cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed he he that blesseth thee'; as yet to be 'grafted again into their own olive-tree,' the church of God; and, as many believe, to be restored to that goodly land which was confirmed to them by oath before they were a nation; which was taken from its original possessors to be given to them, when they were homeless pilgrims; which is still theirs, twice exiled from it as they have been,—now for nearly eighteen hundred years,—and wonderfully kept from permanent occupation by any Gentile people;—in a word, as the standing miracle of modern times, changing in themselves nature's most firmly established laws, without interfering with the harmony that everywhere else prevails in convincing contrast. Such are the Jews in the eye of Christian faith.'⁴⁰⁴

Judeans have continuously and heavily promoted the myth that they are the divinely inspired chosen people, who have a right to enslave the rest of humanity. Ancient Jews taught their children to be absolutely intolerant of any dissent against Jews, or Jewish mythology, and to quash any dissent by exterminating those who have opposed the Jews, or Jewish mythologies. They feared that any challenge, or competition, to Judaism would reveal that they had fabricated and plagiarized their myths, which were little but a bluff meant to intimidate others far stronger than themselves. Even an unsuccessful challenge to any Jew, or to Jewish myths, would show to the world the intrinsic weakness of the position of the Jewish people and the inanity and meanspiritedness of the mythologies they had appropriated and corrupted. It is important to note that the Jews wanted other peoples to fear and to obey them, and to never entertain the slightest doubt of Jewish infallibility, or to challenge them. To this day the strongest taboos in society are the prohibition against questioning the existence of the Jewish God who chose the Jews to rule, and the prohibition against criticizing the modern State of Israel.

God commands the Jews to exterminate Amalek, because Amalek was the first to attack Israel and expose its terrible vulnerability. Jews so viciously attack anyone who even hints at challenging their supremacy, because they are in a very vulnerable position and must cut off all challenges before they grow. Jews must maintain the illusion that they are protected by God and invulnerable and cannot be challenged. Jews must maintain the lie that they are a divine blessing and a divine curse. That is why they are so hateful of Amalek and have carried the lesson down through history that they must not only tribalistically attack all who question any Jew, but that they must nip such challenges in the bud, or better yet prevent them from ever occurring, lest a significant number of Gentiles learn of their ill intentions and their vulnerability and put an end to the threat they pose. Rather than modify their behavior to socially acceptable norms, they band together to quash all challengers

and feel no compunctions about committing immoral acts in order to defend the tribe from the truth. They are out to exterminate any and all who do not obey them and they are out to exterminate the truth of what they are doing.

The modern State of Israel has practiced censorship of the press and kept important historical information under lock and key. Israeli soldiers have gone so far as to murder journalists and activists who record the Israelis' atrocities against the Palestinians. In the illegally Occupied Territories, Israelis humiliate and degrade their fellow human beings, while declaring to the world that Israel, one of the most undemocratic of the nations formed in the Twentieth Century, is the only democracy in the Middle East—a false declaration intended to degrade their Moslem enemies. The Jews have always had strong prohibitions against blasphemy and Judeans and Christians have held back the progress of science and politics for two thousand years in order to preserve their mythologies by preventing any open challenges to them. Pious Jews cling to the myth of a Jewish cult-hero, Moses, who gave to them God's Law, which cannot be questioned. Christians cling to the myth of a Jewish cult-hero, Jesus, who came to fulfill the Law, which cannot be questioned. "Einstein's" irrational and physically contradicted theories are promoted as if irrefutable, and challenges to the theories are regularly excluded from publication as if a matter of principle. Dissent against the theories is punished by ridicule and career infringement, as well as by charges of anti-Semitism where there are no grounds for such charges.

The ancient Jews fabricated the mythology that they have genetic enemies, whom they must subjugate, then exterminate. Jacob's brother, Esau, is said to be the father of a people who are inherently antagonistic to Jews and who must be exterminated. Louis Ginzberg states in his *The Legend of the Jews* (and bear in mind that Amalek represents Esau, his grandfather, and ultimately Haman, Rome, and Christianity; and, though Islam is traditionally associated with Abraham and Hagar's son Ishmael, when it comes to the genocide of the Palestinians, Arabs, Turks and Persians, they are called Amalek⁴⁰⁵; as are Gentiles in general—enemies of the Jews in general, as is revealed in various other passages in Ginzberg's many volumes),

“Although Amalek had now received the merited punishment from the hands of Joshua, still his enterprise against Israel had not been entirely unavailing. The miraculous exodus of Israel out of Egypt, and especially the cleaving of the sea, had created such alarm among the heathens, that none among them had dared to approach Israel. But this fear vanished as soon as Amalek attempted to compete in battle with Israel. Although he was terribly beaten, still the fear of the inaccessibility of Israel was gone. It was with Amalek as with that foolhardy wight who plunged into a scalding-hot tub. He scalded himself terribly, yet the tub became a little cooled through his plunge into it. Hence God was not content with the punishment Amalek received in the time of Moses, but swore by His throne and by His right hand that He would never forget Amalek's misdeeds, that in this world as well as in the time of the Messiah He would visit punishment upon him, and would completely exterminate him in the future world. So long as the seed of

Amalek exists, the face of God is, as it were, covered, and will only then come to view, when the seed of Amalek shall have been entirely exterminated.

God had at first left the war against Amalek in the hands of His people, therefore He bade Joshua, the future leader of the people, never to forget the war against Amalek; and if Moses had listened intently, he would have perceived from this command of God that Joshua was destined to lead the people into the promised land. But later, when Amalek took part in the destruction of Jerusalem, God Himself took up the war against Amalek, saying, ‘By My throne I vow not to leave a single descendant of Amalek under the heavens, yea, no one shall even be able to say that this sheep or that wether belonged to an Amalekite.’

God bade Moses impress upon the Jews to repulse no heathen should he desire conversion, but never to accept an Amalekite as a proselyte. It was in consideration of this word of God that David slew the Amalekite, who announced to him the death of Saul and Jonathan; for he saw in him only a heathen, although he appeared in the guise of a Jew.

Part of the blame for the destruction of Amalek falls upon his father, Eliphaz. He used to say to Amalek: ‘My son, dost thou indeed know who will possess this world and the future world?’ Amalek paid no attention to this allusion to the future fortune of Israel, and his father urged it no more strongly upon him, although it would have been his duty to instruct his son clearly and fully. He should have said to him: ‘My son, Israel will possess this world as well as the future world; dig wells then for their use and build roads for them, so that thou mayest be judged worthy to share in the future world.’ But as Amalek had not been sufficiently instructed by his father, in his wantonness he undertook to destroy the whole world. God, who tries the reins and the heart, said to him: ‘O thou fool, I created thee after all the seventy nations, but for thy sins thou shalt be the first to descend into hell.’

To glorify the victory over Amalek, Moses built an altar, which God called ‘My Miracle,’ for the miracle God wrought against Amalek in the war of Israel was, as it were, a miracle for God. For so long as the Israelites dwell in sorrow, God feels with them, and a joy for Israel is a joy for God, hence, too, the miraculous victory over Israel’s foe was a victory for God.”⁴⁰⁶

In the jargon of Jewish racists, the Gentiles are called “Esau” or “Edom”, and the Jews, “Jacob”. The Old Testament book of *Obadiah* instructs the Jews to destroy the wise among the Gentiles, and then to exterminate the Gentiles (“cut off”=“murder”)—much as the Communists have done. Noted Hebrew and Rabbinical scholar Johannes Buxtorf wrote in 1603, quoting from Machir of Toledo’s *Avkat Rokhel*, Constantinople/Istanbul, (1516):

“Then shall *Armillus* with his whole army die, and the Atheistical Edomites (the Christians they mean) who laid waste the house of our God, and led us captive into a strange land, shall miserably perish; then shall the Jews be

revenged upon them, as it is written, {Obad. 18} *The house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau* (that is, we Christians, as the Jews interpret, whom they Christen Edomites) *shall be for stubble*. This stubble the Jews shall set in fire, that nothing be left to us Edomites which shall not be burnt and turned into ashes."⁴⁰⁷

The book of *Obadiah*:

“1 The vision of Obadiah. Thus saith the Lord GOD concerning Edom; We have heard a rumour from the LORD, and an ambassador is sent among the heathen, Arise ye, and let us rise up against her in battle. 2 Behold, I have made thee small among the heathen: thou art greatly despised. 3 ¶ The pride of thine heart hath deceived thee, thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, whose habitation *is* high; that saith in his heart, Who shall bring me down to the ground? 4 Though thou exalt *thyself* as the eagle, and though thou set thy nest among the stars, thence will I bring thee down, saith the LORD. 5 If thieves came to thee, if robbers by night, (how art thou cut off!) would they not have stolen till they had enough? if the grapegatherers came to thee, would they not leave *some* grapes? 6 How are *the things* of Esau searched out! *how* are his hidden things sought up! 7 All the men of thy confederacy have brought thee *even* to the border: the men that were at peace with thee have deceived thee, *and* prevailed against thee; *they that eat* thy bread have laid a wound under thee: *there is* none understanding in him. 8 Shall I not in that day, saith the LORD, even destroy the wise *men* out of Edom, and understanding out of the mount of Esau? 9 And thy mighty *men*, O Teman, shall be dismayed, to the end that every one of the mount of Esau may be cut off by slaughter. 10 For *thy* violence against thy brother Jacob shame shall cover thee, and thou shalt be cut off for ever. 11 In the day that thou stoodest on the other side, in the day that the strangers carried away captive his forces, and foreigners entered into his gates, and cast lots upon Jerusalem, even thou *wast* as one of them. 12 But thou shouldest not have looked on the day of thy brother in the day that he became a stranger; neither shouldest thou have rejoiced over the children of Judah in the day of their destruction; neither shouldest thou have spoken proudly in the day of distress. 13 Thou shouldest not have entered into the gate of my people in the day of their calamity; yea, thou shouldest not have looked on their affliction in the day of their calamity, nor have laid *hands* on their substance in the day of their calamity; 14 Neither shouldest thou have stood in the crossway, to cut off those of his that did escape; neither shouldest thou have delivered up those of his that did remain in the day of distress. 15 For the day of the LORD *is* near upon all the heathen: as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee: thy reward shall return upon thine own head. 16 For as ye have drunk upon my holy mountain, so shall all the heathen drink continually, yea, they shall drink, and they shall swallow down, and they shall be as though they had not been. 17 ¶ But upon mount Zion shall be deliverance, and there shall be holiness; and the house

of Jacob shall possess their possessions. 18 And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau for stubble, and they shall kindle in them, and devour them; and there shall not be *any* remaining of the house of Esau; for the LORD hath spoken *it*. 19 And *they* of the south shall possess the mount of Esau; and *they of* the plain the Philistines: and they shall possess the fields of Ephraim, and the fields of Samaria: and Benjamin *shall possess* Gilead. 20 And the captivity of this host of the children of Israel *shall possess* that of the Canaanites, *even* unto Zarephath; and the captivity of Jerusalem, which *is* in Sepharad, shall possess the cities of the south. 21 And saviours shall come up on mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be the LORD's."

Sanhedrin 59a states that Gentiles who study the Torah must be killed. *Soferim*, Chapter 15, Rule 10, states, quoting the much celebrated genocidal racist Jew Simon ben Yohai:

"The best among the Gentiles deserves to be killed."⁴⁰⁸

Michael Berenbaum wrote in his book, *After Tragedy and Triumph*,

"Menachim Begin built upon this realization and constructed a usable past upon the twin pillars of antisemitism and the need for power. *Goyim* (literally, 'the nations') hate Jews, Begin maintained. In traditional language, Esau hates Jacob. According to Begin's worldview, Jews are a people that dwells alone. Power is essential. Powerlessness invites victimization. Jews must determine their own morality. The world's pronouncements toward the Jews mask—sometimes more successfully and sometimes less so—their genocidal intent. The desire to make the world *Judenrein* continues, and only fools would allow themselves to be deceived."⁴⁰⁹

Isaac and his wife Rebekah had twin sons: Esau,⁴¹⁰ the firstborn, and Jacob, the younger son. Even before the twins were born, they fought each other in the womb (*Genesis* 25:22). God told Rebekah that her sons would father two peoples and that Esau, the elder, would serve Jacob, the younger (*Genesis* 25:23). Isaac favored Esau, but Rebekah favored Jacob. Esau was a hunter, and Jacob, a farmer. Isaac and Rebekah did not sacrifice Esau and pass him through the fire to the gods of heaven, which is perhaps why Rebekah did not favor Esau, the firstborn who opened her womb—the firstborn who had rights to the covenant.

The differences of character between Esau and Jacob became key features in Jewish mythology. Esau, the hunter, came to represent strong warrior peoples—Esau was a belligerent people like the Hyksos.⁴¹¹ Jacob, whom God renamed "Israel" (*Genesis* 25:26; 32:27-28; 35:10), came to represent the agrarian, weak and scholarly peoples, who were allegedly entitled by God to be immoral—even genocidal—especially genocidal—and to use Esau as their sword and their slave (*Genesis* 25:23; 27:38-41)—Jacob was a people like the ancient Egyptians.

When some Jews attempted to stigmatize Germans, Christians and Gentiles as genetically predisposed to be warlike and anti-Semitic, as they often have, they were recalling Esau and Jacob, and stating that they (Jacob/Israel) have the God-given right to exploit the Germans, Christians, Moslems and Gentiles in general (Esau) as slaves and warriors, then to exterminate them in accordance with God's wishes; because the Gentiles are by nature ungodly and anti-Semitic, according to Jewish mythologies. In accord with the Old Testament, Zionists repeatedly asserted that the Gentile nations were obliged to fight for Israel and to finance it—hence the common paradox of the anti-nationalist pacifist Zionist warmonger.

It is noteworthy that the British and Americans fought to secure Palestine from the Turks—those Turks who had for centuries treated the Jews better than anyone else—and to end the Nazi régime, which had instilled tremendous fear in Jews—all of which cleared the way for the formation of the State of Israel. It is also noteworthy that today America is fighting wars for Israel, and that the comparatively insignificant and wealthy nation of Israel receives more foreign aid from the United States of America than any other nation on Earth, though it has carried out worse espionage campaigns against the United States⁴¹² than even the outspoken enemies of the United States, these wasted monies donated to sponsor oppression while millions of the unchosen needlessly perish from starvation and disease around the world. Israel plays a prominent rôle in international politics and the media, in spite of the fact that the world faces far more important issues than the fate of a comparatively small, and forever troublesome, minority among humanity. Jewish selfishness apparently knows no bounds. It is deeply entrenched in Jewish religious mythology.

One day, after returning home from the field so hungry that he was starving to death, Esau asked Jacob to spare his life and give him some food. Jacob took advantage of the situation to coerce Esau into surrendering his birthright to Jacob for some lentil porridge (*Genesis 25:29-34*). Through deceit, Rebekah and Jacob, whom God renamed Israel (*Genesis 32:27-28*), stole Esau's blessing from Isaac, who had inherited it from Abraham, and gave it to treacherous Jacob. Esau pledged to kill his younger twin brother Jacob, thereby expressing the genocidal imagery between Jews and Gentiles, and Jewish self-obsession and selfishness found throughout Jewish history:

“1 And it came to pass, that when Isaac was old, and his eyes were dim, so that he could not see, he called Esau his eldest son, and said unto him, My son: and he said unto him, Behold, *here am I*. 2 And he said, Behold now, I am old, I know not the day of my death: 3 Now therefore take, I pray thee, thy weapons, thy quiver and thy bow, and go out to the field, and take me *some* venison; 4 And make me savoury meat, such as I love, and bring *it* to me, that I may eat; that my soul may bless thee before I die. 5 And Rebekah heard when Isaac spake to Esau his son. And Esau went to the field to hunt *for* venison, *and* to bring *it*. 6 And Rebekah spake unto Jacob her son, saying, Behold, I heard thy father speak unto Esau thy brother, saying, 7 Bring me venison, and make me savoury meat, that I may eat, and bless thee before the

LORD before my death. 8 Now therefore, my son, obey my voice according to that which I command thee. 9 Go now to the flock, and fetch me from thence two good kids of the goats; and I will make them savoury meat for thy father, such as he loveth: 10 And thou shalt bring *it* to thy father, that he may eat, and that he may bless thee before his death. 11 And Jacob said to Rebekah his mother, Behold, Esau my brother *is* a hairy man, and I *am* a smooth man: 12 My father peradventure will feel me, and I shall seem to him as a deceiver; and I shall bring a curse upon me, and not a blessing. 13 And his mother said unto him, Upon me *be* thy curse, my son: only obey my voice, and go fetch me *them*. 14 And he went, and fetched, and brought *them* to his mother: and his mother made savoury meat, such as his father loved. 15 And Rebekah took goodly raiment of her eldest son Esau, which *were* with her in the house, and put them upon Jacob her younger son: 16 And she put the skins of the kids of the goats upon his hands, and upon the smooth of his neck: 17 And she gave the savoury meat and the bread, which she had prepared, into the hand of her son Jacob. 18 And he came unto his father, and said, My father: and he said, Here *am* I; who *art* thou, my son? 19 And Jacob said unto his father, I *am* Esau thy firstborn; I have done according as thou badest me: arise, I pray thee, sit and eat of my venison, that thy soul may bless me. 20 And Isaac said unto his son, How *is it* that thou hast found *it* so quickly, my son? And he said, Because the LORD thy God brought *it* to me. 21 And Isaac said unto Jacob, Come near, I pray thee, that I may feel thee, my son, whether thou *be* my very son Esau or not. 22 And Jacob went near unto Isaac his father; and he felt him, and said, The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands *are* the hands of Esau. 23 And he discerned him not, because his hands were hairy, as his brother Esau's hands: so he blessed him. 24 And he said, *Art* thou my very son Esau? And he said, I *am*. 25 And he said, Bring *it* near to me, and I will eat of my son's venison, that my soul may bless thee. And he brought *it* near to him, and he did eat: and he brought him wine, and he drank. 26 And his father Isaac said unto him, Come near now, and kiss me, my son. 27 And he came near, and kissed him: and he smelled the smell of his raiment, and blessed him, and said, See, the smell of my son *is* as the smell of a field which the LORD hath blessed: 28 Therefore God give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine: 29 Let people serve thee, and nations bow down to thee: be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee: cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed *be* he that blesseth thee. 30 And it came to pass, as soon as Isaac had made an end of blessing Jacob, and Jacob was yet scarce gone out from the presence of Isaac his father, that Esau his brother came in from his hunting. 31 And he also had made savoury meat, and brought it unto his father, and said unto his father, Let my father arise, and eat of his son's venison, that thy soul may bless me. 32 And Isaac his father said unto him, Who *art* thou? And he said, I *am* thy son, thy firstborn Esau. 33 And Isaac trembled very exceedingly, and said, Who? where *is* he that hath taken venison, and brought *it* me, and I have eaten of all before thou

camest, and have blessed him? yea, *and* he shall be blessed. 34 And when Esau heard the words of his father, he cried with a great and exceeding bitter cry, and said unto his father, Bless me, *even* me also, O my father. 35 And he said, Thy brother came with subtilty, and hath taken away thy blessing. 36 And he said, Is not he rightly named Jacob? for he hath supplanted me these two times: he took away my birthright; and, behold, now he hath taken away my blessing. And he said, Hast thou not reserved a blessing for me? 37 And Isaac answered and said unto Esau, Behold, I have made him thy lord, and all his brethren have I given to him for servants; and with corn and wine have I sustained him: and what shall I do now unto thee, my son? 38 And Esau said unto his father, Hast thou but one blessing, my father? bless me, *even* me also, O my father. And Esau lifted up his voice, and wept. 39 And Isaac his father answered and said unto him, Behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above; 40 And by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck. 41 And Esau hated Jacob because of the blessing wherewith his father blessed him: and Esau said in his heart, The days of mourning for my father are at hand; then will I slay my brother Jacob. 42 And these words of Esau her elder son were told to Rebekah: and she sent and called Jacob her younger son, and said unto him, Behold, thy brother Esau, as touching thee, doth comfort himself, *purposing* to kill thee. 43 Now therefore, my son, obey my voice; and arise, flee thou to Laban my brother to Haran; 44 And tarry with him a few days, until thy brother's fury turn away; 45 Until thy brother's anger turn away from thee, and he forget *that* which thou hast done to him: then I will send, and fetch thee from thence: why should I be deprived also of you both in one day? 46 And Rebekah said to Isaac, I am weary of my life because of the daughters of Heth: if Jacob take a wife of the daughters of Heth, such as these *which are* of the daughters of the land, what good shall my life do me?"—*Genesis 27:1-46*

This story conveys many of the tenets of Zionism—that other nations shall serve Israel, and especially that they shall fight its wars and secure its borders—that deceit is encouraged in the pursuit of Israel—and that Edom will be the mortal enemy of Israel. In the minds of many Jews, Edom became associated with Amalek, Haman, Rome and with European Gentiles and Christians in general. Esau's grandson Amalek (*Genesis 36:9-12*) was first to wage war on Israel, and therefore the first to expose the vulnerability of the Jews. God obliged the descendants of Jacob—Israel, to utterly destroy the seed of Amalek (*Sanhedrin 20b. P188L Dvarim 25:19*)—obliged Israel to exterminate Gentiles, Christians, Moslems, etc.:

“Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way, when ye were come forth out of Egypt; How he met thee by the way, and smote the hindmost of thee, *even* all *that* were feeble behind thee, when thou *wast* faint and weary; and he feared not God.”—*Deuteronomy 25:17-18*

“And the LORD said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua: for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven. And Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah-nissi: For he said, Because the LORD hath sworn *that* the LORD *will have* war with Amalek from generation to generation.”—*Exodus* 17:14-16

“Therefore it shall be, when the LORD thy God hath given thee rest from all thine enemies round about, in the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee *for* an inheritance to possess it, *that* thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven; thou shalt not forget *it*.”—*Deuteronomy* 25:19

[Should the Zionists continue in their attempts to carry out their ancient plans we can expect that when Israel gains hegemony over the Middle East, it will seek to exterminate the peoples of European descent. Zionists are clearly attempting to destroy the militaries of those Moslem nations which would react with rage and which would likely attack Israel, when the Cabalistic Jews and their Christian Dispensationalist slaves destroy the Dome of the Rock and the Al Aqsa Mosque and build in their place a Jewish Temple. Should Israel succeed in destroying Iran and Syria, they will likely destroy the Dome of the Rock and the Al Aqsa Mosque, and the Moslem world will be unable to stop them. They will then unleash the priests of Aaron, and reinstitute ritual sacrifices. Greater Israel will emerge and occupy the territory from the Nile to the Euphrates. Zionists will generate anti-Semitism around the world in order to force “racial” Jews to emigrate to Israel, who will then populate the greater Israel of the Covenant. Then the Jewish King, perhaps a descendent of the Rothschilds, will emerge and many Jews will likely take up Judaism—the “Messiah” will be a dynasty passing from father to son, or a supposed incarnation from one man to the next in the Shabbataian style, much like the Dalai Lama, see: 2 Samuel 7. Perhaps the proposed Jewish King is alive today, hidden from view. The Lubavitchers, under the leadership of the now deceased Rebbe Schneerson, have declared that the Messiah is alive today and will soon be anointed. They are an immensely powerful Cabalistic Jewish sect, which has infiltrated governments around the world. We can expect that Soviet-style oppression will grip the West—one already sees that news organizations restrict the international news Americans see, much as happened in the Soviet Union. China will likely become the new America for the Zionists, and their “Iron Scepter”, which Israel will utilize to smash the West, which will have plunged into deep depression and an international police state. Racist Jews, who view themselves as Orientals, will then enslave the rest of humanity, and through laws mandating miscegenation dilute the blood of “Esau”. Then they will likely break up Israel into classes, where Ashkanazi Jews reign over Sephardic and Coptic Jews—a process which is already well underway. Those who

doubt it are invited to consider what happened to Germany and Russia at the hands of Jewish financiers and to further consider the precarious economic condition of the United States as a result of the organized efforts of Zionists to undermine the sovereignty of America, its moral and educational strengths, and to export its industries.]

“1 The burden of the word of the LORD to Israel by Malachi. 2 I have loved you, saith the LORD. Yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us? *Was* not Esau Jacob’s brother? saith the LORD: yet I loved Jacob, 3 And I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness. 4 Whereas Edom saith, We are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate places; thus saith the LORD of hosts, They shall build, but I will throw down; and they shall call them, The border of wickedness, and, The people against whom the LORD hath indignation for ever. 5 And *your* eyes shall see, and ye shall say, The LORD will be magnified from the border of Israel. 6 A son honoureth *his* father, and a servant his master: if then I *be* a father, where *is* mine honour? and if I *be* a master, where *is* my fear? saith the LORD of hosts unto you, O priests, that despise my name. And ye say, Wherein have we despised thy name? 7 Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar; and ye say, Wherein have we polluted thee? In that ye say, The table of the LORD *is* contemptible. 8 And if ye offer the blind for sacrifice, *is it* not evil? and if ye offer the lame and sick, *is it* not evil? offer it now unto thy governor; will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy person? saith the LORD of hosts. 9 And now, I pray you, beseech God that he will be gracious unto us: this hath been by your means: will he regard your persons? saith the LORD of hosts. 10 Who *is there* even among you that would shut the doors *for nought*? neither do ye kindle *fire* on mine altar for nought. I have no pleasure in you, saith the LORD of hosts, neither will I accept an offering at your hand. 11 For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name *shall* be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense *shall* be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name *shall* be great among the heathen, saith the LORD of hosts. 12 But ye have profaned it, in that ye say, The table of the LORD *is* polluted; and the fruit thereof, *even* his meat, *is* contemptible. 13 Ye said also, Behold, what a weariness *is it!* and ye have snuffed at it, saith the LORD of hosts; and ye brought *that which was* torn, and the lame, and the sick; thus ye brought an offering: should I accept this of your hand? saith the LORD. 14 But cursed *be* the deceiver, which hath in his flock a male, and voweth, and sacrificeth unto the LORD a corrupt thing: for I *am* a great King, saith the LORD of hosts, and my name *is* dreadful among the heathen.”—*Malachi* 1:1-14

Rabbi Shlomo Yitzhaki’s (Rashi’s) *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, Exodus 17:14-16, states,

“14. Write this (for) a memorial that Amalek came to battle against Israel

prior to all the (other) nations. **And rehearse (it) in the ears of Joshua** who will bring into the land, that he should command Israel to recompense him (Amalek) for his deed. Here it was hinted to Moses that Joshua would bring in Israel to the land. **For I will utterly blot out** Therefore I admonish you thus, for I desire to blot them out. **15. And he called the name of it** (I. e.,) of the altar. Adonai-nissi (lit., the Lord is my banner (or miracle). The Holy One Blessed Be He wrought for us here a ‘miracle’. It is not that the altar was called ‘Lord’ but (that) he who mentioned the name of the altar would recall the miracle which the Omnipresent wrought: ‘The Lord He is our miracle.’ **16. And he said** (I. e.,) Moses, **The hand upon the throne of the Lord** The hand of the Holy One Blessed Be He was raised to swear by His throne that there would be for Him war and hatred against Amalek forever. And why is (it written) (throne) and not stated [***]? Is then the (Divine) Name also divided in half (i. e.: [***] instead of the full name)? The Holy One Blessed Be He swore that His name will not be whole (i. e., [***] instead of the full name) nor His throne whole (i. e. [***]) instead of [***] until there will be blotted out the name of Amalek utterly. And when his (Amalek’s) name will be blotted out (then) will the (Divine) Name be whole, and it is stated (Ps. 9.7): ‘O thou enemy, the waste places are come to an end forever’ this refers to Amalek, regarding whom it is written Amos 1.11): ‘And his anger he kept forever,’ ‘And the cities which thou didst uproot Their very memorial is perished’ (Ps., *ibid.* 7). What does (Scripture) state after this? ‘But the Lord is enthroned forever’ (verse 8)—behold the (Divine) Name is whole (expressed in full); ‘He hath established His throne for judgment’ (*ibid.*)—behold his throne is whole [***].”⁴¹³

The Judaic religious doctrine of the genocide of the seed of Amalek is alive today. Yehoshafat Harkabi wrote in his book *Israel’s Fateful Hour*,

“Some nationalistic religious extremists frequently identify the Arabs with Amalek, whom the Jews are commanded to annihilate totally (Deuteronomy 25:17-19). As children, we were taught that this was a relic of a bygone and primitive era, a commandment that had lapsed because Sennacherib the Assyrian king had mixed up all the nations so it was no longer possible to know who comes of the seed of Amalek. Yet some rabbis insist on injecting a contemporary significance into the commandment to blot out Amalek.”⁴¹⁴

Some Jews to this day celebrate the genocidal destruction of their enemies and their hatred of Gentiles once a year at the festival of Purim; which commemorates the execution of Haman and the genocidal mass murder of “enemies of the Jews”. Haman is said to have descended from Amalek through Hammedatha the Agagite,⁴¹⁵ and was allegedly the archenemy of the Jews and sought to exterminate them (*Esther* 3)—it is clear that the story of Esther fabricates the pretext of a Haman conspiracy in order to justify the Jewish genocide of the “Amalekites”. Esther and Mordecai wormed their way into power under false pretensions, concealing the fact that

“Esther” was Jewish. The name “Esther” means “that which is hidden”.⁴¹⁶ Her true Jewish name was Hadassah. She was one of the first “crypto-Jews”, who conceal their identity in order to corrupt societies and betray those who trust in them.

It should be noted that it is well known that the *Book of Esther* is work of fiction and does not correspond to the historical facts of Persian history. The Judeans fabricated a history of captive exile in Babylon in order to justify the theft of Jerusalem and the lands of all of the other inhabitants of Canaan. Based on *Ezra* 1-6, one might even conclude that the Judeans themselves were an alien horde of Babylonians—or Persians—who the Persians placed in power to rule over the Canaanites and gather the gold and silver of the world as a tribute to the Persian King. They fabricated the entire Old Testament in order to justify their theft of land, their racist credos, their self-declared right to conquer and rule the world, and in order to inspire superstitious fear of their God, and, thereby, fear of them.

4.4.3 Crypto-Jews

Cabalistic Jews have the pantheistic belief that God is hidden in all things and only reveals himself to the enlightened. They believe that the Jews are God among the beasts of the Earth who are the Gentiles. Based on these myths, Cabalistic Jews hold that they should play God’s hidden rôle as the secret controller and ruler over the Earth, the secret and divine master of the Gentile beasts—just as God is the secret and divine master of the Universe.

When the Jews of Spain were ordered to convert to Christianity, or leave the country, Jewish leadership instructed them to become crypto-Jews—Jews who feign conversion, but secretly remain Jews and attempt to subvert the churches and the societies in which they live. The crypto-Jews of Spain became known as “Marranos”. The correspondence advising the Jews of Spain to feign Christian conversion and destroy Gentile Spanish society was republished in Julio Iniguez de Medrano’s book, *La Silva curiosa*, Marc Orry, Paris, (1608), pp. 157-157, and an English translation appears in: L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), pp. 73-74,

“Respuesta de los Iudios de Constantinopla,
a los Iudios de España

AMados hermanos en Moysen vuestra carta recibimos, en la qual nos significais los trabajos & infortunios que padescéis, de cuyo sentimiento nos a cabido tanta parte como a vosotros. El parescer de los grandes Satrapas, y Rabi es lo siguiente.

A lo que dezis que el Rey de España os haze boluer Christianos, que lo hagias pues no podeis hazer otto. A lo que dezis que os mandan quitar vuestras haziendas, hazed vuestros hijos mercaderes, para que poco a poco les quiten las suyas. A lo que dezis que os quita lasvidas, hazed vuestros hijos medicos y boticarios, para que les quiten las suyas. A lo que dezis que os destruyen vuestras Sinagogas, hazed vuestros hijos clerigos y theologos, para que les destruyan sus templos. Ya lo que dezis que os hazen otras

vexaciones, procurad que vuestros hijos sean abogados, procuradores, notarios, y consejeros, y que siempre entiendan en negocios de Republicas, para que sujetandolos ganeis tierra, y os podais vengar dellos, y no salgais desta orden que os damos, porque por experiencia vereis que de abatidos, verneis a ser tenidos en algo.

V S S V S F F Principe de los Iudios de Constantinopla.”⁴¹⁷

Many of the Bolshevik mass murderers were crypto-Jews, as were many of the “Young Turks”,⁴¹⁸ who committed genocide against the Armenian Christians—the Spanish Civil War was led and fought by many Cabalistic and crypto-Jews, on both sides of the struggle, and served as a prototype for the bloodshed of World War II. The Frankist crypto-Jews of Poland wormed their way into the Catholic Church of Poland and came to dominate Polish aristocracy.

Jews and crypto-Jews also worked for the Czar—at least they pretended to work for the Czar—they were notorious assassins and double agents who murdered members of State, like Vyacheslav Plehve and Peter Stolypin, and who betrayed State secrets to the Jewish revolutionaries. In an article entitled, “The Protocol Forgery” published in *The London Times* on 17 August 1921 on page 9, it states,

“THE FIRST REVOLUTION.

But the principal importance of the Protocols was their use during the first Russian revolution. This revolution was supported by the Jewish element in Russia, notably by the Jewish Bund. The Okhrana organization knew this perfectly well; it had its Jewish and crypto-Jewish agents, one of whom afterwards assassinated M. Stolypin; it was in league with the powerful Conservative faction with its allies it sought to gain the Tsar’s ear. For many years before the Russian revolution of 1905-1906 there had been a tale of a secret council of Rabbis who plotted ceaselessly against the Orthodox.”

Some Jewish revolutionaries, like Emma Goldberg, did not hide their “Jewish sounding names”, though they often did not mention—perhaps a very small few did not even realize—that they were fulfilling Judaic Messianic prophecies. Other Jewish Communist radicals did conceal their Jewish identities by changing names; including “Miss Rose Pastor”, a Russian Jew, and Morris Hillquit, born Moses Hillkowitz in Riga, Latvia,⁴¹⁹ and Leon Trotsky, born Lev Davidovich Bronstein in Yanovka, Ukraine, and Leo Kameneff, born Rosenfeld, and married to Trotsky’s sister.⁴²⁰

These Jewish radicals, often born into wealthy Jewish families,⁴²¹ were funded by unimaginably wealthy Jewish financiers, who profited from the strife they caused; and who, being pious Jews, sought to fulfill their Messianic goals. These goals included the utter destruction of all nations but Israel, all religions but Judaism, all cultures but Jewish culture; and the “restoration” of the Jews to Palestine, the rebuilding of the Temple, and the anointment of the Messiah, the King of the Jews, who would rule a ruined world. Crypto-Jews and Gentiles married to Jews continued

to dominate the Soviet Régime through the 1930's and beyond.⁴²²

The United States Government published a report entitled “Bolshevism and Judaism” dated 13 November 1918, which is found in State Department Decimal File (861.00/5339).⁴²³ The report was translated into French and then translated back into English in Denis Fahey’s *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan, Dublin, London, (1935), pp. 89-91, 90, *see also*: pp. 77, 86, 92-93. Fahey cites: *La Vieille France*, (1920); and E. Jouin, “Les ‘Protocoles’ des Sages de Sion: Coup d’Oeil d’Ensemble”, *Le Péril Judéo-Maçonnique*, Part 3, Revue Internationale des Sociétés Secrètes, Paris, (1921), pp. 249-250. *La Vieille-France*, Volume 160, published the following French translation of the report in 1920 under the heading “Les Juifs ont créé le Bolchevisme. Les Gouvernements de l’Entente le savent.” which was republished in the French translation of the *Protocols* published by *La Vieille-France* as: *La Conspiration Juive Contre les Peuples: «Protocols» Procès-verbaux de Réunions Secrètes des Sages d’Israël*, La Vieille-France, Paris, (1920), pp. 90-91:

“En février 1916, pour la première fois, on apprit qu’une Révolution se préparait en Russie. On découvrit que les personnes et maisons suivantes étaient engagées dans cette œuvre de destruction:

Jakob Schiff — Kuhn, Loeb et Co — Félix Warburg — Otto Kahn Mortimoff L. Schiff — Jérôme H. Hahauer — Guggenheim — Max Breitung.

Il n’y a donc guère de doute que la Révolution russe, qui éclaira en 1917 cette information de 1916, fut fomentée et lancée par des influences purement **Juives**.

En fait, au mois d’avril 1917, Jakob Schiff déclara *publiquement* que la Révolution russe avait réussi *grâce à son appui financier*.

Au printemps de 1917, Jakob Schiff commença de commanditer Trotsky (Juif Braunstein) pour organiser en Russie la Révolution sociale. Le *Forward*, journal juif bolcheviste de New-York, versa sa contribution.

De Stockholm, le Juif Max Warburg commanditait également Trotsky. A ce *consortium* de Juifs bolchevicks et de Juifs multimillionnaires participaient le syndicat (juif) Westphalien-Rhénan, le Juif Olet Aschberg de la *Nye Banken* (Stockholm) et le Juif Jivolovsky, dont la fille a épousé Trotsky.

En octobre 1917, quand les Soviets établirent leur pouvoir sur le peuple russe, on y remarquait: *Oulianov* dit Lénine, *Braunstein* (Trotsky), *Nachamkes* (Stockloff), *Zederbaum* (Martoff), *Apfelbaum* (Zinovieff), *Rosenfeld* (Kameneff), *Gimel* (Souchanoff), *Krochmann* (Sagerski), *Silberstein* (Bogdanoff), *Lurge* (Larin), *Goldmann* (Gorev), *Radomislky* (Uritzky), *Katz* (Kamenev), *Furtenberg* (Ganetzky), *Gourevitch* (Dan), *Goldberg* (Meschkovsky), *Goldfandt* (Parvus), *Goldenbach* (Riasanov), *Zibar* (Martinoff), *Chernomordkin* (Chernomorsky), *Bleichmann* (Solntzeff), *Zivin* (Piatnisky), *Rein* (Abromovitch), *Voinsten* (Zvesdin), *Rosenblum* (Maklakosky), *Loevenschen* (Lapinsky), *Natansohn* (Bobriev), *Orthodox* (Axelrod), *Garfeld* (Garin), *Schultze* (Glasonnoff), *Ioffe*: **tous Juifs** sous de

faux noms russes.

En même temps, aux Etats-Unis, le **Juif** Paul Warburg laissait voir des relations si étroites avec les personnalités bolchevistes qu'il ne fut pas réélu au *Federal Reserve Board*.

Jakob Schiff a pour intime ami et pour agent très actif le rabbin Judas Magne, protagoniste du Judaïsme international, qui a lancé aux Etats-Unis la première organisation ouvertement bolcheviste, dite *Conseil du Peuple*. Le 24 octobre 1918, Judas Magne a fait la déclaration publique de son adhésion sans réserve au Bolchevisme, dans une réunion du Comité Juif d'Amérique à New-York. Commandité par Jakob Schiff, administrant avec lui la *Kebillah* juive, le rabbin Judas Magne est le directeur effectif de l'organisation sioniste *Poale*, et du «Parti travailliste juif».

La firme juive Kuhn, Loeb et Co est étroitement liée au Syndicat Westphalien-Rhénan, aux Juifs Lazard de Paris, à la firme juive Gunsbourg (Petrograd-Paris-Tokio), à la firme juive Speyer et Co (Londres-New-York-Francfort) et à la firme juive *Nye Banken* (Stockholm): d'où il apparaît que *le Bolchevisme est l'expression d'un mouvement général juif, où sont intéressées les grandes banques juives*.

La reconnaissance formelle d'un **Etat Juif** en Palestine, la constitution de Républiques juives en Allemagne et en Autriche ne sont que les premiers pas vers la domination du monde. La Juiverie internationale s'agite fiévreusement. Elle a réuni dernièrement, en peu de jours, aux Etats-Unis, sous prétexte d'écoles en Palestine, un fonds de guerre d'un **milliard de dollars**."

Whether or not Lenin was of partial Jewish descent, he was married to a Jewish woman, and was put in power by Jewish bankers. The Jews who put Lenin in power were not likely to put a known full-blooded Jew into the position of dictator over Russia unless left with no other choice. Jewish leaders believed that a known Jew would have a difficult time dominating Russia. Max Nordau wrote in 1909,

"In Russia today it would be impossible for a Jew, whether he had been baptized or no, to rouse a mass movement like that led by Lasalle in Germany in the fifties and sixties; or to rise to the premiership, as Disraeli did in England."⁴²⁴

Lenin was clearly serving the interests of Jewish leadership. His personal ethnic heritage is largely irrelevant. The Jews may have chosen Lenin to be the dictator over Russia for the very reason that he was not a full-blooded Jew. That does not render Bolshevism any less of a Jewish led movement. Lenin served that movement. He was not its ultimate leader. However, the fact that Bolshevism was a Jewish movement does not mean that all Jews were Bolsheviks.

The Jewish Chronicle published the following article on 11 April 1919 on page 10,

"Percentage of Jewish Bolsheviks in Petrograd.

COPENHAGEN [F. O. C.]

On the trustworthy authority of the well-known Zionist leader, M. Idelson (of Petrograd), I am in a position to state that only two and a-half per cent. of the Jews in Petrograd have declared themselves in sympathy with Bolshevism. Although sixty per cent. of the Bolsheviki leaders are Jews, and although a declaration against Bolshevism involves serious sacrifices, the Jews of Petrograd have fearlessly stated their attitude towards the movement. We are, therefore, confronted with the anomaly of the Jews furnishing for the Bolsheviki the majority of their leaders, although a smaller percentage of Jews than of any other nationality approve of Bolshevism.”

“Janus” wrote a Letter to the Editor of the *London Times* which was published on 26 November 1919 on page 8,

**“JEWS AND BOLSHEVISM.
REVOLUTIONARY ELEMENTS.
TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.**

Sir,—I have read with much interest the letters you published on the 21st and 25th instant from Mr. Israel Cohen and that signed ‘Philojudæus’ in your issue of the 22nd instant. Without being concerned in the question of whether the Jewish population of Russia as a whole is for or against Bolshevism, or, as one should more correctly describe it, Communism, it is certainly a remarkable fact that the following 28 conspicuous Bolshevists, most of them Commissaries, are either full-blooded Jews or of Jewish extraction. Nearly all possess a Russianized name. In Hungary also the Commissaries were nearly all Jews, and so are the Bolshevist propagandists in the United States and other countries. This is no more a reflection upon the Jewish race as a whole than the exploits of Marat are a reflection upon the French. All that one can say is that wherever there are subversive movements the restless and enterprising boil up to the surface. The list is as follows:

RUSSIAN NAME.	FORMER NAME.
Lunacharsky	—
Uritsky	—
Litvinov	Fineklstein.
Trotsky	Bronstein.
Steklov	Nahamkes.
Zinoviev	Apfelbaum.
Chernov	Liebermann.

Volodarsky	Cohen.
Kamkov	Katz.
Kamenev	Rosenfeldt.
Solntsev	Goldstein.
Naut	Ginsburg.
Dau	Gurevicz.
Martov	Zederbaum
Zvezdich	Feinstein.
Lebedeva	Simon.
Meshkovsky	Goldenberg.
Parvus	Goldfarb.
Kamensky	Hoffmann.
Gorev	Goldmann.
Sukhanov	Himmer.
Rjazanov	Goldenbach.
Zagorsky	Krachmalnik.
Izgoev	Goldmann
Bogdanov	Silberstein.
Larin	Lurier.
Bunakov	Fundamentsky.
Radek	

Yours faithfully,

JANUS.”

Israel Cohen responded in *The London Times* on 27 November 1919 on page 15,

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—In your issue of to-day your correspondent ‘Janus’ gives a list of 28 ‘conspicuous Bolsheviks’ who, he states, ‘are either full-blooded Jews or of Jewish extraction.’ It is only fair to your readers that they should be informed that as many as 10 names in this list are those either of non-Jews or of anti-Bolsheviks or of dead Bolsheviks:—

(1-3) Lunacharsky, Chernov, and Bogdanov are pure Russian Bolsheviks.

(4) Zagorsky is neither a Jew nor a Bolshevik, but a Russian Radical.

(5-6) Kamkov and Bunakov are Social Revolutionaries—*i.e.*, anti-Bolsheviks. Kamkov (-Katz), after his participation in the assassination of Count Mirbach, had to flee from Bolshevik Russia to Archangel.

(7-8) Dan and Martov are the Jewish leaders of the Mensheviks—*i.e.*, the most determined opponents of Lenin and his group. They were referred to as anti-Bolsheviks in your columns only a few days ago.

(9-10) Uritzky and Volodarsky have both been murdered, the former by the Jew Kannesgiesser.

I have no doubt that 'Janus' has sent you his list in good faith, but the fact that it has to be discounted to such a great extent is typical of the general misrepresentations of the Jewish share in Bolshevism.

Yours faithfully,

ISRAEL COHEN.

77, Great Russell-street, W.C., Nov. 26."

The New York Times reported on 20 April 1906 on page 20 on a Jewish revolutionary from Russia, who hid his identity with a "Gentile sounding name", and who traveled through America with falsified passports seeking support (note that there is no call for his arrest),

**“MAXIME COMES HERE
TO AID REVOLUTION
To Stir Up Sentiment Among the
Jews of America.
TELLS OF RUSSIAN BUND
Declares Upheaval Is Coming Soon—
Thinks Father Gapon an Agent
of the Government.**

Sent for by the Revolutionary Bund of this city, an organization of Jewish citizens helping the Jewish revolutionary movement in Russia, a young man with a high forehead and piercing, black eyes, and describing himself as Gregory Maxime of St. Petersburg, arrived yesterday in New York as the representative of the parent bund in Russia. How he came and where he agitated last he declined to say. He admits that Maxime is not his real name, and that he may address the Jewish people of some other large city by some other name in a few weeks.

Maxime is the representative of the powerful Jewish revolutionary party in Russia. It is known that he is of fine education, and that his father is a wealthy Jew in Russia. Under the name of Maxime he headed the provisional government in Riga after the big railroad strike, and, while the names of the central committee of the Bund are known to very few sympathizers in the old

country or abroad, he is believed to be a member of it, and also a controlling mind in the direction of the Jewish end of the revolutionary work.

The Bund is strong, and contributes largely to the work of the organization in Russia. As all the Bund's work is done underground, and as many members of it are subject to imprisonment, exile, or death at the hands of the Russian Government, Maxime changes his passports, his name, and as far as possible his appearance as frequently as he deems it necessary to dodge Russian spies. At present he looks the student. He is 27 years old, dresses simply and neatly, and wears a neatly trimmed black beard and mustache. He might easily pass as a university instructor.

Maxime's practical rule of Riga came to an end when the Czar's agents poured into that city sufficient troops to overwhelm the large revolutionary population of Jews and Letts. Maxime says that he was addressing an audience in the theatre of the city when the place was surrounded and artillery trained on it. He had escaped from exile in Siberia just prior to the strike, and he knew that he was wanted. He dropped through a trap in the stage as the officers entered the theatre, and was hurried to the roof of an adjoining building, which was the home of a member of the Bund. He was then shaven and in a few moments was in the garments of a woman and rushing out with the women of the household as they fled to the streets and the Czar's officers rushed in. The Government Secret Service has not had trace of him since.

Maxime will remain in New York about three weeks, addressing the Jews of the city on the revolutionary movement in Russia. Next Sunday night he will talk at Grand Central Palace. After several addresses in Yiddish in this city he will visit other cities with large Jewish populations.

Asked what he thought of Maxim Gorky's plight in this country, he said yesterday: 'I have never met Gorky. In Russia we accept him as a great writer and factor for good, and do not pry into his private affairs. The Mme. Gorky who is with him here was accepted in Russia as Mme. Gorky by the best people. As for me, I'm here unmarried—that is, my wife's in Russia.'

'What do the Jewish revolutionists think of Father Gapon?' he was asked.

'They think him an agent of the Government.'

'What is the opinion of Count Witte?'

'Witte is first for himself and the emoluments,' was the reply. 'He would serve any form of government for the price.'"

On 30 June 1912, on page 9, *The New York Times* published a letter from the radical Jewish Communist Zionist of the Poale Zion, Baruch Charney Vladeck—a. k. a. B. Charney Vladeck, a. k. a. Bruce Vladeck—born Baruch Nachman Charney in Minsk—spent time in prison for attempting to overthrow the Government of Russia—fled to America under a false name—a correspondent for the Jewish Socialist Federation's *Naye Velt* and City Editor of the *Jewish Daily Forward*; a New York City Alderman who led the *Bund* until 1908—and who would later become a member of the New York City Housing Authority and first President of the

Jewish Labor Committee—and who made an unsuccessful bid for the United States Congress,

“REAL NAMES IN RUSSIA.

Lenin’s not German—Other Radicals

May Be from Baltic Provinces.

New York, June 25, 1917.

To the Editor of The New York Times:

In this morning’s TIMES there is a little item of news from Petrograd, under the headline ‘Leader’s Names Assumed,’ credited to The London Post, which is full of misinformation, and ought to be corrected. The item referred to contains the following two statements:

1—That the real name of the leader of the extremist faction, Lenin, is Zedarbluhm or Zedarbaum.

2—That of the eighteen members of the Executive Committee of the Council of Workmen’s and Soldiers’ Delegates the real names of fourteen sound German.

As to Lenin, his real name is Ulianoff, a ‘Stolbovoy Dvorianin,’ which means a member of the nobility. He is of Russian parentage, born in one of the innermost Russian provinces. Zedarbaum is the real name of an influential Socialist of the moderate faction whose nom de plume is Martoff.

As for the Executive Committee of the Council of Workmen’s and Soldiers’ Delegates, it consists of fifty-four members, not of eighteen, these fifty-four being divided into a majority of thirty-two moderates or minimalists and twenty-two extremists or maximalists.

Of the fourteen members referred to in the news item, several represent the Jewish Socialist organization known as the Bund, as Goldman, Lurie, &c. The seven or eight whose real names sound German may come from provinces with a large German population, like the Baltic provinces, or they may simply have a name that sounds German, but has nothing to do with German policies.

It is perfectly legitimate to disagree with the Council of Workmen’s and Soldiers’ Delegates in Petrograd, but I don’t see why the council and its members should be constantly vilified by people who, for lack of insight into the great Russian crisis, try to explain away events of historical importance by insignificant trifles.

It is true that most of them have studied statesmanship in prison, but so have many others whose names now shine forth from the pages of history. Everybody at all acquainted with the recent history of Russia knows that nearly every able writer from Lermontov down to Gorky: every original thinker from Herzen down to the present Minister Chernov or Plekhnov; every independent citizen from the Becabrists down to Breshkovskaya, the grandmother of the revolution, were persecuted, humiliated, and imprisoned by the old régime, so that very often the prison was the only place where they

could learn anything.

B. C. VLADECK,
City Editor Jewish Daily Forward.”

Simon Sebag Montefiore wrote in his book *Stalin: The Court of the Red Tsar*,

“In 1937, 5.7 percent of the Party were Jews yet they formed a majority in the government. Lenin himself (who was partly Jewish by ancestry) said that if the Commissar was Jewish, the deputy should be Russian: Stalin followed this rule. [***] Many Jewish Bolsheviki used Russian pseudonyms. As early as 1936, Stalin ordered Mekhlis at *Pravda* to use these pseudonyms: ‘No need to excite Hitler!’”⁴²⁵

In another among many instances of organized Jewish censorship, many Jews made corrupt use of their power in the media, universities and government to censor and ridicule anyone who told the truth about the dominant and destructive rôle Jews played in Bolshevism, Socialism and Communism. While Jews who chose to do so were free to boast of the commonality of Judaism and Bolshevism, Gentiles who pointed out that same linkage were ruined. In the Soviet Union, outing a crypto-Jew was an offense punishable by death.

Denis Fahey wrote extensively of organized Jewish power to censor and punish those who told those truths leading Jews did not want exposed to the public. Fahey quoted a June, 1924, article “The Russian Revolution and the English Official White Paper, Russia, No. 1, 1919,” by G. P. Mudge, which was published in *Loyalty League*, in which Mudge wrote, *inter alia*,

“WHY DOES THE BRITISH FOREIGN OFFICE SUPPRESS THE
TRUTH UNPALATABLE TO JEWRY?”

In the April issue of the *Loyalty League* I dealt with the attempt made, in the course of a series of lectures by a Mr. M. Farbman, at the London School of Economics, to transfer the responsibility for the hideous Russian revolution of 1917 from the real perpetrators, the Jews, and to ascribe it to a purely agrarian movement among the peasants. I undertook in that article to marshal the voluminous and conclusive evidence that this revolution was entirely Jewish in organization and operation, to show that it had nothing to do with an agrarian movement, or indeed with any cause that had Russian interests in view.

Perhaps one of the most damning pieces of evidence, not only that this revolution, but also the world-revolution which is planned, is Jewish, lies in the strenuous and partially successful efforts which organized Jewry has made to suppress the truth about it. Not only has Jewry succeeded in large measure in suppressing the truth, but it has seemingly been able to intimidate or cajole the *British Foreign Office to suppress a very vital part of one of its own official publications.*”⁴²⁶

Mudge went on to quote from the British War Cabinet's unabridged "White Paper" of April, 1919, which includes Oudendyke's report of 6 September 1918. Oudendyke was the Netherlands' Minister at St. Petersburg,

"The following collection of Reports from His Majesty's official representatives in Russia, from other British subjects who have recently returned from that country, and from independent witnesses of various nationalities, covers the period of the Bolshevik *régime* from the Summer of 1918 to the present date. *They are issued in accordance with a decision of the War Cabinet in January last.* They are unaccompanied by anything in the nature either of comment or introduction, since they speak for themselves in the picture which they present of the principles and methods of Bolshevik rule, the appalling incidents by which it has been accompanied, the economic consequences which have flowed from it, and the almost incalculable misery which it has produced. [***] The foregoing report will indicate the extremely critical nature of the present situation. The danger is now so great that I feel it my duty to call the attention of the British and all other Governments to the fact that, if an end is not put to Bolshevism in Russia at once, the civilization of the whole world will be threatened. This is not an exaggeration, but a sober matter of fact; and the most unusual action of German and Austrian consuls-general, before referred to, in joining in protest of neutral legations, appears to indicate that the danger is also being realized in German and Austrian quarters. I consider that the immediate suppression of Bolshevism is the greatest issue now before the world, not even excluding the war which is still raging, and unless, as above stated, *Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately, it is bound to spread in one form or another over Europe and the whole world, AS IT IS ORGANIZED AND WORKED BY JEWS WHO HAVE NO NATIONALITY, AND WHOSE ONE OBJECT IS TO DESTROY FOR THEIR OWN ENDS THE EXISTING ORDER OF THINGS. . . . I would beg that this report may be telegraphed as soon as possible in cypher in full to the British Office in view of its importance.*"⁴²⁷

Denis Fahey quoted an 18 July 1929 article "Censorship of the Anglo-Saxons" in the *Patriot*, which stated, among other things,

"The censorship in force is Jewish in character, in backing, and in its operative machinery. But it is not confined in its supervision and operation to a definitely organized body of men, even if there be such an organization unknown to us. The Jewish race is absolutely apart from all others in its solidarity, which is maintained in spite of complete dispersion over the globe, and in spite of fundamental differences in religion, in politics, and in material and spiritual attachments within many different nations. The dispersion of the individuals—accompanied as it is by close inter-communications, through business relations in all countries, and by literature on racial interests—permits of the exercise of an ever-growing world power. [***]

Other countries have also organizations aiding Jewish solidarity; and that this solidarity does exist can be shown by two illustrations: First, the amazing way in which the whole world was shaken up on several occasions during the long period of the trials for treason of a single French Army officer, Dreyfus; and second, by the persistent policy of concealment, from all peoples, of the leading part played by a section of revolutionary Jews in all the bloodshed and commercial destruction of the Russian people. That concealment is enforced so successfully that neither writers of books nor editors of newspapers can safely forget the interdict. Even a Government White Book issued in April, 1919, and making clear the world-danger of the Jewish-Bolshevik conspiracy against civilization was, by some unknown influence, suppressed, and a bowdlerised abridgement was substituted.

The over-riding power in literature and publicity of a small Jewish minority in most countries is made up of a variety of elements. There is vast wealth to be drawn on for racial objects; there is ownership or control of large numbers of newspapers; and that control is not merely over the complexion given to some news, but over those reviews of new publications which affect largely their sales. The news agencies feeding the newspapers are mostly under Jewish control. The power exercised in film and theatrical productions is pretty generally known. The enormous potential force of a combination of the wealthy Jewish advertisers in all important papers is fully recognized by journalists, for whom advertisements are the life blood of commercial publication. While the political power of Jews might appear negligible because they are equally active in all three Parties here, it is a fact that the division works to great advantage; for, not only is the power exercised out of proportion to numbers in each Party, but it is multiplied by three in matters of racial interest. This is clearly expressed in the words of Emanuel Shinwell, M. P. (Financial Secretary to the War Office), in a speech at the annual dinner of 'B'nai B'rith,' on 23rd, June: *The Jews in the House of Commons, whatever their political opinions may be, will always stand in that assembly for the rights of the Jewish community. It has been said that they must emphasize the fact of the Judaism before the fact of citizenship. He held that they must regard themselves as Jews and citizens equally.*²⁸

Fahey also quoted from a 20 February 1930 article in the *Patriot*,

“As bearing on the part taken by Red Jews in the Bolshevik triumph over Russia, we quote Dr. Angelo S. Rappaport, a Jewish writer, who published a book in 1918 called *Pioneers of the Russian Revolution*:—

‘To a greater degree than the Poles, the Letts, or Finns, or, indeed, any other ethnic group in the vast Empire of the Romanovs, the Jews have been the artisans of the revolution of 1917. . . . It is no exaggeration to say that the small, even insignificant, amount of freedom obtained by the Russian Liberals in 1905 and 1906 was largely due to the effort of the Jews. . . . There was no political organization in the vast Empire that was not influenced by

Jews or directed by them. . . . Throughout history the spirit of the Jew has always been revolutionary and subversive. . . . Long before they had been formulated in French, the principles of the 'Rights of Man' had been announced in Hebrew. . . . The Russian Jews, the pioneers of the revolution, are now continuing to fight for the cause of Justice, for the principles of Democracy against German Militarism.'

When the Jewish and Russian Bolsheviki seized power, Red Jews flocked to the scene from all countries, and reinforced the brains and hands of the murderous tyranny. Mr. Robert Wilton, for seventeen years correspondent of *The Times* in Russia [***] wrote a book, *The Last Days of the Romanoffs*. This book showed that the murder of the Czar and his family was the work of Red Jews, and that they prepared the whole revolution, and became masters of Russia from their domination of all the important offices under the Soviet. He wrote in 1920: 'The Jewish domination in Russia is supported by certain Russians. . . they are all mere screens or dummies behind which the Sverdlovs and the thousand and one Jews of Sovdepiä continue their work of destruction.'

After this Mr. Wilton's chances in English journalism were gone. He was a true British patriot; and he died in very straitened circumstances in France in January, 1925. No one who has paid the slightest attention to the course of Russian events since the Bolshevik accession to power in November, 1917, can have failed to know that, when all the important members of the Russian aristocracy, the learned profession, the Army and Navy, had been executed, or imprisoned, or driven abroad, Red Jews were in possession of the great majority of responsible positions in and under the Soviet. So clear was this that, in the past, Jewish apologists, here and in America, have explained the fact by the true statement that only among the Jews could be found any longer the brains and business experience for filling important posts. Yet in the face of this situation there have been dozens of books published in English, and innumerable articles throughout the Press, and any number of lectures delivered, all with the astounding omission of any mention of Jewish handiwork in Russian Bolshevism. There have been public references to the sufferings of some orthodox non-Communist Jews at the hands of the Soviet.

Newspapers bear witness to a censorship over them by what they omit to publish, and by their sketchy apologetic mention of incidents tending to produce undesired conclusions about the march of events. Authors can safely reckon on the refusal of book publishers to produce any book unorthodox to current propagandä which supports the censorship.⁴²⁹

Gorky stated soon after the Russian Revolution of 1917, that the crypto-Jews "Lenin" and "Trotsky" (Lev Davidovitch Bronstein) had turned the revolutionary movement for democracy, liberty, equality and fraternity into a dictatorship; which suppressed human rights and civil liberties; and which censored the press, including Gorky's own daily newspaper, *Новая Жизнь* or "New Life" published in Petrograd.

It was a common practice for Cabalist Jews to foment revolution with cries for liberty, equality and fraternity—especially in the press, which they owned—then destroy the nation, culture and religion of a people after the revolution, and declare that only a dictatorship, run by one of their agents, would have the ability to restore order among the chaos, which insufferable chaos they themselves had intentionally created. The dictatorship would then set about to destroy the people themselves, and spread war and famine to the nation and to its neighbors. The English Revolution, the French Revolution, the Young Turk Revolution, the Russian Revolution, Hitler's burning of the Reichstag, etc. followed this Cabalistic Jewish model, which we know was employed by Jews at least since the time of the Roman Caesars, and which appears in Jewish literature in their fabricated tales of "exile" and "captivity" in Egypt and Babylon.

At the festival of Purim, Jews wear costumes which conceal their identity in order to symbolize the status of a crypto-Jew, one who undermines the nation in which he or she resides. Some have interpreted the festival of Purim as an occasion for the Rabbis to augment their power by manufacturing an artificial common enemy for their followers to fear and to hate.⁴³⁰ Purim is based on the story of Esther, which story is read at the festival.

In the story of "Esther" (a crypto-Jewish name, her actual name was Hadassah) the Jews manipulated and betrayed the Persian Kings, who had freed the Jews from their captivity and exile among the Babylonians. If the stories can be believed—and they cannot, Cyrus, King of Persia, freed the Jews and restored them to Palestine and helped them to "rebuild" the Temple. Ahasuerus, King of Persia, (no such king ever existed) married and obeyed Esther, a deceitful crypto-Jewish agent placed in his midst after Ahasuerus' first wife had died, or had been killed. The Jews repaid the generosity of the Persians with deceit and genocide, in their own mythologies, which genocidal mythologies are inculcated into the minds of Jewish youth.

We find parallels to this ancient story today. The President of Iran (Persia) may be an agent of the Zionists and a traitor to the Iranian people. Judging by his actions, this modern "Persian King" wants to lead the Iranians toward their own destruction in order to benefit the Israelis. Like the Turks who followed the crypto-Jewish Young Turks,⁴³¹ who mass murdered Armenians; like the Russians who followed crypto-Jewish Bolsheviks, who mass murdered Russians, Jews and countless others; like the Germans who followed crypto-Jewish Nazis, who mass murdered Germans, Jews and countless others; Americans, Iranians, British, etc. are today led by Zionist Jews and crypto-Jews, who are bringing about their destruction.

Celebrated annually, the festival of Purim is widely considered to be the Jews' favorite holiday. The Biblical book of *Esther* (whose "real" name was Hadassah) and the "war against Amalek" are discussed in the *Tractate Megillah*, Chapter 1. On Purim, Jewish children are encouraged to commit symbolic acts of violence while in a frenzy, and to cry out for genocide and curse the Gentiles (*Orach Chaim* 690:16). In 1603, Johannes Buxtorf, the world's foremost expert on Judaism and Jews, wrote of Purim, a drunken Jewish festival celebrating genocide and hatred, and the use of crypto-Jews to subvert a government,

“CHAP. XXIV.

Of their Feast of Purim.

THe word *Purim* is a Persian word, and is rendered by the Hebrew *Goral*, which signifies a lot. This Feast therefore took its name from that plot and wicked device of *Haman* the Agagite, {*Esther* 3.} who in the moneth *Nisan* in the twelfth year of *Ahasuerus* cast *Pur*, that is a lot, whereby all the Jews, both young and old, children and women in all the Kings Provinces should be destroyed and rooted out in one day, even upon the thirteenth day of the twelfth moneth, which is the moneth *Adar* of February; which decree was written in the name of the King, and sealed with his Ring.

The end of this conspiracy fell far contrary to *Hamans* intent. For *Haman* was hanged upon a pair of Gallows fifty foot high, and the King granted the Jews {*Esther* 8.} in what Cities soever they were to gather themselves together, and to stand for their life to root out, slay, and destroy, all them that vexed them. So that strengthened by the Kings Letter Patents, they put their adversaries to death. In *Shushan* the Palace they slew five hundred men, and the ten sons of *Haman*; and the Jews that were in the Provinces of King *Ahasuerus* slew of them that hated them seventy five thousand men, upon the thirteenth day of the moneth *Adar*, and rested upon the fourteenth and fifteenth thereof. Wherefore it is instituted and ordained, that upon the fourteenth and the fifteenth day of the said moneth every yeer should a Feast be kept by the Jews in all quarters, in remembrance of this great deliverance throughout their generations by an ordinance for ever. Wherein they rested from their enemies, in the moneth which turned unto them from sorrow to joy, from mourning to a joyful day: as we may read in the ninth Chapter of the book of *Esther*.

These two dayes are celebrated at this day by the Jews imitation of their ancestors, but in that manner, that they rather deserve the name of the dayes of profanation and drunkennesse, then of joy and gladnesse.

Although upon these dayes working is not prohibited by the text of Scripture: yet the Jewes at this day rest from all manner of labour, writing and affirming in the Talmud, {Tract. Megilah.} that he will never thrive or prosper that does any work upon them. For there it is recorded, that upon a certain time that a man being sowing line-seed upon one of these dayes, a certain Rabbin coming by and seeing him, began to reprove and curse him. Whereupon it came to passe, that the seed never came to growth, nor did ever peep out of the ground.

In the first place therefore the women are enjoyed in a more peculiar manner to sanctifie and celebrate this Festival, because this deliverance was wrought by the hands of Queen *Esther*. The night being come, they light the Lamps of joy in the Synagogue, and the *Chasan* or the Minister expounding the book of *Esther*, reads it from end to end: whereat the women and children

ought to be present, and give diligent attention; and they have a custome that the little ones so often as *Haman* is named, keep a vile stir and a tumultuous noise in the terrible and forcible explosion thereof. {Orach chajim, nu. 690. Sect. 16.} In former times they were wont to provide themselves two stones, upon one of which the name of *Haman* was written. These they did beat one against the other, until the name was quite demolished and worn out; which when they perceived, they presently cried aloud, *Let his name be blotted out. The name of the wicked shall rot; Accursed be Haman; Blessed by Mordecai; Cursed be Zeresh; Blessed be Esther the wife Ahasueras. Cursed be all they that worship idols or the host of heaven. Blessed be all the people of Israel.* When the Lecturer comes to that place where mention is made of the ten sons of *Haman*, he is bound to read it with one breath, for they write, that all these sons of *Haman* perished in the twinkling of an eye, and their souls in a very moment took their farewel of their beloved lodging the body. They celebrate this Feast in a very voluptuous manner, sousing their guts in wine and beer, because *Esther* the Queen found favour and grace in the eyes of King *Ahasuerus* when he sate at her banquet, and obtained pardon for the Jews, and a grant that they might stand for their lives. And hence it comes to pass, that for the space of these two dayes, they busie themselves with no other things then eating and drinking, smelling, and bibbing, dancing, and piping, singing, and roaring, feasting, and sporting, riming, and scoffing, the women putting on mens apparrell and the men clothing themselves in womens attire, which although it be expresly forbid in the law of *Moses*, yet they make there one exception, {Orach:chajim num: 615.} saying, that it is lawful and no offence to practice it upon this day, and this occasion: seeing it is done by them only for worldly joy and recreation, *Rabbi Isaac Tirna* in this *Minhagim* hath left in record to posterity, {De rit: Jud: p. 61.} that it is commanded as a work of great excellency, to make merry as upon these dayes, to goe a whoring, to drink and be drunke, yea in that measure, that he cannot make any difference between *Mordecai* the blessed, and *Haman* the accursed, that is to say, untill he be so besotted with the ale tappe, that he cannot for his heart declare how many letters be contained in any of these words, yea moreover, any one is permitted at this time to poure in strong drink, until he knowes not how many fingers he hath on either hand. Which precept indeed is most diligently observed and kept, according to the very rigour thereof by the Jews at this day, and that chiefly by the beggerly crew, to whom the richer sort send gifts and presents in a far greater measure then they do at other times, to the end that one may not mock another for being drunk, being commanded and strictly prohibited to send away their meat and drink to any other end and purpose. With these Bacchanal rites, drunken fits, and besotting beastliness, they put an end to their annual feasts. For this of Purim is the last festival in the year, having no more until the feast of the passover. If the Prophet *Isaiah* were alive at this day, or should rise from the dead, truly and really might he take occasion, and that both forcible and urgent to cry out, *Woe and alass unto them that rise up early to follow*

drunkenness, and to them that continue until the night, till the wine do inflame them."⁴³²

4.4.4 The Gentiles Must be Exterminated Lest God Cut Off the Jews

An important aspect of the Jewish Alamek mythology is the belief that Esau, or Edom, sought to destroy a belief in the Creator God of the Old Testament. This offense against God makes it easier for Jewish religious fanatics to justify their merciless genocide of Gentiles—they believe that any evil done in the name of God is good. *Deuteronomy 7:2-3* states:

“2 And when the LORD thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them, *and* utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them: 3 Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son.”

Deuteronomy 7:16-18 states:

“16 And thou shalt consume all the people which the LORD thy God shall deliver thee; thine eye shall have no pity upon them: neither shalt thou serve their gods; for that *will be* a snare unto thee. 17 If thou shalt say in thine heart, These nations *are* more than I; how can I dispossess them? 18 Thou shalt not be afraid of them: *but* shalt well remember what the LORD thy God did unto Pharaoh, and unto all Egypt;”

Some Jews have seen Amalek in Haman, Marcion, Rome, Christianity, Islam, Germany, Russia, even in all Gentiles; and though the Moslems—especially the Islamic Turkish Empire—are traditionally associated with Isaac’s half-brother Ishmael, rather than Esau, they are often referred to today as Amalek, as the race that must be exterminated.⁴³³ Jewish mythology emphasizes the threat that God will be angry with, and punish, any Jew who fails to exterminate the seed of Amalek. I *Samuel 15:1-35* states (one wonders, together with Voltaire,⁴³⁴ if Agag was meant as a human sacrifice to Baal):

“Samuel also said unto Saul, The LORD sent me to anoint thee *to be* king over his people, over Israel: now therefore hearken thou unto the voice of the words of the LORD. 2 Thus saith the LORD of hosts, I remember *that* which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid *wait* for him in the way, when he came up from Egypt. 3 Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass. 4 And Saul gathered the people together, and numbered them in Telaim, two hundred thousand footmen, and ten thousand men of Judah. 5 And Saul came to a city of Amalek, and laid wait in the valley. 6 ¶ And Saul said unto the Kenites, Go, depart, get you down from

among the Amalekites, lest I destroy you with them: for ye shewed kindness to all the children of Israel, when they came up out of Egypt. So the Kenites departed from among the Amalekites. 7 And Saul smote the Amalekites from Havilah *until* thou comest to Shur, that *is* over against Egypt. 8 And he took Agag the king of the Amalekites alive, and utterly destroyed all the people with the edge of the sword. 9 But Saul and the people spared Agag, and the best of the sheep, and of the oxen, and of the fatlings, and the lambs, and all *that* was good, and would not utterly destroy them: but every thing *that was* vile and refuse, that they destroyed utterly. 10 Then came the word of the LORD unto Samuel, saying, 11 It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king: for he is turned back from following me, and hath not performed my commandments. And it grieved Samuel; and he cried unto the LORD all night. 12 And when Samuel rose early to meet Saul in the morning, it was told Samuel, saying, Saul came to Carmel, and, behold, he set him up a place, and is gone about, and passed on, and gone down to Gilgal. 13 And Samuel came to Saul: and Saul said unto him, Blessed *be* thou of the LORD: I have performed the commandment of the LORD. 14 And Samuel said, What *meaneth* then this bleating of the sheep in mine ears, and the lowing of the oxen which I hear? 15 And Saul said, They have brought them from the Amalekites: for the people spared the best of the sheep and of the oxen, to sacrifice unto the LORD thy God; and the rest we have utterly destroyed. 16 Then Samuel said unto Saul, Stay, and I will tell thee what the LORD hath said to me this night. And he said unto him, Say on. 17 And Samuel said, When thou *wast* little in thine own sight, *wast* thou not *made* the head of the tribes of Israel, and the LORD anointed thee king over Israel? 18 And the LORD sent thee on a journey, and said, Go and utterly destroy the sinners the Amalekites, and fight against them until they be consumed. 19 Wherefore then didst thou not obey the voice of the LORD, but didst fly upon the spoil, and didst evil in the sight of the LORD? 20 And Saul said unto Samuel, Yea, I have obeyed the voice of the LORD, and have gone the way which the LORD sent me, and have brought Agag the king of Amalek, and have utterly destroyed the Amalekites. 21 But the people took of the spoil, sheep and oxen, the chief of the things which should have been utterly destroyed, to sacrifice unto the LORD thy God in Gilgal. 22 And Samuel said, Hath the LORD *as great* delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Behold, to obey *is* better than sacrifice, *and* to hearken than the fat of rams. 23 For rebellion *is as* the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness *is as* iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the LORD, he hath also rejected thee from *being* king. 24 ¶ And Saul said unto Samuel, I have sinned: for I have transgressed the commandment of the LORD, and thy words: because I feared the people, and obeyed their voice. 25 Now therefore, I pray thee, pardon my sin, and turn again with me, that I may worship the LORD. 26 And Samuel said unto Saul, I will not return with thee: for thou hast rejected the word of the LORD, and the LORD hath rejected thee from being king over Israel. 27 And as Samuel turned about to

go away, he laid hold upon the skirt of his mantle, and it rent. 28 And Samuel said unto him, The LORD hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbour of thine, *that is* better than thou. 29 And also the Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent: for he *is* not a man, that he should repent. 30 Then he said, I have sinned: yet honour me now, I pray thee, before the elders of my people, and before Israel, and turn again with me, that I may worship the LORD thy God. 31 So Samuel turned again after Saul; and Saul worshipped the LORD. 32 ¶ Then said Samuel, Bring ye hither to me Agag the king of the Amalekites. And Agag came unto him delicately. And Agag said, Surely the bitterness of death is past. 33 And Samuel said, As thy sword hath made women childless, so shall thy mother be childless among women. And Samuel hewed Agag in pieces before the LORD in Gilgal. 34 ¶ Then Samuel went to Ramah; and Saul went up to his house to Gibeah of Saul. 35 And Samuel came no more to see Saul until the day of his death: nevertheless Samuel mourned for Saul: and the LORD repented that he had made Saul king over Israel.”

The Jewish God of the Old Testament preferred genocidal extermination to mercy and tolerance, as revealed in *Joshua* 10:34-42,

“And from Lachish Joshua passed unto Eglon, and all Israel with him; and they encamped against it, and fought against it: 35 And they took it on that day, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and all the souls that *were* therein he utterly destroyed that day, according to all that he had done to Lachish. 36 And Joshua went up from Eglon, and all Israel with him, unto Hebron; and they fought against it: 37 And they took it, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and the king thereof, and all the cities thereof, and all the souls that *were* therein; he left none remaining, according to all that he had done to Eglon; but destroyed it utterly, and all the souls that *were* therein. 38 And Joshua returned, and all Israel with him, to Debir; and fought against it: 39 And he took it, and the king thereof, and all the cities thereof; and they smote them with the edge of the sword, and utterly destroyed all the souls that *were* therein; he left none remaining: as he had done to Hebron, so he did to Debir, and to the king thereof; as he had done also to Libnah, and to her king. 40 So Joshua smote all the country of the hills, and of the south, and of the vale, and of the springs, and all their kings: he left none remaining, but utterly destroyed all that breathed, as the LORD God of Israel commanded. 41 And Joshua smote them from Kadesh-barnea even unto Gaza, and all the country of Goshen, even unto Gibeon. 42 And all these kings and their land did Joshua take at one time, because the LORD God of Israel fought for Israel.”

Deuteronomy 3:4-7; 7:2, 16-18; 20:16; 26:19; and 28:9 state:

“And we took all his cities at that time, there was not a city which we took

not from them, threescore cities, all the region of Argob, the kingdom of Og in Bashan. All these cities *were* fenced *with* high walls, gates, and bars; beside unwalled towns a great many. And we utterly destroyed them, as we did unto Sihon king of Heshbon, utterly destroying the men, women, and children, of every city. But all the cattle, and the spoil of the cities, we took for a prey to ourselves. [***] And when the LORD thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them, *and* utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor shew mercy unto them: [***] And thou shalt consume all the people which the LORD thy God shall deliver thee; thine eye shall have no pity upon them: neither shalt thou serve their gods; for that *will be* a snare unto thee. [***] But of the cities of these people, which the LORD thy God doth give thee *for* an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth: [***] And to make thee high above all nations which he hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honour; and that thou mayest be an holy people unto the LORD thy God, as he hath spoken. [***] The LORD shall establish thee an holy people unto himself, as he hath sworn unto thee, if thou shalt keep the commandments of the LORD thy God, and walk in his ways.”

Numbers 21:3, 35; and 31:1-18 state:

“3 And the LORD hearkened to the voice of Israel, and delivered up the Canaanites; and they utterly destroyed them and their cities: and he called the name of the place Hormah. [***] 35 So they smote him, and his sons, and all his people, until there was none left him alive: and they possessed his land. [***] And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, 2 Avenge the children of Israel of the Midianites: afterward shalt thou be gathered unto thy people. 3 And Moses spake unto the people, saying, Arm some of yourselves unto the war, and let them go against the Midianites, and avenge the LORD of Midian. 4 Of every tribe a thousand, throughout all the tribes of Israel, shall ye send to the war. 5 So there were delivered out of the thousands of Israel, a thousand of *every* tribe, twelve thousand armed for war. 6 And Moses sent them to the war, a thousand of *every* tribe, them and Phinehas the son of Eleazar the priest, to the war, with the holy instruments, and the trumpets to blow in his hand. 7 And they warred against the Midianites, as the LORD commanded Moses; and they slew all the males. 8 And they slew the kings of Midian, beside the rest of them that were slain; *namely*, Evi, and Rekem, and Zur, and Hur, and Reba, five kings of Midian: Balaam also the son of Beor they slew with the sword. 9 And the children of Israel took *all* the women of Midian captives, and their little ones, and took the spoil of all their cattle, and all their flocks, and all their goods. 10 And they burnt all their cities wherein they dwelt, and all their goodly castles, with fire. 11 And they took all the spoil, and all the prey, *both* of men and of beasts. 12 And they brought the captives, and the prey, and the spoil, unto Moses, and Eleazar the priest, and unto the congregation of the children of Israel, unto the camp at

the plains of Moab, which are by Jordan *near* Jericho. 13 And Moses, and Eleazar the priest, and all the princes of the congregation, went forth to meet them without the camp. 14 And Moses was wroth with the officers of the host, *with* the captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, which came from the battle. 15 And Moses said unto them, Have ye saved all the women alive? 16 Behold, these caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against the LORD in the matter of Peor, and there was a plague among the congregation of the LORD. 17 Now therefore kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. 18 But all the women children, that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves.”

See also: *The Book of Jubilees* 32:17-20.

In Jewish mythology, the Messiah of the Jews will destroy the nations, destroy all the religion of the Gentiles, enslave the Gentiles and then exterminate them. It is very important to remember that the Messiah of genocidal Judaism is not the gentle healer of the sick, and willing victim of the powerful, whom we call Jesus of Nazareth. The Messiah of genocidal Judaism is a demonic figure who will lay the Gentiles to waste—he is worse than those who were promoted in the press of their day as messiahs—worse than Napoleon, worse than Marx, worse than Hitler, worse even than Stalin. *Psalms* 2:1-12 states:

“Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? 2 The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the LORD, and against his anointed, *saying*, 3 Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. 4 He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision. 5 Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. 6 Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion. 7 I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou *art* my Son; this day have I begotten thee. 8 Ask of me, and I shall give *thee* the heathen *for* thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth *for* thy possession. 9 Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel. 10 Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. 11 Serve the LORD with fear, and rejoice with trembling. 12 Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish *from* the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed *are* all they that put their trust in him.”

Psalms 110:1-7 states,

“The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. 2 The LORD shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. 3 Thy people *shall be* willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth. 4 The LORD hath sworn, and will

not repent, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. 5 The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath. 6 He shall judge among the heathen, he shall fill *the places with* the dead bodies; he shall wound the heads over many countries. 7 He shall drink of the brook in the way: therefore shall he lift up the head.”

The Jews scoffed at that idea that Jesus should have been the Messiah of the Jews, because Jesus did not commit genocide against the Gentiles with an iron scepter as was prophesied (*Numbers* 24:17-20. *Psalms* 2:9). Jesus was humble, not a demonic and wealthy king who destroyed the nations, enslaved the Gentiles and then murdered them, as some sects of Judaism design and desire to this day.

Israel is today a nation. The Jewish religion, as practiced by some, calls for the extermination of the seed of Amalek. This meant to some Jews the sterilization of Germans, assimilationists, criminals, etc.; to others the planned effects of “race-mixing”, which would dilute and weaken the seed of Amalek; to others, it has meant the obliteration of Islamic Nations.⁴³⁵ There have been allegations that Israel is developing genetically targeted biological weapons. Israel is heavily armed with nuclear, biological and chemical weapons. *The Sunday Times* of London reported, among other things, on 15 November 1998, in an article by Uzi Mahnaimi and Marie Colvin entitled “Israel Planning ‘Ethnic’ Bomb as Saddam Caves in / Pentagon Warns Over ‘Ethno Bomb’”, on pages 1 and 2,

“In developing their ‘ethno bomb’, Israeli scientists are trying to exploit medical advances by identifying genes carried by some Arabs, then create a genetically modified bacterium or virus. [***] The programme is based at the biological institute in Nes Tziyona, the main research facility for Israel’s clandestine arsenal of chemical and biological weapons.”

Israel plans to destroy all human life on Earth, if its Messianic goals are not fulfilled. The Israeli government, which represents only a few million persons, has prepared a doom’s day device called the “Samson Option”, which will detonate enough nuclear devices to kill off all of humanity. They plan to use it if the State of Israel fails.⁴³⁶ Judaism calls on the “righteous”—fanatically religious Jews—to mass murder the rest of humanity in the Messianic Era.⁴³⁷ *Deuteronomy* 32:9, states,

“For the LORD’s portion *is* his people; Jacob *is* the lot of his inheritance.”

The criminal Israeli cult of assassination and espionage, the Mossad, wages war on the rest of the world. The Mossad’s motto is, “By way of deception, thou shalt do war.”⁴³⁸

The ultimate purpose of the racist Jews’ war on humanity is ultimately to leave no one left alive but “righteous” Jews.⁴³⁹ All Gentiles are destined to be killed. All assimilated Jews are destined to be killed. Michael Higger wrote in his book *The Jewish Utopia*,

“First, no line will be drawn between bad Jews and bad non-Jews. There will be no room for the unrighteous, whether Jewish or non-Jewish, in the Kingdom of God. All of them will have disappeared before the advent of the ideal era on this earth.⁸⁴ Unrighteous Israelites will be punished equally with the wicked of other nations.⁸⁵ [***] In general, the peoples of the world will be divided into two main groups, the Israelitic and the non-Israelitic. The former will be righteous; they will live in accordance with the wishes of one, universal God; they will be thirsty for knowledge, and willing, even to the point of martyrdom, to spread ethical truths to the world. All the other peoples, on the other hand, will be known for their detestable practices, idolatry, and similar acts of wickedness. They will be destroyed and will disappear from earth before the ushering in of the ideal era.²¹⁸ All these unrighteous nations will be called to judgment, before they are punished and doomed. The severe sentence of their doom will be pronounced upon them only after they have been given a fair trial, when it will have become evident that their existence would hinder the advent of the ideal era.²¹⁹ Thus, at the coming of the Messiah, when all righteous nations will pay homage to the ideal righteous leader, and offer gifts to him, the wicked and corrupt nations, by realizing the approach of their doom, will bring similar presents to the Messiah. Their gifts and pretended acknowledgment of the new era, will be bluntly rejected.²²⁰ For the really wicked nations, like the wicked individuals, must disappear from earth before an ideal human society of righteous nations can be established. No ideal era of mankind can be established as long as there are peoples living idolatrous, ungodly lives ; as long as there are oppressors of the righteous, friends of slavery, enemies of freedom and liberty, and defiant enemies of God.²²¹ [***] Moreover, rabbinic sources, in speaking of Israel’s fate in the ideal era, ascribe Israel’s spiritual victory in the future to the fact that righteousness will be victorious over wickedness, and that the upright and just will succeed in bringing about the disappearance of the unrighteous from the earth.²²⁶ [***] Consequently, before the Kingdom of God will be established, a number of important reforms and changes will take place. Idolatry and idol worshippers, wicked people, unrighteous nations will disappear from the earth.^{230,440}

It should be noted that Higger asserts that Gentiles will first be offered an opportunity to join the “righteous Jews”, but those whom the Jewish Messiah rejects will be mass murdered in a broad genocide. What is to prevent the Jewish Messiah, a political Jewish King, not a divine being, from merely pronouncing all Gentiles “unrighteous” as is the case in the Hebrew Bible? What is “righteous” about genocide? Why do religious disagreements give the “righteous Jews” the right to slaughter their Catholic, Buddhist, Hindu, and assimilated Jewish neighbors?

Tom Segev quoted Ehud Praver in Segev’s book, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*,

“In the wake of Kahane, we heard more and more about soldiers who,

exposed to the history of the Holocaust, were planning all sorts of ways to exterminate the Arabs,' recalled education-corps officer Ehud Praver. 'It concerned us very much, because we saw that the Holocaust was legitimizing the appearance of Jewish racism. We learned that it was necessary to deal not only with the Holocaust but also with the rise of fascism and to explain what racism is and what dangers it holds for democracy.' According to Praver, 'too many soldiers were deducing that the Holocaust justifies every kind of disgraceful action.'⁴⁴¹

Jewish hatred of the Gentiles spans across history. The *Zohar*, I, 28b, states,

"One kind is from the side of the serpent; another from the side of the Gentiles, who are compared to the beasts of the field[.]"⁴⁴²

We also find the racist Jews Isaac Luria, Nachman of Bratslav and Shneur Zalman degrading Gentiles as if sub-human. Shneur Zalman believed that,

"Gentile souls are of a completely different and inferior order. They are totally evil, with no redeeming qualities whatsoever. Consequently, references to gentiles in Rabbi Shneur Zalman's teachings are invariably invidious. . . . Their material abundance derives from supernal refuse. Indeed, they themselves derive from refuse, which is why they are more numerous than the Jews, as the pieces of chaff outnumber the kernels. . . . All Jews were innately good, all gentiles innately evil. Jews were the pinnacle of creation and served the Creator, gentiles its nadir and worshiped the heavenly hosts."⁴⁴³

Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook wrote in the Twentieth Century that,

"the difference between the Israelite soul. . . and the souls of all non-Jews, no matter what their level, is bigger and deeper than the difference between the human soul and the animal soul."⁴⁴⁴

The Jewish Encyclopedia wrote in its article "Gentile",

"According to Hananiah b. Akabia the word רעהו (Ex. xxi. 14) may perhaps exclude the Gentile; but the shedding of the blood of non-Israelites, while not cognizable by human courts, will be punished by the heavenly tribunal (Mek., Mishpatim, 80b). [***] Another reason for discrimination [against Gentiles] was the vile and vicious character of the Gentiles: 'I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation' (נכל = 'vile,' 'contemptible'; Deut. xxxii. 21). The Talmud says that the passage refers to the Gentiles of Barbary and Mauretania, who walked nude in the streets (Yeb. 63b), and to similar Gentiles, 'whose flesh is as the flesh of asses and whose issue is like the issue of horses' (Ezek. xxiii. 20); who can not claim a father (Yeb. 98a). The

Gentiles were so strongly suspected of unnatural crimes that it was necessary to prohibit the stabling of a cow in their stalls ('Ab. Zarah ii. 1). Assaults on women were most frequent, especially at invasions and after sieges (Ket. 3b), the Rabbis declaring that in case of rape by a Gentile the issue should not be allowed to affect a Jewish woman's relation to her husband. 'The Torah outlawed the issue of a Gentile as that of a beast' (Mik. viii. 4, referring to Ezek. i. c.)."⁴⁴⁵

Albert Einstein's friend Georg Friedrich Nicolai (Lewinstein) stated in 1917,

"Apart from this strange story of Cain, however, murder is forbidden in the Bible, and very sternly forbidden. But—it is only the murder of Jews. As is natural, considering the period from which it dates, the Bible is absolutely national, in character. Only the Jew is really considered as a human being; cattle and strangers might be slain without the slayer himself being slain. In this case there was a ransom. Accordingly, war was of course allowed also, and the Jews were no more illogical than the Moslem who kills the outlander. Of late years the Jews and the Old Testament have often been reproached for their contempt for those who were not Jews; and in practice even Christ acted in precisely the same way."⁴⁴⁶

In an article "Begin and the 'Beasts'", *New Statesman*, Volume 103, Number 2674, (25 June 1982), page 12, Amnon Kapeliuk wrote of Menachem Begin, the Prime Minister of Israel,

"The war in Lebanon cannot be interpreted, even by its most devoted proponents in Israel, as a war of survival. For this reason, the government has gone to extraordinary lengths to dehumanise the Palestinians. Begin described them in a speech in the Knesset as 'beasts walking on two legs'. Palestinians have often been called 'bugs' while their refugee camps in Lebanon are referred to as 'tourist camps'. In order to rationalise the bombing of civilian populations, Begin emotively declared: 'If Hitler was sitting in a house with 20 other people, would it be correct to blow up the house?'"⁴⁴⁷

In a "Letter to the Editor", signed by Isidore Abramowitz, Hannah Arendt, Abraham Brick, Rabbi Jessurun Cardozo, Albert Einstein, Herman Eisen, M. D., Hayim Fineman, M. Gallen, M. D., H. H. Harris, Zelig S. Harris, Sidney Hook, Fred Karush, Bruria Kaufman, Irma L. Lindheim, Nachman Majsel, Seymour Melman, Myer D. Mendelson, M. D., Harry M. Orlinsky, Samuel Pitlick, Fritz Rohrlich, Louis P. Rocker, Ruth Sager, Itzhak Sankowsky, I. J. Schoenberg, Samuel Shuman, M. Znger, Irma Wolpe, Stefan Wolpe; dated "New York. Dec. 2, 1948."; published as: "New Palestine Party; Visit of Menachen Begin and Aims of Political Movement Discussed", *The New York Times*, (4 December 1948), p. 12; it states, *inter alia*,

“Among the most disturbing political phenomena of our time is the emergence in the newly created state of Israel of the ‘Freedom Party’ (Tnuat HaHerut), a political party closely akin in its organization, methods, political philosophy and social appeal to the Nazi and Fascist parties. It was formed out of the membership and following of the former Irgun Zvai Leumi, a terrorist, right-wing, chauvinist organization in Palestine. The current visit of Menachen Begin, leader of this party, to the United States is obviously calculated to give the impression of American support for his party in the coming Israeli elections, and to cement political ties with conservative Zionist elements in the United States. [***] The Deir Yassin incident exemplifies the character and actions of the Freedom Party. Within the Jewish community they have preached an admixture of ultranationalism, religious mysticism, and racial superiority. Like other Fascist parties they have been used to break strikes, and have themselves pressed for the destruction of free trade unions. In their stead they have proposed corporate unions on the Italian Fascist model. [***] This is the unmistakable stamp of a Fascist party for whom terrorism (against Jews, Arabs, and British alike), and misrepresentation are means, and a ‘Leader State’ is the goal.”

Racist Zionist Moses Hess declared that Germans are the genetic enemies of Israel in 1862 (contrast Hess’ views with Goldhagen’s negative analysis of Germans under Hitler⁴⁴⁸ and see Hartmut Stern’s response to Goldhagen⁴⁴⁹). Moses Hess’ statement must be seen in the context of Jacob and Esau, and Isaac’s “blessing” to Esau that Esau should be the servant and the sword of Jacob, of Israel. *Genesis 25:23* states,

“And the LORD said unto her, Two nations *are* in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and *the one* people shall be stronger than *the other* people; and the elder shall serve the younger.”

Genesis 27:38-41 states,

“38 And Esau said unto his father, Hast thou but one blessing, my father? bless me, *even* me also, O my father. And Esau lifted up his voice, and wept. 39 And Isaac his father answered and said unto him, Behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above; 40 And by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck. 41¶ And Esau hated Jacob because of the blessing wherewith his father blessed him: and Esau said in his heart, The days of mourning for my father are at hand; then will I slay my brother Jacob.”

Hess may have envisioned the annihilation of the German “race”—referred to by some Jews as the people of the sword. It was clearly better for the Jews to kill off

Esau before his descendants “broke his yoke from off his neck” than to let them live and potentially seek revenge on the Jews. Hess’ book told his fellow Jews that Germans were the seed of Amalek and must be exterminated. At least as early as the 1860’s, Moses Hess argued that the “German race” had a genetically programmed antagonism towards the “Jewish race”—the implication being that one must destroy the other in order to survive. In the Jewish mythology, this confrontation called for the extermination of the Germans. Two World Wars nearly accomplished the destruction of Germany and ended their prominence in world affairs. Two World Wars killed off many of the strongest, smartest and most assertive Germans. Hess wrote in 1862,

“It seems that German education is not compatible with our Jewish national aspirations. Had I not once lived in France, it would never have entered my mind to interest myself with the revival of Jewish nationality. Our views and strivings are determined by the social environment which surrounds us. Every living, acting people, like every active individual, has its special field. Indeed, every man, every member of the historical nations, is a political, or as we say at present, a social animal; yet within this sphere of the common social world, there are special places reserved by Nature for individuals according to their particular calling. The specialty of the German of the higher class, of course, is his interest in abstract thought; and because he is too much of a universal philosopher, it is difficult for him to be inspired by national tendencies. ‘Its whole tendency,’ my former publisher, Otto Wigand, once wrote to me, when I showed him an outline of a work on Jewish national aspirations, ‘is contrary to my pure human nature.’

The ‘pure human nature’ of the Germans is, in reality, the character of the pure German race, which rises to the conception of humanity in theory only, but in practice it has not succeeded in overcoming the natural sympathies and antipathies of the race. German antagonism to Jewish national aspiration has a double origin, though the motives are really contrary to each other. The duplicity and contrariety of the human personality, such as we can see in the union of the spiritual and the natural, the theoretical and the practical sides, are in no other nation so sharply marked in their points of opposition as in the German. Jewish national aspirations are antagonistic to the theoretical cosmopolitan tendencies of the German. But in addition to this, the German opposes Jewish national aspirations because of his racial antipathy, from which even the noblest Germans have not as yet emancipated themselves. The publisher, whose ‘pure human’ conscience revolted against publishing a book advocating the revival of Jewish nationality, published books preaching hatred to Jews and Judaism without the slightest remorse, in spite of the fact that the motive of such works is essentially opposed to the ‘pure human conscience.’ This contradictory action was due to inborn racial antagonism to the Jews. But the German, it seems, has no clear conception of his racial prejudices; he sees in his egoistic as well as in his spiritual endeavors, not German or Teutonic, but ‘humanitarian tendencies’; and he

does not know that he follows the latter only in theory, while in practice he clings to his egoistic ideas.

[***]

In 1858, there appeared, at Leipzig, a work written by Otto Wigand under the title *Two discourses concerning the desertion from Judaism*, being an analysis of the views on this question expressed in the recently published correspondence of Dr. Abraham Geiger. The author endeavors to prove that the conclusions of Dr. Geiger are untenable both from a philosophic and from a social standpoint. Here are his social arguments:

‘My friend,’ says the author, ‘there are certain conclusions which you cannot escape. The stamp of slavery, if we may use this expression, which centuries of oppression have deeply impressed upon the Jewish features, might have been obliterated by the blessed hand of regained civil liberty. The gait of the Jews, buoyed up by the happy reminiscences of the victory won in the struggle for the noble possession of liberty, might have been straighter and prouder. The Jewish face may certainly beam with pride, as it views the tremendous progress made by the Jews in a brief time, their mighty flight to the spiritual height upon which they now stand, which is especially notable considering the fact that their poets and writers at whose greatness the nation is astonished, and of whose talents the entire people takes account, have sprung from those who, a generation ago, could hardly converse correctly in the language of the land. Such a state of affairs should undoubtedly call forth admiration in the hearts of the present German generation, and yet, in spite of these achievements, the wall separating Jew and Christian still stands unshattered, for the watchman that guards them is one who will not be caught napping. It is the race difference between the Jewish and Christian populations. If this assertion of mine surprises or astonishes you, I ask you to consider whether it is not almost a rule with the Germans that race differences generate prejudices which cannot be overcome by any manifestation of good-will on the part of the other race. The relations existing between the German and the Slavic populations in Bohemia, in Hungary and Transylvania, between the Germans and the Danes in Schleswig, or between the Irish and the Anglo-Saxon settlers in Ireland, illustrates well the power of race antagonism in the German world. In all these countries the different elements of the population have lived side by side for centuries, sharing equally all political rights, and yet, so strong are the national or racial differences, that a social amalgamation of the various elements of the population is even at the present day quite unthinkable. And what comparison is there between the race differences of a German and Slav, a Celt and Anglo-Saxon, or a German and Dane, and the race antagonism between the children of the Sons of Jacob, who are of Asiatic descent, and the descendants of Teut and Herman, the ancestors of whom have inhabited Europe from time immemorial; between the proud and the tall blond German and the small of figure, black-haired and black-eyed Jew? Races which differ in such a degree oppose each other instinctively and against such opposition

reason and good sense are powerless.’

These expressions are certainly frank and sincere in their meaning, though they by no means prove the conclusions to which the author wishes to arrive, namely, the desirability of conversion; for conversion will not turn a Jew into a German. But they at least contain the confession, that an instinctive race antagonism triumphs in Germany above all humanitarian sentiments. The ‘pure human nature’ resolves itself, according to the Germans, in the nature of pure Germanism. The ‘high-born blond race’ looks with contempt upon the regeneration of the ‘black-haired, quick-moving mannikins,’ without regard to whether they are descendants of the Biblical patriarchs, or of the ancient Romans and Gauls.

While other civilized western nations mention the shameful oppression to which the Jews were formerly subjected, only as an act of theirs of which they are ashamed, the German remembers only the ‘stamp of slavery’ which he impressed upon ‘the Jewish physiognomy.’

In a *feuilleton* which appeared recently in the *Bonnerzeitung*, entitled ‘Bonn Eighty Years Ago,’ the author speaks of the Jews in mocking terms and describes them as people who lived in separate quarters and supported themselves by petty trades. I believe that we should wonder less at the fact that the Jews, who were forbidden to participate in the important branches of industry and commerce, lived on petty trade, than at the fact that they were able to live at all in those centuries of oppression. As a matter of fact, almost every means of existence, including the right of domicile, was denied them. It was only by means of bribes that every Jewish generation could procure anew the ‘privilege’ not to be driven out of their homes in Bonn, and they felt happy indeed if, in spite of the contract, they were not robbed of their property and exiled, or attacked by a fanatical mob in the bargain. I, also, can tell a story of ‘eighty years ago.’ A Jew won the high favor of the Kurfuerst of Bonn, that he and his descendants were granted the ‘privilege’ to settle in Ebendich.

[***]

Gabriel Riesser, the editor of the magazine, *The Jew*, as far as I can recollect, never fell into the error, common to all modern German Jews, that the emancipation of the Jews is irreconcilable with the development of Jewish Nationalism. He demanded emancipation for the Jews on the one condition only, that of their receiving all civil and political rights in return for their assuming all civil and political burdens.”⁴⁵⁰

Jewish financiers including Jacob Schiff brought about the downfall of Russia in the name of saving the Children of Israel from Edom. England, France, Germany, Turkey and Russia caused each other great harm, but their wars resulted in the emancipation of the Jews, a reduction in the power of the Roman Catholic Church, and, ultimately, in the formation of the State of Israel. *Micah* 5:8 states,

“And the remnant of Jacob shall be among the Gentiles in the midst of many

people as a lion among the beasts of the forest, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep: who, if he go through, both treadeth down, and teareth in pieces, and none can deliver.”

The *Zohar* I, 25a-25b, states that peoples other than the Jews will be exterminated when the Jews form a state in Palestine,

“But as ‘*tohu* and *bohu*’ gave place to light, so when God reveals Himself they will be wiped off the earth. But withal redemption will not be complete until Amalek will be exterminated, for against Amalek the oath was taken that ‘the Lord will have war against Amalek from generation to generation’ (Ex. XVII, 16).”⁴⁵¹

Amalek and Esau are seen as the genetic and reincarnate spirit of Cain who slew Abel. I *Enoch* 22:7, states that the spirit of Abel prays for the extermination of the seed of Cain:

“And he answered and said to me, saying: ‘That is the spirit that proceeded from Abel, whom his brother Cain slew; and it laments on his account till his seed is destroyed from the face of the earth and his seed disappear from among the seed of men.’”⁴⁵²

Genesis 3:14-15 implies that Eve and the serpent which tempted Eve had a son, Cain who slew Abel. *Yebamoth* 103b states that serpent infused Eve with lust when they copulated. The Jews were supposedly cleansed of this lust infused into Eve by the serpent, on Mount Sinai (*Abodah Zarah* 22b. *Shabbath* 145b-146a). *Yebamoth* 63a states that Adam had intercourse with all animals and beasts, but only derived satisfaction from Eve. Voltaire ridiculed Judaism and Jews for their laws against sexual relations with animals, which laws Voltaire alleged indicate that the practice of bestiality was common among ancient Jews, for otherwise Jews would have required no laws proscribing bestiality.⁴⁵³

It is significant that Enoch is given two different lineages in *Genesis* and that Cain was a farmer, while Abel was a shepherd. God (like Isaac) preferred Abel’s (Esau’s) offering of flesh to Cain’s (Jacob’s) offering of fruit (*Genesis* 4). This relates Cain to Jacob and Abel to Esau. Cain, the first murderer, might be said to have been the first “wandering Jew” and his descendants were city dwellers. *Genesis* 3:14-15 states,

“And the LORD God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.”

Certain Cabalists believe that Jews descend from Cain.⁴⁵⁴

4.4.5 Jewish Dualism and Human Sacrifice—Evil is Good

The Dualism implicit in the stories of Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel, and Jacob and Esau, has been interpreted in Marcionistic and Gnostic terms as the blessings and curses of two distinct gods. There is the good spiritual god who brought us Jesus, and the evil Creator god who created the corpse of the flesh in which divine spirits are trapped—the lesser creator God of the Old Testament. Jewish Dualism is apparent in the Old and New Testament *Logos*, mistranslated as divine “Word”, which word in fact signifies the dialectic and Dualistic principles of Heraclitus and Plato—the dialectic of good and evil, light and darkness, flesh and spirit, which is the eternal flame of the Universe.

These Dualistic mythologies have been put to great political effect over the centuries and are intentionally confused to bewilder the uninitiated into believing that all Jews worship the Devil; or, alternatively, that Catholics worship the Devil and that the Pope is the anti-Christ; or, alternatively, that all Dualist sects actually worship the Devil alone; etc.

However, it is true that Jewish Dualism teaches Jews to view evil as a good thing which originates in God, as do all things. Many Dualistic Jews even see evil as a stronger force for action than good, because they fear evil, but have no fear of good. Many Dualistic Jews view evil as a more powerful force, because they believe it attracts God’s attention and causes Him to act. Many Dualistic Jews teach their adherents to commit acts of evil, the worse the better, as a means to summon the Messianic Era.

In many Jewish racist myths, various myths which frequently contradict one another, angels are blamed for bringing evil to mankind and for interbreeding with human females to create, alternatively, depending upon political and religious bias, an evil or a divine race, which race of demigods must be exterminated, or defended (*Genesis* 6:1-5. *Numbers* 13:25-33. I *Enoch*). The Dualism expressed in Jewish writings may have its origin in the Sumerian myths of An, Enlil and Enki. The Biblical legend of evil giants descended from angels may derive from the epic of *Gilgamesh*—as well as in the Greek myths of giants and demi-gods. Jewish Dualism has always been a dangerously racist belief system which defines specific peoples as “elect” and “good”, and other peoples as an evil race destined to be exterminated (*Isaiah* 65; 66. *See also: Enoch*).

Judaism is likely a mixed-up sect of the Canaanite religions, incorporating Mesopotamian, Greek and Egyptian myths. Jacob worships the god “El” (*Genesis* 35) and was himself called El (*Tractate Megillah*, Chapter 2). El was a Canaanite god who bore Baal-Hadad, a calf, and is sometimes depicted seated and with the head and horns of a bull. This god was a fertility god. “Baal” has been translated as “Lord” and the Hebrews referred to their God as “Baal”. In Canaanite myth, Baal is a mighty storm and in the Bible the word we know of today as “spirit” or “ghost”, as in “Holy Ghost”, is in fact “wind” in the original languages. From the beginnings of *Genesis* through the New Testament, God is a mighty and wrathful storm, or wind, or “Holy Wind”, which we today call “Holy Ghost”. This poetic imagery was likely derived from the Canaanite religion. Baal worship, especially the worship of

Moloch, involves human sacrifice, in particular, that of burning one's firstborn child—the child who opens the womb, as did Esau. Gentiles are to be human sacrifices to Baal for the sake of Jacob, the Jews.

The Canaanite Baal and El, like the Jews' God, were jealous gods and there was an enmity between them. Perhaps this enmity between gods and tribes is what led Jews—Judeans—into accepting a stubborn and intolerant Egyptian monotheism violently and fanatically opposed to all other religions. The Jews have also had several sects which have worshiped a form of Eleatic Monism. Perhaps, the enmity between Baal and El is the source of the Dualistic beliefs of some Jewish and Christian sects. Perhaps the original authors of Judaism made their God a jealous God because they created their God to protect their racism. God's jealousy is linked to commandments not to intermarry with other peoples, because this would lead the Hebrews to worship foreign gods, but the real underlying motive is the preservation of "racial purity" and the religious mythology was merely a means of controlling people and thereby preserving the "race". The Jewish religion was a survival tactic and a very effective one.

The Jews of Judea knew that peoples could disappear, and that even to conquer another people could lead to intermarriage and the disappearance of one's own people. This is clearly spelled out in *Ezra* 9:

"Now when these *things* were done, the princes came to me, saying, The people of Israel, and the priests, and the Levites, have not separated themselves from the people of the lands, *doing* according to their abominations, *even* of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Egyptians, and the Amorites. 2 For they have taken of their daughters for themselves, and for their sons: so that the holy seed have mingled themselves with the people of *those* lands: yea, the hand of the princes and rulers hath been chief in this trespass. 3 And when I heard this thing, I rent my garment and my mantle, and plucked off the hair of my head and of my beard, and sat down astonished. 4 Then were assembled unto me every one that trembled at the words of the God of Israel, because of the transgression of those that had been carried away; and I sat astonished until the evening sacrifice. 5 And at the evening sacrifice I arose up from my heaviness; and having rent my garment and my mantle, I fell upon my knees, and spread out my hands unto the LORD my God. 6 And said, O my God, I am ashamed and blush to lift up my face to thee, my God: for our iniquities are increased over *our* head, and our trespass is grown up unto the heavens. 7 Since the days of our fathers *have we been* in a great trespass unto this day; and for our iniquities have we, our kings, *and* our priests, been delivered into the hand of the kings of the lands, to the sword, to captivity, and to a spoil, and to confusion of face, as *it is* this day. 8 And now for a little space grace hath been *shewed* from the LORD our God, to leave us a remnant to escape, and to give us a nail in his holy place, that our God may lighten our eyes, and give us a little reviving in our bondage. 9 For we *were* bondmen; yet our God hath not forsaken us in our bondage, but hath

extended mercy unto us in the sight of the kings of Persia, to give us a reviving, to set up the house of our God, and to repair the desolations thereof, and to give us a wall in Judah and in Jerusalem. 10 And now, O our God, what shall we say after this? for we have forsaken thy commandments, 11 Which thou hast commanded by thy servants the prophets, saying, The land, *unto* which ye go to possess it, *is* an unclean land with the filthiness of the people of the lands, with their abominations, which have filled it from one end to another with their uncleanness. 12 Now therefore give not your daughters unto their sons, neither take their daughters unto your sons, nor seek their peace or their wealth for ever: that ye may be strong, and eat the good of the land, and leave *it* for an inheritance to your children for ever. 13 And after all that is come upon us for our evil deeds, and for our great trespass, seeing that thou our God hast punished us less than our iniquities *deserve*, and hast given us *such* deliverance as this; 14 Should we again break thy commandments, and join in affinity with the people of these abominations? wouldest not thou be angry with us till *thou* hadst consumed us, so that *there should be* no remnant nor escaping? 15 O LORD God of Israel, thou *art* righteous: for we remain *yet* escaped, as *it is* this day: behold, we *are* before thee in our trespasses: for *we* cannot stand before thee because of this.”

Nehemiah 9:2; 13:3, 23-30 state:

“9:2 And the seed of Israel separated themselves from all strangers, and stood and confessed their sins, and the iniquities of their fathers. [***] 13:3 Now it came to pass, when they had heard the law, that they separated from Israel all the mixed multitude. [***] 13:23¶ In those days also saw I Jews *that* had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, *and* of Moab: 13:24 And their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews’ language, but according to the language of each people. 13:25 And I contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair, and made them swear by God, *saying*, Ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons, nor take their daughters unto your sons, or for yourselves. 13:26 Did not Solomon king of Israel sin by these *things?* yet among many nations was there no king like him, who was beloved of his God, and God made him king over all Israel: *nevertheless* even him did outlandish women cause to sin. 13:27 Shall we then hearken unto you to do all this great evil, to transgress against our God in marrying strange wives? 13:28 And *one* of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib the high priest, *was* son in law to Sanballat the Horonite: therefore I chased him from me. 13:29 Remember them, O my God, because they have defiled the priesthood, and the covenant of the priesthood, and of the Levites. 13:30 Thus cleansed I them from all strangers, and appointed the wards of the priests and the Levites, every one in his business;”

Exodus 34:11-17 states (note that Zionist Jews have repeatedly committed such atrocities against Palestinians):

“11 Observe thou that which I command thee *this* day: behold, I drive out before thee the Amorite, and the Canaanite, and the Hittite, and the Perizzite, and the Hivite, and the Jebusite. 12 Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, lest it be for a snare in the midst of thee: 13 But ye shall destroy their altars, break their images, and cut down their groves: 14 For thou shalt worship no other god: for the LORD, whose name *is* Jealous, *is* a jealous God: 15 Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and they go a whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods, and *one* call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice; 16 And thou take of their daughters unto thy sons, and their daughters go a whoring after their gods, and make thy sons go a whoring after their gods. 17 Thou shalt make thee no molten gods.”

Deuteronomy 7:2-3 states:

“2 And when the LORD thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them, *and* utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them: 3 Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son.”

El was the supreme god of the Canaanites, but Baal ruled the Earth. Baal, a god of fertility, dies and is resurrected each year. From these myths emerged Christianity, which in its earliest incarnation preached that Jesus was the son of a supreme and spiritual God, perhaps “El”; and that Judaism worshiped the earthly and devilish “Covenant of Baal” (*Exodus* 32. *Leviticus* 26:30. *Numbers* 22:41. *Judges* 2:11-14; 3:7; 6:25, 31; 8:33; 9:4; 11:31, 39. I *Kings* 14:22-24; 16:31-33; 18:18-19, 26; 19:10, 14, 18; 22:53. II *Kings* 3:2-3; 8:18, 27; 10:18-28; 11:18; 16:3-4; 17:10, 16-18, 23; 18:4-5; 21:6; 22:5; 23:5, 12, 32, 37; 24:9, 19. I *Chronicles* 12:5 “Bealiah”; II *Chronicles* 23:17; 24:7; 28:1-4. *Jeremiah* 7:3, 9, 31; 11:12-13; 17:2; 19:5,13; 32:29, 35. *Ezekiel* 14:11. *Hosea* 2:16)—a. k. a. Baal-Berith (*Judges* 8:33, 9:4), also called El-Berith (*Judges* 9:46), Baal-Zebub (II *Kings*, 1:2, 3, 6, 16. *Shabbath* 83b. *Sanhedrin* 63b), Baal-Peor (*Numbers* 25:1-9, 18; 31:16. *Deuteronomy* 3:29. *Joshua* 22:17. *Hosea* 9:10. *Psalms* 106:28 [eating the sacrifices of the dead]), Baal-Habab, Baal-Moloch (II *Chronicles* 28:1-4)—the God of Flies, the Golden Calf, the religion of Devil worship and human sacrifices (*Genesis* 22:1-18. *Exodus* 8:26; 13:2. *Leviticus* 27:28-29. *Joshua* 13:14. *Judges* 11:31, 39. I *Kings* 13:1-2. II *Kings* 16:3-4; 17:17; 21:6; 23:20-25. II *Chronicles* 28:1-4. *Jeremiah* 7:3; 19:5; 32:35. *Ezekiel* 16:20-21; 20:26, 31; 23:37).

Early Christians accepted Dualism and worshiped Jesus as Lucifer, the light, the Canaanites’ god of the Sun. In the tradition of the Dualist principles of good and evil, male and female, corpse and spirit, they ate semen and drank menstrual blood as a

form of prayer to the fertility gods they worshiped and as a form of protest against the alleged “evil” of procreation—of capturing a spirit in a corpse—a protest against the birth of a child into the morbid flesh. Here we see the stumbling stone the Jews laid on the path of the Romans in an attempt to exterminate them with Jewish Liberalism. Epiphanius wrote,

“[26] 4,1 But I shall pass to the substance of their deadly story—they vary in their wicked teaching of what they please—because in the first place, they hold their wives in common. (2) And if a guest who is of their persuasion arrives, they have a sign that men give women and women give men, the tickling of the palm as they clasp hands in pretended greeting, to show that the visitor is of their religion.

4,3 And now that they know each other from this, the next thing they do is feast—and though they may be poor, they set the table with lavish provisions for eating meat and drinking wine. But then, after a drinking bout and practically filling the boy’s veins, they next go crazy for each other. (4) And the husband will withdraw from his wife and tell her— speaking to his own wife!—‘Get up, perform the Agape with the brother.’ And when the wretched couple has made love—and I am truly ashamed to mention the vile things they do, for as the holy apostle says, ‘It is a shame even to speak’ of what goes on among them. Still, I shall not be ashamed to say what they are not ashamed to do, to arouse horror by every method in those who hear what obscenities they are prepared to perform. (5) For besides, to extend their blasphemy to heaven after making love in a state of fornication, the woman and man receive the male emission on their own hands. And they stand with their eyes raised heavenward but the filth on their hands, and pray, if you please—(6) the ones called Stratiotics and Gnostics—and offer that stuff on their hands to the actual Father of all, and say, ‘We offer thee this gift, the body of Christ.’ (7) And then they eat and partake of their own dirt, and they say, ‘This is the body of Christ; and this is the Pascha, because of which our bodies suffer and are made to acknowledge the passion of Christ.’

4,8 And so with the woman’s emission when she happens to be having her period—they likewise take the unclean menstrual blood they gather from her, and eat it in common. And ‘This,’ they say, ‘is the blood of Christ.’ (5,1) And thus, when they read, ‘I saw a tree bearing twelve manner of fruits every year, and he said unto me, This is the tree of life,’ in apocryphal writings, they interpret this allegorically of the menses.

5, 2 But though they copulate they forbid procreation. Their eager pursuit of seduction is for enjoyment, not procreation, since the devil mocks people like these, and makes fun of the creature fashioned by God. (3) They come to climax but absorb the seeds in their dirt—not by implanting them for procreation, but by eating the dirt themselves.

5, 4 But even though one of them gets caught and implants the start of the normal emission, and the woman becomes pregnant, let me tell you what more dreadful thing such people venture to do. (5) They extract the fetus at

the stage appropriate for their enterprise, take this aborted infant, and cut it up in a trough shaped like a pestle. And they mix honey, pepper, and certain other perfumes and spices with it to keep from getting sick, and then all the revellers in this <herd> of swine and dogs assemble, and each eats a piece of the child with his fingers. (6) And now, after this cannibalism, they pray to God and say, ‘We were not mocked by the archon of lust, but have gathered the brother’s blunder up!’ And this, if you please, is their idea of the ‘perfect Passover.’”⁴⁵⁵

In addition to the appearance of these practices in numerous apocryphal books, the Gnostics claimed that these anti-procreation practices stemmed from Jesus, himself, and cited canonical passages like *Luke 20:34-38*, *John 6:26-71*, and *I Corinthians 7:32-40* as evidence of their claim. *I Timothy 4:3* proves that among the earliest of Christians, like the Cathars who descended from them, were vegetarians who forbade marriage. This was one means the Jewish Dualists had to exterminate “Goy races” which converted to Christianity, and to prevent them from sacrificing animals, which sacrifices the Baalists believed would give their enemies power and divine protection. It was a Jewish means to weaken and exterminate the enemies of the Jews by giving them a foreign religion as a stumbling block.

The fall of Rome coincided with the rise of Christendom. Dogmatic Judaism in the form of dogmatic Christianity proved fatal to European progress and plunged Europe into the Dark Ages.

While the Romans were gullible, they were not quite so gullible as to adopt the outright suicidal practices of the Gnostic Christian Jews, at least not in large numbers—Americans are far more vulnerable to Jewish mythologies which destroy Gentiles. *The Catholic Encyclopedia* writes of the Gnostic Cathar sect known as the “Albigenses”,

“What the Church combated was principles that led directly not only to the ruin of Christianity, but to the very extinction of the human race.”⁴⁵⁶

Centuries of censorship and fabrication have modified the presence of Baal in the Jewish faith and no doubt in the minds of most of the modern Jews and Christians who practice their faiths outside of Dualist sects—but the ancient, and even Medieval and no small number of modern Jews were superstitious, told and believed fables, segregated themselves and participated in Dualist sects and Baal worship. The worship of Dualism is pervasive in the religious myth that free will requires that there be evil as well as good.

The story of Jesus was interpreted by many Gnostic cults as an instance of Heraclitian dialectics. The *Logos*, the eternal fire of change, incorporates both good and evil. Jesus and Judas were often seen as opposing forces of the same divine principle—they bore the same name—the Jew. Jesus was also referred to as Lucifer, the Light. Jesus was both the son of man and the son of God. It was only through death, through human sacrifice, through the shedding of the evil flesh, that Jesus attained life, existence as pure Spirit, the wind of flame, and this death which

brought life came at the hands of Jesus' alter ego, Judas, whose evil betrayal brought good tidings. This Dualistic Heraclitian dialectical theme was already many centuries old at the time the Gospels were written—the end is the beginning, death is life, bad is good, the way up the stairs is the way down the stairs, etc.

The Jews set out to ruin the Gentiles with a suicidal liberalism based on these Hellenistic dialectics. The Jews witnessed many examples of hermetic monks wasting away their lives in childless ruin, endlessly contemplating meaningless idealistic and self-destructive dogmas, which likely inspired the Jews to ruin the Romans in this fashion. They were largely successful.

[4.4.6 Gentiles are Destined to Slave for the Jews, Then the Slaves Will be Exterminated](#)

The *Zohar*, I, 28b-29a, states that the peoples who are descended from Eve and the serpent, through Cain, are Esau, Amalek, the Christians, and that they will be exterminated,

“At that time the mixed multitude shall pass away from the world [***] The mixed multitude are the impurity which the serpent injected into Eve. From this impurity came forth Cain, who killed Abel. [***] for they are the seed of Amalek, of whom it is said, ‘thou shalt blot out the memory of Amalek’ [***] Various impurities are mingled in the composition of Israel, like animals among men. One kind is from the side of the serpent; another from the side of the Gentiles, who are compared to the beasts of the field; another from the *mazikin* (goblins), for the souls [29a] of the wicked are literally the *mazikin* (goblins) of the world; and there is an impurity from the side of the demons and evil spirits; and there is none so cursed among them as Amalek, who is the evil serpent, the ‘strange god’. He is the cause of all unchastity and murder, and his twin-soul is the poison of idolatry, the two together being called Samael (lit. poison-god). There is more than one Samael, and they are not all equal, but this side of the serpent is accursed above all of them.”⁴⁵⁷

Zohar, II, 219b, states,

“So they went nearer and they heard him saying: ‘Crown, crown, two sons are kept outside, and there will be no peace or rest until the bird is thrown down in Cæsarea.’ R. Jose wept and said: ‘Verily the *Galuth* is drawn out, and therefore the birds of heaven will not depart until the dominion of the idolatrous nations is removed from the earth, which will not be till the day when God will bring the world to judgement.’”⁴⁵⁸

Jews often took a predominant rôle in the production of revolutionary literature in Europe and in revolutions meant to create world government. Many Jews were eager to destroy all “princes”, to eliminate the monarchies of Europe. The

Rothschilds caused war after war in order to make the Gentile peoples weary of war and clamor for peace. This proscription for Jewish domination was spelled out in the Old Testament. Jews then offered the Gentiles a solution to the wars the Jews had covertly caused. The Jews preached the message that the only solution to war was world government—world government run by Jews out of Jerusalem in an era of peace, as prophesied in *Isaiah*. The Jews have employed this model for centuries to lure the nations into surrendering their sovereignty to Jewish domination. The *Zohar*, III, 19b, states,

“It is, however, as R. Abba has said: all the other days are given over to the angelic principalities of the nations, but there is *one* day which will be the day of the Holy One, blessed be He, in which He will judge the heathen nations, and when their principalities shall fall from their high estate.”⁴⁵⁹

Zohar, III, 43a, states that Gentiles must be converted to Judaism and used as the work animal, the horse or ass, of the Jews’ (or “lambs”) desire to destroy the Gentiles’ own governments. Should any resist conversion and the destruction of their own nations, they are to be killed. Bear in mind that to many Jews, as Moses Hess stated, Judaism is not a religion but a “racially” based nation; and the religion is the expression of this prophetic “race”; and that which is attributed to God, must in their minds be their mandate to themselves, a mandate represented by the genocidal murder of the firstborn of Egypt. The *Zohar*, III, 43a,

“To these He appointed as ministers Samael and all his groups—these are like clouds to ride upon when He descends to earth: they are like horses. That the clouds are called ‘chariots’ is expressed in the words, ‘Behold the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt’ (Isa. XIX, 1). Thus the Egyptians saw their Chieftain like a horse bearing the chariot of the Holy One, and straightaway ‘the idols of Egypt were moved at His presence, and the heart of Egypt melted in the midst of it’ (*Ibid.*), i. e. they were ‘moved’ from their faith in their own Chieftain. AND EVERY FIRSTLING OF AN ASS THOU SHALT REDEEM WITH A LAMB, AND IF THOU WILT NOT REDEEM IT. . . THOU SHALT BREAK HIS NECK.”⁴⁶⁰

Zohar, III, 282a, states,

“From the side of idolatry Shabbethaj (Saturn) is called Lilith [*Footnote*: Lilith is a female demon, comp. Is. XXXIV. 14 and Weber, *Altsynagogale palästinische Theologie*, p. 246.], mixed dung, on account of the filth mixed from all kinds of dirt and worms, into which they throw dead dogs and dead asses, the sons of ‘Esau and Ishma‘e1, and there (read ובה) Jesus and Mohammed, who are dead dogs, are buried among them. She (Lilith) is the grave of idolatry, where they bury the uncircumcised, (who are) dead dogs, abomination and bad smell, soiled and fetid, a bad family. She (Lilith) is the ligament [*Footnote*: מַדְכָּא is a fibre attached to the lungs] which holds fast the

‘mixed multitude’ (Ex. xii. 38), which is mixed among Israel, and which holds fast bone and flesh, that is, the sons of ‘Esau and Ishma‘el, dead bone and unclean flesh torn of beasts in the field, of which it is said (Ex. xxii. 31): ‘Ye shall cast it to the dogs.’”⁴⁶¹

In commenting on the *Abodah Zarah*, the *Tosefta* states (the bracketed text is original to the Neusner edition),

“8:5 A. *For bloodshed — how so?*

B. A gentile [who kills] a gentile and a gentile who kills an Israelite are liable. An Israelite [who kills] a gentile is exempt.

C. *Concerning thievery?*

D. [If] one has stolen, or robbed, and so too in the case of finding a beautiful captive [woman], and in similar cases:

E. a gentile in regard to a gentile, or a gentile in regard to an Israelite — it is prohibited. And an Israelite in regard to a gentile — it is permitted.”⁴⁶²

The Old Testament book of *Numbers* 24:17-20, which prophesies the Messiah, also prophesies the extermination of Amalek,

“I shall see him, but not now: I shall behold him, but not nigh: there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth. And Edom shall be a possession, Seir also shall be a possession for his enemies; and Israel shall do valiantly. Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion, and shall destroy him that remaineth of the city. And when he looked on Amalek, he took up his parable, and said, Amalek *was* the first of the nations; but his latter end *shall* be that he perish for ever.”

In addition to the well-known prophecies of Jewish world domination, the destruction of Gentile nations, Gentile servitude and the extermination of Gentiles found in the Old Testament (*see also: The Book of Jubilees* 32:17-20), the apocalyptic literature of the Qumran is overtly racist and genocidal—and this Jewish literature forms the basis for the genocidal visions of the Christian apocalyptic nightmares, which were iterated soon after. Horrific genocidal visions, and racist invectives are found in 1 *Enoch*, 2 *Baruch*, *The War Scroll*, and 4 *Ezra*.⁴⁶³ If the Jews who wrote these genocidal works had their way, not a single Gentile or apostate Jew would be left alive.

Some Christians also look to the mythology of Esau and Jacob to justify their belief that the Jews will be “justly” annihilated should they refuse to accept the sacrifice of Jesus Christ as their salvation. Isaac’s blessing to Esau stated that Esau would someday break off the yoke of Jacob,

“39 And Isaac his father answered and said unto him, Behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above; 40

And by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck.”—*Genesis 27:39-40*

In the early days of Christianity, Cyprian wrote in his Twelfth Treatise, “Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews”, First Book, Testimony 19,

“19. That two peoples were foretold, the elder and the younger; that is, the old people of the Jews, and the new one which should consist of us.

In Genesis: ‘And the Lord said unto Rebekah, Two nations are in thy womb, and two peoples shall be separated from thy belly; and the one people shall overcome the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger.’ [*Footnote: Gen. xxv. 23.*] Also in Hosea: ‘I will call them my people that are not my people, and her beloved that was not beloved. For it shall be, in that place in which it shall be called not my people, they shall be called the sons of the living God.’ [*Footnote: Hos. ii. 23. i. 10.*]⁴⁶⁴

Abraham’s covenant with God is both a blessing and a curse to Jews—and to Gentiles. *Genesis 12:1-3* states:

“Now the LORD had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father’s house, unto a land that I will shew thee: 2 And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: 3 And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.”

Zionists and Christians use the Old Testament and the New Testament to justify the murder of apostate Jews. *Deuteronomy 11:24-28* states,

“24 Every place whereon the soles of your feet shall tread shall be yours: from the wilderness and Lebanon, from the river, the river Euphrates, even unto the uttermost sea shall your coast be. 25 There shall no man be able to stand before you: *for* the LORD your God shall lay the fear of you and the dread of you upon all the land that ye shall tread upon, as he hath said unto you. 26 Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; 27 A blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the LORD your God, which I command you this day: 28 And a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the LORD your God, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods, which ye have not known.”

Romans 9 states (*see also: Matthew 12:30; 21:43-45. Romans 11:7-8. Galatians 3:16. Hebrews 8:6-10*):

“I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, 2 That I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. 3 For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: 4 Who are Israelites; to whom *pertaineth* the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service *of God*, and the promises; 5 Whose *are* the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ *came*, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen. 6 Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they *are* not all Israel, which are of Israel: 7 Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, *are they* all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. 8 That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these *are* not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. 9 For this *is* the word of promise, At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son. 10 And not only *this*; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, *even* by our father Isaac; 11 (For *the children* being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;) 12 It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. 13 As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated. 14 What shall we say then? *Is there* unrighteousness with God? God forbid. 15 For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. 16 So then *it is* not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy. 17 For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. 18 Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will *have mercy*, and whom he will he hardeneth. 19 Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will? 20 Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed *it*, Why hast thou made me thus? 21 Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour? 22 *What* if God, willing to shew *his* wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction: 23 And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory, 24 Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles? 25 As he saith also in Osee, I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved. 26 And it shall come to pass, *that* in the place where it was said unto them, Ye *are* not my people; there shall they be called the children of the living God. 27 Esaias also crieth concerning Israel, Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved: 28 For he will finish the work, and cut *it* short in righteousness: because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth. 29 And as Esaias said before, Except the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed, we had been as Sodoma, and been made like unto Gomorrha. 30 What shall we say then? That the

Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith. 31 But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. 32 Wherefore? Because *they sought it* not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law. For they stumbled at that stumblingstone; 33 As it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a stumblingstone and rock of offence: and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.”

One of the reasons some Jews attempt to degrade other cultures, especially Christian cultures, is that they want Christians to become decadent and lose favor in the eyes of God. Though Esau broke the yoke, Jacob’s yoke will yet again—and forever—fall upon Esau should the Christians become decadent. Should this happen, the Jews will then again find favor with the Lord, according to Paul—and in some minds, Jesus (*Luke 21:24*). In some minds, the period of Gentile rule began as God’s punishment to unfaithful Jews in 606 B. C. with the ascendance of Nebuchadnezzar and eventual captivity and exile of the Jews in Babylon and the destruction of Jerusalem. According to this belief system, Gentile rule is supposed to have lasted for a period of 2520 years, which time span ended in 1914—the first year of the First World War, when the Jews began to rule the world.

Jews have dominated the mass media in many societies in which they have lived. Though within their own families they wisely promote education, thrift, tradition and morality, these same values are often absent from the messages they convey through the mass media. Though Jews have a racist tradition of segregation and nationalism, they often promote miscegenation and internationalism to the Gentiles. The Old Testament teaches the Jews again and again that a nation which loses favor in the eyes of God will be utterly destroyed—for example in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah (*Genesis 18; 19*). These lessons teach Racist and tribalistic Jews that if they can rob a nation of its righteousness, they will have destroyed it before God. They are taught that if they can turn the entire Gentile world to “evil”, then any righteous Jews remaining will inherit God’s blessing and the era of Gentile domination will be at an end.⁴⁶⁵

Those throughout history who best knew the Jews, men like Cyprian, John Chrysostom, Martin Luther, Johannes Buxtorf, etc., warned Christians that Jews were out to destroy them, and that they ought not to stumble over the stumbling stones the Jews threw on their path, and must remain righteous, or lose the favor of the Lord, which the Jews believed would then return to them. Johannes Buxtorf wrote in the preface of his *Synagoga Judaica: Das ist Jüden Schul ; Darinnen der gantz Jüdische Glaub und Glaubensbung. . . grundlich erkläret*, Basel, (1603); as translated in the 1657 English edition, *The Jewish Synagogue: Or An Historical Narration of the State of the Jewes, At this Day Dispersed over the Face of the Whole Earth*, Printed by T. Roycroft for H. R. and Thomas Young at the Three Pidgeons in Pauls Church-Yard, London, (1657),

“THE AUTHORS

PREFACE

To the Christian Reader.

Christian Reader,

When once we exactly ponder in the Scales of our understanding that thrice pressing load of Jewish ingratitude, disobedience, and obstinacy, for which they were daily branded by *Moses* and the rest of the Prophets with a foul guilt, to which was annexed a vehement reprehension. When we seriously consider those horrid threats and execrations where with God in his justice would depress them, unless they framed their lives according to the strict rule of his Commandments; this ought to be a warning piece unto us to entertain such blessings with a more gratefull acceptance, and hitherto to bend all our studies, that by our unthankfulness we should not make our selves unworthy of them, and so be dis-inherited of such a possession. *Moses* in this manner prophesies of the Jews ingratitude, {Deut. 32.15.} *Jesurun waxed fat, and kicked. (thou art waxen fat, thou art grown thick, thou art covered with fatness) then he forsook God which made him, and lightly esteemed the worke of his salvation.* This issued from a propheticall spirit, declaring that as already present, which after the revolution of many a year was to be fulfilled and accomplished. This ingratitude was in its swadling clouts when *Joshua* led *Israel* into the land of promise, which is ratified by the unanimous suffrage of the whole College of Prophets, and almost in the very same terms by *Hosea* in chap. 13. *Jeremy* arraigns them as guilty of the same crime. The bill of inditement runs thus: {Jer. 11.10.} *They are turned back to the iniquities of their fore-fathers which refused to hear my words, and they went after other gods to serve them: the house of Israel and the house of Judah have broken the Covenant which I made with their Fathers.* And God himselfe by the mouth of his Prophet thus proclaims their obstinacy: {Jer. 7.25.26.} *Since the day that your Fathers came out of the Land of Egypt unto this day, I have even sent unto you all my servants the Prophets, dayly rising up early and sending them; yet they hearkened not unto me, nor inclined their eare, but hardened their neck, they did worse then their Fathers.* The obstinacy of this People at last grew to so high a pitch, that they stopt their ears at the admonition of the Prophets, who cried aloud unto them to amend their waies, and curbed their offences with tart reprehensions, killing, stoning, rewarding every one with some bitter death; which act of theirs is faithfully registred by the holy Spirit, *Ezra* 2: {Nehem. 9.25.26.} *They tooke strong Cities and a fat Land, and possessed houses full of all goods, wels digged, Vineyards and Oliveyards and fruit trees in abundance: so they did eat and were filled, and became fat, and delighted themselves in thy great goodness: nevertheless they were disobedient and rebelled against thee, and cast thy Law behind their backs, and slew thy Prophets which testified against them to turn them to thee, and wrought great provocations.* And *Jeremy* also may be cited for

a witness, for his words are these: {Ier. 2.29 30.} *Wherefore will ye plead with me? ye all have transgressed against me, saith the Lord. In vain have I smitten your children, they have received no correction: your own sword hath devoured your Prophets like a destroying Lion.* When the Lord sees this his people thus altogether incapable of corection, he afflicts them with all the punishments which *Moses* by the spirit of God had denounced against them, neither their bodies nor goods can now escape the lash of his fury; he sends among them the sword, famine and pestilence, tempests, diseases, imbred dissention, and discord; and to make their misery compleat, casts them out of that Land flowing with milk and hony, and causes them to trace the captives steps into another which they knew not. The ten tribes together with their King *Hoshea* is carried by *Salmanasser* into *Assyria*, 2 *Kin.* {2 Reg. 17.} and when the two remaining Tribes, *Juda* and *Benjamin*, were not hurried to repentance by the present view of their brethrens afflictions, God sends *Nebuchadnezzar* King of *Babel* against them, who leads them captive into the Land of *Chaldea*, makes *Jerusalem* a desolate heap, and turns their Temple, their chief beauty into ashes. Nevertheless the space of 70 years fully expired, these 2 tribes were again brought out of the house of bondage, because it was the Almighty's pleasure to preserve the tribe of *Judah* even unto that time, when according to his promise, out of that tribe, and in the promised land the *Messias* should be incarnate. But for all this these 2 tribes did not much outstrip the other 10 in the practice of holiness; for they always following their own devices, seriously traced the forbidden by-paths of their forefathers, for which the later Prophets, *Haggai*, *Zachary* and *Malachi* were earnest declamitants against them: the last of which being a Priest, & proclaiming them guilty of a wicked life, threatens them with a finalrejection.

But

[There are pages missing from both the microfilm and digital reproductions of this text which were used in this transcription. Your author apologizes and would be grateful if an intact copy were found and the missing text provided.]

out in obscurity, that so we might again be cast headlong into that darknesse in which we sate, before it was the Lords pleasure by his mercy to impart unto us the saving knowledge of his heavenly word.

My second Motive was this, that the hardened in heart, and blindfolded Jews at last descending into the Chambers of their strict cogitations, might have some glimpse of the greatness of their infidelity, and so convicted before the face of the whole world of that more than brutish folly in the expounding of the holy Scriptures, and of their old wives tales, whereby God for the most part is blasphemed, and his saving word against all humane reason after an execrable manner perverted, they might begin to be ashamed, who with such a whorish forehead, and want of wit did not fear to speak or write in this manner of God Almighty, and his holy word, and that at length they might think, that they had stumbled at that stone of stumbling, and rock of offence laid in *Sion*, and thereupon that they shall fall prostrate upon the

ground, be broken, to Gods Law ensnared and captivated, and finally that God {Isa. 29.10,11.} *poured upon them the spirit of deep sleep*, and so closed their eyes, that every prophesie and the whole Scripture was to them as the words *of a book that is sealed, & that the wisdom of their wise men is now altogether perished, and the understanding of their prudent men hid*, as the Prophet *Isaiah* foretold them. The God of mercies have mercy upon them, and convert them, and keep us firm and immoveable in the knowledge of his truth, that in it we may hope to gain eternall life, as Christ himself witnesseth to our comfort, when he saith, {John 17.3} *This is eternall life, that they might know thee the onely true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*, To him be ascribed, praise, honour and glory for evermore, Amen.

MICAH c. 4 v. 1, 2.

I*N the last dayes it shall come to passe, that the mountains of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills, and people shall flow unto it.*

And many Nations shall come and say, come, and let us go up to the mountains of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Iacob, and he will teach us of his wayes, and we will walk in his paths; for the Law shall go forth from Sion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

Luther upon these words of *Micah*, hath left this consequent paragraph in memory concerning the Iews. So goes the matter, hereupon arise these mentall divisions, this is that which makes the Jews mad and foolish, that which forceth them to a sense so damnable, that they are compelled without the least shew of honesty, to wrest every parcell of the Scripture, because it contradicts their will, and they cannot endure that we Gentiles should be equal copartners with them in Gods favour, and the Messias should in a like measure administer to us and them joy and consolation. Moreover, rather than they would vouchsafe, that we the offspring of the Gentiles (who are by them daily contemned, accursed and devoted to the infernall haggges, torn and cut in pieces by their sladerous back-bitings) should participate in the Merits of the Messias, and enjoy the title of coheirs and brethren, they had rather ten Messias should suffer the shameful death of the crosse, and afflict God himself (if there were any possibilty in nature) the holy Angels and all other creatures with the stroke of death, nay, they would not be afraid of the fact, though a thousand hellish torments were to be endured for the effecting of it, so incomprehensible and austere is the pride mixed with the honourable blood of these Fathers, and circumcised Saints, who alone would enjoy the promised Messias, and be capped for the sole *Donns* of the world. {Chjim.} The Nations or Gentiles ought onely to be these accursed vassals, and to give up their desire, that is their silver and gold unto the Iews, and that they should be constrained to submit themselves unto them after the manner of beasts prepared to the slaughter, rather then they will relinquish one whit of this their assertion, they will not refuse wittingly to be damned eternally.”

Though Johannes Buxtorf, Martin Luther, and many others expressed anger at

the Jews for not converting to Christianity, Jews simply could not accept that Jesus was their Messiah, or that Gentiles, whom they considered to be less than human—less than Jews, had a right to Jewish beliefs. Jesus did not level the nations with an iron scepter. He did not make the Jews rulers of the world and the Gentiles their slaves. He did not lay to waste the lands outside of Israel. He was not the repressive and horrible Messiah the Jews prophesied in the Old Testament.

Unlike Christians, Jews were not concerned with eternal life on an individual basis, but were concerned with the survival, the immortality, of the Jewish “race”. Judaism is less a spiritual religion than is Christianity. It is much more materialistic, and combines religion, politics, commerce and mundane laws with religion, such that the boundaries between the secular and the religious do not really exist. A Jewish racist and/or tribalist can erase God from the Old Testament and still find in it his or her identity as a “Jew”, and a mission in life. For him or her, this belief system is meant for none other than those who created it, the Jews. Racist secular Jews merely believe that “God” is the product of Jewish “racial instincts”. God is a Jew and Jews embrace Judaism as the expression of their Jewish “soul”, the material product of a chosen people, not an individual, but a people bold enough and superior enough to chose themselves to be the natural rulers of the Earth, rulers over the “lesser races” of non-Jews, whom they will eventually exterminate.

For many Jews, Jesus was far too weak and ineffective, far too universal in his message, to have been their Jewish Messiah, the tyrannical Jewish King promised to give them the world. Jews do not wish to wait for death to obtain paradise. They want a Jewish Utopia on Earth and they want their rewards on this Earth in this lifetime. They do not believe in a Christian Heaven and they do not believe poverty and sacrifice and repression will earn them eternal rewards. Nor do they believe that they will be eternally punished for doing wrong. They are out to obtain what they can here on this Earth in this lifetime. Judaism is a very different religion from Christianity. It is more of a mundane racist and genocidal political movement than it is a spiritual and ethical religion.

Many have accused leading Jews of using their power in the American media to degrade American culture and Christianity. The same accusations appeared in Germany. Leading Jews used Communism to destroy cultures, nations and religions. In the Spanish, Nazi, Turkish, Russian, French and English revolutions, leading Jews followed the same model of requesting liberal freedoms, which resulted in revolution, which resulted in chaos. Then, leading Jews spread word through their channels which control public opinion, that it would be impossible for anyone but a dictator to restore order out of the chaos—chaos the Jews had covertly intentionally created. The foolish Gentiles who were duped into clamoring for liberty, equality and freedom by the means of nihilistic revolution, are then duped into clamoring for an absolute dictatorship to restore order. The whole process is overseen by Jewish and crypto-Jewish leaders. After they have a dictator in place and the Gentiles have surrendered all of their rights to the Jews’ puppet dictator, they destroy religion and culture, and mass murder the leading class of intellectual elites. For them it is the process of breeding the type of cattle they want to serve them—degenerate, stupid and compliant cattle.

4.4.7 Lenard Sickens of Einstein's Libels

Germany had been very good to the Jews. German Jews were the wealthiest people in the world. In the years following the First World War, the Germans resented the fact that the Jews, Einstein being their chief spokesman, had stabbed the Germans in the back during the war, and then twisted the knife at the peace negotiations in France, where a large contingent of Jews decided Germany's fate, and reneged on Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points, one of which assured Germany that it would lose no territory. The Germans had thought that Wilson's pledge would be honored after the Germans had surrendered in good faith. Had not the Germans received this promise of the Fourteen Points, they would not have surrendered and were in a position to continue the war. The promise was broken.

In addition, the Allies insisted that Germany pay draconian war reparations that would forever ruin the nation. Leading Jews in Germany sided with the Allies against their native land. It was obvious that leading Jews were profiteering from the war in every way possible, at the expense of the German nation and its People. Jewish leaders instigated crippling strikes in the arms industry, which left German troops without adequate armaments. Jewish revolutionaries took advantage of Germany's weakened state, which Jews had deliberately caused for the purpose, and created a Soviet Republic in Bavaria and overthrew the monarchy. German-Jewish bankers cut off Germany's access to funds. German-Jewish Zionists moved to London and brought America into the war on the side of the British at the very moment Germany was about to win the war.

Those arms which were produced were often substandard and were peddled by Jews to Jews in the German Government, which also left the German troops without adequate arms, while making Jews immensely wealthy. German-Jewish bankers conspired with German arms manufacturers to produce weapons for both sides. The German-Jewish press, which had initially beat the war drums louder than anyone else, teamed up with leading Jews in the German Government at the end of the war and demanded that Germany submit to the demands of the Allies, give up vast territories and make the reparations payments. The German-Jewish press and Jews in the German Government, many of whom were the same persons who had most boisterously called upon the German People to go to war, insisted that the Germans accept responsibility for causing the war, though they had not caused it. Etc. Etc. Etc.

While millions of Germans were starving to death, many Jews in Germany had never known better times. Whenever anyone revealed the truth of what was happening, the Jewish press immediately smeared them by calling them "anti-Semites". The situation was similar to, though even worse than, the situation in America today.

Many German Jews were very wealthy after the war. They had a great deal of power, and many were very arrogant, especially in their dealings with German Gentiles. A famous German engineer and physicist, who had anticipated many aspects of the theory of relativity, Rudolf Mewes proved that Einstein was a plagiarist. Mewes demonstrated that Albert Einstein had stolen many of his ideas from German scientists.

Albert Einstein made a great show of ridiculing Germans, though he was born in Germany, lived and earned his living in Germany throughout the war, worked for the Prussian Academy of Sciences in Berlin, and published in German journals. Einstein assisted in, and pushed hard for, plans to punish and oppress German scientists after the war—to punish and oppress his German colleagues while he was feted in the British press as the “Swiss Jew”. Einstein’s ingratitude and treachery were unbearable and he epitomized the Jewish betrayal of Germany in the First World War.

Rudolf Mewes was not afraid to challenge Einstein, or the “Einstein myth” of the “Jewish Newton” which was based on lies, plagiarism, ingratitude, self-glorification and Jewish racism,

“But then, given the above exposé, one must admit that [Max] Born’s contention is correct, that the relativistic ideas were not only first conceived and recorded in the German language, but rather also that they demonstrably derived from pure German scientists, namely Christian Doppler, Wilhelm Weber and Rudolf Mewes, though not from the Semitic Professor and Communist Dr. Albert Einstein. The relationship of Mewes to Einstein can accordingly be briefly characterized by the slogans:

‘German versus Jew
 Increaser of Knowledge versus Fleecer of Knowledge
 Rightful Ownership versus Plagiarism
 Monarchist versus Communist”

“Dagegen muß man nach den vorstehenden Darlegungen die Behauptung Borns als richtig zugeben, daß die relativistischen Ideen zuerst nicht nur in deutscher Sprache gedacht und aufgezeichnet worden sind, sondern auch von rein deutschen Forschern, nämlich Christian Doppler, Wilhelm Weber und Rudolf Mewes, nachweislich herrühren, aber nicht von dem semitischen Professor und Kommunisten Dr. Albert Einstein. Das Verhältnis von Mewes zu Einstein läßt sich demgemäß kurz mit den Schlagworten kennzeichnen:

„Deutscher gegen Jude,
 Wissensschöpfer gegen Wissenschröpfer,
 Eigentum gegen Diebstahl,
 Monarchist gegen Kommunist.“⁴⁶⁶

Germans then knew far more about the genocidal prophecies of Judaism than they do today. They could see them deliberately fulfilled before their eyes. They recognized that Bolshevism and the “Great War”, the “War to End All Wars”, which prepared the way for the “League of Nations”, was largely accomplished under the directorship of Jews and deliberately fulfilled Jewish Messianic prophecy. They knew that leading Jews had lured Germany into the war and then destroyed Germany and profited as much as possible from the destruction.

In addition, an unwise and unproductive rift between British science and German science had existed at least since the time of the Leibnitz-Newton priorities dispute

over the invention of calculus, and before that there were strong controversies between the Continent and the Island among Giordano Bruno, Henry More, Isaac Newton, Samuel Clark, René Des Cartes, Christiaan Huyghens, and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz. Einstein sided with the British against the Germans during and after the war, despite the fact he was treated like royalty in Berlin.

Jewish news sources promoted the causes of the Social Democrats, Liberal Democrats, Marxists, Bolsheviks, Anarchists or Chernyshevskiiist revolution, and they also promoted Albert Einstein, which inspired suspicion of ethnic bias.⁴⁶⁷ The segregationist policies of Albert Einstein, Chaim Weizmann—the political Zionists in general—caused many to suspect that the shameless promotion of Albert Einstein involved a Jewish ethnic bias in favor of Einstein.⁴⁶⁸ This unfair and unethical Jewish bias preceded and caused the reactions of Ludwig Glaser, Philipp Lenard, Johannes Stark, Willy Wien, Hugo Dingler, Bruno Thüring, and others who sought to defend themselves, their students and their nation.

Einstein was famously quoted in the forward of the first edition to Lucien Fabre's French book, *Une Nouvelle Figure du Monde: les Théories d'Einstein avec une Préface de M. Einstein*, Payot, Paris, (1921), pp. 15-18; not long after the First World War ended,

“I am a German (Jew) by birth, but I lived in Switzerland from the age of 15 until I was 35, except for brief interruptions. I earned my degree in Zurich; I am a pacifist in favor of an international agreement and have always faithfully conducted myself according to this ideal.”

“Je suis Allemand (israélite) de naissance, mais j'ai vécu en Suisse de l'âge de 15 à celui de 35 ans, sauf de courtes interruptions. J'ai conquis mes grades à Zurich; je suis pacifiste, partisan d'une entente internationale et resté toujours fidèle dans ma ligne de conduite à cet idéal.”

Einstein's political statements were scripted. He repeated his script and asked others to repeat it. Einstein was quoted in *The Literary Digest* of 16 April 1921, pages 33-34,

“Dr. Einstein asked whether he could not see a copy of my interview with him before it was printed. I told him that I would not write the interview until after my return to America.

‘In that event,’ he said, ‘when you write it, be sure not to omit to state that I am a convinced pacifist, that I believe that the world has had enough of war. Some sort of an international agreement must be reached among nations preventing the recurrence of another war, as another war will ruin our civilization completely. Continental civilization, European civilization, has been badly damaged and set back by this war, but the loss is not irreparable. Another war may prove fatal to Europe.’”

Note that Einstein's scripted statements are classic Jewish propaganda and typify the

Jewish method of undermining the sovereignty of the Gentile nations. First, the Zionists caused the war. Then they prolonged it by bringing America into it. Then they threatened the war weary nations with a worse war and offered up what they claimed was the only solution: A world led by Israel with a world government in fulfillment of Judaic Messianic prophecies. The conference Einstein hoped for was a conference where the Zionists could push the Palestine Mandate and demand a nation for the Jews. It was a conference that Einstein knew would be dominated by Jews, who would dictate to the ruined nations their future. Einstein was not concerned for humanity. He was an ardent and thoroughly scripted Jewish Zionist propagandist.

The language used in Einstein's statement in French was somewhat open to interpretation. For example, Stjepan Mohorovičić wrote in 1922,

“Einstein selbst sagt in dem Vorwort des Werkes von L. Fabre (Anmerk. 30) den Franzosen ausdrücklich, daß er nur in Deutschland geboren sei, sonst sei er ein Jude, Pazifist und Mitglied einer internationalen Verbindung.... Es ist nicht schwer zu raten, warum Einstein dies gerade den Franzosen gegenüber gesagt hat (mit eigener Unterschrift), aber lassen wir das, es ist dies nur Geschmacksache...; unsere Arbeit hier ist eine wissenschaftliche. Es ist traurig genug, daß ich gezwungen bin, dies hier zu erwähnen!”⁴⁶⁹

Einstein's use of the word “entente” might also have been interpreted by Germans as a subtle allusion to the Allies. In 1904, England and France entered into an “Entente Cordiale”—an agreement between the two governments; which, while resolving colonial disputes between England and France, created tensions with Germany. In 1906 the “Entente” evolved into a military alliance, which came to include Russia in 1907. This alliance was opposed to the “Triple Alliance” of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy. England, France and Russia, who fought against Germany in World War I, were often referred to as the “Entente” and it might have appeared from Einstein's statement that he had always been a devout enemy of Germany and a partisan for the enemies of Germany, though he had lived in Germany throughout the war. We know that this was in fact the case, whether or not it was what Einstein meant to say in his scripted letter to Fabre. It was almost certainly not what Einstein meant to say in that letter.

Einstein used the word “Entente” to describe the Allies in many of his letters and should have been more careful with “his” words. For example, in a letter to Paul Ehrenfest of 6 December 1918,

“Ich werde nächster Tage über die Schweiz nach Paris reisen, um die Entente zu bitten, die hiesige ausgehungerte Bevölkerung vor dem Hungertod zu retten.”⁴⁷⁰

Einstein wrote to Emil Zürcher on 15 April 1919,

“Wenn die Entente gut orientiert[. . .]”⁴⁷¹

Einstein wrote to Hedwig Born on 31 August 1919,

“Intervention der Entente in Schlessien”⁴⁷²

Einstein wrote to the *Neue Freie Presse* on 6 December 1919,

“[. . .]der Centralmächte und denen der Entente[. . .]”⁴⁷³

Einstein wrote to Hedwig and Max Born on 27 January 1920,

“Jedenfalls ist die Wirkekraft ihrer Parole gross, denn die Kriegsgeräte der Entente, welche das deutsche Heer aufgerieben haben, schmelzen in Russland dahin wie der Schnee in der Märzsonne.”⁴⁷⁴

Einstein was careless in “his” letter to Fabre, which letter was quoted in Fabre’s book.

Einstein did often assert that he was an internationalist and a pacifist, without implying that he had sided with the Allies in the First World War. However, we learn from Einstein’s statements to the Frenchman Romain Rolland, as recorded in Rolland’s diary after conversations with Einstein in Switzerland on 16 September 1915, that Einstein was indeed loyal to the Entente, not Germany. Rolland wrote,

“What I hear from [Einstein] is not exactly encouraging, for it shows the impossibility of arriving at a lasting peace with Germany without first totally crushing it. Einstein says the situation looks to him far less favorable than a few months back. The victories over Russia have reawakened German arrogance and appetite. The word ‘greedy’ seems to Einstein best to characterize Germany. [***] Einstein does not expect any renewal of Germany out of itself; it lacks the energy for it, and the boldness for initiative. He hopes for a victory of the Allies, which would smash the power of Prussia and the dynasty. . . . Einstein and Zangger dream of a divided Germany—on the one side Southern Germany and Austria, on the other side Prussia. [***] We speak of the deliberate blindness and the lack of psychology in the Germans.”⁴⁷⁵

Einstein often spoke in genocidal and racist terms against Germany and for the Jews and England. He betrayed Germany before, during and after the war. For example, Einstein wrote to Paul Ehrenfest on 22 March 1919,

“[The Allied Powers] whose victory during the war I had felt would be by far the lesser evil are now proving to be *only slightly* the lesser evil. [***] I get most joy from the emergence of the Jewish state in Palestine. It does seem to me that our kinfolk really are more sympathetic (at least less brutal) than these horrid Europeans. Perhaps things can only improve if only the Chinese are left, who refer to all Europeans with the collective noun ‘bandits.’”⁴⁷⁶

Einstein almost certainly was not referring to the Allies when referring to an *entente internationale*, but rather to an international agreement. His wording caused further consternation given that there was the soon to appear *Entente Internationale des Partis Radicaux et des Partis Démocratiques similaires*, a group of liberals from many nations who based their movement on the spirit of the *Plan des Libéraux pour recommencer la révolution*, Paris, (1821); probably in the form of the *Carté*. There was also the First International of Marx and Engels, and its offspring: The International Workingmen's Association, the Second International, the Socialist International, the Third International, the Comintern, the Vienna International, the Two-and-a-half International, the Labor and Socialist International, the Fourth International, the Trotsky International, etc. The *Carté* was founded by Communist Henri Barbusse and Einstein's friend and confidant, pacifist Socialist Romain Rolland. In late 1919 and early 1920, Einstein sought to establish a German chapter of the *Clarté* for the purposes of promoting Internationalism.⁴⁷⁷ This in itself troubled many Germans, who had come to believe that "Internationalism" was a code word for "Jewish supremacy". Even before the war, the "Proclamation of the Alliance Against the Arrogance of Jewry" of 1912 stated,

"The Reichstag elections of 1912 have taken place under the sign of Jewry—that is, under the sign of open and clandestine republicanism and internationalism. 'National is irrational' . . . was and is the slogan that misled millions of Germans, blinded by the fraudulent Jewish catchwords of international culture and international progress. [***] Jewry is international in the sense of Schopenhauer's phrase: 'The fatherland of the Jews is other Jews.'"⁴⁷⁸

Einstein's declarations of his "tribal"—to use his term—loyalty, his public insults against Germans, and his allegedly privileged Zionist nationalism were viewed as legitimate causes for concern—as was the modern terror of the Internationalism of the Bolsheviks, who had made Bavaria a Soviet Republic for a short span of time.

Many Germans were outraged by Einstein's statement as quoted in Fabre's book,⁴⁷⁹ which was an obvious attempt by Einstein to distance himself from Germany (Gentiles) and ingratiate himself to the French, no matter how one translated it—and Einstein and his friends instigated a smear campaign against Fabre in order to deflect attention from Einstein's volatile comments.⁴⁸⁰ Einstein's friend Solovine smeared Fabre, claiming that he was an anti-Semite—even though Fabre had written a book which was highly flattering to Einstein.

Einstein charged that Fabre cobbled together the forward from Einstein's statements and published this compilation of quotes without Einstein's approval. Einstein protested that Fabre had no right to designate this compilation as if it were a forward Einstein intended to write for Fabre, because he allegedly had not written it in the form in which it appeared and had not approved its publication as a forward to Fabre's book—though he had made the statements—a fact he appeared to publicly deny. Einstein alleged to Solovine that his words were corrupted in translation though the addition of French *gentillesse* by an acquaintance of his, who Einstein

implies wrote the letters.

In the second edition of his book, Fabre stated that he had only given a public expression to Einstein's views to a wanting public, with the best of intentions. Fabre stated that Einstein had repudiated Einstein's own statements. Einstein's friends let Einstein know that Fabre had begun to spread the word after Einstein had attacked Fabre, that Henri Poincaré was the true father of the special theory of relativity. Einstein hid from Fabre's accusation that Einstein had plagiarized Poincaré's theory.⁴⁸¹

The preface to Fabre's first edition states,

“PRÉFACE

L'ouvrage de M. Fabre est des plus intéressants et fort bien écrit. Ses explications sur l'œuvre de Newton, de Faraday et de Maxwell sont admirablement réussies. L'auteur est un vrai enthousiaste rempli d'un sentiment vibrant pour la beauté scientifique.

L'éloge dont il veut bien honorer mes théories est terriblement exagéré. La théorie de la relativité ne peut ni veut donner aucun système du monde, mais seulement une condition restrictive à laquelle les lois de la nature doivent se soumettre, comme par exemple les deux principaux axiomes de la thermodynamique. Celui-là même qui ne reconnaîtrait pas la théorie de la relativité se voit cependant obligé d'admettre une interprétation physique claire des coordonnées de l'espace et du temps. C'est justement à ce point de vue que pèchent les écrits de certains des savants cités par l'auteur.

L'ouvrage de l'un d'entre eux défend une thèse sans espoir qui, traduite en termes géométriques dirait ceci: «Parmi toutes les directions X possibles dans l'espace, il n'existe qu'une seule direction de coordonnée X absolue» (il s'agit en l'espèce d'un temps absolu devant être préposé aux transformations Lorentz), entreprise sans espoir appuyée sur quelques ambiguïtés involontaires mathématiques.

Un autre de ces savants ne remarque pas — abstraction faite de ce qu'il oublie d'interpréter physiquement l'espace et le temps — que la vitesse de la lumière conformément à l'expérience joue un rôle spécial. Les deux erreurs étroitement liées se cachent sous une enveloppe épaisse de formules mathématiques. Aucun homme raisonnable n'admettra cependant que le son se propage, relativement à l'air en repos, selon les mêmes lois que relativement à l'air en mouvement. L'expérience nous a appris, par contre, que, seule, la vitesse de la lumière est indépendante de l'état de mouvement du système de coordonnées.

On ne peut pas dire non plus que la théorie générale de la relativité ait abandonné, par rapport à la vitesse de la lumière, le principe de la continuité. La vitesse de la lumière, mesurée avec perche et horloge unitaires, dans l'entourage infinitésimal d'un point est toujours, dans la théorie de la relativité aussi, invariablement la même.

Albert EINSTEIN.

Je crois devoir joindre à cette préface quelques extraits d'une lettre de M. Einstein qui me paraissent éclairer la physionomie du savant allemand.

L. F.

Cher Monsieur,

5-VII-20

J'ai reçu, par notre ami Oppenheim, au retour d'un long voyage, votre amicale lettre du 19 juin. J'ai étudié votre intéressant travail et j'y ai pris beaucoup de plaisir (en particulier dans l'exposé du développement historique de la théorie).

. Parmi les savants français, Langevin a parfaitement pénétré la théorie de la relativité. C'est un esprit merveilleusement clair et un homme sympathique

. Je joins à ma lettre le curriculum vitae que vous souhaitez. — Je suis Allemand (israélite) de naissance, mais j'ai vécu en Suisse de l'âge de 15 à celui de 35 ans, sauf de courtes interruptions. J'ai conquis mes grades à Zurich; je suis pacifiste, partisan d'une entente internationale et resté toujours fidèle dans ma ligne de conduite à cet idéal.

Agréez,

A. EINSTEIN.

Voici les renseignements biographiques fournis par M. Einstein:

Albert Einstein est né à Ulm le 14 mars 1879. Il était âgé de six semaines lorsque ses parents émigrèrent vers Munich où il passa son enfance et fréquenta les écoles jusqu'à sa quatorzième année. A quinze ans il se rendit en Suisse, resta un an au collège de Aarau et y obtint son *abiturium*. Il étudia ensuite les mathématiques et la physique à Zurich. En 1902, Einstein fut attaché au bureau des brevets à Berne et prépara simultanément son examen du doctorat auquel il fut admis en 1905. Il fut appelé comme professeur à l'Université de Zurich en 1909, à celle de Prague en 1911 et retourna à Zurich en 1912 comme professeur au Polytechnikum, qu'il quitta en 1914 pour aller occuper un siège à l'académie royale de Prusse à Berlin. Il est également directeur de l'Institut Kaiser-Wilhelm pour la physique."

Einstein wrote in *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 9, Number 13, (1 April 1921), p. 219, giving the false impression that he had not said what he had said,

“Zuschriften an die Herausgeber.

Zur Abwehr.

Herr *Lucien Fabre* hat im Verlage von Payot in Paris ein Buch „Les théories d'Einstein“ mit dem Zusatz „Avec une préface de M. Einstein“ herausgegeben. Ich erkläre, daß ich keine Vorrede zu dem Buche geschrieben

habe und protestiere gegen diesen Mißbrauch meines Namens. Ich bringe den Protest zu Ihrer Kenntnis in der Hoffnung, daß er aus Ihrer Zeitschrift den Weg in die weitere Öffentlichkeit und im besonderen auch in die Zeitschriften des Auslandes finden wird.

Berlin, 16. März 1921.

Albert Einstein.”

According to Ernst Gehrcke, Einstein’s statement was indeed reprinted in the popular press. Fabre responded with a statement published in the *Neue Züricher Zeitung* on 9 May 1921, and in many other papers, and Gehrcke quoted the following from it:

“Diese Vorrede besteht aus drei Dokumenten: sie enthält biographische Daten, wissenschaftliche Ansichten und zuletzt ein internationalistisches Glaubensbekenntnis. Ich halte aufs entschiedenste folgende Behauptungen aufrecht: 1. Verfasser dieser Vorrede ist Herr EINSTEIN. 2. Er selbst hat sie mir zugeschickt und zwar in der Form von Briefen und als Antwort auf briefliche Anfragen meinerseits. 3. Sie war ausschließlich dazu bestimmt, meinen Lesern, d. h. dem französischen Publikum, die moralische und wissenschaftliche Persönlichkeit dieses Gelehrten vorzustellen. Ich bin bereit, obige Behauptungen durch unwiderlegliche Schriftstücke zu bezeugen. . .”⁴⁸²

Fabre had composed the forward from letters he had received from Einstein, and he still held them as proof that Einstein had made the statements he later disowned.

Fabre wrote in the second edition *Une Nouvelle Figure du Monde: Les Théories d’Einstein. Accrue de notes Liminaires, d’un Exposé des Théories de Weyl, et de Trois Notes de M. M. Guillaume, Brillouin et Sagnac sur Leurs Propres Idées*, Payot, Paris, (1922),

“NOTES LIMINAIRES

La présente édition de cet ouvrage diffère des précédentes.

J’ai procédé à une épuration et à une mise à jour.

*
* *

J’ai d’abord purgé mon livre des déclarations de M. Einstein qui lui servaient de préface. Une partie de la presse et des amis qui me sont chers, avaient critiqué la forme et le fond de ces déclarations. Je ne les avais moi-même insérées que pour permettre au savant israélite allemand de dire publiquement du haut de cette tribune ce qu’il voulait donner comme vrai sur ses opinions politiques, sa vie, sa nationalité, ses sentiments, en un mot, sa physionomie non scientifique, laquelle, on le sait de reste, est extrêmement discutée.

Bien que j'eusse laissé à M. Einstein la responsabilité de ses déclarations je m'en sentais un peu complice puisque je leur donnais l'hospitalité. Mais je n'en aurais pas purgé ce livre, même si leur teneur m'eût été démontrée mensongère, car elles donnaient sur ce grand savant le témoignage le plus précieux puisqu'il émanait de lui.

L'événement le plus imprévu m'a décidé; M. Einstein a, en effet, renié ses déclarations dans la presse allemande. Je me hâte donc de les retrancher de cet ouvrage qui n'aura à connaître que de la figure purement scientifique du grand théoricien; c'est la seule qu'on puisse considérer avec sérénité et même avec quelque sympathie.

*
* *

Il va sans dire que j'ai également indiqué sur le mode dubitatif, ou même supprimé, les assertions que j'avais, dans le cours de l'ouvrage, avancées sur la foi des paroles d'Einstein, les autographes de celles-ci demeurant entre mes mains pour exercer la sagacité des psychologues futurs.

*
* *

Il m'a semblé indispensable d'ajouter à ce travail un bref exposé des théories de Weyl qui complètent très heureusement celles d'Einstein. Leur audace et leur beauté ne peut guère à l'heure actuelle apparaître qu'aux savants. Il est toutefois dès à présent certain que le disciple égale au moins le maître; et peut-être le dépasse-t-il.

*
* *

Les nombreuses lettres qui me sont parvenues m'ont aussi convaincu de l'intérêt que présente pour le public la question du temps relatif. J'ai donné avec assez de détails le point de vue einsteinien pour n'y pas revenir. Mais j'ai pensé que le lecteur entendrait avec plaisir sur le même sujet la voix de M. Guillaume dont j'avais brièvement exposé les théories. Le savant bernois a bien voulu écrire, spécialement pour le présent ouvrage, la note qu'on lira en appendice. On trouvera agrément et profit à la méditer.

M. Brillouin a bien voulu également indiquer lui-même son point de vue aux lecteurs du présent ouvrage; on trouvera sa lettre en appendice.

Il faut admirer la sûreté, la clarté de cette belle page bien française. Elle met exactement à sa place scientifique la théorie einsteinienne; elle en dégage la convenance et l'utilité en tant qu'hypothèse; très sobrement, elle met en garde contre les commentaires où se peuvent aventurer ceux qui confondent l'hypothèse et le réel; j'y discerne, sans vouloir engager la

pensée de son auteur, une méfiance à l'égard des conceptions philosophiques déduites des travaux einsteiniens.

Il n'est pas possible de ne pas souscrire à un jugement si parfaitement lucide; sa réserve et sa sagesse ne diminuent en rien l'enthousiasme que les théories d'Einstein et celles de Weyl, peuvent, indépendamment de leur adéquation au réel, inspirer à qui y recherche un excitant intellectuel.

*
* *

Enfin M. Sagnac, dont on a pu écrire, en faisant allusion à la phrase qui termine ce livre, qu'il était peut-être le nouveau Poincaré, le seul capable de nous donner une réponse définitive sur la valeur des théories einsteiniennes, a accepté de confier à ce petit ouvrage le sort d'une note originale dont l'extraordinaire importance n'échappera à personne.

Cette note:

—d'une part résume l'effet Sagnac sur la rotation dans l'éther (auquel nous avons fait allusion dans notre ouvrage);

—d'autre part institue une théorie générale des champs en translation par une extension de la pure mécanique des petits mouvements.

Nous sommes extrêmement heureux de pouvoir donner à nos lecteurs la primeur d'un travail qui nous paraît contenir en germe les plus belles découvertes."

Many interesting and telling facts emerge from the affair—smear tactic and vilification used to rescue Einstein by means of personal attack meant to divert attention from the real issue, and Einstein's dependence upon collaborators to write his statements, as well as Einstein's image. The preface to Fabre's book was only one of many of Einstein's anti-German, pro-Allies, and, elsewhere, Anglophilic, statements made public.⁴⁸³

Suspicion also fell upon Einstein because the "war to end all wars", *i. e.* the end of war—pacifism, socialism, revolution and economic hardship—which were great concerns of the Germans in the post-war period—were forecast in Ivan Stanislavovich Bloch's book, *The Future of War in Its Technical, Economic, and Political Relations; Is War Now Impossible?*, Doubleday & McClure Co., New York, (1899). Bolch was a hero and an inspiration to many Jews and to many Socialists. He was part of the culture that inspired H. G. Wells, Russell, Lorentz and Einstein; and Einstein was seen as a believer in, and vocal advocate of, this Blochian philosophy. The concept of the "war to end all wars" is also a prophetic and Apocalyptic one of Jewish world leadership foretold in the period of peace of the book of *Enoch*, with its "elect" and "Elect One" (*see also: Isaiah 65; 66*) and in the final war in the Old Testament in, among other places, *Isaiah 2:1-4*:

"1 The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem. 2 And it shall come to pass in the last days, *that* the mountain of

the LORD's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. 3 And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem. 4 And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

"Pacifists" often promoted the Apocalyptic prophesy of a "war to end all wars", which would establish a "world government" according to prophecy, one run by Jews in Jerusalem. Albert Einstein was one of the many advocates of this plan. "Pacifists" often sought to provoke the most terrible of wars humankind has yet endured on the false premise that it would end war. What these brutal and genocidal wars instead did was weaken the nations making them vulnerable to Jewish revolution, while simultaneously making the Jewish financiers unimaginably wealthy. Thereby, the Jewish financiers could sponsor revolution, dictatorship and genocide, and could buy up the world at reduced rates. The people were intentionally made so weary of war, that they become vulnerable to the sophistical message that the only means to secure peace is to destroy all nations such that there will be no nations left to war with each other. Some Jews press this message in order to bring to fulfillment the Messianic prophecy that the Jews will destroy all nations and religions, and rule the Earth. The false message that the loss of sovereignty leads to peace was a fundamental theme in Communist régimes. The loss of Gentile sovereignty has instead led to the enslavement and extermination of the Gentile peoples, in fulfillment of Judaic Messianic prophecy.

In the era of the German Enlightenment, Moses Mendelssohn asserted that the "Jewish mission" was to convert the world to monotheism and to instill in all peoples the principles of the Jewish moral code, which according to some initially only applied only to Jews, with the ancient Jews viewing Gentiles as subhuman and therefore undeserving of moral treatment. Einstein's friend Georg Friedrich Nicolai (Lewinstein) stated in 1917,

"Apart from this strange story of Cain, however, murder is forbidden in the Bible, and very sternly forbidden. But—it is only the murder of Jews. As is natural, considering the period from which it dates, the Bible is absolutely national, in character. Only the Jew is really considered as a human being; cattle and strangers might be slain without the slayer himself being slain. In this case there was a ransom. Accordingly, war was of course allowed also, and the Jews were no more illogical than the Moslem who kills the outlander. Of late years the Jews and the Old Testament have often been reproached for their contempt for those who were not Jews; and in practice even Christ acted in precisely the same way."⁴⁸⁴

Mendelssohn's message was not very different from that of Jesus Christ, as expressed in the Gospels; or, indeed, that of Islam, "There is no God but God." The political Zionists tended to be secular and racist, and based their beliefs on biological, Darwinistic principles. Albert Einstein saw Judaism as step away from paganistic Polytheism towards utilitarian and scientific morality, with the objectionable premise in the ancient tradition that one is led to morality through fear of the "imaginary" God.⁴⁸⁵ However, all of these movements, which meant to lessen the suspicion among Gentiles of Jewish religious aspirations, perpetuated those aspirations which were always more political and racist in nature, than spiritual. Moses of the ten commandments was little different from Moses Mendelssohn.

Einstein followed the line of thought which sponsored European Liberalism, "such as Jacobinism, Fourierism, Owenism, Fabian Socialism, Marxism, and the like",⁴⁸⁶ as essentially adopting the moral values of Judaism and replacing the source of these values, "God", with a quasi-Deistic conception of nature. Many critics of the Jews found this irrational, in that the removal of "God" *a priori* removes the fundamental premise of all that can be deduced from this premise, including codes of moral and just conduct, without providing a substitute premise which rationally deduces their conclusions. These critics sought a more synthetic basis for morality than neo-Platonism, and many arrived at pragmatic Darwinism and Metempsychosis, which they argued were logically consistent and empirically justified. In reality, there was less difference between the two points of view than was apparent on the face of the dispute.

Before Bloch were Bertha von Suttner and Alfred Hermann Fried of the *Friedensbewegung* (peace movement) which attracted pacifist physicist and Einstein-supporter Hans Thirring. Suttner published *Die Waffen nieder!*⁴⁸⁷ in 1892, which emphasized the harm done to civilians in modern warfare. The American Civil War had demonstrated the destructive force of modern industry applied to warfare. Friedrich Nietzsche, whose work was well known, predicted the massive destruction this would cause in the Twentieth Century.

Unlike Albert Einstein, Philipp Lenard had expressed his loyalty to Germany during and after the First World War. After Einstein smeared him without cause, Nobel Prize laureate Philipp Lenard demanded a very public personal apology from Albert Einstein, which was not forthcoming. Einstein repeatedly made harshly anti-German and warmly Anglophilic statements before and after the Bad Nauheim debate which outraged many Germans.⁴⁸⁸ Einstein was member of a commission which intended to investigate and publicize alleged German war atrocities, in 1919, for the purposes of a psychological attack on the German psyche attempting to coerce them into accepting Einstein's view that Germany's defeat was a victory for humanity.⁴⁸⁹ Einstein also wanted to increase the hardships on the already starving Germans with foreign boycotts on German products soon after the First World War ended.⁴⁹⁰ Many hundreds of thousands, if not millions of Germans had starved to death during a naval blockade in the war. Einstein's, and like minded vindictive spirits', love of punishing Germans made the Germans resentful of the Jews who had stabbed them in the back.

Ethnocentric attacks against German science appeared in America⁴⁹¹ in 1918, and

in England⁴⁹² in 1919. In addition, English and French scientists, in collusion with traitors like Albert Einstein, took punitive actions against German scientists under the auspices of the International Research Council. Among other punitive sanctions, they excluded German and Austrian nationals from international congresses and banned the Nations of the former Central Powers from membership for a period of ten years. Einstein was marketed to the Allies as a Swiss Jew who had opposed Germany from the beginning of the war and Einstein, the “Swiss Jew”, was safe from these vicious attacks on the liberty and dignity of German scientists.

Max Born knew that Hendrik Antoon Lorentz was a friend of the Allies after the First World War and Born disliked him.⁴⁹³ Einstein, who had lived in Germany throughout the war, in spite of the fact that he hated Germany and wanted to see the nation destroyed, wrote to Lorentz on 1 August 1919,

“Exclusion of German scholars from social international scholarly exchanges for a number of years might perhaps be a lesson in humility for them, which will not do much harm at all—and, it is to be hoped, might even help.”⁴⁹⁴

Many German scientists resented Einstein’s treachery. Indeed, under pressure from Lenard for his anti-German activities and as a result of the economic conditions in Germany, Einstein published an appeal to ease the punitive measures taken against German science, which he himself had initially sponsored.⁴⁹⁵ However, racist Zionist Albert Einstein saw to it that no German scientist would be present at the Solvay Conference in April of 1921. His friend Hendrik Antoon Lorentz invited only one German scientist to attend the conference, Albert Einstein. Racist Zionist Albert Einstein then refused the invitation with the excuse that he was heading for America to exploit his ill-founded fame to raise money for his fellow racist Zionists. Einstein wrote to Lorentz,

“As this venture lies close to my heart, and as I, as a Jew, feel a duty to contribute, as far as I am able, to its success, I accepted.”⁴⁹⁶

Fellow German Jew Fritz Haber was outraged at Albert Einstein’s racist treachery and disloyalty. Einstein confirmed that he was disloyal and a racist, and was obligated,

“[. . .] to step in for my persecuted and morally depressed fellow tribesmen, as far as this lies within my power[.]”⁴⁹⁷

In point of fact, Einstein was instead promoting himself and hiding from his critics.

In response to the Berlin Philharmonic lectures, Einstein and his friends arranged for a discussion of the theory of relativity at the Eighty-Sixth Meeting of German Natural Scientists in Bad Nauheim in late September of 1920. These were annual gatherings which had been interrupted by the war. Einstein threatened that Lenard and all critics of the theory of relativity would be humiliated. Einstein was known for his childish and evasive responses to criticism. He was known for hiding from

criticism. Einstein responded,

“The best proof that I by no means dodge criticism is that I myself arranged that the theory of relativity be discussed at the meeting of the GDNA in Nauheim.”⁴⁹⁸

Einstein stated in his challenge that anyone brave enough should speak in Bad Nauheim.

Einstein, himself, was not brave enough. Contrary to his public bravado, Einstein feared the confrontation he had created and wanted others to speak on his behalf. He knew that he could not defend the theory of relativity and that he had no legitimate defense for his plagiarism. Einstein instead wanted to hide from the criticism directed at him.

Albert Einstein wrote to Arnold Sommerfeld on 6 September 1920 that he wanted to hide from the debate,

“But I do not on any account want to speak myself[.]”⁴⁹⁹

[4.4.8 Let the Debate Begin](#)

Einstein, against his better judgement, did speak at Nauheim. The event was highly publicized by Einstein and his supporters and thousands showed up to see the debate. The theory of relativity was hyped beyond all reasonable limits and many were certain that the great hero Einstein would crush his opponents, as advertised. The much anticipated debate between Lenard and Einstein over the general theory of relativity began on Thursday, at 12:45 PM. Einstein’s advocates, Max Planck who chaired the session, *et al.*, employed armed police to keep anti-relativists and neutral parties out of the audience and attempted to stack the audience with a pro-Einstein clique. This resulted in a tumultuous protest and unbiased audience members stormed the hall and held their ground.

After long and boring lectures by Einstein and his friends which began at 9:00 AM, the bell sounded at 12:45 PM for the time allotted to Einstein-critics to begin. Einstein and Lenard began to debate.

Though accounts of the meeting are incomplete and vary,⁵⁰⁰ Lenard clearly made Einstein look very foolish in a very short time. Einstein was flustered and could not give cogent responses, even though Lenard repeated his questions. In a prearranged maneuver, Max Planck called the session, which had begun at 12:45 PM, to an end at about 1:00 PM, after only a few minutes of debate, so as to let Einstein off the hook and prevent a fuller exposure of Einstein’s incompetence. Fifteen minutes before the afternoon session began, Einstein ran away. Gehrcke, who had humiliated Einstein at the Berlin Philharmonic, and whom Einstein had openly challenged to speak at Bad Nauheim, repeatedly demanded time to speak, but Max Planck refused to allow Gehrcke a chance to speak, and delayed Gehrcke until the session was closed. Planck also refused to allow Rudolph, another Einstein critic, time to speak.

Pursuant to Planck’s corrupt plan, Einstein’s critics were only allotted fifteen

minutes to speak, including responses from Einstein and his friends, after hours of pro-Relativity lectures. Planck tried to arrange it so that only pro-Einstein mathematical lectures would occur, which would be entirely uninteresting to the public and to the press.

Max Planck fed Friedrich von Müller, the opening speaker to the Bad Nauheim gathering, a prepared speech Planck and Arnold Sommerfeld had written lauding Einstein and unfairly degrading his opponents. Planck arranged it so that armed guards would intimidate anti-Einstein participants and prevent them from attending the meeting hall and attempted to stack the audience and the stage with a pro-Einstein clique. Planck not only limited the time of the anti-Relativists at the Thursday meeting to a few minutes, Planck also greatly restricted their time at the Friday meeting to 12 minutes including discussion—a meeting which Einstein and his cronies did not attend. Einstein hid from his opponents and ran away from the debate, even after Max Planck had arranged it so that Einstein would have every conceivable advantage.

Albert Einstein was ashamed of the fact that he had run away. He wrote to Max Born in October of 1920,

“I will live through all that is in store for me like an unconcerned spectator and will not allow myself to get excited again, as in Nauheim. It is quite inconceivable to me how I could have lost my sense of humour to such an extent through being in bad company.”⁵⁰¹

4.4.8.1 Einstein Disappoints—“Albertus Maximus” is a Laughingstock

Einstein’s cowardice and incompetence did not go unnoticed. Johannes Riem ridiculed Albert Einstein,

“Amerika über Einstein

Von

Professor Dr. Johannes Riem.

Es ist kaum anzunehmen, daß Einstein mit reiner Freude an seine amerikanische Rundreise zurückdenken wird. Ein großer Teil der dortigen Physiker und Astronomen stand von vornherein ablehnend da, vor allem der bekannte Michelson, dessen berühmtes Experiment in seiner falschen Deutung mit den Anlaß für die Relativitätstheorie gegeben hat. Vor mir liegen zwei Zeitungsblätter, „The Minneapolis Sunday Tribune“, 1921 May 22, und „The St. Pauly Daily News“, 1921 May 8. Beide beschäftigen sich mit der Relativitätstheorie und Einsteins Auftreten drüben. Zunächst die Feststellung, daß Einstein gleichzeitig mit der Abordnung der Zionisten drüben ankam, und daß die Presse davon in ausgedehntem Maße Kenntnis nahm. Doch habe man sehr bald dies als bezahlte Mache erkannt, und die ganze Einsteinsche Reise von Beginn an als einen Bluff erfaßt.

Die Amerikaner wären denn doch zu skeptisch gewesen, ihn ohne weitere Beweise für größer als Kopernikus und Newton zu halten, bloß, weil seine Lehre unverständlicher sei. Denn die Wahrheit sei einfach und verständlich. Man habe die Relativitätstheorie deswegen als einen Schwindel zurückgewiesen, und Reuterdahl vom College St. Paul bezeichnet Einstein als den „Barnum der wissenschaftlichen Welt, der die ganze Welt mit seiner mythischen Theorie zum Narren halte“. Derselbe Reuterdahl hat Einstein zu einer Erörterung aufgefordert, auch ihm ist es ergangen, wie voriges Jahr den Gegnern Einsteins in Nauheim, denn Einstein zog sich beizeiten zurück, so daß Reuterdahl die ganze Einsteinfahrt für eine von vornherein abgekartete Geschäftsreise erklärt.

Er führt des längeren aus, daß Leute, wie Mewes, Gehrccke und andere durchaus recht hätten, wenn sie Einstein des Plagiates beschuldigen. Er hat seine Gedanken zum Teil den Arbeiten Zieglers in Bern entnommen, wo ja Einstein früher wohnte, dessen Gedanken aber von der Wissenschaft unterdrückt seien, ferner von Gerber, dessen Arbeiten auch schwer zugänglich waren. Die Zeitungen sind beide über die Gelehrten bei uns gut unterrichtet, die gegen Einstein arbeiten, Leonard, Gehrccke, Fricke.

Der Reklamefeldzug, den die Presse vor einiger Zeit mit und für Einstein machte, wird den Amerikanern als eine Art Film vorgeführt, der aber für die deutsche Wissenschaft, für ihre Ehre und Förderung wenig nützlich gewesen sei. Es sei sehr zu bedauern, daß die Deutsche Wissenschaft durch einen ihrer Vertreter selbst lächerlich gemacht werde. Lodge, Reuterdahl, Heidenreich und andere haben drüben vorher gewarnt, man solle den Einsteinismus nicht so ohne weiteres annehmen. Natürlich zuerst vergeblich, denn dieser neue Ismus rollte wie eine Flutwelle ungehemmt dahin, aber die Ernüchterung kam bald.

Man geht gegen Einstein vor als den Goliath des Skeptizismus. Vorlesungen dagegen werden veranstaltet. In scharfsinniger Weise wird in einem viel gelesenen Buche „Relativität oder innere Abhängigkeit“ die Unhaltbarkeit der Relativitätstheorie nachgewiesen. Der Einwand Einsteins, dies sei nur eine besondere Form des Antisemitismus, wird sehr energisch zurückgewiesen, und mit der Anerkennung Spinozas beantwortet.

Man ist sich darüber klar, daß es sich dabei vor allem darum handelt, mit allen Mitteln die Grundlagen der Theorie zu bekämpfen, da diese fehlerhaft, unvollständig und geeignet ist, das Universum in mechanistische Ideen aufzulösen. Es ist eine widerrechtliche Besitzergreifung durch die Mathematik. Der Astronom Glanville bezeichnet die Relativitätstheorie als eine neue Droge, die als ein neues Allheilmittel angepriesen wird. Dr. Skidmore hat die Sache richtig erfaßt, wenn er sagt, daß die Relativitätstheorie ausgehe von der Nichteuklidischen, sogenannten Metageometrie, sie bestehe aus rein gedanklichen Konstruktionen, die durchaus subjektiv sind und denen in der Natur nichts entspricht. Sehr hübsch ist folgendes Bild: Man nehme der Relativitätstheorie den mathematischen blauen Dunst, in den sie sich hüllt, dann bleibt nur ein

lebloses Skelett und dessen Einsteinscher Schädel grinst andauernd seine Zehen an, die auf der Grundlage Galileis stehen. Man stelle sich das einmal vor!”⁵⁰²

On 22 April 1922, the *Luzerner Neueste Nachrichten* ridiculed Einstein’s flight from the debate (Einstein would often repeat the cliché that great truths are simple, as if he were the first to make use of it),

“Americans have too much common sense for that. They know that all the great truths are simple and easily understood, and are, therefore, justly suspicious of the unintelligible theory of relativity of Einstein. More than that they have rejected it as a swindle. Just for example Reuterdahl, dean of engineering of the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota, calls Einstein a ‘Barnum of the scientific world who is trying to fool the whole world with a mythical theory.’ It is further reported that Reuterdahl has challenged Einstein to a debate, into which he is as likely to enter as in the debate announced last year at the meeting for scientific investigation in Bad Nauheim, where he preferred to withdraw himself quietly before the announced opponents of his theory could say what they had to say. To these opponents was expressed the regret that Mr. Einstein was unable, because of circumstances, to answer them. This, of course, was another prearranged matter of his general trafficking. It is very likely that he is acting in a similar manner towards Reuterdahl. The more so because the latter has accused him of scientific theft, for Reuterdahl maintains that Einstein has taken the fundamentals of his theory from a work which appeared in 1866 under the pseudonym of ‘Kinertia.’”⁵⁰³

“Dazu haben die Amerikaner noch zu viel gesunden Menschenverstand. Sie sind sich der großen Tatsachen bewußt, daß alle großen Mehrheiten auch einfach und leicht verständlich sind, und bringen daher der unverständlichen Relativitätslehre Einsteins ein durchaus gerechtfertigtes Mißtrauen entgegen. Ja, mehr als das: sie lehnen sie als Schwindel ab. So nennt Reuterdahl, der Dekan des St. Thomas College in Minneapolis, Einstein „einen Barnum in der wissenschaftlichen Welt“, der mit seiner mystischen Theorie alle Welt zum Besten halte. Auch soll Reuterdahl Einstein zu einer Disputation aufgefordert haben, zu welcher sich dieser aber wohl ebenso wenig stellen dürfte, wie zu der an der letztjährigen deutschen Naturforscher-Versammlung in Bad Nauheim angekündigten, wo er es vorzog, sich in aller Stille zu drücken, bevor die zum Worte vorgemerkten Gegner seiner Theorie an die Reihe kamen. Man drückte ihnen dann das Bedauern aus, daß ihnen Herr Einstein nicht habe Rede und Antwort stehen können. Das war natürlich eine abgekartete Sache seines Klüngels. Aehnlich dürfte er sich nun auch gegenüber Reuterdahl verhalten, umso mehr, als ihn dieser des wissenschaftlichen Diebstahls bezichtigt. Reuterdahl behauptet nämlich, Einstein habe die Grundlage seiner Theorie einem Werke entlehnt, welches

1866 unter dem Pseudonym „Inertia“ erschien.”

J. E. G. Hirzel wrote in the *Luzerner Neueste Nachrichten* of 20 September 1921,

“Albertus Maximus und die Blamage der Schulweisheit.

Warum Maximus? — In Amerika gefeiert und herausgefordert. — Seine Vorläufer als Duellanten: Reuter Dahl in Amerika und Dr. J. H. Ziegler in der Schweiz. — Der Reklameturm von Potsdam.

Am 1. April dieses Jahres wurden in Neuyork die letzten Vorbereitungen zum Empfang des größten Genies getroffen, welches die Welt bisher hervorzubringen imstande war. Wenigstens hieß es allgemein, daß alle großen Denker und Entdecker, denen unsere Wissenschaft und Kultur ihr Dasein verdanken, in Zukunft nur noch als bescheidene Vorläufer oder als Herolde jenes größern Genies gelten könnten, so daß fortan Namen wie die eines Heraklit, Giordano Bruno, Kopernikus, Kepler, Newton und wie sei sonst noch heißen mögen die großen Leuchten des Menschengeschlechts, neben dem seinigen ihren Glanz verlören. Dieses alles überstrahlende Gestirn am Himmel der heutigen Wissenschaft heißt **Al b e r t E i n s t e i n**. Ein findiger Berliner Journalist fand jedoch diesen Namen zu bürgerlich und nannte ihn kurz **Al b e r t u s M a x i m u s**. So heißt er jetzt im Hinblick auf jenen berühmten Zeitgenossen des Roger Bacon, welcher den Gelehrten seiner Zeit allgemein als *doctor mirabilis* bekannt war und als der gelehrteste von allen galt, **Albertus Magnus**: dem großen Lehrer des Kirchenvaters Thomas Aquinas, dem *doctor angelicus* und eigentlichen Begründer der thomistisch-aristotelischen Philosophie, welche die Wissenschaft das ganze Mittelalter hindurch bis auf die Neuzeit beherrschte. Da diese beiden gewaltigen Männer bekanntlich später von der katholischen Kirche kanonisiert wurden, so erwarteten die Amerikaner den ihnen avisierten ganz Großen mit einer Art heiliger Scheu, auch schon deshalb, weil seine Lehre noch schwerer verständlich sein sollte, als die des heiligen Thomas, welche bereits den gelehrten Theologen schon genug harte Nüsse zu knacken gegeben hatte. Von der Lehre Einsteins hieß es allgemein, sie sei nur für die größten Mathematiker verständlich. Den meisten **A m e r i k e r n** genügte es darum, den Namen dieser Wunderlehre zu kennen, und man war praktisch genug, sich nicht auch noch um ihren Inhalt zu kümmern. Trotzdem war man allgemein von ihr entzückt, und zwar eben deshalb, weil sie so geheimnisvoll war. Nach ihr sollte es überhaupt nichts Absolutes mehr geben, alles sollte nur noch relativ sein. Aber Einstein sagte nicht, warum. Doch nannte er sie die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie. Sie bedeutet die vollste Freiheit im Denken und Handeln, denn sie befreit alle von jeder absoluten Verpflichtung. Der Glaube an das Absolute ist mit ihr erledigt. Er gehörte zu den Grundirrtümern einer veralteten Weisheit, welche einst durch den Teufel in

die Welt gekommen sein mußten. Einstein wollte nun gründlich damit aufräumen. Darum die große Spannung. Man hoffte in ihm den kommenden Erlöser aus der Not des Unverstandes, des Zweifels und Irrtums begrüßen zu dürfen, und den Schlichter jeglichen Streites, den Friedensfürsten, welcher im Glorienschein schon vollbrachter und noch zu vollbringender Wundertaten der geplagten Menschheit den geistlichen und weltlichen Frieden bringen und das Reich Gottes auf Erden errichten werde. Einstein aber hatte ganz eigene Absichten. Der Verkünder der Relativitätstheorie wußte, daß alles nur relativ sei, also auch seine Messiasmission, und daß es deshalb am klügsten für ihn sei, dies den Amerikanern nicht zu sagen. Er wollte ihnen im Bluff einmal den Meister zeigen.

Am 1. April ließ er sie hangen und bängen, aber am 2. erschien er, vorläufig aber erst im Hafen von Neuyork. Da die Ankunft programmgemäß auf einen Samstag fiel, so halten Einstein und seine Begleiter dadurch Gelegenheit, ihren frommen Landslauten in New-Jerusalem gleich einen Beweis ihrer orthodoxen Frömmigkeit zu geben. Man wartete deshalb mit der Ausschiffung noch bis zum Sabbath-Ende. Dann erst ließ man sich von einem mit der amerikanischen und jüdischen Flagge versehenen, vom Bürgermeister extra zur Verfügung gestellten majors cutter ans Land setzen. Umgeben von einer zionistischen Delegation, unter Führung des Oberzionisten Weizmann und dessen Adjutanten Ussischkin und Mossinsohn betrat der neue Messias den Boden des gelobten Goldlandes Dollarika. Bei der Fahrt durch die Stadt (so berichtet die jüdische Pressezentrale vom 15. April) harpte ihrer eine unabsehbar Menge — ein Bericht spricht sogar von einer Million — von der sie enthusiastisch akklamiert wurde, so daß der E i n z u g E i n s t e i n s in New-Jerusalem den einfachen von Christus in Alt-Jerusalem vollständig in den Schatten stellte. Offenbar war er viel besser gemanaged. Alles schrie Hosiannah, denn alle Zuschauer waren Juden. Einstein selbst berichtet, er habe in Neuyork zum erstenmal jüdische Volkshaufen gesehen. Aber diese streuten keine Palmblätter, sondern, was den Zionisten viel lieber war, Banknoten und Schecks auf die Bank von England. Denn die jüdische Delegation hatte es nicht auf die Bekehrung der Yankees abgesehen, sondern nur auf die Erleichterung ihrer Börsen. Sie spekulierte nicht auf Seelenfang, sondern auf Gold, und dieses war nach alttestamentlicher Tradition am reichlichsten in Amerika zu finden. Schon Salomo hatte seine Knechte mit denen Hiram's nach dem Lande Ophir geschickt, welches nach Mewes mit Peru identisch ist, und sie hatten ihm von dort 450 Zentner Gold zurückgebracht. Jetzt brauchte man es nicht mehr im rohen Zustande. Für die in Jerusalem zu gründende Welt-Universität dienten solide Papiere noch besser, und diese waren in Nordamerika leichter zu beschaffen. Und wirklich brachten die Zionisten hier mit Einstein als „great attraction“ in ebenso viel Monaten, als Salomos Knechte Jahre gebraucht hatten, 23 Millionen Dollars zusammen, womit für derartige Expeditionen ein neuer Weltrekord aufgestellt war. Einstein brauchte dabei nicht einmal zu reden. Erstens geriet so sein Geheimnis weniger in Gefahr und zweitens

verstärkte sein Schweigen den Nimbus seiner Theorie. Auch wäre ohnedies niemand genial genug gewesen, ihn zu verstehen. Denjenigen, die ihn durchaus hören wollten, spielte er etwas auf seiner Geige vor. Der Präsident und der Vizepräsident der Union bezeugten ihm für seine Leistungen ihre Anerkennung dadurch, daß sie sich mit ihm zusammen photographieren ließen.

Leider wurde Einstein vor seiner Abreise noch ein schlimmer Streich gespielt, ohne den er seinen lukrativen Aufenthalt wahrscheinlich noch erheblich verlängert hätte. Ich erwähnte bereits, daß seine Mission mehr darin bestand, den Amerikanern einen Propheten zu zeigen, als ihnen seine Theorie auseinanderzusetzen. Reden ist Silber, Schweigen ist Gold. Seine Abneigung gegen das Disputieren hatte Einstein schon an der Naturforscher-Versammlung in Bad Nauheim gezeigt. Ueberhaupt läßt sich kein Prophet, der an sich glaubt, aufs Disputieren ein und einer, der es nicht tut, noch viel weniger. Leider hatte nun aber ein amerikanischer Professor hiefür weder das richtige Verständnis, noch das nötige Zartgefühl. Dieser wollte nicht begreifen, daß eine wertvolle Lehre unverständlich sein müsse, sondern meinte, alle großen Wahrheiten müßten notwendig auch einfach und leicht verständlich sein. Aus diesem Grunde forderte er Herrn Einstein auf, diese Meinungsverschiedenheit mit ihm auf dem Wege einer *ö f f e n t l i c h e n* *D i s p u t a t i o n* auszutragen. Eine derartige Zumutung einem öffentlich beglaubigten Genie gegenüber erscheint etwas brutal und erinnert beinahe an den Boxermatsch Dempsen-Carpentier. Da aber dem Friedensfürsten jede Art von Streit ein Greuel ist, so strafte er die taktlose *H e r a u s f o r d e r u n g* des Professors *A r v i d R e u t e r d a h l* mit stiller Verachtung. Vielleicht fürchtete er auch, er könnte in der Hitze des Zweikampfes seinem Gegner mit seiner übermenschlich-geistigen Kraft schweren Schaden zufügen. Sei dem, wie ihm wolle, jedenfalls verbot ihm seine Menschenliebe den Zweikampf. Aber die Amerikaner verkannten die hohe Moralität Einsteins und glaubten, er fürchte sich vor Reuterdahl und wäre deshalb vor ihm ausgekniffen. Und so fingen sie an, ihn plötzlich und von allen Seiten so grausam zu verhöhnen und lächerlich zu machen, daß sie dabei sogar den guten Ton verletzten und ihre gute Erziehung vergaßen. Das mußte Einstein noch tiefer schmerzen. Denn jetzt kamen sogar die „guten Eindrücke“ in Gefahr, welche er von den Amerikanern empfangen hatte. Um diese zu retten, brach er nun schleunigst seine Tournee ab und schiffte sich so rasch als möglich nach England ein, wo er sich dann von Lord Haldane, einem gefühlvollen Stammesgenossen, über die gehabte Enttäuschung trösten ließ.

So endigte das anfängliche Hosiannah auch bei Einsteins Messiaade mit einem Kreuziget ihn! Doch ist es heute nicht mehr Brauch, seine Ueberzeugung durch das Martyrium zu bekräftigen. Darum drückte sich der Prophet, bevor seine Sache eine tragische Wendung nahm. Erst, als er sich in Berlin ganz in Sicherheit wußte, stellte er wieder seinen Mann, machte den Amerikanern eine lange Nase und plimperte mit dem Geld in seiner Tasche. Es klang wie fröhliches Kichern. So endigte sein Triumphzug durch Amerika

fast genau so, wie es die „Luzerner Neuesten Nachrichten am 22. April vorausgesagt hatten.

Und Reuter dahl? Nun, Reuter dahl konnte sich darüber trösten, daß ihn Einsteins Flucht um den Triumph gebracht hatte, ihm in öffentlicher Disputation die Richtigkeit seiner famosen Relativitätstheorie zu beweisen und ihm dabei die Denkermaske vom Gesicht zu reißen und dem Publikum nur dasjenige eines schlaun wissenschaftlichen Schiebers zu zeigen. Reuter dahl brauchte diesen Triumph nicht. Als Dekan der Ingenieur- und Architektenabteilung des St. Thomas College in St. Paul (Minnesota) genoß er schon Ansehen genug, auch stand sein Ruf als tiefer Denker und bedeutender Mathematiker längst zu fest, als daß er seiner bedurft hätte. Ernsten Forschern liegt nur die Wahrheit am Herzen und sie verachten die Reklame. Die Flucht Einsteins war das schmachvolle Eingeständnis seiner Niederlage. Nach der hochgeachteten Monatsschrift „The Dearborn Independent“ vom 30. Juli sollen bei Einsteins Abfahrt von Neuyork nur noch ein halbes Dutzend Freunde zugegen gewesen sein. Ein stilles Leichenbegängnis! Die Hunderttausende, welche den Ankömmling begrüßt hatten, blieben zu Hause. Viele von ihnen studierten bereits Reuter dahls Werk „Wissenschaftlicher Deismus gegen Materialismus“. Die Tendenz dieses Buches ist eine rein absolutistische, radikal antirelativistische, wenn man den Relativismus im Einsteinschen Sinne versteht. Reuter dahl zeigt darin, daß die heutige agnostische Wissenschaft bloß auf vereinbarten Unbestimmtheiten beruht, „scientific unknowns“, und daß diesem unsichern Zustande nur durch die sichere Bestimmung der notwendig absolut einfachen Grundlage abgeholfen werden könne. Dieses Absolute nennt er, so wie es die Religion tut, Gott. Aber als Mann der Wissenschaft begnügt er sich nicht mit dem unbestimmten Begriff von Gott. Vielmehr faßt er das Prinzip des allmächtig alles Bewirkenden und Durchwirkenden wieder ähnlich auf, wie es früher die beiden gelehrten Jesuiten Athanasius Kircher und Pater Joseph Boskowich getan hatten. Der letztere starb als Professor der Philosophie, Physik, Astronomie und Mathematik im Jahre 1787 in Mailand. Auch war er Verfasser einer Atomistik. Das ewige Grundprinzip von allen Weltlichen bestand nach ihm aus lauter Kraftzentren. Zu eben diesem Schlusse kam auch Reuter dahl. Er vereinigt aber damit ferner auch die beiden Grundbegriffe von Raum und Zeit. Alle zusammen bilden den absoluten Urgrund, auf dem oder woraus sich dann alles Relativ in verständlicher Weise entwickelt. Damit sichert er diesem von Anfang an ein festes System, während in einer bloßen Relativität ohne Voraussetzung eines bestimmten Absoluten selbstverständlich alles systemlos bleibt, so wie es bei Einsteins Lehre der Fall ist. Diese ist darum nicht nur unverständlich, sondern sogar höchst gefährlich. Sie ist absolut ordnungswidrig, nihilistisch und negativ. Beidenkapp nannte sie bolschewistisch. Und sie wirkt deshalb nur zersetzend auf Religion und Wissenschaft ein, anstatt stützend und fördernd. Beiden entzieht sie den festen Boden. Bei Reuter dahl ist das Gegenteil davon der Fall. Darum stimmt er aufs Beste mit den Lehren und Bestrebungen J.

H. Zieglers überein, dessen Werk er in seiner jüngsten Schrift: „Einstein and The New Science“ mit unverhelter Freude rühmt und als grundlegend für die neue und wahre Wissenschaft anerkennt. Zieglers System fußt bekanntlich ebenfalls auf den drei Begriffen von Urkraft, Urraum und Urzeit, deren Einheit nachzuweisen ihm gelungen ist. Einstein spricht dagegen die Zeit als vierte Dimension des Raumes an! Reuterdahl und Ziegler, der Mathematiker und der Chemiker, ergänzen sich gegenseitig. Einstein dagegen bringt nur mißtönende Anklänge an die Theorie des letztern vor. Immerhin muß man ihm eines lassen. Niemand hat mehr wie er und seine zionistischen und nichtzionistischen Freunde zum Sturze der agnostischen Wissenschaft beigetragen. Denn nichts konnte ihre innere Hohlheit der Menschheit besser zum Bewußtsein bringen, als das marktschreierische Treiben der Einsteinianer. Dieses Treiben lenkte erst die Aufmerksamkeit auf den Schaden und machte sie auf dem ganzen Erdenrund lächerlich und unhaltbar. Das war nun allerdings nicht beabsichtigt, aber es ebnete der neuen, wahren Wissenschaft den Weg. Einstein wurde dadurch nolens volens, zwar nicht zu ihrem Begründer, aber doch wenigstens zu ihrem Herold. Es geht eben oft anders, als man denkt. Das müssen jetzt auch die Koryphäen der alten Wissenschaft erfahren, denn damit, daß sie sich wie ein Mann hinter einen Nachtreter stellen, um mit ihm den ihnen unbequemen Hauptbegründer der neuen Wissenschaft gemeinsam an die Wand zu drücken, gerieten sie nur noch tiefer in den Sumpf einer bodenlosen Relativität, wobei sie ihre Autorität gänzlich einbüßen. Sie suchen sie jetzt vergeblich zu retten; alle Kniffe werden ihnen nichts mehr helfen. In diesen Tagen taufte sie gelegentlich eines Astronomen-Kongresses in Potsdam ein dort errichtetes Observatorium auf den Namen Einsteins und ließen dieses welterschütternde Ereignis sofort durch den Telegraphen urbi et orbi bekannt machen. Der Einsteinturm paradiert daher schon heute in jeder illustrierten Zeitung als aktuellste Sehenswürdigkeit. Er soll dazu dienen, die öffentliche Aufmerksamkeit von den ruhig und still vor sich gehenden Hauptereignissen abzulenken. Ob er aber den Ruhm des großen Mannes verewigen werde, ist daher noch fraglich. Dieser Reklameturm dürfte meines Erachtens in Zukunft eine weiser gewordene Menschheit an die ungeheure Geistesverwirrung unserer agnostischen Zeit erinnern. Der Einsteinturm wäre demnach nur mehr ein Denkmal für ihre letzte Torheit und größte Blamage.

J. E. G. Hirzel.”

Artur Fürst and Alexander Moszkowski stated in 1916 that Einstein was the Galileo of the Twentieth Century. They suggested that since the designation *Albertus Magnus* was already taken (by Albert Graf von Bollstädt), the title “*Albertus Maximus*”⁵⁰⁴ might be reserved for Einstein:

“So ist auch das jenseitige Ufer der neuen Theorie, der Relativität, nur unter Gefahr zu gewinnen. Aber der Wagemutige, der hinüberkommt, sieht sich in einer unermeßlichen neuen Welt, in der auf Schritt und Tritt

ungeahnte Wahrheitswunder erblühen. Und mit Bewunderung gedenkt er der Männer, stie ihm diesen Weg wiesen. Zu ihnen gehören die Physiker und Mathematiker L o r e n t z und M i n k o w s k i , vor allen aber der gewaltige Baumeister des neuen Relativitätsgebäudes, der Galilei des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts: A l b e r t E i n s t e i n .

Vor sieben Jahrhunderten lebte ein Wundermann der Naturlehre, der Graf von Bollstädt, der sich den Namen eines Großen, A l b e r t u s M a g n u s , errang. Die Bezeichnung Albertus Maximus ist noch frei. Es könnte sein, daß dieser Titel für Albert Einstein vorbehalten bleibt und ihm dereinst verliehen wird.”⁵⁰⁵

Fürst and Moszkowski were copying Eugen Karl Dühring’s pronouncement that Robert Mayer was the “Galileo of the Nineteenth Century” in Dühring’s book *Robert Mayer, der Galilei des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. Eine Einführung in seine Leistungen und Schicksale*, E. Schmeitzner, Chemnitz, (1880).

The feature article Hirzel referred to was published in the *Luzerner Neueste Nachrichten* on 22 April 1921:

**“Feuilleton.
Professor Einstein „Triumphzug“
durch Amerika.**

In Nr. 164 vom 9. April brachte die „Vosische Zeitung“ folgende überseeische Depesche: „Prof. Albert Einstein und die gleichzeitig mit ihm eingetroffene zionistische Delegation wurden bei ihrer Ankunft in Neuyork sehr warm begrüßt. Die gesamte Neuyorker Presse widmet dem Ereignis als solchem und der Persönlichkeit Einsteins ausführliche Artikel.“ Man sieht auf den ersten Blick, daß es sich hierbei wieder um eine bestellte Reklame handelt, wie denn überhaupt das ganze Einsteinsche Unternehmen von Anfang an auf den Bluff berechnet war. Diesmal sollten nun die Amerikaner „dran glauben“. Aber die Yankees scheinen weniger naiv zu sein, als die guten Deutschen und Schweizer und sich nicht so leicht zum Glauben an den neuen Propheten kommandieren zu lassen. Sie sind zu skeptisch, um ohne weiteres zu glauben, daß er ein größeres Genie sei, als Kopernikus und Newton, bloß weil er unverständlicher sei als diese. Dazu haben die Amerikaner noch zu viel gesunden Menschenverstand. Sie sind sich der großen Tatsachen bewußt, daß alle großen Mehrheiten auch einfach und leicht verständlich sind, und bringen daher der unverständlichen Relativitätslehre Einsteins ein durchaus gerechtfertigtes Mißtrauen entgegen. Ja, mehr als das: sie lehnen sie als Schwindel ab. So nennt Reuterdahl, der Dekan des St. Thomas College in Minneapolis, Einstein „einen Barnum in der wissenschaftlichen Welt“, der mit seiner mystischen Theorie alle Welt zum Besten halte. Auch soll Reuterdahl Einstein zu einer Disputation aufgefordert haben, zu welcher sich dieser aber wohl ebenso wenig stellen dürfte, wie zu der an der letztjährigen deutschen Naturforscher-Versammlung in Bad Nauheim angekündigten, wo er es vorzog, sich in aller Stille zu

drücken, bevor die zum Worte vorgemerkten Gegner seiner Theorie an die Reihe kamen. Man drückte ihnen dann das Bedauern aus, daß ihnen Herr Einstein nicht habe Rede und Antwort stehen können. Das war natürlich eine abgekartete Sache seines Klüngels. Aehnlich dürfte er sich nun auch gegenüber Reuterdahl verhalten, umso mehr, als ihn dieser des wissenschaftlichen Diebstahls bezichtigt. Reuterdahl behauptet nämlich, Einstein habe die Grundlage seiner Theorie einem Werke entlehnt, welches 1866 unter dem Pseudonym „Inertia“ erschien. Da indessen dieses Werk in Europa kaum bekannt geworden ist, so dürfte Beschuldigung grundlos sein. Aehnliche Beschuldigungen wurden übrigens auch schon von deutschen Gelehrten, wie dem Ingenieur Rudolf Mewes, Prof. E. Gehrke, Paul Weyland u. a. erhoben. Nach ihnen soll sich Einstein aus einer schwer zugänglichen Veröffentlichung vom Jahre 1898 des verstorbenen Oberlehrers Gerber stillschweigend eine Formel angeeignet haben. Wie es sich damit tatsächlich verhält, wird schwer festzustellen sein. Immerhin gibt schon das eigentümliche Gebaren Einsteins und die ungebührliche und auffällige Reklame seines Klüngels genügend Anlaß, seiner Sache nicht ganz zu trauen. Doch scheinen die meisten auf falscher Fährte zu sein, weil sie die Umstände, welche bei der Entstehung der Einsteinschen Lehre herrschten und darauf Einfluß haben konnten, nicht genügend kennen. Und doch können eigentlich nur diese den äußerst verdächtigen Widerspruch erklären, der uns in Einsteins Lehre von Anfang an entgegentritt und darin besteht, daß sie sich einerseits auf eine zwar durchaus richtige, aber von Einstein gar nicht näher begründete, sondern rein hypothetische Annahme abstellt, nämlich auf die Konstanz der Lichtgeschwindigkeit im Vakuum, währenddem andererseits seine weiteren Begründungen dermaßen verworren und widerspruchsvoll sind, daß sie einem ganz andern Geiste entslossen zu sein scheinen. Diese sonderbaren Begründungen und die noch sonderbareren daraus gezogenen Schlüsse wurden von vielen Gelehrten, speziell von Prof. Lenard, einem der frühern Nobelpreisträger für Physik, gerügt. Lenard bemerkte ganz richtig, daß sie dem gesunden Menschenverstand direkt ins Gesicht schlugen. Was dagegen die Annahme von der Konstanz der Lichtgeschwindigkeit betrifft, welche Einstein als feststehendes Bezugsobjekt im uferlosen Ozean seiner Relativitätstheorie annimmt, so scheint es damit eine eigene Bewandnis zu haben. Sie ist schon deshalb verdächtig, weil die Physiker zu jener Zeit die Existenz eines absolut leeren Raumes bestimmt leugneten und als unmöglich hinstellten, sie aber dann mit der Annahme von Einsteins Hypothese ohne weiteres zugaben und ihm diese zudem als eine hervorragende geniale Tat anrechneten. Tatsächlich scheint sie aber eine **B e r a u b u n g** der nur fünf Jahre früher von J. H. Ziegler aufgestellten universellen **L i c h t l e h r e** zu sein. Das würde den Verzicht Einsteins auf ihre nähere Begründung zur Genüge erklären. Es gibt aber auch noch andere Gründe, welche mit größter Wahrscheinlichkeit darauf hindeuten, daß die Lehre Zieglers der verborgene Quell der Einsteinschen Entdeckung war, u. a. den,

daß sie damals besonders in Bern, wo Einstein domiziliert war, stark diskutiert worden war. Zieglers Lehre gründet sich auf den unwiderleglichen Beweis, das die Grundlage der Welt in dem Urgegensatz von der Masse der unbedingt vollen Urlichtatome, dem Urlicht, und von der Masse des unbedingt leeren Raumes gebildet ist, deren gegenseitiges aktiv-passives Durchdringungsverhältnis Ziegler als Urzeit bezeichnet. Ziegler sprach deshalb von einer Dreieinigkeit von Kraft, Raum und Zeit, einer Dreieinigkeit, welche dann auch Herr Einstein, allerdings in verschleierte Form, brachte. Da die klare und einfache Lehre Zieglers, wonach alle Wirkungen der ewigen Wirklichkeit, d. h. alle Naturerscheinungen, lediglich Mischformen des strahlenden Urlichts und des bewegten Leeren sind, den Vertretern der offiziellen Physik sehr unbequem war, weil sie so ziemlich das Gegenteil von den lehrte, was diese bis anhin gelehrt hatten, so suchten sie dieselbe von Anfang an zu unterdrücken und totzuschweigen, und schufen so einen Zustand, der einem schlaun und geschickten Plagiator die günstigste Gelegenheit zur Aneignung ihrer Hauptlehren darboten mußte. Ja, ein solcher konnte dabei sogar des Beifalls und der Unterstützung der Physiker sicher sein, besonders für den Fall, daß er sein Plagiat in einer nur ihrer Zunft verständlichen, dem großen Publikum aber unverständlichen Form vortrug. Dazu eignete sich die Mathematik am besten. Wer in ihrer Sprache schreibt, kann nur vom Mathematiker und Physiker verstanden werden, und diese haben dann volle Freiheit, der Laienwelt davon mitzuteilen, was sie für gut halten. Die gewöhnliche, gebildete Welt ist dann ganz von ihnen abhängig. Der Chemiker und Nichtmathematiker Ziegler aber hatte den „Fehler“ gemacht, allgemein verständlich zu schreiben und dadurch auch die heutige Physik öffentlich bloßzustellen. Darum erschien Einstein den Physikern wie ein Deus ex machina. Er wurde zum Retter aus der Not. Kein Wunder, daß man ihn denn auch sofort auf den Schild erhob und ihm vor allem Volke als dem längst ersehnten Messias, d. h. dem wahren Lichtbringer, huldigte. Sein Ruhm wurde durch die Zeitungen in alle Weltteile ausposaunt. Das Volk mußte überall an ihm glauben und glaubte auch schließlich an ihn, weil es seine Lehre ja doch nicht selbst auf ihren Wahrheitsgehalt prüfen konnte. Es sah und hörte nur, wie der große Einstein in der Hierarchie der Physiker mit unglaublicher Schnelligkeit von Stufe zu Stufe stieg. Dies wirkte überzeugend, und die große internationale Presse, welche sich fast ganz in den Händen der Volksgenossen Einsteins befindet, bestärkt es fortwährend in dieser Ueberzeugung. Von dem Schweizer Ziegler hörte dagegen niemand etwas. Und so stände denn alles schön und herrlich für die Einsteinianer, hätte die Sache ihres Helden eben nicht auch ihre Achillesferse. Ziegler hatte seine Lehre nicht immer so ausführlich ausgedrückt, daß sie jeder bei oberflächlicher Kenntnisnahme sofort richtig verstehen könnte. Dadurch bot sie Anlaß zu allerlei Mißverständnissen. Und so wird es leicht verständlich, woher die vielen Irrtümer der Relativitätslehre herrühren. Wie sollte sie einheitlich und klar sein können, wenn sie nur einem Mixedpickles aus

vielen, mehr oder weniger irrigen Plagiaten gleicht. Daß sie der Zieglerschen Lichtlehre von Jahr zu Jahr ähnlicher wurde, ist auch kein Gegenbeweis dafür, daß man die letztere nicht als den Urquell für die Einsteinsche Weisheit zu betrachten habe, so wenig als der schon seit zwanzig Jahren andauernde Boykott, in den die Einstein-Presse Ziegler getan hat. Davon wissen nun zwar die Herren Amerikaner nichts. Wenn sie Einstein ablehnen, so dürfte es vielmehr nur aus dem Grunde geschehen, daß sie sich darüber ärgern, für dumm genug gehalten zu werden, um die größten wissenschaftlichen Entdeckungen auch für die unverständlichsten zu halten. Die Amerikaner wissen ganz genau, daß das Gegenteil davon der Fall ist. Und schon darum dürfte sich die Geschäftsreise des falschen Propheten im Lande Dollarika wohl kaum zu einem Triumphzuge gestalten. —G—”

Another newspaper article notable for its mention of the Bad Nauheim debate wrote,

“Wie steht’s um Einstein?”

Jüdische Propaganda. — Astronomen in Potsdam. — „Silbersteine“ des Einsteinturms. — Die Verschobene Rot-Linie. — Konzessionierter Aether. — Kneip-Knippe in Nauheim und Amerika. — Schlichte Presse.

Wie es vom alten Odysseus heißt, daß er der vielgewandte und erfindungsreiche war, der vieler Menschen Länder und Städte gesehen hatte, und dessen Name bis zum Himmel reichte, so haben wir gegenwärtig in *E i n s t e i n* einen Mann, von dem die ihm nahestehende Presse das gleiche behauptet, — daß er die größten Größen der Wissenschaft, Kopernikus, Kepler Newton bei weitem überträffe, — deren Werke haben bis in die Gegenwart gedauert, das Gedankenwerk Einsteins aber währe in alle Zeiten!

Merkwürdig, daß man das schon voriges Jahr so genau wußte! Jetzt wäre manch’ einer froh, es nicht geschrieben zu haben. Vorschußlorbeeren sind immer ein Ding mit zwei verschiedenen Seiten. Denn nachdem die Einsteinpresse das Lob ihres Heros gar zu laut gesungen hatte, so daß die Gegner sich der Sache gründlicher annahmen, da wandte sich das Blatt. Eine lange Reihe von Denkern wurden genannt, bis Descartes zurück, die das, was an der Relativitätstheorie richtig ist, schon lange von Einstein gefunden hatten, daß aber die Theorie in der Form, die ihr Einstein gegeben hat, den allerheftigsten Widerspruch herausfordert.

In Einsteins Gegenwart, und ohne daß dieser oder ein anderer der Seinen etwas dagegen sagen konnte, ist auf der *A s t r o n o m e n v e r s a m m l u n g* in Potsdam im August dieses Jahres gezeigt worden, daß weder die Beobachtungen der Sterne bei totalen Sonnenfinsternissen, noch die Bewegungen des Planeten Merkur irgendwie eine Beweiskraft für die Relativitätstheorie haben. Die beobachteten Größen finden ihre befriedigende Erklärung auf andere einfache Weise.

Aber hoch ragt jetzt in Potsdam der Einsteinturm, dessen Baugerüst gerade am Tage des Besuches der Astronomenversammlung abgenommen wurde, damit die Fachmänner ihn besuchen konnten. Wie am Vormittag in einem Vortrage gesagt wurde, soll damit eine Messungsreihe gemacht werden, die die Theorie unmittelbar bestätigen würde. Der Turm dient also den Theorien von Einstein, beobachten wird daran Freun d l i c h, erbaut hat den Turm der Architekt M e n d e l s o h n, und das Geld soll, wie erzählt wurde, stammen von der Firma S i l b e r s t e i n. So ist es denn auch ein Bauwerk geworden, was den andern einheitlich gestalteten Bauwerken des astrophysikalischen Observatoriums gegenüber sich verhält, wie der Geist Einsteins zum Geiste von Vogel und Lohse, Müller, Kempf und den andern Astronomen, die die Anstalt berühmt gemacht haben. Es sieht aus wie der Vorderteil eines Kriegsschiffes, von der Seite gesehen. Einer nannte es Bismarckturm, da Freun d l i c h gesagt hatte, seine Formgebung entspräche modernen Anschauungen, ein anderer den Tempel Salomonis, denn wir fanden, daß der unterirdische Raum sieben Vorhöfe hatte!

Aber es ist nur gut, daß die Einrichtung vielseitig gebraucht werden kann, denn es ist un z w e i f e l h a f t n a c h g e w i e s e n, daß der gewünscht Betrag einer Verschiebung der Spektrallinien nach Rot nicht vorhanden. — Sehr peinlich! Denn Einstein sagt, daß mit dieser Verschiebung seine Theorie stehe und falle.

Die ganze Theorie gleicht überhaupt einem Proteus, sie nimmt dauernd neue Formen an: zuerst die spezielle, dann die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie; gegenwärtig hat sie wieder eine neue Gestalt. So ist sie unfaßbar, unverständlich, weil sie nach G e h r c k e unverstehbar ist! Eine M a s s e n s u g g e s t i o n!

Bekannt ist die L e u g n u n g des Aethers. Jetzt hat ihn Einstein unter anderer Form wieder in der Theorie drin. Und L e n a r d sagt, daß bei einer vernünftigen Aethertheorie überhaupt gar kein Raum mehr für die Relativitätstheorie in der Physik bleibe; sie habe gewissermaßen von den Lücken in unserer Erkenntnis gelebt. Daher auch das Verhalten Einsteins den Gegnern gegenüber in der Oeffentlichkeit. Man erinnere sich an N a u h e i m voriges Jahr, wo er versprochen hatte, in öffentlicher Diskussion Rede und Antwort zu stehen. Als es so weit war, erschien er nicht, und die Geschäftsordnung machte die Gegner mundtot. In A m e r i k a hat er es ebenso gemacht; der als Mathematiker, Physiker und Philosoph bekannte Prof. R e u t e r d a h l von St. Thomas College hat Einstein bei seiner Amerikafahrt aufgefordert, eine Erörterung öffentlich stattfinden zu lassen. Der Erfolg war der gleiche wie in Nauheim, er paßte nicht in das Reiseprogramm. Dadurch ist die amerikanische Presse sehr ernüchtert worden. Als Einstein drüben ankam, waren gegen 150 000 Menschen am Schiff, darunter zahllose Photographen, b e i d e r A b r e i s e e i n h a l b e s D u t z e n d! Es trat eben gar zu kraß hervor, daß die ganze Fahrt eine Verherrlichung das jüdischen Geistes sein sollte. Die Ankunft

gleichzeitig mit den Vertretern der Zionisten, der Kreis von jüdischen Lokalkomitees, der den Gefeierten umschloß, die Kritik amerikanischer Zustände durch Einstein nach seiner Rückreise haben bewirkt, daß die dortige Presse mit einer Deutlichkeit sich über den erst Gefeierten ausdrückt, die uns erstaunlich vorkommt. Hält man sich dies vor Augen, dazu die Einblicke in seine Gedankenwelt, wie sie Moszkowski gibt, politisch und wissenschaftlich, dazu die Tatsache, daß er mit der Sowjetregierung Beziehungen hat und gleichzeitig Mitglied der preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaft ist, so sagt man mit dem echten Berliner: Das ist wirklich allerhand! R.”

Ernst Gehrcke wrote in 1924,

“Auf dem Deutschen Naturforschertag in Nauheim, wo Tausende aus allen Teilen Deutschlands und viele ausländische Besucher zusammenströmten, wurde von den Anhängern der Relativitätstheorie eine „Diskussion über die Relativitätstheorie“ in die Wege geleitet. Am 20. September stellte der Vorsitzende der *Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte* in seiner Einführungsrede diese mit neugieriger Spannung erwartete Relativitätsdiskussion in Aussicht, wobei er gleich seine Meinung dahin äußerte, daß die Physik «die größten Veränderungen ihrer wissenschaftlichen Grundlage» erlitten habe, indem «der Begriff des Äthers im Weltall verschwindet und durch die Relativitätstheorie Einsteins die Begriffe von Raum und Zeit wandelbar wurden.» (Bericht der *Frankfurter Zeitung* vom 20. September 1920). Diese Aussprache begann am 23. September. Sie wurde von EINSTEIN eröffnet, der zu drei vorher gehaltenen Vorträgen anderer Redner (WEYL, GREBE, v. LAUE) Stellung nahm: «EINSTEIN lehnte die WEYLsche Theorie» (eine von der Einsteinschen verschiedene, formale Relativitätstheorie) «ab, wogegen dieser von EINSTEIN den Beweis für seine Theorie aus den Naturgesetzen verlangte» (Bericht des *Berliner Lokal-Anzeigers* vom 24. September 1920). Besonderen Eindruck machte der öffentliche Meinungs-austausch zwischen EINSTEIN und dem berühmten Heidelberger Physiker LENARD. «LENARD . . . wandte sich gegen die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie, nach welcher jede Art von Bewegung für uns unerkennbar sein soll, und wir nicht entscheiden können, ob wir uns zum Beispiel in drehender Bewegung befinden oder die gesamte Umwelt sich gegen uns drehe» (aus dem Bericht der *Frankfurter Zeitung* vom 24. September 1920). Eine Einigung zwischen LENARD und EINSTEIN wurde nicht erzielt, und nachdem noch andere Redner für (z. B. Prof. BORN) und wider (Prof. PALAGYI-Budapest) die Relativitätstheorie gesprochen hatten, wurde die weitere Erörterung vertagt, da, wie der Vorsitzende der Sitzung, der berühmte Physiker PLANCK aus Berlin, bemerkte, «die Relativitätstheorie es leider bisher noch nicht fertig gebracht habe, die für die Sitzung verfügbare absolute Zeit von neun bis ein Uhr zu verlängern» (*Kölnische Zeitung* vom 30. September 1920).—Die vertagte Diskussion

wurde dann ohne EINSTEIN beendet, der eine Viertelstunde vor Beginn der Nachmittagsitzung abgereist war. Ein mit großen Erwartungen ins Werk gesetztes Ereignis war vorübergegangen, das Pendel der relativistischen Massenbewegung hatte geschwankt und eine Dämpfung erfahren, ohne aber schon zur Ruhe zu kommen.”⁵⁰⁶

Philipp Lenard was surprised by Albert Einstein’s poor performance. Lenard was hoping for a stimulating debate that might challenge his beliefs. Einstein was instead evasive and ill-prepared, then ran away. When Einstein hid from Prof. Arvid Reuterdahl’s challenge to debate the following year, many likened it to his flight from Bad Nauheim—this after all the hype assuring the public that Einstein would humiliate the opponents of relativity theory. Lenard wrote after the debate,

“Auch sonst war ich schließlich erstaunt, wie wenig Herr Einstein auf die Beantwortung meiner Fragen vorbereitet zu sein schien — die doch schon zwei Jahre lang mit seiner Kenntnis gedruckt vorgelegen haben, — während von seiner Seite und auch von einem andern Fachmann Zeitungslesern gegenüber ganz ausdrücklich der Anschein der unbedingten Überlegenheit meinen Gedankengängen gegenüber erweckt worden war. Da ich weder Anhänger noch Gegner irgendeines Prinzips bin, sondern nur Naturforscher sein möchte — wie auf S. 12 schon zu erkennen gegeben, — hätte ich den Nachweis, daß und an welcher Stelle meine Überlegungen nicht genügend gründlich waren, als Gewinn entgegennehmen müssen, wenn er geführt worden wäre (vgl. auch Note k, S. 23), zumal in der rein auf die Sache gerichteten Form, in welcher die Nauheimer Aussprache ablief. Die einzige Aufklärung, welche ich von der Diskussion mitgenommen habe, stammt von seiten des Herrn Mie; sie wird im weiter Folgenden bezeichnet werden.”⁵⁰⁷

Einstein lost all credibility at the debate and knew that the scientific community was against him. He undoubtedly wanted only to flee Germany and retreat from the public eye. As happened after Einstein’s public humiliation at the Berlin Philharmonic, the Einstein sycophants and the ethnically biased pro-Einstein Jewish press came to his rescue after his public humiliation at Bad Nauheim and carried him through this time of criticism as he traveled the world promoting himself, relativity theory and Zionism, until his second rush of fame, which came with the announcement of the award of his Nobel Prize in late 1922. Many found the award scandalous, given that Einstein was a proven sophist and plagiarist.

Lorentz, Born, von Laue and the others were loyal to Einstein. The acceptance of their fatally flawed theories hinged on the cult of personality which was created for Einstein. If Lorentz exposed Einstein, Lorentz’ beliefs and legacy would suffer. The relativists were, and are, so pernicious in their suppression of opposing views, because they were, and are, so insecure and politically motivated. They were, and are, so vicious in their defense of Einstein, because their mythologies are so easily defeated. The theory attacks gullible persons who are willing to accept irrational

arguments and who act out of hero worship. Therefore, it is not surprising that these same individuals behave in an unscrupulous and adolescent manner when confronted with the facts.

Knowing they had lost at the debate, Einstein and his friends sought a rapprochement with Lenard which would dull the sting of Einstein's humiliation at Nauheim. Tragically, Lenard and Stark, (Nobel Prize laureates each) who were initially very helpful to Einstein in the early years of the special theory of relativity, after witnessing the corruption in the press and in the German Physical Society, after witnessing the Zionist betrayal of Germany, succumbed to the racial mythologies of the National Socialists and became outspoken advocates of Nazism, and in so doing were yet again the victims of Zionist Jews, though they did not realize it. Einstein's actions played no small rôle in elevating Adolf Hitler to power, in that the Nazis exploited Einstein as an example to stereotype millions of innocent people. The Nazis also exploited Einsteinian racist Zionist mythology to promote their own racial myths, which they imposed on the German People at the behest of Jewish Zionists who wanted assimilating Jews segregated from the allegedly inferior "Goyim".⁵⁰⁸

This was, and is, a common practice among Zionists and anti-Semites. They promote one another's common racism. This compounds the problem by creating an incentive for non-racists to forgive the intolerable behavior of characters like Einstein and to refuse to speak out against it for fear of having that behavior generalized in a sense unfavorable to them. An article in the *Patriot* of 18 July 1929, stated,

"When Ambassador Page was editor of the *Atlantic Monthly* he gave the following advice to a young journalist: *'The most interesting fellow in America is the Jew: but don't write about Jews: without intending it, you may precipitate the calamity America should be most anxious to avoid—I mean Jew-baiting.'* Incidentally we may mention that an English book which happened to contain that quotation was suppressed, soon after birth, by a very obvious withdrawal of the usual advertising nourishment."⁵⁰⁹

The young journalist was Rollin Lynde Hartt.⁵¹⁰ This censorship further results in a group dynamic whereby one member of the group who speaks out against another is chastised for "betraying" the group which will allegedly be unfairly stereotyped by the exposure of the behavior of an individual like Albert Einstein. Of course, it is human nature to think in symbols and to generalize, especially when viciously and unfairly attacked and threatened, as were the anti-Relativists Lenard and Stark.

4.4.8.2 Contemporary Accounts of the Bad Nauheim Debate

As many have recognized,⁵¹¹ Max Born and others gave a very unrealistic portrayal of the events which took place in Germany in the 1920's and 1930's, vilifying Lenard, Gehrcke and Weyland with falsehoods; which accounts, while dramatic and shocking, simply do not agree with the facts. It is probably best to reproduce

contemporary accounts from the period in order to obtain a realistic picture of what occurred at Nauheim.

The *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 21, (1920), pp. 666-668 gave a partial account of the debate between Lenard and Einstein:

“Allgemeine Diskussion über Relativitätstheorie.

Lenard: Ich habe mich gefreut, heute in einer Gravitationstheorie vom Äther sprechen gehört zu haben. Ich muß aber sagen, daß, sobald man von der Gravitationstheorie auf andere als massenproportionale Kräfte übergeht, sich der einfache Verstand eines Naturforschers an der Theorie stößt. Ich verweise auf das Beispiel vom gebremsten Eisenbahnzug. Damit das Relativitätsprinzip gilt, werden bei Benutzung nicht massenproportionaler Kräfte die Gravitationsfelder hinzugedacht. Ich möchte sagen, daß man sich im physikalischen Denken zweier Bilder bedienen kann, die ich als Bilder erster und zweiter Art bezeichnet habe. In den Bildern erster Art sprach z. B. Herr Weyl, indem er alle Vorgänge durch Gleichungen ausdrückt. Die Bilder zweiter Art deuten die Gleichungen als Vorgänge im Raume. Ich möchte lieber die Bilder zweiter Art bevorzugen, während Herr Einstein bei der ersten Art stehen bleibt. Bei den Bildern zweiter Art ist der Äther unentbehrlich. Er war stets eines der wichtigsten Hilfsmittel beim Fortschritt in der Naturforschung, und seine Abschaffung bedeutet das Abschaffen des Denkens aller Naturforscher mittels des Bildes zweiter Art. Ich möchte zuerst die Frage stellen: Wie kommt es, daß es nach der Relativitätstheorie nicht unterscheidbar sein soll, ob im Falle des gebremsten Eisenbahnzuges der Zug gebremst oder die umgebende Welt gebremst wird?

Einstein: Es ist sicher, daß wir relativ zum Zug Wirkungen beobachten und wenn wir wollen, diese als Trägheitswirkungen deuten können. Die Relativitätstheorie kann sie ebensogut als Wirkungen eines Gravitationsfeldes deuten. Woher kommt nun das Feld? Sie meinen, daß es die Erfindung des Herrn Relativitätstheoretikers ist. Es ist aber keine freie Erfindung, weil es dieselben Differentialgesetze erfüllt wie diejenigen Felder, die wir als Wirkungen von Massen aufzufassen gewohnt sind. Es ist richtig, daß etwas von der Lösung willkürlich bleibt, wenn man einen begrenzten Teil der Welt ins Auge faßt. Das relativ zum gebremsten Zug herrschende Gravitationsfeld entspricht einer Induktionswirkung, die durch die entfernten Massen hervorgerufen wird. Ich möchte also kurz zusammenfassend sagen: Das Feld ist nicht willkürlich erfunden, weil es die allgemeinen Differentialgleichungen erfüllt und weil es zurückgeführt werden kann auf die Wirkung aller fernen Massen.

Lenard: Herrn Einsteins Ausführungen haben mir nichts Neues gesagt; sie sind auch nicht über die Kluft von den Bildern erster Art zu den anschaulichen Bildern zweiter Art hinweggekommen. Ich meine, die hinzugedachten Gravitationsfelder müssen Vorgängen entsprechen und diese Vorgänge haben sich in der Erfahrung nicht gemeldet.

E i n s t e i n : Ich möchte sagen, daß das, was der Mensch als anschaulich ansieht, und was nicht, gewechselt hat. Die Ansicht über Anschaulichkeit ist gewissermaßen eine Funktion der Zeit. Ich meine, die Physik ist begrifflich und nicht anschaulich. Als Beispiel über die wechselnde Ansicht über Anschaulichkeit erinnere ich Sie an die Auffassung über die Anschaulichkeit der galileischen Mechanik zu den verschiedenen Zeiten.

L e n a r d : Ich habe meine Meinung in der Druckschrift „Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation“ zum Ausdruck gebracht, daß der Äther in gewissen Beziehungen versagt hat, weil man ihn noch nicht in der rechten Weise behandelt hat. Das Relativitätsprinzip arbeitet mit einem nichteuklidischen Raum, der von Stelle zu Stelle und zeitlich nacheinander verschiedene Eigenschaften annimmt; dann kann nun eben in dem Raum ein Etwas sein, dessen Zustände diese verschiedenen Eigenschaften bedingen, und dieses Etwas ist eben der Äther. Ich sehe die Nützlichkeit des Relativitätsprinzips ein, solange es nur auf Gravitationskräfte angewandt wird. Für nicht massenproportionale Kräfte halte ich es für ungültig.

E i n s t e i n : Es liegt in der Natur der Sache, daß von einer Gültigkeit des Relativitätsprinzips nur dann gesprochen werden kann, wenn es bezüglich aller Naturgesetze gilt.

L e n a r d : Nur wenn man geeignete Felder hinzudichtet. Ich meine, das Relativitätsprinzip kann auch nur über Gravitation neue Aussagen machen, weil die im Falle der nichtmassenproportionalen Kräfte hinzugenommenen Gravitationsfelder gar keinen neuen Gesichtspunkt hinzufügen, als nur eben den, das Prinzip gültig erscheinen zu lassen. Auch macht die Gleichwertigkeit aller Bezugssysteme dem Prinzip Schwierigkeiten.

E i n s t e i n : Es gibt kein durch seine Einfachheit prinzipiell bevorzugtes Koordinatensystem; deshalb gibt es auch keine Methode, um zwischen „wirklichen“ und „nichtwirklichen“ Gravitationsfeldern zu unterscheiden. Meine zweite Frage lautet: Was sagt das Relativitätsprinzip zu dem unerlaubten Gedankenexperiment, welches darin besteht, daß man z. B. die Erde ruhen und die übrige Welt um die Erdachse sich drehen läßt, wobei Überlichtgeschwindigkeiten aufheben?

Der erste Satz ist keine Behauptung, sondern eine neuartige Definition für den Begriff „Äther“.

Ein Gedankenexperiment ist ein prinzipiell, wenn auch nicht faktisch ausführbares Experiment. Es dient dazu, wirkliche Erfahrungen übersichtlich zusammenzufassen, um aus ihnen theoretische Folgerungen zu ziehen. Unerlaubt ist ein Gedankenexperiment nur dann, wenn eine Realisierung prinzipiell unmöglich ist.

L e n a r d : Ich glaube zusammenzufassen zu können: 1. Daß man doch besser unterläßt, die „Abschaffung des Äthers“ zu verkünden. 2. Daß ich die Einschränkung des Relativitätsprinzips zu einem Gravitationsprinzip immer noch für angezeigt halte, und 3., daß die Überlichtgeschwindigkeiten dem Relativitätsprinzip doch eine Schwierigkeit zu bereiten scheinen; denn sie heben bei der Relation jedes beliebigen Körpers auf, sobald man dieselbe

nicht diesem, sondern der Gesamtwelt zuschreiben will, was aber das Relativitätsprinzip in seiner einfachsten und bisherigen Form als gleichwertig zuläßt.

R u d o l p h : Daß sich die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie glänzend bewährt hat, ist kein Beweis gegen den Äther. Die E i n s t e i n sche Theorie ist richtig, nur ihre Ansicht über den Äther ist nicht richtig. Auch wird sie erst annehmbar mit der W e y l schen Ergänzung, geht dann aber sogar aus der Ätherhypothese hervor, wenn zwischen den beim Fließen verschobenen Ätherwänden L ü c k e n bleiben, die durch Schleuderkraft infolge Richtungsänderung der Sternfäden l e e r gehalten werden.

P a l a g y i : Die Diskussion zwischen E i n s t e i n und L e n a r d hat auf mich einen tiefen Eindruck gemacht. Man begegnet hier wieder den alten historischen Gegensätzen zwischen experimentaler und mathematischer Physik, wie sie schon z. B. zwischen F a r a d a y und M a x w e l l bestanden. Herr E i n s t e i n sagt, daß es kein ausgezeichnetes Koordinatensystem gibt. Es gibt eins. Lassen Sie mich biologisch denken. Dann trägt jeder Mensch sein Koordinatensystem in sich. In der Verfolgung dieses Gedankens ist eine Widerlegung der Relativitätstheorie enthalten.

E i n s t e i n weist darauf hin, daß kein Gegensatz zwischen Theorie und Experiment besteht.

B o r n : Die Relativitätstheorie bevorzugt sogar die Bilder zweiter Art. Ich betrachte als Beispiel die Erde und die Sonne. Wäre die Anziehung nicht, liefe die Erde geradlinig davon usw.

M i e : Daß die Ansicht, der Äther sei der greifbaren Materie wesensgleich, erst durch die Relativitätstheorie als unmöglich erkannt sein solle, habe ich nie verstehen können. Das war doch schon lange vorher durch L o r e n t z in seinem Buch „Elektrische und optische Erscheinungen in bewegten Körpern“ geschehen. Auch A b r a h a m hat in seinem Lehrbuch schon damals, als er der Relativitätstheorie noch ablehnend gegenüberstand, gesagt: „Der Äther ist der leere Raum.“

Ich bin der Ansicht, daß man auch bei Annahme der E i n s t e i n schen Gravitationstheorie doch ganz scharf unterscheiden muß zwischen den bloß fingierten Gravitationsfeldern, die man nur durch die Wahl des Koordinatensystems in das Weltbild hineinbringt, und den wirklichen Gravitationsfeldern, die durch den objektiven Tatbestand gegeben sind. Ich habe kürzlich einen Weg gezeigt, wie man zu einem „bevorzugten“ Koordinatensystem kommen kann, in welchem von vornherein alle bloß fingierten Felder ausgeschlossen sind.

E i n s t e i n : Ich kann nicht einsehen, wieso es ein bevorzugtes Koordinatensystem geben soll. Höchstens könnte man daran denken, solche Koordinatensysteme zu bevorzugen, in bezug auf welche der M i n k o w s k i sche Ausdruck für ds^2 a n n ä h e r n d gilt. Aber abgesehen davon, daß es für große Räume solche Systeme gar nicht geben dürfte, sind diese Koordinatensysteme sicherlich nicht exakt, sondern nur approximater definierbar.

K r a u s weist auf eine erkenntnistheoretische Differenz zwischen den Bildern erster und zweiter Art hin, indem er die Bilder erster Art für höherwertig als die Bilder zweiter Art hält.

L e n a r d: Es ist soeben das Schwerpunktsprinzip hineingebracht worden; ich glaube jedoch, daß das auf prinzipielle Fragen keinen Einfluß haben kann.”

The *Berliner Tageblatt* published a report on 24 September 1920, which fills in some of the gaps in the incomplete account presented in the *Physikalische Zeitschrift*,

“Die Einstein-Debatte auf dem Naturforschertag.

Vier physikalisch-mathematische Vorträge. — Ein
Redeuell Einstein-Lenard.

(Telegramm unseres Sonderkorrespondenten.)

G. G. Bad Nauheim, 23. September.

Vorläufiger Bericht. Heute vormittag fand vor dichtgefülltem Saale unter dem Vorsitz des Geheimrats Planck und in Gegenwart sämtlicher großen Physiker und auch der Berliner Einstein-Gegner die *E i n s t e i n - S i t z u n g* der mathematischen und physikalischen Abteilung des Naturforschertages statt. Die Vorträge behandelten zumeist den Gegenstand in streng mathematischer Weise. Es sprachen hintereinander: **Weyl** (Zürich), **Mie** (Halle), **Laue** (Berlin), **Grebe** (Bonn). Dieser berichtete über Vergleichsmessungen der Sonnenspektren und irdischer Spektre, die sich auf die dritte experimentelle Bestätigung der Relativitätstheorie beziehen. Bei der Diskussion, in welcher u. a. Laue und Mie eingriffen, entspann sich **ein lebhaftes Redeuell zwischen Einstein und Lenard**. Dieser warf ein, daß die Einsteinsche Theorie der Anschaulichkeit für den gesunden Menschenverstand entbehre. Seine *E i n z e l a r g u m e n t e*, die Einstein die willkürliche Annahme irrealer Gravitationsfeldes vorwarfen und Widerspruch der Theorie in sich über die Lichtgeschwindigkeit behaupteten, widerlegte Einstein. Die spannende Diskussion zog sich durch mehrere Stunden hin. (Siehe auch Seite 4.)

[***]

Ein neuer Beweis für die Einstein-Theorie. Das Redeuell Einstein-Lenard.

Die Rotverschiebung im Sonnenspektrum.

(Telegramm unseres Sonderberichterstatters.)

G. S. Bad Nauheim, 23. September.

Wie wir schon gemeldet haben, spielte sich heute unter ungeheuerem

Interesse die mit Spannung erwartete große **Einstein-Debatte** des Naturforscherkongresses ab. Der Saal des Badehauses war bis auf die letzte Ecke gefüllt.

Alle unsere großen Physiker, auch die Physikochemiker und eine Menge Interessierter aus anderen Wissensgebieten hatten sich eingefunden. Der scharfe Mathematikerkopf **Planck** s blickt vom Vorstandstisch her. Ihm gegenüber sitzt in der vordersten Reihe der, um dessen Werk es geht, **Einstein**. Was die Physiker in Erwartung und zur abwehr des kolossalen Ansturms angekündigt hatten, bewahrheitete sich: „Die Sitzung wird die Theorie in rein wissenschaftlicher, **streng mathematischer Form** behandeln.“ Die Einzelheiten der Darlegungen und der vorgebrachten Beweisführung entziehen sich denn auch der summarischen Wiedergabe in eiliger Berichterstattung. Als erster spricht **Weyl** (Zürich) über seine Theorie von „Elektrizität und Gravitation“, dann Professor **Mie** (Halle) über „das elektrische Feld eines um ein Gravitationszentrum rotierenden geladenen Partikelchens“, endlich **v. Laue** (Berlin) über „neue Versuche zur Optik bewegter Körper“. Es hagelt jetzt Differentiale, Koordinateninvarianz, elementare Wirkungsquanten, Transformationen, Vectorialsysteme usw. Gespannt lauschen die Fachleute, **Einstein** seelenruhig, **Rubens** mit seinem bezeichnenden Kopfnicken, **Nernst** erhobenen Hauptes, **Frank** interessiert lächelnd, **Haber** in bequemer Stellung die Decke betrachtend. Dem Laien aber graut es. Einzelne verlassen den Saal, die meisten aber harren in der Schwüle tapfer der Dinge, die da kommen sollen. Und sie werden nicht betrogen.

Professor **Grebe** aus Bonn ergreift jetzt das Wort. Und was er berichtet, ist des Aufhorchens wert: „Einsteins Theorie hat ihre vorläufige **Bestätigung** erfahren durch die gelungene Berechnung der Merkurbahn und der Lichtablenkung im Gravitationsfeld der Sonne. Es fehlte noch **der Nachweis der von Einstein geforderten Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien der Sonne**. Dazu muß das Absorptionsspektrum der Sonne mit einem irdischen Emissionsspektrum verglichen werden. Mannigfache Einflüsse machen die Messungen schwierig. Wir fanden aber schließlich im **Bandenspektrum des Stickstoffes**, dem früher so genannten Cyanspektrum, ein gut verwertbares Spektrum. Unser **Vergleichsspektrum** wurde im Kohlenlichtbogen erzeugt. An jeder einzelnen Linie wurden zwanzig bis vierundzwanzig Messungen gemacht.“ Es folgt ein **Projektionsbild**, das in mehreren Linienpaaren die Abweichungen zwischen Sonnen- und irdischen Spektrallinien, zugleich aber auch die Schwierigkeiten der Beobachtung und die vielfachen gegenseitigen Störungen der Linien zeigt. Redner fährt fort: „Der von uns gefundene Unterschied in der Lage der Linien stimmt gut überein mit dem anderer, amerikanischer Beobachtungen. Jedoch war die Verschiebung bei den einzelnen Linien verschieden. Berücksichtigt man aber die gegenseitigen Beeinflussungen, so kommt man zu einem Wert von etwa 0,66, der mit dem Einsteinschen Wert für die Verschiebung von 0,62 bis 0,68 übereinstimmt.“

Zweifellos müssen auch noch weitere Experimente gemacht werden. Aber wir haben jetzt schon guten Grund zu der Annahme, daß die von der Einsteinschen Theorie verlangte Rotverschiebung wirklich vorhanden ist.“

Nun eröffnet Planck die *D i s k u s s i o n*. Einstein ist der erste Redner. Unwillkürlich tritt feierliche stille ein. Einstein bespricht die Weylsche Theorie. Weyl, Mie, Laue sprechen weiterhin. Es handelt sich zuerst um die vorhin gehaltenen Vorträge. Dann kommt die Generaldiskussion über die Relativitätstheorie überhaupt. Sie ist ein Zwiegespräch zwischen Geheimrat **Lenard** (Heidelberg) und Einstein, der sein eigener Anwalt ist. Jetzt kann auch der nicht auf den Höhen der Wissenschaft Thronende wieder leidlich folgen. Es kommt Leben in die Menge. Die zerstreuten Blicke konzentrieren sich jetzt auf die beiden Gegner. Es ist wie ein Turnier. Lenard läßt nicht locker, aber Einstein pariert vorzüglich. Hinter mir steht *W e y l a n d*, der Berliner Einstein-Töter. Auf dem Boden dieser *w i s s e n s c h a f t l i c h e n* Versammlung hält er sich im Hintergrunde der Ereignisse und gibt sein Interesse nur durch nervöses Schütteln der Mähne und leise Beifallsrufe bei **Lenards** Worten zu erkennen. Dieser sagt: „Ich bewege mich nicht in Formeln, sondern in den tatsächlichen Vorgängen im Raume. Daß ist die Kluft zwischen Einstein und mir. Gegen seine *s p e z i e l l e* Relativitätstheorie habe ich gar nicht. Aber seine Gravitationslehre? Wenn ein fahrender Zug brennt, so tritt doch die Wirkung tatsächlich nur im Zuge auf, nicht draußen, wo alle Kirchtürme stehen bleiben!“

Einstein: „Die Erscheinungen im Zuge sind die Wirkungen eines *G r a v i t a t i o n s f e l d e s*, das induziert ist durch die Gesamtheit der näheren und ferneren Massen.

Lenard: „Ein solches Gravitationsfeld müßte doch auch anderweitig noch Vorgänge hervorrufen, wenn ich mir sein Vorhandensein *a n s c h a u l i c h* machen will!“

Einstein: „Was der Mensch als *a n s c h a u l i c h* betrachtet, ist großen Aenderungen unterworfen, ist eine Funktion der Zeit. Ein Zeitgenosse Galileis hätte dessen Mechanik auch für sehr unanschaulich erklärt. Diese „anschaulichen“ Vorstellungen haben ihre Lücken, genau wie der viel zitierte „gesunde Menschenverstand“. (Heiterkeit.)

Lenard: „Diese Diskussion wird unfruchtbar. Eine andere Frage: Wenn die Erde rotiert, so sagt Einstein, man könne genau so gut sagen, die Erde ruhe, und alle Materie rotiere um sie. Dann kommt man aber für die fernsten Gestirne zu Geschwindigkeiten, die *w e i t ü b e r* Lichtgeschwindigkeit liegen. Diese soll nach der Theorie aber eine Grenzgeschwindigkeit sein. Das ist ein *W i d e r s p r u c h i n s i c h*.“

Einstein: Nein, die Lichtgeschwindigkeit ist Grenzgeschwindigkeit nur für die geradlinig gleichförmigen Bewegungen der speziellen Relativität; bei beliebig bewegten Systemen können beliebige Geschwindigkeiten des Lichts auftreten.“

Es griffen dann noch verschiedene Herren in die Debatte ein, der Wert und Sinn von Gedankenexperimenten, die „Kluft“ zwischen mathematischen

und praktischen Physikern, philosophische und erkenntnistheoretische Fragen werden gestreift. Da aber, wie Professor Planck humorvoll bemerkt, die Versammlung nicht beschließen kann, daß die absolute Zeit von 9-1 länger als vier Stunden dauert, so muß man sich schließlich trennen.”

Vossische Zeitung reported on 24 September 1920,

“Der Kampf um Einstein. Die Auseinandersetzung auf dem Naturforschertag.

Dr. **B. Bad Nauheim**, 23. September.

Die Einzelheiten der Relativitätstheorie führen in schwierige Gebiete, die nur mit der Kenntnis der höheren Mathematik zu bewältigen sind. Man sollte daher glauben, einer Diskussion über ihre Grundlagen würden andere, als Fachphysiker und Mathematiker, kein besonderes Interesse entgegenbringen. Aber durch die bekannten Vorgänge in Berlin, wo man die Leistungen Einsteins in öffentlichen Versammlungen angreift und sich auch zu persönlichen Beschimpfungen des Gelehrten versteigt, ist die allgemeine Aufmerksamkeit noch mehr, als durch die Erfolge der Theorie bei der jüngsten Sonnenfinsternis, auf sie gelenkt worden.

Kein Wunder, daß auch auf der Naturforscherversammlung die Sitzung der Physikalischen und Mathematischen Abteilung, in der über Dinge, die mit der Relativitätstheorie zusammenhängen, gesprochen werden sollte, das größte Interesse erregte. Um zu verhindern, daß die Physiker und Mathematiker selbst von einem Publikum verdrängt würden, dessen Sensationsluft bei dieser wissenschaftlichen Behandlung sicher nicht befriedigt werden konnte, wurden zunächst nur Mitglieder der Physikalischen und Mathematischen Gesellschaft als Hörer zugelassen und dann erst der Eingang für weitere Besucher geöffnet. Schnell war der große Raum völlig gefüllt, der zusammen mit der Galerie wohl 500 bis 600 Personen faßte.

In nüchtern fachlicher Weise, seine Ausführungen reichlich mit mathematischen Formeln erläuternd, trug nun Weyl-Zürich seine Erweiterung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie vor, durch die er neben der Gravitation auch die elektrischen Erscheinungen umfassen will. Es folgte Mie-Greifswald, der das allgemeine Relativitätsprinzip lieber durch ein Prinzip der Relativität der Gravitation ersetzen will. Dann leitet Laue-Berlin rechnerisch aus den Grundlagen der Theorie die bekannte Folgerung ab, daß ein Lichtstrahl in einem Gravitationsfeld sich krümmen müsse, also z. B. beim Vorbeipassieren an der Sonne, und daß die Spektrallinien in einem solchen Gravitationsfeld sich noch dem roten Ende des Spektrums verschieben müßten. Schließlich berichtete Grebe-Bonn über seine gemeinsam mit Herrn Bachem angestellten Versuche, diese Rotverschiebung

der Spektrallinien als wirklich zu erweisen.

Nachdem einige Einzelheiten dieser Vorträge noch besprochen waren, wurde die allgemeine Erörterung über die Relativitätstheorie eröffnet. In ihrer Art erinnerte sie an die Wettkämpfe mittelalterlicher Gelehrter, denn in ihrem Hauptteil gestaltete sie sich zu einer Zwiesprache zwischen dem bedeutenden Experimentalphysiker L e n a r d-Heidelberg und E i n s t e i n. Sie konnte, wie vorauszusehen war, zu keinem Ergebnis führen. Lenard stellte zum Schluß fest, daß weder er überzeugt sei, noch wohl auch seinen Gegner überzeugt habe. Es handle sich um den Gegensatz zwischen experimentellen und mathematischen Physikern, der nicht zu überbrücken sei, wenn der mathematische Physiker nicht von den Bildern erster Art, nach Lenards Ausdruck, in denen er zu denken gewohnt sei, zu den Bildern zweiter Art übergehe, den anschaulichen Bildern, in denen der Experimentalphysiker denke.

Von anderen Rednern wurde das Vorhandensein eines solchen Gegensatzes lebhaft bestritten; der mathematische Physiker fasse vielmehr die Erscheinungen, die der Experimentalphysiker erforsche, unter einheitlichen Gesichtspunkten zusammen. M i e hob lebhaft hervor, daß Einstein keineswegs nur als Mathematiker zu betrachten sei, sondern durchaus als Physiker, der seine bedeutende mathematische Geschicklichkeit mit großem physikalischen Blick verbinde.

E i n s t e i n selbst bemerkte, die Meinung, was anschaulich oder was nicht anschaulich sei, habe sich im Wechsel der Zeit sehr beträchtlich gewandelt, sie sei im wahrsten Sinne selbst eine Funktion der Zeit. Die Physik sei eben ihrem Wesen nach b e g r e i f l i c h und nicht anschaulich. Den Zeitgenossen Galileis war dessen Mechanik gewiß recht wenig anschaulich, heute aber, und zwar schon lange vor Begründung der Relativitätstheorie betrachtet man die elektrischen Felder als die elementarsten Gebilde, mit denen man arbeitet. Es gibt sogar Elektriker, die sich mechanische Vorgänge erst mit Hilfe der elektrischen Felder anschaulich machen können. L e n a r d führte das Beispiel des plötzlich gebremsten Eisenbahnzuges an, in dem der darin Sitzende eine gewaltige Erschütterung erleide; es würde jedem gesunden Menschenverstand widersprechen, wenn man annehmen wollte, nicht der Mensch sei in Bewegung gewesen, sondern die gesamte Umwelt.

E i n s t e i n warnte vor dem Operieren mit dem „gesunden Menschenverstand“, der sehr leicht in die Irre gehe; es komme darauf an, ein für die Rechnung bequemes Koordinatensystem zu wählen, an sich gäbe es in der Welt kein bevorzugtes Koordinatensystem. Das erwiderte er auch auf den Vorhalt, daß bei der Annahme, die Erde ruhe und um sie bewege sich die gesamte Umwelt, man für gar nicht so weit entfernte Massen zu Ueberlichtgeschwindigkeiten kommen müsse. Einstein scheut sich nicht vor diesen Geschwindigkeiten, die keineswegs dem allgemeinen Relativitätsprinzip widersprächen, er sieht in ihnen keinen Grund, ein Koordinatensystem zu verwerfen, wenn nur sonst bei seiner Wahl die

Rechnung einfach werde.

In diesem Punkte trat M i e den Einwänden Lenards bei; auch er will die fingierten Gravitationsfelder fortlassen. Sie haben, meint er, keinen Erkenntniswert; ihm kämen diese Dinge als „zu feinspintisiert“ vor, er wolle demgegenüber doch lieber an dem gesunden Menschenverstand festhalten. Er glaube auch, daß es tatsächlich ein bevorzugtes Koordinatensystem gäbe. Aber auf die Frage Einsteins, wodurch denn eine solche Bevorzugung eines Koordinatensystemes verständlich gemacht werden sollte, mußte er die Antwort schuldig bleiben.

Am deutlichsten wird für den Leser der Gegensatz der Anschauungen vielleicht, wenn man sich erinnert, daß Lenard immer und immer wieder betont, an dem „Aether“ müsse festgehalten werden, der Aether könne gar nicht abgeschafft werden, der „Aether“ sei keine Hypothese, sondern Wirklichkeit, denn wenn es keinen „Aether“ gäbe, könne man ja die Welt nicht mechanisch begreifen, dann könne man nicht alle physikalischen Erscheinungen auf Bewegungsvorgänge zurückführen. Demgegenüber muß doch betont werden, daß fast alle modernen Physiker die Forderung von der mechanischen Begreifbarkeit der Natur längst aufgegeben haben — es sei nur an den glänzenden Vortrag Plancks auf der Königsberger Naturforscherversammlung vor 10 Jahren erinnert. Es ist eben eine unbegründete Forderung, daß die Natur mechanisch begreifbar sein soll. Der Physiker hat an die Natur keine Forderungen, sondern nur Fragen zu stellen und zu sehen, was die Natur auf diese Fragen antwortet. In Verkennung dieses Verhältnisses hat man lange Jahre von der Natur ihre mechanische Begreifbarkeit gefordert. Die Natur ist aber nicht so liebenswürdig gewesen, diese Forderung zu erfüllen.

Im Verfolg der Erörterungen hob M i e mit Nachdruck hervor, daß die Abschaffung des Aethers ja gar nichts mit der Relativitätstheorie zu tun habe, er sei vielmehr schon in den 80er Jahren des vorigen Jahrhunderts durch die grundlegenden Arbeiten von Lorentz beseitigt worden.

Professor Born-Göttingen meinte, daß gerade die Relativitätstheorie das Bedürfnis nach Anschaulichkeit befriedige. Nach der Newtonschen Auffassung werde die Erde bei den Lauf um die Sonne von der Anziehung der Sonne und der Trägheit in ihrer Bahn gehalten, denke man sich die Sonne weg, so müßte die Erde in grader Linie weitergehen. Warum aber denn in grader Linie und wohin, müß man doch fragen. Hier sage nun die Einsteinsche Theorie, selbst wenn die Sonne weggedacht wird, so bleibt in der Umwelt noch eine große Massenverteilung übrig, und diese wirkt auf der Erde, so daß die Erde in eine gradlinige Bahn gezwungen wird. Im Grunde gebe die Newtonschen Anschauung dem leeren Raum bestimmte Eigenschaften, während die Einsteinsche Theorie nur Wechselwirkungen kennt. Daß die Einsteinsche Theorie darüber hinaus noch zu den Beziehungen der Anziehung zwischen Sonne und Erde komme, und sie erklären könne, obwohl sie gar nicht ihren Voraussetzungen stecke, sei eine glänzende Leistung.

So weit das Wesentliche der Erörterungen.

Ein dem Berichterstatter nahestehendes Lehrbuch aus dem Jahre 1892 beginnt mit den Worten „Die Physik hat die Aufgabe, die Erscheinungen der Natur als Bewegungsvorgänge zu beschreiben“. Auf Grund der seitherigen Erfahrungen über Elektrizität hat der Verfasser diese Auffassung preisgegeben. Aus dem Festhalten an ihr kann man die Gegnerschaft gegen Einsteins Theorie verstehen. Aus ihrer Preisgabe leiten sich die Denkrichtungen Einsteins und seiner Anhänger ab.

*

Einsteins Ernennung zum Leydener Professor. Aus dem Haag meldet „Holl. Nieuwsbüro“: Die Regierung genehmigte die Ernennung von Professor Dr. Einstein zum „außerordentlichen Professor“ der Naturwissenschaften an der Universität in L e y d e n. (Die Meldung ist in der vorliegenden Form geeignet, Anlaß zu Mißverständnissen zu geben. Prof. Einstein hat sich, wie bereits vor längerer Zeit berichtet, auf Ersuchen der Leydener Universität bereit erklärt, dort in jedem Jahre während einiger Frühjahrswochen Vorlesungen über Relativitätstheorie und andere Kapitel der theoretischen Physik zu halten. Wohl um diese Verpflichtung äußerlich zu kennzeichnen, hat man die Form der Ernennung zum Honorarprofessor gewählt; von einer dauernden Uebersiedelung des berühmten Gelehrten an die holländische Hochschule kann kein Rede sein. D. Red.)”

The *Frankfurter Zeitung* reported,

“86. Versammlung deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte.

Bad Nauheim, 24. September.

Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie wurde gestern vor dem zuständigen Forum, in den vereinigten mathematischen und physikalischen Abteilungen der deutschen Naturforscher- und Aerzteversammlung behandelt. Da es bekannt war, daß Professor Einstein selbst das Wort zu den Referaten den Professoren Dr. Weyl-Zürich, Lau-Berlin, Mie-Halle und Grebe-Bonn über seine Theorie in der Aussprache nehmen werde, hatte sich eine zahlreiche Zuhörerschaft eingefunden. Der geräumige Saal des Badehauses 8 und die Galerie waren gedrängt voll. Ganz auf dem Standpunkt Einsteins stand das Referat von Mie und auch Grebe-Bonn vertrat die Ansicht, daß sich für die von ihm angestellten Spezialstudien über die Cyanbande des Sonnenspektrums die Einsteinsche Theorie mit den von ihm gefundenen Werten decken. Professor Weyl-Zürich und Lau-Berlin stimmten zwar nicht vollständig mit Einstein überein, lehnten ihn aber keineswegs prinzipiell ab. Das tat nur Professor Leonard-Heidelberg. Einstein selbst ging auf jeden erhobenen Einwand der Reihe nach ein und tat das in vornehmer, bescheidener, ja fast schüchterner und gerade dadurch überlegener Weise. Zum Schluß trat noch der erst jüngst von

Frankfurt nach Göttingen berufene Physiker Professor Dr. Born in entschiedener Weise für Einstein ein, der auf alle Fälle die große Mehrheit der Versammlung auf seiner Seite hatte. Wir geben aus der Aussprache Folgendes wieder:

Weyl-Zürich sprach über eine von ihm vorgenommene Erweiterung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie, die auch die elektrischen Erscheinungen mitumfassen und aus allgemeinen Grundlagen erklären will. Dann trug Mie die Durchrechnung eines Spezialproblems vor, demzufolge er lieber von der Relativität der Gravitation als von der allgemeinen Relativität sprechen will. Hierauf leitete Laue-Berlin die Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahls durch ein Gravitationsfeld und die Rot-Verschiebung der Spektrallinien in einem solchen aus der Theorie her, und schließlich berichtete Grebe-Bonn über seine gemeinsam mit Bachem ausgeführten Messungen, die diese von der Theorie geforderte Rot-Verschiebung der Spektrallinien auf der Sonne wirklich zeigen. Die sich anschließende Diskussion mußte streng auf diese Vorträge selbst beschränkt bleiben. Erst nach ihrer Erledigung wurde in eine allgemeine Diskussion über die Relativitätstheorie eingetreten. Sie gestaltete sich sehr lebendig, in der Hauptsache zu einer Diskussion zwischen Einstein und Professor Lenard. Lenard bekannte sich zu einem Anhänger der speziellen Relativitätstheorie, nach welcher eine vollkommen gleichförmige Translationsbewegung durchaus unerkennbar sein muß, dagegen wandte er sich gegen die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie, nach welcher jede Art von Bewegung für uns unerkennbar sein soll und wir nicht entscheiden können, ob wir uns zum Beispiel in drehender Bewegung befinden oder die gesamte Umwelt sich gegen uns drehe, oder ob wir, wenn wir in einem plötzlich gebremsten Eisenbahnzug eine schwere Erschütterung erleiden, diese erleiden zufolge einer Veränderung der Bewegung des Eisenbahnzuges oder nicht vielmehr durch die entsprechend entgegengesetzte Bewegung der Erde. Das letztere widerspricht nach seiner Meinung jedem gesunden Menschenverstand, den der Physiker gerade so gut braucht und anwenden muß wie jeder andere. Auch die Abschaffung des Aethers durch die Relativitätstheorie lehnt Lenard ab, er hält seine Existenz vielmehr für durchaus erwiesen, weil wir ohne ihn die physikalischen Erscheinungen nicht restlos als mechanische Bewegungsvorgänge erklären können — eine Forderung, die notwendig sei, um die Erscheinungen anschaulich begreifen zu können. In Bezug auf diese letzte Bemerkung erwiderte Einstein, was der Mensch als anschaulich oder nicht anschaulich betrachtet, das hat im Laufe der Zeit beträchtlich gewechselt, die Physik ist eben ihrem Wesen nach begrifflich und nicht anschaulich. Den Zeitgenossen Galileis war dessen Mechanik gewiß recht unanschaulich, heute aber, und zwar schon lange vor der Relativitätstheorie betrachtet man die elektrischen Felder als die elementarsten Gebilde, mit denen man arbeitet; dem Elektriker ist das elektrische Feld das anschaulichste, was nicht überholten werden kann, und es gibt Elektriker, die sich mechanische Vorgänge erst mit Hilfe der elektrischen Felder anschaulich machen können. Was den gebremsten

Eisenbahnzug betrifft, so handelt es sich eben um die Wechselwirkung zwischen diesem und allen übrigen in der Welt vorhandenen Massen, wobei es ganz gleichgültig ist, welche von beiden gegen die andere bewegt wird. Mit dem gesunden Menschenverstand zu operieren, sei sehr gefährlich. Für die mathematische Behandlung gibt es eben kein an sich bevorzugtes Koordinatensystem und man wird daher jedesmal das für die Durchführung der Rechnung bequemste wählen. Das gleiche gilt von den Rotationsbewegungen. Wenn man bei der Annahme, die Umwelt bewege sich rotierend, und die Erde stehe still, zu Ueberlicht-Geschwindigkeiten komme, so sei das auch kein Widerspruch gegen die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie, die garnicht wie die spezielle eine konstante Lichtgeschwindigkeit fordere. In Bezug auf die Abschaffung des Aethers betonte Professor Mie, daß sie nichts mit der Relativitätstheorie zu tun habe. Schon in den 80er Jahren ist der Aether durch die grundlegenden Arbeiten von L o r e n t z abgeschafft worden. Im übrigen bekannte sich Mie zwar als begeisterten Anhänger der Relativitätstheorie, trat aber in einem Punkte Herrn Lenard bei, nämlich, daß er glaube es gäbe wirklich ein bevorzugtes Koordinatensystem und man könne fingierte Gravitationsfelder fortlassen. Es scheine ihm nicht als ob ihre Einführung erkenntnistheoretischen Wert habe, es komme ihm vor, als ob man da zu sein spintisiere demgegenüber lobt er sich doch immer unseren gesunden Menschenverstand. Inwiefern es aber ein bevorzugtes Koordinatensystem in der Welt geben soll, konnte er Herrn Einstein nicht sagen. Lenard meinte, die Diskussion habe zu einer Einigung der abweichenden Anschauungen und zu einer gegenseitigen Ueberzeugung ihrer Vertreter nicht führen können, weil der Gegensatz der experimentellen und mathematischen Physiker hier zum Ausdruck komme, eine Meinung, der von anderer Seite lebhaft widersprochen wurde, denn der mathematische Physiker stehe nicht im Gegensatz zum Experimentalphysiker, sondern stelle die von diesem erforschten Erscheinungen unter einheitlichen Gesichtspunkten dar.”

The *Frankfurter Zeitung*, on 21 September 1921, and the *Berliner Tageblatt*, Evening Edition, 20 September 1920, had reported on the Eighty-Sixth Meeting of German Natural Scientists. In the opening address to the meeting of natural scientists, Friedrich von Müller performed a staged and scripted homage to Einstein, and slandered anyone and everyone who disagreed with Einstein. Max Planck and Arnold Sommerfeld provided Müller with the speech. Planck and Sommerfeld also made certain that their personal attacks against Einstein’s critics would be accompanied by scripted applause from Einstein’s friends.⁵¹² The *Frankfurter Zeitung* stated on 21 September 1920, first morning edition:

**“Versammlung deutscher Naturforscher
und Aerzte.**

(Privattelegramm der „Frankfurter Zeitung“.)

L—z Bad Nauheim, 20. Septbr.

Mit einem phantastischen Schmuck bunter Herbstfarben hat sich das mit Naturreizen so überaus reich versehene Bad Nauheim bekleidet, um die Teilnehmer der 86. Versammlung Deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte zu begrüßen. Der große Saal des Konzerthauses und seine Galerien sind dicht besetzt mit Männern und Frauen, als bald nach 9 Uhr der Geschäftsführer der 86. Versammlung, Prof. Dr. Grödel (Bad Nauheim) die Erschienenen begrüßt. Dabei gedenkt er nicht nur der Auslandsdeutschen, sondern auch der wenigen Ausländer, die zur Versammlung gekommen sind, und betont, daß die Wissenschaft bei uns keine nationalen Grenzen kenne. Zugleich weist er auf den Unterschied dieser Versammlung gegenüber den früheren hin, der in der veränderten allgemeinen Lage begründet ist. Diese Tagung soll eine Tagung des Ernsts sein. — Als zweiter Redner begrüßte der Präsident des hessischen Bildungsamtes Dr. Streckler die Versammlung. Er bezeichnet die Versammlung als ein Symbol des Aufbaus. Insbesondere sei eine der wichtigsten Aufgaben der deutschen Aerzteschaft, den physischen Wiederaufbau der Bevölkerung zu leiten und zu ermöglichen. Dem Naturforscher und Wissenschaftler im allgemeineren Sinne liegt der geistige Wiederaufbau ob. Die Bedeutung der Natur als Lehrerin bei unserm Nachwuchs zur Geltung zu bringen, sei seine wichtigste Aufgabe. Aus den allgemeinen Betrachtungen heraus fällt das Wort, daß wir nicht nur die Kräfte der Natur beherrschen lernen müssen, sondern auch die im Menschen lebenden Naturkräfte. — Hatte diese politische Anspielung schon den Beifall der Versammlung hervorgerufen, so nimmt die Teilnahme der Zuhörer außerordentlich zu, als nach einigen kurzen Begrüßungsworten des Ministerialrats Balse n als Vertreter des hessischen Finanzministeriums, des Hausherrn der Versammlung als Besitzerin des staatlichen Bades Nauheim, und des Bürgermeisters der Stadt Nauheim Dr. Kaiser der Rektor der hessischen Landesuniversität Gießen im Namen der vier benachbarten Hochschulen Marburg, Gießen, Frankfurt und Darmstadt das Wort ergreift. Er nennt als führenden Namen der Hochschulen auf dem Gebiete der Naturwissenschaften Ehrlich für Frankfurt, Behring für Marburg, Liebig für Gießen und Merck für Darmstadt und löst den ersten Beifall aus, als er wünscht, daß nun auch ein leider scheinbar abhanden gekommenes Gefühl sich wieder einstellen möge, das Gefühl des Stolzes, ein Deutscher zu sein. Deutsche Forschung und Wissenschaft kann uns nicht genommen werden; sie müssen zwar darben, aber können nicht untergehen. Helmholtz, Virchow und Haber kann man nicht wegleugnen und annekieren.

Der Vorsitzende der Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte, Prof. Dr. Friedrich v. Müller (München), der nunmehr die eigentlichen Arbeiten der Versammlung einleitet, gedenkt zunächst der zahlreichen Toten, die die Gesellschaft, besonders der Vorstand, in den sechs Jahren, in denen die Versammlungen unterbrochen waren, zu beklagen hat. Er bezeichnet dann den Beschluß, schon in diesem Jahre eine Naturforscherversammlung

abzuhalten, als eine mutige Tat, deren Ausführung besonders durch Ernährungs- und Unterkunftsschwierigkeiten in Gefahr geriet. Deshalb mußte Hannover als Versammlungsort aufgegeben werden, und dem hessischen Staat wie der Stadt Nauheim sei besonderer Dank dafür abgestattet, daß sie die Abhaltung der Versammlung durch ihr außerordentliches Entgegenkommen ermöglicht haben. Der Redner streift dann die Aufgaben der Versammlung und deren besondere Bedeutung in den heutigen Tagen. Die *S e u c h e n b e k ä m p f u n g* ist während des Krieges dank unserer medizinischen Wissenschaft und den Männern des Kriegssanitätsdienstes in großem Maße möglich gewesen, so daß wir vor schweren Seuchen bewahrt geblieben sind. Aber drei furchtbare Seuchen gilt es zu bekämpfen: Grippe, Schlafkrankheit und Syphilis. Diesen Krankheiten werden die Arbeiten der Versammlung besonderes Augenmerk widmen. Unter den Naturwissenschaften haben Chemie und Physik in dieser Zeit die größten Veränderungen ihrer wissenschaftlichen Grundlage erlitten: die Chemie dadurch, daß der Grundsatz der Unteilbarkeit der Atome zu Fall gekommen ist, die Physik dadurch, daß der Begriff des Aethers im Weltall verschwindet und durch die Relativitätstheorie *E i n s t e i n*s die Begriffe von Raum und Zeit wandelbar wurden. Damit ist dem Redner Gelegenheit gegeben, in ausdrucksvollen Worten gegen die *Berliner Vorgänge* zu protestieren. Die außerordentlichen geistigen Taten eines Einstein gehören nicht vor das Forum einer mit Schlagworten und aus politischen Motiven arbeitenden öffentlichen Versammlung, sondern eines Berufskreises von Gelehrten. — Diese offene und deutliche Ehrung Einsteins erweckt lauten Beifall. Müller kommt dann auf die weiteren großen Probleme, deren Behandlung der Versammlung obliegt, zu sprechen: Stickstoff und Eiweiß und die Fragen des Unterrichts. Er betont den Wert der humanistischen Bildung und warnt vor einer Geichmachung des geistigen Besitzes in Anlehnung an die Bestrebungen zur Ausgleichung materiellen Besitzes. Die Beziehungen zum Ausland bezeichnet der Redner als noch gering. Die Zeit für internationale Kongresse ist noch nicht für uns gekommen. Diese sind auch nicht so nötig wie die fremde Literatur. Die Zeitschriften- und Büchernote ist eine große Gefahr für die Wissenschaft. Die Aufrichtung einer absperrenden Mauer gegen unsere geistigen Erzeugnisse erscheint dem Redner weniger gefährlich. Sie spreche eher für eine eistige Armut dessen, der sie aufrichtet. Denn geistig positive Völker vertragen keinen Abschluß, sie brauchen die andern Völker für die Publikation ihrer geistigen Tätigkeit. Von den allgemeinen Betrachtungen gleitet der Redner dann aber ab, als er auf die frühere Gewohnheit, des Landesherrn bei solchen Anlässen zu gedenken, hinweist. Diese Gewohnheit habe nun in Fortfall kommen müssen. Aber er halte es für seine Pflicht, der deutschen Fürsten als Förderer der Wissenschaften zu gedenken. Setzt bei diesen Worten schon ein starker Beifall ein, so steigert er sich noch, als der Redner sagt, die Monarchie pflege, die Republik schütze die Wissenschaft, die Revolution zerstöre. Er erinnert dabei an die Hinrichtung *L a v o i s i e r*s

während der französischen Revolution und die sie begleitenden Worte des Richters: *nous n'avons plus besoin de savants*. Aber er hofft, ebenso wie im Frankreich der Revolution ein gewaltiger geistiger Aufschwung folgte, daß auch wir neben dem materiellen einen geistigen Aufschwung erreichen. — Der langdauernde Beifall der Versammlung sprach dafür, daß der Redner mit seiner kleinen Abschweifung auf politisches Gebiet doch sehr den Zuhörern aus dem Herzen gesprochen hat, und das mag bei einer Versammlung von wissenschaftlich gebildeten Zuhörern doch von Bedeutung sein.

Im Anschluß an diese einführenden Worte sprachen Dr. B o s c h, der Direktor der Badischen Anilin- und Sodafabriken, Prof. E h r e n b e r g (Göttingen) und Geheimrat R u b n e r (Berlin) zu dem Thema des Stickstoffes, worüber weiterer Bericht folgt.”

Paul Weyland redressed the dishonest press reports disseminated by Einstein's friends in a statement Weyland published in “Die Naturforschertagung in Nauheim. Erdrosselung der Einsteingegner!”, *Deutsche Zeitung*, Number 449, (26 September 1920), Morgen-Ausgabe, 1. Beiblatt, p. 1;⁵¹³ reprinted as “Die Naturforschertagung in Nauheim”, *Politisch-Anthropologische Monatsschrift für praktische Politik, für politische Bildung und Erziehung auf biologischer Grundlage*, Volume 19, (1920), pp. 365-370:

“Die Naturforschertagung in Nauheim.

W e y l a n d.

Begünstigt von blendend schönem Wetter, gefördert durch den Opfersinn von Bevölkerung und Badeverwaltung, tagte in dieser Woche in dem unvergleichlich schönen Bad Nauheim die 86. Versammlung Deutscher Naturforscher und Ärzte. Seit der 85., die in Wien stattfand, wo im Jahre 1913 der greise Kaiser Franz Joseph es sich nicht nehmen ließ, den wissenschaftlichen Gästen seine Hofburg zur Verfügung zu stellen, liegt der Weltkrieg, der hemmend in die Wissenschaft eingriff und nur die Gebiete der Kriegs-Chirurgie und Kriegsmedizin befruchtend beeinflusste. Lediglich die Physik hatte neben der Medizin eine Frage von weitgehender wissenschaftlicher Bedeutung zu erörtern, und dieses war die Relativitäts-Theorie, die seit 1911 und 1915 von Einstein eingeführt wurde. So ist es denn kein Wunder, daß sich mangels jeder anderen wissenschaftlichen Ausbeute dieser fünf Jahre das Hauptinteresse auf die Donnerstag- und Freitag-Sitzung konzentrierte, in welcher Einstein seiner wachsenden Opposition Rede und Antwort zu stehen hatte.

Um es gleich vorweg zu nehmen: er hat nicht sehr glänzend abgeschnitten, wenngleich die unter Einsteinschem Einfluß stehenden Presse-Referate der Deutschen physikalischen Gesellschaft völlig entstellte Berichte in die Welt jagten, die natürlich ein einseitiges Bild der Situation geben. Wir

wollen versuchen, so kurz wie möglich die wichtigsten Vorträge herauszugreifen und müssen dabei leider bemerken, daß tatsächlich in diesen fünf Jahren außer der mathematischen Abstraktion der Relativitätstheorie nichts Neues hervorgebracht wurde, es sei denn, daß man als Fortschritt feststellt, daß die physikalische Forschung im Sinne ihrer jetzigen geistigen Leitung völlig zum Sklaven mathematischer Abstraktionen herabgesunken ist und jedes vernunftgemäße Forschen ausschaltet. Einstein hat denn auch eine Art Glaubensbekenntnis abgelegt, indem er die denkwürdigen Worte aussprach: „Gesunden Menschenverstand in die Physik einzuführen, ist gefährlich.“ Der einzige positive Gewinn dieser Naturforschertagung ist denn auch der, daß die Scheidung der Geister sich vollzogen hat und unter der Leitung Lenards die Vergewaltigung der Physik durch mathematische Dogmen abgelehnt wird, während auf der anderen Seite die Einsteinophilen auf ihrem Standpunkt beharren und hurtig den Parnas ihres Formelkramers zu erklimmen versuchen . . . bis sie von ihren „eisigen Höhen“ einmal jäh herabfallen werden.

Schon in der Eröffnungssitzung wies Herr von Müller darauf hin, das diese Versammlung im Zeichen der Relativitätstheorie steht, indem er in einem ihm von dem Einsteinleuten unterschobenen Konzept bemerkte, daß von Einstein eine der größten Geistestaten geschehen ist: er hat ja den Äther abgeschafft. Im übrigen wies Herr von Müller in seiner glänzenden Rede auf die Errungenschaften der Kriegsmedizin und Chirurgie hin, gedachte der Toten der deutschen Naturforscher und leitete in taktvoll feinen Worten die Versammlung ein. Als Vertreter der Regierung Hessens sprach der ehemalige Patriot und jetzige Linksmann Professor Strecker einige Begrüßungsworte, indem er um sich einige Phrasen verbreitete, daß die Naturforscher der Wahrheit dienen sollen und nun auch dafür zu sorgen hätten, daß die Wahrheit auch in uns Deutschen selbst einzudringen hat, daß nicht wieder durch deutsches Verschulden ein solcher Krieg entsteht. Diese versuchte Politisierung wurde merkwürdigerweise schweigend hingenommen und von einem Teil der Versammlung beklatscht. Als aber der Rektor der Gießener Universität Kalbfleisch sich in einer kernigen deutschen Rede an das Auditorium wandte und den famosen Vorredner glatt abfallen ließ, brauste ein nicht endenwollender Beifall durch das Haus. Ein erhebendes Bekenntnis zum Deutschtum lag in dieser Akklamation, und als ferner Herr von Müller in einem weiteren Referat mit Wehmut feststellte, daß man zum ersten Male, so lange die deutschen Naturforscher tagen, nicht mehr des Kaisers gedenken darf und es der Versammlung anheimstellte, in Dankbarkeit der deutschen Fürsten zu gedenken, unter deren Fürsorge die deutsche Wissenschaft blühte und gedieh, zog es wie schmerzlich durch die so zahlreich erschienenen aufrechten deutschen Männer, und mancher gedachte der schönen Zeiten, wo deutsche Wissenschaft an der Spitze aller Wissenschaft stand und die deutschen Institutsleiter nicht von Herrn Haenisch mit Androhung von Disziplinarstrafen belästigt wurden, wenn sie nicht mit ihrem Friedensetat auskamen. Wohl selten hat der Theatersaal

einen derartigen Sturm des Beifalls erlebt, wie er durch die Worte von Müllers, der deutschen Fürsten zu gedenken, ausgelöst wurde.

Die allgemeinen Vorträge behandelten die Atom- und Molekulartheorie, welche hauptsächlich von Debye, Frank und Kossel referiert wurden. Das Ernährungsproblem wurde von Bosch, Ehrenberg, von Grube und Paul behandelt.

Neue fundamentale Tatsachen wurden in diesen Vorträgen nicht verkündet. Lediglich des jungen Debyes blendender Vortragskunst gelang es, auch den Wissenden zu fesseln und sein Sammelreferat über Atomstruktur als Plus zu verbuchen. Er gipfelte *summa summarum* in der Andeutung, daß sich die Welt wahrscheinlich aus Vielheiten des Wasserstoffatoms zusammensetzt, wie dies die letzten Rutherfordischen Untersuchungen gezeigt haben, so daß also mit Wahrscheinlichkeit anzunehmen ist, daß die mehr als hundertjährige Proutische Hypothese wieder zu Ehren gelangt und wahrscheinlich auch Goethes Standpunkt in der Farbenlehre von seinem oppositionellen Standpunkt gegen Newton wieder zur Anerkennung gelangt. Die Vorträge von Frank und Kossel bewegten sich in ähnlichem Rahmen und bestätigten auf anderem Wege die Ausführungen Debyes. In der Medizin war es besonders Sudhoff, dessen greiser Charakterkopf überall in der Versammlung auffiel, der durch eine mit seltener Liebe und Sorgfalt zusammengebrachte Vesal-Ausstellung zu Ehren des 400 jährigen Geburtstages des Begründers der deutschen Anatomie fesselte. Lehmann erfreute sein dankbares Auditorium mit kinematographischen Aufnahmen über die neuesten Ergebnisse in der Forschung der flüssigen Kristalle, und Rinn löste Beifallsstürme seiner Zuhörerschaft aus, die er in seiner lebenswürdigen humoristischen Art mit blendendem Material an sein Thema über Kristallgitter fesselte.

Sehr zu erwähnen ist ferner der von außerordentlicher Fachkenntnis getragene Vortrag von Steur über die Geologie der Nauheimer Quellen.

Es waren dies ungefähr die Höhepunkte der allgemeinen Vorträge, wenn man von den naturwissenschaftlichen Filmen absehen will, welche die „Ufa“ durch Adam vortragen ließ, auf die wir vom pädagogischen Standpunkt aus noch einmal zurückkommen werden. Mittwoch nachmittag begannen die Spezialsitzungen der einzelnen Fakultäten, welche der Öffentlichkeit nichts Bemerkenswertes boten und über die zu referieren zu weit führen würde. Es sei nur bemerkt, daß allein die Physiker z. B. 56 solcher Vorträge zu erledigen hatten, die jedoch samt und sonders nicht über den Rahmen üblicher Laboratoriumstätigkeit hinausgingen und auch ohne Naturforschertag in Zeitschriften ihre Erledigung hätten finden können. So nahte der Donnerstag nachmittag mit seiner Hauptsitzung heran, wo sich zahlreiche Opponenten gegen Einstein gemeldet hatten. Diese Sitzung ist nun wohl eine von den denkwürdigsten, die in der Geschichte der deutschen Naturforschung stattgefunden hat. Obwohl es jedem Tagesteilnehmer freistand, mit seinem Ausweis jeden Vortrag zu besuchen, hatte der Vorstand der Deutschen physikalischen Gesellschaft die Stirn, an der Eingangstür eine

scharfe Siebung vorzunehmen, um nur diejenigen hineinzulassen, welche ihm genehm waren. Es erhob sich ein gewaltiger Tumult, das empörte Auditorium schob die wissenschaftliche Polizei beiseite, stürmte den Saal und behauptete sich. Auf diesem Wege gelangten auch andere als Einstein-Freunde hinein. Und nun geschah das Unglaubliche. Statt daß es zu einer wissenschaftlichen Auseinandersetzung kam, wurde von der Vorstandsleitung unter dem Vorsitz von M a x P l a n c k dafür gesorgt, daß die Opposition einfach mundtot gemacht wurde. In stundenlangen Reden verbreiteten sich W e y l, M i e, v o n L a u e und G r e b e über das Relativitätsprinzip, während den gegnerischen Rednern einschließlich Diskussion 15 Minuten zugebilligt wurden. Um 1 Uhr sollte die Sitzung beendet sein, um $\frac{3}{4}$ 1 Uhr war man noch mit der Diskussion der Einstein-Vorträge beschäftigt, und der Apparat der Erdrosselung klappte so vorzüglich, daß tatsächlich die Diskussion ausschließlich von Einstein-Leuten geführt wurde, hauptsächlich von Einstein selbst. G e h r c k e-Berlin, der sich mehrfach energisch zum Wort meldete, wurde bis zuletzt gelassen, um ihm dann mitzuteilen, daß die Diskussion geschlossen sei. R u d o l p h-Koblenz versuchte, wenigstens im Wege einer Geschäftsordnungsbemerkung zu Worte zu kommen: ihm wurde von Planck bedeutet, daß er nicht das Wort habe. L e n a r d-Heidelberg wurde schon nach drei Sätzen von Planck in die Parade gefahren, so daß Lenard auf das Wort verzichtete. P a l a g y i-Ofenpest, von dem hauptsächlich neben Mach Einstein seine Weisheit bezog, wurde $\frac{1}{2}$ Minute Redezeit bewilligt (in Worten eine halbe Minute), die dann auf 3 Minuten ausgedehnt wurde (!!!) und ähnlich Anmutigkeiten mehr. Der ehrwürdigen und geachteten Persönlichkeit Lenards, über den sich selbst ein Planck nicht hinwegzusetzen vermochte, gelang es schließlich, sich mit aller Energie Gehör zu verschaffen und Einstein zur Rede zu stellen. Er führte kurz aus, daß es nach seiner Auffassung wohl zwei Möglichkeiten physikalischer Forschung gäbe, nämlich die logisch verständliche und die mathematisch abstrakte. Er richtete an Einstein die klar präzierte Frage und die dringende Bitte, ihm vernünftig zu erklären, wie es denn komme, daß beim plötzlichen Anrücken des berühmten Eisenbahnzuges nicht der Kirchturm des benachbarten Dorfes umfalle, sondern der Mann im Zuge, welche Voraussetzungen durch die Einsteinsche Theorie gegeben seien. Einstein drückte sich in seinen bekannten gewundenen Erklärungen und billigen Witzeleien um die Beantwortung der Frage herum, was Lenard zu weiterer zweimaliger Anfrage an Einstein veranlaßte, ihm Rede und Antwort zu stehen. Als es ihm nicht gelang, von Einstein eine sachliche Antwort zu erlangen, verzichtete Lenard auf das Wort mit der Feststellung, daß es ihm nicht gelungen sei, eine Übereinstimmung zwischen Einstein und ihm in dem Sinne zu erzielen, daß Einstein eine an ihn klar gerichtete Frage ebenso klar beantworten konnte. M i e trat Lenard zur Seite und erklärte, daß die vernünftige Anschauungsweise nicht ausgeschaltet werden dürfe. Hierauf gefiel sich Einstein in der denkwürdigen Bemerkung, daß es gefährlich sei, mit dem menschlichen Verstand zu operieren, womit er vor aller Welt

kundgab, daß er mit der Vernunft nichts mehr zu tun hat. Die im vorhergehenden mitgeteilten Tatsachen finden sich nun nicht in dem offiziellen Pressebericht der Naturforschertagung, der selbstverständlich von den Einsteinleuten herausgegeben wurde. Es verdient hiermit festgenagelt zu werden, in welcher geradezu korrupten Art und Weise die Berichterstattung dieser Leute vonstatten geht und die freie wissenschaftliche Meinung systematisch geknebelt wird. Daß ein Max Planck sich zu derartigen Machenschaften hergab, ist bedauerlich, aber wohl dadurch verständlich, daß er sich, wie die anderen Spitzen der deutschen physikalischen Gesellschaft, mit Einstein wissenschaftlich und noch anders zu eng liiert hat, um anders handeln zu können.

Die zu Wort gemeldeten Gegner Einsteins wurden auf den Freitag versetzt, wo ihnen 12 Minuten Redezeit einschließlich Diskussion bewilligt wurde. Selbstverständlich war es am Freitag nachmittag nicht möglich, fünf Vorträge in einer Stunde à 12 Minuten wissenschaftlich zu erledigen, sie gaben nur Bruchstücke oder wurden schon in der Einleitung vom Vorsitzenden abgesetzt. Wir werden die Berichte jedoch nach dem Manuskript an dieser Stelle später behandeln.

Zu bemerken ist ferner, daß weder Einstein noch seine Freunde diesen Vorträgen beiwohnten.

Zusammenfassend kann man sagen, daß die Art und Weise der freien Forschung, wie sie von der Deutschen physikalischen Gesellschaft verstanden wird, ein in der Geschichte der deutschen Wissenschaft beispielloser Skandal ist und daß es wohl die höchste Zeit wird, daß in dieses Rattennest wissenschaftlicher Korruption einmal frische Luft kommt. Wenn man bedenkt, daß Einstein sogar Weyl ablehnt, weil dessen Mathematik wieder zur einfachen euklidischen Geometrie hinüberführt, so versteht man wohl, daß es sich nicht darum handelt, in der Deutschen physikalischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft noch zu dienen, sondern daß es nur gilt, ihrem Papste Einstein die Tiara zu erhalten. Mit einem Gefühl tiefster Beschämung mußte man diese Versammlung verlassen, und auf der Kurpromenade und allen Gängen, wo das Thema besprochen wurde, gab es nur ein Wort der Entrüstung über das unerhörte Gebaren des Vorstandes, besonders seines Vorsitzenden Max Planck. Forscher von Ruf versichern mir, in dieser Gesellschaft kein Wort mehr zu sprechen.

Im übrigen verlief die Tagung in vollster Harmonie, kleine technische Mängel, die ja schließlich überall vorkommen, waren vorhanden. Die Ausstellung war glänzend beschickt, besonders von den optischen Firmen. Hier ragten insbesondere die Stände von Goerz, Leitz und Winkel hervor. Besonders Leitz fesselte durch ein neues dermatologisches Mikroskop, welches durch einfaches Aufsetzen auf den menschlichen Organismus, z. B. durch einfaches Auftragen einer Immersionsflüssigkeit das Leben des Gewebes erkennen ließ und die Blutkörperchen in Vene und Arterie deutlich machte. Höchst beachtenswert war ferner der neue Helldunkelfeldkondensator, welcher der biologisch-bakteriologischen

Forschung neue Wege zu weisen berufen ist.”

Franz Kleinschrod, who had a theory and an agenda of his own to promote, wrote,

“Die Einsteinsche Relativitätslehre ist bereits zur *cause célèbre* der Wissenschaft geworden. Noch vor wenigen Monaten nur der nächsten Umgebung bekannt, ist heute der Name Einstein im Munde, man darf sagen, wohl der gesamten Wissenschaft. Es dürfte wohl wenig wissenschaftliche Persönlichkeit geben, die in so kurzer Zeit den höchsten Gipfel wissenschaftlicher Popularität ersteigen. Man kann es verstehen, wenn man die Behauptungen und die schrankenlose Begeisterung seiner Anhänger liest: „Damit ist aber die alte Newtonsche Mechanik durch das Relativitätsprinzip über den Haufen geworfen. Das RP greift somit in alle durch Alter geheiligten Denkgewohnheiten ein, es zerstört alle Begriffe, mit denen wir aufgewachsen sind, und es verlangt von uns außerdem eine Fähigkeit zur Abstraktion, gegen die selbst die Anforderungen der vierdimensionalen Mathematik ein Kinderspiel sind. Aber als Gegengabe beschert uns das RP eine Fülle neuer Einsichten; es beschert uns Tag, wo vordem Dämmerung oder Nacht war. Kurz, es ist eine geistige Befreiung, wie die Tat des Kopernikus.“ (Das Einsteinsche Relativitätsprinzip. A. Pflüger. 2. Aufl. 1920. Cohen-Bonn.) Im ähnlichen Tone ergehen sich alle Anhänger.—

Aber bald erhob sich auch dagegen, wie vorauszusehen war, die Kritik und setzte mächtig ein. Mit großer Spannung erwartete man auf der Naturforscherversammlung in Nauheim die Aussprache der Gegner mit Einstein. Sie verlief, wie auch hier vorauszusehen war, resultatlos. Es stand wohl der größere Teil der Gelehrten auf Seite von Einstein, aber Einstein konnte seine Gegner, besonders seinen Hauptgegner, Lenard (Heidelberg), nicht widerlegen, — aber die Gegner konnten auch Einstein nicht widerlegen. So blieb der Streit unentschieden und wird es auch bleiben, denn beide Parteien schossen mit ihren Angriffen immer dicht an dem Ziel vorbei. Keiner traf den andern richtig. [***] „Ja, selbst die Begriffe von Raum und Zeit, die wir seit Jahrtausenden als feststehend anzusehen gewohnt sind, sind w a n d e l b a r geworden durch die Relativitätstheorie.“ Mit diesen Worten eröffnete Friedr. von Müller die 86. Naturforscherversammlung deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte zu Nauheim 1920.”⁵¹⁴

Philipp Lenard commented on the Bad Nauheim debate in the third edition of his booklet *Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation*, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1921), pp. 36-44:

“Zusatz,
betreffend die Nauheimer Diskussion über das

Relativitätsprinzip.

Während der Vorbereitung der vorliegenden Neuauflage hat am 23. Sept. d. J. die Diskussion über das Relativitätsprinzip bei der Nauheimer Naturforscherversammlung stattgefunden. Es hat dabei Herr E i n s t e i n auf die in dieser Schrift hervorgehobenen Schwierigkeiten einzugehen und die dabei sich ergebenden Fragen zu beantworten versucht, nachdem die Herren W e y l und M i e in ihren Vorträgen über Elektrizität und Gravitation besondere Anregungen gegeben hatten.

Der Eindruck, welchen die Aussprache hinterließ, an welcher außer den genannten Herren auch andere Vertreter der Mathematik und der Physik sich beteiligten, ging nach meinem Urteil im allgemeinen dahin, daß in der Tat an den in dieser Schrift gekennzeichneten Stellen Schwierigkeiten und Fragen vorliegen, deren Erledigung nicht ohne weiteres in befriedigender Weise gelingt und deren Hervorhebung also wohl berechtigt war. Es darf wohl scheinen, daß das Weitergehen auf dieselben bei Überwindung der vorhandenen Hindernisse eine Weiterführung der Theorie mit Beseitigung ihrer gegenwärtigen Härten ergeben sollte, wie denn auch besonders die von Herrn M i e gelieferten Beiträge nach einer Weiterführung strebten, und zwar nicht ohne teilweises Abgehen von Herrn E i n s t e i n s ursprünglichem Wege [*Footnote*: Vgl. in verwandtem Sinne auch E. W i e c h e r t, Astron. Nachr. Bd. 211, Nr. 5054, S. 275, 1920, woselbst auch auf eine bevorstehende weitergehende Veröffentlichung desselben Verfassers über Gravitation in den Annalen der Physik hingewiesen wird. (Erschienen während der Drucklegung des Vorliegenden in Bd. 63, S. 301.)]. Die Hindernisse gegen volles Eingehen auf die von mir hervorgehobenen Schwierigkeiten und Fragen liegen, wie auch bei der Diskussion wieder erkennbar wurde, in der Kluft, welche für gewöhnlich zwischen den Benutzern der beiden auf Seite 25 des Vorliegenden erläuterten Bilderarten besteht.

[*Page 25*: Daß Andere den Äther in ihrem Gesamtbilde und auch bei ihrer Arbeit entbehren können, beweist nichts gegen den Äther, sondern ist vollkommen selbstverständlich, wenn man die Z w e i f a c h h e i t der B i l d e r bedenkt, die der Menscheng Geist von der (unbelebten) Natur bisher sich zu machen verstand. Es sei gestattet, diese Zweifachheit hier mit schon einmal gebrauchten Worten zu erläutern [*Footnote*: „Über Äther und Materie“, Heidelberg (C. Winter) 1911, S. 5.]: „Nun sind aber diese Bilder des Naturforschers doch von zweierlei Art. Quantitativ sind sie immer; sie können aber — und das ist die erste Art — sich sogar ganz darin erschöpfen, quantitative Beziehungen zwischen beobachtbaren Größen zu sein. In diesem Falle sind sie vollkommen darstellbar in Gestalt mathematischer Formeln, meist Differentialgleichungen. Dies ist der Weg, den K i r c h o f f und H e l m h o l t z bevorzugt haben, von K i r c h o f f die mathematische

Beschreibung der Natur genannt. Die denkwürdigen Folgen der Bilder, in deren Entwicklung die Benutzung und zugleich die Prüfung der Bilder besteht, sind dann die mathematischen Folgen jener Gleichungen, und auch weiter nichts. Man kann aber weitergehen — und dies ergibt die *zweite Art* der Bilder —, indem man sich von einer Überzeugung leiten läßt, ohne welche die Naturforschung sicherlich nie Erfolg gehabt hätte. Von der Überzeugung nämlich, daß alle Vorgänge in der Natur — in der unbelebten Natur wenigstens — bloße Bewegungsvorgänge sind, d. i. nur in Ortsveränderungen ein für allemal gegebenen Stoffes bestehen. Dann würde es sich in jedem Falle um Mechanismen handeln, und die Gleichungen, welche wir uns als Bilder erster Art gemacht haben, müssen Gleichungen der Mechanik sein, sie müssen ganz bestimmten Mechanismen entsprechen, und dann können wir auch geradezu diese Mechanismen als die Bilder betrachten, die wir uns von den Naturvorgängen gemacht haben. Wir haben dann mechanische Modelle, dynamische Modelle der Dinge als Bilder derselben in unserem Geiste. Die mechanischen Modelle und die Gleichungen, also die beiden Bildarten, sind, wenn die beide richtige Bilder sind, einander in den Resultaten, welche sie ergeben, vollkommen gleichwertig“ [*Footnote*: Man sieht aus dieser Erörterung, daß ich die Bilder zweiter Art als höherstehend betrachte, gegenüber denen erster Art, da sie, wenn vollendet, eine Weiterentwicklung der letzteren sind, obgleich sie in den Anfängen auch umgekehrt oft einleitend diesen letzteren vorausgehen. Allerdings kommt es aus diesem in der Entwicklung liegenden Grunde stellenweise vor, daß bereits gute Bilder erster Art vorhanden sind, wo die Herstellung vollendeter Bilder zweiter Art noch nicht gelungen ist, und dies verleiht den Bildern erster Art an solchen Stellen Überlegenheit.]]

Die Benutzer der Bilder erster Art, zu welchen besonders auch Herr *Einstein* zählt, scheinen zumeist nicht geneigt, sich nach dem Standpunkt der Bilder zweiter Art zu begeben, um die Schwierigkeiten und Fragen, die von dort aus am deutlichsten zu erkennen sind, überhaupt genügend ins Auge zu fassen. Unzweifelhaft ist es aber, daß eine Theorie, mag sie auf Bilder erster oder zweiter Art gegründet sein, erst dann als einwandfrei gelten kann, wenn sie von beiden Standpunkten aus standhält; denn beide Standpunkte haben sich im Fortschreiten der Naturforschung als voll berechtigt gezeigt, und alle bisherigen gut bewährten Theorien sind von beiden Standpunkten aus widerspruchsfrei erschienen. Wer freilich die „Abschaffung des Äthers“ verkündet

[*Footnote*: Die „Abschaffung des Äthers“ wurde in Nauheim in großer Eröffnungssitzung wieder als Resultat verkündet (zur früheren Verkündung in Salzburg, von Herrn *Einstein* selbst, siehe das Zitat in Note 17, S. 27). {*Footnote 17, Pages 27-28*: Als das Überspringen eines Abgrundes konnte wohl seinerzeit die Entdeckung der *Lichtquanten* erscheinen: Auf der einen Seite waren die Wellen des Lichtes, auf der anderen die neuartigen

Lichtquanten, und die Kluft zwischen ihnen wurde leer gelassen, was allerdings dem kühnen Springer selber niemand verdenken wird. Weitergehend war aber, nach der negativen Seite hin, der an diese Entdeckung geknüpfte Ausspruch (Naturforscherversammlung zu Salzburg am 21. September 1909, Verh. d. D. Phys. Ges. S. 482, Physik. Zeitschr. Bd. 10, S. 817, 1909): „Heute aber müssen wir wohl die Ätherhypothese als einen überwundenen Standpunkt ansehen“, was zu einer nachträglichen Überbrückung der Kluft, die doch im Interesse der Wissenschaften zu wünschen war, nicht eben ermunterte. Ich habe dennoch eine solche Überbrückung versucht und bin dabei zu dem Resultat gelangt, daß die Lichtquanten dasselbe seien, was man als kohärente Lichtwellenzüge schon lange vorher ins Auge gefaßt hatte, allerdings mit dem wesentlichen neuen Zusatze der Konzentrierung der Energie auf einen Strahl von bestimmter Richtung, welches letztere ich durch die auch sonst naheliegende Annahme nur eines elektrischen Kraftlinienringes (gedacht als diskreter Ätherwirbelring) in jeder durch die Schwingung eines einzelnen Elektrons emittierten Lichtwelle erklärte (S. „Über Äther und Materie“, Heidelberg 1911, S. 19 u. f. und die Untersuchung über Phosphoreszenz, Heidelb. Akad. 1913 A 19, S. 34 Fußnote 61. Als kohärente Wellenzüge hat, wie ich nachträglich finde, auch bereits H. A. Lorentz die Lichtquanten erklärt; Physikal. Zeitschr. Bd. 11, S. 353, 1910). Man sieht aus solcher Erklärungsmöglichkeit, was für das Gesamtbild des Naturforschers doch nicht unwichtig ist, daß die Lichtquanten nichts Umstürzendes für die Theorie des Lichtes sind, namentlich auch, daß sie für oder gegen die „Ätherhypothese“ überhaupt gar nichts aussagen, sondern daß sie in der Hauptsache eine besondere, bis dahin unbekannt gewesene Eigenschaft der lichtemittierenden Atome betreffen, nämlich die, auf kohärente Wellenzüge von bestimmtem mit der Schwingungsdauer zusammenhängenden Energieinhalt eingerichtet zu sein.

Die Vorstellung, daß das Lichtquant ein kohärenter Wellenzug sei, dessen Länge demnach in jedem Falle durch optische Interferenzversuche feststellbar wäre, hat durch neuartige Versuche von Herrn W. Wien (Annalen d. Phys., Bd. 60, S. 597, 1919) eine augenfällige Bestätigung erfahren, indem die Zeitdauer der Emission des Lichtquants gemessen wurde. Sehr bemerkenswert ist dabei die hier als unmittelbares Beobachtungsergebnis auftretende Erkenntnis, daß die Energie des Lichtquants ungleichmäßig über die Länge des Wellenzugs verteilt ist, indem ein allmähliches Abklingen des emittierenden Atoms stattfindet (nach einer Exponentialfunktion, wie beim akustischen Wellenzuge einer angeschlagenen Glocke), so daß eine bestimmte Länge des Wellenzuges nur dann sich ergibt, wenn man festsetzt, in welchem Stadium des Abklingens man das Ende als erreicht ansehen will. Setzt man beispielsweise das Ende bei $1/7$ (genauer $1/e^2$) der Anfangsintensität fest, so ergibt sich nach Herrn W. Wiens Messungen die Länge des Lichtquants zu rund 10 m, und zwar gilt diese Länge — was an sich wieder sehr bemerkenswert ist —

nach den bisherigen Messungen für Lichtquanten aller Wellenlängen, trotz des verschiedenen Energieinhalts der Lichtquanten verschiedener Wellenlänge. Es käme das darauf hinaus (wenn man bei diesen neuartigen Versuchen schon jetzt verallgemeinern darf), daß die Energie jeder einzelnen Welle irgendeines Lichtquants bei gleichem Abstände vom Anfange des Wellenzuges die gleiche ist. Der verschiedene Energieinhalt verschieden weit vom Anfange abstehender Wellen bestünde dabei in unserer Vorstellung in verschieden großer senkrecht zum Strahl gemessener Breite des elektrischen Kraftlinienringes dieser Wellen.} Man hat nicht dazu gelacht. Ich weiß nicht, ob es anders gewesen wäre, wenn die Abschaffung der Luft verkündet worden wäre.]

und vertritt, der will die Bilder zweiter Art hinwegleugnen (vgl. S. 27); er kann dann allerdings nicht in der Lage sein, auf deren Standpunkt sich zu begeben, und von ihm ist dann die Lösung der Schwierigkeiten und der damit verbundene Fortschritt auch nicht zu erwarten. Es wäre unnützlich, hierauf weiter eingehen zu wollen, und es war dankenswert, daß die Aussprache an diesem Punkte in Nauheim von selber abbrach;

[*Footnote:* Die Frage des vierdimensionalen Raumzeitbegriffes war in der Diskussion von vornherein außer Spiel geblieben. Es wäre in Gegenwart so vieler Mathematiker (die oft dem mathematischen Hilfsmittel ebensoviel Bedeutung beilegen, als dem physikalischen Sinn) nicht förderlich gewesen, den mir als Naturforscher (der aber nicht nur die materielle Welt sehen will) allein annehmbar erscheinenden diesbezüglichen Standpunkt (vgl. S. 7 u. Anm. 7, S. 14) zu betonen, da es als Geschmackssache betrachtet werden kann, wieviel Denkfreiheit man zugunsten der „Relativierung der Zeit“ opfern will.]

man findet sich hier von der zu Bescheidenheit mahnenden Erkenntnis der ganz außerordentlichen Ansprüche, welche an dieser Stelle der Entwicklung an den Geistesumfang des Naturforschers gestellt werden. Große mathematische Begabung, welche die Bilder erster Art mit Leichtigkeit meistert, scheint nicht oft in demselben Kopfe mit der Leichtigkeit der inneren dynamischen, physikalischen Anschauung verbunden zu sein, welche mehr Vorliebe für die Bilder zweiter Art verleiht, — und umgekehrt [Footnote: Man kann hieraus wohl auch ermessen, wie wenig Zweck es hat, wenn volkstümliche Schriften oder Vortragende von einseitigem Standpunkt aus das Relativitätsprinzip vor die Öffentlichkeit bringen, wobei auch der Verdacht kaum abzuweisen ist, daß die Einseitigkeit um des größeren Aufsehens willen, das sie hervorbringt, geliebt wird. Es ist das eine bedauerliche Erscheinung; aber sie besteht, und es wäre ein ungesundes Zeichen, und als solches sicherlich noch viel bedauerlicher, wenn darauf nicht Gegenwirkung einträte. Die „Relativisten“ müßten aber eine von ihnen selbst hervorgerufene Gegenwirkung jederzeit ruhig hinzunehmen wissen.]

Im Einzelnen ergab die Aussprache etwa das Folgende:

Es wurden zwei Fragen gesondert diskutiert, deren Zusammenhang aber doch so wesentlich sich zeigte, daß wir sie hier der Kürze halber teilweise zusammenfassen können, nämlich 1. die Frage (vgl. S. 15, 16): Wie ist es im Beispiel des gebremsten Eisenbahnzuges, wo die Folgen der ungleichförmigen Bewegung nur innerhalb des Zuges sich zeigen, möglich, den Sitz der ungleichförmigen Bewegung trotz dieser Einseitigkeit der Erscheinung für unauffindbar erklären zu wollen, wie es die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie tut? Und 2. die Frage des unerlaubten Gedankenexperiments (vgl. Note 10, S. 16, 17): Bedeutet nicht das Auftreten von Überlichtgeschwindigkeiten im Falle einer Drehung der Gesamtwelt, z. B. um die Erde, die von der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie als eine mit der Drehung irgendeines Körpers, z. B. der Erde, bei ruhender Gesamtwelt gleichwertige Annahme angesehen wird, einen inneren Widerspruch, da doch Überlichtgeschwindigkeiten nach eben derselben Theorie ausgeschlossen seien?

Es wurde von Herr E i n s t e i n s Seite selbstverständlich Gewicht auf die Gravitationsfelder gelegt, welche in seiner Theorie jeden Fall ungleichförmiger Bewegung begleiten müssen; aber es blieb doch dabei, daß diese Felder zunächst nur zu dem Zwecke hinzugenommen seien, um das Relativitätsprinzip allgemeingültig erscheinen zu lassen und auf alle Fälle anwenden zu können, woraus aber noch nicht hervorgeht, daß diese Felder weitere Beziehungen zur Wirklichkeit haben, die die Notwendigkeit ihrer Einführung den sie begleitenden Härten gegenüber erweisen (vgl. S. 22). Dabei sollte nicht bezweifelt sein, daß jedes Auftreten einer ungleichförmigen Bewegung mit gewissen Zuständen des Äthers (des „Raumes“ liebt die Relativitätstheorie zu sagen, vgl. S. 28) in ihrer Umgebung verbunden sei; aber so lange die E i n s t e i n s chen Gravitationsfelder mit ihrem Zubehör den gesunden Verstand nicht befriedigen, wird man zweifeln dürfen, ob sie diese Zustände des Äthers ganz allgemein richtig abbilden. Vergeblich mahnt hierbei Herr E i n s t e i n zu Mißtrauen gegenüber dem gesunden Verstand: Eine Theorie, die nicht in der Lage ist, auf so einfache Fragen, wie die obigen beiden es sind, eine entsprechende einfache, den gewöhnlichen Verstand befriedigende Antwort zu geben, ist nicht einwandfrei. Sie kann Erfolge haben und man kann solche bewundern, sie kann verbesserungsfähig, ja vielleicht schon in Verbesserung begriffen sein, aber sie darf nicht mit den üblichen weit gesteigerten Ansprüchen auftreten, welche wir in der vorliegenden Schrift getadelt haben, und sie darf das am allerwenigsten vor der Allgemeinheit tun, die als nicht sachkundig leicht beliebig irre zu führen ist. Es ist besser, der Allgemeinheit neben den Resultaten auch die Zweifel vorzuführen, um ihr den Ernst der Forschung zu zeigen, — oder aber gar nichts.

Auf die zweite Frage ist übrigens überhaupt keine entscheidende Antwort erfolgt [*Footnote*: Auch sonst war ich schließlich erstaunt, wie wenig Herr E i n s t e i n auf die Beantwortung meiner Fragen vorbereitet zu sein schien

— die doch schon zwei Jahre lang mit seiner Kenntnis gedruckt vorgelegen haben, — während von seiner Seite und auch von einem andern Fachmann Zeitungslesern gegenüber ganz ausdrücklich der Anschein der unbedingten Überlegenheit meinen Gedankengängen gegenüber erweckt worden war. Da ich weder Anhänger noch Gegner irgendeines Prinzips bin, sondern nur Naturforscher sein möchte — wie auf S. 12 schon zu erkennen gegeben, — hätte ich den Nachweis, daß und an welcher Stelle meine Überlegungen nicht genügend gründlich waren, als Gewinn entgegennehmen müssen, wenn er geführt worden wäre (vgl. auch Note k, S. 23), zumal in der rein auf die Sache gerichteten Form, in welcher die Nauheimer Aussprache ablief. Die einzige Aufklärung, welche ich von der Diskussion mitgenommen habe, stammt von seiten des Herrn M i e ; sie wird im weiter Folgenden bezeichnet werden.], und man darf daher wohl sagen, daß die Überlichtgeschwindigkeiten des unerlaubten Gedankenexperiments der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie in der Tat eine Schwierigkeit bereiten [*Footnote*: Man muß immer bedenken, daß jeder beliebige rotierende Körper auf Erden, mag er auch nur eine Umdrehung in 3000 Jahren ausführen, Überlichtgeschwindigkeit schon der Orionsterne, vielhundertfache Lichtgeschwindigkeit der vielhundertfach ferneren Nebelsysteme ergibt, sobald man die Rotation nicht a b s o l u t dem Körper, sondern also der Umwelt zuschreiben will.]. Dies bedeutet aber nicht weniger, als daß diese Theorie in sich selbst — ganz abgesehen von ihrer Übereinstimmung oder Nichtübereinstimmungen mit der Wirklichkeit, — d. i. logisch nicht in Ordnung ist. Der innere Widerspruch, welchen sie enthält, fällt weg, wenn man nach Herrn M i e s Vorschlag gewisse, von ihm „vernunftgemäß“ genannte Koordinatensysteme für bevorzugt erklärt [*Footnote*: Vgl. G. M i e , Physikal. Zeitschr. 18, S. 551, 574, 596, 1917 und Annalen d. Physik 62, S. 46, 1920.] und die anderen möglichen Koordinatensysteme ausschließt [*Footnote*: Ganz im Sinne der auf S. 15 des Vorliegenden Gesagten; vgl. besonders auch die Note 8a.] Gleichzeitig wäre damit auch die erste Frage erledigt; man braucht nur ein mit dem Eisenbahnzug verbundenes Koordinatensystem als ruhend gedachtes Bezugssystem auszuschließen und dafür das mit dem Erdboden verbundene Koordinatensystem als vernunftgemäß in Benutzung zu nehmen, um der Schwierigkeit der Frage enthoben zu sein. Aber dieser Ausweg bedeutet nicht eine Rettung, sondern eine Vernichtung des Relativitätsprinzips in seiner allgemeinsten, von Herrn E i n s t e i n aufgestellten, einem einfachen und zugleich allumfassenden Naturgesetz entsprechenden und daher das besondere philosophische Interesse in Anspruch nehmenden Form. Denn das Prinzip sagt in dieser Form aus, daß der Ablauf allen Naturgeschehens — die Formulierung der allgemeinen Naturgesetze — unabhängig ist von der Wahl des Bezugssystems [*Footnote*: Dies ist auch wirklich nach dem Ursprung des Prinzips sein einfacher Sinn, wenn überhaupt einer vorhanden ist. Es nützte in philosophischer Beziehung nichts, kompliziertere, verklausulierte Fassungen einzuführen; sind solche notwendig, so hat damit das Prinzip nicht

zwar seinen möglichen Wert als Hilfsmittel der Naturforschung, aber doch seine Ansprüche auf Wichtigkeit für das allgemeine Denken, für die Naturauffassung im Ganzen verloren.], wodurch es in allen Fällen unmöglich würde, durch irgendwelche Naturbeobachtungen absolut über Vorhandensein von Ruhe oder Bewegung zu entscheiden. Es müßten dann alle Bezugssysteme durchaus gleichwertig sein für die Schlüsse die sie ergeben (weshalb auch Herr E i n s t e i n die verschiedenen Koordinatensysteme, auch die, welche zu den offensichtlichsten Schwierigkeiten oder zu inneren Widersprüchen führen, immer wieder als prinzipiell gleichwertig hinstellen will), [*Footnote*: Nur praktische, nicht prinzipielle Gründe sollten nach Herrn E i n s t e i n s Äußerung von der Wahl gewisser Koordinatensysteme abhalten. Hierin liegt aber, wenn man sich vergegenwärtigt, daß gewisse, durch das Prinzip selbst gar nicht gekennzeichnete Koordinatensysteme in die Irre führen, eben der (wenn auch versteckte) Hinweis auf die Nichtigkeit der höchsten theoretischen Ansprüche des Prinzips; ganz unbeschadet natürlich seines etwaigen heuristischen und auch entwicklungsfördernden Wertes.] was aber nicht der Fall ist, wie die Beispielsfälle unserer beiden Fragen und in strengerer Form Herrn M i e s Untersuchungen zeigen.

Man kann dann also — wie die Sache bis heute steht — das allgemeine Relativitätsprinzip nicht als Naturgesetz in strengem Sinne hinnehmen, und zwar, wie aus den Untersuchungen von Herrn M i e hervorzugehen scheint — und was hier als über den Inhalt der vorstehenden Teile dieser Schrift hinausgehend besonders hervorzuheben ist, — selbst dann nicht, wenn man seine behauptete Allgemeingültigkeit einschränken will auf massenproportionale Kräfte (Gravitationsprinzip, vgl. S. 18);

[*Footnote*: Das allgemeine Relativitätsprinzip ohne Einschränkung scheidet, wenn wirklich ernst genommen, an b e i d e n oben ausgesprochenen Fragen. Das Gravitationsprinzip (die von mir vorgeschlagene Einschränkung des allgemeinen Relativitätsprinzips) ist dagegen allerdings fern von jeder Schwierigkeit der e r s t e n Frage gegenüber (da es sich auf deren Fall gar nicht bezieht), zeigt aber doch der zweiten Frage gegenüber den inneren Widerspruch, der, wie es nun scheint, jeder Anwendung des Relativitätsprinzips auf ungleichförmige Bewegungen gefährlich werden muß, wenn nicht geeignete Kunstgriffe dagegen schützen. Man könnte danach sagen, daß das Gravitationsprinzip zwar in höherem Grade einwandfrei erscheint als das allgemeine Relativitätsprinzip, daß es aber doch ebenfalls nicht völlig und ohne weiteres einwandfrei ist. Immerhin erscheint der Unterschied in den Mängeln der beiden Prinzipien groß genug, um die in der vorliegenden Schrift geschehene Einführung und Hervorhebung des Gravitationsprinzips zu rechtfertigen.]

sondern man kann es — will man Irreführung vermeiden — nur als ein heuristisches Prinzip hinstellen (vgl. Note 11, S. 17), dessen Anwendung von der Hinzunahme nicht in dem Prinzip liegender Festsetzungen oder von

besonderem Geschick oder Glück in Nebenannahmen begleitet sein muß, um das Ausmünden in falsche Resultate zu vermeiden, als ein Prinzip also, das unter Umständen richtige, wertvolle, ganz neue Zusammenhänge beobachtbarer Dinge liefern kann, wobei aber doch der wirkliche Beweis für die Richtigkeit der so vorausgesagten Zusammenhänge nur in noch hinzuzunehmender Erfahrung zu suchen wäre, mit der sie besonders verglichen werden müssen, nicht in mathematisch noch so einwandfreier Ableitung aus dem Prinzip.

[*Footnote:* Man bemerkt hier einen Unterschied gegenüber den sonstigen physikalischen Prinzipien, beispielweise dem Energieprinzip. Die aus solchen Prinzipien bei richtiger Beachtung der zugehörigen Begriffe mathematisch fehlerlos gezogenen Schlüsse darf man ohne weiteres für ebenso zutreffend halten wie die Gesamtheit der Erfahrungen, welche dem Prinzip zugrunde liegen und an welchen es bereits bewährt ist. Der Unterschied mag an der Neuheit des Relativitätsprinzips liegen (vgl. S. 14), die noch nicht genügend Klarheit hat aufkommen lassen über Gültigkeitsbereich oder über Zusatzbedingungen, welche bei der Anwendung einzuhalten und also als wesentlich zum Prinzip gehörig zu betrachten sind. Jedenfalls scheint mir bei dieser Sachlage im Falle der Perihelverschiebung des Merkur doch immer noch Gerbers „Ableitung“ des richtigen quantitativen Zusammenhanges (sei sie auch nur Scheinableitung gewesen) mit Berücksichtigung der Frühzeitigkeit nennenswert zu bleiben gegenüber der nach dem Gesagten doch auch nur scheinbar aus strenger Anwendung eines Prinzips allein hervorgegangenen Ableitung E i n s t e i n s (vgl. S. 10-12 u. 30). Ganz abgesehen ist dabei in bezug auf G e r b e r davon, daß es mir durchaus unzulässig erscheint, einem längst Verstorbenen, der einen für richtig gehaltenen Zusammenhang (nämlich die Endgleichung für die Perihelverschiebung), also etwas Nützliches gebracht hat (mit dem Ungeschick der Hinzufügung eines anfechtbaren Beweises, aber auch ohne jedes Streben damit hervorzutreten), Puscherei oder dergleichen vorzuwerfen, wie es geschehen ist. Ich glaube, daß man den Pythagoräischen Lehrsatz, wenn ihn Pythagoras bloß veröffentlicht und nicht bewiesen hätte, doch heute noch nach ihm benennen würde — damaliges genügend schnelles Bekanntwerden des Satzes angenommen, — da er richtig und wertvoll ist.]

Ein möglicherweise praktisch wertvolles Prinzip ist das Relativitätsprinzip also, aber keines, auf das eine neue Weltanschauung sich gründen ließe, oder das berufen sein könnte, bewährte anders geartete Wege der Naturforschung nun auf einmal als abgetan erscheinen zu lassen, wenn es auch selber einen neuen, augenblicklich vielbeschrifteten Weg eröffnet hat.

[*Footnote:* Man kann dann auch wohl sagen, daß es sich beim verallgemeinerten Relativitätsprinzip um ein durch Mathematik in quantitative Bahnen gedämmtes System des Erratens von Naturvorgängen

handelt. Solches Erraten unter Aufwand eines ziemlich ausgedehnten mathematischen Apparats spielt auch sonst in der gegenwärtigen Physik eine früher nicht in gleichem Maße dagewesene Rolle, z. B. bei den quantentheoretischen Betrachtungen, und das Verfahren hat sich als sehr förderlich erwiesen, insofern die Kontrolle durch die Beobachtung nicht fehlte. Aber es wäre doch falsch, wenn man — wie einige Mathematiker es tun — nun eine Verwandlung der Physik in einen Nebenzweig der Mathematik als Endziel der Entwicklung vor sich sehen wollte. Die Natur, deren Erforschung Aufgabe der Physik ist, wird mit ihren Wundern, die jederzeit auch tiefsinnigste Forscher überrascht haben, noch nicht so bald zu Ende sein. — Offenbar ist es auch nur Geschmackssache, ob man lieber mit oder ohne mathematische Ableitung sich auf neue, der erfahrungsmäßigen Prüfung wert erscheinende Thesen bringen läßt, wenn die Ableitung nicht exakten Anschluß der Thesen an Erfahrungsergebnisse und an Annahmen von einfacher physikalischer Bedeutung liefert.]

Der mögliche praktische Wert des Prinzips kann umso höher bemessen werden, als es vielleicht richtige Zusammenhänge hat angeben helfen, die auf die Gravitation sich beziehen, auf eine Kraft, der man seit *Newton* und *Cavendish*, also über 100 Jahre lang nicht mehr weiter systematisch hat beikommen können [*Footnote*: Wozu, wenn solche Leistungen in Frage stehen, noch — genau besehen — übertriebene Ansprüche stellen?] Es liegen in dieser Beziehung bekanntlich drei Resultate vor: Die (schon von *Gerber* angegebene) Perihelverschiebungsgleichung, die Lichtstrahlenkrümmung und die Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien bei Gravitationszentren, und es handelt sich um deren Prüfung an der Erfahrung, die auch über den mehr oder weniger großen Wert der Theorie entscheiden muß.

Der gegenwärtige Stand dieser Prüfung ist für die beiden erstgenannten Zusammenhänge, Perihelverschiebung und Lichtstrahlenkrümmung, im Vorliegenden bereits besprochen worden (S. 19, 20), und es kann hier der Lage der Sache nach auch nicht so schnell neue Erfahrung hinzukommen. Die Frage des drittgenannten Zusammenhangs, der Rotverschiebung (vgl. Note 6, S. 19), ist dagegen augenblicklich mehr in Fluß. Es scheint dabei fast, als ob die mit besten Mitteln und von bewährtesten Seiten bisher ausgeführten Beobachtungen zu negativem Resultat sich vereinigten. [*Footnote*: Siehe die reichhaltige Zusammenstellung der in Betracht kommenden Veröffentlichungen in der auf S. 36 zitierten, soeben in den *Annalen der Physik* erschienenen Arbeit von *E. Wicbert*.] Jedenfalls erschien es bei der hierauf bezüglichen Diskussion in *Nauheim* nicht günstig für einwandfreien Überblick, daß nur die *Bonner* Beobachter (mit positivem Resultat) zu Wort kommen konnten, deren Hilfsmittel, so weit bekannt, weniger vollkommen waren als die der *amerikanischen* Beobachter, deren Resultat ebenso wie das kürzlich noch hinzugekommene von *Julius* in *Utrecht* [*Footnote*: *W. H. Julius* u. *P. H. van Cittert*, *Kon. Akad.*

van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, 29. Mai 1920.] aber negativ war. [Footnote: Die in bezug auf die Bonner Beobachtungen noch vorhandenen Zweifel erinnern mich an zwei Fälle, die zeigen, daß im Bonner Physikalischen Institut bei spektralanalytischen Beobachtungen nicht gerade traditionelles Glück vorhanden ist. Man vergleiche die gänzlich unrichtigen Angaben über die räumliche Verteilung der spektralen Lichtemission in den Alkalibogenflammen, die noch heute in nicht genügend kritisch bearbeiteten Werken eine irreführende Rolle spielen (s. dazu Heidelb. Akad. 1914 A 17, Fußnote 94, S. 48, auch Stark's Jahrb. 13, S. 234, 1916) und ebenso die Beobachtungen über spektrale Erregungsverteilungen von Phosphoreszenzbanden, die ebenfalls mit der Annahme in die Irre gingen, bereits vorhandene Beobachtungen an Feinheit übertroffen zu haben (siehe dazu Heidelb. Akad. 1913 A 19, Fußnote 1, S. 3.)]

Man kann daher bei der Rotverschiebung gegenwärtig noch von keiner experimentellen Bestätigung reden. Die beiden anderen Zusammenhänge sind zwar bestätigt, jedoch — wie auf S. 19, 20 erläutert — so, daß es noch fraglich blieb, ob diese Bestätigung überhaupt auf das Gravitationsprinzip sich beziehen läßt. Weiteres muß erst die Zukunft zeigen. Man wird dann sehen können, wie weit das Gravitationsprinzip — neben dem schon durch einfachste alltäglich Erfahrung widerlegten allgemeinen Relativitätsprinzip — wenigstens heuristischen Wert bewährt.”

Hermann Weyl defended Einstein, though Einstein did not agree with Weyl's work.⁵¹⁵ Weyl repeatedly demonstrated dishonesty and his unscientific, unfair and adolescent pro-Einstein bias. In addition to being unfair to Gehrcke, Weyl intentionally underrated David Hilbert's priority for the generally covariant field equations of gravitation of the general theory of relativity. Though Weyl acknowledged Hilbert's work, he failed to emphasize Hilbert's priority as the first to deduce the generally covariant field equations of gravitation of the general theory of relativity. Weyl committed this vile act over Hilbert's objections, in Weyl's book *Space-Time-Matter*.⁵¹⁶

Weyl published an article in *Die Umschau*, Volume 24, Number 42, (23 October 1920) pp. 609-610, which was not accessible to your author up to time of this publication. Other references to contemporary accounts which do not appear herein include: “Einladung zur 86. Vers. Dt. Naturforscher.”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 37, IV; and *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, 25 September 1920) Morning edition, p. 2.

Ernst Gehrcke redressed Hermann Weyl's (and Kleinschrod's) statement regarding the Bad Nauheim debate,

“Der in der Umschau vom 23. Oktober 1920, Seite 610, erstattete Bericht von WEYL über die Relativitätssitzung in Nauheim bedarf in mehrfacher Hinsicht der Ergänzung.

Ein nicht ganz unwichtiger Punkt, der auf der Nauheimer Tagung mit bemerkenswerter Deutlichkeit hervortrat, ist dem Berichte von Herrn WEYL

nachzutragen: EINSTEIN hat nämlich unzweideutig und klar in der Diskussion seine Mißbilligung der WEYLschen Theorie zum Ausdruck gebracht und die Erklärung abgegeben, daß eine aus rein mathematischen Forderungen der Symmetrie aufgebaute Theorie, wie die von WEYL, abzulehnen sei. Wenn Herr WEYL es unternimmt, seine Gedanken der Öffentlichkeit näher zu führen, so sollte er einen so interessanten Punkt wie den der Stellungnahme EINSTEINs zur WEYLschen Theorie nicht unerwähnt lassen, damit in der Öffentlichkeit von vornherein keine irrtümliche Meinung darüber entstehen kann, wie der Urheber der Relativitätstheorie zur species Relativismus von WEYL steht.

Herr WEYL glaubt in seinem Bericht konstatieren zu dürfen, daß LENARD den Sinn der Relativitätstheorie nicht erfaßt habe. Dies ist nur eine Zurückgabe der von LENARD auf der Nauheimer Tagung gemachten Feststellung, daß die Relativisten kein Verständnis für die Erfordernisse der Wirklichkeitsforschung in der Physik gezeigt hätten, und daß sie keinen Versuch machen, die „Kluft“ zu überbrücken. WEYL sollte bedenken, daß auch wenn jemand als Mathematiker virtuose Geschicklichkeit in der Handhabung mathematischer Symbole besitzt, er doch für andere Abstraktionen als Größenbeziehungen der Mathematik einen Mangel an Verständnis bezeugen kann, von dem universeller begabte Naturen frei sind. An Hand der WEYLschen Schriften würde sich leicht eine Liste von erkenntnistheoretischen Schnitzern und begrifflichen Wirrnissen anlegen lassen; es sei in diesem Zusammenhang übrigens auch auf die kürzlich erschienene Schrift von RIPKE-KÜHN: KANT contra EINSTEIN, Verlag von KEYSER-Erfurt, verwiesen.

Der von Herrn WEYL in seinem Bericht näher ausgeführte Punkt in der Diskussion zwischen EINSTEIN und LENARD hinsichtlich dessen Beispiel des gebremsten Eisenbahnzuges läßt den wesentlichen, von LENARD näher erläuterten Einwand vermissen, daß zur Erzeugung eines Gravitationsfeldes doch nach unseren heutigen physikalischen Kenntnissen Massen da sein sollten, die das Gravitationsfeld hervorbringen. Im Falle des Eisenbahnunglücks, wo nach Angabe des Relativisten nicht der Zug, sondern die ganze Umgebung gebremst worden sein soll, ist keine Massenordnung und nichts ersichtlich, was das zur Bremsung der Umgebung erforderliche Gravitationsfeld erzeugt haben könnte. Der Relativist wurde denn auch in Nauheim veranlaßt, ausdrücklich Gravitationsfelder ohne erzeugende, gravitierende Massen anzunehmen, wobei er allerdings u. a. offen ließ, woher die Energie dieser Gravitationsfelder genommen wird. Von all dem berichtet uns Herr WEYL nichts.

Endlich hat die Diskussion in Nauheim die Erklärung EINSTEINs gezeitigt, daß nach der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie der Körper jede beliebige Geschwindigkeit, größer als die Lichtgeschwindigkeit, besitzen dürfen. Auch diese in ihren Folgerungen hier nicht weiter zu behandelnde Angelegenheit erwähnt Herr WEYL nicht. „Ergebnislos“ war

die Debatte in Nauheim also keineswegs.”⁵¹⁷

Weyl answered *Die Umschau* a.k.a. *Die Umschau; Wochenschrift über die Fortschritte in Wissenschaft und Technik*; a. k. a. *Umschau in Wissenschaft und Technik*, Volume 25, (1921), p. 123.

Ernst Gehrcke wrote,

“Ich möchte hier zum Ausdruck bringen, daß EINSTEIN auf der Nauheimer Naturforscherversammlung die Möglichkeit der Überlichtgeschwindigkeiten vom Standpunkt seines allgemeinen Relativitätsprinzips zugestanden hat. Wenn Herr WEYL dies leugnen zu können glaubt, so ist nur ein neuer Widerspruch zwischen ihm und EINSTEIN — wenigstens zur Zeit der Nauheimer Tagung — festzustellen. Die Erklärung EINSTEINs über die Überlichtgeschwindigkeiten, so unbefriedigend sie sein mag, ist tatsächlich abgegeben worden, und Herr WEYL hätte besser getan, das Beweismaterial zu prüfen, als einen Irrtum LENARDS anzunehmen.”⁵¹⁸

Hermann Weyl wrote in 1921:

**“Die Relativitätstheorie auf der Naturforscherversammlung
in Bad Nauheim.**

Von H. WEYL in Zürich.

Auf Veranlassung der Deutschen Mathematikervereinigung war auf der letztjährigen Naturforscherversammlung in Bad Nauheim die Relativitätstheorie in einer kombinierten Sitzung der mathematischen und physikalischen Sektion zum Mittelpunkt einer Reihe von Vorträgen und einer allgemeinen Diskussion gemacht worden; darüber sei hier — nach reichlich langer Zeit, die aber vielleicht der Klärung und ruhigen Beurteilung der Sachlage zugute kommt — Bericht erstattet.

Den ersten Teil der Sitzung bildeten vier Vorträge aus dem Gebiete der Relativitätstheorie: 1. H. W e y l , Elektrizität und Gravitation; 2. G. M i e , Das elektrische Feld eines um ein Gravitationszentrum rotierenden geladenen Partikelchens; 3. M. v. L a u e , Theoretisches über neuere optische Beobachtungen zur Relativitätstheorie; 4. L. G r e b e , Über die Gravitationsverschiebung der Fraunhoferschen Linien. Den vier Vorträgen folgte die auf ihren Inhalt sich beziehende „Spezial“-Diskussion. Der letzte und dramatischste Teil, die allgemeine Diskussion über die Relativitätstheorie, gestaltete sich im wesentlichen zu einem Zweikampf zwischen E i n s t e i n und L e n a r d . Mit großem Geschick, Strenge und Unparteilichkeit waltete P l a n c k seines Amtes als Vorsitzender; ihm war es nicht zum wenigsten zu danken, daß dieses „Nauheimer Relativitätsgespräch“, in welchem entgegengesetzte erkenntnistheoretische Grundauffassungen der Wissenschaft aufeinanderstießen, einen würdigen

Verlauf nahm.

Auf den Inhalt der Vorträge werde hier nur insoweit eingegangen, als er mit den prinzipiellen Fragen der Relativitätstheorie in Zusammenhang steht. Nach der speziellen Relativitätstheorie beruht der *Dopplereffekt* auf den folgenden beiden Tatsachen: 1. Die Frequenzen der von zwei Atomen der gleichen Konstitution, etwa zwei Wasserstoffatomen, ausgesendeten Spektrallinien sind einander gleich, wenn jede von ihnen gemessen wird in der dem Atom eigentümlichen *Eigenzeit*. 2. Die Frequenz einer Lichtwelle ist im ganzen Raum überall die gleiche, wenn sie gemessen wird in der „kosmischen“ Zeit t , die zusammen mit den drei Raumkoordinaten ein System linearer Koordinaten für die ganze Welt bildet. Wie übertragen sich diese beiden Tatsachen in die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie? Hier wird die Eigenzeit nach E i n s t e i n definiert durch die „metrische Fundamentalform“ $ds^2 = \sum g_{ik} dx_i dx_k$, eine quadratische Differentialform der vier willkürlichen Weltkoordinaten x_i vom Trägheitsindex 3; und das Analogon zu 1. lautet: für zwei Atome gleicher Konstitution hat das Integral $\int ds$, erstreckt über eine volle Periode, den gleichen Wert. Fragt man indes danach — um der Sache etwas mehr auf den Grund zu gehen —, wodurch das ds^2 physikalisch bestimmt ist, wodurch insbesondere der Vergleich der Maßeinheiten des ds an verschiedenen Weltstellen ermöglicht wird, so antwortet E i n s t e i n, daß dazu die Atomuhren das Mittel bilden (auch starre Maßstäbe oder, physikalisch etwas strenger gesprochen, die Gitterabstände in einem Kristall können zum gleichen Zwecke dienen): kommt die Atomuhr im Laufe ihrer Geschichte vom Weltpunkt O nach dem Weltpunkt O' und legt sie beim Passieren von O während einer Periode die unendlichkleine Weltstrecke \mathfrak{S} , beim Passieren von O' während einer Periode die unendlichkleine Weltstrecke \mathfrak{S}' zurück, so hat *definitionsgemäß* \mathfrak{S}' die gleiche Länge ds wie \mathfrak{S} . 1. ist danach keine erklärungsbedürftige Tatsache, sondern ds ist physikalisch so definiert, daß 1. zutrifft. Dennoch schließt die Möglichkeit dieser Festsetzung über den Transport der Maßeinheit eine physikalische Grundtatsache ein, nämlich die folgende: Haben zwei Atomuhren, die sich an derselben Weltstelle O befinden, dort die gleiche Frequenz und treffen sie, nachdem sie verschiedene Wege in der Welt durchlaufen haben, in einem anderen Weltpunkt O' wieder zusammen, so haben sie auch dort gleiche Frequenz. Meine Theorie von Elektrizität und Gravitation, auf einer Weltgeometrie beruhend, in welcher die Übertragung einer Strecke durch kongruente Verpflanzung längs eines Weges vom Wege abhängig ist, war von den Physikern meist dahin mißverstanden worden, als wolle ich an dieser Tatsache rütteln. Der Hauptzweck meines Vortrages in Nauheim war, dem entgegenzutreten. Ich akzeptiere jene Grundtatsache so gut wie E i n s t e i n; wir weichen voneinander ab in ihrer theoretischen Deutung. Nach E i n s t e i n ist die metrische Struktur des Äthers von der

Art, wie sie R i e m a n n annimmt, die Streckenübertragung vom Wege unabhängig. Die Frequenzen der Atomuhren folgen dieser kongruenten Verpflanzung; die Erhaltung der Frequenz beruht also auf einer von Augenblick zu Augenblick infinitesimal wirksamen *Beharrungstendenz*. Im Gegensatz dazu scheint mir die einzig mögliche physikalische Deutung jener Grundtatsache die zu sein, daß sich die Frequenz durch *Einstellung* auf eine gewisse Feldgröße (von der Dimension einer Länge) bestimmen muß: zufolge ihrer *Konstitution* hat die Atomuhr an einer beliebigen Feldstelle eine Periode, die im Verhältnis zu jener Feldgröße einen bestimmten numerischen Gleichgewichtswert besitzt. [*Footnote*: In einer jüngst erschienenen Note (Berliner Sitzungsberichte 1921, S. 261). akzeptiert E i n s t e i n, wenn ich ihn recht verstehe, diesen Standpunkt, nicht aber meine weltgeometrische Deutung der Elektrizität.] In der Tat ergeben die Naturgesetze, daß sich die materiellen Körper so verhalten, und zwar ist die Feldgröße, auf welche sich die Längen einstellen, der aus der skalaren Krümmung des Feldes zu berechnende Krümmungsradius. Die aus dem Verhalten der materiellen Körper in der geläufigen Weise abgelesene Maßgeometrie ist also mit der metrischen Struktur des Äthers nicht identisch, sondern geht aus ihr hervor, indem die kongruente Verpflanzung ersetzt wird durch die Einstellung auf den Krümmungsradius. In der anschließenden Diskussion wurde der beiderseitige Standpunkt klar und knapp zum Ausdruck gebracht, ohne daß einer den andern zu bekehren oder zu widerlegen suchte. [*Footnote*: Eine ausführliche Darstellung meiner Auffassung wurde von mir gerade jetzt veröffentlicht in zwei Arbeiten in den Ann. d. Physik **65** und der Physik. Zeitschrift **22** unter den Titeln: „Feld und Materie“, „Über die physikalischen Grundlagen der erweiterten Relativitätstheorie“.]

Ich komme zu der oben erwähnten Tatsache 2. und ihrer Übertragung in die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie. Davon handelte der Lauesche Vortrag. Ein *statisches* Gravitationsfeld ist dadurch gekennzeichnet: man kann die vier Weltkoordinaten $x_0 = t, x_1 x_2 x_3$ (statische Koordinaten) so wählen, daß sich Zeit (t) und Raum ($x_1 x_2 x_3$) vollständig trennen und die Beschaffenheit des Feldes zeitlich konstant ist; d. h. es wird

$$ds^2 = f^2 dt^2 - d\sigma^2,$$

wo f , die Lichtgeschwindigkeit, und $d\sigma^2$, die metrische Fundamentalform des Raumes, nur von dem Raumkoordinaten $x_1 x_2 x_3$ abhängen; $d\sigma^2$ ist positiv-definit. In einem solchen statischen Gravitationsfeld haben die Maxwell'schen Gleichungen (komplexe) Lösungen von folgender Art: das elektromagnetische Feld ist gleich einem zeitlich konstanten Felde multipliziert mit dem von der Zeit abhängigen rein periodischen Term e^{ivt} ; v ist die konstante Frequenz. Sind derartige „einfache Schwingungen“, wie wir es annehmen wollen, für den tatsächlichen Vorgang der

Lichtausbreitung maßgebend, so heißt das: 2. In einem statischen Gravitationsfeld ist die Frequenz der von einem ruhenden Körper ausgesendeten Lichtwelle überall im Raum die gleiche, gemessen in der kosmischen Zeit t , der Zeitkoordinate im System der vier statischen Koordinaten. Aus den beiden Tatsachen 1. und 2. ergibt sich mit Notwendigkeit die von Einstein behauptete *Rotverschiebung der Spektrallinien* in der Nähe großer Massen, die ja nach dem Äquivalenzprinzip mit dem Dopplerschen Prinzip auf engste zusammenhängt; denn im statischen Gravitationsfeld hat f in der Nähe großer Massen einen kleineren Wert als fern von ihnen. — Außerdem leitete L a u e in seinem Vortrag nach dem Muster des von D e b y e für die klassische Elektrodynamik vorgeschlagenen Verfahrens aus den Maxwell'schen Gleichungen als erste Näherung für hohe Frequenzen das Grundgesetz der geometrischen Optik her, daß ein Lichtsignal eine geodätische Nulllinie beschreibt. Man macht den Ansatz, daß alle Feldkomponenten multiplikativ den Term e^{ivE} enthalten mit einem sehr großen konstanten v , und erhält dann für die „Eikonalfunktion“ E die partielle Differentialgleichung

$$\sum_{ik} g^{ik} \frac{\partial E}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial E}{\partial x_k} = 0,$$

deren Charakteristiken die geodätischen Nulllinien sind.

An das eben aufgestellte Prinzip 2. sei es gestattet, hier eine kritische Bemerkung anzuknüpfen. Das Prinzip ist eindeutig, wenn durch die Forderung der statischen Koordinaten die Zeit t bis auf eine lineare Transformation in sich, die drei Raumkoordinaten $x_1 x_2 x_3$ bis auf eine willkürliche Transformation untereinander festgelegt sind. Im allgemeinen ist das der Fall, aber nicht immer. Die gravitationslose Welt der speziellen Relativitätstheorie:

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - (dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + dx_3^2)$$

ist ein Beispiel dafür. Doch wird hier unter den linearen Koordinatensystemen eine bestimmte kosmische Zeit t dadurch ausgezeichnet, daß man fordert, der licht-aussendende Körper solle ruhen; und so gestatten in diesem Falle unsere beiden Forderungen 1. und 2. die Lichtwellen zu vergleichen, die von zwei relativ zueinander bewegten Körpern ausgehen (Dopplersches Prinzip). Ein anderes wichtiges Beispiel ist die leere Welt, wie sie sich ergibt, wenn man in den Gravitationsgleichungen das Einsteinsche kosmologische Glied mitberücksichtigt. Nach d e S i t t e r [*Footnote: On Einsteins theory of gravitation and its astronomical consequences III, Monthly Notices of the R. Astron. Society, Nov. 1917.*] ist

diese leere Welt ein „Kegelschnitt“ $\Omega(x) = a^2$ in einem 5-dimensionalen Euklidischen Raum mit dem Linienelement $ds^2 = -\Omega(dx)$;

$$\Omega(x) = x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2 - x_5^2.$$

Durch die Substitution

$$(*) \quad x_4 = z \cdot \cos \frac{t}{a}, \quad x_5 = z \cdot \sin \frac{t}{a}$$

kommt man hier auf statische Koordinaten t, x_1, x_2, x_3 ; es wird nämlich

$$-ds^2 = (dx_1^2 + dx_2^2 + dx_3^2 + dz^2) - \frac{z^2}{a^2} dt^2$$

mit
$$z^2 = a^2 - r^2, \quad r^2 = x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2.$$

$f^2 = 1 - \left(\frac{r}{a}\right)^2$ nimmt vom Werte 1 im Nullpunkt bis zum Werte 0 auf dem

Äquator ab. Ist diese statische Zeit für die Ausbreitung des Lichtes maßgebend, so würden also die Spektrallinien von Sternen um so stärker nach dem Rot verschoben sein, je weiter sie vom Nullpunkt entfernt liegen. De Sitter hat die Möglichkeit erwogen, auf diese Weise die tatsächlich vorhandene systematische starke Rotverschiebung in den Spektren der Spiralnebel kosmologisch zu deuten. Nun ist aber t offenbar keineswegs die einzige „statische Zeit“; zu dem Spiralnebel als Nullpunkt wird ebenso eine solche Zeit gehören wie zu der bisher als Nullpunkt angenommenen Sonne. In der Tat kann man ja vor Ausführung der Substitution (*) die Koordinaten $x_1 \dots x_5$ einer willkürlichen linearen Transformation unterwerfen, welche $\Omega(x)$ invariant läßt; dann bekommt man ein ganz anderes t . Welches soll nun nach dem Prinzip 2. maßgebend sein für die Ausbreitung des Lichtes? Die durch (*) eingeführten statischen Koordinaten stellen nicht den ganzen de Sitterschen Kegelschnitt, sondern nur den Keil $x_4^2 - x_5^2 > 0$ reell dar. Ist die wirkliche Welt der ganze de Sittersche Kegelschnitt, so ist also das Prinzip 2. völlig unberechtigt. Wenn aber die Welt nur aus einem derartigen Keil besteht, wie Einstein es annimmt, ist natürlich dasjenige, bis auf eine lineare Transformation eindeutig bestimmte t zu nehmen, welches diesem Keil entspricht. Steht das im Einklang mit der Wirklichkeit, so ist also auf die Ausbreitung einer Lichtwelle vom Moment ihrer Entstehung an der Zusammenschluß der Welt im Ganzen von Einfluß, während man doch erwarten sollte, daß die Lichtwelle darauf erst reagieren kann, wenn sie den

ganzen Weltraum durchlaufen hat. Mit der in den retardierten Potentialen zum Ausdruck kommenden alten Hertz'schen Vorstellung von der Entstehung einer Lichtwelle ist das gewiß unverträglich. So bedarf das Prinzip 2., der Mechanismus der Übertragung der Frequenz in einer Lichtwelle, noch sehr der physikalischen Aufklärung.

Inwieweit die nach Einstein zu erwartende *Rotverschiebung* der Fraunhoferschen Linien im Sonnenspektrum gegenüber den von irdischen Lichtquellen stammenden Linien durch die *Experimente* bestätigt wird, darüber berichtete Grebe. Die Messungen sind angestellt worden von Schwarzschild, dann von Evershed und Royds, später von St. John, schließlich von Bachem und Grebe. Namentlich die mit den schärfsten Hilfsmitteln ausgeführten Beobachtungen von St. John sprachen *gegen* das Vorhandensein des Einsteineffektes. Alle Beobachter stellen aber übereinstimmend fest, daß verschiedene Linien verschiedene Verschiebungen aufweisen. Grebe und Bachem machten nun darauf aufmerksam, daß für die Erklärung dieser Unregelmäßigkeiten vor allem der Umstand in Betracht fällt, daß unmittelbar benachbarte Linien sich gegenseitig in der Lage ihrer Intensitätsmaxima stören. Sie sonderten deshalb auf Grund mikrophotometrischer Aufnahmen aus den von ihnen gemessenen 36 Linien der sogenannten Cyanbande 11 aus, die sie als störungsfrei glaubten in Anspruch nehmen zu dürfen; diese zeigen nun im Mittel eine Rotverschiebung, welche dem Einsteineffekt ungefähr entspricht. Ebenso ergab sich als Mittel der Verschiebungen von 100 *aufeinanderfolgenden* Cyanbandenlinien *ohne jede Auswahl* — wo man erwarten darf, daß die gegenseitigen Störungen sich ausgleichen — nahezu derselbe Wert. Wenn man diese Untersuchungen auch noch kaum als eine definitive experimentelle Bestätigung des Einsteineffektes ansprechen darf, so verstärken sie doch die Wahrscheinlichkeit seines wirklichen Vorhandenseins erheblich. In der seit der Nauheimer Tagung verflossenen Zeit hat sich die Situation in dieser Hinsicht durch neue Beobachtungen noch weiter verbessert.

Um Sinn und Tragweite des Einsteinschen *Äquivalenzprinzips* durch ein vollständig zu übersehendes, nicht triviales Beispiel zu illustrieren, berechnete Mie nach diesem Prinzip das elektrische Feld eines geladenen Teilchens, das um ein elektrisch neutrales Gravitationszentrum unter dem Einfluß der Gravitation eine Kreisbahn beschreibt. Die statischen Koordinaten, in welchen das kugelsymmetrische Gravitationsfeld die von Schwarzschild angegebene Form besitzt, bezeichnet Mie als das vernünftige Koordinatensystem. In einem gewissen „künstlichen“ Koordinatensystem, in welchem sowohl das Teilchen ruht wie auch das Gravitationsfeld stationär ist, haben die Maxwell'schen Gleichungen eine von der Zeit unabhängige Lösung, welche in der unmittelbaren Nähe des Teilchens mit der elektrostatischen Lösung identisch ist. Transformiert man sie auf das vernünftige Koordinatensystem, so erhält man diejenige Lösung des Problems, welche nach dem Äquivalenzprinzip dem elektrostatischen

Feld eines ruhenden Teilchens gleichwertig ist. Das Feld ist in unendlichgroßer Entfernung nicht von solcher Art, daß eine Ausstrahlung von Energie stattfindet, sondern man erhält es dort, wenn einem nach den Liénard-Wiechertschen Formeln berechneten ausstrahlenden Feld ein einstrahlendes von gleicher Stärke superponiert wird. Zweifellos ist das eine mit den uns bekannten Feldgesetzen verträgliche Lösung; dennoch ist es sicher, daß das wirkliche Verhalten eines elektrisch geladenen Körpers, der um ein Gravitationszentrum rotiert, nicht ihr entspricht, sondern eine elektromagnetische Welle ausstrahlt und dadurch selber in seiner Bewegung modifiziert wird. Die *tatsächlichen* Vorgänge bei Ruhe und Rotation sind also *nicht* einander äquivalent. M i e äußert sich darüber so: Man denke sich ein Einsteinsches Kupee, welches auf einer Kreisbahn um das Gravitationszentrum herumfährt; die Beobachter stellen an einem mitgeführten elektrischen Teilchen Beobachtungen an. Bestehen die Wandungen des Kupees aus Metall, so daß das von dem Teilchen erregte elektrische Feld dort endigt, so gilt das Äquivalenzprinzip; bestehen die Wandungen jedoch aus isolierendem Material, so können die Beobachter im Kupee ihre Bewegung feststellen; die Feldlinien des Teilchens sind sozusagen Fühler, die sie aus dem Kupee heraus ins Unendliche strecken. Damit kann man sich sehr wohl auch vom Einsteinschen Standpunkt aus einverstanden erklären. Solange man mit einem unendlichen Raum operiert, hat man immer den unendlich fernen Saum dieses Raumes zu berücksichtigen, über den gewissermaßen ein das Feld bestimmendes Agens ebenso herüberwirkt wie über die inneren Feldsäume, welche den verschiedenen Materieteilchen entsprechen. Mathematisch äußert sich das darin, daß nur solche Koordinaten zulässig sind, für welche im Unendlichen das ds^2 die Gestalt der speziellen Relativitätstheorie hat. In Einsteins geschlossenem Raum aber fällt der unendlich ferne Saum weg, an seine Stelle treten die weit entfernten Massen.

Der Durchrechnung dieses speziellen Problems schickte M i e einige grundsätzliche Bemerkungen voraus, welche zeigen, daß er in einigen Punkten einen andern Standpunkt einnimmt als Einstein. Insbesondere glaubt er an ein ausgezeichnetes „vernunftgemäßes“ Koordinatensystem. Nun ist ja zuzugeben, daß sich in speziellen Problemen oft aus der Beschaffenheit des metrischen Feldes heraus ein besonders einfaches und zweckmäßiges Koordinatensystem definieren läßt. So kann man im Schwarzschildschen Fall des statischen kugelsymmetrischen Gravitationsfeldes die Raumkoordinaten $x_1 x_2 x_3$ derart wählen, daß, wenn man mit ihrer Hilfe den wirklichen Raum auf einen Cartesischen abbildet, das lineare Vergrößerungsverhältnis für Linienelemente, welche senkrecht zu den Radien im Bildraum stehen, $= 1$ wird (für radiale Linienelemente wird es dann, wie aus den Gravitationsgleichungen hervorgeht, $= 1/f$, und f^2 ist $= 1 - \frac{2\alpha}{r}$; α eine Konstante, r die im Bildraum gemessene Entfernung von Zentrum). Aber

gerade in diesem Fall kann man über die radiale Maßskala z. B. doch auch so verfügen, daß die Abbildung auf den Cartesischen Bildraum konform ist (dann wird das Vergrößerungsverhältnis für alle Linienelemente $= \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{r}\right)^2$, und f ist $= \frac{r - \alpha/2}{r + \alpha/2}$). Hier ist gar nicht abzusehen, warum man das eine dieser beiden Koordinatensysteme als „vernunftgemäßer“ ansprechen soll denn das andere. Die Frage nach der Existenz eines vernunftgemäßen Koordinatensystems hängt aufs engste mit der andern zusammen, inwiefern es berechtigt ist, zu behaupten: die wahre Geometrie des Raumes sei die *euklidische*; daß materielle Maßstäbe nicht die Relationen erfüllen, welche diese Geometrie für den idealen starren Körper angibt, liege daran, daß die materiellen Körper durch das Gravitationsfeld in bestimmter Weise deformiert werden. Dieser Standpunkt, den z. B. Dingler und Hamel vertreten [*Footnote*: Dingler: Der starre Körper, Physik. Zeitschr. 1920 S. 487; Hamel: Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Mathem. Gesellschaft 1921. S. 65.], ist zunächst natürlich gegenüber der Gravitation physikalisch ebenso berechtigt wie gegenüber der Temperatur (Einstein selbst zieht diese Parallele in seiner populären Schrift über die Relativitätstheorie): kein Mensch behauptet, daß auf einer ungleichförmig erwärmten Platte eine nichteuklidische Geometrie gilt, sondern daß die zur Ausmessung verwendeten Maßstäbe durch die verschiedenen Temperaturen verschiedene Ausdehnungen erfahren. Aber in diesem Fall existiert eine absolut ausgezeichnete Reduktion, die Reduktion auf „gleiche Temperatur“, durch welche das Verhalten der Maßstäbe mit der euklidischen Geometrie in Einklang gebracht wird. Im Fall der Gravitation existiert zwar auch eine „Reduktion auf Euklid“ (das ist sogar selbstverständlich), aber unter den unendlich vielen möglichen derartigen Korrekturvorschriften, deren jede zu andern Resultaten führt, ist keine physikalisch so ausgezeichnet, daß sie sich zwingend als die „einzig richtige“ aufdrängt. Darum ist es hier wertlos, den an den materiellen Körpern abgelesenen Maßzahlen durch Korrektur eine euklidische Geometrie zu supponieren. Vielleicht hat der Philosoph immer noch Recht mit seiner Ansicht, daß man ohne einen idealen euklidischen Anschauungsraum nicht auskomme; ihm entspräche in der mathematischen Darstellung die Notwendigkeit, ein Koordinatensystem zu verwenden. Aber seine Beziehung auf das Ordnungsschema der physikalischen Ereignisse ist wie die Wahl des Koordinatensystems in hohem Maße willkürlich. Die universelle Konstruktion, welche Mie selber für das vernunftgemäße Koordinatensystem andeutet (mit Hilfe einer Einbettung des vierdimensionalen wirklichen Raumes in einen zehndimensionalen euklidischen) ist vieldeutig und ohne inneres Vorzugsrecht. Es ist gar nicht einzusehen, welche Erleichterung dadurch für die Beschreibung der physikalischen Vorgänge geschaffen werden soll; sie läßt sich ja immer mittels invarianter Begriffe vollziehen. — Noch in einem andern Punkte weicht Mie von Einstein ab; er meint, man dürfe nicht von allgemeiner

Relativität, sondern nur von einer Relativität der Gravitationswirkungen sprechen, da man nach der Einsteinschen Theorie das Verhalten eines beschleunigt bewegten materiellen Systems aus dem des ruhenden nur dann berechnen kann, wenn die wirkende Kraft die eines Gravitationsfeldes ist. Mir scheint, das ist kein Einwand gegen die Allgemeinheit des Relativitätsprinzips, sondern eine Bemerkung über seine Tragweite: nur für die im „Führungsfeld“ neben der Trägheit mitgehaltenen Kräfte (Zentrifugalkraft, Gravitation), die man an ihrer Massenproportionalität erkennt, ist dieses Prinzip ausreichend, ihre Wirkungsweise *a priori* aus dem Galileischen Trägheitsprinzip abzuleiten.

Die beiden zuletzt erörterten Punkte kamen auch in der *allgemeinen Diskussion*, die vor allem von L e n a r d benutzt wurde, zwischen L e n a r d und E i n s t e i n zur Sprache. Es sei um der Übersichtlichkeit willen gestattet, aus diesem Wechselgespräch zunächst noch zwei weitere Streitfragen herauszuschälen, die neben der am Schluß zu besprechenden Hauptdifferenz nur von nebensächlicher Bedeutung sind. Das ist erstens die *Existenz des Äthers*. L e n a r d meint, E i n s t e i n habe, bei Aufstellung der speziellen Relativitätstheorie, allzu voreilig die Abschaffung des Äthers verkündet. In der Tat kann er ja darauf hinweisen, daß E i n s t e i n heute wieder in der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie von einem Äther spricht. [*Footnote*: Siehe namentlich die Leidener Antrittsvorlesung E i n s t e i n s über Äther und Relativitätstheorie, Springer 1920.] Man darf sich doch aber durch das gleichlautende Wort nicht über die Verschiedenheit der Sache täuschen lassen! Der alte Äther der Lichttheorie war ein *substantielles* Medium, ein dreidimensionales Kontinuum, von welchem sich jede Stelle P in jedem Augenblick t in einem bestimmten Raumpunkt p (oder an einer bestimmten Weltstelle) befindet; die Wiedererkennbarkeit derselben Ätherstelle zu verschiedenen Zeiten ist dabei das Wesentliche. Durch diesen Äther löst sich die vierdimensionale Welt auf in ein dreifach unendliches Kontinuum von eindimensionalen Weltlinien; infolgedessen gestattet er, *Ruhe* und *Bewegung* absolut voneinander zu unterscheiden. *In diesem Sinne*, etwas anderes hat E i n s t e i n nicht behauptet, ist der Äther durch die spezielle Relativitätstheorie abgeschafft; er wurde ersetzt durch die affingometrische Struktur der Welt, welche nicht den Unterschied zwischen Ruhe und Bewegung festlegt, sondern die *gleichförmige Translation* von allen andern Bewegungen absondert. Der substantielle Äther war von seinen Erfindern als etwas Reales, den ponderablen Körpern Vergleichbares gedacht. In der Lorentzschen Elektrodynamik hatte er sich in eine rein geometrische, d. h. ein für allemal feste, von der Materie nicht beeinflusste Struktur verwandelt. In E i n s t e i n s spezieller Relativitätstheorie trat an ihre Stelle eine andere, die affingometrische Struktur. In der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie endlich verwandelte sich die letztere, als „affiner Zusammenhang“ oder „Führungsfeld“, wieder zurück in ein mit der Materie in Wirkungszusammenhang stehendes Zustandsfeld von physikalischer Realität. Und darum hielt es E i n s t e i n für angezeigt, das alte Wort Äther

für den vollständig gewandelten Begriff wieder einzuführen; ob das zweckmäßig war oder nicht, ist weniger eine physikalische als eine philologische Frage.

Zweitens: die *Überlichtgeschwindigkeit*. L e n a r d meint, die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie führe die Überlichtgeschwindigkeit wieder ein, da sie als Bezugssystem z. B. die rotierende Erde zuläßt; in hinreichend großen Entfernungen treten dabei Überlichtgeschwindigkeit auf. Dies ist ein offenes Mißverständnis. Sind x_1, x_2, x_3 die in bezug auf die rotierende Erde gemessenen Raumkoordinaten, x_0 die zugehörige „Zeit“ (auf ihre präzise Definition kommt es jetzt nicht an), so werden die Koordinatenlinien x_0 , auf denen bei konstanten x_1, x_2, x_3 nur x_0 variiert, nicht alle zeitartige Richtung haben, d. h. es wird in diesen Koordinaten nicht überall $g_{00} > 0$ sein. Nun behauptet E i n s t e i n allerdings, daß auch solche Koordinatensysteme zulässig sind; auch in solchen Koordinatensystemen gelten seine allgemein invarianten Gravitationsgesetze. Dagegen hält er durchaus daran fest, daß die *Weltlinie eines materiellen Körpers* stets zeitartige Richtung besitzt, daß an einem materiellen Körper (und als „Signalgeschwindigkeit“) keine Überlichtgeschwindigkeit auftreten kann. Ein Koordinatensystem von der oben angegebenen Art läßt sich infolgedessen nicht in seiner ganzen Ausdehnung durch einen „Bezugsmollusken“ wiedergeben, d. h. man kann sich kein materielles Medium denken, dessen einzelne Elemente die Koordinatenlinien x_0 jenes Koordinatensystems als Weltlinien beschreiben.—

Aber es wird Zeit, daß ich auf den entscheidenden Gegensatz zwischen L e n a r d und E i n s t e i n zu sprechen komme. L e n a r d behauptet, daß die Einsteinsche Theorie mit *fingierten Gravitationsfeldern* operiere, zu denen sich keine erzeugende Materie nachweisen ließe und welche nur dem Relativitätsprinzip zuliebe eingeführt würden. Das anschauliche Lenardsche Beispiel des durch einen entgegenfahrenden Zug plötzlich gebremsten Eisenbahnzuges diene auch hier als Unterlage der Diskussion. Warum, fragt L e n a r d, geht der Zug in Trümmer und nicht der Kirchturm neben dem Zug, da doch nach E i n s t e i n ebensogut von ihm wie von dem Eisenbahnzug gesagt werden kann, daß er gebremst werde? Hierauf scheint mir die Antwort leicht. In der Einsteinschen Theorie gibt es so gut wie nach alter Auffassung das *Führungsfeld*, dem ein Körper nach dem Galileischen Prinzip folgt, solange auf ihn keine Kräfte wirken. Die Katastrophe ereignet sich am Zuge und nicht am Kirchturm, weil der erstere durch die Molekularkräfte des entgegenfahrenden Zuges aus der Bahn des Führungsfeldes herausgeworfen wird, der Kirchturm hingegen nicht. Diese Antwort ist auch vollkommen im Einklang mit dem „gesunden Menschenverstand“, der von Herzen damit einverstanden ist, die sich den Kräften entgegenstimmende Beharrungstendenz des Führungsfeldes mit E i n s t e i n als eine physikalische Realität anzusehen. Die Frage ist jetzt

aber weiter die: ist dieses Führungsfeld eine Einheit oder lassen sich in ihr zwei Bestandteile, die „Trägheit“ und die „Gravitation“, grundsätzlich voneinander trennen, derart daß die erste von selber ein für allemal vorhanden ist als affin-lineare Struktur der vierdimensionalen Welt und nur die zweite durch die Materie erzeugt wird? Hier, für die Gleichberechtigung aller Bewegungszustände, ist die Sachlage eine ganz analoge wie für die Gleichberechtigung aller Richtungen im Raum. Nach *Demokrit* gibt es an sich ein absolutes Oben-Unten; die wirkliche Fallrichtung eines Körpers setzt sich zusammen aus dieser absoluten Richtung und einer aus physikalischen Ursachen entspringenden Abweichung davon. *Demokrit* könnte etwa gegen *Newton*, der die Fallrichtung als Einheit ansieht, genau so argumentieren wie *Lenard* gegen *Einstein*: Macht man eine andere als jene wahre Richtung zur Normalrichtung, so muß man außer ihr und der wirklichen Abweichung drittens noch eine überall gleiche und nicht in der Materie verankerte fingierte Abweichung einführen; und das nur, um dem Prinzip von der Gleichberechtigung aller Richtungen im Raume zu genügen. Sobald man die absolute Richtung Oben-Unten zugibt, kann man scheiden zwischen wirklicher und fingierter Abweichung; sobald man ein ausgezeichnetes, „vernunftgemäßes“ Koordinatensystem annimmt, muß man (mit *Mie* und *Lenard*) scheiden zwischen wirklichen und fingierten Gravitationsfeldern. Auf dem Relativitätsstandpunkt hingegen wird eine solche Scheidung unmöglich. Wenn wir aber mit *Newton* gegen *Demokrit* die Unzerlegbarkeit der wirklichen Fallrichtung in ein absolutes Oben-Unten und eine Abweichung davon behaupten, so müssen wir auch nicht nur für die *Abweichung*, sondern für die *Fallrichtung als Ganzes eine physikalische Ursache* angeben; genau so hat *Einstein* die Verpflichtung, zu zeigen, *wie und nach welchem Gesetz das Führungsfeld als Ganzes durch die Materie erzeugt wird*. Das verlangt *Lenard* mit vollem Recht von ihm, und das ist der tiefste und eigentlich entscheidende Punkt seiner Einwände. Es muß unverhohlen zugegeben werden, daß hier für die Relativitätstheorie bei ihrer jetzigen Formulierung noch ernstliche Schwierigkeiten vorliegen. *Einstein* weist zur Beantwortung auf seine *Kosmologie* der räumlich geschlossenen Welt hin; er erwidert *Lenard*: Das Feld ist nicht willkürlich erfunden, weil es die allgemeinen Differentialgleichungen erfüllt und weil es zurückgeführt werden kann auf die Wirkung aller fernen Massen. Solange man überhaupt an dem Gegensatz von Materie und Feld festhält (und nur dann ist ja die Forderung, daß die Materie das Feld erzeuge, sinnvoll und berechtigt), bedeutet die Einsteinsche Kosmologie dies, daß neben den inneren Säumen des Feldes, über welche die einzelnen Materieteilchen feldbestimmend herüberwirken, nicht noch ein weiterer unendlichferner Saum als ein das Feld im Unendlichen bestimmendes Agens hinzukommt; an seine Stelle ist die Gesamtheit der fernen Massen getreten. Das Mitdrehen der Ebene des Foucaultschen Pendels mit dem Fixsternhimmel macht das ganz sinnfällig. Behoben ist damit die Schwierigkeit aber noch nicht. Erstens ist zu sagen, daß von *Einstein* nur

die Gesetze angegeben werden, welche den inneren differentiellen Zusammenhang des Feldes binden, aber noch keine klare Formulierung der Gesetze vorliegt, nach welchen die Materie das Feld determiniert (das liegt übrigens beim elektromagnetischen Feld nicht wesentlich anders). Zweitens aber und vor allem ist es sogar ganz ausgeschlossen, daß die Materie das Feld eindeutig bestimmen kann, wenn man als Charakteristika der Materie, wie kaum anders möglich, *Masse, Ladung* und *Bewegungszustand* ansieht. Man kann nämlich in der Welt ein solches Koordinatensystem einführen, daß für die dadurch bewirkte Abbildung der Welt auf einen vierdimensionalen Cartesischen Bildraum nicht nur der Weltkanal *eines* Teilchens, sondern *aller* Teilchen simultan vorgegebene Gestalt annimmt, z. B. alle diese Kanäle vertikale Geraden werden. Im Vergleich zu *M a c h*, dessen Bezugskörper stets ein starrer Körper ist, hat sich bei *E i n s t e i n* das Koordinatensystem so „erweicht“, daß es sich simultan den Bewegungen aller Teilchen anschmiegen kann, daß man alle Teilchen zugleich auf Ruhe transformieren kann; es hat also hier nicht einmal einen Sinn mehr, vom *relativen* Bewegungszustand verschiedener Körper gegeneinander zu sprechen. Diese Schwierigkeit hat neuerdings *R e i c h e n b ä c h e r* deutlicher hervorgehoben. [*Footnote*: Schwere und Trägheit, Physik. Zeitschr. **22** (1921), S. 234-243.] Das Prinzip, daß die Materie das Feld erzeuge, wird sich danach nur aufrechterhalten lassen, wenn der Begriff der Bewegung ein dynamisches Moment mit in sich aufnimmt; nicht um den Gegensatz *absolut* oder *relativ*, sondern *kinematisch* oder *dynamisch* dreht es sich bei der Analyse des Bewegungsbegriffs. —

In einer zweiten Sitzung am andern Tage demonstrierte *F. P. L i e s e g a n g* (Düsseldorf) einige treffliche Schaubilder zur Darstellung der Zeitraumverhältnisse in der speziellen Relativitätstheorie, und es verlas *H. D i n g l e r* (München), wie es schien nur zu formalem Protest gegen die Relativitätstheorie, ohne sich um das Publikum zu kümmern, seine kritischen Bemerkungen zu den Grundlagen der Theorie; es ist sonderbar, daß sich bei *D i n g l e r* mit seinem an *P o i n c a r é* orientierten konventionalistischen Standpunkt die dogmatische Halsstarrigkeit des geborenen Apriorikers verbindet. Daß der Tragödie am Schluß das Satyrspiel nicht fehle, entwickelte *H r . R u d o l p h* eine phantastische Äthertheorie mit „Lücken“ zwischen fließenden Ätherwänden, Sternfäden usw., mit Hilfe deren er aus Nichts die Sonnenmasse auf eine beliebige Anzahl von Dezimalen genau bestimmte . . .

Ich habe hier in freier Weise die Fragen kennzeichnen wollen, die in der Nauheimer Diskussion zur Sprache kamen, nicht aber einen objektiven Bericht über den Verlauf der Sitzung erstatten wollen; für eine gekürzte, aber sinngetreue Wiedergabe der Vorträge und der Diskussion sei der Leser auf das Dezemberheft 1920 der *Physikalischen Zeitschrift* verwiesen.

(Eingegangen am 29. 8. 21.)”⁵¹⁹

Bruno Thüring wrote,

“Im selben Jahre 1920 fand in Bad Nauheim auf der dortigen Naturforschertagung die berühmt gewordene Diskussion zwischen Philipp Lenard und Albert Einstein statt. In dieser Diskussion, welche in echt jüdischer Weise zu einer Sensation aufgebauscht wurde, verglich Einstein sein Werk mit demjenigen Galileis und tat, als sich Lenard auf den gesunden Menschenverstand berief, die Äußerung, daß es gefährlich sei, den gesunden Menschenverstand in der Physik zur Anwendung zu bringen. Diese seltsame Argumentation ist dann auch in die populärwissenschaftliche Literatur eingegangen.

Im übrigen kam es bei dieser Tagung auch zu tumultuarischen Szenen. Der Vorsitzende Max Planck sah es als seine Hauptaufgabe an, die Einsteinpartei gegen ihre wissenschaftlichen Gegner möglichst gleich durch organisatorische Maßnahmen zu schützen. Er ließ, wie aus Presseveröffentlichungen hervorgeht, an der Eingangstüre eine Siebung vornehmen, um ihm nicht genehme Personen fernzuhalten. Darauf erhob sich zwar ein großer Tumult, und das empörte Auditorium stürmte den Saal. Planck erreichte seinen Zweck schließlich dadurch, daß er die Relativisten in stundenlangen Vorträgen sich verbreiten ließ, während den antirelativistischen Rednern einschließlich Diskussion insgesamt nur 15 Minuten zugewilligt werden sollten. Unter den Rednern dieser Tagung befand sich auch der im Kampf gegen Einstein an vorderster Stelle stehende Hugo Dingler.

Freilich erlag die Opposition gegen den relativistischen Wissenschaftsbetrieb in der Folgezeit der Übermacht der jüdischen Pressepropaganda und der staatlichen Schutzmaßnahmen. Bald wurde Einsteins Lehre als eine „Selbstverständlichkeit“ bezeichnet, und die maßgebenden Männer der internationalen Gelehrtenrepublik hielten nach Möglichkeit jeden von einem Lehrstuhl fern, der sich gegen das relativistische Dogma — sei es auch in der wissenschaftlich-sachlichsten Weise — ausgesprochen hatte. So wurden diese Dogmatismen an die junge Physikergeneration so gut wie widerspruchslos weitergegeben.”⁵²⁰

4.5 Einstein the Genocidal Racist

Albert Einstein was himself a racist; and, therefore, a hypocrite when criticizing the racism of others. John Stachel wrote,

“While he lived in Germany, however, Einstein seems to have accepted the then-prevalent racist mode of thought, often invoking such concepts as ‘race’ and ‘instinct,’ and the idea that the Jews form a race.”⁵²¹

On 8 July 1901, Einstein wrote to Winteler,

“There is no exaggeration in what you said about the German professors. I have got to know another sad specimen of this kind — one of the foremost

physicists of Germany.”⁵²²

Einstein wrote to Besso sometime after 1 January 1914,

“A free, unprejudiced look is not at all characteristic of the (adult) Germans (blinders!).”⁵²³

After the war Einstein and some of his friends alluded to much earlier conversations with Einstein, where he had correctly predicted the eventual outcome of the war. In his diaries, Romain Rolland recorded his conversations with Einstein in Switzerland at their meeting of 16 September 1915,

“What I hear from [Einstein] is not exactly encouraging, for it shows the impossibility of arriving at a lasting peace with Germany without first totally crushing it. Einstein says the situation looks to him far less favorable than a few months back. The victories over Russia have reawakened German arrogance and appetite. The word ‘greedy’ seems to Einstein best to characterize Germany. [***] Einstein does not expect any renewal of Germany out of itself; it lacks the energy for it, and the boldness for initiative. He hopes for a victory of the Allies, which would smash the power of Prussia and the dynasty. . . . Einstein and Zangger dream of a divided Germany—on the one side Southern Germany and Austria, on the other side Prussia. [***] We speak of the deliberate blindness and the lack of psychology in the Germans.”⁵²⁴

Einstein’s dreams during the First World War remind one of the “Carthaginian Peace” of the Henry Morgenthau, Jr. plan for the destruction of Germany following the Second World War. Morgenthau worked with Lord Cherwell (Frederick Alexander Lindemann), Churchill’s friend and advisor, who planned to bomb German civilian populations into submission. Lindemann studied under Einstein’s friend, Walther Nernst, who worked with Fritz Haber, a Jewish developer of poisonous gas. James Bacque argues that the Allies, under the direction of General Eisenhower, starved hundreds of thousands, if not millions of German prisoners of war to death. Dwight David Eisenhower was called “the terrible Swedish-Jew” in his yearbook for West Point, *The 1915 Howitzer*, West Point, New York, (1915), p. 80. He was also called “Ike”, as in. . . Eisenhower? The Soviets also abused and murdered countless German POW’s after the Second World War.⁵²⁵

Einstein often spoke in genocidal and racist terms against Germany, and for the Jews and England, and he betrayed Germany before, during and after the war. Einstein wrote to Paul Ehrenfest on 22 March 1919,

“[The Allied Powers] whose victory during the war I had felt would be by far the lesser evil are now proving to be *only slightly* the lesser evil. [***] I get most joy from the emergence of the Jewish state in Palestine. It does seem to me that our kinfolk really are more sympathetic (at least less brutal) than

these horrid Europeans. Perhaps things can only improve if only the Chinese are left, who refer to all Europeans with the collective noun ‘bandits.’”⁵²⁶

While responsible people were trying to preserve some sanity in the turbulent period following World War I, Zionists like Albert Einstein sought to validate and encourage the racism of anti-Semites. The Dreyfus Affair taught them that anti-Semitism had a powerful effect to unite Jews around the world. The Zionists were afraid that the “Jewish race” was disappearing through assimilation. They wanted to use anti-Semitism to force the segregation of Jews from Gentiles and to unite Jews, and thereby preserve the “Jewish race”. They hoped that if they put a Hitler-type into power—as Zionists had done in the past, they could use him to herd up the Jews and force the Jews into Palestine against their will. This would also help the Zionists to inspire distrust and contempt for Gentile government, while giving the Zionists the moral high-ground in international affairs, despite the fact that the Zionists were secretly behind the atrocities. In 1896, Theodor Herzl wrote his book *The Jewish State*,

“Great exertions will not be necessary to spur on the movement. Anti-Semites provide the requisite impetus. They need only do what they did before, and then they will create a love of emigration where it did not previously exist, and strengthen it where it existed before. [***] I imagine that Governments will, either voluntarily or under pressure from the Anti-Semites, pay certain attention to this scheme; and they may perhaps actually receive it here and there with a sympathy which they will also show to the Society of Jews.”⁵²⁷

Albert Einstein wrote to Max Born on 9 November 1919. Einstein encouraged anti-Semitism and advocated segregation (one must wonder what rôle Albert’s increasing racism played in his divorce from Mileva Marić—a Gentile Serb),

“Antisemitism must be seen as a real thing, based on true hereditary qualities, even if for us Jews it is often unpleasant. I could well imagine that I myself would choose a Jew as my companion, given the choice. On the other hand I would consider it reasonable for the Jews themselves to collect the money to support Jewish research workers outside the universities and to provide them with teaching opportunities.”⁵²⁸

In 1933, the Zionists publicly declared their allegiance to the Nazis. They wrote in the *Jüdische Rundschau* on 13 June 1933,

“Zionism recognizes the existence of the Jewish question and wants to solve it in a generous and constructive manner. For this purpose, it wants to enlist the aid of all peoples; those who are friendly to the Jews as well as those who are hostile to them, since according to its conception, this is not a question of sentimentality, but one dealing with a real problem in whose solution all

peoples are interested.”⁵²⁹

On 21 June 1933, the Zionists issued a declaration of their position with respect to the Nazi régime, in which they expressed a belief in the legitimacy of the Nazis’ racist belief system and condemned anti-Fascist forces.⁵³⁰

Michele Besso wrote that it might have been Albert Einstein’s racism and bigotry which caused him to separate from his first wife Mileva Marić in 1914. Besso wrote to Einstein on 17 January 1928,

“[. . .]perhaps it is due in part to me, with my defense of Judaism and the Jewish family, that your family life took the turn that it did, and that I had to bring Mileva from Berlin to Zurich[.]”⁵³¹

The hypocrisy of racist Zionists often manifested itself. As another example, consider the fact that racist Zionist Moses Hess was married to a Christian Gentile prostitute named Sybille Pritsch.

Einstein may have been effected by his mother’s early racist opposition to his relationship with Marić. Another factor in the Einsteins’ divorce was, of course, Albert’s incestuous relationship with his cousin Else Einstein, and his desire to bed her daughters, as well as Albert’s general promiscuity—some believe he was a whore monger. Albert Einstein opposed his sister Maja’s marriage to the Gentile Paul Winteler on racist grounds and thought they should divorce. Albert Einstein wrote to Michele Besso on 12 December 1919 and stated that, “No mixed marriages are any good (Anna says: oh!)”⁵³² Besso, himself, was married to a Gentile, Anna Besso-Winteler. Denis Brian wrote,

“When asked what he thought of Jews marrying non-Jews, which, of course, had been the case with him and Mileva, [Albert Einstein] replied with a laugh, ‘It’s dangerous, but then all marriages are dangerous.’”⁵³³

On 3 April 1920, Einstein wrote, criticizing assimilationist Jews,

“And this is precisely what he does *not* want to reveal in his confession. He talks about religious faith instead of tribal affiliation, of ‘Mosaic’ instead of ‘Jewish’ because the latter term, which is much more familiar to him, would emphasize affiliation to his tribe.”⁵³⁴

After declaring that Jewish children segregate due to natural forces and that they are “different from other children”,⁵³⁵ not due to religion or tradition, but due to genetic features and “heritage”, Einstein continued his 3 April 1920 statement,

“With adults it is quite similar as with children. Due to race and temperament as well as traditions (which are only to a small extent of religious origin) they form a community more or less separate from non-Jews. [***] It is this basic community of race and tradition that I have in mind when I speak of ‘Jewish

nationality.’ In my opinion, aversion to Jews is simply based upon the fact that Jews and non-Jews are different. [***] Where feelings are sufficiently vivid there is no shortage of reasons; and the feeling of aversion toward people of a foreign race with whom one has, more or less, to share daily life will emerge by necessity.”⁵³⁶

Einstein made similar comments in a document dated sometime “after 3 April 1920”. Einstein was in agreement with Philipp Lenard that a “Jewish heritage” (read for “heritage”, “racial instinct”) could be seen in intellectual works published by Jews. Einstein stated,

“The psychological root of anti-Semitism lies in the fact that the Jews are a group of people unto themselves. Their Jewishness is visible in their physical appearance, and one notices their Jewish heritage in their intellectual works, and one can sense that there are among them deep connections in their disposition and numerous possibilities of communicating that are based on the same way of thinking and of feeling. The Jewish child is already aware of these differences as soon as it starts school. Jewish children feel the resentment that grows out of an instinctive suspicion of their strangeness that naturally is often met with a closing of the ranks. [***] [Jews] are the target of instinctive resentment because they are of a different tribe than the majority of the population.”⁵³⁷

Albert Einstein often referred to Jews as “tribesmen” and Jewry as the “tribe”. Fellow German Jew Fritz Haber was outraged at Albert Einstein’s racist treachery and disloyalty. Einstein confirmed that he was disloyal and a racist, and was obligated,

“[. . .] to step in for my persecuted and morally depressed fellow tribesmen, as far as this lies within my power[.]”⁵³⁸

In a draft letter of 3 April 1920, Einstein wrote that children are conscious of “racial characteristics” and that this alleged “racial” gulf between children results in conflicts, which instill a sense of foreignness in the persecuted child. Einstein wrote,

“Unter den Kindern war besonders in der Volksschule der Antisemitismus lebendig. Er gründete ich auf die den Kindern merkwürdig bewussten Rassenmerkmale und auf Eindrücke im Religionsunterricht. Thätliche Angriffe und Beschimpfungen auf dem Schulwege waren häufig, aber meist nicht gar zu böse. Sie genügten immerhin, um ein lebhaftes Gefühl des Fremdseins schon im Kinde zu befestigen.”⁵³⁹

Einstein’s racism was perhaps a defense mechanism to depersonalize the attacks he faced as a child and to counter the hurt with a sense of communal love and communal hatred, which was sponsored by his racist mother. Like Adolf Stoecker

before him,⁵⁴⁰ Albert Einstein advocated the segregation of Jewish students. Peter A. Bucky quoted Albert Einstein,

“I think that Jewish students should have their own student societies. [***] One way that it won’t be solved is for Jewish people to take on Christian fashions and manners. [***] In this way, it is entirely possible to be a civilized person, a good citizen, and at the same time be a faithful Jew who loves his race and honors his fathers.”⁵⁴¹

Einstein stated,

“We must be conscious of our alien race and draw the logical conclusions from it. [***] We must have our own students’ societies and adopt an attitude of courteous but consistent reserve to the Gentiles. [***] It is possible to be [***] a faithful Jew who loves his race and honours his fathers.”⁵⁴²

On 5 April 1920, Einstein repeated what he had heard from his political Zionist friends who believed that anti-Semitism was necessary to the preservation of the “Jewish race”,

“Anti-Semitism will be a psychological phenomenon as long as Jews come in contact with non-Jews—what harm can there be in that? Perhaps it is due to anti-Semitism that we survive as a race: at least that is what I believe.”⁵⁴³

and,

“I am neither a German citizen, nor is there in me anything that can be described as ‘Jewish faith.’ But I am happy to belong to the Jewish people, even though I don’t regard them as the Chosen People. Why don’t we just let the Goy keep his anti-Semitism, while we preserve our love for the likes of us?”⁵⁴⁴

This letter was published in the *Israelitisches Wochenblatt für die Schweiz*, on 24 September 1920, on page 10. It became famous and was widely discussed in newspapers and was used as a political issue. Einstein’s racism had already become a weapon for Jewish critics to wield against German Jews who were loyal to the Fatherland. Einstein ridiculed the *Central-Verein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens*, an organization that combated anti-Semitism and vigorously defended and celebrated Jews, because Einstein sought to promote anti-Semitism and because Einstein believed that being “Jewish” was a racial, not a religious, state. Einstein knew quite well that the letter had been published. The *C. V.* contacted him about it and published a statement regarding it in their periodical *Im deutschen Reich* in March of 1921,

“So wurde auch in einzelnen Versammlungen der b e k a n n t e B r i e f des

Naturforschers Professor Einstein, den dieser an den Central-Verein gerichtet hat, und in welchem er die Bestrebungen des Central-Vereins ablehnt, weil sie zu national-deutsch und zu wenig jüdisch orientiert seien, zum Gegenstand der Erörterungen gemacht. Dieser Brief hat in der öffentlichen Erörterung der jüdischen und judengegnerischen Presse in den letzten Monaten und auch bei den Wahlen eine gewisse Rolle gespielt und Anlaß zu den verschiedenartigsten Betrachtungen je nach der Parteistellung der Versammlungsredner und der verschiedenen Zeitungen gegeben. So hat sich z. B. die jüdisch-nationale „Wiener Morgenzeitung“ veranlaßt gesehen, den Central-Verein in wenig vornehmer Weise anzugreifen und ihn wegen seines nationaldeutschen Standpunktes zu verdächtigen. Diese Angriffe würden durch die Auffassung von Professor Einstein nicht gedeckt worden sein, wenn die „Wiener Morgenzeitung“ gewußt hätte, daß Professor Einstein ohne nähere Kenntnis der Bestrebungen und der Arbeit des Central-Vereins seinen Brief geschrieben und keineswegs an eine Veröffentlichung, die nur durch eine Indiskretion erfolgt ist, gedacht hat. Erst nach der Veröffentlichung hat er von der Art und Weise der Tätigkeit des Central-Vereins Kenntnis erhalten und hat, wie mit gutem Grund versichert werden kann, infolge dieser Kenntnis eine wesentlich andere Auffassung vom Werte der Arbeit unseres Central-Vereins gewonnen. Auch dieser Vorfall sollte Anlaß geben, Urteile in der Öffentlichkeit erst dann zu fällen, wenn die Sachlage einigermaßen geklärt ist.”⁵⁴⁵

On 24 May 1931, the *Sunday Express* of London published an interview it claimed it had had with Einstein while he was visiting Oxford. The interview contained inflammatory statements similar to those published in the *Israelitisches Wochenblatt für die Schweiz* on 24 September 1920. These statements were repeated in several German language newspapers across Europe together with scathing editorial indictments of Einstein. Einstein claimed that no interview had taken place and the quotations were taken from a letter he had written eleven years prior. Einstein stated in a letter to Michael Traub of 22 August 1931 that this letter had never been published,⁵⁴⁶ though it had been published and Einstein knew quite well that it had been published.

Einstein accused the *Central-Verein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens e. V.* of instigating the “forgery”. The C.V. denied that it was behind the publication in the *Sunday Express* and invited Einstein to respond in their official organ the *Central-Verein Zeitung*. Einstein took the opportunity and stated, “Es wurden mir schon wiederholt Auszüge aus einem Artikel der „S u n d a y E x p r e ß“ zugesandt, aus denen ich ersehe, daß es sich **um eine glatte Fälschung** handelt. Ich habe in O x f o r d überhaupt kein einziges Zeitungsinterview gegeben. Der Inhalt ist eine böswillige Entstellung eines vor elf Jahren geschriebenen, nicht für die Öffentlichkeit bestimmten Briefes.”⁵⁴⁷ He affirmed in 1931 that he had made the statements in 1920 and did not repudiate them.

In 1932, Einstein stated, referring to the “deplorably high development of

nationalism everywhere”—his own rabid Zionism apparently excepted,

“The introduction of compulsory service is therefore, to my mind, the prime cause of the moral collapse of the white race, which seriously threatens not merely the survival of our civilization but our very existence. This curse, along with great social blessings, started with the French Revolution, and before long dragged all the other nations in its train.”⁵⁴⁸

Einstein had a reputation as a rabid anti-assimilationist—here again Einstein merely parroted the racist anti-assimilationism of his Zionist predecessors, like Solomon Schechter who dreaded assimilation more than pogroms—and Zionists encouraged pogroms in order to discourage assimilation.

Zionists were by no means alone in the anti-assimilationist panic that struck the western world at the end of the Nineteenth Century. In 1906, Chaim Weizmann had persuaded Arthur James Balfour to become a racist Zionist.⁵⁴⁹ In 1908, Balfour published a racist and nationalistic lecture on the subject of race degeneration and stagnation called *Decadence*.⁵⁵⁰ In America, Theodore Roosevelt had an enduring interest in racial questions and feared “racial suicide” and the decline of a race like the decline of an organism in old age.⁵⁵¹ On 5 March 1908, Roosevelt wrote to Balfour, later signatory of the Balfour Declaration,

“Most emphatically there is such a thing as ‘decadence’ of a nation, a race, a type; and it is no less true that we cannot give any adequate explanation of the phenomenon. Of course there are many partial explanations, and in some cases, as with the decay of the Mongol or Turkish monarchies, the sum of these partial explanations may represent the whole. But there are other cases, notably, of course, that of Rome in the ancient world, and, as I believe, that of Spain in the modern world, on a much smaller scale, where the sum of all the explanations is that they do not wholly explain. Something seems to have gone out of the people or peoples affected, and what it is no one can say.”⁵⁵²

The London Times wrote on 12 February 1919 on page 9, confirming that Balfour’s Declaration was based on precisely the same racist myths of “Blut und Boden” the Nazis would later assert to justify the racism of Nazi Germany,

“MR. BALFOUR ON ZIONISM. THE CASE FOR A NATIONAL HOME.

Mr. Balfour, in whose hands has been placed the interests of Palestinian Jewry at the Peace Conference, has written a preface to the History of Zionism, shortly to be published from the pen of M. Sokolow, one of the four leaders of the Zionist Executive Committee.

Mr. Balfour says that convinced by conversations with Dr. Weizmann in January, 1906, that if a home was to be found for the Jewish people,

homeless now for nearly 1900 years, it was vain to seek it anywhere but in Palestine. Answering the question why local sentiment is to be more considered in the case of the Jew than (say) in that of the Christian or the Buddhist, Mr. Balfour says:—‘The answer is, that the cases are not parallel. The position of the Jews is unique. For them race, religion, and country are interrelated, as they are interrelated in the case of no other race, no other religion, and no other country on earth. By a strange and most unhappy fate it is this people of all others which, retaining to the full its racial self-consciousness, has been severed from its home, has wandered into all lands and has nowhere been able to create for itself an organized social commonwealth. Only Zionism—so at least Zionists believe—can provide some mitigation of this great tragedy.

‘Doubtless there are difficulties, doubtless there are objections—great difficulties, very real objections. . . . Yet no one can reasonably doubt that if, as I believe, Zionism can be developed into a working scheme, the benefit it would bring to the Jewish people, especially perhaps to that section of it which most deserves our pity, would be great and lasting.’

The criticism that the Jews use their gifts to exploit for personal ends a civilization which they have not created, in communities they do little to maintain, Mr. Balfour declares to be false. He admits, however, that in large parts of Europe their loyalty to the State in which they dwell is (to put it mildly) feeble compared with their loyalty to their religion and their race. How, indeed, could it be otherwise? he asks. ‘In none of the regions of which I speak have they been given the advantages of equal citizenship; in some they have been given no right of citizenship at all.’

‘It seems evident that Zionism will mitigate the lot and elevate the status of no negligible fraction of the Jewish race. Those who go to Palestine will not be like those who now migrate to London or New York. . . . They will go in order to join a civil community which completely harmonizes with their historical and religious sentiments; a community bound to the land it inhabits by something deeper even than custom; a community whose members will suffer from no divided loyalty nor any temptation to hate the laws under which they are forced to live. To them the material gain should be great; but surely the spiritual gain will be greater still.’

Mr. Balfour goes on to consider the position of those, though Jews by descent, and often by religion, who desire wholly to identify themselves with the life of the country wherein they have made their home, many of them distinguished in art, medicine, politics, and law. ‘Many of this class,’ he says, ‘look with a certain measure of suspicion and even dislike upon the Zionist movement. They fear that it will adversely affect their position in the country of their adoption. The great majority of them have no desire to settle in Palestine. Even supposing a Zionist community were established, they would not join it. . . .

‘I cannot share these fears. I do not deny that, in some countries where legal equality is firmly established, Jews may still be regarded with a certain

measure of prejudice. But this prejudice, where it exists, is not due to Zionism, nor will Zionism embitter it. The tendency should surely be the other way. Everything which assimilates the national and international status of the Jews to that of other races ought to mitigate what remains of ancient antipathies; and evidently this assimilation would be promoted by giving them that which all other nations possess—a local habitation and a national home.”

Others repeated Theodor Herzl’s theme, that Jews could not assimilate, because the presence of Jews in a host nation ultimately led to anti-Semitism due to Jewish parasitism—according to Herzl. Hilaire Belloc was a strong advocate of the view that Jews should not integrate. Belloc published a book on the subject entitled *The Jews* in 1922, and expressed similar convictions in *G. K.’s Weekly* in the 1930’s. Belloc wrote biographies of men who had fallen under the influence of Zionists, like Oliver Cromwell and Napoleon. Belloc, however, was strongly opposed to Nazism. Douglas Reed took a similar Zionist stance on the alleged unassimilability of Jews in the late 1930’s,⁵⁵³ though he later opposed Zionism.

Racist Zionist Solomon Schecter stated, in harmony with numerous political Zionists, though in opposition to the vast majority of Jews,

“It is this kind of assimilation [the death of a “race” through integration], with the terrible consequences indicated, that I dread most; even more than pogroms.”⁵⁵⁴

On 15 March 1921, Kurt Blumenfeld wrote to Chaim Weizmann,

“Einstein [***] is interested in our cause most strongly because of his revulsion from assimilatory Jewry.”⁵⁵⁵

Einstein stated in 1921,

“To deny the Jew’s nationality in the Diaspora is, indeed, deplorable. If one adopts the point of view of confining Jewish ethnical nationalism to Palestine, then one, to all intents and purposes, denies the existence of a Jewish people. In that case one should have the courage to carry through, in the quickest and most complete manner, entire assimilation. We live in a time of intense and perhaps exaggerated nationalism. But my Zionism does not exclude in me cosmopolitan views. I believe in the actuality of Jewish nationality, and I believe that every Jew has duties towards his coreligionists. [***] [T]he principal point is that Zionism must tend to strengthen the dignity and self-respect of the Jews in the Diaspora. I have always been annoyed by the undignified assimilationist cravings and strivings which I have observed in so many of my friends.”⁵⁵⁶

In 1921, Einstein declared, referring to Eastern European Jews,

“These men and women retain a healthy national feeling; it has not yet been destroyed by the process of atomisation and dispersion.”⁵⁵⁷

Einstein wrote in the *Jüdische Rundschau*, on 21 June 1921, on pages 351-352,

“This phenomenon [*i. e.* Anti-Semitism] in Germany is due to several causes. Partly it originates in the fact that the Jews there exercise an influence over the intellectual life of the German people altogether out of proportion to their number. While, in my opinion, the economic position of the German Jews is very much overrated, the influence of Jews on the Press, in literature, and in science in Germany is very marked, as must be apparent to even the most superficial observer. This accounts for the fact that there are many anti-Semites there who are not really anti-Semitic in the sense of being Jew-haters, and who are honest in their arguments. They regard Jews as of a nationality different from the German, and therefore are alarmed at the increasing Jewish influence on their national entity. [***] But in Germany the judgement of my theory depended on the party politics of the Press[.]”⁵⁵⁸

Einstein also stated,

“The way I see it, the fact of the Jews’ racial peculiarity will necessarily influence their social relations with non-Jews. The conclusions which—in my opinion—the Jews should draw is to become more aware of their peculiarity in their social way of life and to recognize their own cultural contributions. First of all, they would have to show a certain noble reservedness and not be so eager to mix socially—of which others want little or nothing. On the other hand, anti-Semitism in Germany also has consequences that, from a Jewish point of view, should be welcomed. I believe German Jewry owes its continued existence to anti-Semitism.”⁵⁵⁹

Nazi Zionist Joseph Goebbels, sounding very much like political Zionist Albert Einstein, was quoted in *The New York Times*, on 29 September 1933, on page 10,

“It must be remembered the Jews of Germany were exercising at that time a decisive influence on the whole intellectual life; that they were absolute and unlimited masters of the press, literature, the theatre and the motion pictures, and in large cities such as Berlin, 75 percent of the members of the medical and legal professions were Jews; that they made public opinion, exercised a decisive influence on the Stock Exchange and were the rulers of Parliament and its parties.”

On 1 July 1921, Einstein was quoted in the *Jüdische Rundschau* on page 371,

“Let us take brief look at the *development of German Jews* over the last hundred years. With few exceptions, one hundred years ago our forefathers

still lived in the Ghetto. They were poor and separated from the Gentiles by a wall of religious tradition, secular lifestyles and statutory confinement and were confined in their spiritual development to their own literature, only relatively weakly influenced by the forceful progress which intellectual life in Europe had undergone in the Renaissance. However, these little noticed, modestly living people had one thing over us: *Every one of them belonged with all his heart to a community*, into which he was incorporated, in which he felt a worthwhile member, in which nothing was asked of him which conflicted with his normal processes of thought. Our forefathers of that era were pretty pathetic both bodily and spiritually, but—in social relations—in an enviable state of mental equilibrium. Then came emancipation. It offered undreamt of opportunities for advancement. The isolated individual quickly found their way into the upper financial and social circles of society. They eagerly absorbed the great achievements of art and science which the Occidentals⁵⁶⁰ had created. They contributed to the development with passionate affection, and themselves made contributions of lasting value. They thereby took on the lifestyle of the Gentile world, turning away from their religious and social traditions in growing masses—took on Gentile customs, manners and mentality. It appeared as if they were being completely dissolved into the numerically superior, politically and culturally better organized host peoples, such that no trace of them would be left after a few generations. The complete eradication of the Jewish nationality in Middle and Western Europe appeared to be inevitable. However, it didn't turn out that way. It appears that racially distinct nations have instincts which work against interbreeding. The adaptation of the Jews to the European peoples among whom they have lived in language, customs and indeed even partially in religious practices *was unable to eliminate all feelings of foreignness* which exist between Jews and their European host peoples. In short, this spontaneous feeling of foreignness is ultimately due to a loss of energy.⁵⁶¹ For this reason, *not even well-meant arguments can eradicate it*. Nationalities do not want to be mixed together, rather they want to go their own separate ways. A state of peace can only be achieved by mutual tolerance and respect.”

Einstein stated that Jews should not participate in the German Government,

“I regretted the fact that [Rathenau] became a Minister. In view of the attitude which large numbers of the educated classes in Germany assume towards the Jews, I have always thought that their natural conduct in public should be one of proud reserve.”⁵⁶²

Einstein merely parroted the Zionist Party line. Werner E. Mosse wrote,

“While the leaders of the CV saw it as their special duty to represent the interests of the German Jews in the active political struggle, Zionism stood

for. . . systematic Jewish non-participation in German public life. It rejected as a matter of principle any participation in the struggle led by the CV.”⁵⁶³

In 1925, Einstein wrote in the official Zionist organ *Jüdische Rundschau*,

“By study of their past, by a better understanding of the spirit [Geist] that accords with their race, they must learn to know anew the mission that they are capable of fulfilling. [***] What one must be thankful to Zionism for is the fact that it is the only movement that has given many Jews a justified pride, that it has once again given a despairing race the necessary faith, if I may so express myself, given new flesh to an exhausted people.”⁵⁶⁴

On 12 October 1929, Albert Einstein wrote to the *Manchester Guardian*,

“In the re-establishment of the Jewish nation in the ancient home of the race, where Jewish spiritual values could again be developed in a Jewish atmosphere, the most enlightened representatives of Jewish individuality see the essential preliminary to the regeneration of the race and the setting free of its spiritual creativeness.”⁵⁶⁵

Einstein’s public racism eventually waned, but he continued to publicly express his segregationist philosophy in the same terms as anti-Semites, as well as his belief that Jews “thrived on” and owed their “continued existence” to anti-Semitism. Einstein stated in December of 1930 to an American audience,

“There is something indefinable which holds the Jews together. Race does not make much for solidarity. Here in America you have many races, and yet you have the solidarity. Race is not the cause of the Jews’ solidarity, nor is their religion. It is something else—which is indefinable.”⁵⁶⁶

Einstein’s confusing public statement perhaps resulted from his desire to promote multi-culturalism in America, which had the benefit of freeing up Jewish immigration to the United States.⁵⁶⁷ Einstein was also likely parroting, or trying to parrot, a fellow anti-assimilationist political Zionist whose pamphlet was well known in America, Solomon Schechter and his *Zionism: A Statement*, Federation of American Zionists, New York, (1906), in which Schechter states, among other things, “Zionism is an ideal, and as such is indefinable.”⁵⁶⁸

Einstein stated in 1938,

“JUST WHAT IS A JEW?”

The formation of groups has an invigorating effect in all spheres of human striving, perhaps mostly due to the struggle between the convictions and aims represented by the different groups. The Jews, too, form such a group with a definite character of its own, and anti-Semitism is nothing but the antagonistic attitude produced in the non-Jews by the Jewish group. This

is a normal social reaction. But for the political abuse resulting from it, it might never have been designated by a special name.

What are the characteristics of the Jewish group? What, in the first place, is a Jew? There are no quick answers to this question. The most obvious answer would be the following: A Jew is a person professing the Jewish faith. The superficial character of this answer is easily recognized by means of a simple parallel. Let us ask the question: What is a snail? An answer similar in kind to the one given above might be: A snail is an animal inhabiting a snail shell. This answer is not altogether incorrect; nor, to be sure, is it exhaustive; for the snail shell happens to be but one of the material products of the snail. Similarly, the Jewish faith is but one of the characteristic products of the Jewish community. It is, furthermore, known that a snail can shed its shell without thereby ceasing to be a snail. The Jew who abandons his faith (in the formal sense of the word) is in a similar position. He remains a Jew.

[***]

WHERE OPPRESSION IS A STIMULUS

[***]

Perhaps even more than on its own tradition, the Jewish group has thrived on oppression and on the antagonism it has forever met in the world. Here undoubtedly lies one of the main reasons for its continued existence through so many thousands of years.”

Albert Einstein was parroting racist political Zionist leader Theodor Herzl, who wrote in his book *The Jewish State*,

“Oppression and persecution cannot exterminate us. No nation on earth has survived such struggles and sufferings as we have gone through. Jew-baiting has merely stripped off our weaklings; the strong among us were invariably true to their race when persecution broke out against them. This attitude was most clearly apparent in the period immediately following the emancipation of the Jews. Later on, those who rose to a higher degree of intelligence and to a better worldly position lost their communal feeling to a very great extent. Wherever our political well-being has lasted for any length of time, we have assimilated with our surroundings. I think this is not discreditable. Hence, the statesman who would wish to see a Jewish strain in his nation would have to provide for the duration of our political well-being; and even Bismarck could not do that. [***] The Governments of all countries scourged by Anti-Semitism will serve their own interests in assisting us to obtain the sovereignty we want. [***] Great exertions will not be necessary to spur on the movement. Anti-Semites provide the requisite impetus. They need only do what they did before, and then they will create a love of emigration where it did not previously exist, and strengthen it where it existed before. [***] I imagine that Governments will, either voluntarily or under pressure from the Anti-Semites, pay certain attention to this scheme; and they may perhaps

actually receive it here and there with a sympathy which they will also show to the Society of Jews.”⁵⁶⁹

In 1938, Einstein stated in his essay “Our Debt to Zionism”,

“Rarely since the conquest of Jerusalem by Titus has the Jewish community experienced a period of greater oppression than prevails at the present time. [***] Yet we shall survive this period too, no matter how much sorrow, no matter how heavy a loss in life it may bring. A community like ours, which is a community purely by reason of tradition, can only be strengthened by pressure from without.”⁵⁷⁰

Einstein avowed *circa* 3 April 1920, that,

“If what anti-Semites claim were true, then indeed there would be nothing weaker, more wretched, and unfit for life, than the German people”.⁵⁷¹

Einstein often avowed that the anti-Semites’ beliefs were true, and, hence, Einstein wished the Germans dead. When discussing the meaning of life, Einstein spoke to Peter A. Bucky about persons and creatures who “[do] not deserve to be in our world” and are “hardly fit for life.”⁵⁷² Einstein’s language is quite similar to the language of Hitler’s “T4” “*Euthanasia-Programme*”.

After siding with Germany’s enemies in the First World War—while living in Germany, and after intentionally provoking Germans into increased anti-Semitism, which he thought was good for Jews, and after defaming German Nobel Prize laureates in the international press to the point where they felt obliged to join Hitler’s cause, which cause eventually resulted in the genocide of Europe’s Jews; Einstein sponsored the production of genocidal weapons to mass murder Germans, whom he had hated all of his life, in the famous letter to President Roosevelt that Einstein signed urging Roosevelt to begin the development of atomic bombs—before the mass murder of Jews had begun.⁵⁷³

Einstein callously asserted that the use of atomic bombs on civilian populations was “morally justified”. I quote Einstein without delving into the question of who first bombed civilian centers,

“It should not be forgotten that the atomic bomb was made in this country as a preventive measure; it was to head off its use by the Germans, if they discovered it. The bombing of civilian centers was initiated by the Germans and adopted by the Japanese. To it the Allies responded in kind—as it turned out, with greater effectiveness—and they were morally justified in doing so.”⁵⁷⁴

Einstein advocated genocidal collective punishment,

“The Germans as an entire people are responsible for these mass murders and

must be punished as a people if there is justice in the world and if the consciousness of collective responsibility in the nations is not to perish from the earth entirely.”⁵⁷⁵

and,

“It is possible either to destroy the German people or keep them suppressed; it is not possible to educate them to think and act along democratic lines in the foreseeable future.”⁵⁷⁶

Albrecht Fölsing has assembled a compilation of post-WW II quotations from Einstein, which evince Einstein’s lifelong habit of stereotyping people based on their ethnicity. Einstein expressed his hatred in the horrific post-Holocaust context—a temptation Max Born had resisted,

“With the Germans having murdered my Jewish brethren in Europe, I do not wish to have anything more to do with Germans, not even with a relatively harmless Academy. [***] The crimes of the Germans are really the most hideous that the history of the so-called civilized nations has to show. [***] [It was] evident that a proud Jew no longer wishes to be connected with any kind of German official event or institution. [***] After the mass murder committed by the Germans against my Jewish brethren I do not wish any publications of mine to appear in Germany.”⁵⁷⁷

Einstein wrote to Born on 15 September 1950 that his views towards Germans predated the Nazi period,

“I have not changed my attitude to the Germans, which, by the way, dates not just from the Nazi period. All human beings are more or less the same from birth. The Germans, however, have a far more dangerous tradition than any of the other so-called civilized nations. The present behavior of these other nations towards the Germans merely proves to me how little human beings learn even from their most painful experiences.”⁵⁷⁸

and on learning that Born would return to Germany, Einstein wrote on 12 October 1953,

“If anyone can be held responsible for the fact that you are migrating back to the land of the mass-murderers of our kinsmen, it is certainly your adopted fatherland — universally notorious for its parsimony.”⁵⁷⁹

4.6 Racist Jewish Hypocrisy, Intimidation and Censorship

Sigmund Freud used prominent Gentiles, or “Goyim” as Freud called them, to promote his theories of psychology. He did this to give himself and the theories he

plagiarized from Plato and others credibility in the broader “Gentile world”. Though Freud thought that Gentiles were inferior to Jews, Freud was after fame.

Freud was another feted Jewish racist, who believed that the Jews were a superior race. Kevin MacDonald wrote in his book *The Culture of Critique*,

“Freud’s powerful racial sense of ingroup-outgroup barriers between Jews and gentiles may also be seen in the personal dynamics of the psychoanalytic movement. We have seen that Jews were numerically dominant within psychoanalysis, especially in the early stages when all the members were Jews. ‘The fact that these were Jews was certainly not accidental. I also think that in a profound though unacknowledged sense Freud wanted it that way’ (Yerushalmi 1991, 41). As in other forms of Judaism, there was a sense of being an ingroup within a specifically Jewish milieu. ‘Whatever the reasons—historical, sociological—group bonds did provide a warm shelter from the outside world. In social relations with other Jews, informality and familiarity formed a kind of inner security, a ‘we-feeling,’ illustrated even by the selection of jokes and stories recounted within the group’ (Grollman 1965, 41). Also adding to the Jewish milieu of the movement was the fact that Freud was idolized by Jews generally. Freud himself noted in his letters that ‘from all sides and places, the Jews have enthusiastically seized me for themselves.’ ‘He was embarrassed by the way they treated him as if he were ‘a God-fearing Chief Rabbi,’ or ‘a national hero,’ and by the way they viewed his work as ‘genuinely Jewish’ (in Klein 1981, 85; see also Gay 1988, 599).

As in the case of several Jewish movements and political activities reviewed in Chapters 2 and 3 (see also *SAID*, Ch. 6), Freud took great pains to ensure that a gentile, Jung, would be the head of his psychoanalytic movement—a move that infuriated his Jewish colleagues in Vienna, but one that was clearly intended to deemphasize the very large overrepresentation of Jews in the movement during this period. To persuade his Jewish colleagues of the need for Jung to head the society, he argued, ‘Most of you are Jews, and therefore you are incompetent to win friends for the new teaching. Jews must be content with the modest role of preparing the ground. It is absolutely essential that I should form ties in the world of science’ (in Gay 1988, 218). As Yerushalmi (1991, 41) notes, ‘To put it very crudely, Freud needed a goy, and not just any goy but one of genuine intellectual stature and influence.’ Later, when the movement was reconstituted after World War I, another gentile, the sycophantic and submissive Ernest Jones, became president of the International Psychoanalytic Association.”⁵⁸⁰

The aggressive rôle that the “Shabbas Goy” Max von Laue played in personally attacking Einstein’s critics was a part of this pattern.⁵⁸¹ He put a Gentile face on the assault against the rights of Einstein’s critics to hold their own opinions and express them in public. Laue championed a smear campaign against Einstein’s critics in the full knowledge that Einstein had plagiarized the works of Poincaré and Lorentz, and

in full knowledge of the fact that the experimental evidence which had allegedly confirmed the general theory of relativity, did not confirm it, but rather disproved it.

Laue must have known that Einstein was an outspoken Jewish racist, but instead of condemning Einstein for his racism, Laue let himself be used to miscast the scientific and ethical critique of Einstein as if it were an expression of anti-Jewish racism. Einstein played a central rôle in corrupting the universities, the journals and the popular press of his day with Jewish racists and sycophantic Gentiles, who would promote him and the theories he appropriated from others.

Freud did not invent the field of psychology. He was a career plagiarist and he largely deprived the field of its synthetic scientific basis, which appeared in the earlier work of Spencer and James. Freud converted psychology into an introspective metaphysical analysis of his own mental maladies. Freud abused the pseudoscientific doctrines he plagiarized, and the fame he had achieved through the Jewish community, to make political attacks against persons whom he hated, and against Rome—against the Catholic Church. Largely under the directorship of Jews, the field of psychology degenerated into a sadistic house of tortures and mutilation. It was exploited as a means to suppress dissent, especially in Marxist countries, and particularly in the hands of Jews. Psychology, under Freud, also become a means to enrich psychiatrists by providing sick persons with someone with whom they could talk, and giving them the false hope that this panacea of talk would cure them of their physical ailments.

Max Born intimated in his 16 July 1955 lecture in Bern (as had Moszkowski and Freundlich) that the hype promoting Einstein in 1919 was intended, in part, as a *rapprochement* between Great Britain and Germany after the war. Eddington wrote to Einstein on 1 December 1919,

“It is the best possible thing that could have happened for scientific relations between England and Germany. I do not anticipate rapid progress towards official reunion, but there is a big advance towards a more reasonable frame of mind among scientific men, and that is even more important than the renewal of formal associations. [***] [T]hings have turned out very fortunately in giving this object-lesson of the solidarity of German and British science even in time of war.”⁵⁸²

Others wrote of their excitement that the eclipse sensation would promote better international relations.⁵⁸³

This indicates that the eclipse “observations” signified a political maneuver, not a legitimate experiment. At the time much was made of the fact that Einstein’s book had been translated into English and was the first book to be translated from German to English after the war.⁵⁸⁴ Einstein’s correspondence regarding this translation and his article for the *The London Times* also reveal some of the political motives of *rapprochement* behind the Einstein hype of 1919, and beyond.⁵⁸⁵

In 1955, Born stated that the eclipse expeditions of 1919 created an undescribable stir around the world,

“EINSTEIN became at once the most famous and popular figure, the man who had broken through the wall of hatred and united the scientists to a common effort, the man who had replaced ISAAC NEWTON’s system of the world by another and better one. But at the same time an opposition, which had already been apparent while I was in Berlin, grew under the leadership of PHILIPP LENARD and JOHANNES STARK. It was springing from the most absurd mixture of scientific conservatism and prejudice with racial and political emotions, due to EINSTEIN’s Jewish descent and pacifistic, antimilitaristic convictions.”⁵⁸⁶

Born also stated,

“[. . .]EINSTEIN’s theory was new and revolutionary, an effort was needed to assimilate it. Not everybody was able or willing to do so. Thus the period after EINSTEIN’s discovery was full of controversy, sometime of bitter strife.”⁵⁸⁷

Nobel Prize laureates Philipp Lenard (1905 Nobel Prize for Physics) and Johannes Stark (1919 Nobel Prize for Physics) had initially sponsored Einstein and his work, and it was only after Einstein played the race card—publicly and internationally smearing Philipp Lenard without cause, that race became an issue in the debate over relativity theory—mostly for Einstein, Max von Laue and Max Born, who had a financial interest in the Einstein myth, and for the press people who smeared Einstein’s opponents. They desperately wanted to change the subject from the legitimate claims of Einstein’s plagiarism, legitimate arguments against the irrationality of the theory of relativity and the shameless hype and misrepresentation of experimental evidence by Einstein and his friends, to name-calling and racial strife provoked by them.

Lenard and Stark initially opposed Einstein on purely scientific and ethical grounds related to Einstein’s sophistry, self-promotion and plagiarism. They later embraced Nazism and its racial mythologies.

Einstein eventually succeeded in bringing racial politics into the debate, though it was initially a larger issue for him than for his opponents. Einstein most often outright refused to discuss his plagiarism or purely scientific, non-political critiques of the theory of relativity; but he did not hesitate to name-call and smear his critics. He could not win in a dispute over the scientific and historical facts, so he provoked a race war over relativity theory in order to avoid legitimate criticism. It was a war everyone would ultimately lose.

Einstein’s complaints were hypocritical. He himself sought ethnically segregated educational institutions and an ethnically segregated society and often stated that anti-Semitism was both correct and good for Jews. Einstein had bad experiences early in his youth⁵⁸⁸ and always bore a stereotypical prejudice against Gentile Germans, which is consistent with the racism inherent in genocidal Judaism.

Max Born, himself, “played the race card” and misrepresented events at the Bad Nauheim debate. Born stated,

“[Philipp Lenard] directed sharp, nasty attacks against Einstein, with a blatantly anti-Semitic tendency. Einstein became agitated and answered him sharply, and I believe I remember that I supported him.”⁵⁸⁹

Born took pride in his biased and unfair efforts to quash any opposition to Einstein’s mythologies. Born stated,

“There appeared attacks against EINSTEIN by well-known scientists and philosophers in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* which aroused my pugnacity. I answered in a rather sharp article.”⁵⁹⁰

Born’s contradictory claim that Einstein had concurrently united and divided scientists indicates Born’s blindness to his own hypocrisy and the magnitude of the zealotry he felt for his political cause, which he believed would make him rich. While Born and his ilk boasted of their opposition to anti-Semitism, they themselves were elements in the atmosphere which created Hitler’s tragic ascent to power, and for them to pretend to victory among that horror, greatly dishonors the innocent lives lost in the Holocaust. Political Zionists, Einstein among them—Born not, saw anti-Semitism as a good thing and promoted segregation and racial tension. Some even delighted in the fact that forced segregation would bring more Jews into the political Zionist camp.

Albert Einstein was one of the world’s leading political Zionists. Political Zionism was a new form of racism that emerged at the end of the Nineteenth Century. It held that Jews were a pure race that could not coexist with non-Jews. Einstein had many powerful friends in the Zionist and Socialist press. Einstein’s friends and supporters, in what political Zionist founder Theodor Herzl called the “Jewish papers”,⁵⁹¹ libeled those who opposed Einstein or the theory of relativity and deflected attention from Einstein’s plagiarism by misrepresenting any criticism of Einstein as if it were anti-Semitism, *per se*.⁵⁹²

There was also an anti-Einstein press and an unbiased press which documented Einstein’s plagiarism and his scientific and philosophical defeats. Like radicals in general, radical Socialists, Zionists and Communists had well-deserved reputations as defamers, which manifested itself in their vitriolic attacks on Jewish leaders who refused to fund their schemes; or, in the case of Zionism, opposed their racist agenda. Einstein stated, “But in Germany the judgement of my theory depended on the party politics of the Press[.]”⁵⁹³ German newspapers had well-deserved reputations as being organs for the many political parties which were active in Germany in the Teens of the Twentieth Century. They brought politics into science in a way not previously known.

Einstein took advantage of the political climate after World War I to change the subject from the accusations of plagiarism against him, which were easily proven, to racial politics, which were explosive at the time. It is tragic that the search for the truth in Physics, and in Ethics related to priorities, became a political issue centered on “the Jewish question”, but Einstein succeeded in making it one.

Political Zionists, Einstein and his friends among them, have earned a reputation

throughout their history for preventing free and open public dialog about important issues they would rather not see discussed. They have often had open access to the press to publish their smears and the means to largely prevent those who have been wronged from responding. They accomplish these feats by: spuriously presuming to speak for all persons of Jewish descent, organized intimidation, boycott, smear tactic, intensive letter writing campaigns which give an inflated appearance that their views are widely held, threats and acts of violence, etc.

Even the disciples of Christ are said to have feared Jewish tribalism and Jewish religious intolerance, for example in *John* 20:19:

“Then the same day at evening, being the first *day* of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace *be* unto you.”

In 1914, Edward Alsworth Ross, a Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, wrote in his book, *The Old World in the New: The Significance of Past and Present Immigration to the American People*, The Century Co., New York, (1914), pages 143 and 165,

“IN his defense of Flaccus [*Pro Flaccus*, Chapter 28], a Roman governor who had ‘squeezed’ his Jewish subjects, Cicero lowers his voice when he comes to speak of the Jews, for, as he explains to the judges, there are persons who might excite against him this numerous, clannish and powerful element. With much greater reason might an American lower his voice to-day in discussing two million Hebrew immigrants united by a strong race consciousness and already ably represented at every level of wealth, power, and influence in the United States. [***] This cruel prejudice—for all lump condemnations are cruel—is no importation, no hang-over from the past. It appears to spring out of contemporary experience and is invading circle after circle of broad-minded. People who give their lives to befriending immigrants shake their heads over the Galician Hebrews. It is astonishing how much of the sympathy that twenty years ago went out to the fugitives from Russian massacres has turned sour. Through fear of retaliation little criticism gets into print; in the open the Philo-semites have it all their way. The situation is: Honey above, gall beneath. If the Czar, by keeping up the pressure which has already rid him of two million undesired subjects, should succeed in driving the bulk of his six million Jews to the United States, we shall see the rise of the Jewish question here, perhaps riots and anti-Jewish legislation. No doubt thirty or forty thousand Hebrews from eastern Europe might be absorbed by this country each year without any marked growth of race prejudice; but when they come in two or three or even four times as fast, the lump outgrows the leaven, and there will be trouble.”

Cicero’s *Pro Flaccus*, Chapter 28, states,

“XXVIII. The next thing is that charge about the Jewish gold. And this, forsooth, is the reason why this cause is pleaded near the steps of Aurelius. It is on account of this charge, O Lælius, that this place and that mob has been selected by you. You know how numerous that crowd is, how great is its unanimity, and of what weight it is in the popular assemblies. I will speak in a low voice, just so as to let the judges hear me. For men are not wanting who would be glad to excite that people against me and against every eminent man; and I will not assist them and enable them to do so more easily. As gold, under pretence of being given to the Jews, was accustomed every year to be exported out of Italy and all the provinces to Jerusalem, Flaccus issued an edict establishing a law that it should not be lawful for gold to be exported out of Asia. And who is there, O judges, who cannot honestly praise this measure? The senate had often decided, and when I was consul it came to a most solemn resolution that gold ought not to be exported. But to resist this barbarous superstition were an act of dignity, to despise the multitude of Jews, which at times was most unruly in the assemblies in defence of the interests of the republic, was an act of the greatest wisdom. ‘But Cnæus Pompeius, after he had taken Jerusalem, though he was a conqueror, touched nothing which was in that temple.’ In the first place, he acted wisely, as he did in many other instances, in leaving no room for his detractors to say anything against him, in a city so prone to suspicion and to evil speaking. For I do not suppose that the religion of the Jews, our enemies, was any obstacle to that most illustrious general, but that he was hindered by his own modesty. Where then is the guilt? Since you nowhere impute any theft to us, since you approve of the edict, and confess that it was passed in due form, and do not deny that the gold was openly sought for and produced, the facts of the case themselves show that the business was executed by the instrumentality of men of the highest character. There was a hundredweight of gold, more or less, openly seized at Apamea, and weighed out in the forum at the feet of the prætor, by Sextus Cæsius, a Roman knight, a most excellent and upright man; twenty pounds weight or a little more were seized at Laodicea, by Lucius Peducæus, who is here in court, one of our judges; some was seized also at Adramyttium, by Cnæus Domitius, the lieutenant, and a small quantity at Pergamus. The amount of the gold is known; the gold is in the treasury; no theft is imputed to him; but it is attempted to render him unpopular. The speaker turns away from the judges, and addresses himself to the surrounding multitude. Each city, O Lælius, has its own peculiar religion; we have ours. While Jerusalem was flourishing, and while the Jews were in a peaceful state, still the religious ceremonies and observances of that people were very much at variance with the splendour of this empire, and the dignity of our name, and the institutions of our ancestors. And they are the more odious to us now, because that nation has shown by arms what were its feelings towards our supremacy. How dear it was to the immortal gods is proved by its having been defeated, by its revenues having been farmed out to our contractors, by its being reduced to a state of subjection.”⁵⁹⁴

United States Army Captain Montgomery Schuyler reported on 1 March 1919,

“It is probably unwise to say this loudly in the United States but the Bolshevik movement is and has been since its beginning guided and controlled by Russian Jews of the greasiest type[. ..]”⁵⁹⁵

Senator Ernest F. Hollings argued before the United States that his position was being mischaracterized, when he put America’s interests ahead of the Neo-Conservatives’ plan for providing Israel with hegemony in the Mid-East and was called “anti-Semitic”. Senator Hollings’ comments appear in the *Congressional Record* (Proceedings and Debates of the 108th Congress, Second Session), Volume 150, Number 72, (20 May 2004), pages S5921-S5925; which includes Senator Hollings’ article, “Bush’s Failed Mideast Policy is Creating More Terrorism”, *Charleston Post and Courier*, 6 May 2004, which article has appeared in several websites. The *Congressional Record* is also available online. At pages S5921-S5925, Senator Hollings states, *inter alia*,

“Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleagues. I have, this afternoon, the opportunity to respond to being charged as anti-Semitic when I proclaimed the policy of President Bush in the Mideast as not for Iraq or really for democracy in the sense that he is worried about Saddam and democracy. If he were worried about democracy in the Mideast, as we wanted to spread it as a policy, we would have invaded Lebanon, which is half a democracy and has terrorism and terrorists who have been problems to the interests of Israel and the United States. [***] I want to read an article that appeared in the Post and Courier in Charleston on May 6; thereafter, I think in the State newspaper in Columbia a couple days later; and in the Greenville News—all three major newspapers in South Carolina. You will find that there is no anti-Semitic reference whatsoever in it. [***] But in any event, the better way to do it is go right in and establish our predominance in Iraq and then, as they say, and I have different articles here I could refer to, next is Iran and then Syria. And it is the domino theory, and they genuinely believe it. I differ. I think, frankly, we have caused more terrorism than we have gotten rid of. That is my Israel policy. You can’t have an Israel policy other than what AIPAC [American Israel Public Affairs Committee] gives you around here. I have followed them mostly in the main, but I have also resisted signing certain letters from time to time, to give the poor President a chance. I can tell you no President takes office—I don’t care whether it is a Republican or a Democrat—that all of a sudden AIPAC will tell him exactly what the policy is, and Senators and members of Congress ought to sign letters. I read those carefully and I have joined in most of them. On some I have held back. I have my own idea and my own policy. I have stated it categorically. [***] Again, let me read: Bush thought tax cuts would hold his crowd together and that spreading democracy in the Mideast to secure Israel would take the Jewish vote from the Democrats. Is there anything

wrong with referring to the Jewish vote? Good gosh, every 1 of us of the 100, with pollsters and all, refer to the Jewish vote. That is not anti-Semitic. It is appreciating them. We campaigned for it. I just read about President Bush's appearance before the AIPAC. He confirmed his support of the Jewish vote, referring to adopting Ariel Sharon's policy, and the dickens with the 1967 borders, the heck with negotiating the return of refugees, the heck with the settlements he had objected to originally. They had those borders, Resolution No. 242—no, no, President Bush said: I am going along with Sharon, and he was going to get that and he got the wonderful reception he got with the Jewish vote. There is nothing like politicizing or a conspiracy, as my friend from Virginia, Senator ALLEN, says—that it is an anti-Semitic, political, conspiracy statement. That is not a conspiracy. That is the policy. I didn't like to keep it a secret, maybe; but I can tell you now, I will challenge any 1 of the other 99 Senators to tell us why we are in Iraq, other than what this policy is here. It is an adopted policy, a domino theory of The Project For The New American Century. Everybody knows it because we want to secure our friend, Israel. If we can get in there and take it in 7 days, as Paul Wolfowitz says, then we would get rid of Saddam, and when we got rid of Saddam, now all they can do is fall back and say: Aren't you getting rid of Saddam? Let me get to that point. What happens is, they say he is a monster. We continued to give him aid after he gassed his own people and everything else of that kind. George Herbert Walker Bush said in his book *All The Best* in 1999, never commit American GIs into an unwinnable urban guerrilla war and lose the support of the Arab world, lose their friendship and support. That is a general rephrasing of it. The point is, my authority is the President's daddy. I want everybody to know that. I don't apologize for this column. I want them to apologize to me for talking about anti-Semitism. They are not getting by with it. I will come down here every day—I have nothing else to do—and we will talk about it and find out what the policy is. [***] We are losing the terrorism war because we thought we could do it militarily under the domino policy of President Bush, going into Iraq. That is my point. That is not anti-Semite or whatever they say in here about people's faith and ethnicity. I never referred to any faith. I should have added those other names from the Project For The New American Century, but I picked out the names I had quotes for. And for space, I left other things out. Mr. President, on May 12 of this year, I had printed in the RECORD the article in its entirety. I diverted from the reading of the article several times, so for the sake of accuracy I wanted the whole article printed. This particular op-ed piece appeared in the Post and Courier. Never would they have thought, having read it, if it was anti-Semitic, that they would have ever put it in there. Nor would the Knight Ridder newspapers in Columbia, SC. Nor would the Metro Media newspapers in Greenville, SC. But the Anti-Defamation League picked it up and now they have given it to my good friend, Senator ALLEN of Virginia. I have his particular admonition how I am anti-Semitic and I cannot let that stay there. [***] Come on. So we have to go out and not speak

sense with respect to policy, and when you want to talk about policy, they say it is anti-Semitic. Well, come on the floor, let's debate it. Because my friend from Virginia admonishes me. Referring to me he says, 'I suggest he should learn from history before making accusations.' I didn't make any accusations. I stated facts. That is their policy. That is not my policy."

Former Illinois Congressman Paul Findley experienced first hand the ability and willingness of Zionists in more recent times to defame those who call for open public debate on issues the Zionists would rather suppress, or would have told from their heavily biased perspective and from their perspective only. Findley has written several books exposing the Zionists' ability to unfairly smear him and others, and to force silence through intimidation on any who would otherwise side with Findley in his efforts to involve the American people in an honest and open dialog about the rights of Palestinians.⁵⁹⁶ Just as the Zionists have often sought to suppress public discussion of the Palestinians' rights and an honest discussion of what is in America's best interests, as opposed to the Zionists' perceived self-interests, political Zionists—and indeed like minded Marxist-leaning Socialists—have often obstructed public debate about Einstein's plagiarism from the moment Einstein became their most famous and important spokesman.

Many have been wrongfully and viciously smeared as alleged "anti-Semites" because they refuse to discriminate in their opposition to racism, including but not limited to, their opposition to political Zionist racism. The vast majority of Jews initially opposed political Zionism due to its expressed racism. Their leaders were smeared. After the founding of Israel, debate was largely stifled.

Prof. Tony Martin was attacked when he added the book *The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews*⁵⁹⁷ among his offerings in the school bookstore at the university at which he taught. In his book, *The Jewish Onslaught: Despatches from the Wellesley Battlefield*, Majority Press, Dover, Massachusetts, (1993); Prof. Martin details the organized attacks he faced when exposing Jewish involvement in the slave trade and Jewish racism towards blacks. Prof. Martin exposts upon the fact that the Hamitic myth, the "curse of Ham", which condemns Blacks to perpetual slavery and degrades the stereotypical phenotype of a black person or "Canaanite", stems from the story of Noah and his son Ham in the Old Testament (*Genesis 9:20-27*); and from the racist Talmudic interpretations of this story; as well as their misuse to justify the injustice and inhumanity of Black slavery, which was a profitable industry for Jews, especially the trade to Brazil, where the Jews also profited from agriculture—in particular sugar cane.⁵⁹⁸

Genesis 9:20-27:

"20 And Noah began *to be* an husbandman, and he planted a vineyard: 21 And he drank of the wine, and was drunken; and he was uncovered within his tent. 22 And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without. 23 And Shem and Japheth took a garment, and laid *it* upon both their shoulders, and went backward, and covered the nakedness of their father; and their faces *were* backward, and they saw not

their father's nakedness. 24 And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him. 25 And he said, Cursed *be* Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. 26 And he said, Blessed *be* the LORD God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant. 27 God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant."

Harold Brackman wrote of the evolution of the Hamitic myth in his PhD dissertation in 1977,

"The opening centuries of the Christian era constituted an interregnum in the native African record of historical achievement separating Cush's era of ancient prominence from the medieval accomplishments of the great Negro states of the Sudan. These same centuries formed the seedbed of rabbinic Judaism. And this fateful coincidence goes far toward explaining why they also formed such fertile soil for the growth of Jewish lore demeaning the Negro. The most famous of these anti-Negro legends cluster about Ham and Noah's cursing of Canaan [***] There is no denying that the Babylonian Talmud was the first source to read a Negrophobic content into the episode by stressing Canaan's fraternal connections with Cush [***] The Talmudic glosses of the episode added the stigma of blackness to the fate of enslavement that Noah predicted for Ham's progeny [***] According to it, Ham is told by his outraged father [Noah] that, because you have abused me in the darkness of the night, your children shall be born black and ugly; because you have twisted your head to cause me embarrassment, they shall have kinky hair and red eyes; because your lips jested at my exposure, theirs shall swell; and because you neglected my nakedness, they shall go naked[.]"⁵⁹⁹

The racist Talmud states in *Sanhedrin 70a*,

"Ubar the Galilean gave the following exposition: The letter *waw* [*and*]⁴ occurs thirteen times in the passage dealing with wine: *And Noah began to be an husbandman, and he planted a vineyard: And he drank of the wine and was drunken; and he was uncovered within his tent. And Ham the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without. And Shem and Japheth took a garment, and laid it upon their shoulders, and went backward and covered the nakedness of their father, and their faces were backward, and they saw not their father's nakedness. And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him.*⁵ [With respect to the last verse] Rab and Samuel [differ,] one maintaining that he castrated him, whilst the other says that he sexually abused him. He who maintains that he castrated him, [reasons thus;] Since he cursed him by his fourth son,⁶ he must have injured him with respect to a fourth son.⁷ But he who says that he sexually abused him, draws an analogy between '*and he*

saw’ written twice. Here it is written, *And Ham the father of Canaan saw the nakedness of his father*; whilst elsewhere it is written, *And when Shechem the son of Hamor saw her [he took her and lay with her and defiled here]*.⁸ Now, on the view that he emasculated him, it is right that he cursed him by his fourth son; but on the view that he abused him, why did he curse his fourth son: he should have cursed him himself?—Both indignities were perpetrated.^{1,600}

The racist Talmud states in *Sanhedrin* 108*b*,

“Our Rabbis taught: Three copulated in the ark, and they were all punished—the dog, the raven, and Ham. The dog was doomed to be tied, the raven expectorates [his seed into his mates mouth], and Ham was smitten in his skin. [*Footnote*: I.e., from him descended Cush (the negro) who is black-skinned.]”⁶⁰¹

The racist *Midrash Rabbah* (Genesis 36:7) states,

“7. AND NOAH AWOKE FROM HIS WINE (IX, 24): he was sobered from his wine.

AND KNEW WHAT HIS YOUNGEST SON HAD DONE UNTO HIM. Here it means, his worthless son, as you read, *Because the brazen altar that was before the Lord was too little to receive the burnt-offering*, etc. (I Kings VIII, 64).¹

AND HE SAID: CURSED BE CANAAN (IX, 25): Ham sinned and Canaan is cursed! R. Judah and R. Nehemiah disagreed. R. Judah said: Since it is written, *And God blessed Noah and his sons* (Gen. IX, 1), while there cannot be a curse where a blessing has been given, consequently, HE SAID: CURSED BE CANAAN. R. Nehemiah explained: It was Canaan who saw it [in the first place] and informed them, therefore the curse is attached to him who did wrong.

R. Berekiah said: Noah grieved very much in the Ark that he had no young son to wait on him, and declared, ‘When I go out I will beget a young son to do this for me.’ But when Ham acted thus to him, he exclaimed, ‘You have prevented me from begetting a young son to serve me,² therefore that man [your son] will be a servant to his brethren!’ R. Huna said in R. Joseph’s name: [Noah declared], ‘You have prevented me from begetting a fourth son, therefore I curse your fourth son.’³ R. Huna also said in R. Joseph’s name: You have prevented me from doing something in the dark [sc. cohabitation], therefore your seed will be ugly and dark-skinned. R. Hiyya said: Ham and the dog copulated in the Ark, therefore Ham came forth black-skinned while the dog publicly exposes its copulation. R. Levi said: This may be compared to one who minted his own coinage⁴ in the very palace of the king, whereupon the king ordered: I decree that his effigy be defaced and his coinage cancelled. Similarly, Ham and the dog copulated in the Ark and were

punished.⁵⁹⁹⁶⁰²

Moses Maimonides, a famous Jewish philosopher and a racist, wrote in the Twelfth Century in his *Guide of the Perplexed*,

“Now I shall interpret to you this parable that I have invented. I say then: Those who are outside the city are all human individuals who have no doctrinal belief, neither one based on speculation nor one that accepts the authority of tradition: such individuals as the furthestmost Turks found in the remote North, the Negroes found in the remote South, and those who resemble them from among them that are with us in these climes. The status of those is like that of irrational animals. To my mind they do not have the rank of men, but have among the beings a rank lower than the rank of man but higher than the rank of the apes. For they have the external shape and lineaments of a man and a faculty of discernment that is superior to that of the apes.”⁶⁰³

The racist cabalistic doctrine of the *Zohar*, I, 73a, associates Blacks with the racist Jewish legend that Eve copulated with the serpent and produced a demonic race that descends from Cain, who slew his brother Abel. Racist Jews claimed that the dark skin of Blacks was the “mark of Cain” (*Genesis* 4:10-12, 15), and the “curse of Ham”. The *Zohar* states,

“Of the three sons of Noah that went forth from the ark, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, Shem is symbolic of the right side, Ham of the left side, whilst Japheth represents the ‘purple’, which is a mixture of the two. AND HAM WAS THE FATHER OF CANAAN. Ham represents the refuse and dross of the gold, the stirring and rousing of the unclean spirit of the ancient serpent. It is for that reason that he is designated the ‘father of Canaan’, namely, of Canaan who brought curses on the world, of Canaan who was cursed, of Canaan who darkened the faces of mankind. For this reason, too, Ham is given a special mention in the words, ‘Ham, the father of Canaan’, that is, the notorious world-darkener, whereas we are not told that Shem was the father of such-a-one, or that Japheth was the father of such-a-one. No sooner is Ham mentioned, than he is pointed to as the father of Canaan. Hence when Abraham came on the scene, it is written, ‘And Abraham passed through the land’ (Gen. xii, 6), for this was before the establishment of the patriarchs and before the seed of Israel existed in the world, so that the land could not yet be designated by this honoured and holy name. Observe that when Israel were virtuous the land was called by their name, the Land of Israel; but when they were not worthy it was called by another name, to wit, the Land of Canaan. Hence it is written: AND HE SAID, CURSED BE CANAAN, A SERVANT OF SERVANTS SHALL HE BE UNTO HIS BRETHREN, for the reason that he brought curses on the world, in the same way as the serpent, against whom was pronounced the doom, ‘Cursed art thou among all cattle’ (Gen. III,

14).”⁶⁰⁴

The stigmata of the “mark of Cain”, which Jewish racists placed on Blacks, had a lasting destructive effect and was used to justify slavery in the Americas and anti-miscegenation laws. A black slave named Phillis Wheatley published a poem in 1773, which evinces the racist accusation that blacks bear the mark of Cain,

“On being brought from AFRICA to
AMERICA.

’T WAS mercy brought me from my *Pagan*
land,
Taught my benighted soul to understand
That there’s a God, that there’s a *Saviour* too:
Once I redemption neither sought nor knew,
Some view our sable race with scornful eye,
‘Their colour is a diabolic die.’
Remember, *Christians, Negros*, black as *Cain*,
May be refin’d, and join th’ angelic train.”⁶⁰⁵

Congressman Paul Findley stated, among his many revealing remarks about Zionist influence,

“Journalist Harold R. Piety observes that ‘the ugly cry of anti-Semitism is the bludgeon used by the Zionists to bully non-Jews into accepting the Zionist view of world events, or to keep silent.’ In late 1978 Piety, withholding his identity in order not to irritate his employer, wrote an article on ‘Zionism and the American Press’ for *Middle East International* in which he decried ‘the inaccuracies, distortions and—perhaps worst—inexcusable omission of significant news and background material by the American media in its treatment of the Arab-Israeli conflict.’

Piety traces the deficiency of U.S. media in reporting on the Middle East to largely successful efforts by the pro-Israel lobby to ‘overwhelm the American media with a highly professional public relations campaign, to intimidate the media through various means and, finally, to impose censorship when the media are compliant and craven.’ He lists threats to editors and advertising departments, orchestrated boycotts, slanders, campaigns of character assassination, and personal vendettas among the weapons employed against balanced journalism.”⁶⁰⁶

Former Mossad agent Victor Ostrovsky wrote in his book *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad’s Secret Agenda* (note that a “Sayanim” is a disloyal and deceitful Jew, who is prepared to betray his or her neighbors at any time in order to advance a perceived Israeli interest),

“The American Jewish community was divided into a three-stage action team. First were the individual *sayanim* (if the situation had been reversed and the United States had convinced Americans working in Israel to work secretly on behalf of the United States, they would be treated as spies by the Israeli government). Then there was the large pro-Israeli lobby. It would mobilize the Jewish community in a forceful effort in whatever direction the Mossad pointed them. And last was B’nai Brith. Members of that organization could be relied on to make friends among non-Jews and tarnish as anti-Semitic whomever they couldn’t sway to the Israeli cause. With that sort of one-two-three tactic, there was no way we could strike out.”⁶⁰⁷

Prof. Norman G. Finkelstein writes in his book, *Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History*, University of California Press, Berkeley, (2005), pp. 21-22, 32, and 66,

“**THE LATEST PRODUCTION** of Israel’s apologists is the ‘new anti-Semitism.’ [***] The main purpose behind these periodic, meticulously orchestrated media extravaganzas is not to fight anti-Semitism but rather to exploit the historical suffering of Jews in order to immunize Israel against criticism. [***] Finally, whereas in the original *New Anti-Semitism* marginal left-wing organizations like the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers Party were cast as the heart of the anti-Semitic darkness, in the current revival Israel’s apologists, having lurched to the right end of the political spectrum, cast mainstream organizations like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch in this role. [***] **WHAT’S CURRENTLY CALLED** the new anti-Semitism actually incorporates three main components: (1) exaggeration and fabrication, (2) mislabeling legitimate criticism of Israeli policy, and (3) the unjustified yet predictable spillover from criticism of Israel to Jews generally. **EXAGGERATION AND FABRICATION** The evidence of a new anti-Semitism comes mostly from organizations directly or indirectly linked to Israel or having a material stake in inflating the findings of anti-Semitism.”⁶⁰⁸

In 2006, Professors John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt wrote in their paper, “The Israel Lobby and U. S. Foreign Policy”,

“No discussion of how the Lobby operates would be complete without examining one of its most powerful weapons: the charge of anti-Semitism. Anyone who criticizes Israeli actions or says that pro-Israel groups have significant influence over U. S. Middle East policy—an influence that AIPAC celebrates—stands a good chance of getting labeled an anti-Semite. In fact, anyone who says that there is an Israel Lobby runs the risk of being charged with anti-Semitism, even though the Israeli media themselves refer to America’s ‘Jewish Lobby.’ In effect, the Lobby boasts of its power and then attacks anyone who calls attention to it. This tactic is very effective,

because anti-Semitism is loathsome and no responsible person wants to be accused of it.”⁶⁰⁹

There is nothing new about fabricated accusations of anti-Semitism. The Judeans who fabricated the Old Testament fabricated a history of Egyptian tyranny which never occurred, and which fictions recklessly defamed the Egyptians as anti-Semites. Esau was defamed as an hereditary anti-Semite for daring to be angry at Jacob for stealing the Covenant from him.⁶¹⁰ Jewish historians defamed Caligula for not tolerating Judean intolerance (etc. etc. etc.).

Douglas Reed, who was a British journalist, but was forced out of the profession, because he reported on Zionist brutality, wrote in December of 1950,

“More important still, during all that period and to the present time, it was not possible freely to report or discuss a third vital matter: Zionist Nationalism. In this case the freedom of the press has become a fallacy during the past two decades. Newspaper-writers have become less and less free to express any criticism, or report any fact unfavourable to this new ambition of the Twentieth Century. When I eventually went to America I found that this ban, for such it is in practice, prevailed even more rigidly there than in my own country.

Today an awakening is supposed to have occurred in the matter of Communism. During the most fateful and decisive years of the Second War, when the things were being done which obviously set the stage for a third one, it was in fact almost impossible for any independent writer to publish any reasonable criticism, supported by no matter what evidence, about Soviet Communism and its intentions. Now, when the damage is done, Communism is much attacked, but even so the mass of Communist writers who were planted in the American and British press during those years has by no means been displaced; and the attentive newspaper-reader in either country may see for himself how the most specious Communist sophistries are daily injected into the editorial arguments and the news-columns of newspapers professing the most respectable principles.

In the matter of Zionist Nationalism, which I hold to be allied in its roots to Soviet Communism, the ban is much more severe. In my own adult lifetime as a journalist, now covering thirty years, I have seen this secret ban grow from nothing into something approaching a law of *lèse majesté* at some absolute court of the dark past. In daily usage, no American or British newspaper, apparently, now dares to print a line of news or comment unfavourable to the Zionist ambition; and under this thrall matters are reported favourably or non-committally, if they are reported at all, which if they occurred elsewhere would be denounced with the most piteous cries of outraged morality. The inference to me is plain: the Zionist Nationalists are powerful enough to govern governments in the great countries of the remaining West!

I believe Zionist Nationalism to be a political movement organized in all

countries, which aims to bring all Jews under its thrall just as Communism enslaved the Russians and National Socialism the Germans. I hold it to be as dangerous as both of those, and when I recall the results that came of the subtle suppression of information in the cases of Stalinism and Hitlerism, I judge that the consequences of this even more rigorous suppression will not be less grave.

I think it a cardinal error to identify ‘Jews’ with Zionist Nationalism, ‘Russians’ with Communism, or ‘Germans’ with National Socialism. I saw the enslavement of Germans and Russians and know different. I believe that the astonishingly powerful attempt to prevent any discussion of Zionist Nationalism by dismissing it as the expression of an aversion to Jews, as Jews, is merely meant to stop any public discussion of its objects, which seem to me to be as dangerous to Jew as to Gentile. Of the three groups which have appeared, like stormy petrels, to presage the tempests of our century, the Zionist Nationalists appear to me the most powerful. National Socialism, I think, was but a stooge or stalking horse for the pursuit of Communist aims. Communism is genuinely tigerish, and was strong enough to infest governments everywhere and distort the policies which were pursued behind the screen of military operations; but, if forced into a corner by the rising unease of their peoples, Western politicians are prepared in the last resort to turn against it.

But Zionist Nationalism! . . . That is a different matter. Today American Presidents and British Prime Ministers, and all their colleagues, watch it as anxiously as Muslim priests watch for the crescent moon on the eve of Ramadan, and bow to it as the faithful prostrating themselves in the mosque at Mecca. The thing was but a word unknown to the masses forty years ago; today Western politicians hardly dare take the seals of office without first, or immediately afterwards, making public obeisance towards this strange new ambition.”⁶¹¹

Gore Vidal wrote,

“Currently, there is little open debate in the United States on any of these matters. The Soviet Union must be permanently demonized in order to keep the money flowing to the Pentagon for ‘defense,’ while Arabs are characterized as subhuman terrorists. Israel may not be criticized at all. (Ironically, the press in Israel is far more open and self-critical than ours.) We do have one token Palestinian who is allowed an occasional word in the press, Professor Edward Said, who wrote (*Guardian*, December 21, 1986): since the ‘1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon . . . it was felt by the Zionist lobby that the spectacle of ruthless Israeli power on the TV screen would have to be effaced from memory, by the strategy of incriminating the media as anti-Semitic for showing these scenes at all.’ A wide range of Americans were then exuberantly defamed, including myself.”⁶¹²

Robert I. Friedman wrote in 1987,

“Indeed, Americans have very little idea about how severely troubled Israel is, or how critical many Israelis are of their own government’s policies, such as arming the contras, Khomeini’s Iran, and South Africa. And some prominent U.S. editors and publishers who have dropped all pretense of objectivity to become public-relations advisors for the Israeli government hope to keep it that way. [***] And many others who have tried to defy this orthodoxy have come under unrelenting attack from the Israel lobby—a coalition of editors and publishers, pro-Israel PACs, and wealthy businessmen—which tries to silence dissidents with accusations of anti-Israel bias or anti-Semitism. [***] Yet these tactics of intimidation in the service of Israel may backfire. ‘It is precisely the fact that it is the job of the national press to be fair and objective that gets these superoverheated Jews foaming,’ said the *Washington Post*’s Stephen Rosenfeld. ‘They want 100 percent. They don’t want fairness: they want unfairness on their side, and when they don’t get it they accuse the press of being unfair. Most journalists get so much uninformed, unfair whining from the organized Jews that Jewish organizations—and ultimately Israel—may lose their credibility.’”⁶¹³

Arvid Reuter Dahl wrote to William L. Fisher on 17 October 1931,

“My dear Mr. Fisher,

Dr. Erich Ruckhaber recently sent you a letter of Aug. 29, 1931, addressed here to me for consideration.

Having lived through the Einstein Battle, I am well aware of all the difficulties which opposition to Einsteinism meets with everywhere, and not the least in the United States. I have had articles refused by Scientific Societies of which I am a member, because they clearly exposed the Einsteinian Sham.

It would be a great stroke for truth if we could find the means of getting ‘100 Autoren Gegen Einstein’ published in the English. I managed to get a reference in a St. Paul Paper, and another indirect reference in the Kansas City Star, on the occasion of a visit to Kansas City. I enclose a copy of the latter. Through friends, elsewhere, I tried to get newspaper notices, but without success.

The forces behind Einstein have excellent control over the press and scientific journals. They control our mathematical and scientific departments (indirectly) in our universities and colleges—a most deplorable condition. I know, by actual experience, whereof I speak.

I fear that no American publishing house will lend its name to ‘100 Autoren’, because of possible boycott and persecution (financial). Hence the publication involves raising the required funds independently and creating a marketing organization. Where the funds can be raised, at the present time of depression, is a stupendous problem. I too know Dr. Dayton C. Miller

through correspondence—a splendid gentleman and true scientist. I have had correspondence with Dr. Charles Lane Poor and he knows of my efforts against Einsteinism. But,—are they in a position to back such a venture? My prolonged illness has incapacitated me financially.

I have seen references to the stand taken by Dr. L. J. Moore of Cincinnati, and he is sound on the Einstein fiasco. There are others. There are other U[niversity] scientists—a few besides these three—who are aware of the Einsteinian nonsense, but many are afraid of losing scientific caste, and perhaps their positions.

Since you are personally acquainted with Dr. Dayton C. Miller, it may be possible for you to approach him on the subject in order to learn his reaction. From his answer, conclusions may be drawn which will be of solid and practical value.

If you will kindly take this step, then we can confer again by correspondence. You may, of course, mention my name to Dr. Miller, stating my position in reference to the urgent need of an English translation of ‘100 Autoren --’.

If a fearless champion can be found who has the financial resources, then ‘100 Autoren --’ can be gotten to the intelligent public and the days of Einsteinism in the U. S. will soon be numbered—such is the power of ‘100 Autoren’ as I appraise it.

Of course, I am ready to serve in such way as Dean in order to bring this most desirable purpose to a realization.

With best wishes, I remain,
Most cordially yours,”⁶¹⁴

Stjepan Mohorovičić wrote,

“Eine vorzügliche und sehr scharfsinnige Kritik veröffentlichte G. v. GLEICH 1930, wo er alle seine diesbezüglichen Arbeiten gesammelt und geordnet hatte, obwohl das ‘Relativitätssyndikat’ mit allen Mitteln trachtete, das Erscheinen dieses Werkes zu verhindern. Nun es war sehr schwer die Kritik gänzlich zu unterdrücken, da man in der Wahl der Mittel nicht kleinlich war. Alle, für die Relativitätstheorie ungünstigen Arbeiten wurden einfach kurzerhand als unrichtig, fehlerhaft oder falsch bezeichnet oder als un w i c h t i g (heutzutage ein sehr beliebtes Wort!) oder wenigstens als un i n t e r e s s a n t verschwiegen. Von den Philosophen erhielten nur die Applaudierenden das Wort, den kritisch Gesinnten warf man ihre mathematischen Unkenntnisse vor; wer sich darüber unterrichten will, sollte die offenen Briefe des bekannten Philosophen O. KRAUS nachlesen,

[Endnote: Vgl. Lit. [*Oskar Kraus : Offene Briefe an Albert Einstein u. Max v. Laue über die gedanklichen Grundlagen der speziellen und allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie. Wien u. Leipzig 1925.*] S. 78 u. ff., dann S. 96 u. ff. So sagte beispielsweise O. KRAUS wörtlich S. 94-95: ‘Herr

EINSTEIN selbst ist philosophisch Laie. . . Mit der Zuwendung zu Reichenbachs radikalem Konventionalismus hat er, scheint es, nun den Standpunkt erreicht, der seiner Theorie kongenial ist. . . Der Konventionalismus fälscht den Wahrheitsbegriff pragmatistisch. Diesem Niveau entspricht die Relativitätstheorie vom philosophischen Standpunkt aus.' (O. KRAUS war Professor an der deutschen Universität in Prag zu gleicher Zeit wie auch A. EINSTEIN).]

und doch haben die Philosophen die Grundlage der Rechnung, nicht aber die Rechnung selbst untersucht. Aber die Relativisten haben übersehen, daß die modernen Relativitätstheorien, ähnlich wie die moderne Musik, voll von Dissonanzen sind, (eine solche Musik entzückt den heutigen Snob außerordentlich und er kann nicht begreifen, daß es gebildete Leute gibt, welche die moderne Musik nicht ausstehen können, aber dafür muß man das Ohr und die richtige musikalische Erziehung haben!). O. KRAUS hat besonders den Umstand hervorgehoben (l. c. S. 96.), 'daß jeder Quark, der für die Theorie zu sein scheint, von den Relativisten mit freundlicher Gebärde begrüßt wird. . . während eine ernste Kritik mißhandelt wird'.

[*Endnote*: Ein erschreckendes Beispiel ist z. B. der beschleunigte Tod des verdienstvollen 80-jährigen Physikers. C. ISENKRAHE, (vgl. 317 [*Oskar Kraus : Offene Briefe an Albert Einstein u. Max v. Laue über die gedanklichen Grundlagen der speziellen und allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie. Wien u. Leipzig 1925.*] S. 96-97); dann wie M. ABRAHAM behandelt wurde; oder, wenn man einen Physiker als den Gegner der modernen Relativitätstheorien bezeichnet, so sind dann alle seine wissenschaftlichen Verdienste umsonst und ein jeder Stümper bildet sich ein, er habe das Recht ihn zu verleumden.— Ein anderes Beispiel ist der weltbekannte und große deutsche Philosoph HUGO DINGLER; in [*Hans Wagner : Hugo Dingers Beitrag zur Thematik der Letztbegründung. Kantstud. 47, 148-167, 1955-56. Sonderdruck, Köln 1956.*] S. 1. lesen wir folgendes über den von ihm geführten Kampf für die strenge Wissenschaft: '...ein Kampf, der unter schweren äußeren Bedingungen hatte geführt werden müssen — erst unter dem Vorwurf des Antisemitismus, seit er der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie entgegengetreten war, nach 1933 unter dem Vorwurf der Semitophilie, welcher ihn alsbald auch seinen Darmstädter Lehrstuhl kostete, 1945 unter dem Vorwurf einer Verbundenheit mit dem Ungeist des Hitlerreichs, der ihn abermals von der Lehrtätigkeit verwies und über ihn die aktuelle Gefahr eines buchstäblichen Hungertodes heraufführte, schließlich nach seiner Rehabilitierung unter der Last eines schweren Augenleidens.' usw. usw. Der Verfasser könnte noch vieles aus eigener Erfahrung beifügen, aber man wird das alles nach seinem Tode erfahren. . . (vgl. Anm. 90 [Dies alles sage ich aus eigener Erfahrung. Was ich z. B. persönlich in dieser Beziehung erlebt und zu ertragen habe, wird

man erst nach meinem Tode erfahren. Dies wird eine wahre Anklage gegen die relativistischen unerhörten Kampfmethoden sein, welche nur mit der mittelalterlichen Inquisition verglichen werden können.)). Siehe auch [*Wilhelm Krampf: Die Philosophie Hugo Dinglers. München 1955.*] u. [A. FRITSCH, G. BARTH, S. MOHOROVIČIĆ: Hugo Dingler Gedenkbuch zum 75. Geburtstag. Wissen im Werden 2, H. 4, 169-183, 1958 (und als selbständige Broschüre München 1959).].

Dies wirkte aber verhängnisvoll und diese modernen Theorien wurden größtenteils ein Tätigkeitsfeld *pour ceux qui savent vivre* ... oder wie ein lachender Philosoph sagte:

[*Endnote: * * * Demokritos oder hinterlassene Papiere eines lachenden Philosophen. 4. Aufl. Bd. VII., Stuttgart 1853., S. 322.—Wir müßten ebenfalls mit JULIAN APOSTATA eine Rede gegen die ungebildeten. . . halten.—Siehe auch [Clyde R. Miller: Kunstgriffe der Propaganda (Das Institut für Propaganda-Analyse d. Columbia University). Neue Auslese 3, 93-97; 1948 (übersetzt aus d. Jb. 'New Directions', New York).—Hier lesen wir folgendes (S. 96): 'Mit falschen Karten spielen ist ein Kunstgriff, bei dem der Propagandist alle Künste der Täuschung und des Truges anwendet, um unsere Unterstützung für sich selbst, seine Gruppe, Nation, Rasse, Politik, Methoden und Ideale zu gewinnen. Er entstellt bewusst die Wahrheit. Er übertreibt oder 'untertreibt', um sich um Diskussionen zu drücken und den Tatsachen aus dem Weg zu gehen. Er 'vernebelt' eine peinlich Angelegenheit, indem er mit grossem Trara eine neue Streitfrage aufs Tapet bringt. Er liefert Halbwahrheiten unter der Maske der Wahrheit (von uns unterstrichen). Durch den Kunstgriff der 'falschen Karten' wird ein mittelmässiger Kandidat als ein Genie hingestellt; . . . Zu dieser Art von Falschspielerei gehören Täuschung, Heuchelei und Unverschämtheit'.]*

‘. . . an Höfen ist Höflichkeit der Verstand und die Münze. . .’⁶¹⁵

4.7 Einstein's Trip to America

Einstein was discredited in Germany in late 1920. In early 1921, Einstein desperately needed a boost and a break. Zionist Kurt Blumenfeld arranged for Einstein to take a trip to America in order to spread propaganda for political Zionism and to raise money for the cause, on the deceitful premise that the money would go to fund an university in Jerusalem, the “Jewish university”⁶¹⁶ or “Hebrew University”. Einstein was deceived. The real goal of the Zionists who took advantage of him was to exploit Einstein's fame for profit.

Elements of the American press again promoted Einstein as the greatest genius of all time. For Jewish racists, this provided helpful racist propaganda claiming that all important contributions to the world of thought were made by Jews. The racist

political Zionist United States Supreme Court Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis wrote in a letter dated 1 March 1921,

“You have doubtless heard that the Great Einstein is coming to America soon with Dr. Weizmann, our Zionist Chief. Palestine may need something more now than a new conception of the Universe or of several additional dimensions; but it is well to remind the Gentile world, when the wave of anti-Semitism is rising, that in the world of thought the conspicuous contributions are being made by Jews.”⁶¹⁷

Viktor G. Ehrenberg, Hedwig Born’s father, wrote to Einstein on 23 November 1919,

“So it uplifts the heart and strengthens one’s faith in the future of mankind when one sees the researchers of all nations prostrating themselves before a man of Jewish blood, who thinks and writes in the German language, in full recognition of his greatness.”⁶¹⁸

Paul Ehrenfest wrote to Einstein that he had heard that the Zionists were using Einstein to promote the myth that he was a “Jewish Newton” and a Zionist. Ehrenfest was tortured by the fact that his character would not allow him to participate in the dishonest promotion of Einstein to the public. He believed it would ultimately be destructive to Jews. Ehrenfest committed suicide in 1933.

In 1905 and 1906, Paul Ehrenfest considered Lorentz’ 1904 paper⁶¹⁹ on special relativity and Poincaré’s 1905 Rendiconti paper⁶²⁰ on space-time to be the most significant work (both historically and scientifically) on the subject of the principle of relativity. Ehrenfest and his wife Tatiana attended David Hilbert’s 1905 Göttingen seminars on electron theory, which described Lorentz’ and Poincaré’s work on special relativity. They knew that Einstein did not create the theory of relativity. Paul Ehrenfest wrote to Albert Einstein on 9 December 1919,

“I hear, for ex., that your accomplishments are being used to make propaganda, with the ‘Jewish Newton, who is simultaneously an ardent Zionist’ (I personally haven’t *read* this yet, but only *heard* it mentioned). [***] But I cannot go along with the propagandistic fuss with its *inevitable* untruths, precisely *because* Judaism is at stake and *because* I feel myself so thoroughly a Jew.”⁶²¹

Immediately upon his arrival at America’s shores, Einstein mischaracterized any and all opposition to him and the theory of relativity as if it were anti-Semitism, *per se*.⁶²² After Einstein returned to Europe and after these Zionists bilked many generous Americans in the name of ethnic pride and duty, the promised funding of the university did not materialize. The nationalists allegedly could not agree on the final form this ethnically segregated school should take.⁶²³ We learn from American Zionist Louis Dembitz Brandeis’ letters that the University was nothing but a “side

show”,

“The University, important & dear to us, is merely a side show. It can wait. Nothing must be done in relation to it which would embarrass or confuse the main issue. It should be taken up—if and only if it would be helpful in furthering our fight on the main issue.”⁶²⁴

And where did the money go, which good-hearted Americans had donated for a university? Again, Brandeis’ letters provide us with some likely answers,

“In telling [Einstein] of the misappropriation of which we learned in London, I mentioned the diversion also of a University Fund & our apprehension as to further diversion.”⁶²⁵

The editors of Brandeis’ letters wrote,

“It was L[ouis] D[embitz] B[randeis]’s belief that the funds earmarked for the Hebrew University had been used for various projects in the Haifa area, and he wanted deHaas to provide whatever information they had on the matter to Einstein.”⁶²⁶

Zionist racists set the tone for the racist “Aryan Physics” movement that would soon follow the political Zionists’ smear campaigns against Germans, which followed centuries of active discrimination against Jews which was only then beginning to lessen, and so the cycle of hatred continued. These political Zionists had little respect for the truth or for the innocents they bilked. Einstein’s “secretary” on the trip, Salomon Ginzberg, later wrote,

“It was also hoped that the University, being a non-political institution of great spiritual appeal, would find supporters among the wealthier non-Zionist Jews who might not contribute to Zionist funds proper.”⁶²⁷

Salomon Ginzberg, a. k. a. Simon Ginsberg, was the son of the famous Zionist Ha’am. Ginzberg apparently thought that Einstein was a somewhat ridiculous person. Ginzberg mocked Einstein’s “speech”—a Goebbels-like plea for ethnic unity behind a lone *Führer*.⁶²⁸ Einstein declared to the Zionists of America,

“You have one leader — Weizmann. Follow him and no other!”⁶²⁹

Jewish lore had long inspired a desire among Jews for a charismatic leader, be it another Moses, or the Messiah King. In the 1600 and 1700's many would-be messiahs appeared and some, like Shabbatai Zevi and Jacob Frank, attracted large followings numbering in the millions. Graetz famously called for a charismatic leader to lead the Jews in the modern world. On the Zionists’ quest to find a “great man” to be their “dictator” and on the naturalness of dictatorships to Zionists,

see: N. Goldman, "Zionismus und nationale Bewegung", *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 4, (1920-1921), pp. 237-242, at 240-242; which was part of a series including: "Zionismus und nationale Bewegung", *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 1, (1920-1921), pp. 45-47; and "Zionismus und nationale Bewegung", *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 7, (1920-1921), pp. 423-425.

When Albert Einstein traveled to America in April of 1921 to promote his Zionist agenda he had received a triumphant welcome, but soon met with great and growing opposition. Einstein was lampooned and humiliated in certain segments of the international press. Einstein left America in defeat. He expressed his bitterness towards America in an interview for the *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*. Einstein stated, as reported in *The New York Times* on 8 July 1921 on page 9,

"BERLIN, July 7.—Dr. Albert Einstein, the famous scientist, made an amazing discovery relative to America on his trip which he recently explained to a sympathetic-looking Hollander as follows:

'The excessive enthusiasm for me in America appears to be typically American. And if I grasp it correctly the reason is that the people in America are so colossally bored, very much more than is the case with us. After all, there is so little for them there!' he exclaimed.

Dr. Einstein said this with vibrant sympathy. He continued:

'New York, Boston, Chicago and other cities have their theatres and concerts, but for the rest? There are cities with 1,000,000 inhabitants, despite which what poverty, intellectual poverty! The people are, therefore, glad when something is given them with which they can play and over which they can enthuse. And that they do, then, with monstrous intensity.

'Above all things are the women who, as a literal fact, dominate the entire life in America. The men take an interest in absolutely nothing at all. They work and work, the like of which I have never seen anywhere yet. For the rest they are the toy dogs of the women, who spend the money in a most unmeasurable, illimitable way and wrap themselves in a fog of extravagance. They do everything which is the vogue and now quite by chance they have thrown themselves on the Einstein fashion.

'You ask whether it makes a ludicrous impression on me to observe the excitement of the crowd for my teaching and my theory, of which it, after all, understands nothing? I find it funny and at the same time interesting to observe this game.

'I believe quite positively that it is the mysteriousness of what they cannot conceive which places them under a magic spell. One tells them of something big which will influence all future life, of a theory which only a small group, highly learned, can comprehend. Big names are mentioned of men who have made discoveries, of which the crowd grasps nothing. But it impresses them, takes on color and the magic power of mystery, and thus one becomes enthusiastic and excited.

'My impressions of scientific life in America? Well, I met with great interest several extraordinarily meritorious professors, like Professor

Milliken [*sic*]. I unfortunately missed Professor Michelson in Chicago, but to compare the general scientific life in America with Europe is nonsense.”⁶³⁰

This is but a part of a longer polemic interview, in which Einstein also smeared all Germans as corrupt. Einstein repeated some of what Gehrcke had said, though Einstein had called Gehrcke “anti-Semitic” for saying the same thing. The full interview of 29 June 1921 is reproduced in Dutch and English, together with an interpretation initially published in German in the *Berliner Tageblatt* on 7 July 1921, in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Appendix D, (2002), pp. 620-627.

Einstein’s comments met with much criticism and a damage control apparatus quickly began to repair the harm he had done to his reputation, by denying that he had said what he had said.⁶³¹ Some Americans stepped forward to say, “I told you so!” *The Minneapolis Evening Tribune* wrote on 8 July 1921,

“Einstein Has No Valid Cause to Congratulate Self, Reuter Dahl Says

In Calling Americans ‘Lot of
Bored Low Brows,’ He
Forgets the Ungullible.

Makes No Mention of Terrific
Lamprooning He Received at
Hands of His Critics.

Professor Albert Einstein’s lofty conception of the American people as a lot of bored lowbrows who couldn’t find intellectual amusement elsewhere and so turned to his theory of relativity without understanding it, drew a sharp rejoinder today from Prof. Arvid Reuter Dahl, dean of the department of engineering and architecture at St. Thomas college. The remarks by the scientist whose recent visit to the United States attracted nation-wide attention, were cabled last night from Berlin.

‘Doctor Einstein has omitted all reference to the terrific lamprooning to

which he was subjected by the Eastern newspapers during the last week of his sojourn with us,' Professor Reuterdaahl remarked. 'He has no valid reason to congratulate himself while smiling at the unsophistication and gullibility of the American people.

Einstein Appeared Amused.

'The radio dispatch from Berlin, which appeared in The Minneapolis Morning Tribune today, conveys the impression that Doctor Einstein was greatly amused by his recent reception in the United States,' he continued. 'He attributes the exaggerated enthusiasm shown him to the fact that our people are bored. In that connection he points out that we have theaters to alleviate the weariness of our dull existence but he intimates that we, nevertheless, welcome new thrills. His remarks indicate that he believes that he furnished us with a new 'thrill,' which accounts for the alleged enthusiasm.

'Professor Einstein found this attitude very comical and consequently confirmative of his pre-established conviction that Americans are lacking in intelligence. However, Doctor Einstein did not hesitate to come to our shores in order to lend zest to the financial campaign of the Zionists, who do not underestimate the advertising value of an international celebrity. This remark is not intended to be derogatory to the Zionist movement, which, undoubtedly is a worthy cause. Nevertheless, we cannot avoid feeling like a man who, having been outwitted in a trade, must remain impassive while the victor laughs at him.

Entire Tale Untold.

'Dr. Einstein, however, has not told the entire tale. He has adroitly omitted all reference to the terrific lampooning to which he was subjected by the eastern newspapers during the last week of his sojourn with us. Never before has a man been subjected to such colossal ridicule. He was even likened to the notorious Dr. Cook and Friedmann.

'Mr. Nelson Robbins, in the Baltimore Evening Sun, April 29, 1921, says: 'But the proletariat having forgotten Friedmann and his unexplainable discoveries, it hasn't forgotten a host of men like him. Remembering them, the proletariat will be ding-busted if it will swear allegiance to any idea that it cannot understand and which is labeled unexplainable by the 'mentally equipped,' who tap the individual inquirer on the head and, with kindly smile, tell him to run along and not bother his little brain about things he cannot understand.'

'Dr. Einstein, therefore, has no valid reason to congratulate himself enthusiastically while smiling outwardly at the unsophistication and gullibility of the American people.'"

Einstein's feigned amusement is belied by his bitterness at being mocked in America. Contrast Einstein's later remarks, after he had left America, with an interview he gave to *The New York Times* while in America, which was published in *The New York Times Book Review and Magazine* on 1 May 1921 on page 50. In

this interview Einstein appears as an especially odd and childlike man, who had wondered from his script. On 15 March 1921, Zionist Kurt Blumenfeld had warned Zionist Chaim Weizmann that it would be unwise to let Einstein make speeches during his trip to America, “Einstein is a poor speaker and often says things out of naiveté that are unwelcome to us[.]”⁶³² The “secretary” who broke into the conversation during the interview was the son of Zionist Ha’am, Salomon Ginzberg. Many of Einstein’s comments are reminiscent of the spirit of Zionist Israel Zangwill’s play *The Melting-Pot: Drama in Four Acts*, Macmillan, New York, (1909); and Einstein may have been encouraged to promote the melting-pot idea in order to promote the immigration of Eastern European Jews to America. Einstein’s interview:

“Einstein on Irrelevancies

By DON ARNALD

How comfortable you make everything in the hotel! Every door, every window, is perfect; nothing is out of order. It is all so well planned and well organized. I never saw such rooms; such care for details; such hotel lobbies, with so many to serve you. Everything—everything is systematized, down to the bathrooms. You people in America are very practical. I like the way you light up the windows with the signs. I like the cheerful way you arrange the electricity up and down the streets.’

So spoke Professor Albert Einstein, apostle of relativity, in the course of a talk about his experiences in New York.

‘What was it that impressed you most when you arrived?’ the interviewer asked.

‘Ah! I see so many nationalities living together so well. America is a country of many different peoples at peace with one another. Then, too, I like the restaurants with the ‘color’ of the nations in the air. Each has its own atmosphere. It is like a zoological garden of nationalities, when you go from one to the other.

‘Are you a bit disappointed not to find some beer in our dining rooms?’

‘I cannot say alcohol is as bad as people think it is,’ replied the professor. ‘It may not be so good for men to spend all their wages on drinking. But it is more an economic question than a question of health. Some workmen must have liquor, it seems. We must not take everything away. Prohibition shows the strength of your democratic Government against private interests. In a corrupt State this could not be done.’

‘Do you consider it against personal liberty to take liquor away?’

‘How could that be in America? You have a republic. You have no dictator who makes slaves of people. Nothing is done by a democratic Government could be done against freedom. I think you will find it best for the economic welfare of the people in the end.’

‘How about tobacco?’ was the next question. ‘Some people want to take

that away, too.'

Dr. Einstein drew back in surprise. 'Oh, my, no! I never heard of it. So some one is starting this? Who is doing this?'

'Some temperance organization here in the United States.'

The professor said: 'If I do not wish to smoke, I say it is excellent to take my tobacco away. But I do wish to smoke, so I say I do not like you to do that.'

'But they say it is not healthful.'

'If you take our tobacco and everything else away, what have you left?' cried Professor Einstein. 'It may be healthful to take away tobacco, but it is mighty lonesome.' He thought a moment. 'But this is economic, too,' he said at last. 'The men spend too much money on cigars, and their wives kick; therefore, they take it away. They say it costs too much money to smoke. I do not know! I have never heard of such a thing as taking away a man's smoking! I'll stick to my pipe. I do not care who will not smoke. I will! If you take everything away, life is not worth while!'

'And the blue laws—how about them?'

'Blue laws? Blue laws? I never heard of those blue laws in my life. What are you saying?' The professor fairly blazed with consternation.

'They want to pass laws to close up all places of amusement on Sunday,' the interviewer explained. 'All theatres, music shows, baseball and other places will be shut down, including everything for relaxation, even amusement parks and the movies.'

'For Heaven's sake. More laws? I never heard of such a thing. Here's what I say: Men must have rest, yes? But what is the right rest? You cannot make a law to tell people how to do it. See—some people have rest when they lie down and go to sleep. Others have rest when they are wide awake and are stimulated. They must work or write or go to amusements to find rest. If you pass one law to show all people how to rest, that means you make everybody alike. But everybody is not alike. No, I do not care for these blue laws. They will do no good for the country or the people.'

'Many workmen want to go to movies on Sunday because they have no time during the week days, so they find rest there,' he continued. 'And that is very good.'

'What do you think of our movies and the theatres?'

'I've been so busy that I haven't had much time, but I have never in my life seen such theatres—everything for your taste, all sorts of plays, comedy, tragedy, romance, pageants. And the movies? I am enthusiastic about them—I mean for the presentation of living moving things. They will develop more and more. In general, the pictures shown now are not so artistic, but they will get better, very much better, all the time. The art is not high enough now, but soon you will have science through this art, as well as you are now having art through this science. I see how the movies will be used in the future for science in bacteriology and technology. Perhaps not so soon for astronomy, because the motions of the heavenly bodies are too

quick for measurement. But the movies must only be fitted well, and they can be used most adequately for instruction in all science! I think, all in all, the movies are only in their infancy. They are very beautiful, but they will get better, until the best plays can be shown. You deserve much credit for doing such fine pictures. I compliment you, and I hope for more artistic plays right along.'

At this point his wife, a charming little gray-haired lady, slipped into the room and sat by her husband's side.

'Maybe I can help you,' she said kindly. 'I speak English, and I can interpret for him.' The interview up to that point had been in German.

'Perhaps you can tell me something about the professor's life,' I asked. Dr. Einstein laughed heartily.

'He does not want my life,' said he. 'That is of no use to him. Why should he care for that. He is asking what I think of New York. I tell him glorious! I tell him I see here the greatest city in the world, like Paris, like London, only better! I tell him here all people of all nationalities are melted together—and are happy. I tell him the stranger comes here and is full of joy because he goes to his people at once and feels at home.'

'But your book on relativity translated into English, maybe he wants that,' queried Mrs. Einstein.

'No, why that?' said the professor. 'He doesn't come here for relativity. He comes here to see me. I want to say something to the people, how I like the restaurants and the theatres and the movies and the hotels, and how I do not like the blue laws—and if they take away my tobacco—I do not know what I'll do, but I'll take America anyway, no matter what they do.'

At this the secretary arrived. He wanted to add a word on the professor's mission in America. He said:

'I suppose you know Professor Einstein is here to help the University of Palestine. Its foundation stone was laid by Dr. Weizmann in 1918, and since then the university site has been expanded. There is also a library with more than 3,000 volumes and rapidly growing. Plans have been worked out both for the complete university of the future and for a comparatively modest beginning. The time has now come for us to make a foundation fund, part of which will go to the university. American people play a great part in world politics, showing that their aspirations are noble, and we have come from sick and suffering Europe with feelings of hope, convinced that our spiritual aims will command the full sympathy of the American Nation.'

Dr. Einstein broke in: 'We will receive their enthusiastic approval, we are sure, but the people know all this. This gentleman asks me other things, and I tell him what I think of New York.'

He slapped me on the back and added: 'You greet for me all the good people of America and you say, 'I feel at home here among people, many different people from all the nations in the world.'''

4.7.1 Einstein Faces Criticism in America

Though Einstein had hoped to run away from his critics, he had an international reputation as a coward, a plagiarist and a scientific fraud. Things were not as easy for Einstein in America as he had hoped they would be.

4.7.1.1 Einstein Hides from Reuterdahl's Challenge to Debate

On 10 April 1921, *The Minneapolis Sunday Tribune* reported Prof. Arvid Reuterdahl's charges against Einstein,

*“Einstein Branded Barnum of Science,
Minnesota Man Calls Relativity ‘Bunk’*

St. Thomas Dean of Engineering Challenges German to Debate.

Teuton's Pet 'Cult' Born 13 Years Before Him, Says Professor.

Reuterdahl Cites Passages in 1914 Treatise to Back Assertions.

Branding Prof. Albert Einstein as a sophist, a dealer in 'might-have-beens' and the Barnum of the scientific world, Prof. Arvid Reuterdahl, dean of the Engineering school of St. Thomas College, St. Paul, yesterday challenged the German savant to a written debate on his theory of relativity.

Professor Reuterdahl, who has been exploring the worlds conquered by Einstein since 1902, declared that he was willing to meet the much-heralded mathematician at any time in a written debate, and that he was prepared to prove that Einstein's theory is largely 'bunk.' Professor Reuterdahl used the scientific word for it, but that is what he meant.

'Work Antedated by Another.'

Coupled with his challenge to a debate, Professor Reuterdahl declared Einstein was not only deceiving scientists with a mythical theory, but that he was either a plagiarist, or his work has been antedated by another without his knowledge.

'Einstein is at liberty to accept either horn of the dilemma,' he said.

That the Einstein theory of relativity in its gravitational aspects was advanced in 1866, 13 years before Einstein was born, by a scientist known under the pen name of 'Kinertia' is the contention of Professor Reuterdahl, in a statement in which he gives the life history of both men, and gives references and dates to prove his charge. While not accepting the theory, he

gives 'Kinertia' credit for its origin.

American Scientists 'Jolted.'

Professor Reuterdahl, however, gives credit to Einstein for one thing, which, he says, more than justifies his claim to prominence. The German savant, he says, has broken down the barriers of set ideas in science, and made it possible for a hearing for new ideas.

'The American scientists,' said Professor Reuterdahl, 'are the most clannish and orthodox in the world. In the Old World the scientific journals publish articles advancing new theories. Here they will not consider anything except that which is based on their own knowledge and belief. If Einstein has done anything, he has jolted American scientists into accepting something new.' Professor Reuterdahl paid tribute to Einstein's genius as a mathematician, declaring him to be one of the greatest in the world.

Magazine Articles Cited.

Professor Reuterdahl refers to 11 articles which appeared in Harper's Weekly in 1914 giving 'Kinertia' credit for originating the so-called Einstein theory of gravitation.

'If it is true that 'Kinertia' actually considered the Einsteinian problem in these essays,' he says, 'then the question of priority is inevitably raised and the unparalleled originality claimed for Einstein's work becomes a debatable matter.'

Einstein's investigation of his theory is traced by articles which appeared in German publications.

'The year 1905 is considered, by most authorities on Einstein's work,' he says, 'as the birth year of the theory of relativity.'

Theory Announced in 1915.

'Careful search, however, has revealed a paper on this subject which was published in Berlin during the year 1904 in the journal 'Sitzungsberichte.' That portion of Einstein's theory which deals with the phenomenon of gravitation is a later development. Einstein first gave his attention to the problem of gravitation in 1911, when he developed the principle of equivalence of gravitational and accelerative fields.

'Other phases of this subject were dealt with in papers which appeared in the years 1912 and 1913. A further elaboration, the joint work of Einstein and Marcel Grossman, appeared in 1914. The theory in its final and complete form was announced in the year 1915.'

Historical Summary.

'A brief historical summary of the work of 'Kinertia' is now in order. Lord Kelvin first aroused 'Kinertia's' interest in the problem of gravitation. That was in the year 1866, when 'Kinertia' was a student under Lord Kelvin. 'Kinertia' even then did not agree with the Newtonian theory of force as presented by Lord Kelvin. Incidentally, we desire to call the reader's attention to the fact that Albert Einstein was born in 1879 in Ulm, Germany, 13 years later.

'During the period from 1877 to 1881, 'Kinertia' became convinced that

acceleration was the basic cause of what we generally speak of as ‘weight.’

‘Kinertia’ Ridiculed in U. S.

‘The reader undoubtedly is aware of the fact that acceleration plays the fundamental role in Einstein’s theory of gravitation. ‘Kinertia’ corresponded with Kelvin, Tait and Niven of Cambridge with the hope that he would be able to interest these men in his startling theory. This attempt met with little or no sympathy.

‘His attempts, dating from the year 1899, to persuade our stubborn American scientists that the Newtonian theory of gravitation must be revised met with nothing but ridicule and indifference. To Harper’s Weekly and its managing editor, Mr H. D. Wheeler, belongs the credit of having published ‘Kinertia’s’ series of articles entitled ‘Do Bodies Fall?’ The first article appeared in the issue of August 29, 1914, Vol. 59.

Similarity of Views Pointed Out.

The final article is dated November 7, 1914. From the preceding it is evident that ‘Kinertia’ derived his norm of gravitation before Einstein was born.

Professor Reuterdahl quotes from the writing of Einstein and ‘Kinertia’ to prove the similarity of their views, and says:

‘It is noteworthy that the only real difference between these two citations is that Einstein derives his conclusions from a hypothetical case, whereas ‘Kinertia’ draws his conclusions from an actual experiment upon himself.’

Further quotations are from Prof. A. S. Eddington’s ‘Space Time Gravitation,’ published by the Cambridge University Press in 1920; from an article by Prof. Edwin B. Wilson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and from ‘Kinertia’s’ articles.

Striking Similarity.

These quotations, he says. ‘show the striking similarity existing between Einstein and ‘Kinertia’ when they consider the relation between acceleration and gravitation, a similarity which extends not only to intent but affects even the very words.’

The following quotation from Einstein’s ‘Relatively’ illustrates that scientist’s theory as to the relation between acceleration and gravitation, according to Professor Reuterdahl:

‘We imagine a large portion of empty space, so far removed from stars and other appreciable masses that we have before us approximately the conditions required by the fundamental law of Galilei.

Hypothetical Example.

As reference body let us imagine a spacious chest resembling a room with an observer inside who is equipped with apparatus. Gravitation naturally does not exist for this observer. He must fasten himself with strings to the floor, otherwise the slightest impact against the floor will cause him to rise slowly toward the ceiling of the room.

‘To the middle of the lid of the chest is fixed externally a hook with rope attached, and now a ‘being’ (what kind of a ‘being’ is immaterial to us)

begins pulling at this with a constant force. The chest, together with the observer, then begins to move upwards with a uniformly accelerated motion. In course of time their velocity will reach unheard of values, provided that we are viewing all this from another reference body which is not being pulled with a rope.

Viewpoint of Man in Chest.

‘But how does the man in the chest regard the process? The acceleration of the chest will be transmitted to him by the reaction of the floor of the chest. He must therefore take up this pressure by means of his legs if he does not wish to be laid out full length on the floor. He is then standing in the chest in exactly the same way as anyone stands in a room of a house on our earth. If he releases a body which he previously had in his hand, the acceleration of the chest will no longer be transmitted to this body, and for this reason the body will approach the floor of the chest with an accelerated motion.

The observer will further convince himself that the acceleration of the body towards the floor of the chest is always of the same magnitude, whatever kind of body he may happen to use for the experiment.’

‘Kinertia’ Quoted.

‘Kinertia’s’ theory of the relation between acceleration and gravitation is set forth in the following quotation from ‘Do Bodies Fall?’ and is used by Professor Reuterdahl in building up his argument:

‘I set to work to find out by experiment whether bodies actually did fall with the acceleration which the force of attraction was said to produce. Years before that, when in England, where some of our coal mines had vertical shafts about 1,500 feet deep, I had studied the cause of weight by having the hoisting engine drop me down with the full acceleration for about 500 feet. Then, by retardation during the lowest 500 feet, I could experience increase of weight all over me so marked that my legs could hardly support me.

Weight Not a Force.

‘That taught me that acceleration was the proximate cause of weight, but at the time of these experiments I still thought the acceleration of the falling cage was really caused by the earth’s attraction.

‘Weight is not a kinetic force because it cannot produce acceleration. If a body were accelerated in proportion to its weight, then weight would be a force.’

‘Laying aside the right of Einstein to claim originality for his theory,’ said Professor Reuterdahl yesterday, ‘he is a sophist, and the world will know him as such in due time. He is dealing with mythical beings. They are ‘might-have-beens.’

‘His fourth dimension is a composite of time and space. That cannot be, because time and space never can be one. Space may be referred to as the distance between two points, A and B. We may travel from A and B, and return to find the same permanent objects in their places. We may require a certain amount of time to make the journey, but when we turn back that time

is gone.

‘I demand that Einstein show me his proof. I believe in dealing in the physical things of this world. In other words, I am from Missouri. I shall be glad to meet Professor Einstein at any time or place and debate this subject. But I shall demand an actual demonstration of his theory, not a journey into the realm of the mythical. That demonstration he can never give.’”

The story of Reuterdaahl’s challenge to Einstein was covered by newspapers around the world. *The New York Times* reported on 10 April 1921,

“CHALLENGES PROF. EINSTEIN

St. Paul Professor Asserts Relativity Theory Was Advanced in 1866.

Special to The New York Times.

MINNEAPOLIS, April 9.—Professor Arvid Deuterdaahl, Dean of the College of Engineering of St. Thomas College, St. Paul, yesterday challenged Prof. Albert Einstein to a written debate on his theory of relativity.

That the Einstein theory was advanced in 1866, thirteen years before he was born, by a scientist known under the pen name of ‘Kinertia,’ is the contention of Professor Reuterdaahl, in a statement in which he gives the life history of both men, and gives references and dates to support his contention.

Professor Reuterdaahl, however, says the fact that Professor Einstein has broken down the barriers of set ideas in science and made it possible for a hearing for new ideas more than justifies his claim to prominence.

‘The American scientists,’ said Professor Reuterdaahl, ‘are the most clannish, I should say the most pig-headed, in the world. In the Old World the scientific journals publish articles advancing new theories. Here they will not accept anything that is not based on their own knowledge and belief. If Einstein has done anything he has jolted American scientists into accepting something new.’

Professor Reuterdaahl refers to eleven articles which appeared in Harper’s Weekly in 1914, in giving ‘Kinertia’ credit for originating the Einstein theory.

‘Kinertia,’ Professor Reuterdaahl says, is the nom de plume of a professor believed to be living in California now.”

The Chicago Tribune (European Edition, Paris) reported on 11 April 1921,

“*AMERICAN CALLS EINSTEIN ‘BARNUM’*”

(Special Cable to **The Tribune**.)

MINNEAPOLIS, April 10.—Professor Arvid Reuterdaahl, dean of the college of engineers at St. Thomas college, has styled Dr. Einstein, discoverer of the theory of relativity, ‘the Barnum of the scientific world’ and challenges him to a written debate on his theory.

Dr. Reuterdaahl asserted that Einstein is not only ‘fooling scientists with his mystical theory’ but is a plagiarist. He declares the ‘Einstein theory’ was advanced in 1866 by a scientist under the pen name of ‘Inertia.’”

On 11 April 1921, *The Sun* of New York reported,

“Challenges Einstein, Calls Him Plagiarist

MINNEAPOLIS, April 11. — Not only has Einstein’s theory of relativity been challenged but the scientist himself has been charged with being a plagiarist and the ‘Barnum of Science’ by Prof. Arvid Reuterdaahl, dean of the Engineering School of St. Thomas’s College, St. Paul. He has issued a challenge to the German scientist to meet him in a written debate.

The gravitational aspects of the Einstein theory were presented in 1866 in *Harper’s Weekly* by a writer who called himself ‘Kinertia,’ Prof. Reuterdaahl asserts. But the professor does give Prof. Einstein credit for blazing a new trail in thought for American scientists whom Dr. Reuterdaahl declares to be more orthodox than European scientists.”

On 11 April 1921, the *New York American* wrote,

“EINSTEIN CHARGED WITH PLAGIARISM

St. Paul Educator Says Theory of
Relativity Was Advanced in
Harper’s Weekly in 1866.

Special Dispatch to the New York American.

MINNEAPOLIS, April 10.—That the Albert Einstein theory of relativity in its gravitational aspects was advanced in 1866, thirteen years before Einstein was born, by a scientist known under pen name of ‘Kinertia’ was the assertion made to-day by Professor Arvid Reuterdaahl, dean of the engineering school of St. Thomas College in St. Paul. He challenged the German savant to defend his theories in a written debate.

Professor Reuterdahl declared Einstein was not only deceiving scientists with a mythical theory, but that he was either a plagiarist or his work had been antedated by another without his knowledge.

He then cited ‘Kinertia,’ whose theory was expounded in eleven articles running in Harper’s Weekly in 1914, according to Professor Reuterdahl. These give ‘Kinertia’ credit for the so-called Einstein theory of gravitation, which is a later development of the theory of relativity.

The theory of relativity itself, says Einstein’s challenger, was made public exactly one year before authorities on Einstein’s work credit him with having made the discovery. In 1904, says Professor Reuterdahl, there was a paper on this subject, published in Berlin in the Journal *Sitzungsberichte*.”

On 12 April 1921, the *New York American* reported,

“EINSTEIN REFUSES TO DEBATE THEORY

Dean Reuterdahl’s Challenge to
Discuss Relativity Declined as
Detraction from Mission.

Dr. Albert Einstein was interviewed yesterday in his headquarters at the Hotel Commodore regarding the attack on his theory of relativity made by Dean Arvid Renterdahl, of St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minn.

Dr. Einstein smilingly listened to newspaper accounts of the Reuterdahl attack. Through his secretary he said:

‘I came here with one object—the promotion of the establishment of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. I will not be led into a discussion of my theory with persons who may not understand. There may be some personal intent in the remarks of this gentleman, whom I have not the honor of knowing.

‘The great purpose of my mission to this country must not be overshadowed by my theory. I will be here a short time, and all of that time must be devoted to the great Palestine reconstruction project.

‘I have consented to deliver a few lectures, but beyond that I do not wish to encroach upon my limited time. It must be seen plainly that I cannot enter into newspaper discussions with persons who doubt or misunderstand my theories or question my integrity.

‘I have not had the opportunity to look into this challenge to debate issued by Dean Reuterdahl. Being without knowledge of the person called ‘Kinertia’ who is said to have written on the subject, I am not prepared to

express any opinion.

It was further said for Dr. Einstein that he had no desire to popularize his theory of relativity; that he had writ-*[Unfortunately your author's photocopy of this article lacks the remainder.]*"

Segments of the press came to Einstein's defense. The *World* of New York wrote on 12 April 1921, quoting Einstein,

“EINSTEIN AMUSED BY A NEW ATTACK

‘Being Called P. T. Barnum of
Scientific World Only What
I Get at Home.’

DECLINES REUTERDAHL'S CHALLENGE TO A DEBATE.

He, Prof. Weizmann and Others
to Be Guests at Jewish
Mass Meeting To-Night.

Prof. Albert Einstein was not greatly disturbed yesterday when he learned that Prof. Arvid Reuterdahl, dean of the engineering school of St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minn., had called him the ‘P. T. Barnum of the scientific world.’ In fact, Prof. Einstein was amused.

‘It reminds me of home,’ he said, ‘In Germany I am quite accustomed to being called names by persons who disagree with me.’

Prof. Einstein said he had never heard of Prof. Reuterdahl and that he was not in the least interested in the latter's challenge to a written debate on the subject of relativity. He intimated that he might read an article written by Prof. Reuterdahl if he happened to come across it, but as for entering a controversy, he couldn't waste the time.

The professor's mail is flooded with letters from persons who have pet theories which they wish to put before him, or who wish to argue on the subject of relativity. Several letters have been received from ‘Messiahs’ with plans for leading the Jews back to Palestine.

Prof. Chaim Weizmann, President of the World Zionist Organization,

Prof. Einstein, M. M. Ussishkin, Chairman of the Zionist Commission to Palestine, Dr. Ben Zion Mosesohn, Principal of the Hebrew High School in Jaffe, and Dr. Schmaya Levine, member of the International Zionist Committee, will be the principal guests at an all-Jewish mass meeting tonight in the 69th Regiment Armory, 25th Street and Lexington Avenue. This reception is in charge of a committee of 100, representing more than 1,800 local Jewish organizations of every variety and type.

Senator Calder and Dr. Butler, President of Columbia University, will be the principal speakers. In addition there will be addresses by prominent Jewish leaders representing the various elements in Jewry. Morris Rothenberg will welcome the guests in behalf of the American Jewish Congress.

Tickets are free and the seats will be reserved for ticket holders until 8 P. M., and after that all the seats will be thrown open to the public. Reservations have been made for a large delegation of Jewish wounded veterans of the World War. They will be brought from the nearby hospitals under an escort of Jewish legionnaires who fought in Palestine under Gen. Allenby.”

4.7.1.2 Cowardly Einstein Caught in a Lie

Einstein hypocritically called his critics name-callers, when in fact Einstein had been recklessly defaming his critics for years, and had encouraged others to not respond to criticism of relativity theory other than by way of personal attack. The newspaper tried to deflect attention away from Einstein’s evasiveness, but their story also unwittingly revealed that Albert Einstein was dishonest. E. Lee Heidenreich wrote in the *Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, on 16 May 1921,

“Calls Einstein’s Statements Irreconcilable.

To the Editor of The Tribune:

The scientific world has lately been much entertained and somewhat mystified by the increasing doubts, which have gradually crept into the press, regarding both the authenticity and the reliability of Professor Einsteins much-vaunted theory of relativity.

Professor Arvid Reuterdaahl of St. Thomas college has challenged Professor Einstein to a written debate on the latter’s theory, but has so far only been met with more or less evasive statements by Professor Einstein, some of which appear to the writer simply irreconcilable.

Thus, the New York World of April 12, 1921, says: ‘Professor Einstein said he never heard of Professor Reuterdaahl, and that he was not in the least interested in the latter’s challenge to a written debate on the subject of relativity. He intimated that he might read an article written by Professor Reuterdaahl, if he happened to come across it, but as for entering a controversy, he could not waste his time.’

The writer spent four months in Norway in 1920, and took occasion to give to ‘Aftenposten’ in Christiania a brief synopsis of Professor

Reuter Dahl's theory of interdependence, containing also considerable adverse criticism of both the authenticity and reliability of Professor Einstein's theory of relativity. The latter at that time was in Christiania, where he gave a lecture on his relativity.

'Aftenposten,' Christiania, of June 18, 1920, says: 'But what does Professor Einstein say to this? It would be interesting to know whether he is acquainted with the product of Professor Reuter Dahl's pen. 'No,' answers Professor Einstein at our question, 'I do not know the name of Professor Reuter Dahl and have never heard mentioned that he is said to have worked on the theory of relativity. I have often corresponded with Professor Mittag-Leffler, but he never mentioned any such work.'

And later, in the same interview, Professor Einstein continues: 'Ein rechter mensch (a man of justice) would not have made the public announcement which Professor Reuter Dahl has made through the American press.'

During the 'frequent correspondence' between Professor Mittag-Leffler and Professor Einstein, the original manuscript by Professor Reuter Dahl of his space-time potential remained in the hands of Professor Mittag-Leffler for about four years, sometime between 1914 and 1918, and we have to take Professor Einstein's word for it that no discussion of the space-time potential took place during this 'frequent correspondence'—it would not have mattered much—except for the peculiar fact that Professor Einstein so carefully disclaims any notice of Reuter Dahl's existence.

In spite of this, on the 12th day of April, 1921, Professor Einstein, in an interview, stated that 'he had never heard of Professor Reuter Dahl.'

One might ask why the professor is afraid of admitting that he has heard of Reuter Dahl? Does a ghost of a MS held by Mittag-Leffler lurk around somewhere? Have we here a sword of Damocles?

Professor Einstein denies that he has heard of Reuter Dahl on April 12, 1921, in New York World, whereas he did hear of him and discussed his statements in Christiania to Aftenposten June 18, 1920, nearly a year earlier!

Either his memory has slipped away into the four dimensional space-time continuum, or for some reason he misrepresents facts.

As one of the remaining champions of materialistic and atheistic science, why does not the professor bravely come forth to defend the moss-grown theories against the onslaught of Scientific theism, and valiantly charge into the shrinking form of his adversary, right in the arena of the public eye? Does it behoove a world acclaimed scientist, a giant of mathematics, to say: 'My arguments you will not understand, I cast not my pearls before swine.'

It reminds one of the old fairy tale by H. C. Anderson, 'The Emperor's New Clothes,' which were so intricately and fearfully spun that they could not be seen by persons who were not wise, or who could not properly serve his majesty—and thus the visibility of the emperor's new clothes became a criterion of intellect of his subjects—only to have the bubble pricked by an unsophisticated street gamin, who cried out in astonishment: 'But the

emperor is stark naked!’—tableau!

If someone has said that only seven, or was it twelve, men in the whole world would understand Einstein’s theory of relativity, he should add ‘as Einstein dresses it’—for relativity with common sense and logic instead of a lot of sophistic embellishments is not such a formidable study.

The writer was amazed at the spectacular ascendancy of Professor Einstein in the public view and the acquiescent attitude of a seemingly bewildered lot of scientific institutions—an attitude almost similar to the impulsive reception of Dr. Cook of North Pole fame.

When the reaction comes, when Professor Einstein has left the United States, covered with decorations, the professor probably will realize that it were better had he met the questions squarely in the spirit in which they were made, because they now will stand as though cut in granite: Relativity or Interdependence? And must sooner or later be met without beating the devil around a bush with evasive and irreconcilable statements.—E. Lee Heidenreich, Kansas City, Mo.”

As Heidenreich had affirmed, the *Aftenposten* of Oslo, Norway wrote on 18 June 1920,

“Diskussionen om relativitetsteorien.

En amerikansk professor, som gjør krav paa at være
teoriens skaber.

En udtalelse af professor Einstein.

Vi har liggende foran os et eksemplar af den amerikanske avis »St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press«, som udkommer i St. Paul, Minnesota. Numeret er dateret 1ste februar 1920 og indeholder bl. a. en længere artikel om relativitetsteorien. Bladet giver en fremstilling af det arbejde, som den amerikanske professor Arvid Reuter dahl har nedlagt til udforskning af den saa meget omtalte relativitetsteori. Det dreier sig om en meget mystisk affære, idet det heder, at professor Reuter dahl saa tidlig som i 1902 har skapt teorien, men paa en lidt usandsynlig maade er hans manuskript kommet paa afveie. Hvordan? Jo, historien lyder som følgende i »St. Pauls Pioneer«:

Professor Einstein offentliggjorde sin teori i »Annalen der Physik« for 1905. Reuter dahl foretog sin teori den 5te april 1902 i »The American Electrochemical society« ved dets aabningstnode i Philadelphia. Udviklingen af teorien beskjaeftigede ham helt til 1914, da han var færdig med udarbeidelsen. Hans teori vakte straks stor interesse og i februar 1915 gav han forelæsninger over sin teori ved Kansas State Agricultural College og senere ved Kansas universitet.

Den 19de februar 1915 blev professor Reuter dahls manuskript sendt til Norge, hvor det var meningen, at redaktør O p p e d a l skulde offentliggøre

det i »Verdens Gang«. Redaktør Oppedal refererede professor Reuterdahls arbeide til professor Størmer; men presserende arbeide hindrede en undersøgelse og overveielse. Det blev saa refereret for professor Mittag-Leffler i Stockholm. Her mister man ethvert spor af manuskriptet.

Albert Einstein er nu medlem af en tysk videnskabelig kommission. Hans sidste arbeide hader »Time, Space and Gravitation«. Reuterdahls manuskript bærer titelen »Space, Time Potential, a new concept of Gravitation and Electricity«. Postprotokoller viser, at manuskriptet var et sted i Europa i hænde hos en tysk professor i begyndelsen af 1915.

Professor Reuterdahl har nu under udarbeidelse en ny bog om sin teori og denne bog vil blive hans livsverk.

Saavidt vor amerikanske kilde. Alle de forsøg vi har sat igang for at finde sporet efter det forsvundne manuskript er mislykket og nogen berettiget mening om den mystiske affæres vitterlighed skal vi ikke driste os til at have.

Men hvad siger professor Einstein til dette. Det vilde have sin interesse at vide, om han kjender professor Reuterdahls arbeider. »Nei«, svarer professor Einstein paa vor forespørgsel. »Jeg kjender ikke professor Reuterdahls navn og har aldrig hørt tale om, at han skal have arbeidet paa relativitetsteorien. Jeg har ofte korresponderet med professor Mittag-Leffler, men han omtalte aldrig noget saadant arbeide. Jeg vil ikke bestemt paastaa umuligheden i det, som nævnes i den amerikanske avis, men jeg finder det hele lidet sandsynlig. Hvis professor Reuterdahl virkelig har opdaget relativitetsteorien, vilde vi med stor sandsynlighed have faaet underretning om det. Jeg kjender størstedelen af den literatur om dette emne, men noget arbeide af Reuterdahl har jeg ikke truffet paa. Dette er jo ikke bevis«, slutter professor Einstein, og tilføier: »Ein rechter Mensch vilde ikke have gjort den reklame, som professor Reuterdahl har gjort gennem den amerikanske avis«.

Det var Einsteins svar, som ikke stiller professor Reuterdahls paastand i noget godt lys. Et moment, som taler for den samme antagelse, ligger deri, at hvis professor Reuterdahl havde ret, vilde et universitet som University of Columbia have tildet ham sin store guldmedalje. Som vi tidligere har meddelt, har Columbiauniversitetet tildelt professor Einstein denne medalje.”

4.7.1.3 Reuterdahl Pursues Einstein, Who Continues to Run

Heidenreich was right, Einstein’s refusal to respond to charges that he was a plagiarist haunted Einstein around the world and throughout his lifetime. The *Minneapolis Evening Tribune* wrote on 15 April 1921,

**“Einstein, Jolted
Out of Silence,**

Defends Theory

Challenged by St. Thomas Mentor,
Scientist Goes Deeper Into
Relativity Explanation.

Mathematician Ignores Charge
That He Is Not Originator of
Deductions Reached.

Professor Albert Einstein has been jolted out of a silence he has maintained since his arrival in America by the challenge of Professor Arvid Reuterdaahl of St. Thomas college, according to dispatches today from New York.

Plagiarism Charge Ignored.

The charge that the famous mathematician is a plagiarist or at least not the originator of the theory which upset the scientific world is ignored, on the ground that it is not important. Professor Reuterdaahl, however, has succeeded in bringing out a specific statement as to a test of the Einstein theory of relativity, and today the St. Thomas professor declared he was ready to meet the assertions concerning that test, and would make a statement later.

Einstein's Test Stated.

Professor Einstein's test, upon which he declares he is willing to rest his whole theory, was stated as follows:

'You know the solar spectrum. Everybody has seen it in the rainbow. You have also seen it when the sunlight passes through a triangular glass prism and falls upon a screen.

'Any light-giving body produces a spectrum, but the spectra from a different bodies are not alike. The spectrum from sodium for instance, shows only two yellow lines. The hydrogen spectrum shows only four colors.

Band With Seven Colors.

'The solar spectrum is a colored band, showing seven primary and secondary colors, ranging from red at one side to violet at the other.

'My theory demands that the spectrum of solar light, as compared with similar spectra from all other bodies, must be different in this respect.

'The lines of the solar spectrum must be found displaced—that is out of line—in the direction of red. If my theory of relativity is true, then this must be true. Why? Because of the nearness of the original solar light to the great mass which is the sun. If my theory is true, that mass must affect the spectral lines as I have said.'”

The *Minneapolis Morning Tribune* reported on 16 April 1921,

“Relativity Hit Counter Blow By Reuterdahl

Twin City Man Says Einstein
Cult Has Not Attained
Dignity of Theory.

Conceding that Prof. Albert Einstein, famous mathematician, whose theory of relativity startled the scientific world, has been supported by the results of one experiment, but contending that his theory still is a mere hypothesis without a foundation in fact, Prof. Arvid Reuterdahl of St. Thomas college yesterday renewed his attack upon the theory.

Replying to Professor Reuterdahl's challenge, Professor Einstein gave out a statement in New York, the first since his arrival in America, in which he declared that he was willing to rest his whole theory upon one experiment.

‘Admission Proves Contention.’

In turn, Professor Reuterdahl declared that the mathematicians' admission that the theory had not been proved substantiated his contention that relativity had not been established and never would be.

One effect of the challenge by Professor Reuterdahl was that the man whom he had called the Barnum of the scientific world was jolted out of a profound silence. To the charge of plagiarism Professor Einstein gave no heed, but he did rush to the defense of his pet theory.

Einstein's Test Stated.

Professor Einstein's test, upon which he declares he is willing to rest his whole theory, was stated as follows:

‘You know the solar spectrum. Everybody has seen it when the sunlight passes through a triangular glass prism and falls upon a screen.

‘Any light-giving body produces a spectrum, but the spectra from different bodies are not alike. The spectrum from sodium, for instance, shows only two yellow lines. The hydrogen spectrum shows only four colors.

Band With Seven Colors.

‘The solar spectrum is a colored band, showing seven primary and secondary colors, ranging from red at one side to violet at the other.

‘My theory demands that the spectrum of solar light, as compared with

similar spectra from all other bodies, must be different in this respect.

‘The lines of the solar spectrum must be found displaced—that is out of line—in the direction of red. If my theory of relativity is true, then this must be true. Why? Because of the nearness of the original solar light to the great mass which is the sun. If my theory is true, that mass must affect the spectral lines as I have said.’

Professor Reuterdaahl’s answer to this statement follows:

‘Professor Einstein refuses to enter into a written debate with me concerning the correctness of the basic tenets of the theory of relativity for the reason that he is willing to risk the validity of the entire theory on the result of an experiment. The theory of relativity assumes the displacement of the solar spectral lines toward the red will take place when the original solar light is near to a great mass like the sun. Professor Einstein admits that if this displacement does not take place then the general theory of relativity must be abandoned as untenable.

‘Upon the results of this experiment Dr. Einstein rests the validity of his entire theory. Many experiments intended to discover this displacement have already been made. Had these experiments been successful Professor Einstein would not have made the statement which has this very day been transmitted to me by The Minneapolis Tribune.

‘Professor Einstein’s admission of the absence of this verification transforms the entire situation and leaves the theory as an hypothesis yet to be verified.

‘Furthermore, Professor Einstein has admitted that it is extremely difficult to observe the deflection, even if it does exist, because of the fact that the predicted displacement is extremely small.

‘Moreover, Professor Einstein has conceded the further fact that it is very difficult to make any calculations whatsoever, because of the indefiniteness of the involved facts.

‘Now Professor Einstein himself admits that he rests the validity of his entire intellectual structure upon the future results of this extremely delicate experiment involving conditions difficult of realization.

‘Professor Einstein, in his reply to my challenge, makes no mention of the significance of the observations made by the English solar expedition and the observed motion of the planet Mercury.

‘Apparently he magnanimously waives the right to contend that the result of his predictions and calculations concerning the bending of light rays and the perihelion-perturbation of Mercury has bearing upon the validity of his theory.

‘I gladly grant the importance and bearing of these mathematical deductions of Professor Einstein. The granting of these contentions, however, in no way modifies my conviction that the theory of relativity is grounded upon fallacious assumptions, and therefore cannot survive. The history of science shows that one mathematic-physical theory after another has been abandoned because of inadequacy, unnecessary complexities, and

untenability in the light of wider knowledge.

‘It is true, of course, that this is the price which must be paid for intellectual advancement.

‘Nevertheless it is also true that an hypothesis based upon fallacious assumptions contains the leaven of its own ultimate dissolution, despite the fact that some of the results of its applications to physical phenomena may be approximately correct.

‘This I am prepared to prove is the status of Professor Einstein’s theory of relativity. I am, indeed, surprised that Professor Einstein, while claiming that he had written his book from scientific motives and not for the sake of notoriety, lightly brushes to one side a challenge to a debate upon the validity of his theory. In no better way can the cause of science be served.

‘A theory which so completely upsets all common-sense deductions concerning realities cannot hope forever to go unchallenged. Certainly it is not in keeping with the scientific motives of which Professor Einstein claims to be so ardent an exponent, continuously to reiterate the platitude that those who do not accept his theory are incapable of comprehending its alleged profundities.

‘I desire to disabuse Professor Einstein of the correctness of the inference that any ulterior personal motive caused me to issue my challenge to him. The matter of nationality of an earnest investigator or any other ulterior motive never has had and never will have any bearing upon my attitude toward the significance and value of his work.’”

The Kansas City Post reported on 17 April 1921,

**“DUBS EINSTEIN ‘BARNUM
OF SCIENCE’ AND ‘KIDDER’**

German Savant Challenges
Theorist to Written Debate
on Relativity.

Charges Feted Jew With
Having Plagiarized Material
From the Past.

A ‘Barnum of science.’

Thus is Prof. Albert Einstein, German scientist, who at present is making a triumphal visit to the United States, branded by a former Kansas City public school professor, Dr. Arvid Reuterdaahl, dean of the engineering school of St. Thomas college, St. Paul.

While New York hands the celebrated discoverer of the theory of relativity the key to the city, and while savants, scholars, bankers, butchers, hang on his non-understandable words, Dr. Reuterdaahl steps out and boldly calls him names.

A 'sophist,' a dealer in 'might have beens,' says Dr. Reuterdaahl of Einstein.

The former Kansas City teacher then challenges the widely heralded mathematician to a written debate.

Dr. Reuterdaahl, speaking of course in scientific language, has said in effect that he is prepared to prove the Einstein theory largely 'bunk,' and a borrowing from older scientists. It is easy enough, he insinuates, to set forth a theory of any kind, so long as you make it sufficiently abstruse not to be understood.

Long before Einstein announced his visit to America, Dr. Reuterdaahl and he had become involved in an international dispute over his theory. The controversy has attracted wide attention in the old world from Norway to Italy.

Dr. Reuterdaahl, who was an instructor at the Polytechnic institute here, left Kansas City in 1915. In the fall of the same year he gave lectures at the Kansas State Agricultural college at Manhattan and at Kansas university on 'Space-Time-Potential,' in which he set forth some of the same views enunciated by Einstein, crediting them to scientists who lived before Einstein was born.

At that time Dr. E. Lee Heidenreich of the Heidenreich Engineering company of Kansas City, a friend of Dr. Reuterdaahl, wrote the Carnegie institute of Dr. Reuterdaahl's lectures, saying:

'It takes a scientific giant to gainsay a Newton and such a giant we have with us today.'

Coupled with his challenge to a debate, Dr. Reuterdaahl now asserts that Einstein is deceiving scientists with a mythical theory and that he is a plagiarist, his works being antedated by another.

Dr. Reuterdaahl points out that the Einstein theory of relativity in its gravitational aspects was advanced in 1866 by a scientist who wrote under the pen name of 'Kinertia.' The latter, when a student under Lord Kelvin, is said to have questioned the Newton theory of force.

Dr. Reuterdaahl gives Einstein credit for breaking down the barriers of set ideas in science and making it possible for hearing new ideas.

'The American scientists,' says Dr. Reuterdaahl, 'are the most clannish and orthodox in the world. They will not consider anything but what is based on their own knowledge and belief.'

Dr. Reuterdaahl, while giving Einstein credit for being one of the greatest

mathematicians in the world, 'calls' him on many parts of his theory.

'I demand that Einstein show me his proof,' says the American professor. 'I believe in dealing in the physical things in the world. In other words, I am from Missouri. I shall be glad to meet Professor Einstein at any time or place and debate this subject. But I shall demand an actual demonstration of his theory, not a journey into the realm of the mythical. That demonstration he can never give.'"

Ernst Gehrcke noted in his book *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie: Kulturhistorisch-psychologische Dokumente*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 29-30; that the *Neue Preußische (Kreuz-) Zeitung* wrote on 11 April 1921, together with many other papers,

"EINSTEIN als Plagiator herausgefordert. Aus Paris, 11. April, wird gedrahtet: Aus Minneapolis erfährt die „*Chicago Tribune*“ Prof. ARVID REUTERDAUL, der Präsident der Ingenieure der St. Thomas-Universität, erklärt über die Theorie des Professor EINSTEIN, daß dieser der „BARNUM“ der Wissenschaft für die Welt sei. Professor REUTERDAUL fordert EINSTEIN zu einer schriftlichen Debatte über die Relativitätstheorie heraus. REUTERDAUL nennt EINSTEIN nicht nur einen verrückten Wissenschaftler mit mystischer Theorie, sondern auch einen Plagiator und behauptete, daß die EINSTEINSche Theorie bereits 1866 von einem Gelehrten unter dem Namen „INERTIA“ entdeckt worden sei."

Gehrcke further notes that the *Vorwärts* wrote on 18 April 1921,

"Ein amerikanischer Professor hat die Theorie des Prof. EINSTEIN für eitel Humbug erklärt und ihn als einen Mann hingestellt, der einfach die wissenschaftliche Welt an der Nase herumführe. EINSTEIN ist der Schöpfer von etwas Neuem, nicht Dagewesenem, der Menge vor der Hand Unbegreiflichem, und daß alle neuen und großen Entdeckungen ihre Gegner haben und in der Geschichte stets hatten, scheint beinahe eine Notwendigkeit zu sein."

According to Gehrcke, the *Dresdner Anzeiger* reported on 18 April 1921,

"Professor EINSTEIN äußerte mit Bezug auf das Urteil des amerikanischen Prof. REUTERDAHL vom Thomas-College über seine Relativitätstheorie, sie sei die Leistung eines „Barnum der Wissenschaft“, daß solche Angriffe ihn sehr an seine deutsche Heimat gemahnten . . . Prof. EINSTEIN lehnte es formell ab, mit Professor REUTERDAHL sich in eine wissenschaftliche Aussprache einzulassen."

Die Hamburger Woche wrote on 9 June 1921,

“Jenseits des großen Teiches hat A l b e r t E i n s t e i n , der mit seiner Relativitätstheorie raschen Weltruhm gewann, große Ehrungen erfahren. Beim Besuch der Princeton-Universität wurde er in Anwesenheit vieler Gelehrter anderer amerikanischer Hochschulen zum Ehrendoktor ernannt. Von einer anderen amerikanischen Hochschulseite dagegen ist Einstein ein neuer scharfer Gegner erstanden. Professor A r v i d R e u t e r d a h l , der Präsident der Ingenieure der St. Thomas-Universität, erklärte über die Theorie des Professors Einstien, daß dieser der „Barnum der Wissenschaft“ für die Welt sei. Professor Reuterdahl fordert Einstein zu einer schriftlichen Debatte über die Relativitätstheorie heraus. Reuterdahl nennt Einstein nicht nur einen „verrückten Wissenschaftler mit hysterischer Theorie“, sondern auch einen P l a g i a t o r und behauptet, daß die Einsteinsche Theorie bereits 1866 von einem Gelehrten unter dem Namen „I n e r t i a“ entdeckt worden sei.

Man darf gespannt sein, welches objektive Endergebnis sich aus den Kämpfen für und wider Einstein die Wissenschaft schließlich herausdestillieren wird! . . .”

4.7.2 Einstein All Hype

On 27 April 1921, Gertrude Besse King wrote about the publicity campaign for Einstein in *The Freeman* of New York,

“ALADDIN EINSTEIN. THE popular interest in America in Professor Einstein’s theories has astonished the professor. The public who does not know whether the theory of relativity has accounted for the alteration of mercury or of Mercury, waylays his steps, and delights, with the exception of a mere alderman or two, to do him honour. Gifted newspaper-reporters herald him as the originator of the theory of relativity, which, by the way he is not, and question him as to the ultimate nature of space, though only a mathematical physicist who is also a philosopher could understand the professor’s answers.

This general interest in an extremely difficult science is not quite what it seems. Probably Professor Einstein does not realize how sensationally and cunningly he has been advertised. From the point of view of awakening popular curiosity, his press-notices could hardly have been improved. The newspapers first announced his discovery as revolutionizing science. This sounds well, but its meaning, after all, is rather vague. Then they printed a series of entertaining oddities, supposedly deducible from his hypothesis, although most of them could have been equally well deduced from the conclusions of Lorentz or Poincaré: for example, moving objects are shortened in the direction of their motion. This is a gay novelty until one learns the proportion of the reduction, which is calculated to divest the statement of interest to any but scientists. Further, our newspapers told us that if we were to travel from the earth with the speed of light, and could see

the clock we left behind, it would always remain at the same moment, permanently pausing, unable to reach the next tick. But we should be unable to travel at the rate of light for a number of reasons, the most interesting and perhaps the most decisive being that such a speed would cause our mass to be infinite! Finally, our informants assert that no point in space, no moment of time can serve as a permanent base for measurement; we can measure only the relations of space, the relations of time, never absolute space or time; and even to measure space-relations, we have to take into account time! What a fascinating dervish-dance of what we used to regard as immutable fixities! Is it possible that these delicious contradictions are serious and accredited doctrines among those who know? Yet so they appear, for though Professor Einstein is always careful in stating that his hypothesis enjoys as yet only a tentative security, his methods are vouched for by the experts, his procedure is according to Hoyle, and the crowd is at liberty to gorge its appetite for marvels untroubled by the ogres of scientific orthodoxy.

Aside from the fact that Professor Einstein comes as a distinguished and somewhat mysterious foreigner to partake of our insatiable hospitality, his popular welcome is to be accounted for by the spell of wizardry that the press has cast upon his interpretations. For it is the necromancy of these strange theories, not their science, that catches the gaping crowd. Reporters are often good, practical psychologists. Instinctively they have divined the public eagerness for miracles, without grasping the factors that feed this taste. They know that most of us are essentially children still clamouring for fairy tales. Man is congenitally restless with the prison-house of this too, too solid world. He is always looking for short-cuts to power. Since he can not find them to his mental satisfaction as once he could through the miracles and divine dispensations of the Church, or through the magic and occultism that were his legitimate resources in the Middle Ages, he now turns to the wonders of science and philosophy. Here, even in theories that he does not understand, he can find release for his cramped position, here he can taste the intoxicating freedom of a boundless universe, and renew his sense of personal potency. [. . .]”⁶³³

Thomas Jefferson Jackson See wrote in *The San Francisco Journal* on 27 May 1923,

“If anyone should ask how Einstein managed to get such vast publicity in the matter of relativity, we may observe that he has the habit of a promoter. Mark Twain humorously wrote to the president of the St. Louis exposition in 1904, that he ‘would like to attend the exposition and exhibit himself.’ So also does Einstein contrive constantly to be seen among men in conspicuous places. When he came to America, with the Zionist committee, some two years ago, he had to go to the White House at Washington and talk relativity to President Harding. The President, with becoming modesty, said he could not understand the subject.

Things in Europe afterwards became uncomfortable for Einstein, and he sought refuge in an Oriental trip. When in Tokyo he called upon the emperor of Japan, and it was advertised over the world that he was without a dress suit. This report is spectacular and like that of a skillful advertiser.

His return trip is duly chronicled by the press. Thus he finally arrives in Egypt, and on reaching Spain addresses the Academy of Science, at a session held in the presence of the king of Spain. If this is not the trumpeting of an organized press agency, what is it?

Einstein is not liked in Germany. A year or so ago, the students at the University of Berlin hooted him down. It was reported that he was in fear of assassination—but it probably was only a ruse to gain public sympathy.”⁶³⁴

The Minneapolis Sunday Tribune published a letter from Arvid Reuterdaahl on 22 May 1921, which, while not the best work on the subject, is notable for its ridicule of Einstein for running away from the Bad Nauheim debate, as well as Einstein’s refusal to debate Reuterdaahl. It quotes a Swiss newspaper’s statement that Einstein’s flight from the Nauheim debate, “was another prearranged matter of his general trafficking.” The alleged corruption is proven by Philipp Frank, who described Max Planck’s biased control over the debate and his abuse of his power to censor speakers, intimidate the would-be audience and anti-Einstein speakers with armed guards, and restrict the topics of discussion in a way that would favor Einstein and prevent Einstein’s having to face criticisms of the Metaphysics in the theory of relativity.⁶³⁵ Frank wrote,

“[Max Planck] arranged it so that the greatest part of the available time was filled with papers that were purely mathematical and technical. Not much time remained for Lenard’s attack and the debate that would ensue. The entire arrangement was made to prevent any dramatic effects. [***] The armed policemen who had watched the building were withdrawn.”⁶³⁶

The theory of relativity is largely a metaphysical theory, not a scientific theory. In order to oppose the Metaphysics of relativity theory one must, of course, discuss Metaphysics. Proponents of relativity theory often refuse to discuss Metaphysics claiming that Metaphysics has nothing to do with science, and they thereby insulate their theory from criticism. Einstein did not grasp the distinction between Metaphysics and science. He stated in 1930, “Science itself is metaphysics.”⁶³⁷

Hugo Dingler, a critic of relativity theory, confirmed that severe time restrictions were placed on the opponents of relativity theory at the Bad Nauheim debate. Others complained that Einstein’s followers had stacked the audience with a pro-Einstein clique and tried to prevent the admission of neutral “unauthorized” persons into the forum.⁶³⁸ Philipp Frank admitted that the corruption backfired—every fairminded person smelled a rat, and knew that Einstein and the relativists were avoiding the facts and dodging the issues. Just when Nobel Prize winner Philipp Lenard, Einstein’s primary opponent, had cornered Einstein at the debate, Einstein ran away. Max Planck stopped the discussion for a break, and Einstein never returned. It is

difficult to believe that this was not a prearranged maneuver to save face for Einstein.

Reuterdaahl's article published in *The Minneapolis Sunday Tribune* on 22 May 1921,:

“Science’s ‘Baby Guy’ Was Simple Child Till Einstein Adopted It

Clothed in a Garbled Dress of Mathematical Theories,
the Youngster, ‘Relativity,’ Joined Ranks of
Unintelligible Genii—Swiss Paper Backs Reuterdaahl.

By Arvid Reuterdaahl.

**Dean Department of Engineering and Architecture
the College of St. Thomas.**

In a signed statement published in *The Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, issue of May 16, Dr. E. Lee Heidenreich, the eminent engineer, mathematician, and philosopher of Kansas City, Mo., points out that Dr. Einstein does not hesitate to make irreconcilable statements in order to avoid facing issues squarely. I now have in my possession a copy of the ‘Aftenposten’ article which was cited by Dr. Heidenreich in his communication to *The Tribune*. I also have a copy of the *New York World* interview with Dr. Einstein. The date of the ‘Aftenposten’ article is June 18, 1920, and the *New York World* interview is dated April 12, 1921.

There is only one verdict possible when a comparison is made of these two conflicting statements of Professor Einstein, either his statements are relativistic conveniences or his memory has been weakened by relativistic sophistries. Dr. Einstein, it seems, is permitted to say anything he pleases without being held accountable.

Access to Ziegler’s Work.

From abroad I have received copies of publications which convey the idea, in no uncertain terms, that while Dr. Einstein was in Switzerland he had access to the work of Dr. J. H. Ziegler and that he used the results of this able investigator’s work without giving him any credit whatsoever.

I have now in my possession evidence furnished by ‘Kinertia,’ which shows conclusively that in the year 1903, copies of certain contributions of ‘Kinertia’ were in the hands of the imperial Prussian academy of science in Berlin. Did Dr. Einstein avail himself of those easily accessible records? Moreover in September, 1904, a well-known American journal published a statement setting forth ‘Kinertia’s’ theory of gravitation.

Swiss Paper on Einstein.

The following quotations from the well known Swiss paper, ‘the Lucerne

Daily News,' of April 22, 1921, should have been interesting reading to Dr. Einstein under the heading, 'Professor Einstein's Triumphal March Through America,' a translation of the article reads:

'Professor Albert Einstein and the Zionist delegation which arrived simultaneously with him, was accorded a very warm welcome on its arrival in New York. The entire New York press devoted a good deal of space to this happening, as well as to the personality of Einstein. One can clearly see that there is again question here of the previously ordered advertising, just as the whole Einstein undertaking has been from its very beginning a bluff. This time the Americans were supposed to believe, but the good Yankee seemed to be less naive than the good Germans and Swiss, and were not so easily forced into a belief in the new prophet. They are too skeptical to believe without a further proof that he is a greater genius than Copernicus and Newton, simply because he is more unintelligible.

Too Much Common Sense.

'Americans have too much common sense for that. They know that all the great truths are simple and easily understood, and are, therefore, justly suspicious of the unintelligible theory of relativity of Einstein. More than that they have rejected it as a swindle. Just for example Reuterdahl, dean of engineering of the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota, calls Einstein a 'Barnum of the scientific world who is trying to fool the whole world with a mythical theory.' It is further reported that Reuterdahl has challenged Einstein to a debate, into which he is as likely to enter as in the debate announced last year at the meeting for scientific investigation in Bad Nauheim, where he preferred to withdraw himself quietly before the announced opponents of his theory could say what they had to say. To these opponents was expressed the regret that Mr. Einstein was unable, because of circumstances, to answer them. This, of course, was another prearranged matter of his general trafficking. It is very likely that he is acting in a similar manner towards Reuterdahl. The more so because the latter has accused him of scientific theft, for Reuterdahl maintains that Einstein has taken the fundamentals of his theory from a work which appeared in 1866 under the pseudonym of 'Kinertia.'

Work Little Known In Europe.

'As this work is scarcely known in Europe, the accusation may possibly be groundless. Similar accusations have been made by German scientists, such as the Engineer Rudolph Mewes, Professors E. Gehrke and Paul Weyland, etc. According to them, Einstein is supposed to have secretly taken a formula from a publication of the deceased Professor Gerber which appeared in 1898, and was very inaccessible, and to have made it his own. The facts in the matter are, of course, difficult to prove, nevertheless, the peculiar conduct of Einstein and his sensational advertising campaign lead one to believe that his whole business is very suspicious. However, most of these opponents seem to be upon a wrong scent, because they do not understand the circumstances which existed at the time of the origination of

the Einsteinian teaching, and do not sufficiently understand the influences that may have been at work in regard to his theory. He seems to have started with the correct notion of the constancy of the velocity of light, and of vacuum; which notion, however, he did not test out further, but simply accepted hypothetically; whereas, the other teachings of his theory are so tangled and contradictory that they seem to have come from an entirely different source.

Deductions Criticized.

‘These other peculiar assumed proofs, and the still more peculiar deductions made from them have been criticized by many scientists, notably by Professor Lenard, a former Nobel Prize winner in physics. Lenard calls attention to the fact that these suppositions and deductions are contradictory to common sense. Einstein’s acceptance of constancy of the velocity of light, which he makes the one stable concept in the shoreless ocean of his theory of relativity, seems to be a special case. It is already suspicious, because the physicists at that time denied the existence of absolute empty space, and regarded such a thing as impossible, but then conceded it without more adieu when they accepted Einstein’s hypotheses, and in addition regarded him as having performed a very acceptable thing. As a matter of fact Einstein’s theory of velocity of light seems to be a direct theft of the universal theory of light given out by J. H. Ziegler five years previous. There are reasons that seem to point with great probability to the fact that the teaching of Ziegler was the hidden spring of Einstein’s discovery.

The Unmoved Emptiness.

‘Just to mention one of them, the findings of Ziegler were very much discussed in Berne, which was at the time Einstein’s domicile. Ziegler speaks of the trinity of energy, space and time, a trinity which Mr. Einstein then brought forth in a modified form. The clear and simple teaching of Ziegler, according to which all natural phenomena are mixed forms of radiating source light (urlicht), and unmoved (unergized) emptiness, were very inconvenient to the exponents of accepted physics, and so they tried from the beginning to suppress it. Thus they created an opportunity for a clever and foxy plagiarist to possess himself of these principle teachings. He would get all the greater hearing and support from those physicists if he would proffer his plagiarism in a manner intelligible to them, but unintelligible to the general public. Mathematics served as an excellent medium. The chemist (not the mathematician) Ziegler, had made the mistake of writing intelligibly and of revealing the mistakes in modern physics, thus Einstein appeared to these physicists as a Deus ex Machina, he was a friend in need. It is no wonder that he was hailed as long-expected Messiah of the world of physics, the true bringer of light.

Ziegler’s Name Forgotten.

‘Ziegler’s name was forgotten in the great propaganda which the papers carried on for Einstein. Ziegler has not always propounded his teachings so clearly that superficial study would lead to a great understanding of it. Thus,

there was occasion of all sorts of misconception. Hence the many mistakes of the theory of relativity. How could this theory of relativity be unified and clear when it was only a mixed pickle affair of erroneous plagiarisms. The fact that Einstein's theory approached the Ziegler light theory more and more every year does not disprove that the Ziegler theory is a source of Einsteinian wisdom, even though the Einsteinian press has carefully boycotted Ziegler for 20 years. The Americans, of course, know nothing of this. If they reject Einstein, it is rather because they are angry to be considered so stupid as to regard the greatest scientific discovery as the most unintelligible. The Americans know well enough that the opposite is the case, and for this reason the business trip of the false prophet in the United States will scarcely constitute a triumphal march.

From German Journal.

The following excerpts from the Scientific journal 'Weltwissen,' May, 1921, published in Munich, Germany, is significant:

'From numerous sources we have previously received various printed articles and manuscripts directed against Einstein, among others, one from the 'Regierungsrat,' Dr. H. Fricke, 'The Error In Einstein's Theory of Relativity' and from the Engineer A. Patschke, 'The Overthrow of the Einsteinian Theory of Relativity.' The tremendous advertising campaign, which Einstein has for some time conducted throughout the world has been carried on to such an extent as to throw a sort of protective film over his work. Such procedure does not redound to the honor and furtherance of science, in special letters, at the beginning of the year 1920, we called the attention of the University of Berlin and of the minister of education to this horn-tooting for Einstein. It is a very deplorable fact that German science should be laid open to ridicule by one of Germany's own scientists.'

This statement emanated from Dr. Johannes Zacharias of the editorial department of the journal 'Weltwissen.'"⁶³⁹

4.8 Assassination Plots

Though Theodor Wolff, editor of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, had stated that there was no anti-Semitic movement in the German government in 1915, Wolff spread the rumor in 1922 (which was denied by the German police) that assassins were out to murder him and Albert Einstein. Wolff's pronouncement followed on the heels of the assassination of Walter Rathenau. Rathenau was a German Jew who found a way around the Treaty of Versailles (which he had supported—profiteering off of the reparations payments made by Germany) by restoring Germany's military in Russia with the Rapallo Treaty. It was alleged that he and his friends could financially profit from this venture and that they sought to sponsor Bolshevism. Bolshevism itself stole the wealth of Russia and channeled it other hands. Rathenau was preparing the way for the Second World War.

Wolff's baseless claims of assassination plots may have been a pretext for Einstein's withdrawal from the meetings of the League of Nations, where he would

have had to have met with his critic Henri Bergson, and been publicly challenged to debate his positions. Instead of running this risk, Einstein ran around the world promoting himself and advertising the theory of relativity—and Zionism, at a critical point in the history of the Zionist Movement. In this same period, Wickham Steed prevented Lord Northcliffe, principal owner of *The London Times* and outspoken critic of Zionism, from voicing his objections to the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine of 24 July 1922 (reproduced in the endnote⁶⁴⁰). Perhaps the Zionists sought sympathy for their cause by spreading rumors that Einstein was in danger from those who had murdered Rathenau. They failed to explain how exposing himself in public and traveling abroad safeguarded Einstein.

Einstein's Internationalism and his anti-Germanism did indeed cause some Germans to wish him dead; and a year earlier, in 1921, Rudolph Leibus put a bounty on Einstein's head and Leibus was prosecuted for it. *The New York Times* carried the story reported by the *Chicago Tribune*,

**“Urged Murder of Einstein,
Pays \$16 Fine in Berlin Court**

Copyright, 1921, by The Chicago Tribune Co.

BERLIN, April 7.—Charged with attempting to incite the murder of Professor Albert Einstein, who is now in America on a lecture tour, Rudolph Leibus, an anti-Semitic leader, was assessed a fine of \$16 by a Berlin Judge.

Leibus recently offered a reward for the murder of Einstein, Professor Foerster and Maximilian Harden, saying that it was a patriotic duty to shoot these leaders of pacifist sentiment.”

Jewish anti-Zionist Walter Rathenau was assassinated on 24 June 1922. Both nationalist Germans and political Zionists hated Rathenau. The political Zionists resented Rathenau for being an advocate for, and prime example of, the possibility of assimilation; and for being a vocal anti-Zionist who believed that assimilation was the best means to end anti-Semitism. Rathenau published an article in Maximilian Harden's newspaper *Die Zukunft* in 1897, in which Rathenau called on Jews to assimilate by adopting the Teutonic values of honesty, manhood and integrity, because they were allegedly not an integral part of German society, but were instead an “alien organism in its body.”⁶⁴¹ He famously wrote, *inter alia*,

“What a peculiar sight! Amidst German life, a segregated and heterogeneous tribal race, glitteringly and gaudily garnished, with a hot-blooded and restless temperament. An Asiatic horde on the soil of Brandenburg.”

“Seltsame Vision! Inmitten deutschen Lebens ein abgesondert fremdartiger Menschenstamm, glänzend und auffällig staffiert, von heißblütig beweglichem Gebaren. Auf märkischem Sand eine asiatische Horde.”⁶⁴²

Rathenau also famously stated that there was a committee of 300 persons, known to each other, who effectively ruled the world. Some believed that Rathenau was one

of them, and that they were the “Elders of Zion”. Rathenau was considered one of the many leading Jews who stabbed Germany in the back in the First World War.

The Zionists had stated that it was *impossible* for Jews to assimilate in a Gentile nation and Rathenau’s murder bolstered their contention and lent sympathy to their cause. German nationalists believed that Rathenau, who had numerous connections to big business and was the son of the founder of AEG and became its chairman in 1915, had profited from the war in his role as Director of Economic Mobilization in control of military spending in the German War Ministry, and had bought inferior goods from Jewish merchants at inflated prices, then at war’s end sold off Germany’s machinery of war to his Jewish friends. They quoted statements by Rathenau, in which Rathenau declared that he wanted Germany to lose the war. German nationalists resisted Rathenau, who became Minister of Reconstruction in 1921 and Foreign Minister in 1922, because he had sponsored the punitive Versailles Treaty and had demanded that Germany pay the oppressive reparations it imposed. Furthermore, they thought that the Rapallo Treaty was but another opportunity for Jews to profit from war and that it aided the Bolsheviks.

Anti-Communist *Freikorps* soldier Ernst von Salomon, who served a five year prison sentence for conspiring to assassinate Rathenau, may have believed that Rathenau was one of the alleged Elders of Zion, who wanted to bring Bolshevism to Germany. Rathenau brought about the Rapallo Treaty with the Bolsheviks, and Rathenau had alleged that 300 men controlled the economic destiny of Europe, which 300 some German nationalists assumed were the alleged Elders of Zion. The murder of Rathenau on 24 June 1922, no matter who had committed it and regardless of the reasons behind it, served as a convenient propaganda tool for the Zionists’ promotion of the adoption of the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine on 24 July 1922.

Racist-segregationist and genocidal-Zionist Albert Einstein stated,

“I regretted the fact that [Rathenau] became a Minister. In view of the attitude which large numbers of the educated classes in Germany assume towards the Jews, I have always thought that their natural conduct in public should be one of proud reserve.”⁶⁴³

Chaim Weizmann wrote,

“[Rathenau’s] attitude was, of course, all too typical of that of many assimilated German Jews; they seemed to have no idea that they were sitting on a volcano; they believed quite sincerely that such difficulties as admittedly existed for German Jews were purely temporary and transitory phenomena, primarily due to the influx of East European Jews, who did not fit into the framework of German life, and thus offered targets for anti-Semitic attacks.”⁶⁴⁴

The *Berliner Tageblatt*, Morgen-Ausgabe, reported on 5 August 1922,

“Einsteins Absage an den Naturforschertag.

Auf der Liste der Mörderorganisation.

(Telegramm unseres Korrespondenten.)

Leipzig, 4. August.

Die „Leipziger Neuesten Nachrichten“ bringen in ihrer Sonnabendnummer vom 5. August folgende aufsehen erregende Meldung aus Naturforscherkreisen: Professor Albert Einstein hatte zugesagt, auf der Hundertjahrfeier der Gesellschaft deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte in Leipzig einen Vortrag über die Relativitätstheorie zu halten. Kurz nach der Ermordung Rathenaus teilte aber Einstein dem Vorsitzenden der Gesellschaft, Geheimrat Planck, mit, daß er seine Beteiligung an der Hundertjahrfeier absagen müsse, weil er für mehrere Monate ins Ausland gehe. Diesen plötzlichen Entschluß faßte Einstein, als er erfuhr, daß auch sein Name auf der Liste der Opfer stehe, die von der Mörderorganisation beseitigt werden sollten, der schon Rathenau zum Opfer gefallen ist. Der Entschluß Einsteins, unter diesen Umständen auf längere Zeit ins Ausland zu gehen, war vollkommen zu begreifen. Inzwischen hat sich durch das tatkräftige Eingreifen der Regierung die Lage im Reich erfreulicherweise bedeutend gebessert. Die Mörderorganisation ist aufgedeckt. Alle Schuldigen und Verdächtigen sind in Gewahrsam gebracht worden, so daß nun hoffentlich dem schädlichen Treiben dieser Kreise ein für allemal ein Ende bereitet worden ist. Der Vorsitzende der Gesellschaft deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte hat nun den Versuch unternommen, Einstein zur Rückkehr nach Deutschland und zur Teilnahme an der Leipziger Hundertjahrfeier zu bewegen, und er bedauert sehr, daß es seinen Bemühungen bisher noch nicht gelungen ist, Einstein zur Rückkehr zu bewegen. Es scheint, daß ein den Gelehrten umgebender engerer Kreis von Freunden und Bewunderern besorgter ist als Einstein selbst. Denn von dieser Seite wird alles getan, die Rückkehr des Gelehrten nach Deutschland zu verhindern oder doch hinauszuschieben. Hoffentlich aber lassen sich noch diese Schwierigkeiten rechtzeitig überwinden, damit Einstein seinen Vortrag über die Relativitätstheorie in Leipzig doch noch persönlich halten kann.

*

Wie wir erfahren, trifft es zu, daß Professor Einstein an der Leipziger Hundertjahrfeier der Gesellschaft deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte nicht teilnehmen wird. Gewiß ist es ein tief bedauerlicher Vorgang, daß einer der ersten Gelehrten unserer Zeit an einer Veranstaltung von dem Range der Leipziger Tagung deshalb nicht teilnehmen kann, weil er befürchten muß, in Deutschland, seiner Heimat, statt der Ehrungen, die ihm in der ganzen Welt entgegengebracht worden sind, der Kugel eines Meuchelmörders ausgesetzt zu sein. Die Meldung, die das Leipziger Blatt aus Naturforscherkreisen veröffentlicht, ist gewiß sehr gut gemeint. Wir vermögen auch nicht zu beurteilen, in welchem Grade das Leben und die

Sicherheit des großen Gelehrten gefährdet sind. Aber wenn sich auch durch das tatkräftige Eingreifen der Regierung die Lage gebessert hat, so ist doch die Behauptung, daß alle Schuldigen und Verdächtigen in Gewahrsam gebracht seien, etwas kühn und schwerlich zu verantworten. Der Mordbube, der den Anschlag auf Maximilian Harden ausgeführt hat, ist beispielsweise noch nicht gefaßt und Erzbergers Mörder leben in Freiheit und in Saus und Braus. Es ist auch sehr begreiflich, daß die Freunde des Gelehrten in höherem Maße besorgt sind, als er selbst, und es ist sehr bedauerlich, daß Rathenau trotz vielfacher Warnung so wenig besorgt gewesen ist. Vielleicht dient dieser Vorgang, dessen tief beschämender Charakter niemandem entgehen kann, endlich dazu, der moralischen Verwilderung, die aus den genügend gekennzeichneten Gründen in weiten Kreisen des Rechtsradikalismus eingerissen ist, durch die entschiedene Abwehr der anständigen Elemente aus allen Lagern im Interesse des deutschen Namens und der deutschen Ehre Einhalt zu tun.”

The *Rheinisch-Westfälische Zeitung* (Essen a. Ruhr) reported on 5 August 1922 that the whole affair was contrived as a means to advertize Einstein, whose stardom was fading,

“Die flüchtige Relativität

Eine Teilnahme Einsteins am deutschen Naturforscherkongreß in Leipzig ist, wie das B. T. meldet, nicht zu erwarten. Einstein sollte dort einen Vortrag über seine Relativitätstheorie halten. Nach dem Morde Rathenaus ist er aber ins Ausland gereist, da er, wie er erklärte, auf der schwarzen Liste stände.

*

Die Propagierung der Einsteinschen allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie hat zwar einen für das deutsche Kulturleben gemeingefährlichen Charakter, doch hat Einsteins Person damit nichts zu tun. Seine Flucht und die erdachte schwarze Liste sind eins der vielen jetzt auftauchenden republikanischen Propagandamittel, die man sachlich nicht ernst zu nehmen hat. Einsteins Person ist viel zu unwichtig, als daß jemand um ihretwillen sein Leben aufs Spiel setzen wollte. Daß die von ihm in Szene gesetzte Flucht als Reklame auszulegen ist, die seinen schon merklich verblaßten Stern in neuem Glanze erstrahlen lassen soll, dürfte wohl des Pudels Kern in dieser Affäre bedeuten.”

Thomas Jefferson Jackson See wrote in *The San Francisco Journal* on 27 May 1923,

“If anyone should ask how Einstein managed to get such vast publicity in the matter of relativity, we may observe that he has the habit of a promoter. Mark Twain humorously wrote to the president of the St. Louis exposition in 1904, that he ‘would like to attend the exposition and exhibit

himself.' So also does Einstein contrive constantly to be seen among men in conspicuous places. When he came to America, with the Zionist committee, some two years ago, he had to go to the White House at Washington and talk relativity to President Harding. The President, with becoming modesty, said he could not understand the subject.

Things in Europe afterwards became uncomfortable for Einstein, and he sought refuge in an Oriental trip. When in Tokyo he called upon the emperor of Japan, and it was advertised over the world that he was without a dress suit. This report is spectacular and like that of a skillful advertiser.

His return trip is duly chronicled by the press. Thus he finally arrives in Egypt, and on reaching Spain addresses the Academy of Science, at a session held in the presence of the king of Spain. If this is not the trumpeting of an organized press agency, what is it?

Einstein is not liked in Germany. A year or so ago, the students at the University of Berlin hooted him down. It was reported that he was in fear of assassination—but it probably was only a ruse to gain public sympathy."⁶⁴⁵

The Associated Press spread Theodor Wolff's rumors of assassination plots. *The New York Times* wrote on 6 August 1922 in Section 2, on page 1,

“Einstein Has Fled Temporarily From Germany Because of Threats That He Will Be Killed

LEIPSIC, Aug. 5 (Associated Press).—Professor Albert Einstein, originator of the theory of relativity, has fled from Germany temporarily because he was threatened with assassination by the group that caused the murder of Dr. Walter Rathenau, German Foreign Minister, according to a letter from Professor Einstein canceling an engagement to address a meeting here.

Efforts to induce the noted scientist to return, in view of the Government's success in coping with the situation, are said to have so far proved unavailing.

Receipt of the letter was announced by the President of the German Physicists' Association, before which Dr. Einstein was to discuss his relativity theory at the organization's 100th anniversary meeting. It was received soon after Dr. Rathenau's assassination, and stated that Dr. Einstein had learned that he also was listed to be killed and had, therefore, decided to go abroad.

It appears that Dr. Einstein's friends and admirers had been more concerned in keeping the scientist safe in this manner than was he himself, and were doing their utmost to prevent, or at least postpone, his return. Dr. Einstein is not accompanying the expedition to Christmas Island, contrary to previously announced plans.

Considerable comment was caused in Geneva early last week by the absence of Dr. Einstein from the meeting of the members of the Intellectual Committee of the League of Nations to begin the work of organization. He had been designated to represent Germany, but did not appear. It was said he was unable to leave his work at the University of Berlin.

Dispatches from Germany soon after the Rathenau murder quoted police authorities there as accusing the notorious 'Consul' organization of having marked twelve leading politicians, editors and financiers of Jewish extraction for assassination, including Dr. Rathenau, Theodor Wolff, editor of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, and Max Warburg, the Hamburg banker."

The New York Times wrote on 8 August 1922 on page 7,

"URGE EINSTEIN TO HIDE.

Friends Fear Because He Is on Anti-Semite Blacklist.

BERLIN, Aug. 7 (Jewish Telegraph Agency).—Friends of Professor Albert Einstein insist upon his remaining abroad, where he is understood to be hiding from the 'Deutsche Nationale' plotters, by whom he has been blacklisted, together with a number of other leading German Jews.

The fear of Professor Einstein's friends is justified, in the opinion of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, whose editor, Theodor Wolff, is included in the monarchists' blacklist.

'Professor Einstein's continued concealment is advisable,' the *Tageblatt* says, 'because the assailants of Maximilian Harden and Mathias Erzberger have not been apprehended. Professor Einstein's enforced absence is a blot on the German name and honor.'"

The New York Times published a statement on 9 August 1922 on page 10, that perpetuated the myth that anyone who disagreed with Einstein did so out of envy and resultant malice,

"His Offense Can Be Imagined.

It takes not a little thought to arrive at even a suspicion why anybody wants to assassinate Dr. EINSTEIN. Whoever has seen his picture knows how unlikely he is to excite angry passions in any minds. He is gentleness personified, and it is incredible that he ever gave anybody any of the ordinary forms of offense.

But wait! Not long ago he announced, or at least allowed somebody else, without denial, to announce, that there were not more than twelve people in the world who could understand his new theory of relativity. That, come to think of it, did waken something of animosity in every mind whose possessor lacked the self-confidence to number himself among the so exceptional dozen. Humiliation is an unpleasing sensation, and few if any turn more

readily to dislike of him who causes it, and hatred is not far away.

This may not be the basis of the rumored plot against Dr. EINSTEIN, but it is a working hypothesis that will stand until facts are brought forward to prove it untenable.”

The German police refuted Wolff’s alarmist claims. The *Casseler Allgemeine Zeitung* reported on 12 August 1922, that the alleged “blacklist” did not exist and that the pro-Einstein press was corrupt:

“Eine nicht vorhandene Mordliste. Nach der Ermordung RATHENAU’s lief die Meldung durch die Presse, es sei eine Liste der Mörderorganisation aufgefunden worden, auf der die Namen Prof. EINSTEIN’s u. a. verzeichnet gewesen sein sollen. Jetzt endlich wird von der zuständigen Berliner Stelle versichert, daß die polizeilichen Erhebungen . . . eine derartige Liste nicht ans Licht gefördert haben. Daß die amtlichen Stellen der Veröffentlichung dieser Gerüchte in der gesamten Presse nicht sofort ein Dementi entgegengesetzt haben, kann selbst in der politischen Verwirrung jener Tage keine zureichende Erklärung finden.”⁶⁴⁶

There were many more reasons why some suspected that Einstein’s flight from the League of Nations, and the Hundertjahrfeier der Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte in Leipzig, on the pretext of unsubstantiated murder plots against him, was a contrived affair to create a false panic over anti-Semitism and to promote sympathy for Einstein, the theory of relativity and Zionism in anticipation of a grand world tour. German science had turned against Einstein. Philipp Lenard and others promised to again embarrass Einstein at the Leipzig meeting as they had done in Bad Nauheim. The racist coward Albert Einstein wanted to hide from them, as Ernst Gehrcke recorded in his book *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie: Kulturhistorisch-psychologische Dokumente*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 62-64. Though Einstein was scheduled to deliver a lecture at the centenary of the Association of German Scientists and Physicians in Leipzig, which was overseen by the corrupt sycophant Max Planck, Einstein again took the coward’s way out. Max Planck and Max von Laue again rescued Albert Einstein from certain embarrassment. Laue, who was far more competent, though no less childish, than Einstein, delivered a lecture on the theory of relativity, while Einstein again hid from his critics.

Several top Physicists, Mathematicians and Philosophers joined Nobel Prize laureate Philipp Lenard in protesting Max Planck’s attempt to deceive the German Public into believing that the scientific community had accepted the theory of relativity as if it were the climax of modern science. These scholars joined together to protect the lay public from the self-aggrandizement and lies of Max Planck and Albert Einstein. Their published protest revealed that the majority of Physicists, Mathematicians and Philosophers considered the theory of relativity to be an unproven hypothesis and a fundamentally flawed, irrational and untenable fiction,

“Die Leitung der „Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Ärzte“ hat es für richtig gehalten, unter den wissenschaftlichen Darbietungen der Leipziger Jahrhundertfeier Vorträge über *Relativitätstheorie* auf die Tagesordnung einer großen, allgemeinen Sitzung aufzunehmen. Es muß und soll dadurch wohl der Eindruck erweckt werden, als stelle die Relativitätstheorie einen Höhepunkt der modernen wissenschaftlichen Forschung dar.

Hiergegen legen die unterzeichneten Physiker, Mathematiker und Philosophen entschiedene Verwahrung ein. Sie beklagen aufs tiefste die Irreführung der öffentlichen Meinung, welcher die Relativitätstheorie als Lösung des Welträtsels angepriesen wird, und welche man über die Tatsache im Unklaren hält, daß viele und auch sehr angesehene Gelehrte der drei genannten Forschungsgebiete die Relativitätstheorie nicht nur als eine unbewiesene Hypothese ansehen, sondern sie sogar als eine im Grunde verfehlt und logisch unhaltbare Fiktion ablehnen. Die Unterzeichneten betrachten es als unvereinbar mit dem Ernst und der Würde deutscher Wissenschaft, wenn eine im höchsten Maße anfechtbare Theorie voreilig und marktschreierisch in die Laienwelt getragen wird, und wenn die Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Ärzte benutzt wird, um solche Bestrebungen unterstützen.”

After his crushing defeat at Bad Nauheim and humiliation at the Berlin Philharmonic, Einstein elected to run away and hide from Lenard and Gehrcke at the Hundertjahrfeier der Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte in Leipzig.

The First World War had emancipated all the Jews of the world. Kerensky and the the Bolsheviks had completely liberated the Jews of Russia. Political Zionism was dying a political death. Would not a world tour expose Einstein to greater danger, not less? Einstein had written to the Generalsekretär des Volkerbundes in Genf in July that he was planning to visit Japan.

The Zionist movement was fractionalizing.⁶⁴⁷ Even Louis Brandeis was coming to realize that the Jews did not want to emigrate to the Palestinian desert in large enough numbers to form a majority population and American Zionists were softening. Weizmann and Einstein had a tense relationship. Zionism needed a common enemy, real or manufactured, to hold it together. *The New York Times* reported on 20 July 1922 on page 19,

“JERUSALEM, June 22 (Correspondence of the Associated Press).—The inhabitants of Palestine, both Moslem and Christian, are immeasurably pleased that the British House of Lords yesterday passed the Islington motion disapproving the Balfour declaration of 1917. The native press is jubilant; pan-Arab demonstrations are being held and the local cable office is swamped with congratulatory messages from Arabs to the House of Lords.

The Balfour declaration pledged the erection of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. The resolution passed yesterday by a vote of 60 to 29 set forth that

‘the mandate for Palestine in its present form is unacceptable to this House, because it directly violates the pledges made by his Majesty’s Government to the people of Palestine in the declaration of October, 1915, and again in the declaration of November, 1918 (pledges given to the Arabs), and is as at present framed opposed to the sentiments and wishes of the great majority of the people of Palestine. That, therefore, its acceptance by the Council of the League of Nations should be postponed until such modifications have therein been effected as will comply with pledges given by his Majesty’s Government.’

The Arabs regard this incident as a great victory. ‘It is the bounden duty,’ says an Arab call to a demonstration of celebration, ‘of all of us to set forth our gratitude to the House of Lords for having proved to the world that God and justice still live in Great Britain.’

Miraat el Shark, a Jerusalem newspaper, says: ‘We will win our fight for freedom; we have God and right on our side.’ Beit el Makdes, another local paper, says: ‘Our victory in the House of Lords is the beginning of the end of political Zionism.’

The Zionists are correspondingly disappointed at the news. They have not failed to cable strong protests to London. The Chairman of the Zionist organization here said to the Associated Press:

‘All our hopes have been shattered on the rocks of political expediency. If the House of Commons follows the lead of the House of Lords, then Jews of the world will have been dealt a more staggering blow than that administered by the Emperor Hadrian 1,800 years ago, when his persecutions brought about the last dispersion of the Jewish race.’”

The New York Times reported on 26 August 1922, on page 4,

**“ARABS COMING HERE
TO OPPOSE ZIONISM
*Declaring Against Palestine Mandate,
They Seek American and
British Support.***

Copyright 1922, by The New York Times Company.

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES

CAIRO, Egypt, Aug. 25.—Following the news last night that the Mesopotamian Ministry had resigned because it was unable to agree with the British regarding the Anglo-Irak treaty comes the news today that the situation in the Irak is restive, due to the efforts of extremists to stir anti-British feeling, while excitement is spreading. The Arab delegation meeting in Congress at Nablus reports that hopes for the success of their Palestine cause against the Jews depend largely on sympathetic action from America and England. Feeling in these two countries is to be aroused for protests against Zionism in Palestine, which will be sent from different Moslem

countries if the Arab propagandists succeed in inducing the Moslems to produce protests.

America may be interested to learn that the Nablus Congress has decided to send an Arab mission to the United States to collect subscriptions for the Arab organization to enable it to continue the campaign against a Jewish national home in Palestine on the present conditions.

A message from Mecca, which is confirmed by Pilgrims recently at Mecca, says Moslems from all Arab countries met there recently and agreed to organize a movement throughout the Moslem Arab world for the elimination of all foreign political and commercial influence from Moslem Arab countries in the Mid-East. Details of the preliminary organization are to be submitted to the Congress which reassembles at Mecca on the occasion of next year's pilgrimage. The native press of Egypt does not favor the Mecca Congress policy on the ground that an exclusively Ismalic policy nowadays is doomed to react on Islam and to the advantage of Islam's opponents.

JERUSALEM, Aug. 25 (Jewish Telegraphic Agency).—The Arab Congress, meeting at Nablus, 33 miles north of here, has adopted a resolution, rejecting the League of Nations mandate plan for Palestine, refusing Palestinian nationality and declining participation in the elections to the Legislature Council.

The congress instructed the political committee to prepare a national covenant and send missions to all Arab settlements in order to create a union of eastern nations. It was also decided to establish propaganda headquarters in London.

The congress was attended by over 100 delegates from all parts of the country. The deliberations ran quietly, undisturbed by demonstrations. Most of the speakers in a determined tone advised the policy of non-co-operation with the British Administration in Palestine.

ZIONISTS URGE UNION.

Karlsbad Congress Seeks to Reconcile

Two American Factions.

KARLSBAD, Aug. 25 (Jewish Telegraph Agency)—Many more delegates to the World Zionist Congress are arriving, the total number now reaching over 150, besides many visitors from Europe and America. Dr. Chaim Weizmann, President of the World Zionist Organization, was to preside at the formal opening today, which follows the meetings of executive committees.

A determined effort is being made to effect a reconciliation between the two Zionist factions in the United States. The delegates chiefly interested in this movement are from Germany, France, Holland and Belgium. It is fostered by the strong sentiment for peace existing among the delegates.

Nahum Sokolow, Chairman of the World Zionist Executive Committee, is said to be advocating an immediate settlement of the differences between

the two American groups in order to unite all the Zionist forces in the task of upbuilding Palestine.”

It is clear that the Zionists needed a common enemy to unite them, and the alleged murder threats against Einstein, real, contrived or imagined, played a rôle in the promotion of that goal. The Zionists then worked to create economic conditions which would make Germany ripe for a Zionist dictator named Adolf Hitler. The history of the political Zionists’ involvement in German wartime politics is discussed in Isaiah Friedman’s *Germany, Turkey, and Zionism, 1897-1918*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, (1977).

4.9 Wolff Crying, Dirty Tricks, Censorship, Smear Campaigns and Anonymous Threats in the Name of Einstein

The promoters of Einstein and the theory of relativity have employed many of the same tactics and strategies common to such corrupt Jewish political movements as Zionism and Bolshevism. Charles Lane Poor worked hard to expose Einstein as a fraud.⁶⁴⁸ Poor complained of terrible censorship of his efforts to expose Einstein and the experiments taken as evidence in support of the theory of relativity. This was and is a common complaint among those who raise concerns about the shameless promotion of the plagiarist Albert Einstein, and who question the metaphysical fallacies and internal contradictions of the theory of relativity.

In 1930, C. L. Poor wrote,

“Thus the claim of Einstein to have found a new law of gravitation and the many assertions that the theory of relativity has worked in accounting for the motions of Mercury and has been conclusively proved by the eclipse observations and by the displacement of spectral lines are all merely unproved, and, so far, really unsupported illusions. Einstein and his followers have been dwelling in the ‘pleasing land of drowsyshed—’; in the land ‘Of dreams that wave before the half shut eye.’”⁶⁴⁹

Though the theory of relativity was hyped in the 1920's as a well-proven and perfectly exact, perfectly logical theory, such claims were just that, just hype. There were few people who were competent to try to defend the theory, and the nonexistence of empirical justification for its fantastical claims led to a great insecurity in the academic community—some members of which had stretched out their necks when the press promoted Einstein as the new and improved “Jewish Newton”—and which was worried that the public might discover that Einstein was a fraud and his theories had no rational justification.

Those brave enough to speak out against the degeneration of science into bizarre mysticism, and the demise of professional integrity in science, faced intimidation, censorship, and the classic pernicious political tactics of crowd manipulation by Einstein’s supporters. Einstein and his followers were not above employing dirty tricks to suppress opposition and the public disclosure of the truth.

Hubert Goenner tells the story of how Oskar Kraus was scheduled to deliver a speech in Berlin against the theory of relativity on 2 September 1920. Kraus was not able to give his speech, because he was not allowed to go to Germany. Johannes Riem stated that Kraus had wired him a telegram on 2 September 1920, which informed him that Kraus, “was refused a visa for political reasons.”⁶⁵⁰ Riem complained that,

“In such a way relativity theory is protected by the immigration service.”⁶⁵¹

Goenner notes that Ernst Gehrcke believed that he was censored at Einstein’s request⁶⁵² from publishing Einstein’s verbal assertion that accelerations are absolute in the theory of relativity. Gehrcke, who was a well published and well respected physicist, attempted to draw attention to Einstein’s beliefs in the journal *Die Naturwissenschaften*, a Julius Springer publication edited by Einstein’s friend and supporter Arnold Berliner,⁶⁵³ which was quick to provide Einstein with an outlet to attack Lucien Fabre,⁶⁵⁴ and which published *ad hominem* attacks against anti-relativists in the form of polemic book “reviews” written by Einstein’s friends of anti-relativistic literature.⁶⁵⁵ Einstein once commented that Springer had “powerful advertising resources”,⁶⁵⁶ and indeed the publishing house was large, influential and long-lived. Einstein was very well connected and most of his friends looked to him for letters of recommendation and for his intervention to obtain them positions, grants and increased salaries.⁶⁵⁷

Arvid Reuterdaahl wrote of the political atmosphere surrounding the corrupt promotion of Einstein,

“The Academy of Nations—Its Aims and Hopes
World-Wide Organization of Learned Men Will Study
Scientific Questions for the Benefit of All Mankind
By ARVID REUTERDAHL

Dean, Department of Engineering and Architecture, the
College of St. Thomas. St. Paul, Minn.

WE ARE emerging from a period of material and intellectual chaos. Nations have clashed in war. The intellectual world is still in conflict on the fields of knowledge. Never before has the demarcation between intellectual camps been so clearly defined. The meteoric rise of Einstein marks the beginning of this division in the modern kingdom of intellect. The history of civilization shows us that there is nothing exceptional in this condition of things. There were distinct schools of philosophy in ancient India and Greece. The Middle Ages tell the same story of intellectual diversity. In more recent times we find the schools of Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Kant, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Comte, Mill, Spencer, Darwin, Lotze, Nietzsche, Bergson and Haeckel.

Now the intellectual world is divided broadly into the Relativistic and

Anti-Relativistic schools. Einstein has served as a chemical reagent which has precipitated relativity from the present content of knowledge as a mass insoluble to the average man. Never before has the attention of the entire world been drawn to an intellectual system in so short a time. What are the reasons for this unprecedented occurrence? Does the theory of Einstein contain elements of unique value to the human race? These and many other questions come to us as we ponder over the almost miraculous and sudden advent of Einsteinism. No one will dispute the truth of the statement that, as far as the general public is concerned, the theory of Einstein has little or no value. The intricacies of its mathematics and the subtleties of its sophistries are beyond the average man.

How Einsteinism Was 'Put Over'

WE DO not deny that certain features of Einstein's theory cannot fail to fascinate the general public. The world's greatest masters of the art of appeal have, with infallible accuracy, provided sufficient potions from the 'world-of-make-believe' to excite the imagination and interest of even the most prosaic and matter-of-fact individual. Effective advertising when coupled with equally potent measures of suppression of all that might be inimical to the propaganda, together constitute a moving force capable of converting the world in a very brief time. By these doubtful means Einsteinism has conquered the world.

Were the Theory of Relativity sound, upright men must, nevertheless, protest against such questionable means of forcing its acceptance. Hidden forces, inimical to the frank and open discussion of alleged merits of this theory, have been at work in every civilized land.

I am in possession of letters from eminent European scientists describing the deplorable methods employed to hinder and, if possible, completely prevent an unbiased and free discussion of the problem of relativity. In addition to this evidence my own experience is proof conclusive that the known evil effects are not due to accidental causes, but arise from a well defined and strongly organized plan.

Scientific journals and societies in the United States have been loath to accept articles which even mildly criticized Einstein's theories. The advertisement of a book which contains a criticism of relativity, written by a well-known opponent of Einstein, was refused by a journal known for its vigorous publicity campaign in favor of Einsteinism. Two leading American journals, whose main alleged purpose is the unbiased presentation of both sides of every question, have until recently refrained from publishing any statements inimical and detrimental to the theory of relativity. The change of attitude is undoubtedly due to the potent fact that despite the attempted suppression of free discussion, the entire world is now fearlessly and openly challenging the foundations of Einsteinism. A reaction against relativity, of unprecedented proportions and intensity, has set in and Einstein now finds

himself on the defensive.

Discrimination Against Scientists

THE writer's article entitled 'Kinertia Versus Enstein' was rejected by a well-known eastern journal. The editor of this journal, after admitting that I had presented a strong case against Einstein, one that would cause something of a sensation, confided that after many misgivings, he, nevertheless, felt that he must return my article.

To draw certain inevitable inferences concerning the real reason for the rejection of the article was undoubtedly justifiable. It was then that THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT accepted the article for publication.

Many of our scientific societies have discriminated against comparatively unknown scientists. Their papers have been returned without even a hasty perusal, because the writers were not members of the inner controlling circle. This criticism is, moreover, true also in the case of many scientific journals. In certain instances material has been appropriated from the articles before being returned. No credit has, in these cases, been given to the original contributors. The sacred unwritten law that credit should always be freely given to a contributor for even the smallest addition made to our quota of knowledge has been entirely ignored in many cases. The writer does not desire to convey the impression that these corrupt practices are universal; on the contrary, the splendid standards of purity and integrity of some scientific societies and journals constitute ideals which all should emulate.

There is, at the present time, a distressful lack of co-operation between learned societies. This unsound condition inevitably retards intellectual progress. International intellectual co-operation is, as yet, entirely unknown. Many years are required to transmit, through the laborious machinery of scientific approval, results and discoveries made in one country to another isolated from the former by language and geographical location. No common clearing house exists in which the appraisal and valuation of theories may be expeditiously effected. Organized attempts at unification, co-ordination and standardization of systems of knowledge to expedite educational progress are entirely lacking. The general public must oftentimes wait many years before receiving even a small measure of benefit from valuable discoveries because of the absence of organized means of systematic dissemination of accurate knowledge in a simple and easily understood form.

Many of these unfortunate conditions and deficiencies have been emphasized by the arrival of the theory of relativity. The rapid advent of Einsteinism, however, has taught us the lesson that a theory can be speedily 'promoted' by systematic publicity, fortified by a campaign of suppression of honest criticism. There is a twofold aspect to the lesson taught:

First, a benevolent aspect, consisting in the exemplified truth that knowledge can be rapidly disseminated by systematic co-operation.

Second, a malevolent aspect, involving the imposition of unproved

hypotheses on the public by coercive means.

The intellectual world should benefit by both aspects of the lesson taught by the rise of relativity. The intellectual world must organize, sanely and safely, for co-operative derivation and dissemination of knowledge by dignified, simple, and accurate means. The world of intellect must protect itself from the evil effects of coercive effort in the 'promotion' of hypotheses.

The crucial question which now faces us may be briefly stated as follows: Can the errors and deficiencies of the *modus operandi* of the intellectual world, forcibly brought to our attention by the advent of Einsteinism, be eliminated and overcome? Have we the remedy at hand which will make impossible the recurrence of these unfortunate and lamentable conditions?

Would Keep World Informed

THE writer herewith presents for the serious consideration of the thinking world a brief outline of the purposes, scope and organization of The Academy of Nations, with the firm conviction that this instrument, when wielded co-operatively by the intellectual world, will transform the existing intellectual chaos into a cosmos of knowledge, advance the general status of education, protect the public against fallacious theories, disseminate knowledge of value to mankind, and enrich the world by the development of the common good.

Before a synopsis of this significant and important movement is presented, it is eminently fitting that a short statement be made concerning its origin.

Dr. Robert T. Browne, one of America's greatest thinkers, and author of the most profound work ever written on the hyperspace movement (*The Mystery of Space*) in a letter, May 9, 1921, to the writer, indicated that a renaissance in the field of education was not only necessary but inevitable at the present time. This conviction of Dr. Browne's was particularly gratifying to the writer because he had held the same view since that memorable day in 1919, when it became known here that Einstein's theory *seemed* to be confirmed by the results of the observations of the English Solar Expedition.

After some correspondence I submitted a plan for an international organization which met with the unqualified approval of Dr. Browne. At the request of the writer Dr. Browne proceeded to amplify the original outline of the plan with the result that an epoch-making document has been produced. The following excerpts from the original document will convey a brief idea of the causes, purposes and scope of the plan:

'The intellectual world is passing through a period of reconstruction. The entire body of knowledge is being reconstituted. New and radical developments are becoming manifest in science, philosophy, religion, and art; and these are approaching a synthesis hitherto undreamed of, being brought to this consummation by the advent of a movement of far-reaching

significance and importance.

‘A powerful creative spirit is at work in the world energizing and illumining the minds of men everywhere. The energies of humankind are seeking new and advanced avenues of expression, demanding freedom, certainty, security and the opportunity for the peaceful pursuit of the highest good.

‘In the mind of man a new consciousness is broadening; the foundations of a new race of superior men are being laid; the seeds of a higher and better civilization which may bless the nations of the earth are beginning to germinate. The development and fruition of these mighty factors in the advancement of mankind demand the earnest intellectual co-operation of strong men throughout the world to give direction and tendance to the new impulses, which as yet are without adequate determination and means of expression.

‘This new order in the world should not and must not be allowed to lose its regenerating power on account of the lack of intelligent co-operation and conscious direction and guidance. The stream of potent human energies must be harnessed and its power utilized for the enrichment of the common good.’

To meet ‘the urgency of the call for the accomplishment of these high purposes’ an international organization known as *The Academy of Nations* has been formed.

The principal purposes of this organization are:

1. Unification of national effort in the world of knowledge.
2. Discovery, investigation and dissemination of truth.
3. Classification, standardization, and evaluation of the data of science, philosophy, religion and art.
4. Dialectic treatment of data with the view of arriving at synthetic judgment thereon.
5. Publication of findings under the impress of The Academy of Nations.
6. Announcement at prescribed intervals of the status of knowledge in the four major branches, viz: science, philosophy, religion, art.

Note—This to be equivalent to the charting of the bounds of material knowledge.

7. Recognition and encouragement of individual effort amid contributions to the body of knowledge.

Will Seek Co-operation

UNDER the plan each national unit will publish a journal at suitable intervals. The most important of these contributions will appear in the journal of the academy, which will be published in the languages of all the nations represented. The Year Book of the Academy of Nations will contain announcement of the advance of knowledge (the knowledge status) for the current year of publication. It will be compiled by an international board composed of members elected by the nation units.

The results of this organized work will be made available to the general public, in simple form, through the medium of the public press and by other suitable means.

The Academy of Nations will function in the unification and co-ordination of systems of knowledge, thus procuring the development of synthesized body of knowledge as against the highly specialized conditions now existing. The methods, aims and programs of education will be standardized. Another important function of the academy will be the promotion of the co-operative commonwealth of man in which the wealth-producing energies, the civilizing energies and the energies inherent in the social heritage of humanity shall be co-ordinated and made to yield the maximum value for the welfare of all mankind. Moreover, the academy will promote the use of scientific knowledge as a guiding principle in every department of human endeavor and it will encourage and develop the application of the principles of scientific human engineering to the problems of humanity and to the shaping of its destiny. There will be instituted a world tribunal for the adjudication of controversies in matters connected with theories, philosophical systems, hypotheses, and so on. The academy will be a powerful instrumentality for effecting international solidarity and for the promotion of good will and accord among the nations of the world. It will function also as a supreme centralized authority for the conferring of honors, merits, prizes, degrees, and so on, for distinguished services and for contributions to the body of knowledge. Heretofore, there has been no world society or authority which could bestow academic honors or recognitions on individuals. Affiliations with governments and other national agencies will be established to advance the cause of knowledge and the execution of its programs.

Organization Meeting Is Held

THE above consists in the main of direct quotations, suitably rearranged, from the original classic document.

In this great academy intellectual freedom will be reborn. There will be no arbitrary exclusion of hypotheses, theories, views and beliefs. The academy will ever function as an open and free forum for the discussion of all the great problems of humanity.

One of the first duties to be assigned to the academy will be the adjudication and appraisal of the precise value and merit of the Theory of Relativity definitely to fix its 'knowledge status.'

The organization meeting of the College of Fellows of the Academy of Nations was held December 28 and 30, 1921, in Brooklyn. National institutes of the Academy of Nations are now being formed in Sweden, Germany, Switzerland, Czecho-Slovakia and Spain. Steps are being taken for the organization of institutes in Norway, Denmark, England, Holland, France and Italy. Within the ensuing year national institutes will be organized in

every civilized country of the world.

The field of the academy embraces every general and special class of knowledge and its interests will, therefore, be universal.”⁶⁵⁸

In the spring of 1922, Edouard Guillaume gave Einstein fair warning that he would debate him in Paris. Guillaume and others had published their findings that the special theory of relativity derives from a particular light sphere in a preferred frame of reference, and that in translational frames of reference this sphere becomes an ellipsoid.⁶⁵⁹ Jánossy and others have since published works which also favor Lorentz’ physical interpretation of light speed anisotropy in “moving” frames of reference, without relying solely upon the paradox of the twins.⁶⁶⁰

The Chicago Tribune reported on 31 March 1922,

**“EINSTEIN FACES
IN PARIS GRAVE
BLOW AT THEORY**

[Chicago Tribune Foreign News Service.]

BERNE, March 30.—Edmond Guillaume says he has discovered a fundamental error in the Einstein theory and is en route to Paris to attend the savant’s lecture and to challenge the relativity discoverer.

M. Guillaume hopes for a public debate in which he can use his ellipsoid to demonstrate Prof. Einstein’s error.

Former Premier Painleve, a celebrated mathematician, has reached the same conclusions as M. Guillaume, but through a different process. M. Guillaume is a cousin of Charles Albert Guillaume, a recent Nobel Prize winner.”

The Minneapolis Journal wrote on 9 April 1922,

**“DR. GUILLAUME’S PROOFS OF
EINSTEIN THEORY’S FALLACY
REVEALED TO THE JOURNAL**

Professor Reuterdahl of St. Thomas Makes Public
Correspondence With Swiss Savant Disclosing
Latter’s Weapons of Attack on Relativity

**BARES FACTS FOR WHICH SCIENTIFIC
WORLD NOW EAGERLY WAITS AT PARIS**

Simple Experience of Every Day Railroad Operation

Relied On to Show That Man Who Upset Accepted Laws of Nature Is All Wrong

With the scientific world awaiting Dr. Edmund Guillaume's appearance in Paris to challenge and attempt to destroy the very foundation of the Einstein theory of relativity, Professor Arvid Reuterdahl, dean of the department of engineering and architecture at the College of St. Thomas, Midway, last night revealed to The Journal the purported proof of the fallacy of 'Einsteinism' which Dr. Guillaume will use in his Paris attack.

Professor Reuterdahl all along has contended the Einstein theory was all wrong and is now preparing a book, 'Fallacies of Einstein.' When Einstein was in America Reuterdahl challenged him to a debate without avail. He has been in correspondence with Dr. Guillaume and has received from the noted Swiss scientist a special contribution for his book containing the very matter which Guillaume will use in his forthcoming Paris attack on relativity. Until Professor Reuterdahl disclosed Dr. Guillaume's proofs to The Journal last night, the St. Thomas dean was the only man in the United States who possessed the explanation that is expected by its advocate to knock the whole Einstein theory of relativity into a cocked hat when Professor Einstein is confronted with it at his forthcoming lecture in Paris.

According to a special cable dispatch published in The Journal March 31, Dr. Guillaume claims that the matter now in possession of Professor Reuterdahl and revealed to the public today, discloses a fundamental error in the Einstein theory. The cable dispatch stated that Dr. Guillaume hoped for a public debate with Einstein in which he would have a chance to hurl his proofs at the author of the relativity theory.

'The final death blow to Einsteinism is about to be delivered by the eminent Swiss physicist and mathematician. Dr. Edouard Guillaume when the scientists convene at Paris,' said Professor Reuterdahl last night. 'Dr. Guillaume in two letters written to me and dated July 25 and Aug. 13, 1921, pointed out a fundamental error in the mathematical speculations of Einstein which explodes the entire theory proving that relativity is the greatest scientific fiasco of all times. Dr. Guillaume shows that Einstein, in his first article entitled, 'Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Koeper,' which appeared in 1905 in Annalen der Physik, volume 17, commits 'the greatest scientific blunder of modern times.'

Swiss Savant's Proofs Revealed

'Einsteinism stands or falls upon the so-called postulate of the absolute velocity of light. Dr. Guillaume in a brilliant analysis, shows that this very postulate is destroyed by a fatal error in Einstein's mathematics.'

The following is a translation of Professor Guillaume's final summary communicated to Professor Reuterdahl:

'Einstein considers a luminous signal produced, for instance, on a track by means of an electric pocket lamp. A brief signal gives rise to a wave which moves through space and in all directions with a velocity of 300,000

kilometers per second. This wave forms at each moment a spherical surface, the ray of which increases with this velocity and the center of which is motionless. Let us inquire now how the wave appears to an observer carried along with the train. Let us apply the transformation of Lorentz. What is found? Einstein maintains that the wave appears also as a sphere with its center motionless as regards the train, and whose ray grows likewise with the velocity of 300,000 kilometers a second.

Simple Test Cited

“Die betrachtete Welle,” says Einstein in conclusion, ‘ist auch in bewegten System (Wagon) betrachte eine Kugelwelle von der Ausbreitungsgeschwindigkeit 300,000 km-sec.’ But if we look more closely we detect an error in the famous physicist’s calculation: the wave seen from the train is not a sphere, but rather an ellipsoid, and the famous principle of the absolute constancy of light vanishes! At the same time collapse all the paradoxes, and at last we are clear of this inextricable web and beyond the reach of the entangling challenges that Einstein has hurled at our good sense, free from what Americans have so well termed ‘Einsteinism.’”

‘Einstein has been challenged to meet Dr. Guillaume at Paris,’ said Professor Reuterdaahl last night. ‘The evidence presented by Dr. Guillaume is so conclusive that Einstein will hasten the death of the already dying theory of relativity by accepting the challenge. If Einstein uses the same caution that he exhibited when challenged by me he will again carefully avoid the issue by veiling himself in sphynx like silence.’”

On 22 April 1922, Edouard Guillaume complained to Arvid Reuterdaahl, in a letter which was reproduced in *The Minneapolis Journal*, which newspaper wrote on 14 May 1922,

“Guillaume, Barred in Move To Debate Einstein, Calls Meeting Political Reunion

Savant, in letter to Professor Reuterdaahl of St. Thomas, Says
Ideals of Science Were Treated With Ignominy in Paris

Failing in an attempt to force a public debate which they hoped would disclose fundamental errors in the Einstein theory of relativity, scientists in the antirelativity group will continue their fight on ‘Einsteinism,’ Professor Arvid Reuterdaahl of St. Thomas college said last night.

Dean of the department of engineering and architecture at St. Thomas, a prominent figure in the scientific world because of his research work, Professor Reuterdaahl has collaborated with Dr. Edouard Guillaume, Swiss savant, in disputing the theory which has brought fame to Einstein.

When Einstein visited the United States Professor Reuterdaahl challenged him to an open debate.

Guillaume Meets Einstein

In Paris recently Dr. Guillaume faced Dr. Einstein on a platform, before French scientists convened at the College of France. His appearance had been awaited eagerly by scientists throughout the world.

‘In a letter which I just have received,’ Professor Reuterdahl said, ‘Dr. Guillaume gives a vivid picture of the scene which ever will remain a blot on the fair escutcheon of science.

Dr. Guillaume had lectured only a few minutes when he was silenced peremptorily in order to give way to the illustrious man of the hour, Einstein, who dismissed the entire matter with the gesture of a conqueror.’

Floor Given to Einstein

‘I had hoped to be permitted quietly to present the results of my researches,’ reads the letter from Dr. Guillaume to Professor Reuterdahl. Unfortunately, I had barely lectured for five minutes when I was interrupted in order to give the floor to Einstein, who was forced to acknowledge the fact that an ellipsoid results from his own mathematics.

(Einstein’s theory is that a wave surface of light, traveling outward from any luminous body, such as an electric light, is a spherical surface. Dr. Guillaume and Professor Reuterdahl contend that this surface is ellipsoidal under certain conditions.)

‘Einstein dismissed the matter,’ the letter continues, ‘by saying that he was not interested. At this statement of Einstein’s the large audience present applauded vociferously. I then saw that it was absolutely impossible to carry on a scientific discussion under these conditions.

‘That, my dear Professor Reuterdahl, is the ignominious treatment which the high ideals of science receive at the present time.

Called Political Reunions

‘Scientific congresses of this kind are nothing more than political reunions. It is urgent that all honest men unite to fight against these deplorable methods, which can only lead to the death of science. You may say definitely in America that all discussion was prevented and made impossible by the fanatic attitude of the relativists.’

When Professor Reuterdahl revealed April 9, through *The Journal*, the points to be used by Dr. Guillaume in his Paris debate, he predicted that that attempt to force Einstein into an honest discussion of his own theory would prove a total failure.

Professor Reuterdahl now is preparing a book, ‘Fallacies of Einstein,’ to which Dr. Guillaume has made a contribution. Dr. Guillaume issued a public statement March 31, which was cabled to *The Journal*, in which he said a fundamental error had been found in the Einstein theory.”

Guillaume’s letter, which was also reproduced in *The New York Times*, Arvid Reuterdahl, “The Origin of Einsteinism”, (12 August 1923), Section 7, p. 8:

“I had hoped to be permitted quietly to present the results of my researches. Unfortunately, I had barely lectured for five minutes when I was interrupted

in order to give the floor to Einstein, who was forced to acknowledge that an ellipsoid results from his own mathematics. Einstein dismissed the matter by saying that he was not interested. At this statement of Einstein's the large audience present applauded vociferously. I then saw that it was absolutely impossible to carry on a scientific discussion under these conditions. That, my dear Professor Reuterdahl, is the ignominious treatment which the high ideals of science receive at the present time. Scientific congresses of this kind are nothing more than political reunions. It is urgent that all honest men unite to fight against these deplorable methods, which can only lead to the death of science. You may say definitely in America that all discussion was prevented and made impossible by the fanatic attitude of the relativists."⁶⁶¹

William Cardinal O'Connell, who had written a letter condemning anti-Semitism and who had signed John Spargo's protest against anti-Semitism,⁶⁶² accused Einstein and his clique of promoting atheism in a lecture the Cardinal had given. Cardinal O'Connell was quoted in the 12 April 1929 issue of the *Boston Evening American*,

"That there is in certain quarters such a heated defense of an unprovable, certainly unproved hypothesis, only again makes it doubly clear that what I said to the students was true—the claue is applauding noisily so as to drown honest criticism. But that has been from all accounts the Einstein method of answer to all who disagree with him."

Other such staged interruptions as happened to Guillaume took place in defense of the indefensible, in defense of Einstein and his metaphysical nonsense. For example, when Arvid Reuterdahl spoke at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, in March of 1926 about the Einstein swindle, the faculty there allegedly disrupted his lecture.⁶⁶³ The University's newspaper, *The Daily Cardinal*, reported,

"Not even a tithe of courtesy is being shown Prof. Reuterdahl [***] At the lecture Wednesday night instructors of the mathematics department interfered with the lecturer so that he was unable to finish his talk. [***] **Staff Tries To Stop Talk** [***] members of the instructional staff of the mathematical department tinkered with the water pressure apparatus which operates the projection screen [***] and made it impossible for the lecturer to continue [***] the members of the department also blinked the lights in the auditorium while the speaker was lecturing, putting the auditorium in darkness temporarily. This is said to have occurred three times."⁶⁶⁴

Johannes Stark alleged that Ernst Gehrcke was denied a full professorship in Germany, because he had argued against the theory of relativity,

"G e h r c k e ist der Kampf gegen die Relativitätstheorie übel bekommen; trotz seiner zahlreichen hervorragenden experimentellen Arbeiten wird er von Fakultäten nicht für ein physikalisches Ordinat vorgeschlagen."⁶⁶⁵

In 1882, Franz Mehring quoted a Jewish author who criticized Jews for, among other things, “the malicious gloating when veritable conspiracies deprived of their livelihoods people who were suspected of anti-Jewish feelings[.]”⁶⁶⁶ Einstein and his friends sought to stigmatize *any* criticism of him or of the theory of relativity as if it were “anti-Semitism” *per se*.⁶⁶⁷ They thereby threatened anyone who dared speak out with career infringement or the absolute inability to find work. Whether or not significant numbers of people interfered with the careers of persons suspected of anti-Jewish feelings for merely questioning Einstein or discussing the facts, the impression that they would exist and had a chilling effect on Einstein’s opposition in the debate over the merits of relativity theory and Einstein’s obvious plagiarism. This has been very detrimental to the progress of Physics.

Hugo Dingler’s allotted time to speak against the theory of relativity at the Bad Nauheim meeting was severely restricted. Ernst Mach wrote of his admiration for Dingler,

“I myself—seventy-four years old, and struck down by a grave malady—shall not cause any more revolutions. But I hope for important progress from a young mathematician, Dr. Hugo Dingler, who, judging from his publications, has proved that he has attained to a free and unprejudiced survey of *both* sides of science.”⁶⁶⁸

Gehrcke’s accusations that Einstein was a plagiarist were fully justified by the facts, and Dingler correctly pointed out several fatal flaws in the metaphysical formulation of the theory of relativity.⁶⁶⁹

Hubert Goenner wrote,

“[Gehrcke] blame[d] Einstein’s reply of 27 August [1920] for arousing political and racial instincts and deflecting public attention from the facts of relativity theory.”

Paul Weyland made the same charge, that Einstein’s defense of his theory and his claims of originality were so weak that he was forced to run away from Germany, and to change the subject to fabricated accusations of anti-Semitism. Arvid Reuterdaahl made a similar claim when the *Scientific American* raised the issue of anti-Semitism in the context of Reuterdaahl’s questioning of Einstein’s priority, while being forced to concede that Reuterdaahl was factually correct in his arguments.⁶⁷⁰ Reuterdaahl responded, stating on 18 June 1921, *inter alia*:

“IN AN article published in this journal, April 30, 1921, Professor Arvid Reuterdaahl presented definite evidence proving the similarity between the work of the unknown scientist ‘Kinertia’ and the much-advertised Einsteinian Theory of Relativity. The similarity is so pronounced that any fair-minded person at once must wonder if the alleged contributions of Dr. Einstein rest upon borrowed foundations. It is a fact that ‘Kinertia’s’ work antedates that of Einstein. It is difficult to prove a direct charge of plagiarism.

This is particularly true whenever the person involved is surrounded by a veritable host of protectors who refuse to permit an honest investigation.

Professor Reuterdahl's reply to his critics follows in part:

In the case of 'Kinertia' Versus Einstein the present writer did not state that Einstein is a plagiarist. To make such a bald statement one must have indisputable proofs. I did state and again repeat the statement: 'If Einstein was aware of 'Kinertia's' discovery then the appellation 'plagiarist,' bestowed upon him by his German professional colleagues, is eminently fitting. If, on the contrary, Einstein was unaware of this work, then he is, nevertheless, antedated by the work of 'Kinertia'. Einstein is at liberty to choose either horn of the dilemma.'

Referring to an editorial criticism in the *Scientific American* of May 14, Professor Reuterdahl continues: 'The *Scientific American* is particularly disturbed by my article entitled "'Kinertia' Versus Einstein.' On the cover of this issue the following question appeared in bold type 'Is Einstein a Plagiarist?' In reference to this question the *Scientific American* states: 'It will be at once understood that according to Professor Reuterdahl he is.' What I actually stated in my article has been again recorded above in order to refresh the memory of the editorial writer. After this perversion of truth a subtle atmosphere is created in order to link, by contrastive suggestion, both the present writer and THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT with the ambitions of the former Kaiser of Germany. A diversion is thereby adroitly produced which removes the reader's attention from the actual question in hand, that is, "'Kinertia' Versus Einstein,' to an entirely different issue. Moreover, another irrelevant issue is deftly imposed, that is, anti-Semitism.

The present writer emphatically denies and resents both insinuations created in this questionable manner. I am a loyal citizen of the United States. I was born in Sweden. I came to the United States when I was six and a half years of age. Furthermore, the allegation, also by innuendo, that my attack upon the theories of Einstein are due to anti-Semitic feeling, I brand as a gross misrepresentation.

The *Scientific American* editorial then becomes a plea for Professor Einstein's mathematical product. There seems to be urgent need to show that although Einstein has benefitted by 'ideas which have had a rather nebulous existence before him' nevertheless in the hands of this master craftsman they have been mathematically welded into a 'crowning achievement' which 'has never been approached or approximated in any way.'

Suppose, for the sake of argument, that we grant that this concession in no way affects the real issue which we may state in the form of a question: Has Einstein given proper credit to the creators of the 'nebulous ideas' which he used in constructing this supreme masterpiece of the human intellect? We are not aware that he has ever referred to their humble contributions to his stupendous structure. It seems that he has ruthlessly discarded the scaffolding which he used in building his edifice without paying for its use. Do we find the name of Dr. J. H. Ziegler mentioned in any of his writings? Is there any

reference to the contributions of ‘Kinertia’? Has he ever answered the charges made by Engineer Rudolph Mewes, Professors E. Gehrke and Paul Weyland that he appropriated a formula which appeared in a work published by the late Professor Gerber in the year, 1898? If perchance Professor Einstein should plead ignorance of these contributions at the time when he developed his mathematical analysis, then we demand that he publicly admit their previous existence and definite worth. It remains to be seen if Dr. Einstein will even condescend to comply with this eminently just demand. We trust that we may be permitted to state that what we have granted in the above, for the sake of argument, we do not admit as an actual fact. The writer is prepared to show that Einsteinism is a pernicious fallacy.”⁶⁷¹

Below is the article in *Scientific American*, which Reuterdaahl rejoined. The author of the *Scientific American* article dubbed the practice of standing up for ethical practices and giving due credit to those who deserve it, “picking the bones”. The author sought to characterize anyone who would assert their priority for ideas Einstein repeated without an attribution, as if a “vulture”. Whereas Reuterdaahl focused on the facts, the author of the *Scientific American* article launched a hand-waving personal attack against Reuterdaahl, *conceding that he was factually correct*, and mischaracterized the general theory of relativity as an exposition on the mechanism and cause of gravitation, which it is not. The author asserted that, “Nobody would claim that Einstein’s entire structure is novel[. . .]” However, that is exactly what Einstein did do by publishing papers completely devoid of references to the work of his predecessors. Daniel Kennefick wrote in his article, “Einstein Versus the *Physical Review*”, *Physics Today*, (September, 2005), pp. 43-48, at 46:

“Although it now bears Einstein and Rosen’s names, the solution for cylindrical gravitational waves had been previously published by the Austrian physicist Guido Beck in 1925. But Beck’s paper was completely unknown to relativists with the single exception of his student Peter Havas, who entered the field in the late 1950’s. In a 1926 paper by the English mathematicians O. R. Baldwin and George B. Jeffery, and in the referee’s report on Einstein’s paper, there was discussion of the fact that singularities in the metric coefficients are unavoidable when describing plane waves with infinite wavefronts. But although such a wave shows some distortion, in the words of the referee, ‘the field itself is flat’ at infinity.”⁹

Clearly, the referee’s familiarity with the literature exceeded Einstein’s, but then Einstein was notoriously lax in that regard. The published Einstein-Rosen paper contains no direct reference to any other paper whatsoever and only two other authors are even mentioned by name. In response to Infeld’s suggestion that he search the literature for previous work, Einstein laughed and said, ‘Oh yes. Do it by all means. Already I have sinned too often in this respect.’^{5”672}

The *Scientific American* of 14 May 1921 stated:

“The Anti-Einstein Campaign

THE intellectual world moves slowly in the matter of extending recognition to those who have consecrated their lives to the cause of reason. Mendel had been dead many years before the remarkable nature of his work was recognized. When we contrast Mendel’s case with that of Einstein we are forced to admit that the German physicist’s sensational rise is the most extraordinary in the history of science. Barnum, king of advertisers, could not have staged a more effective or expeditious advertising campaign.”

With so much of Professor Reuterdahl’s article in the *Dearborn Independent* we suppose anyone will agree. But this article is given its real place by the scare-head of the cover, which asks, in $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch letters, “IS EINSTEIN A PLAGIARIST?” It will be at once understood that according to Professor Reuterdahl he is. We expect this sort of thing from the anti-Semites of Germany, and from those of the former Kaiser’s loyal supporters who resent Dr. Einstein’s refusal to have anything to do with the celebrated Manifesto of the 93 Immortals. But from a reputable American source—even one celebrated for its anti-Semitism—we should look for something a little different.

It is not easy for a layman to form a just estimate of Einstein’s work. And whatever temptation to error is presented to him will be in the direction of underestimation. The phrase “relativity of motion” is not new. The Greeks had it, Newton had it, every popular explanation of Einstein starts by reminding us that this is something we have always known but chosen to ignore. It is easy to overlook that Einstein has taken this familiar notion, applied it with a rigor and a consistency and a generality which it has never before enjoyed, given it a significance and got results out of it which it had never before been dreamed lay in it.

Again with the problem of gravitation. We all know that Newton solved this problem empirically only. We all know that he said nothing about the causes or the mechanism of gravitation—for the excellent reason that he could learn nothing of these. We all know that since his time thousands of scientists have searched for the cause and the mechanism. We do not all know what is equally true, that many of these searchers have been led to propose slight modifications in Newton’s mathematical law—modifications which were in agreement with this or that observed fact.

All this makes it very easy to accuse Einstein of plagiarism. Not alone is everyone acquainted with classical relativity apt to judge the contents by the label on the container and assume that Einstein’s relativity is the same old stuff, but the claim may with some show of plausibility be made that any investigator of gravitation has anticipated Einstein. This claim gains color in the far-from-rare case that its beneficiary can be shown to have attained results which are included in Einstein’s, or to have supplied Einstein with some of his material. Nobody would claim that Einstein’s entire structure is

novel—the sum total of human knowledge is today too large to make it possible for a contribution like his to be made out of whole cloth.

Everyone who possesses enough mathematics to follow Einstein knows that he has made a very material original contribution—that he has formulated mathematically and as a concrete whole ideas which have had a rather nebulous existence before him, cementing the structure with ideas to which he has himself given birth. His crowning achievement is the precise mathematical formulation; this has never been approached or approximated in any way.

We can paraphrase Professor Reuter Dahl with some profit. Never in the history of science has anyone ever made an epoch-marking advance, but what the vultures have flocked about his trail, demanding credit for what he has done and claiming ownership of the work which he has put out. But never before has it been the case that the really big men of science have accepted an advance so promptly and so whole-heartedly, and left this business of picking the bones to the small fry whose names will be forgotten fifty years from now.”

In 1846, an author in the *Scientific American* had demonstrated an interest in Zionist affairs,

“THE ISRAELITES IN GERMANY are in great commotion. At Berlin and Frankfort two-thirds of them have separated from the synagogues, to form new societies, and it is thought that their example will be generally followed. The new school are supported by the government; they celebrate the Sabbath of the Christians, and worship with chaunts, the music of the organ, and sermons. Sir Moses Montefiore, backed by the Rothschilds, is about establishing a Jewish colony in Palestine, and has obtained an ukase from the Emperor Nicholas, authorising the emigration thither of ten thousand Russian Jews.”⁶⁷³

The maltreatment of anyone who disagreed with Einstein, pointed out his plagiarism or questioned the theory of relativity, reminds one of the fanatical and truly vicious abuse political Zionists inflicted upon anyone who dared disagree with them. Albert T. Clay documented the methods of the political Zionists in Palestine in 1921, in an article, “Political Zionism”, *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 127, Number 2, (February, 1921), pp. 268-279, at 276-277,

“The old resident Jews of Palestine certainly have other than religious grounds for their indifference toward the efforts of the Political Zionists. Last winter the Council of Jerusalem Jews appointed a commission of representative men holding leading positions, to visit parents who were sending their children to proscribed schools, in order to secure their withdrawal. Among these schools, which included those conducted by the convents and churches, some of which have existed in Jerusalem for a long

time, are the British High School for Girls, the English College for Boys, and the Jewish School for Girls. In the latter, conducted by Miss Landau, an educated English Jewess, all the teachers are Jewish; most of the teaching is in the English language. This school, which is financed by enlightened Jews of England, was denounced more severely than the others, because, not being in sympathy with the programme of the Political Zionists, Miss Landau refused to teach the Zionist curriculum. She was even informed that her school would be closed.

In a series of articles that appeared in *Doar Hayom*, the Hebrew daily paper, last December, it was stated that the parents who refused to comply with the requests of the Commission [of the Council of Jerusalem Jews] were to be boycotted, cast out from all intercourse with Jews, denied share in Zionist funds, and deprived of all custom for their shops and hotels. 'Anyone who refused, let him know that it is forbidden for him to be called by the name of Jew; and there is to be for him no portion or inheritance with his brethren.' They were given notice that they would 'be fought by all lawful means.' Their names were to be put 'upon a monument of shame, as a reproach forever, and their deeds writte unto the last generation.' 'If they are supported, their support will cease; if they are merchants, the finger of scorn will be pointed at them; if they are rabbis, they will be moved far from their office; they shall be put under the ban and persecuted, and all the people of the world shall know that there is no mercy in justice.'

A month later the results of this 'warfare' were reviewed. We were informed that some Jews had been influenced, 'but others—and the greater number, and those of the Orthodox,—those who fear God—having read the letters [signed by the head of its delegates and the Zionist Commission] became angry at the 'audacity' of the Council of Jerusalem Jews 'which mix themselves up in private affairs,' have torn the letter up, and that finished it.'

Then followed a long diatribe against these parents, boys, and girls, in which it was demanded that the blacklist of traitors to the people be sent to 'those who perform circumcision, who control the cemeteries and hospitals'; that an order go forth so that 'doctors will not visit their sick, that assistance when in need, if they are on the list of the American Relief Fund, will not be given to them.' 'Men will cry to them, 'Out of the way, unclean, unclean.' . . . They are in no sense Israelites.'

It is to be regretted that only these few paraphrases and quotations from the series of articles published can be presented here.

The work of the Councils Committee met with not a little success; pupils left schools, and teachers gave up their positions. Two instructors in the English College, whose fathers were rabbis, and a third, whose brother was a teacher in a Zionist school, resigned. Another refused to do so, and declared himself ready, in the interests of the Orthodox Jews, who were suffering under this tyranny, which they deplored, to give the fullest testimony to the authorities concerning this persecution. The administration, under Governor Bols, finally intervened, and at least no further public efforts to carry out

their programme were made.

If, in this early stage of the development of Political Zionism, even the Palestinian Religious Jews already find themselves under such a tyranny, what will happen if these men are allowed to have full control of the government? And what kind of treatment can the Christian and th Moslem expect in their efforts to educate their children, if the Political Zionists are allowed to develop their Jewish state to such a point that they can dispense with their mandatory and tell the British to clear out? When such things happen under British administration, what will take place if the Jewish State is ever realized, and such men are in full control?"

Prof. Arvid Reuterdaahl was quoted in *The St. Paul Daily News* on 8 May 1921,

*“Einstein’s Theory of Relativity
Upset by St. Paul Scientist Whose
New Book Charges Gross Errors*

World Has Gone Mad About Mythical Unrealities, Declares Prof.
Arvid Reuterdaahl, Dean of Engineering and Architecture at St.
Thomas College—Offers to Debate Question.

Editor’s Note.—The visit to the United States of Prof. Einstein has brought on a countrywide discussion of his theory of relativity. Not many persons know anything about relativity, but nevertheless, they are talking about it and Einstein. In St. Paul there is a man, Prof. Arvid Reuterdaahl, dean, department of engineering and architecture, St. Thomas college, who disputes the Einstein theory. He is writing a book now called ‘The Fallacies of Einstein.’ Prof. Reuterdaahl is a distinguished scientist, both in America and abroad. He is the author of various scientific works and a frequent contributor to magazines. At the request of The Daily News he has written the following article dealing with the Einstein theory of relativity.

* * *

**BY ARVID REUTERDAHL,
Dean, Department of Engineering and
Architecture,**

The College of St. Thomas.

AT THE present time we often hear this question asked:

‘What is the theory of relativity?’

Whenever the question is asked Einstein’s name is invariably mentioned.

To be exact this question should take the following form:

‘What Is Einsteinism?’

A complete answer would require a book of many pages.

However, we may answer the latter question briefly as follows:

Einsteinism is a mind-product produced by combining a few consistent concepts with numerous mythical unrealities into a mental world system with the hope it will correspond with the real physical universe.

‘SWEPT ENTIRE COUNTRY.’

We may say Einsteinism in the United States began with the publication of a dispatch cabled from Berlin Dec. 2, 1919, to the New York Times.

Like an enormous tidal wave Einsteinism then swept from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast.

Mr. Average Man soon began talking about the theory of relativity. Humorous publications gave versions of Einsteinism which for accuracy in presentation oftentimes surpassed the mathematical outbursts of over-enthusiastic savants.

Nowhere could one hear a dissenting voice.

EXPOSED LAST YEAR.

The first brief exposition of the fallacies of Einstein, published in the United States, appeared in my work, ‘Scientific Theism Versus Materialism: the Space-Time Potential.’ This book was published in the fall of 1920 by the Devin-Adair Co., New York. Sir Oliver Lodge a few months previously, however, had issued a warning against the too ready acceptance of Einsteinism.

His warning went unheeded and the great wave of Einsteinism rolled on unchecked. I found myself almost alone in the fight against the greatest and most pernicious scientific fallacy of modern times.

However, I was not entirely alone at this time in my battle against the great sophist of all times.

AIDED BY HEIDENREICH.

In fact, since the year 1914 my dear friend, Dr. E. Lee Heidenreich, the eminent engineer, mathematician and philosopher, had espoused my cause. With the clear vision of a seer, Dr. Heidenreich realized that the old science must give way before a broader cosmic theory based upon sound philosophic principles grounded in fact.

He courageously and fearlessly championed the cause of my Space-Time Potential. He was instrumental in arranging lectures for me at the Kansas state agricultural college and the University of Kansas.

The commendatory letters concerning these lectures which I received from Dr. A. A. Potter, then dean of the agricultural college, and Dr. H. E. Rice, Kansas state university, have been a source of great encouragement to me during my long and arduous fight for the recognition of a broader and more universally consistent view of the physical universe.

Dr. Heidenreich, being a descendant of the Vikings, gloried in the single combat.

Persistently and fearlessly he has championed my cause both in the

United States and in Norway.

When Einsteinism overran the world Dr. Heidenreich refused to accept its fallacious tenets and gave vigorous battle to this new intellectual Frankenstein.

In the early part of the year 1921 an able and fearless writer championed my cause in an article entitled 'Relativity or Interdependence.' This article has since been referred to, time and again, as a classic.

Its author, Rev. Prof. John T. Blankart, in no uncertain terms and with keen acumen points out the inherent inconsistencies in Einsteinism. He brings his masterly article to a close with the following statement:

'Einstein has stated, 'If any deduction from it (the theory of relativity) should prove untenable it must be given up. A modification of it seems impossible without destruction of the whole.'

MORE AID NECESSARY.

'If this article has indicated to the reader that by that statement Einstein has perhaps signed the death warrant of his theory of relativity, the writer shall feel that part of his purpose has been accomplished.'

This exceptionally meritorious contribution exercised a beneficent influence in limited circles. However, one could hardly expect that a lone volume and a single article, without proper publicity, could stem the onrush of the Einsteinistic heresy.

Now, however, the tide is turning. After I issued my challenge to Einstein to a written debate on the theory of relativity I have received letters from prominent scientists and thinkers who assure me they will do their utmost to help vanish this Goliath of skepticism. Prof. Einstein has insinuated that my attack on his theory of relativity is merely a form of anti-Semitic propaganda.

This insinuation is absolutely without foundation in fact.

REVERES BARUCH SPINOZA.

If the originator of the theory of relativity had been born in Sweden, my native land, I would have denounced the tenets of his theory with no less vigor. The fact that Dr. Einstein is of Jewish extraction is not the reason for my attack on his theory.

I desire that this be distinctly understood now and for all future time.

My challenge to Prof. Einstein is based upon purely intellectual grounds. I contend his theory is a monstrous and dangerous fallacy which leads to absolute skepticism. I have profound reverence for Baruch Spinoza, the great philosopher. Spinoza was a Jew.

Certain erroneous inferences and unjust insinuations have been made concerning the appearance of my article entitled 'Kinertia Versus Einstein' in the Dearborn Independent.

Before I submitted this article to the Dearborn Independent I sent it to a well-known eastern journal.

MANUSCRIPT RETURNED.

The editor of this journal finally returned my manuscript with a most courteously worded letter in which he expressed his regret that he could not

risk its publication, despite the fact he felt confident I had made out a particularly strong case against Einstein. In fact, he went so far as to state my article would create a sensation if published. Evidently it would have been unwise for this eastern journal to publish my article. The path of truth is beset with many thorns.

It grieves me to be forced into the admission that our scientific journals, while professing to be the free and untrammelled vehicles of truth for its own sake, generally manage by means of plausible excuses to permanently prevent the publication of contributions which do not conform with the intellectual welfare of the clique in control.

The journals which are free from this destructive influence are generally too timid to assert their own independence.

FREEDOM IN DAILY PRESS.

This latter class is composed of journals which depend upon the European scientists to put the stamp of approval or disapproval upon that which is new or disturbing. It would seem there is much more genuine freedom in the daily press.

The spirit of revolt against this czar of science is growing.

Many independent thinkers have joined the anti-Einsteinism ranks. I believe Einstein himself is now beginning to see the handwriting on the wall.

One may be permitted, not without considerable show of justice, to infer his persistent refusal to enter into any controversial discussion is an indication he tacitly admits the relativity bubble is practically ready to collapse.

The following quotation from a letter which I have recently received from Dr. Robert T. Browne, author of the truly great work, 'The Mystery of Space,' is indeed noteworthy:

'The gods of science have placed their imprimatur upon the theory of relativity and consequently it will be exceedingly difficult to break through the iron ring.

BROWNE PLEDGES AID.

'Primarily, however, I should think with you, as with me, the consideration of greatest importance is not so much with the incidentals of this movement itself. The theory of relativity is but a phase of that deeper and broader movement of mechanistic conceptualism against which you have argued so incontrovertibly in 'Scientific Theism.' The task, then, is not so much to combat the theory, as I see it, as it is to strike with might and main at the vitals, the fundamental premises of that erroneous, fragmentary and biased view which seeks to interpret the universe in terms of mechanistic concepts.'

Dr. Browne concludes his letter to me with the following assurance:

'Please be assured that should the opportunity come my way I shall be allied with you in the fight against this mathematical usurpation.'

COMPARED TO DRUG.

Dr. W. E. Glanville, the eminent astronomer of Baltimore, who is a

member of British, French and American astronomical societies, states:

‘The Einstein theory is like a newly discovered drug which is brought forth and acclaimed as a universal scientific panacea.’

Dr. Sydney T. Skidmore of Philadelphia writes:

‘It (Einsteinism) is shapen from non-Euclidean, otherwise called meta-geometry, and this consists entirely of mental constructions that are purely subjective and correspond to nothing in nature.’

‘Kinertia’ states: ‘Science wants more than agnosticism; it wants to know the absolute truth before accepting any such theory; even if D’Alembert’s ghost is dressed in Hamiltonian functions.’

QUOTES SWISS BOOK.

I have just received a complimentary copy of an exceptionally meritorious work written by Dr. Edouard Guillaume of the University of Lausanne, Switzerland. The title of this work is ‘La Theorie de la Relativite, Et Sa Signification.’

I quote the following from this work:

‘We have gradually come to substitute for Descarte’s rigid system of relation, systems of unheard of subtleness, to which Einstein has given the picturesque name of ‘mollusk systems.’ Our mathematical constructions become, as it were, devilfish which strive, while adapting themselves to fasten upon subtle natural manifestations.’

Note the keen rapier thrusts against Einsteinism by this famous scientific ‘maitre d’armes.’

WORK NEARS COMPLETION.

Dr. Guillaume has not been hoodwinked by the delicate sophism of Einstein.

My work entitled ‘The Fallacies of Einstein’ is now nearing completion.

In this work I have stripped Einsteinism of its mathematical adornment.

Without this mathematical camouflage Einsteinism is scarcely more than a mere devitalized skeleton whose Einsteinian skull is forever grinning at its Galileian toes.”

While it is true that *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* published broad criticisms of Jews, Reuterdahl’s article was not in any way anti-Semitic and an allegation of ethnic bias is not a racist attack, but is rather a defense against racism. Reuterdahl first sought to publish his article elsewhere and it was refused without stated grounds. Reuterdahl asserted that the circulation of Henry Ford’s paper was about 750,000 readers, which offered Reuterdahl the opportunity he had been denied elsewhere to bring his message to a wide audience. Jewish racists ought not to be allowed to censor out all open debate on issues they want suppressed and Reuterdahl had a right and an obligation to express his views wherever he could.

Frederick Drew Bond raised the issue of Reuterdahl’s publication of articles in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* in a polemic against Reuterdahl in *The New York Times* in 1923.⁶⁷⁴ Bond’s second and then current wife was first cousin of the racist Zionist blackmailer United States Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, who

was an ardent and politically influential Zionist with close connections to President Wilson and Chaim Weizmann, and who attained his seat in the Supreme Court by blackmailing President Woodrow Wilson. Bond, perhaps speaking from a guilty conscience, denied that his connection to Brandeis had anything to do with his attack on Reuter Dahl, in private correspondence with Reuter Dahl.⁶⁷⁵ However, it was Bond who raised the issue of his connection to Brandeis, which was not known to Reuter Dahl, and Bond's denial was made as an unsolicited confession. Brandeis had expressed an interest in promoting Einstein. The racist Zionist blackmailer United States Supreme Court Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis wrote in a letter dated 1 March 1921,

“You have doubtless heard that the Great Einstein is coming to America soon with Dr. Weizmann, our Zionist Chief. Palestine may need something more now than a new conception of the Universe or of several additional dimensions; but it is well to remind the Gentile world, when the wave of anti-Semitism is rising, that in the world of thought the conspicuous contributions are being made by Jews.”⁶⁷⁶

The series of letters exchanged in *The New York Times* began with a letter from Dr. Harris A. Houghton, M. D., of No. 97/100 Riverside Drive, New York City, dated 13 April 1923; which accused Einstein of publishing a “Newtonian Duplication”.⁶⁷⁷ Houghton was involved with U. S. Army Intelligence and had called the attention of the U. S. Government to the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* in 1918, informing President Wilson and his cabinet of an alleged plot by Zionists to overthrow the governments of the world and to destroy Christianity.⁶⁷⁸ Brandeis, who controlled Wilson, assured the U. S. Government that the document was a forgery.⁶⁷⁹ Houghton published the “Beckwith” English translation of the *Protocols* in 1920.⁶⁸⁰ Dr. Houghton also wrote to John Spargo, about Louis Marshall's letter to Max Senior of 26 September 1918, in an effort to convince Spargo that Marshall feared Zionists and believed Zionism was a part of a larger Jewish plot—which accusations Marshall denied.⁶⁸¹ Boris Brasol⁶⁸² may have been the one who brought the *Protocols* to U. S. Army Intelligence and convinced them of their authenticity, viz. Dr. Harris Houghton and Natalie De Bogory.⁶⁸³ Houghton wrote to Arvid Reuter Dahl on 15 July 1923.⁶⁸⁴

Here is Reuter Dahl's 30 April 1921 article, to which an author responded in the *Scientific American* with an obnoxious *ad hominem* attack,

“‘Kinertia’ Versus Einstein

By ARVID REUTERDAHL

Dean, Department of Engineering and Architecture.

The College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota

Citations That Raise Delicate Question

on Age of Theory of Relativity

THE intellectual world generally moves slowly in the matter of extending recognition to those who have consecrated their lives to the cause of reason. Mendel had been dead many years before the remarkable nature of his work was recognized. When we contrast Mendel's case with that of Einstein we are forced to admit that the German physicist's sensational rise is the most extraordinary in the history of science. Barnum, the king of advertisers, could not have staged a more effective and expeditious advertising campaign. Within the brief period of a few months, Einstein's name became known in every civilized country in the world. The Theory of Relativity afforded cartoonists material for humorous sketches, and the doctor and his doctrine became subjects for mirth and merriment.

After the first volcanic outburst of scientific approval and humorous recognition, rumblings of discontent were heard from Einstein's native land. A group of German scientists, in no uncertain terms, expressed their doubts concerning the precise value and originality of Einstein's theory. There were even those who boldly charged the author with deliberate plagiarism. In England Sir Oliver Lodge and a few other able men cautioned the world against a too hasty acceptance of the new doctrine of relativity. In the United States, however, Einstein's theory met with immediate and complete success. Even at the present time we rarely hear a dissenting voice. This is particularly strange for the reason that in the year 1914 a well-known American journal published a series of articles by an unknown investigator who discussed the very same problem which brought fame to Einstein. We refer to the eleven articles written by the unknown 'Kinertia,' which appeared in *Harper's Weekly* under the caption 'Do Bodies Fall?' If it is true that 'Kinertia' actually considered the Einsteinian problem in these essays, then the question of priority is inevitably raised and the unparalleled originality claimed for Einstein's work becomes a debatable matter. Indeed, the presentation of the very facts which raise these questions is the main purpose of this article. Since the matter of priority is involved, the introduction in this article of a brief chronological survey of the work of both Einstein and 'Kinertia' is of the utmost importance.

The most significant contributions of Albert Einstein have been published in *Annalen Der Physik*. His papers deal with the Special Theory of Relativity, Theory of the Brownian Movements, Inertia of Energy, the Quantum Law of the Emission and Absorption of Light, Theory of the Specific Heat of Solid Bodies, and the General Theory of Relativity. The year 1905 is considered, by most authorities on Einstein's work, as the birth-year of the Theory of Relativity. Careful search, however, has revealed a paper on this subject which was published in Berlin during the year 1904 in the journal *Sitzungsberichte*. That portion of Einstein's theory which deals with the phenomenon of gravitation is a later development. Einstein first gave his attention to the problem of gravitation in 1911, when he developed the Principle of Equivalence of gravitational and accelerative fields. Other phases of this subject were dealt with in papers which appeared in the years

1912 and 1913. A further elaboration, the joint work of Einstein and Marcel Grossman, appeared in 1914. The theory in its final and complete form was announced in the year 1915.

'Kinertia's' contribution deals principally with the problem of gravitation. The question of priority of 'Kinertia' over Einstein consequently involves the phenomenon of gravitation in particular. It must be admitted, however, that 'Kinertia' has also considered Einstein's earlier problem which involved the significance of motion in reference to an observer. Einstein distinguishes this earlier problem from his theory of gravitation by the separate designation, 'Special Theory of Relativity.' A brief historical summary of the work of 'Kinertia' is now in order.

Lord Kelvin first aroused 'Kinertia's' interest in the problem of gravitation. That was in the year 1866 when 'Kinertia' was a student under Lord Kelvin. 'Kinertia' even then did not agree with the Newtonian theory of force as presented by Lord Kelvin. Incidentally, we desire to call the reader's attention to the fact that Albert Einstein was born in 1879 in Ulm, Germany, thirteen years later. It is a curious coincidence that both 'Kinertia' and Einstein were engineers. During the period of time from 1877 to 1881, 'Kinertia' became convinced that *acceleration* was the basic cause of what we generally speak of as 'weight.' The reader is undoubtedly aware of the fact that *acceleration* plays the fundamental role in Einstein's theory of gravitation. 'Kinertia' corresponded with Kelvin, Tait, and Niven, of Cambridge, with the hope that he would be able to interest these men in his startling theory. This attempt met with little or no sympathy. Some years later, through an accident, 'Kinertia' was unfortunately deprived of his hearing. This misfortune forced him to abandon his engineering profession for a rancher's life in the state of California. This new occupation gave 'Kinertia' the requisite leisure to complete his investigations which resulted in confirming his supposition that *acceleration* was the great norm of the phenomenon of gravitation. His attempts, dating from the year 1899, to persuade our stubborn American scientists that the Newtonian theory of gravitation must be revised met with nothing but ridicule or indifference. To *Harper's Weekly* and its managing editor (1914), Mr. H. D. Wheeler, belongs the credit of having published 'Kinertia's' series of articles entitled, 'Do Bodies Fall?' The first article appeared in the issue of August 29, 1914, Vol. 59. The final article is dated November 7, 1914. From the preceding it is evident that 'Kinertia' derived his norm of gravitation before Einstein was born. The question of priority is therefore definitely and irrefutably established in favor of 'Kinertia' in the case of the General Theory of Relativity considered as a discussion of the problem of gravitation and acceleration.

We turn our attention now to the content of these two gravitational theories. We propose, by means of direct quotations from the works of these two men, to set forth their remarkable similarity. In the case of Einstein we shall quote from his recent book, 'Relativity' (Henry Holt and Company,

1920), and in 'Kinertia's' case our quotations will be from the *Harper's Weekly* articles.

The following comparative quotations show the striking similarity existing between Einstein and 'Kinertia' when they consider the relation between acceleration and gravitation, a similarity which extends not only to intent but affects even the very words.

Einstein.

'We imagine a large portion of empty space, so far removed from stars and other appreciable masses that we have before us approximately the conditions required by the fundamental law of Galilei.—As reference-body let us imagine a spacious chest resembling a room with an observer inside who is equipped with apparatus. Gravitation naturally does not exist for this observer. He must fasten himself with strings to the floor, otherwise the slightest impact against the floor will cause him to rise slowly toward the ceiling of the room.

'To the middle of the lid of the chest is fixed externally a hook with rope attached, and now a 'being' (what kind of a being is immaterial to us) begins pulling at this with a constant force. The chest together with the observer then begin to move 'upwards' with a uniformly accelerated motion. In course of time their velocity will reach unheard of values—provided that we are viewing all this from another reference-body which is not being pulled with a rope.

'But how does the man in the chest regard the process? The acceleration of the chest will be transmitted to him by the reaction of the floor of the chest. He must therefore take up this pressure by means of his legs if he does not wish to be laid out full length on the floor. He is then standing in the chest in exactly the same way as anyone stands in a room of a house on our earth. If he release a body which he previously had in his hand, the acceleration of the chest will no longer be transmitted to this body, and for this reason the body will approach the floor of the chest with an accelerated motion. The observer will further convince himself *that the acceleration of the body toward the floor of the chest is always of the same magnitude, whatever kind of body he may happen to use for the experiment.*'— ('*Relativity*,' pages 78 and 79.)

'Kinertia.'

'I set to work to find out by experiment whether bodies actually did fall with the acceleration which the force of attraction was said to produce. Years before that, when in England, where some of our coal mines had vertical shafts about 1,500 feet deep, I had studied the cause of weight by having the hoisting engine drop me down with the full acceleration for about 500 feet. Then, by retardation during the lowest 500 feet, I could experience increase of weight all over me so marked that my legs could hardly support me. That taught me that acceleration was the proximate cause of weight, but at the

time of these experiments I still thought the acceleration of the falling cage was really caused by the earth's attraction.' —('Do Bodies Fall?' *Harper's Weekly*, August 29, 1914, page 210). 'Weight is not a kinetic force because it cannot produce acceleration. *If a body were accelerated in proportion to its weight, then weight would be a force.*'—('Do Bodies Fall ?' *Harper's Weekly*, October 17, 1914, page 383).

It is noteworthy that the only real difference between these two citations is that Einstein derives his conclusions from an hypothetical case, whereas 'Kinertia' draws his conclusions from an actual experiment upon himself.

The interpreters of Einstein furnish us with further corroborative material which we submit as additional evidence in the case of 'Kinertia' versus Einstein. Professor A. S. Eddington's interpretation of Einstein's theory is authoritative. The following quotations are from his work, 'Space, Time and Gravitation' (Cambridge University Press, 1920). These quotations from Eddington's work also consider the equivalence of acceleration and gravitation.

Eddington.

'The nature of gravitation has seemed very mysterious, yet it is a remarkable fact that in a limited region it is possible to create an artificial field of force which imitates a natural gravitational field so exactly that, so far as experiments have yet gone, no one can tell the difference. Those who seek for an explanation of gravitation naturally aim to find a model which will reproduce its effects; *but no one before Einstein seems to have thought of finding the clue in these artificial fields, familiar as they are.*

'When a lift starts to move upward the occupants feel a characteristic sensation, which is actually identical with a sensation of increased weight.—In fact, the upward acceleration of the lift is in its mechanical effects exactly similar to an additional gravitational field superimposed on that normally present.'—('Space, Time and Gravitation,' page 64.)

On the eminent authority of Eddington we may therefore state with absolute certainty that Einstein found his clue to the nature of gravitation in the *artificial field* created by acceleration. Eddington's statement, however, that Einstein was the first scientist to think of this *clue* is evidently erroneous in view of the preceding quotations from the work of 'Kinertia.'

The remarkable similarity in thought of the following quotations pertaining to the relative effects produced by accelerated and uniform motion, is of high evidential interest.

Eddington.

'The observer in the accelerated lift travels upward in a straight line, say 1 foot in the first second, 4 feet in two seconds, 9 feet in three seconds, and so on. If we plot these points as x and t on a diagram we obtain a curved

track. Presently the speed of the lift becomes uniform and the track in the diagram becomes straight. So long as the track is curved (accelerated motion) a field of force is perceived; it disappears when the track becomes straight (uniform motion) .’—(‘Space, Time and Gravitation,’ page 66.)

‘Kinertia.’

‘The proof that matter can exist without weight depends on the first law of motion; because if a mass moves uniformly in a straight line in space, it cannot have weight. If weight is caused by the mutual attraction of matter, then a mass subject to attraction must move in a curve. If weight is caused by acceleration then it cannot follow Newton’s law and move with uniform velocity in a straight line.’—(‘Do Bodies Fall?’ *Harper’s Weekly*, October 10, 1914, page 350.)

The conclusions of Einstein and ‘Kinertia’ concerning the very existence of the force of gravitational attraction are identical in content. This is apparent from the following citations from an article by Professor Edwin B. Wilson, (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) and ‘Kinertia’s’ basic articles.

Wilson.

‘But just suppose that somebody tells us that the force of gravity is physically non-existing quite as much as the centrifugal or Coriolis force, and that the reason we think that gravity is real is essentially the same that leads the untutored mind to believe there is a physical force acting to move objects to one side when a train goes around a curve—namely, an unhappily ignorant view of Nature. This is what Einstein asserts.’ —(‘Space, Time and Gravitation,’ the *Scientific Monthly*, March, 1920, page 226.)

‘Kinertia.’

‘But now, since it can be proved that there is no such force in the universe as attraction and that the supposed fall of bodies toward the earth *by that force* is only an illusion of the senses, there will be new ground upon which theologians can meet the Laplace attractionists, and Haeckel and his materialists.’—(‘Do Bodies Fall?’ *Harper’s Weekly*, September 19, 1914, page 285.)

The preceding citations are sufficient to establish conclusively the fact that, in underlying essence, ‘Kinertia’s’ theory of gravitation is identical with Einstein’s. Both men find the crux of the problem in acceleration, and the development of both theories is based upon the very same experiment.

It will be particularly interesting to compare the conclusions of the two men concerning the nature of the path of the earth’s motion in space.

Eddington.

‘Consider, for example, two events in space-time, namely, the position of the earth at the present moment, and its position a hundred years ago. Call these events P^2 and P^1 . In the interim the earth (being undisturbed by impacts) has moved so as to take the longest possible track from P^1 to P^2 —or, if we prefer, so as to take the longest possible proper-time over the journey. In the weird geometry of the part of space-time through which it passes (a geometry which is no doubt associated in some way with our perception of the existence of a massive body, the sun) this longest track is a *spiral*—a circle in space drawn out into a spiral by continuous displacement in time. Any other course would have had a shorter interval-length.’—(‘Space, Time and Gravitation,’ page 72.)

Wilson.

‘Draw from the sun perpendicular to the plane of the earth’s orbit a line which shall represent the time-axis and disregard the third spatial dimension. Now for each kilometer that the earth moves around in its orbit, it must be considered to move in time by 10,000 kilometers. The path of the earth in space and time on this diagram is therefore a *helix* with an extremely steep pitch winding once a year about the cylinder standing in the earth’s orbit but advancing ten thousand billion kilometers while ‘circulating’ one billion kilometers.’—(‘Space, Time and Gravitation.’ *The Scientific Monthly*, March, 1920, page 227.)

‘Kinertia.’

‘The possible motion of the sun in space, as adrift with the planets, was anticipated by Newton; but the laws of motion prevented him from reaching the true *corkscrew* path of the planets in space as they revolve round the sun.’—(‘Do Bodies Fall?’ *Harper’s Weekly*, September 19, 1914, page 285.)

In this connection we submit as corroborative evidence of the highest import, the illustration of this *corkscrew* path of the earth and moon which was used to elucidate ‘Kinertia’s’ article in *Harper’s Weekly*, September 19, 1914, page 285.

This illustration, taken in conjunction with ‘Kinertia’s’ statement, quoted above, proves conclusively that the unknown ‘Kinertia’ derived the same type of path for the earth’s motion in space that Einstein claims as his original contribution.

We introduce the following final quotation in order definitely to fix the date of ‘Kinertia’s’ contribution:

‘Kinertia.’

‘This statement is concerning a discovery in natural science and the ordinary phenomena of daily life, which I discovered about fifteen years ago while engaged in carrying on some experiments to verify what I had

previously suspected to be the true physical cause of *Elasticity, Gravity, Weight and Energy*.’—(‘Do Bodies Fall?’ *Harper’s Weekly*, August 29, 1914, page 210.)

Since this article bears the date 1914, it is clear that the year 1899, fifteen years earlier, is the date which can safely be regarded as the birth-year of ‘Kinertia’s’ theory of gravitation. We have seen that Einstein’s first work on gravitation was done in the year 1911; consequently ‘Kinertia’ antedates Einstein by twelve years.

We rest the case of ‘Kinertia’ Versus Einstein on the evidence submitted in this article. If Einstein was aware of ‘Kinertia’s’ discovery then the appellation ‘plagiarist,’ bestowed upon him by his German professional colleagues, is eminently fitting. If, on the contrary, Einstein was unaware of this work, then he is, nevertheless, antedated by the work of ‘Kinertia.’ Einstein is at liberty to choose either horn of the dilemma.”⁶⁸⁵

On 12 February 1920, Einstein gave a speech at the University of Berlin. He allowed non-students to attend, in direct violation of the University’s rules. A similar situation had occurred a year earlier at the University of Zürich, where persons not entitled to attend Einstein’s lectures did attend, and those who had purchased tickets, but whose seats were taken by those without tickets, requested a refund.⁶⁸⁶ During his lecture in Berlin, Einstein called the student council the “dregs of humanity”. Einstein was met again and again with applause and left to general applause.⁶⁸⁷ The only disturbance of any kind was the reaction of the crowd of Eastern European Jews when Einstein spoke of cancelling future lectures should non-students not be permitted to attend, and returning their fees. Eastern European Jews created a series of disturbances,⁶⁸⁸ because they wanted to attend the lectures, which the rules would not allow them to attend. Eastern European Jews were noted for producing Zionists, prostitutes, Frankist revolutionaries and for their pronounced tribalism⁶⁸⁹—their appearance and actions identified them, as the *Deutsche Zeitung* noted,

“[The audience had] a predominantly Asiatic imprint. One saw distinguished matrons, young ladies of questionable quality, schoolboys with the sacred colors of Zion on the blazonry of the Jewish wandering club[.]”⁶⁹⁰

According to Einstein, and the newspaper *Berliner Tageblatt* (14 February 1920), and a petition signed by almost 300 students, nothing anti-Semitic was said or done at the meeting.⁶⁹¹ A young Jewish student, Hans Toby Cohn, wrote to Einstein to apologize for his and his fellow Jews actions, because they were too young to decipher yet whether to be,

“a Communist or a Monarchist, whether an atheist or a nationalistic Jew.”⁶⁹²

The uproar did not involve any anti-Semitic statements, but according to Cohn

did include such statements as, “‘Socialist’ and ‘money refund’ or ‘Are we still students?!’”⁶⁹³ which were made by young Jews. Despite these facts, numerous sources have misrepresented the events which took place and misrepresented the disorderly outbursts of Eastern European Jews, as if anti-Semitic attacks by German Gentiles. As with the Berlin Philharmonic affair, it was Einstein and his friends who made an issue of anti-Semitism, where it was not a legitimate issue. It was yet another example of their Jewish racism and Jewish tribalism. Recall that Einstein called the Student Council, the “refuse of humankind”.⁶⁹⁴

The newspaper *Vorwärts* published an article on 13 February 1920 and wrote of alleged “excesses of an anti-Semitic student mob” “Exzessen eines antisemitischen Studentenpöbels”.⁶⁹⁵ The newspaper *8-Uhr Abendblatt* wrote on 13 February 1920,

“Tumultszenen bei einer Einstein-Vorlesung.

Professor Einstein verzichtet auf weitere Vorlesungen an der Universität. —
Rückzahlung der Kollegien an die Studenten.

Bei der gestrigen Vorlesung des Universitätsprofessors Einstein über seine Relativitätstheorie an der Berliner Universität kam es zu unliebsamen Szenen, die eine Unterbrechung der Vorlesung bewirkten und Professor Einstein zwangen, die Studenten aufzufordern, sich die eingezahlten *Kollegiangelder zurückzahlen* zu lassen. Nach einer uns übermittelten Darstellung dieses Zwischenfalles wollte der Studentenausschuß es nicht zulassen, daß die Vorlesungen des Professors *Einstein* außer den immatrikulierten [*sic*] Studenten auch von *Richtstudenten* besucht werden. Als nun Professor Einstein die gestrige Vorlesung dazu benutzte, um an die Studentenschaft [*sic*] die Bitte zu richten, ihren Standpunkt zu verlassen, wurde dieses Ersuchen mit einem Tumult beantwortet, bei dem auch *Aeußerungen antisemitischen Charakters* fielen. Professor Einstein sah sich infolge dieses unqualifizierbaren Verhaltens der Studentenschaft gezwungen, die Vorlesung abubrechen und an seine studentische Zuhörerschaft die Aufforderung zu richten, sich die *Kollegiangelder zurückzahlen* [*sic*] zu lassen.

Eine Erklärung Professor Einsteins.

Auf unsere Anfrage teilte uns Herr Professor Einstein über den gestrigen Vorfall folgendes mit:

„Meine populär gehaltenen Vorträge über die Relativitätstheorie besuchten nicht nur Studenten, sondern auch viele andere Leute, die dazu eigentlich nicht berechtigt sind. Der Studentenausschuß erklärte deshalb, dies nicht länger zulassen zu wollen. Ich machte darauf aufmerksam, daß der große Saal für alle Platz habe, die zuhören wollen und daß es dadurch zu keinen Unzulänglichkeiten kommen müsse. Der Studentenausschuß hat sich damit jedoch nicht zufrieden gegeben, sondern sich in dieser Frage an den

Rektor gewandt. Der Rektor schrieb mir einen *Brief*, in dem er darauf hinwies, daß nach der bestehenden Vorschrift jene Leute nicht die Berechtigung haben, den Saal zu betreten. Dies ist *formellrichtig*. Ich habe mich jedoch auf den Standpunkt gestellt, daß es mir widerstrebe, ohne inneren Grund es Leuten unmöglich zu machen, weiter zu hören, und ich habe deswegen gestern, statt zu lesen, eine Besprechung mit meiner Zuhörerschaft veranstaltet, die jedoch zu einem bestimmten Ergebnis nicht führte. Ich habe mich daher veranlaßt gesehen, auf meine weiteren Vorlesungen zu verzichten und der Studentenschaft erklärt, sie könne ihre eingezahlten Kollegengelder sich zurückzahlen lassen. Ich habe aber nicht die Absicht, meine Vorlesungen überhaupt zu unterlassen, ich werde sie vielmehr in anderer Form wieder aufnehmen. In welchem Saal ist aber noch unbestimmt. Sollte es noch einmal zu solchen Szenen wie gestern kommen, dann höre ich überhaupt auf. Von einem *Skandal*, der sich gestern abgespielt haben soll, kann nicht die Rede sein, immerhin bewiesen manche Äußerungen, die fielen, eine gewisse animose Gesinnung mir gegenüber. *Antisemitische Äußerungen* als solche fielen nicht, doch konnte ihr *Unterton* so gedeutet werden.”

Eduard Meyer, Rector of the University of Berlin, was astonished by these reports of anti-Semitism, which he knew were utterly false. On 13 February 1920, Meyer wrote to the Ministry of Culture, stating, *inter alia*,

“Vorausschicken muß ich, daß ich zu meinem größten Erstaunen durch Herrn Seeberg erfuhr, daß behauptet wird, dabei habe der Antisemitismus eine Rolle gespielt und sei von Judentum u. ä. dei Rede gewesen. Demgegenüber muß ich erklären, daß das völlig unbegründet ist und ich gar nicht begreife, wie solche Behauptungen haben entstehen können. Das Gespräch, das ich gestern mit Herrn Kollegen Einstein über die Sache hatte, ist in der friedlichsten Weise ganz glatt verlaufen, und ebenso erklärt mir der offizielle Vertreter des studentischen Ausschusses, den ich darum befragt habe, daß in den Diskussionen in der gestrigen Vorlesung, an denen er selbst Anteil genommen hat, mit keinem Wort von Antisemitismus, Judentum usw. die Rede gewesen ist.”⁶⁶

In 1962, Peter Michelmores conveyed an even more alarming, though also purely fictional, account of the events at the University of Berlin, than had the Jewish newspapers,

“A group of black-shirted students broke up one of Einstein’s lectures at the University of Berlin. A blond youth screamed above the din, ‘I’m going to cut the throat of that dirty Jew.’”⁶⁷

This alarmist script, this Jewish canard, appeared many times and was attributed to many different events. Ernst Gehrcke recorded that the newspaper *Freiheit* changed

its story repeatedly after the events at the Berlin Philharmonic of 24 August 1920:

“[. . .]So sprach die *Freiheit*, das Parteiorgan EINSTEINS, am 26. August noch von «wissenschaftlichen Einwänden», am 27. August von der «auf ihre Urheber zurückfallenden, schimpflichen Art, in der der Kampf gegen Professor EINSTEIN und seine Relativitätstheorie geführt wird», am 31. August setzte sich das Blatt über gesellschaftliche und parlamentarische Formen der Berichterstattung hinweg, indem es «einen studentischen Rowdy» sagen läßt, er wolle dem «Saujud EINSTEIN an die Gurgel», und am 4. September: «Die ernsthafte exakte Wissenschaft ist also ein Geschäft, das mit Schiebergewinnen abschließt.»

Die Umschau, Volume 24, (1920), page 554, alleged that someone said,

“man sollte diesem Juden an die Gurgel fahren.”⁶⁹⁸

Vossische Zeitung reported on 29 August 1920, Morning Edition, Supplement 4, front page, that someone loudly stated,

“Diesem Saujuden müßte man eigentlich an die Gurgel springen.”⁶⁹⁹

Yet another account, again by interested pro-Einstein parties, in 1927, places the alleged incident at an unnamed “public meeting in the spring of 1919.”⁷⁰⁰

Johannes Riem, who was not bashful, wrote on 1 July 1921, in reference to Reuter dahl,

“Man geht gegen Einstein vor als den Goliath des Skeptizismus. Vorlesungen dagegen werden veranstaltet. In scharfsinniger Weise wird in einem viel gelesenen Buche „Relativität oder innere Abhängigkeit“ die Unhaltbarkeit der Relativitätstheorie nachgewiesen. Der Einwand Einsteins, dies sei nur eine besondere Form des Antisemitismus, wird sehr energisch zurückgewiesen, und mit der Anerkennung Spinozols beantwortet.”⁷⁰¹

Physicist Stjepan Mohorovičić declared that he was intimidated out of opposing Einstein’s myths and plagiarism, through fear of being labeled an anti-Semite and by anonymous threats. Johannes Jürgenson writes,

“Ein weiterer Punkt war, daß es Einstein, der selbst Jude war, geschickt verstand, seinen Gegnern Antisemitismus zu unterstellen: ‘Die erste Opposition der wissenschaftlichen Welt gegen die neuen Relativitätstheorien hat man einfach gebrochen, indem man sie als eine Folge des Antisemitismus dem breiten Publikum vorgestellt hat’ sagte Mohorovicic 1962. Auch er hatte in jener Zeit in Zagreb seine Kritik zurückgestellt, um nicht als Antisemit zu gelten.”⁷⁰²

Mohorovičić wrote in 1962 in the second volume of *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*,

“The initial opposition in the scientific world against the new theory of relativity was easily crushed by convincing the general public that it was a product of anti-Semitism, although no one could reliably make such an accusation against M. ABRAHAM, O. KRAUS, O. D. CHWOLSON, etc.! But it disgusts me to speak further of such things; those wanting to learn more about it can glean the facts from many sources, for example [269-270] through [316-317] and others.”

“Die erste Opposition in der wissenschaftlichen Welt gegen die neuen Relativitätstheorien hat man einfach gebrochen, indem man sie als eine Folge des Antisemitismus dem breiten Publikum vorgestellt hat, obwohl man dies sicher nicht einem M. ABRAHAM, O. KRAUS, O. D. CHWOLSON, etc. vorwerfen konnte! (usw.). Aber es ekelt mir, über solche Verhältnisse weiter zu sprechen; wer sich darüber unterrichten will, müßte vieles nachlesen, wie z. B. [269-270] bis [316-317] und manches andere.”⁷⁰³

Mohorovičić also stated that the “Relativity Syndicate” vehemently obstructed the publication of works which criticized the theory of relativity (your author has personally witnessed such corrupt practices):

“Eine vorzügliche und sehr scharfsinnige Kritik veröffentlichte G. v. GLEICH 1930, wo er alle seine diesbezüglichen Arbeiten gesammelt und geordnet hatte, obwohl das ‘Relativitätssyndikat’ mit allen Mitteln trachtete, das Erscheinen dieses Werkes zu verhindern. Nun es war sehr schwer die Kritik gänzlich zu unterdrücken, da man in der Wahl der Mittel nicht kleinlich war. Alle, für die Relativitätstheorie ungünstigen Arbeiten wurden einfach kurzerhand als unrichtig, fehlerhaft oder falsch bezeichnet oder als unwichtig (heutzutage ein sehr beliebtes Wort!) oder wenigstens als uninteressant verschwiegen. Von den Philosophen erhielten nur die Applaudierenden das Wort, den kritisch Gesinnten warf man ihre mathematischen Unkenntnisse vor; wer sich darüber unterrichten will, sollte die offenen Briefe des bekannten Philosophen O. KRAUS nachlesen¹⁰⁸), und doch haben die Philosophen die Grundlage der Rechnung, nicht aber die Rechnung selbst untersucht. Aber die Relativisten haben übersehen, daß die modernen Relativitätstheorien, ähnlich wie die moderne Musik, voll von Dissonanzen sind, (eine solche Musik entzückt den heutigen Snob außerordentlich und er kann nicht begreifen, daß es gebildete Leute gibt, welche die moderne Musik nicht ausstehen können, aber dafür muß man das Ohr und die richtige musikalische Erziehung haben!). O. KRAUS hat besonders den Umstand hervorgehoben (l. c. S. 96.), ‘daß jeder Quark, der für die Theorie zu sein scheint, von den Relativisten mit freundlicher Gebärde begrüßt wird... während eine ernste Kritik mißhandelt wird’¹⁰⁹).

Dies wirkte aber verhängnisvoll und diese modernen Theorien wurden größtenteils ein Tätigkeitsfeld pour ceux qui savent vivre... oder wie ein lachender Philosoph sagte ¹¹⁰): ‘...an Höfen ist Höflichkeit der Verstand und die Münze...’ ⁷⁰⁴

Mohorovičić stated in 1922 that he had received anonymous threats for opposing relativity theory,

“Viele wurden von der Behauptung geblendet, daß diese Theorie sich mit der Erfahrung in Übereinstimmung befinde (vgl. II, 4), was von den Anhängern der Einsteinschen Theorie sehr geschickt zu Propagandazwecken ausgenutzt wurde. Das letzte (nämlich diese gewissenlose Reklame) ist gerade auch die dunkelste Seite des erwähnten Kampfes, welcher nie in einer so scharfen Form ausgebrochen wäre, wenn nicht diese unglückliche und unerhörte Propaganda gewesen wäre, welche in der Geschichte fast aller Wissenschaften beispiellos ist [*Footnote deleted*]. Alles dies wird noch durch die Tatsache verschärft, daß Einstein und die Mehrzahl seiner ersten Anhänger Juden sind — (ich hätte keinen Grund, die Rasse Einsteins zu erwähnen, wenn nicht Einstein *selbst* so häufig betont hätte, daß er ein Jude sei) [*Footnote*: Einstein selbst sagt in dem Vorwort des Werkes von L. Fabre (Anmerk. 30) den Franzosen ausdrücklich, daß er nur in Deutschland geboren sei, sonst sei er ein Jude, Pazifist und Mitglied einer internationalen Verbindung.... Es ist nicht schwer zu raten, warum Einstein dies gerade den Franzosen gegenüber gesagt hat (mit eigener Unterschrift), aber lassen wir das, es ist dies nur Geschmacksache...; unsere Arbeit hier ist eine wissenschaftliche. Es ist traurig genug, daß ich gezwungen bin, dies hier zu erwähnen!] —, und da die letzteren fast die ganze Weltpresse in den Händen haben, so bereiteten sie für Einstein eine kolossale Reklame und haben fast jede Arbeit, welche gegen diese Theorie gerichtet wurde, zu unterdrücken gesucht. Zu diesem religiös-sozialen Moment kommt noch ein politisches Moment hinzu, worüber ich hier nicht zu reden wünsche. *Ich bin nur überzeugt, daß wir, die wir uns ziemlich weit von diesem Kampfe befinden, viel ruhiger und objektiver über diese neue Richtung urteilen können, und daß wir nicht sofort blind und kritiklos jede neue Richtung, welche zu uns aus dem Ausland gelangt, anzunehmen brauchen.* [*Footnote*: Leider sind diese »Methoden« des Streits auch zu uns gekommen. Mitglieder einer philosophischen Fakultät, die in ihrem fanatischem Abscheu gegen jede sachliche, kritische Stellungnahme zur Relativitätstheorie offenbar ganz vergessen hatten, daß die Wissenschaft eine *über* den Parteien stehende Sache ist, haben sich nicht gescheut, persönliche Gehässigkeit gegen mich als Kritiker der Relativitätstheorie an den Tag zu legen, wie ich mehrfach erfahren mußte. Einige Herren Relativisten haben mir *anonyme Drohbriefe* zugestellt und sich anderer, sonst in wissenschaftlichen Kreisen sehr ungewöhnlicher Mittel bedient. Es ist die höchste Zeit, mit solchen Methoden endlich aufzuhören!]⁷⁰⁵

Einstein, too, was attacked by lunatics—who made death threats and plots against him, but these were political attacks which were not directly related to the theory of relativity. In the spring of 1921, Rudolph Leibus offered a reward to anyone who murdered Einstein, Harden or Foerster. Theodor Wolff, editor of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, spread the false rumor that Einstein and he were targets of assassins after the murder of Walter Rathenau in 1922. This may have been a pretext to give Einstein an excuse to back away from his commitment with the League of Nations and the police denied Wolff's charges. *The New York Times* reported on the front page on 19 February 1923 that Prof. Herzen of Lausanne University told a meeting of the Brussels Engineering Association in a discussion on the theory of relativity that Einstein was on a death list. *The New York Times* reported on 1 February 1925 on page 13 that Marie Evgenievna Dickson was arrested after she showed up at the Einstein's home and frightened Mrs. Einstein. Dickson had been expelled from France for planning to murder the Soviet Ambassador Leonid Krassin. Years later, after the World Committee for Help for Victims of German Fascism, for which Einstein was a figurehead, published *The Brown Book of the Hitler Terror*,⁷⁰⁶ the rumor spread that the Nazis had put a bounty on Einstein's head.⁷⁰⁷

Ad hominem attack and smear campaigns were Einstein's preferred method of response to challenges to Einstein's priority and challenges to relativity theory, as even Einstein's advocates were forced to concede in 1931. Von Brunn, a defender of Einstein, wrote,

“Even individual fanatic scientific advocates of the Einsteinian theory seem to have finally abandoned their tactic of cutting off any discussion about it with the threat that every criticism, even the most moderate and scrupulous ones, must be discredited as an obvious effluence of stupidity and malice. But even if these monstrous products of the ‘Einstein frenzy’ [*Einstein-Taumel*] now belong to history and are thus eliminated from consideration, thoroughly respectable reasons for a certain discomfort with relativity theory still do remain[.]”⁷⁰⁸

This was published in a pro-Einstein “review” of *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein*, which anti-Einstein book stated,

“It is the aim of this publication to confront the terror of the Einsteinians with an overview of the quality and quantity of the opponents [of the theory of relativity] and opposing arguments.”⁷⁰⁹

Sadly, the *ad hominem* attacks against anyone who criticized Einstein or relativity theory were not relegated to history, despite Brunn's claims; and, ironically, one need only read his “review” of *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein* to see that the so-called “review” was itself an *ad hominem* attack against the authors. *One Hundred Authors Against Einstein* was a response to personal attacks from Einstein and his followers, and largely contained philosophical objections to relativity theory, some better than others.

Charles Lane Poor complained of severe censorship.

Einstein liked to smear his critics. Henri Bergson published a book, which was, according to Abraham Pais, not included in his collected works, and which was a negative critique of relativity theory titled *Duration and Simultaneity*. Pais wrote,

“In his presentation speech on December 10, 1922, Arrhenius said, ‘Most discussion [of Einstein’s oeuvre] centers on his theory of relativity. This pertains to epistemology and has therefore been the subject of lively debate in philosophical circles. It will be no secret that the famous philosopher Bergson in Paris has challenged this theory, while other philosophers have acclaimed it wholeheartedly’.

Bergson’s collected works appeared in 1970 [B3]. The editors did not include his book *Durée et Simultanéité: A Propos de la Théorie d’Einstein*. Einstein came to know, like, and respect Bergson. Of Bergson’s philosophy he used to say, ‘Gott verzeih ihm,’ God forgive him.”⁷¹⁰

In the 1965 English translation of Bergson’s book, *Duration and Simultaneity*, physicist Herbert Dingle wrote an introductory piece detailing the suppression of criticisms of relativity theory. Dingle warned of the dangers of the anti-rational state of awareness induced by Logical Positivism in its pseudo-relativistic adherents, with its celebration of the denial of physical reality, its solipsism, hypocrisy, numerology, and semantics; with the positivists’ acceptance of metaphysical fallacy as if fact.

Dingle asked us all to consider the fact that we place our lives in the hands of a class of scientists who see as their goal the denial of the physical world, as for them it is an illusion supplanted by numbers, and who corruptly pursue the unchecked promotion of their myths. Herbert Dingle, whose words were often suppressed, stated, *inter alia*,

“The facts must be faced. To a degree never previously attained, the material future of the world is in the hands of a small body of men, on whose not merely superficially apparent but absolute, intuitive (in Bergson’s sense of the word) integrity the fate of all depends, and that quality is lacking. Where there was once intellectual honesty they have now merely the idea that they possess it, the most insidious and the most dangerous of all usurpers; the substitution is shown by the fruits, which are displayed in unmistakable clarity in the facts described here. After years of effort I am forced to conclude that attempts with the scientific world to awaken it from its dogmatic slumber are in vain. I can only hope that some reader of these pages, whose sense of reality exceeds that of the mathematicians and physicists and who can command sufficient influence, might be able from the outside to enforce attention to the danger before it is too late.”⁷¹¹

Under the headline “When a scientist challenges dogma, he’s the one who gets mauled”, Scott LaFee wrote in the *The San Diego Union-Tribune* of 2 November 1994,

“But unfortunate things can still happen when a novel contention challenges the perceived or popular ‘truth.’ Instead of receiving an honest but critical evaluation, the new idea can be ridiculed or, worse, ignored, its creator punished professionally and personally.

‘I wouldn’t do it again,’ says Wallace Kantor, a retired local physicist who questioned Einstein’s Special Theory of Relativity in several scientific papers and a book. ‘Reaction to my work ranged from intense rage to contemptuous pity. It was career-damaging. It wasn’t worth it.’”⁷¹²

5 THE PROTOCOLS OF THE LEARNED ELDERS OF ZION

At the turn of century, Sergei Nilus, a Russian Orthodox theologian of good reputation, published a purported transcript of a Judeo-Masonic conspiracy to take over the world. It received little attention at the time, but when it was republished in 1917, and when numerous translations appeared after the First World War, Europeans and Americans realized that the events of the Russian Revolution and the World War fulfilled many of the plans laid out in the “Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion”, which was first published many years before these events began. This cast suspicion over the Jews of the world, who had long been the primary proponents of revolution and the leading warmongers around the globe.

“*The Times* has not as yet noticed this singular little book. Its diffusion is, however, increasing, and its reading is likely to perturb the thinking public. Never before have a race and a creed been accused of a more sinister conspiracy. We in this country, who live in good fellowship with numerous representatives of Jewry, may well ask that some authoritative criticism should deal with it, and either destroy the ugly ‘Semitic’ bogy or assign their proper place to the insidious allegations of this kind of literature.”—*THE LONDON TIMES*, 8 MAY 1920, PAGE 15

“For it is the day of the LORD’s vengeance, and the year of recompences for the controversy of Zion.”—*ISAIAH* 34:8

“A more bloodthirsty and vindictive race has never seen the light of day. They regard themselves as the Chosen of the Lord and believe they are destined to annihilate and torture all Gentiles. The first and foremost task they expect their Messiah to accomplish is that he shall murder and slay all human beings with his sword. From the very earliest days they have undertaken all in their power to practically demonstrate this to the Christians and have continued to do so whenever they could.”—MARTIN LUTHER⁷¹³

5.1 Introduction

We know that the Rothschilds intended for one of theirs to become the King of the Jews. According to Jewish mythology, this King would be the Messiah of the Jews and would own all the wealth of the world and rule over the entire world from Jerusalem. In order for this plan to work without divine intervention, it would require an organized plan.

Jews had been ardent students of politics and political psychology from their beginnings, and their religion is more political, than it is spiritual. The Rothschilds' plan for Messianic rule of the world must have included the incorporation of the ideas of political writers, statesmen, and political sycophants like Machievelli and Maurice Jolly. It would not be surprising to find such ideas discussed by the Rothschilds and their Zionist agents.

The Czar of Russia created a secret police force, in large part to counteract the Jewish revolutionaries, who sought to unseat him and destroy Russian society and mass murder the Russian people. This police force employed Jewish spies to watch over the meetings of Jewish leaders and listen in on the lectures Jewish subversives often gave in synagogues and on street corners. The Czar's police probably had a very good notion of what it was that the Rothschilds and their agents had planned for the world. It is possible that a copy of this plan fell into the hands of patriotic Russians. If the Czar's police forged *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, as many who dispute the authenticity of the *Protocols* claim, it would still not be likely that they entirely fabricated them through plagiarism. Given that the *Protocols* so closely anticipate the methods of the Jewish Bolsheviks and the Zionist Nazis, it appears that whoever wrote the *Protocols* had a very good knowledge of what the Rothschilds and their Zionist agents had planned for the world.

Christians tend to overlook the fact that the so-called "Jewish conspiracy" to take over the world did not appear for the first time in the allegedly forged *Protocols*, but is Judaism itself. Critics of the Jews did not fabricate the Jewish plans to take over the world, rob it of its wealth, destroy all other religions, rule the world in an autocracy headed by a Jewish King descended from David, and then exterminate the "unrighteous Jews" and the Goyim; which plans are plainly stated in the Old Testament,⁷¹⁴ the *Zohar*, the Talmud, and numerous other Jewish religious writings. Jews created these ancient plans and iterated them in the Hebrew Bible, the Talmud and in their Cabalistic writings. Christians see the Old Testament as the work of God, and whether the individual Christian believes these supposedly divine prophecies have already been fulfilled, or were transferred to Christians to be ultimately fulfilled as in the *Revelation*, or are yet to be fulfilled for the allegedly divine race of Jews—God's chosen people, the Christian has often been duped into becoming an agent of the Jewish plan to destroy humanity, a plan better known as "Judaism".

The *Protocols* were effective in revealing this plan, not because they differ substantially from Judaism—they do not, as is revealed by Michael Higger's book *The Jewish Utopia*⁷¹⁵ and by the Old Testament itself—rather, the *Protocols* effectively alerted Christians, because, like the Talmud and *Zohar*, they appeared after Christianity appeared and ridiculed the Christians, just as the Old Testament ridicules and advocates the genocide of the non-Jew. Judaism has remained consistent in its plans. Christians have accepted its myths, because they believe them to have been made Christian. The Christians' blindness to the Judaic plan for their demise is best unmasked by works the Christians do not view as divinely inspired—even if those works simply repeat the Judaic plan for world domination laid out in the Old Testament.

[5.2 The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion](#)

The following is an English translation of the *Protocols*, which translation was first published in 1920, in the book, *The Protocols and World Revolution Including a Translation and Analysis of the "Protocols of the Meetings of the Zionist Men of Wisdom"*, Small, Maynard & Co., Boston, (1920), pp. 11-73:

“Protocols of the Meetings of the Zionist Men of Wisdom

PROTOCOL NO. I

LET us put aside phraseology and discuss the inner meaning of every thought; by comparisons and deductions let us illuminate the situation. In this way I will describe our system, both from our own point of view and from that of the GOYS. [*Footnote: The GOYS—the Gentiles.*]

It must be remembered that people with base instincts are more numerous than those with noble ones; therefore, the best results in governing are achieved through violence and intimidation and not through academic discussion. Every man seeks power; every one would like to become a dictator if he possibly could; and rare indeed are those who would not sacrifice the common good in order to attain personal advantage.

What has restrained the wild beasts we call men?

What has influenced them heretofore?

In the early stages of social life they submitted to brute and blind force; afterwards—to the Law, which is the same force but disguised. I deduce from this that according to the laws of nature, right lies in might.

Political freedom is not a fact but an idea. One must know how to employ this idea when it becomes necessary to attract popular forces to one's party by mental allurements if it plans to crush the party in power. The task is made easier if the opponent himself has contradicted the idea of freedom, the so-called liberalism, and for the sake of the idea yields his power. It is precisely here that the triumph of our theory becomes apparent: the relinquished reins of power are, according to the laws of nature, immediately seized by a new hand because the blind force of the people cannot remain without a leader even for one day, and the new power merely replaces the old, weakened by liberalism.

In our day the *power of gold* has replaced liberal rulers. There was a time when faith ruled. The idea of freedom cannot be realized because no one knows how to make reasonable use of it. Give the people self-government for a short time and it will become corrupted. From that very moment strife begins and soon develops into social struggles, as a result of which states are set aflame and their authority is reduced to ashes.

Whether the state is exhausted by internal convulsions, or whether civil wars deliver it into the hands of external enemies, in either case it can be

regarded as hopelessly lost: it is in our power. The despotism of capital, which is entirely in our hands, holds out to it a straw which the state must grasp, although against its will, or otherwise fall into the abyss.

To him who, because of his liberal inclinations, would contend that arguments of this kind are immoral, I would propound the question: If a state has two enemies, and if against the external enemy it is permitted and it is not considered immoral to use all methods of warfare, and as a protective measure not to acquaint the enemy with the plans of attack, such as night attacks or attacks with superior forces, then why should the same methods be regarded as immoral when applied to a worse foe, a transgressor against social order and prosperity?

How can a sound and logical mind hope successfully to guide the masses by means of reasonable persuasion or by arguments if there is a possibility of contradiction, even though unreasonable, but which may appear more attractive to the superficially thinking masses? Guided entirely by shallow passions, superstitions, customs, traditions, and sentimental theories, the people in and of the mob become embroiled in party dissensions which prevent all possibility of an agreement, even though it be on a basis of perfectly sound reasoning. Every decision of the mob depends upon the accidental or prearranged majority, which, owing to its ignorance of political secrets, pronounces absurd decisions, thus introducing the seeds of anarchy into the government.

Politics have nothing ill common with morals. The ruler guided by morality is not a skilled politician, and consequently he is not firm on his throne. He who desires to rule must resort to cunning and hypocrisy. The great popular qualities—honesty and frankness—become vices in politics, as they dethrone more surely and more certainly than the most powerful enemy. These qualities must be the attributes of GOY countries ; but we by no means should be guided by them.

Our right lies in might. The word 'right' is an abstract idea, unsusceptible of proof. This word means nothing more than : Give me what I desire so that I may have evidence that I am stronger than you.

Where does right begin? Where does it end?

In a state with a poorly organized government and where the laws are insignificant, and the ruler has lost his dignity as the result of the accumulation of liberal rights, I find a new right, namely, the right of might to destroy all existing order and institutions, to lay hands on the law, to alter all institutions, and to become the ruler of those who have voluntarily, liberally renounced for our benefit the rights to their own power.

With the present instability of all authority our power will be more unassailable than any other, because it will be invisible until it is so well rooted that no cunning can undermine it.

From temporary evil to which we are now obliged to have recourse will emerge the good of an unshakable government, which will reinstate the orderly functioning of the mechanism of popular existence now interrupted

by liberalism. The end justifies the means. In laying our plans we must turn our attention not so much to the good and moral as to the necessary and useful. Before us lies a plan in which a strategic line is shown, from which we must not deviate on pain of risking the collapse of many centuries of work.

In working out an expedient plan of action it is necessary to take into consideration the meanness, vacillation, changeability of the mob, its inability to appreciate and respect the conditions of its own existence and of its own well-being. It is necessary to realize that the power of the masses is blind, unreasoning, and void of discrimination, prone to listen to right and left. The blind man cannot guide the blind without bringing them to the abyss; consequently, members of the crowd, upstarts from the people, even were they men of genius but incompetent in politics, cannot step forward as leaders of the mob without ruining the entire nation.

Only the person prepared from childhood to autocracy can understand the words which are formed by political letters.

The people left to themselves, that is to upstarts from among them, are ruined by party dissensions created by greed for power and honors, and by the disorders resulting therefrom. Is it possible for the masses of the people to direct the affairs of the state without rivalries, and without interjecting personal interests? Are they capable of protecting themselves against external enemies?—This is impossible, since a plan divided into as many parts as there are minds in a mob loses its unity, and consequently, becomes incomprehensible and unworkable.

Only an autocrat can outline great and clear plans which allocate in an orderly manner all the parts of the mechanism of the government machinery. From this it is concluded that the government which is the most efficient for the benefit of a country must be concentrated in the hands of one responsible person. Civilization cannot exist without absolute despotism, for government is carried on not by the masses, but by their leader, whoever he may be. A barbarous crowd shows its barbarism on every occasion. The moment the mob grasps liberty in its hands it is speedily changed to anarchy, which is in itself the height of barbarism.

Look at those beasts, steeped in alcohol, stupefied by wine, the unlimited use of which is granted by liberty. Surely you cannot allow our own people to come to this. The people of the GOYS are stupefied by spirituous liquors; their youth is driven insane through excessive study of the classics, and vice to which they have been instigated by our agents—tutors, valets, governesses—in rich houses, by clerks, and so forth, and by our women in the pleasure places of the GOYS. Among the latter I include the so-called ‘society women,’ their volunteer followers in vice and luxury.

Our motto is Power and Hypocrisy. Only power can conquer in politics, especially if it is concealed in talents which are necessary to statesmen. Violence must be the principle; hypocrisy and cunning the rule of those governments which do not wish to lay down their crowns at the feet of the

agents of some new power. This evil is the sole means of attaining the goal of good. For this reason we must not hesitate at bribery, fraud, and treason when these can help us to reach our end. In politics it is necessary to seize the property of others without hesitation if in so doing we attain submission and power.

Our government, following the line of peaceful conquest, has the right to substitute for the horrors of war less noticeable and more efficient executions, these being necessary to keep up terror, which induces blind submission. A just but inexorable strictness is the greatest factor of governmental power. We must follow a program of violence and hypocrisy, not only for the sake of profit, but also as a duty and for the sake of victory.

A doctrine based on calculation is as potent as the means employed by it. That is why not only by these very means, but by the severity of our doctrines, we shall triumph and shall enslave all governments under our super-government.

Even in olden times we shouted among the people the words ‘ Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity.’ These words have been repeated so many times since by unconscious parrots, which, flocking from all sides to the bait, have ruined the prosperity of the world and true individual freedom, formerly so well protected from the pressure of the mob. The would-be clever and intelligent GOYS did not discern the symbolism of the uttered words; did not notice the contradiction in the meaning and the connection between them; did not notice that there is no equality in nature; that there can be no liberty, since nature herself has established inequality of mind, character, and ability, as well as subjection to her laws. They did not reason that the power of the mob is blind; that the upstarts selected for government are just as blind in politics as is the mob itself, whereas the initiated man, even though a fool, is capable of ruling, while the uninitiated, although a genius, will understand nothing of politics. All this has been overlooked by the GOYS.

Meanwhile dynastic government has been based upon this, that the father passed to his son the knowledge of the course of political evolution, so that nobody except the members of the dynasty could possess this knowledge, and no one could disclose the secrets to the governed people. In the course of time the meaning of the dynastic transmission of the true is understanding of politics has been lost, thus contributing to the success of our cause.

In all parts of the world the words ‘ Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity’ have brought whole legions into our ranks through our blind agents, carrying our banners with delight. Meanwhile these words were worms which ruined the prosperity of the GOYS, everywhere destroying peace, quiet, and solidarity, undermining all the foundations of their states. You will see subsequently that this aided our triumph, *for it also gave us, among other things, the opportunity to grasp the trump card, the abolition of privileges; in other words, the very essence of the aristocracy of the GOYS, which was the only protection of peoples and countries against us.*

On the ruins of natural and hereditary aristocracy we built an aristocracy

of our intellectual class—the money aristocracy. We have established this new aristocracy on the qualification of wealth, which is dependent upon us, and also upon science, which is promoted by our wise men.

Our triumph was also made easier because, through our connections with people who were indispensable to us, we always played upon the most sensitive chords of the human mind, namely, greed, and the insatiable selfish desires of man. Each of these human weaknesses taken separately is capable of killing initiative and of placing the will of the people at the disposal of the buyer of their activities.

Abstract liberty offered the opportunity for convincing the masses that government is nothing but the manager representing the owner of the country, namely, the people, and that this manager can be discarded like a pair of worn-out gloves.

The fact that the representatives of the nation can be deposed, delivers them into our power and practically places their appointment in our hands.

PROTOCOL NO. II

IT is necessary for us that wars, whenever possible, should bring no territorial advantages: this will shift war to an economic basis and force nations to realize the strength of our predominance; such a situation will put both sides at the mercy of our million-eyed international agency, which will be unhampered by any frontiers. Then our international rights will do away with national rights, in a limited sense, and will rule the peoples in the same way as the civil power of each state regulates the relation of its subjects among themselves.

The administrators chosen by us from among the people in accordance with their capacity for servility will not be experienced in the art of government, and consequently they will easily become pawns in our game, in the hands of our scientists and wise counselors, specialists trained from early childhood for governing the world. As you are aware, these specialists have obtained the knowledge necessary for government from our political plans, from the study of history, and from the observation of every passing event. The GOYS are not guided by the practice of impartial historical observation, but by theoretical routine without any critical regard for its results. Therefore, we need give them no consideration. Until the time comes let them amuse themselves, or live in the hope of new amusements or in the memories of those past. Let that play the most important part for them which we have induced them to regard as the laws of science (theory). For this purpose, by means of our press, we increase their blind faith in these laws. Intelligent GOYS will boast of their knowledge, and verifying it logically they will put into practice all scientific information compiled by our agents for the purpose of educating their minds in the direction which we require.

Do not think that our assertions are without foundation: note the successes of Darwinism, Marxism, and Nietzscheism, engineered by us. The demoralizing effects of these doctrines upon the minds of the GOYS should be already obvious to us.

It is essential that we take into consideration the modern ideas, temperaments, and tendencies of peoples in order that no mistakes in politics and in guiding administrative affairs may be made. The triumph of our system, parts of whose mechanism must be adapted in accordance with the temperament of the peoples with whom we come in contact, cannot be realized unless its practical application is based upon a résumé of the past as related to the present.

There is one great force in the hands of modern states which arouses thought movements among the people. That is the press. The rôle of the press is to indicate necessary demands, to register complaints of the people, and to express and foment dissatisfaction. The triumph of free babbling is incarnated in the press; but governments were unable to profit by this power *and it has fallen into our hands.* Through it we have attained influence, while remaining in the background. Thanks to the press, we have gathered gold in our hands, although we had to take it front rivers of blood and tears.

But it cost us the sacrifice of many of our own people. Every sacrifice on our part is worth a thousand GOYS before God.

PROTOCOL NO. III

TO-DAY I can tell you that our goal is close at hand. Only a small distance remains, and the cycle of the *Symbolic Serpent*—the symbol of our people—will be complete. When this circle is completed, then all the European states will be enclosed in it as in strong claws.

The modern constitutional scales will soon tip over, for we have set them inaccurately, thus insuring an unsteady balance for the purpose of wearing out their holder. The GOYS thought it had been sufficiently strongly made and hoped that the scales would regain their equilibrium, but the holder—the ruler—is screened from the people by his representatives, who fritter away their time, carried away by their uncontrolled and irresponsible authority. Their power, moreover, has been built up on terrorism spread through the palaces. Unable to reach the hearts of their people, the rulers cannot unite with them to gain strength against the usurpers of power. The visible power of royalty and the blind power of the masses, *separated by us*, have both lost significance, for separated, they are as helpless as the blind man without a stick.

To induce the lovers of authority to abuse their power, we have placed all the forces in opposition to each other, having developed their liberal tendencies towards independence. We have excited different forms of initiative in that direction; we have armed all the parties; we have made authority the target of all ambitions. We have opened the arenas in different states, where revolts are now occurring, and disorders and bankruptcy will shortly appear everywhere.

Unrestrained babblers have converted parliamentary sessions and administrative meetings into oratorical contests. Daring journalists, impudent pamphleteers, make daily attacks on the administrative personnel. The abuse of power is definitely preparing the downfall of all institutions and

everything will be overturned by the blows of the infuriated mobs.

The people are shackled by poverty to heavy labor more surely than they were by slavery and serfdom. They could liberate themselves from those in one way or another, whereas they cannot free themselves from misery. We have included in constitutions rights which for the people are fictitious and are not actual rights. All the so-called 'rights of the people' can exist only in the abstract and can never be realized in practice. What difference does it make to the toiling proletarian, bent double by heavy toil, oppressed by his fate, that the babblers receive the right to talk, journalists the right to mix nonsense with reason in their writings, if the proletariat has no other gain from the constitution than the miserable crumbs which we throw from our table in return for his vote to elect our agents. Republican rights are bitter irony to the poor man, for the necessity of almost daily labor prevents him from using them, and at the same time deprives him of his guarantee of a permanent and certain livelihood by making him dependent upon strikes, organized either by his masters or by his comrades.

Under our guidance the people have exterminated aristocracy, which was their natural protector and guardian, for its own interests are inseparably connected with the well-being of the people. Now, however, with the destruction of this aristocracy the masses have fallen under the power of the profiteers and cunning upstarts, who have settled on the workers as a merciless burden.

We will present ourselves in the guise of saviors of the workers from this oppression when we suggest that they enter our army of Socialists, Anarchists, Communists, to whom we always extend our help, under the guise of the rule of brotherhood demanded by the human solidarity of our *social masonry*. The aristocracy which benefitted by the labor of the people by right was interested that the workers should be well fed, healthy, and strong.

We, on the contrary, are concerned in the opposite—in the degeneration of the GOYS. Our power lies in the chronic malnutrition and in the weakness of the worker, because through this he falls under our power and is unable to find either strength or energy to combat it.

Hunger gives to capital greater power over the worker than the legal authority of the sovereign ever gave to the aristocracy. Through misery and the resulting jealous hatred we manipulate the mob and crush those who stand in our way.

When the time comes for our universal ruler to be crowned, the same hands will sweep away everything which may be an obstacle in our way.

The GOYS are no longer accustomed to think without our scientific advice. Consequently, they do not see the imperative need of upholding that which we will sustain by all means when our kingdom is established, namely, the teaching in the schools of *the only true science, the first of all sciences—the science of the construction of human life, of social existence, which requires the division of labor and, consequently, the separation of*

people into classes and castes. It is necessary that all should know that *equality cannot exist, owing to the different nature of various kinds of work;* that there cannot be the same responsibility before the law in the case of an individual who by his actions compromises an entire caste and another who does not affect anything but his own honor.

The correct science of the social structure, to the secrets of which we do not admit the GOYS, would demonstrate to all that occupation and labor must be differentiated so as not to cause human suffering by the discrepancy between education and work. The study of this science will lead the masses to a voluntary submission to the authorities and to the governmental system organized by them. Whereas, under the present state of science, and due to the direction of our guidance therein, the people, in their ignorance, blindly believing the printed word, and owing to the misconceptions which have been fostered by us, feel a hatred towards all classes whom they consider superior to themselves, since they do not understand the importance of each caste.

This hatred will be still more accentuated by the *economic crisis*, which will stop financial transactions and all industrial life. Having organized a general economic crisis by all possible underhand means, and with the help of gold which is all in our hands, we will throw great crowds of workmen into the street, simultaneously, in all countries of Europe. These crowds will gladly shed the blood of those of whom they, in the simplicity of their ignorance, have been jealous since childhood and whose property they will then be able to loot.

They will not harm our people because we will know of the time of the attack and we will take measures to protect them.

We have persuaded others that progress will lead the GOYS into a realm of reason. Our despotism will be of such a nature that it will be in a position to pacify all revolts by wise restrictions and to eliminate liberalism from all institutions.

When the people saw that they obtained concessions and license in the name of liberty, they imagined that they were the masters, and rushed into power; but like every blind person, they encountered innumerable obstacles; *they rushed to seek a leader, with no thought of returning to the old one,* and laid power at our feet. Remember the French Revolution, which we have called 'great'; the secrets of its preparation are well known to us, for it was the work of our hands.

Since then we have carried the masses from one disappointment to another, so that they will renounce even us in favor of *a despot sovereign of Zionist blood, whom we are preparing for the world.*

At present, as an international force, we are invulnerable, because if we are attacked by one state we are supported by other states. The unlimited baseness of the GOY peoples, who grovel before force, who are pitiless towards weakness, who are merciless to misdemeanors and lenient to crimes, who are unwilling to tolerate the contradictions of a free social structure;

patient unto martyrdom in bearing with the violence of daring despotism—this is what helps our independence. They tolerate and permit such abuses from their modern premiers—dictators—for the least of which they would behead twenty kings.

How can such a phenomenon be explained, such an illogical conception on the part of the mass of the people towards events of seemingly the same nature? This phenomenon can be explained by the fact that these dictators through their agents whisper to their people that by these abuses they injure the states for a supreme purpose, namely, for the attainment of the happiness of the people, their universal fraternity, solidarity, and equality. Of course, they are not told that this unification will be achieved only under our rule. Thus, the people condemn the just and acquit the unjust, more and more convinced that they can do what they please. Owing to this, the people destroy all stability and create disorder on every occasion.

The word ‘Liberty’ brings all society into conflict with all authority, be it that of God or Nature. This is why, at the moment of our enthronement, we shall strike this word from the dictionary as being the symbol of brute power, which turns the masses into bloodthirsty beasts. It is true, however, that these beasts go to sleep as soon as they have drunk blood, and then it is easy to shackle them; but if the blood is not given to them they will not sleep and will struggle.

PROTOCOL NO. IV

EVERY republic passes through several states. The first stage is like the early period of insane ravings of a blind man throwing himself right and left. The second is the demagoguery which breeds anarchy, which inevitably leads to despotism, not of a legal and open character and, consequently, responsible, but an unseen and unknown despotism, no less effective because exercised by some secret organization, acting even less ceremoniously because it is hidden under the cover and behind the backs of different agents. The change of these agents will even help the secret organizations, as it will thus be able to rid itself of the necessity of spending money to reward employees of long terms of service.

Who and what can overthrow an unseen power? For such is the character of our power. *External Masonry* [Footnote: The reference is probably to those Masonic Lodges in Continental Europe which, contrary to the fundamental principles of Anglo-Saxon Lodges, have been converted into quasi political and anti-Christian organizations. See Encyclopedia Britannica, Eleventh Edition, Article ‘Freemasonry,’ Vol. XI, p. 84.] *acts as a screen for it and its aims, but the plan of action of this power, and its very headquarters, will always remain unknown to the people.*

Liberty could also be harmless and remain on the state program without detriment to the well-being of the people if it were to retain the ideas of the belief in God and human fraternity, free from the conception of equality for such a conception is in contradiction to the laws of nature which establish subordination. With such a faith the people would be governed by the

guardians of the parish and would thrive quietly and obediently under the guidance of their spiritual leader, accepting God's dispensation on earth. It is for this reason that we must undermine faith, tearing from the minds of the GOYS the very principal of God and Soul, and substituting mathematical formulas and material needs.

In order that the minds of the GOYS may have no time to think and notice things, it is necessary to divert them in the direction of industry and commerce. Thus all nations will seek their own profit, and while engaged in the struggle they will not notice their common enemy. But in order that liberty should finally undermine and ruin the GOY's society, it is necessary to put industry on a basis of speculation. The result of this will be that everything, absorbed by industry from the land, will not remain in the hands of the GOYS, but will be directed towards speculation; that is, it will come into our coffers.

The intense struggle for supremacy, the shocks to economic life, will create, moreover have already created, disappointed, cold, and heartless societies. These societies will have complete disgust for high politics and religion. Their only guide will be calculation, *i.e.*, gold, for which they will have a real cult because of the material delights which it can supply. It will be at that stage that the lower classes of the GOYS, not for the sake of doing good, nor even for the sake of wealth, but solely because of their hatred towards the privileged, will follow us against our competitors for power, the intelligent GOYS.

PROTOCOL NO. V

WHAT form of government can be given to societies in which bribery has penetrated everywhere, where riches are obtained only by clever tricks and semi-fraudulent means, where corruption reigns, where morality is sustained by punitive measures and strict laws and not by voluntary acceptance of moral principles, where cosmopolitan convictions have eliminated patriotic feelings and religion? What form of government can be given to such societies other than a despotism such as I shall describe?

We will create a strong centralized government, so as to gather the social forces into our power. We will mechanically regulate all the functions of political life of our subjects by new laws. These laws will gradually eliminate all the concessions and liberties permitted by the GOYS. Our kingdom will be crowned by such a majestic despotism that it will be able, at all times and in all places, to crush both antagonistic and discontented GOYS.

We may be told that the despotism outlined by me is inconsistent with modern progress, but I will prove to you that the contrary is the case.

At the time when people considered rulers as an incarnation of the will of God, they subjected themselves without murmur to the autocracy of the sovereigns; but as soon as we inspired them with the thought of their personal rights, they began to regard the rulers as ordinary mortals. The holy anointment fell from the heads of sovereigns in the opinion of the people; and when we deprived them of their belief in God, then authority was thrown

into the street, where it became public property and was seized by us. Moreover, the art of governing the masses and individuals by means of cunningly constructed theories and phraseology, by rulers of social life, and other devices not understood by the GOYS, belongs, among other faculties, to our administrative mind, which is educated in analysis and observation, and is also based upon skillful reasoning in which we have no competitors, just as we have none in the preparation of plans for political action and solidarity. Only the Jesuits could be compared to us in this; but we were able to discredit them in the mind of the senseless mob as a visible organization, whereas we, with our secret organization, remained in the dark. After all, is it not the same to the world who will be its master—whether it be the head of Catholicism or our despot of Zionist blood? To us, however, the Chosen People, it is by no means a matter of indifference.

Temporarily, a world coalition of the GOYS would be able to hold us in check, but we are insured against this by roots of dissension so deep among them that they cannot now be extracted. We have set at variance the personal and national interests of the GOYS: we have incited religious and race hatred, nurtured by us in their hearts for twenty centuries. Owing to all this, no state will obtain the help it asks for from any side because each of them will think that a coalition against us will be disadvantageous to it. We are too powerful—we *must be taken into consideration. No country can reach even an insignificant private understanding without our being secret parties to it.*

Per me reges regnant—‘Through me the sovereigns reign.’ The prophets have told us that we were chosen by God himself to reign over the world. God endowed us with genius to enable us to cope with the problem. Were there a genius in the opposing camp, he would struggle against us, but a newcomer is not equal to an old inhabitant. The struggle between us would be of such a merciless nature as the world has never seen before; moreover their genius would be too late.

All the wheels of government mechanism move by the action of the motor which is in our hands, and *that motor is gold*. The science of political economy, invented by our wise men, has long ago demonstrated the royal prestige of capital.

To attain freedom of action, capital must obtain freedom to monopolize industry and trade; this is already being done by an unseen hand in all parts of the world. Such liberty will give political power to traders, and will aid in subjugating the people. At present it is more important to disarm peoples than to lead them to war; it is more important to utilize flaming passions for our purposes than to extinguish them; more important to grasp and interpret the thoughts of others in our own way than to discard them.

The most important problem of our government is to weaken the popular mind by criticism; to disaccustom it to thought, which creates opposition; to deflect the power of thought into mere empty eloquence.

At all times both peoples and individuals have mistaken words for deeds, as they are satisfied with the visible, rarely noticing whether the promise is

performed in the fields of social life.

Therefore, we will organize ostensible institutions which will prove eloquently their good work in the direction of ‘progress.’

We will appropriate to ourselves the liberal aspect of all parties, of all shades of opinion, and we will provide our *orators with the same aspect, and they will talk so much that they will exhaust the people by their speeches and cause them to turn away from orators in disgust.*

To control public opinion it is necessary to perplex it by the expression of numerous contradictory opinions until the GOYS get lost in the labyrinth, and come to understand that it is best to have no opinion on political questions.

Such questions are not intended to be understood by the people, since only he who rules knows them. This is the first secret.

The second secret necessary for the success of governing consists in so multiplying popular failings, habits, passions, and conventional laws that no one will be able to disentangle himself in the chaos, and consequently, people will cease to understand each other. This measure would help us to sow dissension within all parties, to disintegrate all those collective forces which still do not wish to subjugate themselves to us; to discourage all individual initiative which might in any degree hamper our work.

There is nothing more dangerous than individual initiative; if it has a touch of genius it can accomplish more than a million people among whom we have sown dissensions. We must direct the education of the GOY societies so that their arms will drop hopelessly when they face every task where initiative is required. The intensity of action resulting from individual freedom of action dissipates its force when it encounters another person’s freedom. This results in heavy blows at morale, disappointments and failures.

We will so tire the GOYS by all this that we will force them to offer us an international power, which by its position will enable us conveniently to absorb, without destroying, all governmental forces of the world and thus to form a supergovernment. In lieu of modern rulers, we will place a monster which will be called the Super-Governmental Administration. Its hands will be stretched out like pincers in every direction so that this colossal organization cannot fail to conquer all the peoples.

PROTOCOL NO. VI

WE will soon begin to establish great monopolies—reservoirs of huge wealth, upon which even the large fortunes of the GOYS will depend to such an extent that they will be drowned, together with the governmental credits, on the day following the political catastrophe.

You economists, here present, will please carefully weigh the significance of this scheme! . . .

We must develop, by all means, the importance of our supergovernment by representing it as the protector and reward-giver of all those who willingly submit to us.

The aristocracy of the GOYS as a political force is dead. We do not need

to take it into consideration; but as landowners they are harmful to its because they can be independent in their resources of life. For this reason we must deprive them of their land at any cost.

To attain this object, the best method is to increase land taxes—the indebtedness of the land. These measures will keep land ownership in subjection.

The aristocracy of the GOYS, which as a matter of heredity is unable to be satisfied with small things, will soon be ruined.

At the same time it is necessary to patronize trade and industry vigorously, and more important, to encourage speculation, whose function is to act as a counterbalance to industry. Without speculation, industry will increase private capital and tend to the amelioration of land ownership by freeing it from indebtedness created by the loans granted by agricultural banks. It is necessary that industry should suck out of the land both labor and capital and through speculation deliver into our hands all the money of the world, thus throwing all the GOYS into the ranks of the proletarians. Then the GOYS will bow before us in order to obtain the mere right of existence.

To destroy GOY industry we will create among the GOYS as an aid to speculation the strong demand for boundless luxury which we have already developed.

Let its raise wages, which, however, will be of no benefit to the workers, for we will simultaneously cause the rise in prices of objects of first necessity under the pretext that this is due to the decadence of agriculture, and of the cattle industry.

We will also artfully and deeply undermine the sources of production by teaching the workmen anarchy and the use of alcohol, at the same time taking measures to expel all the intelligent GOYS from the land.

That the true situation should not be noticed by the GOYS until the proper time, we will mask it by a pretended desire to help the working classes and great economic principles, an active propaganda of which principles is being carried on through the dissemination of our economic theories.

PROTOCOL NO. VII

THE intensification of armament and the increase of the police force are essential to the realization of the abovementioned plans. It is necessary that there should be besides ourselves in all countries only the mass of the proletariat, a few millionaires devoted to us, policemen, and soldiers.

We must create unrest, dissensions, and hatred throughout Europe and through European affiliations, also on other continents. In this there is a twofold advantage: First, we will hold all countries under our influence, since they will realize that we have the power to create disorders or to restore order whenever we wish. All countries have come to regard us as a necessary burden. Second, we will entangle by intrigues all the threads stretched by us into all the governmental bodies by means of politics, economic treaties, or financial obligations. To attain these ends we will worm our way into parleys and negotiations, armed with cunning, but in so-called ‘official language’ we

will assume the opposite tactics of seeming honest and reasonable. In this way the peoples and the governments of the GOYS, taught by us to regard only the surface of that which we show them, will look upon us as benefactors and saviors of mankind.

We must be able to overcome all opposition by provoking a war by the neighbors of that country which dares to oppose us. Should, however, those neighbors, in their turn, decide to unite against us we must respond by a world war.

Chief success in politics lies in the secrecy of its undertakings. There must be inconsistency between the words and actions of diplomats.

We must influence the GOY governments to action beneficial to our broadly conceived plan, now approaching its triumphant goal, creating the impression that such action is demanded by public opinion which in reality is secretly organized by us with the help of the so-called 'great power,' namely, the press; the latter, however, with few exceptions that need not be considered, is already entirely in our hands.

In short, to sum up our system of shackling the GOY governments of Europe, we will show our power to one of them by assassination and terrorism, and should there be a possibility of all of them rising against us, we will answer them with American, Chinese, or Japanese guns.

PROTOCOL NO. VIII

WE must provide ourselves with the same arms our enemies can employ against us. We must seek the most subtle expressions and evasions of the legal dictionary to justify those cases in which we will be forced to announce decisions which may seem unnecessarily bold and unjust, for it is important that these decisions should be expressed in terms so forcible that they will appear as the highest moral rules of a legal character.

Our government must be surrounded by all the forces of civilization, in the midst of which it will have to function. It will surround itself with publicists, experienced lawyers, administrators, diplomats, and, finally, people educated along special lines in our special advanced schools.

These people will know all the secrets of social existence; they will know all languages composed of political letters and words; they will be familiar with the reverse side of human nature, with all its sensitive chords, upon which they must know how to play. These chords are the structure of the intellects of the GOYS, their tendencies, their failings, their vices, and their virtues, the peculiarities of classes and castes. It is evident that the highly talented members of our government, to which I refer, will be recruited not from the ranks of the GOYS, accustomed to performing their administrative duties without questioning their aim, and without thinking why they are necessary. The GOY administrators sign papers without reading them and work for profit or for pride.

We will surround our government by a whole world of economists. It is for this reason that economics is the chief science taught to the Jews. We will be surrounded by a crowd of bankers, traders, capitalists, *and most important*

of all, by millionaires, because in essence everything will be decided by a question of figures.

Meanwhile, as it is not yet safe to give the responsible government posts to our brother Jews, we will give them to people whose record and whose character are such that there is an abyss between them and the people; also to people for whom, in case of disobedience to our orders, there will remain nothing but condemnation or exile—thus forcing them to protect our interests to their last breath.

PROTOCOL NO. IX

IN applying our principles, turn your attention to the character of the people in whose countries you will be resident and among whom you will act, for a general similar application of them before the reëducation of a people according to our plan cannot be successful. But by advancing carefully in their application you will see that before ten years have passed the most obstinate character will have changed, and we can then count another people among those who already have submitted to us.

When we are enthroned we will substitute for the liberal words of our Masonic catchword, ‘Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity,’ another group of words expressing simply ideas, namely, ‘the right of Liberty, the duty of Equality, the ideal of Fraternity.’ Thus we will speak and. . . we shall have the goat by the horns. . . . *De facto*, we have already destroyed all governments except our own, although *de jure* there are still many left. At present, if any of the governments raises a protest against us, it is done only as a matter of form, and at our desire, and by our order, because *their anti-Semitism is necessary to enable us to control our smaller brothers*. I will not further explain this, as it has already been the object of numerous discussions.

In reality there are no obstacles before us. Our supergovernment exists under such extra-legal conditions that it is common to designate it by an energetic and strong word—a Dictatorship.

I can honestly state that at the present time we are lawmakers; we are the judges and inflict punishment; we execute and pardon; we, as the chief of all our armies, ride the leader’s horse. We rule by indomitable will because we hold in our hands the fragments of a once strong party now subject to us. We possess boundless ambition, burning greed for merciless revenge, and bitter hatred.

From us emanates an all-embracing terror. People of all opinions and of all doctrines are in our service; people who desire to restore monarchies, demagogues, socialists, communists, and other utopians. We have had to put all of them to work; every one of them is undermining the last remnant of authority, is trying to overthrow all existing order. All the governments have been tortured by this procedure; they beg for peace, and for the sake of peace are prepared to make any sacrifice, but we will not give them peace until they recognize our international super-government openly and with submission.

The masses have begun to demand the solution of the social problem by

means of an international agreement. *The division into parties has delivered all of them to us, because in order to conduct a party struggle money is required, and we have it all.*

We might fear the union of the intelligent power of the GOYS' rulers with the blind power of the masses, but we have taken all measures against such a possibility. Between the two powers we have raised a wall in the form of mutual terror; thus the blind power of the people continues to be our support, and we alone will act as its leader and, naturally, we will direct it towards our goal.

To prevent the hand of the blind from freeing itself from our guidance, we must from time to time keep in close touch with the masses, if not through personal contact then through our most devoted brethren. When we become a recognized power we will personally address the masses in open places, and we will expound political problems in the desired direction.

How verify what is taught in village schools? But whatever the representative of the government or the ruler himself states will be immediately known to the entire nation, for it will rapidly spread by the voice of the people.

In order not prematurely to destroy GOY institutions, we have touched them with our efficient hands and grasped the ends of the springs of their mechanism. Formerly these springs were in rigid but just order; we have changed it to liberal, disorderly, and arbitrary lawlessness.

We have affected legal procedure, electoral law, the press, personal freedom, and, most important, education, the cornerstone of free existence.

We have misled, corrupted, fooled, and demoralized the youth of the GOYS by education along principles and theories known by us to be false but which we ourselves have inspired.

Without changing substantially the existing law we have created stupendous results by distorting the laws through contradictory interpretations. These results first manifested themselves by the fact that interpretation has concealed the law itself, and thereafter has completely hidden it from the eyes of the governments by the impossibility of understanding such complicated jurisprudence.

Hence the theory of the court of conscience. [*Footnote: This probably means the practice which arose of not adhering to the letter of the law but of judging by conscience. In European countries jurors are not compelled to render their verdict pursuant to the technical provisions of law.*]

You may say that there will be an armed rising against us if our plans are discovered prematurely; but in anticipation of this we have such a terrorizing manoeuver in the West that even the bravest soul will shudder.

Underground passages will be established by that time in all capitals, from where they can be exploded, together with all their institutions and national documents.

TODAY I will begin by reiterating what has already been stated. *I beg you to remember that the government and the masses are satisfied with visible results in politics.* How can they examine the inner meaning of things when their representatives consider that pleasure is above everything? It is important to know one detail in our policy. It will help us in discussing division of authority, freedom of speech, of the press, of religion (faith), the right of assembly, equality before the law, inviolability of property and of the home, indirect taxes and the retrospective force of law. All such questions should never be directly and openly discussed before the masses. When it becomes necessary for us to discuss them, they should not be elaborated but merely mentioned, without going into details, pointing out that modern legal principles are being accepted by us. The significance of this reticence lies in the fact that a principle which has not been openly declared gives us freedom of action to exclude unnoticed one point or another, whereas if elaborated the principle becomes as good as established.

The people feel an especial love and admiration towards the political genius, and they always react to their acts of violence as follows:

‘Yes, of course it is villainy, but how clever!—It is a trick but cleverly done! So majestically! so impudently! . . .’

We count upon attracting all nations to the construction of the foundations of the new edifice which has been planned by us. It is for this reason that it is necessary for us first of all to acquire that spirit of daring, enterprise, and force which, through our agents, will enable us to overcome all obstacles in our path.

When we accomplish our coup d'état, we will say to the peoples: 'Everything went badly; all of you have suffered. We will abolish the cause of your sufferings, that is to say, nationalities, frontiers, and national currencies. Of course you are free to condemn us, but would your judgment be just if you were to pronounce it before giving a trial to what we will give you?' Thereafter they will exalt us with a sentiment of unanimous delight and hope. The voting system which we have used as a tool for our enthronement, and to which we have accustomed even the most humble members of humanity by organizing meetings and prearranged agreements, will have performed its last service and will make its last appearance in the expression of unanimous desire to become more closely acquainted with us before hazily pronounced a judgment.

To attain this we must force all to vote, without class discrimination, to establish the autocracy of the majority, which cannot be obtained from the intellectual classes alone. Through this method of accustoming every one to the idea of self determination, we will shatter the GOY family and its educational importance. We will not allow the formation of individual minds, because the mob, under our guidance, will prevent them from distinguishing themselves or even expressing themselves. The mob has become accustomed to listen only to us who pay it for obedience and attention. We will thus create such a blind power that it will be unable to move without the guidance

of our agents, sent by us to replace their leaders.

The masses will submit to this régime because they will know that their earnings, perquisites, and other benefits depend upon these leaders.

The plan of government must emanate already formed from one head, as it would be impossible to put it together if disintegration by many minds into small pieces is allowed. That is why we only are allowed to know the plan of action; but we must not discuss it in order not to affect its ingenuity, the correlation between its component parts, the practical force of the secret meaning of its every clause. Were such a plan to be submitted to and altered by frequent voting, it would reflect the stamp of the misconceptions of every one who has not penetrated its depth and the correlation of its aims. For this reason our plans must be strongly and clearly conceived. Consequently, the inspired work of our leader must not be thrown to the mercy of the mob or even of a limited group.

These plans will not immediately upset contemporary institutions. They will only alter their organization, and consequently the entire combination of their development, which will thus be directed according to the plans laid down by us.

More or less the same institutions exist in different countries under different names, such as representative bodies, ministries, senate, state council, legislative and executive bodies. It is not necessary for me to explain to you the connecting mechanism of these different institutions, as it is well known to you. I only call to your attention that every one of the aforesaid institutions fulfills some important governmental function, and, moreover, I beg you to notice that the word ‘important’ refers not to the institution but to the function. Consequently, it is not the institutions that are important but their functions. Such institutions have divided among themselves all the functions of government, namely, administrative, legislative, and executive powers; therefore, their functions in the state organism have become similar to those in a human body. If one part of the governmental machine is injured, the state itself falls ill, in the same way as the human body, and then it dies.

When we injected the poison of liberalism into the state organism, its entire political complexion changed; the states became infected with a mortal disease, namely, the decomposition of the blood. It is only necessary to await the end of their agony.

Constitutional governments were born of liberalism, which replaced the autocracy that was the salvation of the GOYS, for the constitution, as you well know, is nothing more than a school for dispute, discussion, disagreement, fruitless party agitation, dissension, party tendencies—in other words, a school for everything which weakens the efficiency of government. The platform no less than the press condemned the authorities to inaction and impotency and thereby rendered them useless and superfluous, for which reason they were overthrown in many countries. The rise of the republican era then became possible, and then we substituted for the ruler a caricature of government—a president chosen from the mob, from among our creatures,

our slaves. This was the kind of mine we laid under the GOYS, or, more correctly, under the GOY nations.

In the near future we will make the president a responsible officer, whereupon we will no longer stand on ceremony in carrying out the things for which our dummy will be responsible. What difference does it make to us that the ranks of those aiming at authority will thin out, that confusion will result from inability to find presidents, confusion which will definitely disorganize the country?

To accomplish our plan, we will engineer the election of presidents whose past record contains some hidden scandal, some 'Panama'—then they will be faithful executors of our orders from fear of exposure, and from the natural desire of every man who has reached authority to retain the privileges, advantages, and dignity connected with the position of president. The Chamber of Deputies will elect, protect, and screen presidents, but we will deprive it of the right of initiating laws or of amending them, for this right will be granted by us to the responsible president, a puppet in our hands. Of course then the power of the president will become the target of numerous attacks, but we will give him the means of self-protection by giving him the right of directly applying to the people, for their decision, over the heads of their representatives. In other words, he will turn to the same blind slave—to the majority of the mob. Moreover, we will empower the president to proclaim martial law. We will justify this prerogative under the pretext that the president, as chief of the national army, must control it in order to protect the new republican constitution, which he, as a responsible representative of this constitution, is bound to defend.

It is obvious that under such conditions the keys to the shrine will be in our hands, and nobody except ourselves will be able to guide the legislative power.

We will also take away from the Chamber, with the introduction of the new republican constitution, the right of interpellation in regard to governmental measures, under the pretext that political secrets must be preserved. With the aid of this new constitution we will reduce the number of representatives to the minimum, thus also reducing to the same extent political passions and passion for politics. If, in spite of this, those remaining are recalcitrant, we will abolish them completely by appealing to the majority of the people.

The appointment of the president and vice presidents of the Chamber and Senate will be the prerogative of the president. Instead of continuous parliamentary sessions, we will shorten them to a few months. Moreover, the president, as chief executive, will have the right to convene or dissolve parliament, and in the case of dissolution, defer the appointment of a new parliament. But to prevent the president from being held responsible before our plans are matured for the results of all these essentially illegal actions inaugurated by us, we will give the ministers and other high administrative officials surrounding the president the idea of circumventing his orders by

issuing instructions of their own. Consequently, they will be made responsible instead of him. We recommend that the execution of this plan be given especially to the Senate, State Council, or Council of Ministers, and not to individuals. Under our guidance the president will interpret in ambiguous ways such existing laws as it is possible so to interpret. Moreover, he will annul them when the need is pointed out to him by us: he will also have the right to propose temporary laws and even modifications in the constitutional work of government, alleging as the motive for so doing the exigencies of the welfare of the country.

By such measures we will be able to destroy gradually, step by step, everything that, upon entering into our rights, we were obliged to introduce into government constitutions as a transition to the imperceptible abolition of all constitutions, when the time comes to convert all government into *our autocracy*.

The recognition of our autocrat may come even before the abolition of the constitution; the moment for this recognition will come when the people, tormented by dissension and the incompetency of their rulers, incited by us, will exclaim: Depose them, and give us one universal sovereign who will unite us and abolish the causes of dissension—national frontiers, religion, state indebtedness—and who will give us the peace and quiet which we cannot find with our rulers and representatives.

But you know well that to render such a universal expression of desire possible, it is necessary continuously to disturb the relationship between the people and the government in all countries, and so to exhaust everybody by the dissension, hostility, struggle, hatred, and even martyrdom, hunger, inoculation of diseases, and misery, as to make the GOYS see no other solution than an appeal to our money and complete rule.

Should we give the people a rest, however, the longed for moment will probably never arrive.

PROTOCOL NO. XI

THE Council of State will tend to accentuate the power of the ruler; in the capacity of an ostensible legislative body, it will act as a committee for the drawing up of laws and statutes on behalf of the ruler.

The following is the program of the new constitution which we are preparing. We will make laws and control the courts in the following manner:

1. By suggestions to the legislative body.
2. By means of orders issued by the president as general statutes, decrees of the Senate, and decisions of the Council of State, as regulations passed by the ministries.
3. And when the opportune moment arrives—in the form of a *coup d'état*.

Having thus roughly outlined the *modus agendi*, we will now take up in detail those measures by which we will complete the development of the governmental mechanism in the above direction. By these measures, I mean

the freedom of the press, the right of assembly, religious freedom, electoral rights, and many other things which must disappear from the human repertoire, or must be fundamentally altered on the day following the declaration of the new constitution. It is only at this moment that it will become possible for us to announce all our decrees, for at any time in the future every perceptible change would be dangerous, and this for the following reasons: If these changes should be introduced and rigidly enforced, it might cause despair by creating the fear of further changes in a similar direction; if, however, they are made with a tendency to subsequent leniency, then it might be said that we have recognized our mistakes, which would undermine the faith in the infallibility of the new authority; it might also be said that we were frightened, and that we were forced to make concessions for which nobody would be thankful since they would be considered as legitimately due.

Any of these impressions would be detrimental to the prestige of the new constitution. It is necessary for us that, from the first moment of its proclamation, when the people are still dumbfounded by the accomplished revolution and are in a state of terror and surprise, they should realize we are so strong, so invulnerable, and so mighty that we shall in no case pay attention to them, and not only will we ignore their opinions and desires, but be ready to and capable of suppressing at any moment or place any sign of opposition with indisputable authority. We shall want the people to realize, that we have taken at once everything we wanted, and that we shall under no circumstances share our power with them. Then they will close their eyes to everything out of fear and will await further developments.

The GOYS are like a flock of sheep—we are wolves.

Do you know what happens to sheep when wolves get into the fold?

They will also close their eyes to everything because we will promise to return to them all their liberties after the enemies of peace have been subjugated and all the parties pacified.

Is it necessary to say how long they would have to wait for the return of their liberties?

Why have we conceived and inspired this policy for the GOYS without giving them an opportunity to examine its inner meaning if not for the purpose of attaining by a circuitous method what is unattainable for our scattered race by a direct road?

This constituted a base for our organization of *secret masonry which is not known to and whose aims are not even suspected by these cattle, the GOYS. They have been decoyed by us into our numerous ostensible organizations, which appear to be Masonic lodges, so as to divert the attention of their coreligionists.*

God has given us, his chosen people, the power to scatter, and what to all appears to be our weakness, has proved to be our strength, and has now brought its to the threshold of universal rule.

Little remains to be built on these foundations.

PROTOCOL NO. XII

THE word 'Liberty' can be differently interpreted. We will define it as follows:

Liberty is the right to do that which is permitted by law. Such a definition of this word will eventually serve us, because liberty will be in our power; and also because the laws will either destroy or construct only what we desire in accordance with the above mentioned program.

We will deal with the press in the following manner: What is the present rôle of the press? It serves to arouse furious passions or egotistic party dissensions which may be necessary for our purpose. It is empty, unjust, inaccurate, and most people do not understand what end it serves. We will shackle it and keep a tight rein on it. We will also do the same with other printed matter, for what use would it be for us to rid ourselves of attacks on the part of the periodical press if we remain open to criticism through pamphlets and books? We will convert the products of publicity, now so expensive, owing to the need of censorship, into a source of income for our state. We will impose a special stamp tax. When a newspaper printing shop is started, bonds will have to be deposited, which will guarantee our government from all attacks on the part of the press. In case of an attack, we will mercilessly impose fines. Such measures as stamps, bonds, and fines, the payment of which is guaranteed by the bonds, will bring a huge income to the government. It is true that party papers might not fear the loss of money, so we will suppress these after the second attack on us. No one shall touch the prestige of our political infallibility and remain unpunished. The pretext for stopping a publication will be that the publication in question excites public opinion without cause or reason. *I ask you to bear in mind that among those who attack us there will be also organs established by us, but they will attack exclusively those points which we plan to change.*

Not one notice will be made public without our control. This is already being done by us, since the news from all parts of the world is received through several agencies in which it is centralized.

These agencies will then be completely in our power and they will publish only such news as we will permit.

If we have already managed to subjugate the minds of the GOYS to such an extent that almost all of them see world events through colored glasses which we put over their eyes; if, even at present, there is not one state which bars our access to state secrets, so termed by the stupid GOYS, then what will it be when we, in the person of our universal sovereign, are the recognized rulers of the world?

Let us return to the future of the press. Anybody who wishes to become an editor, a librarian, or a printer, will be obliged to obtain a diploma, which in case of disobedience will be immediately revoked.

With such measures, *thought will become an educational instrument in the hands of our governmentt, which will not allow the people to be led astray into realms of fancy and dreams about beneficent progress.* Who of

us does not know that these fantastic blessings are the direct road to baseless hopes which lead to anarchistic relations between the people and the government? Progress, or better still the idea of progress, has led to the creation of different modes of emancipation without setting any limit to it. All so-called liberals are essentially anarchists in thought if not in action. Each one of them pursues the phantom of liberty, becoming self-willed, that is to say, falling into a state of anarchy by protesting for the mere sake of protesting.

We will now again refer to the question of the press. We will place stamp taxes secured by bonds on each page of all printed matter, while on books containing less than four hundred and eighty pages we will place a double tax. We will classify them as pamphlets, so as to lessen the number of magazines, which represent the worst printed poison—and on the other hand, to force writers to prepare such long works that they will be little read, especially as they will be expensive. Our own publications, guiding public opinion in the direction we desire, will be cheap and rapidly bought. The tax will discourage the writing of mere leisure literature, whereas punishment will make the writers dependent upon us. Even if there were writers who would like to attack us, they would find no publishers for their works. Before printing any work, the editor or printer will have to apply to the authorities for permission. We will then know beforehand of the attacks that are being prepared against us, and we will destroy them by coming out with advance statements on the subject.

Literature and journalism are the two most important educational forces; for this reason our government will become the owner of most of the periodicals. This will neutralize the injurious influence of the private press and have great influence on the people. If we permit ten periodicals, we ourselves will print thirty, and so forth. This, however, must not be suspected by the public. All the periodicals published by us will seem to be of contradictory views and opinions, inviting trust in us, thus attracting to us unsuspecting enemies, and in this way they will be caught in our trap and made harmless.

The predominant place will be held by periodicals of an official character. They will always stand guard over our interests and consequently their influence will be comparatively limited.

In the second category we will place semi-official organs, whose aim will be to attract the indifferent and little interested.

The third category will be our ostensible opposition, which at least in one of its publications will represent the opposition to us. Our real enemies will mistake this seeming opposition as belonging to their own group and will thus show us their cards.

All our newspapers will represent different tendencies, namely, aristocratic, republican, revolutionary, even anarchistic, so long of course as the constitution lasts. Like the Indian God VISHNU, these periodicals will have one hundred arms, each of which will reach the pulse of every group of

public opinion. When the pulse beats faster, these arms will guide opinion toward our aims, since the excited person loses the power of reasoning and is easily led. Those fools who believe that they repeat the opinions expressed by the newspapers of their party will be repeating our opinions or those which we desire them to have. Imagining that they are following the press of their party, they will follow the flag which we will fly for them.

In order that our newspaper militia may carry out our program, we must organize the press with great care. Under the title of the Central Department of the press, we will organize literary meetings at which our agents unnoticed will give the passwords and countersigns. Discussing and contradicting our policies, although always superficially, without touching their essence, our press will conduct an empty fire against official newspapers so as to give us only an opportunity to express ourselves in greater detail than we were able to in our preliminary declarations. This, of course, will be done when it is useful to us.

These attacks against us will also seem to convince the people that complete liberty of the press still exists, and it will give our agents the opportunity to declare that the papers opposing us are mere wind-bags, since they are unable to find any real ground to refute our orders.

Such measures, which will escape the notice of public attention, will be the most successful means of guiding the public mind and of inspiring confidence in our government. Thanks to them, we will as the need arises excite or pacify the public mind on political questions. We will be able to persuade or confuse them, sometimes printing the truth, sometimes lies, referring to facts or contradicting them according to the way they are received by the public, always carefully sounding the ground before stepping on it. *We will surely conquer our enemies, because they will not have the press at their disposal in which to express themselves in full.* Moreover, with the above mentioned plans against the press, we will not even need to refute them seriously.

The trial balloons thrown out by us in the third category of our press, we will deny energetically, in case of need, in our semi-official organs.

In French journalism there already exists the Masonic solidarity of a password; all organs of the press are bound by professional secrecy; like the ancient augurs, not one member will disclose his secret if he is not ordered to do so. Not one journalist will dare to disclose this secret, for not one of them is admitted to literary headquarters unless he has a disgraceful action in his past record. The fact would immediately be made public. While these disgraceful actions are known only to a few, the prestige of the journalist attracts opinion throughout the country—he is admired.

Our plans must extend chiefly to the provincial districts. There we must excite hopes and ambitions opposed to those of the capitals, by means of which we may always attack them, presenting such ambitions to the capitals as the inspired views and aims of provincial districts. It is obvious that their source will be ours. It is necessary for us that while we are not yet in full

power, the capital should be under the influence of provincial public opinion; that is under the influence of the majority prearranged by our agents. It is necessary for us that at the critical psychological moment the capitals should not discuss an accomplished fact, for the mere reason that it had been accepted by the provincial majority.

When we reach the phase of the new régime, which is transitory to our accession to power, we must not allow the press to expose social corruption. It must be thought that the new régime has satisfied everybody to such an extent that even criminality has stopped. Cases of criminal activity must only be known to their victims or their accidental witnesses, and to these alone.

PROTOCOL NO. XIII

THE need of daily bread forces the GOYS to silence and compels them to remain our obedient servants. The agents taken from among them for our press will discuss the facts they are ordered to publish, when it is inconvenient for us to publish statements openly in official documents. While discussion and dispute are taking place, we will simply pass the measures we desire and present them to the public as an accomplished fact. Nobody will dare to demand the rejection of measures thus passed, and the more so as they will be interpreted as an improvement. At this point the press will divert the thoughts of the people to new problems (we having accustomed the people always to seek new emotions). Those brainless creators of destiny, who heretofore have been unable to understand and do not now understand that they are ignorant of matters which they undertake to discuss, will also hasten to discuss these new problems. Political questions are meant to be understood only by those who have created them and have been directing them for many centuries.

From all this you will realize that by aiming to control the opinion of the mob we will only facilitate the functioning of our mechanism, and you will also notice that we seek approbation, not for actions but for words uttered by us on various occasions. We always declare that we are guided in all our policies by the hope and certainty of serving the general good.

To divert the over-restless people from discussing political problems, we now make it appear that we provide them with new problems, namely, those pertaining to industry. Let them become excited over this subject as much as they like. The masses will consent to remain inactive, to rest from so-called political activity (to which we ourselves accustomed them for the purpose of helping us in our struggle against the GOY government), only on condition of a new occupation in which we can show them supposedly the same political background.

To prevent them from reaching any independent decisions, *we will divert their minds by amusements, games, pastimes, passions, and cultural centers for the people.* We will soon begin to offer prize contests, through the press, in the field of art, and sports of all kinds. Such attractions will definitely deflect the mind from problems over which we would otherwise have to fight with the people. By losing more and more the custom of independent

thought, they will begin to talk in unison with us, because we alone will provide new lines of thought through persons with whom of course we will presumably have no connection.

The rôle of liberal Utopians will be definitely terminated when our government is recognized. Until that time, they will do us good service. For this reason we will still direct thought towards different fantastic theories which will appear to be progressive. For it was by the word 'progress' that we have successfully turned the brains of the stupid GOYS. There are no brains among the GOYS to realize that this word is but a cover for digression from the truth, unless it is applied to material inventions, *since there is but one truth and there is no room for progress*. Progress, being a false conception, serves to conceal the truth so that nobody may know it except ourselves, God's elect, who are its guardians.

When our kingdom is established, our orators will discuss the great problems which have stirred humanity for the purpose of bringing it finally under our blessed rule.

Who will then suspect that all those problems were instigated by us, according to a political plan which has not been disclosed by any one during so many centuries.

PROTOCOL NO. XIV

WHEN we become rulers we will not tolerate the existence of any other religion except our own, which proclaims one God, with whom our fate is bound up because we are the Chosen People, and our fate has determined the fate of the world. For this reason we must destroy all other religions. If the result of this produces modern atheists, as a transitory step, this will not interfere with our plans but will act as an example to those generations which will listen to our teaching of the religion of Moses, which, owing to its solid and thoughtful system, will eventually lead to the domination of all nations by us. We will also lay stress on the mystical truth of Masonic teaching which, we will assert, is the foundation of its whole educative power.

On every possible occasion we will then publish articles in which we will compare our beneficial rule with that of the past. The benefits of peace, although attained through centuries of unrest, will serve to demonstrate the beneficial character of our rule. The mistakes made by the GOYS during their administration will be pictured by us in the most vivid colors. We will cause such disgust towards the administration of the GOYS that the masses will prefer the peace of serfdom to the rights of the much lauded liberty which has so cruelly tortured them and drained from them the very source of human existence, and by which they were exploited by a mass of adventurers, ignorant of what they were doing. *The useless changes of government, to which we ourselves prompted the GOYS, when we were undermining their governmental apparatus, will become such a nuisance to the people by that time, that they will prefer to endure anything from us rather than risk a repetition of former unrest and hardships.* We will, moreover, lay particular

stress on the historical mistakes made by the GOY governments, which caused humanity to suffer for many centuries for lack of understanding of all matters pertaining to its true welfare, and because of their search for fantastic schemes of social welfare. The GOYS did not notice that such schemes instead of improving mutual relationship, which is the basis of human existence, have only made it worse.

The whole force of our principles and measures will lie in the fact that they are put forward and interpreted by us as being in sharp contrast to the decayed social order of former times.

Our philosophers will discuss all the shortcomings of the GOY religion, but nobody will ever discuss our religion in the light of its true aspect, and nobody will ever thoroughly understand it, except our own people, who will never dare to disclose its secrets.

In countries so-called advanced we have created insane, dirty, and disgusting literature. For a short time after our entrance into power we will encourage its publication in order that the contrast between it and the speeches and programs which will be heard from our heights should be more pointedly marked. Our wise men, trained as guides to the GOYS, will prepare speeches, plans, memoranda, and articles, by which we will influence the minds and direct them towards the conceptions and the knowledge which we wish them to have.

PROTOCOL NO. XV

WHEN we finally become rulers by means of revolutions, which will be arranged so that they shall take place simultaneously in all countries and immediately after all existing governments shall have been officially pronounced as incapable (which may not happen soon, perhaps not before a whole century), we will see to it that no plots are hatched against us. To effect this, we will kill heartlessly all who take up arms against the establishment of our rule.

The establishment of any new secret society will be met by the death penalty, and those societies which now exist and are known to us and either work or have worked for us, will be disbanded and their members exiled to continents far removed from Europe.

We will deal in the same manner with those Masons among the GOYS who know too much. The Masons whom we may pardon for any reason will be kept under continual fear of exile. We will pass a law whereby all members of secret organizations will be exiled from Europe, that being the center of our government. The decisions of our government will be final and there will be no right of appeal.

In the GOY society, where we have planted such deep roots of dissension and protest, order can only be restored by merciless measures which will serve as evidence that our power cannot be infringed. There is no necessity for regard towards the victims sacrificed for the future good. To attain good, even though by the sacrifice of life, is the duty of every government which realizes that its existence depends not upon privileges alone, but upon the

exercise of its duties as well.

The most important means for erecting a stable government is to strengthen the prestige of authority. This is only obtained by its majestic and unshakable power, which will convey the impression that it is inviolable because of its mystical nature, namely, because chosen by God. *Such until recently has been the Russian Autocracy—our only dangerous enemy throughout the world, with, the exception of the Pope.* Remember Italy drowning in blood; she did not touch a hair on the head of Sulla who had shed that blood. Sulla had become powerful in the eyes of the people, although they were tortured by him; his manly return to Italy placed him beyond persecution. The people do not touch those who hypnotize them by bravery and steadfastness of spirit.

Meanwhile, until our rule is established, we, on the contrary, will organize and multiply free masonic lodges in all the countries of the world. We will attract to them all those who are and who may become public-spirited, because in these lodges will be the chief source of information and from them will emanate our influence.

All these lodges will be centralized under one management, known only to us and unknown to all others; these lodges will be administered by our wise men. The lodges will have their own representative in this management in order to screen the above mentioned Masonic government; he will give the password and elaborate the program. We will tie the knot of all revolutionary liberal elements in these lodges. Their membership will consist of all strata of society. The most secret political plans will be known to us and will fall under our leadership on the very day of their origination. *Among the members of these lodges will be almost all the agents of the international and national police,* whose work is indispensable for us, inasmuch as the police not only are able to take independent measures against the rebellious, but may also serve to mask our actions, provoke discontent, and so forth.

Most people who become members of secret societies are adventurers, career makers, and irresponsible persons in general, with whom we will have no difficulty in dealing and who will help us to set in motion the mechanism of the machine planned by us. If this world becomes perturbed, it will only prove that it was necessary for us to disorganize it so as to destroy its too great solidarity. *If a plot is laid, it must be headed by one of our most trustworthy servants.* It is only natural that we want nobody but ourselves to guide the work of the Masons,

[*Footnote:* It is important to point out that *some of the Jews themselves* in their writings have claimed that Masonry is largely controlled by Jewish influence. In this connection the statement of Dr. Isaac M. Wise may be recalled: ‘Masonry is a Jewish institution whose history, decrees, charges, passwords and explanations are Jewish, from the beginning to the end, with the exception of only one by-decree and a few words in the obligation.’ (Dr. Isaac M. Wise, *The Israelite*, August 3rd and 17th, 1855; quoted by Samuel

Oppenheim in his pamphlet 'Jews and Masonry in the United States before 1810,' American Jewish Historical Society, New York, 1910 No. 19, pp. 1, 2.)]

for we know where we are trending, we know the final aim of every action. The GOYS, however, understand nothing, not even the immediate results. They are usually concerned about the momentary satisfaction of their ambitions in achieving their intentions. They do not notice, however, that the intention itself was not initiated by them, but that it was we who gave them the idea.

The GOYS become members of the lodges out of pure curiosity, or hoping to receive their share in the public funds. There are others who come for the purpose of seizing the opportunity of putting before the public their impossible and baseless hopes. They long for the emotion of success and for the applause which we grant them lavishly. We create their success in order to utilize the self-deception that is born with it and by which people, without noticing, begin to follow our suggestions without suspecting them, and being fully convinced that their infallibility originates its own ideas and, therefore, does not need those of others. You have no idea how easy it is to bring even the most intelligent GOYS to a state of unconscious credulity, and, on the other hand, how easy it is to discourage them by the smallest failure, or merely by ceasing to applaud them, thus bringing them into servitude for the sake of achieving new success. *To the same extent as our people ignore success for the sake of carrying out their plans, so are the GOYS ready to sacrifice all their plans for the sake of success.* Their psychology makes the problem of direction easier for us. Those tigers in appearance have the souls of sheep and nonsense filters through their heads. As a hobby we have given them the dream of submerging human individualism through the symbolic idea of *collectivism*.

They have not yet discovered and will not discover that this hobby is a clear infringement on the principal law of nature, which, from the beginning of the world, created a being unlike all others, precisely for the sake of expressing his individuality.

If we were able to lead them to such insane and blind beliefs, does it not obviously prove the low level of development of the GOY mind as compared to our mind? It is precisely the thing which guarantees our success.

How far sighted were our wise men of old when they said that to attain a serious object one must not stop at the means, nor should one count the victims sacrificed to the cause. We have not counted the victims from among the GOYS, those seeds of cattle. Although we have sacrificed many of our own peoples, we have already given them in return a formerly undreamed-of position on earth. The comparatively few victims from among our own people have saved our race from destruction.

Death is the unavoidable end of all. It would be better to accelerate this end for those who interfere with our cause than for our people or for us,

ourselves, the creators of this cause to die. *We kill Masons in such a way that none but the brothers suspect, not even the victims; they all die when it is necessary, apparently from a natural death.* Knowing this, even the brethren, in their turn, dare not protest. It is through such measures that we have uprooted the heart of protest against our orders from among the Masons. Preaching liberalism to the GOYS, at the same time we hold our people and our agents under iron discipline.

Through our influence the enforcement of the GOY laws has been reduced to a minimum. The prestige of the law has been undermined by the liberal interpretations introduced by us. The courts decide as we dictate the most important principles, both political and moral, viewing the cases in the light presented by us for the GOY administration. This we accomplished naturally through agents, with whom we have ostensibly no connection, namely, through the press or otherwise. Even senators and high officials blindly follow our advice. The purely animal mind of the GOYS is incapable of analysis and observation, and even less so of foreseeing to what results the development of the principle involved in a case may lead.

It is through this difference in the process of reasoning between us and the GOYS that it becomes possible clearly to demonstrate the stamp of God's elect as compared to the instinctive and bestial mentality of the GOYS. They see, but they cannot foresee, and they cannot invent anything except material things. It is clear, therefore, that nature herself intended us to rule and guide the world.

When the time comes for our open rule, then will be the time to show its benefits, and we will change all the laws. Our laws will be short, clear, irrevocable, and requiring no interpretation, so that everybody will be able to know them thoroughly. The chief point emphasized in them will be a highly developed obedience to authority, which will eliminate all abuses, for all without exception will be responsible before the supreme power vested in the highest authority.

Abuse of power by minor officials will then disappear, because it will be punished so mercilessly that they will lose the desire to experiment with their power. We will closely watch every action of the administration, upon which depends the action of the government machinery, for corruption there creates corruption everywhere; not a single violation of law or act of corruption will remain unpunished. Acts of concealment and willful neglect on the part of governmental officials will disappear after they have seen the first example of severe punishment. The prestige of power necessitates that appropriate, that is to say severe, punishments should be inflicted even for the smallest violations of the sanctity of the supreme authority, committed for the sake of personal gain. The guilty, if punished severely, will be like a soldier who falls on the battlefield of administration for the sake of Authority, Principle, and Law; these principles do not allow any digression from their social function for a personal motive, even on the part of those who rule. For instance: *Our judges, will know that by attempting to show stupid mercy, they*

over step the law of justice, which was created solely for exemplary punishment of crimes and not for the manifestation of moral qualities on the part of the judge. Such qualities are commendable in private, but not in public life, which constitutes the educational forum of human life.

The personnel of our judges will not remain in office after the age of fifty-five. First, because old people adhere more persistently to prejudiced opinions and are less capable of submitting to new commands; and secondly, because that enables us to achieve a certain flexibility of change in the personnel, which will bend more easily under our pressure. He who wishes to retain his position will have to obey blindly.

In general, our judges will be selected only from among those who will clearly understand that they must punish people and enforce the laws, and not indulge in dreams of liberalism at the expense of the educational plan of the government, as is now imagined by the GOYS. The method of changing the personnel will also serve to undermine the collective solidarity of the governmental officials and will attach them to the cause of the government, which decides their fate. The younger generation of judges will be so educated as to prevent any criminal activity which might interfere with the inter-relationship which we have established for our subjects.

At present the GOY judges, lacking a clear conception of the nature of their duties, make exceptions to all kinds of crimes. This occurs because the present rulers, when appointing judges, do not take the trouble to encourage the sense of duty and conscientiousness in the work to be performed by them. As the animal sends out its young in search of prey, so the GOYS are giving their subjects responsible offices without taking the time to explain their functions. Owing to this, their rule is undermined by their own efforts and through the actions of their own administration. Let us use the result of such actions as one more example of the advantage of our own rule.

We will eliminate liberalism from all the important strategic positions in our administration upon which depend the training of our subjects for our social order. These positions will be given only to those who have been trained by us for governmental work.

In answer to a possible remark, that the putting of old officials on the retired list may prove expensive for the treasury, I can state first, that, prior to their dismissal, some private work will be found for them to replace what they are losing, and secondly, I may also remark, that all the world's money will be concentrated in our hands; consequently, our government need not fear expense.

Our autocracy will be consistent in every respect, and consequently every manifestation of our great power will be respected and unconditionally obeyed. We will ignore grumbling and discontent, and all active manifestations of either will be suppressed by punishment, which will serve as an example to the rest of the people.

We will abolish the right of appellate courts to annul judicial decisions, which will become the exclusive prerogative of the sovereign, for we cannot

permit the people to think that an incorrect decision may possibly be rendered by the judges appointed by us. Should, however, such an error happen, we ourselves will annul the decision; but the punishment which we will impose upon the judge for misconception of his duties and of his responsibility will be so severe that it will eliminate the very possibility of a recurrence. I repeat that we will watch every step taken by our administration in order to enable us to satisfy the people, for they have a right to demand a good appointee from a good administration.

In the person of our sovereign, our government will bear the appearance of a patriarchal or fatherly tutelage. The people, our subjects, will see in him a father who takes care of every need, every action, and who is concerned with every relationship, both among the subjects themselves and between them and the sovereign.

Thus, they will become imbued with the idea that it is impossible for them to do without this guardian and guide if they wish to live in a world of peace and quiet. *They will recognize the autocracy of our sovereign, whom they will respect and almost deify*, especially when they realize that our agents do not usurp his power, but merely execute his orders blindly. They will be glad that everything is regulated in their lives, as is done by wise parents who wish to educate their children to a sense of duty and obedience. With regard to the secrets of our political plans, both the masses and their administration are like little children.

As you can see for yourselves, I base our despotism upon right and duty; the right of forcing the performance of duty is the direct function of government, acting as the father to its subjects. It is the right of the strong to utilize his power in order to lead humanity towards a social order established by the law of nature, namely, obedience. Everything in the world is subject, if not to some other persons, then to circumstances, or to its own nature; but in any case, to something stronger than itself. Consequently, let us be the strongest for the common good.

We must sacrifice without hesitation those individuals who violate the existing order, for in exemplary punishment of evil there lies a great educational problem.

When the King of Israel [the Jewish Messiah] places the crown offered to him by Europe on his sacred head, he will become the Patriarch of the World. The necessary sacrifices made by him will never equal the number of victims sacrificed to the mania of greatness during the centuries of rivalry between the GOY governments.

Our sovereign will be in constant communication with the people, delivering from tribunes addresses which will be spread to all parts of the world.

PROTOCOL NO. XVI

FOR the purpose of destroying all collective forces except our own, we will nullify the universities, the first stage of collectivism, by reconstructing them along new lines. *Their directors and professors will be*

trained for their work through detailed secret programs of action, from which they will not be able to deviate in the least with impunity. They will be appointed with special care and will be so placed as to be completely dependent upon the government.

We will exclude from the curriculum civic law, as well as all that touches upon political questions. These subjects will be taught only to a few dozen selected for their striking ability from among the initiated. *The universities must not allow the callow youths to graduate who concoct plans of constitutions as they do comedies or tragedies, or who meddle with political matters which even their fathers do not understand.*

Poorly directed study of political questions by a great number of people creates Utopians and poor citizens, as you can judge by the universal education as conducted by the GOYS along those lines. It was necessary for us to infiltrate into their educational system such principles as have successfully broken down their social order. When we are in power, we will eliminate all disturbing subjects from educational systems and will make young people obedient children of their superiors, loving the sovereign as their assurance of hope, peace, and quiet.

For the study of the classics and ancient history, which contain more bad than good examples, we will substitute a program dealing with the future. We will obliterate from the memory of the people all those facts pertaining to former centuries which are not to our advantage, leaving only those which emphasize the mistakes of the GOY governments. The study of practical life, of obligatory social order, of the interrelationship of human beings, the avoidance of evil, egotistical examples that plant the seed of evil, and other questions of a pedagogical nature, will head the educational program. This program will differ for each caste, never allowing education to be of a uniform character. Such a system is of special importance.

Each caste must be educated with strict limitations, according to its particular occupation and the nature of the work. Accidental genius has always been able and always will be able to rise to a higher caste; but, for the sake of this rare exception, to open the door to the inefficient, and to admit them to higher castes or ranks, enabling them to occupy positions of others born and trained to fill them—is absolute insanity. You, yourself, know what happened to the GOYS when they yielded to this nonsense.

In order to implant the sovereign firmly in the minds and hearts of his subjects, it is necessary to acquaint the people, during his term of office, both in schools and in public places, with the importance of his activity and the benevolence of his enterprises.

We will abolish all unlicensed teaching. Students will have the right to gather, with their relatives, in their colleges as if in clubs. During these gatherings, on holidays, the teachers will read supposedly unbiased lectures on problems of human relationship, on the law of imitation, on the cruelty of unrestricted competition, and finally, on new philosophical theories which have not yet been disclosed to the world.

We will promote these theories into dogmatic beliefs, using them as stepping-stones to our faith. After having presented our program of action for the present and for the future, I will read to you the principles of these theories.

In short, knowing from the experience of many centuries that men live and are guided by ideas, that these ideas are imbued only by means of education given to persons of all ages, of course by different methods but meeting with equal success, we will absorb and appropriate to our own advantage the last traces of independent thought, which for a long time have been directed to the goal and to the ideas necessary to us. The system of enslaving thought is already in action through so-called visual education.

This system tends to turn the GOYS into thoughtless, obedient animals, expecting to see in order to understand. In France one of our best agents, Bourgeois, has already announced a new program of visual education.

PROTOCOL NO. XVII

THE lawyer's profession makes people grow cold, cruel, stubborn and unprincipled, and compels them to take an abstract or purely legal viewpoint in all matters. They have learned to consider solely the personal gain derived from every case they handle and not the possibility of the social benefit of its results. They rarely refuse to take a case and always strive for acquittal at all cost, clinging to minor technical points of a legal nature. In this way they demoralize the courts. Therefore we will limit this profession, converting it into an executive public office. Lawyers will be deprived of the right of contact with their clients on the same basis as are the judges. They will receive their cases only from the court, preparing them on the strength of written reports and documents and defending their clients after they have been examined in court on the basis of the facts obtained during the trial. They will receive a salary, regardless of whether the defense has been successful or not. They will act as simple exponents of the case on behalf of the defense in counterbalance to the public prosecutor, who will act as exponent on behalf of the prosecution. This will shorten legal procedure and establish an honest and impartial defense, conducted not for the sake of personal gain, but based on the personal conviction of the lawyer. This will also eliminate the existing bribery among fellow lawyers and prevent their allowing the side to win which pays.

We have already taken care to discredit the clergy of the GOYS and thus to undermine their function, which at the present time could have been very much in our way. Their influence over the people diminishes daily.

To-day freedom of religion has been proclaimed everywhere; consequently, it is only a *question of a few years before the complete collapse of Christendom*. It will be still easier to deal with other religions, but it is too early to discuss this problem. We will confine clericalism and clericals within such a narrow field that their influence will have an effect opposite to what it used to have.

When the moment comes to annihilate the Vatican completely, an

invisible hand, pointing towards this court, will guide the masses in their assault. When, however, the masses attack, we will come forward as defenders to prevent too much bloodshed. By this method we will penetrate its very heart and will not leave it until we have undermined its power.

The King of Israel [the Jewish Messiah] will become the real Pope of the Universe, the Patriarch of the International Church.

But until we have accomplished the re-education of the youth to new transitional religions and finally to our own, *we will not openly attack the existing churches, but will fight them by means of criticism, thus creating dissension.*

In general, our press will denounce governmental activities and religion, and will expose the inefficiency of the GOYS in the most unscrupulous terms, so as to humiliate them to such an extent as only our ingenious race is capable of doing. Our rule will simulate the God Vishnu, who resembles us physically; each of our hundred hands will hold one of the springs of the social machine. We will see everything without the aid of the official police; in its present organization, however, which we have worked out for the GOYS, the police prevent the government from seeing anything. According to our program, one-third of our subjects will watch the others from a pure sense of duty, as volunteers for the government. Then it will not be considered disgraceful to be a spy and an informer; on the contrary, it will be regarded as praiseworthy. Unfounded reports, however, will be severely punished to prevent abuse of this privilege.

Our agents will be recruited both from among the highest and the lowest ranks of society; they will be selected from among the pleasure-loving governmental officials, editors, printers, booksellers, salesmen, workmen, drivers, butlers, etc. This police force will have no official rights or credentials, which give opportunity for the abuse of power, and consequently it will be powerless; it will merely act as observer and will make reports. The verification of such reports and the issue of warrants for arrests will rest with a responsible group of police controllers. The actual arrests, however, will be made by a gendarme corps or the municipal police. In case of failure to report any political matter which has been observed or rumored, the person who should have reported it may be brought to trial for concealment of crime, if it is proven that he is guilty.

In the same way that our brethren are now under obligation to report on their own initiative on all apostates, or on any person marked as being opposed to the Kehillah, so in our Universal Kingdom it will be obligatory for all subjects to serve the state in that direction.

Such an organization will eliminate all abuse of power and various kinds of coercion and corruption, in fact, the very things which have been introduced into the customs of the GOYS by our councils and by the theories of the rights of supermen. But how otherwise could we foment the increasing causes for disorder in the midst of their administration? What other means could we use? Among these means, one of the most important is the

employment of such agents for the preservation of order as are in a position to manifest their own evil inclinations in the course of their destructive work, namely, their self-will, abuse of authority, and, most important of all, bribery.

PROTOCOL NO. XVIII

WHEN the time comes for us to strengthen the measures of police protection (the most terrible poison for the prestige of authority), we will artificially organize disorder or simulate the expression of discontent with the aid of experienced orators. These orators will be joined by sympathizers. This will give us the pretext for searches and special restrictions which will be put in force by our servants among the GOY police.

As most conspirators work as amateurs for the sake of chattering we will not disturb them until we see that they are about to take action; but we will introduce in their midst secret service agents. It must be remembered that the prestige of authority diminishes if conspiracies against it are often discovered, for that leads to the presumption of the weakness of the authority, or, what is worse, to the admission of its own mistakes. You are aware that we have destroyed the prestige of the ruling GOYS by frequent attempts made on their lives through our agents, who were but blind sheep of our flock, easily moved, by a few liberal phrases, to crimes, so long as they were of a political nature. *We have forced the rulers to admit their own weakness by adopting open measures of police protection, and thereby we have ruined the prestige of their authority.*

Our sovereign [the Jewish Messiah] will be protected only by the most invisible guard, because we will never allow any one to think that conspiracy might exist against him which he is unable to combat and from which he has to hide himself. If we were to allow this thought to prevail, as it prevails among the GOYS, we would thereby sign the death warrant, if not of the sovereign himself, then of his dynasty in the near future.

Observing strict decorum, our sovereign will use his power only for the benefit of the people, but never for his own good or for that of his dynasty. By strictly adhering to this decorum, his authority will be respected and protected by his subjects; moreover, he will be worshiped, because it will be known that upon his authority depends the well-being of every citizen of the kingdom, and the stability of the social order itself.

To guard the sovereign openly is equivalent to an admission of the weakness of his governmental organization.

Our sovereign, when amidst his people, will always appear to be surrounded by a crowd of curious men and women, who will stand beside him as though accidentally and will hold back the other people as though through respect for order. This example will implant an idea of self-restraint in others. If there be a person in the crowd trying to present a petition, and working his way through the ranks, the person nearest to him must take the petition and present it to the sovereign in sight of the petitioner himself, so that all may know that the petition presented has reached its destination and consequently that there exists a control of affairs on the part of the sovereign

himself. The prestige of authority demands that the people should be able to say, 'If only the king could know it,' or, 'The king will know about this.'

With the establishment of an official police guard the mystical prestige of authority vanishes at once; with a certain amount of audacity, every one considers himself superior to authority; the assassin realizes his strength and only has to watch his opportunity to make an attempt against an official. We preached differently for the GOYS, but we can see the results to which open methods of protection have led them.

We will arrest criminals upon the first more or less well founded suspicion. Because of the fear of a possible mistake political criminals should not be given the opportunity to escape; indeed towards political crime we will show no mercy. If, in exceptional cases, it may seem possible to allow the investigation of motives which have led to ordinary criminal offences, there is no excuse for those who attempt to deal with matters which no one can understand except the government. Moreover, not even all governments are capable of understanding the right policy.

PROTOCOL NO. XIX

THOUGH we will not allow individuals to become involved in politics, we will, on the other hand, encourage the submission for the approval of the government of all petitions and reports containing suggestions and plans for bettering the condition of the people. This will bring to our knowledge the shortcomings or merely the fantastic aspirations of our subjects. These suggestions we will answer either by favorable action or by refusals proving the lack of intelligence and the errors of those who have submitted such suggestions.

Sedition is nothing but the barking of a lap dog at an elephant. From the point of view of a government which is well organized, not from the police standpoint but with regard to its social basis, the lap dog barks at the elephant because he does not realize his strength. It is only necessary for the elephant to show his strength once and the dog barks no more; he begins to wag his tail the moment he sees the elephant.

In order to eliminate the prestige of martyrdom from political crime, we will seat the political criminal on the same bench with thieves, murderers, and other disgusting and dirty criminals. Then public opinion will regard that class of criminals as quite as disgraceful as any other, and will brand them with equal contempt.

We have endeavored to prevent, and I hope have succeeded in preventing, the GOYS from using such methods of dealing with seditious activities. In order to attain this end, we have made use of the press and public speeches; indirectly, through cleverly compiled historical textbooks, we have given publicity to martyrdom as though revolutionists had undergone it for the sake of human welfare. Such an advertisement has increased the contingent of liberals and forced thousands of GOYS into the herds of our cattle.

PROTOCOL NO. XX

TO-DAY we shall deal with the financial program, the discussion of which I have postponed until the end of my report because it is the most difficult, conclusive, and decisive point in our plans. In approaching it, I will remind you that I have already intimated that the result of our actions is measured in figures.

When we become rulers, our autocratic government, for the sake of self-defense, will avoid burdening the people with heavy taxes, and it will not forget the rôle it has to play, namely, that of Father and Protector. But as government organization is costly, it is necessary to raise the means for its maintenance. Consequently, we must carefully work out the plan of a fair distribution of taxation.

In our government the sovereign will have the legal fiction of owning everything in his kingdom (which is easily put into practice), and can resort to legal confiscation of all money in order to regulate its circulation throughout the country. Consequently, the best method of taxation is the levying of a progressive tax on property. Taxes will thus be paid without difficulty or ruin in respective proportion to the amount of property owned. The rich must realize that it is their duty to give a part of their surplus wealth for the benefit of the country as a whole, because the government guarantees inviolability of the remaining part of their property and the right of honest gain. I say *honest* because the control of property will prevent legal theft.

This social reform must come front above, for the time is ripe and it is becoming necessary as a guarantee of peace.

The tax on the poor is the seed of revolution, and it acts detrimentally to the government, which loses the great in its pursuit of the little. Moreover, the taxation of capital will lessen the increase of wealth in private hands, in which at present we have concentrated it as a counterweight to the governmental power of the GOYS, namely, to the state treasury.

Progressive taxation, assessed according to the amount of capital, will produce a much greater revenue than the present system of taxing every one at an equal rate, which is useful to us now only as a means of exciting revolt and discontent among the GOYS. The power of our sovereign will rest mainly in equilibrium and in guarantees of peace. For these, the capitalists must cede a part of their income so as to protect the action of the government machine. Public needs must be met by those who can best afford to do so and by those from whom there is something to take.

Such a measure will eliminate the hatred of the poor towards the rich, as they will be regarded as the financial supporters of the state and the upholders of peace and prosperity. The poor will also see that the rich are providing the necessary means to insure this end.

To prevent intelligent taxpayers from being too discontented with the new system of taxation, they will be furnished with detailed reports of the disbursement of public funds, exclusive of such as are appropriated for the needs of the throne and administrative institutions.

The sovereign will not own property, since everything in the state will seem to belong to him and these two conceptions would contradict each other. Private means would eliminate his right to own everything.

The relatives of the sovereign, aside from his descendants who will also be supported by the state, must join the ranks of government officials, or otherwise work for the right of holding property. The privilege of being of royal blood must not entitle them to rob the state treasury.

Sales, profits, or inheritances will be taxed by a progressive stamp tax. The transfer of property, whether in cash or otherwise, without the required stamp, will place the payment of the tax on the original owner, dating from the time of the transfer until the time of the reported failure to record the transaction. Transfer vouchers must be shown weekly at the local branch of the state treasury, together with a statement of the names, surnames, and the permanent addresses both of the original and of the new owner. The recording of the names of those participating in a transaction will be necessary in all transactions involving more than a certain amount for ordinary expenditure. The sale of prime necessities will be taxed only by a stamp tax, which will represent a certain small per cent of the cost of the particular article.

Just calculate how many times the amount received from such taxes will exceed the income of the GOY governments.

The state bank must keep a definite reserve fund, and all sums in excess must be put back into circulation. The cost of public works will be met out of this surplus fund. The initiative of such works emanating from the government will also tie the working class to the interests of the government and the rulers. Some of this money will be allotted to prizes for inventions and for the purposes of production.

Even small sums in excess of a certain definite and broadly calculated fund, should not be allowed to be kept in the state treasury, because money is intended to circulate, and every impediment to circulation is detrimental to the governmental mechanism, which the money lubricates; the congestion of lubricating substances can stop the proper functioning of the mechanism.

The substitution of bonds for a part of the currency has created just such an impediment. The result of this has already become sufficiently evident.

We will also establish an auditing office, so as to enable the sovereign to find at all times a full account of state revenues and expenses, except for the current month not yet made up, and that of the previous month not yet presented.

The only person who will not be interested in robbing the state treasury will be the sovereign, its owner. This is the reason why his control will prevent the possibility of loss or misappropriation.

Receptions for the purpose of etiquette, which waste the valuable time of the sovereign, will be abolished, because the ruler needs time for control and thought. Then his power will not be frittered away on the people surrounding the throne for the sake of appearance and brilliance, and who have only their

own and not the public interest in mind.

The economic crises were created by us for the GOYS only by the withdrawal of money from circulation. Huge amounts of capital were kept idle and were taken away from the nations, which were thus compelled to apply to us for loans. Payment of interest on these loans burdened the state finances and made the states subservient to capital. The concentration of industry having taken production out of the hands of the artisan and put it into the hands of capitalists, sucked all the power out of the people and also out of the state.

The present issue of money generally does not coincide with the need per capita, and consequently it cannot satisfy all the needs of the working classes. The issue of currency must correspond with the increase in population, and children must be reckoned as consumers from the day of their birth. The revision of the issue of currency is an essential problem for the whole world.

You know that gold currency was detrimental to the governments that accepted it, for it could not satisfy the requirements for money, since we took as much gold as possible out of circulation.

We must issue a currency based on the value of the working power, whether it be of paper or wood. We will issue money in proportion to the normal demands of every subject, adding a certain amount at every birth and decreasing it with every death.

Every department (the French administrative divisions), [*Footnote*: The words in parentheses would seem to be a comment of Nilus's.] every district, will be in charge of its own accounts.

To avoid any delay in paying government expenses, the terms of such payments will be decreed by order of the sovereign; this will eliminate any favoritism of the ministry (of finance) [*Footnote*: The words in parentheses are inserted by the editors.] over any other department to the detriment of the others.

The budget of revenues and the budget of expenditure will be placed side by side, in order that they may always be compared with each other.

We will present plans for the reform of the GOY financial institutions and of their principles, as planned by us, in such a manner that nobody will be frightened. We will demonstrate the need of reform by the disorderly twaddle produced by the financial disorganization of the GOYS. We will show that the first reason for this confusion lies in the drafting of rough estimates for the budget, which increases from year to year. This annual budget is with great difficulty made to last during the first half of the year; then a revised budget is demanded and the funds thus allotted are spent in the next three months, after which a supplementary budget is called for and all this is wound up by a liquidation budget. As the budget of the following year is based on the total expenditure of the preceding year, the divergence from the normal reaches fifty per cent annually, so that the annual budget trebles every ten years. Owing to such a procedure, resulting from the carelessness of the GOY governments, their treasuries became empty. The period of loans followed

and used up the remainder and brought all the GOY states to bankruptcy.

You can well understand that such a management of financial affairs as we induced the GOYS to pursue cannot be adopted by us.

Every loan proves the impotency of the government and its failure to understand its own rights. Loans, like the sword of Damocles, hang above the heads of the rulers, who instead of placing temporary taxes on their subjects, stretch forth their hands and beg the charity of our bankers. Foreign loans are leeches, which can never be removed from the governmental body until they either fall off themselves or the government itself manages to get rid of them. But the GOY governments instead of throwing them off increase their number, so that these governments must inevitably perish through self-inflicted loss of blood.

Indeed, what is a loan, especially a foreign loan, if not a leech? A loan is the issuance of government obligations which involve the liability to pay interest in proportion to the sum borrowed. If the loan pays five per cent, then in twenty years the government has unnecessarily paid in interest an amount equal to the principal sum borrowed. In forty years it has paid twice; in sixty years it has trebled the sum, while the loan still remains an unpaid debt.

From this calculation it is evident that under the system of universal taxation the government takes the last penny from the poor taxpayers in the form of taxes in order to pay interest to foreign capitalists, from whom the money was borrowed, instead of collecting these same pennies for its needs free from all interest.

So long as the loans were domestic, the GOYS only shifted the money from the pockets of the poor into those of the rich; but when we bribed the proper persons to make the loans foreign, then national riches poured into our hands and all the GOYS began to pay us the tribute of subjects.

The carelessness of the reigning GOYS in statemanship, the corruption of their ministers, the ignorance of other officials of financial problems, has forced their countries into debt to our banks to such an extent that they can never pay off their debts. It should be realized, however, that we have gone to great pains in order to bring about such a state of affairs.

Impediments to the circulation of money will not be allowed by us, and therefore there will be no government bonds, except one per cent bonds, so that the payment of interest should not deliver the power of the state to the sucking of leeches. The right of issuing bonds will be exclusively granted to industrial corporations, which will easily pay the interest out of their profits. The government, however, does not derive profit on borrowed money as these corporations do, since the state borrows money for expenditure and not for production.

Industrial bonds will also be bought by the government, which instead of being, as at present, the payer of tribute on loans, will become a sound creditor. Such a measure will prevent stagnation in the circulation of money, as well as indolence and laziness, which were useful to us so long as the GOYS remained independent, but are not wanted by us in our government.

How apparent is the shortsightedness of the purely bestial brains of the GOYS! It manifested itself when they borrowed money for at interest. It did not occur to the GOYS that, at any rate, this money, with the additional interest on it, would have to be taken from the resources of the country and paid to us. Would it not have been more simple to take the needed money from their own people?

This proves the genius of our distinguished mind, for we were able to present the question of loans to them in such a light that they saw in loans an advantage for themselves.

Our estimates, which we will produce when the time comes, will be based on the experience of centuries, on all those experiments which were conducted by us at the expense of the GOY governments; our estimates will prove to be clear and definite, and will obviously demonstrate the advantage of our new system. They will end all those abuses which made it possible for us to master the GOYS, but which cannot be permitted in our reign.

We will so organize the accounting system that neither the sovereign himself nor the most humble clerk will be able to deflect the smallest sum from its destination or direct it into a different channel from that indicated in our original financial plan.

It is impossible to govern without a definite plan. Traveling along a definite road with an indefinite supply of provisions destroys heroes and knights.

The GOY rulers, to whom we once gave advice to neglect governmental duties for grandiose receptions, etiquette, and pleasures, only concealed our rule. The accounts of the powerful favorites who replaced the sovereign were drawn up by our agents, and they always satisfied the shallow minds by promises that in the future there would be savings and improvements. Savings from what? From new taxes? This might have been asked but was not asked by those who read our reports and plans. You know to what their carelessness has led them, what financial disorganization they have reached in spite of the wonderful diligence of their people.

PROTOCOL NO. XXI

IWILL, add one more detail regarding domestic loans in addition to the report which I made at the last meeting. I will not speak any more of foreign loans, for they filled our coffers with the national money of the GOYS. There will be no foreigners in our government, nobody outside.

We profited by the corruption of the administrators and by the negligence of the rulers in receiving sums that were doubled, trebled, and even more, loaning the GOY governments money which in reality was not needed by the states at all. Who could do the same with regard to us? Therefore, I will only set forth details in regard to domestic loans.

In announcing such a loan, the governments open a subscription to their bonds. To make them accessible to all, they vary the denomination from one hundred to thousands, and the first subscribers are allowed to buy below face value. The following day the price is artificially raised on the pretext that

everybody hurried to buy the bonds. In a few more days there is a pretense that the treasury is filled and that it is not known what to do with the money, which has been oversubscribed. (What was the use of taking it?) The subscription is evidently considerably in excess of the amount asked for. Therein lies the effect, for it is thus demonstrated that the public has confidence in the government obligations.

But after the comedy has been played the fact of the debt appears, and it is usually a heavy one. In order to pay the interest, new loans have to be issued, which do not liquidate but increase the original debt. Then when the borrowing capacity of the government has been exhausted, it becomes necessary to meet the interest on the loan—not the loan itself—by new taxes. These taxes are nothing but a debit used to cover a debit.

Then comes the period of conversions, but these only decrease the payment of interest while they do not annul the debts. Moreover, they cannot be made without the consent of the bondholders. When a conversion is advertised, an offer is made to return the money to those who are not willing to convert their bonds. If everybody were to demand his money, the government would be caught in its own net and would be unable to return all the money. Fortunately, the GOY subjects, ignorant of financial affairs, always preferred to suffer a fall in the value of their securities and a reduction of interest to the risk of new investments; thus, they have given these governments more than one opportunity of throwing off a deficit of several millions. At present, with the existence of foreign loans, the GOYS cannot play such tricks, for they know that we would demand all the money back.

Thus, an avowed bankruptcy will be the best proof of the lack of common interest between the people and their government.

I direct your express attention to the above circumstance, as also to the following: At present all domestic loans are consolidated into so-called floating debts; in other words, into those whose terms of payment are more or less close at hand. Such debts consist of money placed in savings banks. Being at the disposal of the government, for a considerable length of time, these funds vanish in the payment of interest on foreign loans, and they are replaced by an equal amount of government securities. *The latter cover all the deficits in the government treasuries of the Goys.*

When we mount the throne of the universe, such financial expedients, being detrimental to our interests, will vanish. We will also destroy all stock exchanges, for we will not allow the prestige of our authority to be shaken by the shifting of the prices of our securities. We will fix the full price of their value legally without any possibility of its fluctuation. (A rise leads to a fall, and this was precisely what we did to the GOY stocks and bonds at the beginning.)

We will replace the stock exchanges by great government credit institutions, whose functions will be to tax commercial values according to governmental plans. These institutions will be in a position to throw daily on

the market 500,000,000 shares of industrial stocks, or to buy up a like amount. Thus all industrial enterprises will become dependent upon us. You can well imagine what power that will give us.

PROTOCOL NO. XXII

IN all that I have hitherto reported to you I have carefully tried to show you a true picture of the mystery of present events, as also of those of the past, which all flow into the stream of great events, the results of which will be seen in the near future. I have exposed our secret plans which govern our relations with the GOYS, as well as our financial policy. There remains but little to add.

We hold in our hands the greatest modern power—gold. In the course of two days we can get it from our treasuries in any desired quantity.

Is there any more need for us to prove that our rule is decreed by God? Do we not prove by such wealth that all the evil which we were forced to do during so many centuries has served in the end to true happiness—to the restoration of order? Although by means of violence, order will nevertheless be established. We will be able to prove that we are benefactors, who have brought true welfare and individual freedom to the tortured world, insuring at the same time the possibility of enjoying peace, quiet, and dignity of relationships, upon the sole condition, of course, that obedience to the laws established by us is practiced. We will also make it clear that freedom does not mean license and in doing whatever people please, no more than dignity and power imply the right to propound destructive doctrines, like freedom of conscience, equality, and similar things. Individual freedom by no means imports the right of disturbing oneself and others, disgracing oneself by making ridiculous speeches in disorderly gatherings, and implies that true liberty means individual inviolability through an honest and strict obedience to social laws; that moreover, human dignity implies the conception of one's rights as well as the idea of legal inhibitions which prohibit fantastic dreams about the *Ego*.

Our power will be glorious because it will be mighty; it will rule and guide, and not helplessly crawl after leaders and orators, shouting insane words which they call great principles, and which in reality are simply Utopian. Our power will lead to order, which, in turn, brings happiness to the people. The prestige of this power will excite mystical adoration, and the peoples will bow before it. True power does not yield to any right, even be it that of God. None will dare approach it in order to deprive it even of an atom of its might.

PROTOCOL NO. XXIII

TO teach the people obedience the v must be taught modesty, and to accomplish this the production of luxuries must be limited. We will thus improve customs, demoralized by rivalry, resulting from luxury.

We will restore handicraft, which will undermine the private capital of manufacturers. This is necessary, because big manufacturers often influence,

although not always consciously, the thoughts of the people against the government.

A people, practicing handicraft, does not know what unemployment means, and this makes them cling to existing conditions and consequently to the power of authority. Unemployment is most dangerous for a government. It will have finished its work for us as soon as authority falls into our hands.

Drunkenness will also be forbidden by law and will be punishable as a crime against human decency, for man becomes bestial under the influence of alcohol.

Once more I state, that people obey blindly only the hand that is strong and entirely independent of them, in which they see a sword of defense and a stronghold against the blows of social misfortune. Why should the sovereign have an angel's heart. They want to see in him the personification of might and power.

The sovereign who will replace the present existing governments, dragging along their existence in the midst of a society demoralized by us, which denies even the power of God and from whose midst rises on all sides the flames of anarchy, must primarily undertake to extinguish this all-consuming fire. Therefore, he must destroy such a society, if necessary drown it in its own blood, in order to resurrect it as a well-organized army, which consciously struggles against the infection of any anarchy affecting the state organism.

He, God's elect, is chosen from above for the purpose of crushing the insane forces that are moved by instinct and not by intellect, by bestiality and not by humanitarianism. These forces are now triumphant, and assume the form of robberies and all kinds of violence exercised in the name of liberty and of right. They have destroyed all social order, so as to establish the throne of the King of Israel; but their rôle will be ended with his coming into power. Then it will be necessary to sweep them from his path, on which not a twig or an impediment shall remain.

Then we will say to the peoples: Pray to God and bow before him who bears the mark of predestination, to whom God Himself showed His Star, so that none but He Himself should free you from all sinful forces and from evil.

PROTOCOL NO. XXIV

NOW I shall refer to the manner in which we will strengthen the dynastic roots of King David so as to cause this dynasty to endure until the last day [the Jewish Messiahs]. This method will consist chiefly of the same principles which enabled our Wise Men to conserve their power to cope with universal problems and to guide the education of the thoughts of humanity at large.

A few members of the seed of David will train the sovereigns and their successors, who will be selected not by right of inheritance, but according to their personal ability. To them the deep political mysteries and the plan of our rule will be confided, but in such a wise manner that nobody will know

these secrets. The aim of this method is to prove to all that power will not be given to the uninitiated in the mysteries of political art.

Only such people will be taught how to apply the above mentioned plans in practice, by comparing them with the experiences of many centuries, and only they will be initiated in the conclusions drawn from all the observations of political, economic, and social movements and sciences; in short, only they will know the true spirit of the laws, irrevocably established by nature for the purpose of regulating human relationship.

Direct descendants of the sovereign will often be prevented from inheriting the throne if, during the period of their study, they show signs of frivolity, lenience, or other tendencies detrimental to authority, which would make them incapable of government and dangerous to the prestige of the Crown.

Only those of an undoubtedly able and firm, even cruel character, will receive the reins of government from our Wise Men.

In case of illness, loss of will-power, or any other form of inefficiency, the sovereigns will be compelled to hand over the reins of government to new and able hands.

The sovereign's immediate plan of action and its application in the future will be unknown even to the so-called closest advisers.

Only the sovereign and his three sponsors will know the future.

In the person of the sovereign, with his immovable will over himself and humanity, all will recognize Fate itself with her mysterious paths. Nobody will know the aims of the sovereign when he issues his orders, and thus nobody will dare oppose him.

Naturally the mental capacity of the sovereign must be equal to the plan of rule herein contained. For this reason he will not mount the throne before a test of his mind is made by the above mentioned Wise Men.

To make people know and love their sovereign, it is necessary that he should address the people in public places, thus establishing harmony between the two forces, now separated from each other by mutual terror. This terror was necessary for us until the time came to make both forces fall under our influence.

The King of Israel [the Jewish Messiah] must not be influenced by his passions, especially by sensuality. No particular element of his nature must have the upper hand and rule over his mind. Sensuality, more than anything else, upsets mental ability and clearness of vision by deflecting thought to the worst and most bestial side of human nature.

The Pillar of the Universe in the person of the World Ruler, sprung from the sacred seed of David, must sacrifice all personal desires for the benefit of his people.

Our sovereign must be irreproachable.”

5.3 Did Anyone Believe that the *Protocols* were Genuine?

Jews and crypto-Jews instigated and financed the Japanese war against Russia, while concurrently cutting off Russia's access to funds. Jews and crypto-Jews financed and led revolutions against the Czar. Jews and crypto-Jews organized and led massive strikes, which further crippled the Russian economy. Jews and crypto-Jews fought against the Czar's effort to integrate racist Jews into Russian society. When all the havoc Jews and crypto-Jews deliberately caused began to hurt the Russians and the Russian Jews, Jews and crypto-Jews used their media control to blame the Czar for the very things he was desperately trying to prevent, the very things these Jews had deliberately caused. The Jews who were deliberately harming the Russian People turned the Russian People against the Czar who was trying to save them.

Richard B. Spence wrote of the crypto-Jewish spy, financier, warmonger and war profiteer Sidney Reilly, born Salomon Rosenblum, whose adventures fulfilled the plans spelled out in the *Protocols* (it is interesting to note that the author appears to believe that the poor Jewish spies who were out to destroy Russia and to profit from the destruction were inconveniently forced to hide the fact that they were Jews, because the Czar, in his poor paranoia, believed that there were Jewish spies aiming to destroy Russia and profit from its destruction—in reality the practice of crypto-Judaism is already found in the Old Testament story of Hadassah, a. k. a. Esther, *see: Esther 2:7*; and the Jews had long since been accused of war profiteering and revolutionary activity, and the fact that they were doing it again in Russia proved the Czar correct, not incorrect, as is obvious—in addition, the fact that the revolutionaries and fomenters of war were Jewish freemasons lends credence to the genuineness of the *Protocols*, it does not tend to disprove their authenticity),

“It was during 1905, in London or Petersburg, that Reilly first made the acquaintance of (later Sir) George Owens Thurston.⁴¹ The latter was a naval engineer and chief of construction for Vickers [the armaments manufacturer?]. Among his clients worldwide were the Japanese and Russian navies. However, perhaps the most significant thing about him for our purposes is that he was now and for many years to come a close personal friend and advisor to Basil Zaharoff. Thurston certainly forms an important link in the chain linking Reilly and the Greek. Doubtless Thurston, and probably Sir Basil, encouraged Sidney to return to Russia at least partly on their behalf.

Manasevich and Reilly arrived in St. Petersburg around October, just as the revolutionary wave crested and Nicholas' days on the throne seemed numbered. In September, the disastrous Japanese war was brought to end by a treaty negotiated in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. Representing Russia was Sergei Witte who returned the man of the hour. In September a general strike shut down the Imperial capital and other cities. Under pressure from Witte and members of his own family, Nicholas caved in and issued the October Manifesto that promised a constitution and elected parliament, or Duma. Liberals rallied to support the Tsar, while the radical Soviets were crushed. By year's end, Nicholas was again in control.

In the aftermath of war and revolution, Russia stabilized and for the

better part of a decade experienced an unprecedented burst of rearmament and economic expansion. It was a wonderful place to play the System. However, there were hazards as well, notably a sharp rise in violent anti-Semitism. The Tsarist regime fanned the flames by condemning the revolutionary disturbances as an insidious Jewish conspiracy. *The Protocols of Zion*, already noted, was an integral part of this counter-propaganda campaign. Bloody pogroms sprang up across the Empire. In 1906, one struck Bialystok, very near Reilly's boyhood home and still the abode of many of his kin. Under the circumstances, it was more important than ever to conceal or compensate for his Jewish antecedents. Thus, in Petersburg he styled himself an English expatriate 'who had become for all intents and purposes Russian.'⁴² As such, he set out to assemble and exploited an ever-widening network of contacts in Russia's commercial, political and underground spheres. Before long the name and influence of the mysterious Briton would even penetrate the precincts of the Imperial Court.

In 1906, the directory *Ves' Peterburg* ('All St. Petersburg'), listed a new name among its array of businessmen, professionals and public servants—*Sidnei Georg'evich Raille* doing business as a *komisioner* (commission agent) at #1/2 Kazanskaia Ploshchad (Square).⁴³ On hand to assist his climb up the social and Secret World ladders were a bevy of old friends and fellow intriguers. In the immediate aftermath of the war, Zaharoff arrived in St. Petersburg to cash in on Russia's rearmament bonanza. Friend Ginsburg was on the scene as well. Having brushed off accusations of treason in Port Arthur, he was ensconced as a 'first guild' tradesman with interests in banking and insurance, both spheres of acute interest to Reilly.⁴⁴ Zaharoff and Ginsburg each had links to the Brothers Zhivotovskii, Abram (recently encountered in Port Arthur) and David, ambitious *affairistes* with an eye on high finance and Russia's burgeoning armaments industry.⁴⁵ The Zhivotovskiis had their roots in the Grodno-Bialystok region which means they may have known something of Reilly's true origins. However, Abram Zhivotovskii's most interestingly connection was his supposed kinship with one Lev Davidovich Bronshtein, better known as the above-mentioned revolutionary firebrand, Leon Trotsky. Sources cannot agree on just what relationship joined the two, Abram being described variously as Trotsky's brother-in-law, cousin and uncle, but it seems most likely that they were related by marriage.⁴⁶

Besides business, another thing that Reilly, Ginsburg, Abram Zhivotovskii, and Zaharoff (reputedly even Trotsky) had in common was freemasonry. We noted this earlier as a frequent common denominator in Sidney's London associations.⁴⁷ In Petersburg it was almost universal among his contacts and cronies. To simplify matters, when first noted, an (M) after the name will indicate known masonic affiliation. The real question, of course, is what difference does that make? In the semi-liberalized atmosphere after 1905, Russian freemasonry emerged from the shadows. By 1914, some forty lodges flourished, including ones in the Duma and the military. While

the total number of masons was probably less than 2,000 out of a total population of some 150,000,000, the brethren counted among their number a sizable share of the Empire's, commercial, political and intellectual elite. In the Romanov family itself, no less than five Grand Dukes were reputed brethren of one variety or another.⁴⁸ In Moscow, Reilly affiliated with the *Vozrozhdenie* ('Renaissance') lodge whose members included Aleksandr Guchkov, now leader of the center-right Octobrist Party and one of the brightest stars in the Russian political firmament. In Petersburg, Sidney linked himself to the prestigious *Astrea* lodge.

While masonic ideology was not monolithic and factionalism abounded, it would be fair to say that the overwhelming current was liberal and anti-autocratic. On the other hand, frankly revolutionary sentiments could be found as well; both Lenin and Trotsky were alleged to be brethren.⁴⁹ There was no 'masonic conspiracy' in Russia, which is not to say that there were no conspiracies among masons. The main lodges were caught up in 'purely political' agendas.⁵⁰ In 1912, for instance, representatives of many lodges constituted the so-called Supreme Council of the Peoples of Russia.⁵¹ Later rumors held that the body spawned a 'shadow government' that plotted to undermine and replace the regime of Nicholas II. What is certain is that among its adherents were many of the men who five years later would constitute the post-Tsarist Provisional Government, among them Guchkov and a young socialist attorney, Aleksandr Kerenskii.^{52,716}

Einstein's "secretary" during his trip to America in the spring of 1921 was Simon Ginsburg (a. k. a. Salomon Ginzberg, a. k. a. Schlomo Ginossar); who was the son of Zionist Usher Ginsburg (a. k. a. Asher Ginberg, a. k. a. Ahad Ha'am), who published under the *nom de plume* "Achad Ha-am". Ginsburg, the Elder, was the secretary for the Odessa Committee for Palestine. Some alleged that he was the voice behind *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*.⁷¹⁷

It is interesting that Ha-am's son spoke for Einstein on Einstein's self-described "propaganda" tour for extreme racist Jewish nationalism in America—a man who, in Einstein's words,

"translated for me only what was essential."⁷¹⁸

In February of 1923, when Einstein visited Palestine to generate publicity for himself and for his Zionist colleagues, the Zionist Executive appointed Simon Ginsberg to be "Einstein's official escort" and Ginsberg again told Einstein what to say.

Stranger still, many of Einstein's thoughts sound hauntingly similar to passages in *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*⁷¹⁹ (widely available on the internet in many languages), which book portends to be the transcript of a plot by unnamed Jewish leaders, who allegedly controlled the Freemasons, to create a world government by means of the revolutionary activities encouraged by Adam Weishaupt's *Illuminati* and by the Communists, and later the Zionist Nazis.

Much has been written arguing that the *Protocols* are spurious.⁷²⁰ The similarity

between Einstein's comments and the *Protocols* is perhaps due to the racist Zionist *Zeitgeist* and the consistent use of the clichés of early political Zionism, the libertarian *Illuminati*-style views of some political radicals of the period and the influence of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels' writings on both the authors of the *Protocols* and on Einstein, or perhaps one should say, on Einstein's script-writers. Einstein may also have been influenced by H. G. Wells, who predicted back in 1913 that a benevolent world government would follow nuclear holocaust in the 1940's,⁷²¹ or Einstein may have conversed with others about the similar pursuits of some Wellsian Socialists.

The common link in the family tree of all of these factions and various movements for world government is ancient Jewish prophesy, a. k. a. Judaism. The ancient Jews advocated terrorism, subversion and genocide to bring about world rule by a Jewish King, or "Messiah"; or, as the Frankists and their predecessors would have it, a series of incarnations of the "Messiah" in an unbroken string of Jewish kings, who would destroy the Gentiles through attrition.

Many were struck by the similarity of the plans laid out in the *Protocols* to the later events occurring in the Bolshevist movements, particularly those led by Lev Davidovich Bronstein, a. k. a. "Leon Trotsky", and Aaron Cohen, a. k. a. "Béla Kuhn"—around whom the murderous Jews of Hungary rallied.⁷²² The Bolshevists, often led by Jews, committed genocide, destroyed Gentile cultures, subverted Gentile governments, destroyed religions, and took horrible vengeance against nations which lagged behind in the movement to emancipate Jews, all of which was prophesied in the Old Testament and reiterated by Jewish authors throughout history, and reiterated in the *Protocols* of 1905.

The Bolshevist movement was immense in the early Twentieth Century. It worked to undermine all societies and was especially active in Europe. Bolshevism had a disproportionately Jewish leadership, and manifested itself most prominently and successfully in nations with large Jewish populations. Jewish influence was especially pernicious, given that it carried out Jewish vengeance⁷²³ and Jewish aggression—carried out the events called for in Jewish Messianic mythology. The fact that Jewish radicals were deliberately fulfilling horrific Jewish Messianic prophecies caused consternation among several governments around the world and provoked a worldwide panic that racist, tribal Jews, including Albert Einstein, were attempting to take over the world and mass murder, or destroy the lives of, non-Jews and assimilatory Jewry in what they viewed as an historic phase of Judaism.

The United States Government investigated the question of whether or not "Russian Jew" and "Bolshevist" were synonymous terms.⁷²⁴ Did those who were alarmed by the *Protocols*, which foretold the carnage of the First World War, the deaths of tens of millions of Gentiles and the carnage of Bolshevism which threatened to take over the world—the mass murder of hundreds of millions of innocent civilians—the deliberate mass murder of the best of society and of the best of the human gene pool—the utter destruction of Western culture—did those who called attention to the parallels of the events foretold in the *Protocols* published in 1905, and actual unprecedented events which had since occurred from 1914 to 1920, have a right to raise their concerns?

The editors and translators of various editions of the *Protocols* expressed these concerns and published evidence in support of these facts. For example, the Small, Maynard & Company translation of 1920, published in Boston, relied upon an article published in *La Vieille-France*, Number 160, (February, 1920), pp. 10-13, to stress the common belief that,

“The article asserts that Bolshevism is nothing but a phase of Judaism, and also states that the Jewish Bolshevik leaders in Russia were subsidized by Jewish banking houses in the United States and Germany.”⁷²⁵

The book, which also contains the above translation of the *Protocols*, devotes more than half of its pages to proving this thesis, by quoting witnesses and statistics; as well as, in the authors’ minds, implausible, disingenuous and easily refuted denials by leading Jews. The editors even quote eminent Jews like Lionel de Rothschild, who took, or pretended to take, his fellow Jews to task for bringing Bolshevism to England.⁷²⁶ Several references to the predominance of Jews among the Bolsheviks are cited in this translation and exposition, *The Protocols and World Revolution Including a Translation and Analysis of the “Protocols of the Meetings of the Zionist Men of Wisdom”*, Small, Maynard & Co., Boston, (1920); with specific emphasis on testimony from the Overman Committee, as recorded in: *Bolshevik Propaganda. Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Sixty-Fifth Congress, Third Session and Thereafter, Pursuant to S. Res. 439 and 469. February 11, 1919, to March 10, 1919.*, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., (1919), pp. 47, 69, 111, 114, 116, 132, 135, 142, 269, 270, 310, 321, 424.

Whether or not one believed in the authenticity of the *Protocols*, there was no doubting the world-wide threat posed by Jewish Bolsheviks. On 19 June 1920, *The Chicago Tribune* published an article by John Clayton on the front page, which alleged that an international Jewish organization sought Jewish supremacy, largely through the destruction of the British Empire,

**“TROTZKY LEADS
RADICAL CREW
TO WORLD RULE
Bolshevism Only a
Tool for His Scheme**

BY JOHN CLAYTON.

(Chicago Tribune Foreign News Service.)

(By Special Cable.)

(Copyright: 1920: By the Tribune Company.)

PARIS, June 18.—For the last two years army intelligence officers, members of the various secret service organizations of the entente, have been

bringing in reports of a world revolutionary movement other than Bolshevism. At first these reports confused the two, but latterly the lines they have taken have begun to be more and more clear.

Bolshevism aims for the overthrow of existing society and the establishment of an international brotherhood of men who work with their hands as rulers of the world. The second movement aims for the establishment of a new racial domination of the world. So far as the British, French and our own department's inquiry have been able to trace, the moving spirits in the second scheme are Jewish radicals.

Use Local Hatreds.

Within the ranks of communism is a group of this party, but it does not stop there. To its leaders, communism is only an incident. They are ready to use the Islamic revolt, hatred by the central empires for England, Japan's designs on India, and commercial rivalry between America and Japan.

As any movement of world revolution must be, this is primarily anti-Anglo-Saxon. It sees its greatest task in the destruction of the British empire and the growing commercial power of America. The brains of this organization are in Berlin.

Trotzky at Head.

The directing spirit which issues the orders to all minor chiefs and finds money for the work of preparing the revolt is in the German capital. Its executive head is none other than Trotzky, for it is on the far frontiers of India, Afghanistan, and Persia that the first test of strength will come. The organization expert of the present Russian state is recognized, even among the members of his own political party, as a man of boundless ambition, and his dream of an empire of the east is like that of Napoleon.

The organization of the world Jewish-radical movement has been perfected in almost every land. In the states of England, France, Germany, Poland, Russia, and the east it has its groups. It is behind the Islamic revolt with all the propaganda skill and financial aid at its command because it hopes to control the shaping of the new eastern empire to its own ends. Sympathy with the eastern nationals probably is one of the chief causes for the victory of the pro-nationals in the bolshevik party, which threw communism solidly behind the nationalist aspirations of England's colonies.

Out to Grab Trade Routes.

The aims of the Jewish-radical party have nothing of altruism behind them beyond liberation of their own race. Except for this their aims are purely commercial. They want actual control of the rich trade routes and production centers of the east, those foundations of the British empire which always have been the cornerstone of its national supremacy.

They are striking for the same ends as Germany when she entered the war of 1914 to establish Mittel Europa and so give the Germans control of the Bagdad railway. They believe Europe is tired of conflict and that England is too weak to put down a concerted rebellion in part of her eastern possessions. Therein lies the hope of success. They are staking brains and money against

an empire.

Westward the course of empire makes its way, but even it swings backward to the old battleground where for countless ages peoples have fought. Nations have risen and crumbled around control of eastern commerce.”⁷²⁷

The Jewish press tried to make it appear that it was illogical to charge German-Jewish bankers with sponsoring Bolshevism. The following article appeared in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 11 April 1919 on page 8,

“Jews and Bolshevism.

WE observe that writers in the Press describe ninety-five per cent. of the new Bolshevist Government in Hungary as Jews. Whether these reports are correct we do not know. The prominence of certain individual Jews in the Russian movement having been established—though it would seem from a letter which appeared in the *Times* the other day and is quoted by a contributor elsewhere in this issue, the Jewish *personnel* has been much exaggerated—long historical tradition inevitably inclines the uncritical to treat all other Bolshevist administrations as Jewish, and to assume that every sympathiser with LENIN must be a Jew with a disguised name. Despite the identification with it of individual Jews we believe that, in essence, Bolshevism is repugnant to average Jewish sentiments as it exists. For good or ill, the Jew is for the most part a ‘law and order’ man. He hates violence, political equally with civil. He gravitates, in the mass, to Conservative doctrine, as we have seen, in striking fashion, in the political history of British Jewry since the days of emancipation. He has respect for property and an ambition to share the good tidings of the world. So much is this the case, indeed, that the undiscriminating have coined the foolish phrase, ‘as rich as a Jew,’ and malicious writers have for generations confounded Judaism with Capitalism. Trotzky and his companions, therefore—though no one in reason could deny their right to be Bolsheviks because they are Jews or Jews because they are Bolsheviks—are in no sense whatever representative of Jewish feelings or tendencies. Indeed, if popular notions as to Jewish wealth are only half true, then there is no body of men more concerned in the extirpation of Communist ideas than the Jewish people. The world cannot have it both ways. It cannot at one and the same time hold the Jew up to execration as the symbol of Capitalism and of expropriating Socialism. None the less, the Jewish disciples of Bolshevism are, as has been said, in one sense, essentially Jewish. They are Jewish in their search after an ideal. We may quarrel with that ideal—though we see that, stripped of its barbarism and cruelty, as in Hungary, the Allies do not hesitate to hold converse with it and negotiate with it, while, as we were reminded last week, a great London daily newspaper recently declared Bolshevism in essence to be idealism unmatched since the teachings of JESUS were promulgated. Even though we quarrel with Bolshevism, it cannot be doubted that, to many

believers in the theory, it is an ideal, and that, as the writer referred to observed, is the point of attraction for the Jews who are attracted by its doctrines. A people has been exiled from its own soil for centuries and persecuted by the exponents of Nationalism, in every land. Is it really a matter of surprise if, robbed of the national ideal, and schooled to regard it as their worst enemy, some Jews turn away from the jargon of frontiers and armies, and go in quest of some economic ideal? We stress these comments because it is time that the general Press tried to probe deeper into the heart of things, and because we believe they do the interests of this or any other country little good by taking superficial—which too often are harmful—views of current phenomena. The moral will not, we hope, be lost on thinking men—or on thinking Jews.”

The following article appeared in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 11 April 1919 on page 13 (note that the statement in the *Jewish World* to which the *Morning Post* responded was also published in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 28 March 1919 on page 11—see also: *The Jewish Chronicle*, 2 May 1919 on pages 18 and 19, 9 May 1919 on page 18, 25 July 1919 on page 9,

“The ‘Morning Post’ and the ‘Jewish World.’”

Tuesday’s *Morning Post* contained an article entitled ‘Bolstering the Bolshevik,’ in the course of which that paper said:

We notice that the *Daily Herald* and the *Daily News* are persistently telling the people of this country that we are fighting Bolshevism in obedience to the pressure of the capitalists. Now that is a lie. We are fighting Bolshevism in opposition to a very strong group of German-Jewish and Russian-Jewish capitalists, who are secretly working for the Bolshevik cause. We have mentioned several times the disagreeable fact that the Russian Bolsheviks were Russian Jews. Those Jews are at the present moment in control of the Russian Government, and they have powerful friends in all the Allied countries who are helping them. We have appealed to the British Jews, but appealed so far in vain, to dissociate themselves formally from a cause which is doing the Jewish people terrible harm in all parts of the world. In reply the Jewish Press shower upon us not only abuse but threats. Thus, for example, the *Jewish World* threatens us with the fate of Mordecai: ‘. . .we wish it no harm, but we would beg it to recollect,’ so it says, ‘*while yet it has its feet upon the earth* the fate of its anti-Jewish forbear in that narrative, in the hope that it may amend its ways betimes.’

We are aware of the significance of that threat. We fully understand what it means, and the secret Allies upon whom the *Jewish World* reckons when it makes it. We saw them at work in Glasgow and in Belfast. We see them at work now in Budapest, where, it is reported, out of thirty members of the Bolshevik Soviet, twenty-six are Jews. We understand the threat; but we do not propose to be deterred in our duty to the British public by the terrorist

methods of the Bolsheviks. And we suggest to the British Jewish community—most of whom, we believe, are by no means in sympathy with this crusade—that they are being served very badly by their newspapers, which openly threaten Bolshevik methods and scoff at advice which is tendered in a friendly spirit. In secret, we feel certain, the majority of British Jews distrust and dislike the fanatics who are now leading Jewry astray in the cause of a spurious Jewish Imperialism. But they are afraid to dissociate themselves publicly from the dervishes of Judaism. In the meantime these powerful influences are at work in every country, and chiefly in Paris, where they are working powerfully against the cause of Poland. An unseen hand is at this present time stifling the infant Poland in its cradle, and this is being done in the interests of German-Jewish Capitalism. It is a conspiracy which is assisted by so-called Liberal newspapers like the *Daily News* and so-called Labour newspapers like the *Daily Herald*; but it is a conspiracy nevertheless which is directed against the cause of liberty in Poland and in the interests of alien Capitalism.

Wednesday's *Jewish World* trenchantly answered the *Morning Post*, and, it goes without saying, made no little play of its muddling up Mordecai with Haman. It pointed out how the allegations contained in the *Morning Post*, concerning Jews and Bolshevism, were little more than 'a whirling screed of bemused contradictions,' in which Jews are at one and the same time pilloried as Bolsheviks and Capitalists."

If the same Jewish banker can trap some rabbits with a snare in the forest and trap other rabbits with a spring trap in the grass, then the same Jewish banker can sponsor and profit from both Capitalism and Bolshevism at the same time. Jewish leaders have always profited from war and without opposing sides there is no war so it is in their interests to create and sponsor opposing political forces. Indeed the sophistry promoted in the Jewish press that leading Capitalist Jews could not possibly sponsor and profit from Bolshevism is easily refuted by the fact that one of the premier Jewish Capitalists in the world financed the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, financed Trotsky and Lenin, and closed off the Czar's access to international money markets. That banker was Jacob Schiff, a German-Jewish Capitalist whose family had long had intimate ties to the Rothschild family. What would prevent a German-Jewish banker from paying crypto-Jews to overthrow the Czar so that the German-Jewish Capitalists like the Warburgs and their cohorts could steal the wealth of the Russian nation and commit genocide against the Russian People, whom they expressly despised? Apparently nothing, since that is exactly what German-Jewish Capitalists did do, and Jacob Schiff openly bragged about it.

Jewish leaders were very familiar with the Greek and Hegelian notions of the cycles of government and of human history. They sought to control every phase of these cycles and struggles, and there is no contradiction in that fact. They profited from pitting Capitalist nations, which were ultimately under their control, against Bolshevik nations, which were ultimately under their control. The synthesis of these dialectical struggles was gold in their pockets. If it benefitted the Jewish bankers to

have a Capitalist revolution, then they had one. If it profited them to instigate a Bolshevik revolution, then they did so. The Jewish ideal is to take over the wealth and the governments of the world. It is not surprising that Jewish bankers have used various means to accomplish that end. It was not unlike Jews to pretend to be of one faith, while espousing another. Nor was it unlike Jews to throw stumbling stones onto the paths of others, or to promise Utopian dreams to Gentiles to manipulate their actions and as a trap to deliberately lead them into disaster.

No one accused the Jewish bankers of personally and sincerely holding opposing views at the same time. The accusation was quite the contrary, that the basic duplicity of Jewish bankers led them to entice others into self-destruction through deliberate lies and unfair and deceitful practices.

In the minds of the authors of numerous translations of the *Protocols*, the resolution of the seeming paradox of the Jew as capitalist and the Jew as Bolshevik, was easily found in the *Protocols*, where politics is said to be amoral and insincere, where actions are paramount, and where liberal political movements are merely a means to weaken Gentile governments, so that Jewish wealth can prevail and fulfill Jewish prophecy. Denis Fahey was one of many who argued that Jewish financiers were behind Marx, Trotsky, Lenin, Stalin, etc. and sought to use Communism as a means to gain absolute Jewish control over the world.⁷²⁸ Liberalism secured Jewish rights, and, thereby, Jewish access to the press and to government. Liberalism destroyed monarchies, which had served as natural barriers to Jewish political domination, and which Jewish prophecy demanded must be abolished.

Altruism was not the motivating force behind organized “Jewish policy”, behind Jewish Liberalism, rather it was perceived self-interest. The “Jewish idealism” of Bolshevism was a Trojan Horse, which lured Gentile nations into falling into the trap Bolshevism in name of “liberty, equality and fraternity”, which Bolshevism immediately stripped the Gentiles of all their rights and put cruel and murderous Jews into power. When Jewish leaders had sufficiently crippled a society to the point where its members clamored for a dictator to restore order and peace, the principles of Liberalism were not only abandoned by Jewish leadership, they were ridiculed. Jewish Liberalism was not a Jewish ideal, nor an end, but rather a means to obtain absolute Jewish domination. It was the typical Jewish bait of a promised Utopia that once swallowed poisoned its prey. Though the Jewish Bolsheviks held out candy in one hand, they clutched a knife behind their backs the entire time they were petitioning for power.

Jewish Capitalism worked in collusion with Jewish Liberalism toward the same end. The concentrated wealth of the Jewish financiers enabled them to create wars, control the press and politicians, and finance revolutions. It also gave them control over international finance so that they could foment wars and then ensure a given nation would collapse in economic, as well as military, ruin. Jewish revolutionaries would instigate strikes, which would further bankrupt the nation. Jewish revolutionaries would then draw the attention of the public to its misery, misery they had caused but which they would blame on the government. Jewish Liberalism and Jewish Capitalism worked together to create international Jewish domination.

In the *Protocols*, Capitalism and Communism, and the strife between them, all

serve the end of racist, tribal Jewish wealth accumulation and the acquisition of power—the fulfillment of Jewish prophecy through the weakening of Gentile power, especially Gentile monarchies. There is no more a contradiction in self-interests, to the exclusion of lofty logical consistency, in one tribe concurrently advocating both Communism and Capitalism; than there is in one imperialistic nation concurrently advocating both absolute national sovereignty and colonialism—as so often happens. As the *Protocols* indicate, sophistry and hypocrisy do indeed prevail in politics, where the true motives of the leaders are often not reflected in expressed party ideologies.

The accusation that racist, tribal Jews advocated both Communism and Capitalism was not an accusation that they were sincere in both of these mutually exclusive ideals, but that they were insincere and exploitive of others sincerity and naïveté, and sought to profit from conflict. There is no denying that Communist nations have been robbed of their wealth, deliberately and as a matter of circumstances, and that conflicts between Communist nations and Capitalistic nations have profited international financiers, as can any war, and further that where Capitalism has failed to corrupt a monarchy (or rather failed to spice it with the preferred flavor of corruption), Communism can overthrow it—and Communism did infect Eastern Europe following World War II—and many believed that Jews provoked wars so as to weaken societies and leave them vulnerable to Communist takeover, and/or Capitalistic buyout. All the nations of Europe were under constant attack from Bolsheviks during and after the First World War. For those who saw in this attack a tribal mission by racist Jews, which revolutionary mission is a pervasive theme in Judaism, the *Protocols* served as,

“Proof that Communism is a Jewish world plot to enslave the Gentiles by creating wars and revolutions, and to seize power during the resulting chaos and to rule with their claimed superior intelligence as the chosen people.”⁷²⁹

“Part Two” of the 1920, Small, Maynard & Company translation of the *Protocols* starts off with the statement,

“Part Two

EVIDENCE AS TO ORIGIN AND AUTHENTICITY

I. PARALLELISM BETWEEN THE ACTUAL POLICIES OF THE BOLSHEVIKI AND THE PROTOCOLS

THE most striking fact in connection with the *Protocols* is the close resemblance which their ruthless program bears in many respects to the policies actually put into effect by the Bolsheviks in Russia. Indeed, without this fact before us, the necessity for a serious consideration of the *Protocols* would be much less apparent. If the evidence shows that the Bolshevik movement is a movement conducted under Jewish leadership and principally controlled by Jews, and, furthermore, that it closely corresponds with the

political program outlined in the Protocols, then, indeed, we have facts of grave significance supporting the authenticity of the Protocols.”⁷³⁰

“Mentor” wrote in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 4 April 1919 on page 7,

“THERE is much in the fact of Bolshevism itself, in the fact that so many Jews are Bolshevists, in the fact that the ideals of Bolshevism at many points are consonant with the finest ideals of Judaism, some of which went to form the basis of the best teachings of the founder of Christianity—these are things which the thoughtful Jew will examine carefully. It is the thoughtless one who looks upon Bolshevism only in the ugly repulsive aspects which all social revolutions assume and which make it so hateful to the freedom-loving Jew—when allowed to be free. It is the thoughtless one that thus partially examines the greatest problem the modern world has been set, and as his contribution to the solution dismisses it with some exclamation made in obedient deference to his own social position, and to what for the moment happens to be conventionally popular.”

5.3.1 Human Sacrifice and the Plan to Discredit Gentile Government—Fulfilled

Racist Zionist Theodor Herzl secretly wrote in his diary of a conversation he had had with racist Zionist Max Nordau,

“Never before had I been in such perfect tune with Nordau. [***] This has nothing to do with religion. He even said that there was no such thing as a Jewish dogma. But we are of one race. [***] ‘The Jews,’ he says, ‘will be compelled by anti-Semitism to destroy among all peoples the idea of a fatherland.’ Or, I secretly thought to myself, to create a fatherland of their own.”⁷³¹

After the Nazis had segregated, humiliated and slaughtered millions of Jews at the behest of the Jewish financiers, and had ruined Germany and the image of Gentile government, racist Zionist Albert Einstein wrote, among other things, in 1945,

“[The Jews’] status as a uniform political group is proved to be a fact by the behavior of their enemies. Hence in striving toward a stabilization of the international situation they should be considered as though they were a nation in the customary sense of the word. [***] In parts of Europe Jewish life will probably be impossible for years to come. In decades of hard work and voluntary financial aid the Jews have restored the soil of Palestine to fertility. All these sacrifices were made because of trust in the officially sanctioned promise given by the governments in question after the last war, namely that the Jewish people were to be given a secure home in their ancient Palestinian country. To put it mildly, the fulfillment of this promise

has been but hesitant and partial. Now that the Jews—especially the Jews in Palestine—have in this war too rendered a valuable contribution, the promise must be forcibly called to mind. The demand must be put forward that Palestine, within the limits of its economic capacity, be thrown open to Jewish immigration. If supranational institutions are to win that confidence that must form the most important buttress for their endurance, then it must be shown above all that those who, trusting to these institutions, have made the heaviest sacrifices are not defrauded.”⁷³²

Lenni Brenner wrote in his exposé *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, “The Wartime Failure to Rescue”, Chapter 24, Lawrence Hill Books, Chicago, (1983), pp. 235-238 [Brenner cites in his notes: “22. Michael Dov-Ber Weissmandel, *Min HaMaitzer* (unpublished English translation). 23. Ibid. 24. Ibid. (Hebrew edn), p. 92. 25. Ibid., p. 93.”],

“For only with Blood Shall We Get the land’

The Nazis began taking the Jews of Slovakia captive in March 1942. Rabbi Michael Dov-Ber Weissmandel, an Agudist, thought to employ the traditional weapon against anti-Semitism: bribes. He contacted Dieter Wisliceny, Eichmann’s representative, and told him that he was in touch with the leaders of world Jewry. Would Wisliceny take their money for the lives of Slovakian Jewry? Wisliceny agreed for 50,000 in dollars so long as it came from outside the country. The money was paid, but it was actually raised locally, and the surviving 30,000 Jews were spared until 1944 when they were captured in the aftermath of the furious but unsuccessful Slovak partisan revolt.

Weissmandel, who was a philosophy student at Oxford University, had Volunteered on 1 September 1939 to return to Slovakia as the agent of the world Aguda. He became one of the outstanding Jewish figures during the Holocaust, for it was he who was the first to demand that the Allies bomb Auschwitz. Eventually he was captured, but he managed to saw his way out of a moving train with an emery wire; he jumped, broke his leg, survived and continued his work of rescuing Jews. Weissmandel’s powerful post-war book, *Min HaMaitzer* (From the Depths), written in Talmudic Hebrew, has unfortunately not been translated into English as yet. It is one of the most powerful indictments of Zionism and the Jewish establishment. It helps put Gruenbaum’s unwillingness to send money into occupied Europe into its proper perspective. Weissmandel realised: ‘the money is needed here – by us and not by them. For with money here, new ideas can be formulated.’²² Weissmandel was thinking beyond just bribery. He realised immediately that with money it was possible to mobilise the Slovak partisans. However, the key question for him was whether any of the senior ranks in the SS or the Nazi regime could be bribed. Only if they were willing to deal with either Western Jewry or the Allies, could bribery have any serious impact. He saw

the balance of the war shifting, with some Nazis still thinking they could win and hoping to use the Jews to put pressure on the Allies, but others beginning to fear future Allied retribution. His concern was simply that the Nazis should start to appreciate that live Jews were more useful than dead ones. His thinking is not to be confused with that of the Judenrat collaborators. He was not trying to save some Jews. He thought strictly in terms of negotiations on a Europe-wide basis for all the Jews. He warned Hungarian Jewry in its turn: do not let them ghettoise you! Rebel, hide, make them drag the survivors there in chains! You go peacefully into a ghetto and you will go to Auschwitz! Weissmandel was careful never to allow himself to be manoeuvred by the Germans into demanding concessions from the Allies. Money from world Jewry was the only bait he dangled before them.

In November 1942, Wisliceny was approached again. How much money would be needed for all the European Jews to be saved? He went to Berlin, and in early 1943 word came down to Bratislava. For \$2 million they could have all the Jews in Western Europe and the Balkans. Weissmandel sent a courier to Switzerland to try to get the money from the Jewish charities. Saly Mayer, a Zionist industrialist and the Joint Distribution Committee representative in Zurich, refused to give the Bratislavan 'working group' any money, even as an initial payment to test the proposition, because the 'Joint' would not break the American laws which prohibited sending money into enemy countries. Instead Mayer sent Weissmandel a calculated insult: 'the letters that you have gathered from the Slovakian refugees in Poland are exaggerated tales for this is the way of the *'Ost-Juden'* who are always demanding money'.²³

The courier who brought Mayer's reply had another letter with him from Nathan Schwalb, the HeChalutz representative in Switzerland Weissmandel described the document:

There was another letter in the envelope, written in a strange foreign language and at first I could not decipher at all which language it was until I realised that this was Hebrew written in Roman letters, and written to Schwalb's friends in Pressburg [Bratislava] . . . It is still before my eyes, as if I had reviewed it a hundred and one times. This was the content of the letter:

'Since we have the opportunity of this courier, we are writing to the group that they must constantly have before them that in the end the Allies will win. After their victory they will divide the world again between the nations, as they did at the end of the first world war. Then they unveiled the plan for the first step and now, at the war's end, we must do everything so that Eretz Yisroel will become the state of Israel, and important steps have already been taken in this direction. About the cries coming from your country, we should know that all the Allied nations are spilling much of their blood, and if we do not sacrifice any blood, by what right shall we merit coming

before the bargaining table when they divide nations and lands at the war's end? Therefore it is silly, even impudent, on our part to ask these nations who are spilling their blood to permit their money into enemy countries in order to protect our blood—for only with blood shall we get the land. But in respect to you, my friends, *atem taylu*, and for this purpose I am sending you money illegally with this messenger.²⁴

Rabbi Weissmandel pondered over the startling letter:

After I had accustomed myself to this strange writing, I trembled, understanding the meaning of the first words which were 'only with blood shall we attain land'. But days and weeks went by, and I did not know the meaning of the last two words. Until I saw from something that happened that the words '*atem taylu*' were from '*tiyul*' [to walk] which was their special term for 'rescue'. In other words: you, my fellow members, my 19 or 20 close friends, get out of Slovakia and save your lives and with the blood of the remainder—the blood of all the men, women, old and young and the sucklings—the land will belong to us. Therefore, in order to save their lives it is a crime to allow money into enemy territory—but to save you beloved friends, here is money obtained illegally.

It is understood that I do not have these letters, for they remained there and were destroyed with everything else that was lost.²⁵

Weissmandel assures us that Gisi Fleischman and the other dedicated Zionist rescue workers inside the working group were appalled by Schwalb's letter, but it expressed the morbid thoughts of the worst elements of the WZO leadership. Zionism had come full turn: instead of Zionism being the hope of the Jews, their blood was to be the political salvation of Zionism."

Racist Zionist leader Rabbi Stephen S. Wise boldly stated soon after the First World War and the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, as quoted in an article, "President Gives Hope to Zionists", *The New York Times*, (3 March 1919), pp. 1, 3.

"The rebuilding of Zion will be the reparation of all Christendom for the wrongs done to Jews."

As Rabbi Wise' must have known, the Old Testament and modern Zionists asserted that Gentiles, "Esau", would fund, labor, and provide the military needed to create, build and maintain Israel. The Zionists believed that it was the prophetic duty of the Gentile to God and to Jacob to slave and die building and fighting for Israel, the "chosen people". It was the assimilatory Jew's prophetic duty to die together with the Gentile.

The following article appeared in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 22 September 1922

on page 31, which states that there would be no peace without a solution of the Jewish question, and that the Palestine Mandate was “reparation to the Jew for two thousand years of martyrdom”,

“5682.

THE YEAR’S RETROSPECT.

THE year just closing will be for ever memorable in Jewish annals as the year which saw the confirmation of the Mandate, with its formal and solemn establishment of the Jewish claim to Palestine as the National Home of the race. That one great central, irrevocable fact, however it be construed or whittled down by individual statesmen, stamps 5682 as *annus mirabilis* in Jewish history. It calls a halt to two thousand years of aimless drifting, and sets a definite direction in which the Jew may march with confidence. It comes at a moment of immense opportuneness to lift, if ever so little, an almost intolerable burden of suffering, confusion, and despair. It represents a movement which, whatever deductions may legitimately be made from its value upon this or that ground, is, at all events in essence, constructive. It embodies the recognition by the nation that it has a second problem of ‘reparations’ to solve—reparation to the Jew for two thousand years of martyrdom; and that the solution of the Jewish question is indispensable to world peace. Whether the Jewish Palestine, as the politicians are at the moment fashioning it, be a great bright light, illuminating the darkness of the Diaspora, or a will-o’-the-wisp full with fatality for the hopes of our people, the world-approved Mandate we cannot away with. Hold destiny what it may, the future of the Jewish People after the Mandate’s confirmation can never be like the past. It is that which makes the year now ending a year of years in our people’s chequered career, and its story a tale to linger over in the depressing procession of tragedies called Jewish history.”

What absolute power did Zionist Jews have to ensure perpetual war if the Gentiles refused to let themselves be coerced into stealing the land of Palestine from its indigenous population and giving it to Zionist Jews who had no right to it? What debt did the English have to pay as “reparation to the Jew for two thousand years of martyrdom”?

Joseph Finn wrote in a Letter to the Editor of *The Jewish Chronicle* published on 22 September 1922 on page 14,

“We will reach our [Hebrew deleted.] when all wars—military and commercial—shall cease, and in consequence thereof the nations become truly civilised and refined, when they begin to feel sorrow because of the wrongs they have done to us throughout the centuries. Then will *our* day come, when the nations will be eager to compensate us for the wrongs we are suffering and have suffered. Blessed be those who live to see that day!”

Finn speaks of the revenge of the Jews upon the Gentiles for the “Controversy of Zion”—of the prophesied age when the Jews will enslave and then destroy the Gentiles, after the Jewish Messiah passes judgment on non-Jews and assimilated Jews (*Isaiah* 11). The Jewish book of *Zechariah* 8:23 promises the Jews that ten Gentiles will gladly slave for every Jew,

“Thus saith the LORD of hosts; In those days *it shall come to pass*, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard *that God is with you.*”

The Jewish book of *Genesis* 25:23; 27:38-41 promises the Gentiles to the Jews as their slaves and slave soldiers, and gives the Jews an incentive to exterminate the Gentiles because the Gentiles dare to be angry at the Jews for deceiving them and using them as slaves,

“25:23 And the LORD said unto her, Two nations *are* in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and *the one* people shall be stronger than *the other* people; and the elder shall serve the younger. [***] 27:38 And Esau said unto his father, Hast thou but one blessing, my father? bless me, *even* me also, O my father. And Esau lifted up his voice, and wept. 27:39 And Isaac his father answered and said unto him, Behold, thy dwelling shall be the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above; 27:40 And by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck. 27:41 And Esau hated Jacob because of the blessing wherewith his father blessed him: and Esau said in his heart, The days of mourning for my father are at hand; then will I slay my brother Jacob.”

Rabbi Wise’s statement in the immediate post-WW I era, recalls the Jewish prophecy that Gentiles would be massacred as reparation for the wrongs done to the Jews and that the rebuilding of Zion heralded the event. *Isaiah* 34 states:

“1 Come near, ye nations, to hear; and hearken, ye people: let the earth hear, and all that is therein; the world, and all things that come forth of it. 2 For the indignation of the LORD is upon all nations, and his fury upon all their armies: he hath utterly destroyed them, he hath delivered them to the slaughter. 3 Their slain also shall be cast out, and their stink shall come up out of their carcasses, and the mountains shall be melted with their blood. 4 And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig tree. 5 For my sword shall be bathed in heaven: behold, it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse, to judgment. 6 The sword of the LORD is filled with

blood, it is made fat with fatness, and with the blood of lambs and goats, with the fat of the kidneys of rams: for the LORD hath a sacrifice in Bozrah, and a great slaughter in the land of Idumea. 7 And the unicorns shall come down with them, and the bullocks with the bulls; and their land shall be soaked with blood, and their dust made fat with fatness. 8 For it is the day of the LORD's vengeance, and the year of recompences for the controversy of Zion. 9 And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. 10 It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever: from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it for ever and ever. 11 But the cormorant and the bittern shall possess it; the owl also and the raven shall dwell in it: and he shall stretch out upon it the line of confusion, and the stones of emptiness. 12 They shall call the nobles thereof to the kingdom, but none shall be there, and all her princes shall be nothing. 13 And thorns shall come up in her palaces, nettles and brambles in the fortresses thereof: and it shall be an habitation of dragons, and a court for owls. 14 The wild beasts of the desert shall also meet with the wild beasts of the island, and the satyr shall cry to his fellow; the screech owl also shall rest there, and find for herself a place of rest. 15 There shall the great owl make her nest, and lay, and hatch, and gather under her shadow: there shall the vultures also be gathered, every one with her mate. 16 Seek ye out of the book of the LORD, and read: no one of these shall fail, none shall want her mate: for my mouth it hath commanded, and his spirit it hath gathered them. 17 And he hath cast the lot for them, and his hand hath divided it unto them by line: they shall possess it for ever, from generation to generation shall they dwell therein."

Martin Luther, who had intimate contacts with the Jews of his day, wrote,

"A more bloodthirsty and vindictive race has never seen the light of day. They regard themselves as the Chosen of the Lord and believe they are destined to annihilate and torture all Gentiles. The first and foremost task they expect their Messiah to accomplish is that he shall murder and slay all human beings with his sword. From the very earliest days they have undertaken all in their power to practically demonstrate this to the Christians and have continued to do so whenever they could."⁷³³

The Bolsheviks' genocide of the people of Russia, of Hungary, and the millions lost in the "Great War", made many people suspicious of the Zionists and the Bolsheviks and their desire for reparations for thousand of years of suffering in the form of the fulfillment of genocidal Judaic prophesies—especially since the League of Nations was formed to create a world government by a movement disproportionately populated with, and represented by, Jews. This League sought to establish a few of the policies spelled out in the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, such as the proscription that war could not change national borders—that a

nation could not acquire new territory by means of warfare and aggression, which would make war a fountain of wealth for Jews without any chance of the formation of an empire which could challenge their dominance.

Ironically, the Security Council of the United Nations later issued Resolution 242 condemning the State of Israel for violating this principle. Israel refuses to comply with United Nations Resolution 242, reiterated in United Nations Resolutions 267, 338, 446, 452, 465, 468, 469, 471, 476, 478, 484, 605, 607, 608, 636, 641, 672, 673, 681, 694, 726, 799, 1073, 1322; and repeatedly ignored by Israel. Israel has been condemned by United Nations Resolutions countless times and has refused to comply with countless other United Nations Resolutions, including 106, 111, 127, 162, 171, 228, 233, 234, 237, 248, 250, 251, 252, 256, 259, 262, 265, 270, 271, 279, 280, 285, 298, 313, 316, 317, 332, 337, 347, 425, 427, 444, 450, 467, 487, 497, 498, 501, 508, 509, 512, 513, 515, 516, 517, 518, 520, 521, 573, 587, 592, 611, 904, and 3379.

Many have argued that this principle, that territory cannot be acquired by war, is imposed on non-Communist Gentile countries, so that war can become a perpetual means for Jews to reap profits from conflict, and in order to prevent the formation of empires not under direct Jewish control. The “Jewish State”, on the other hand, does not yet occupy “Greater Israel”, the territory from the Nile to the Euphrates. Many Jews have designs on that territory, and go so far as to claim that sorrowful events which befall Israelis today are God’s punishment for the Israeli withdrawal from the Gaza strip. They cite Jewish religious writings, which they believe command Jews to never surrender any “Jewish” soil.

Setting aside Jewish religious myths, which prophesy Jewish world dominance and the genocide of the Gentiles—assuming for the sake of argument that Stephen Wise in no wise referred to such things as Jewish prophesy, which Jews had clung to for centuries in hopes of vengeance against the Gentiles—and so stated in their writings—there is no basis for Wise to assert that the reconstruction of Zion represented the sacrifice of anything by Christendom, nor reparations for anything, let alone for historic offenses committed against Jews by Christians—unless one sees, together with the Zionists, the reconstruction of Zion as the product of the First World War and as the only means to save Western Civilization from Bolshevism—the only means to save Western Civilization from Jews.

The theft of Palestine was instead an unprovoked crime against the Moslems who lived there. It was the appropriation of territory from the Turkish Empire by warfare and bloodshed. The Romans who destroyed Jerusalem and the Temple, and then caused a very significant phase of the Diaspora, were not Christians. What gain was there to anyone in stealing that land from Turkey and giving it to a diverse group of people who did not want to populate it, unless the Zionists’ real plan was to usher in the Messianic Age? For Christian Zionists the end times meant the demise of the Jews, the return of Christ and the ascendance of the Christians. For Jewish Zionists, the end times meant their dominance over the entire world promised to them by themselves by their prophets—profits—reparations?

In addition to the plans set forth in Biblical prophesy, racist Zionist Theodor Herzl believed that the Christians ought to pay the Jews to create Jewish colonies in

Palestine and that the Christians ought to fight for the Jewish Zionists, lest they face the wrath of Jewish revolutionaries. Herzl proposed these things in 1896 in his book *The Jewish State*. He reasoned that since the Christians would profit from the expulsion of the Jews, and since the Christians had the military means to take Palestine and defend it, the Christians ought to be the ones to do the dirty work for the Jews.

The same cynical *quid pro quo* Zionist argument Rabbi Wise had made after the First World War—Jewish suffering and the loss of Jewish life in exchange for Palestinian land and a Christian clear conscience—reappeared after the Second World War, and was made by, among others, Albert Einstein.⁷³⁴ In his book, *The First Holocaust: Jewish Fund Raising Campaigns with Holocaust Claims During and After World War One*, Holocaust Handbook Series, Volume 6, Theses & Dissertations Press, Castle Hill Publishers, Chicago, (October, 2003),⁷³⁵ Don Heddesheimer proved through citation to primary sources, that Jewish relief efforts during and after the First World War taught Jewish leaders that they could raise enormous sums of money by pitching the idea that six million Jews were in danger of perishing in a “holocaust” in Eastern Europe. After the Holocaust of the Second World War, Zionist leaders sought to finance the founding of the State of Israel with reparation monies taken from Germany. What gave them the right to steal Palestinian land, and why did they want it, if not to fulfill Messianic prophecy?

The sacrifice of Jewish life for blood-monies and land was an old idea. In 1924, racist Zionist Israel Zangwill ironically stated that it would be a wonderful thing if the legions of lost Jewish lives could turn a profit with which to fund the founding of the “Jewish State”. Zangwill said,

“Mussolini demanded of Greece fifty million lire as compensation for a few murdered Italians. If we had the power to impose blood-money for *our* murdered, the financing of Palestine would become child’s play.”⁷³⁶

Two decades later, on 20 September 1945, immediately after the Holocaust of the Second World War; Chaim Weizmann demanded reparations from Germany, which were eventually paid to finance Israel.⁷³⁷ Weizmann had read Zangwill’s article of 1924 and had responded to it in the same issue of *The Nation* in which it had appeared.⁷³⁸ One has a right to ask if the Zionists had planned the attacks on Jews in part as a means to fund their project, or merely cynically demanded the “blood-money” after they put the Zionist Nazis into power to persecute innocent Jews and force them towards Zionism against their will.

In 1945, after the Nazi atrocities, Albert Einstein callously reminded the world of the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine Mandate in order to exploit the tragedy of the Holocaust, which the Zionist Nazis had perpetrated, as an opportunity to steal the Palestinians’ land. Einstein exploited the Holocaust—the suffering of millions of Jews—to justify the fulfilment of his racist pre-Nazi political Zionist agenda. Einstein asserted that the Holocaust proved that the world thought of the Jews as a nation, thereby mocking the dead assimilationist Jews Einstein hated—those who had been murdered by the Zionists’ Nazis.

As the *Protocols*, and Max Nordau, forecast, the Zionists caused unimaginable suffering in order to discredit Gentile governments, when in fact all the while it was the Zionists themselves who created the turmoil and took the innocent lives, amny of them innocent Jewish lives. After the Second World War, Germany and much of Europe lay in ruins, and the Zionists obtained their goals of a racist apartheid “Jewish State”, a “United Nations” and the discrediting of the idea of a “fatherland” for any human being other than a Jew.

The Zionists promoted the myth that the Germans were the genetic enemies of the Jews, and that the Jews were the innocent victims of Gentile aggression, when it was the Zionists who had deliberately caused the massive suffering of their assimilating Jewish brethren—not that the European Gentiles should be forgiven for their willingness to follow the Zionists’ leaders into the abyss. The Zionists created the Nazis. The Zionists put the Nazis in power. The Zionists carried out the war and the Holocaust. Then the Zionists destroyed Germany and plunged Eastern Europe into Jewish Bolshevik tyranny.

Genocidal human sacrifice had long been a Judaic tradition, and in more recent times, Friedrich Engels made it clear that the Communists were comfortable with human sacrifices amounting to ten million lives lost in order to prepare the way for revolution and Communist world dominance. In 1887, Frederick Engels knew that the First World War was coming and that it would destroy the empires of Europe and leave them ripe for revolution,

“No other war is now possible for Prussia-Germany than a world war, and indeed a world war of hitherto unimagined sweep and violence. Eight to ten million soldiers will mutually kill each other off, and in the process devour Europe barer than any swarm of locusts ever did. The desolation of the Thirty Years’ War compressed into three or four years and spread over the entire continent: famine, plague, general savagery, taking possession both of the armies and of the masses of the people, as a result of universal want; hopeless demoralization of our complex institutions of trade, industry and credit, ending in universal bankruptcy; collapse of the old states and their traditional statecraft, so that crowns will roll over the pavements by the dozens and no one be found to pick them up; absolute impossibility of foreseeing where this will end, or who will emerge victor from the general struggle. Only *one* result is absolutely sure: general exhaustion and the creation of the conditions for the final victory of the working class.”⁷³⁹

To this day, some argue that the Holocaust, not the Covenant with Abraham, gives Israel a “birthright”, though they fail to explain why the Holocaust, which was created and perpetrated by Zionists in Europe, gave the Jews a right to steal the land of the Palestinians and send the world into perpetual turmoil.

Gideon Levy published an article on *www.haaretz.com*, on 26 February 2006, entitled “Denial Is Not a Reason for Arrest”, which stated,

“Israel’s right to exist, as a birthright of the Holocaust, is stronger than all its

deniers, including the president of Iran.”⁷⁴⁰

In 1945, Einstein wrote, among other things,

“[The Jews’] status as a uniform political group is proved to be a fact by the behavior of their enemies. Hence in striving toward a stabilization of the international situation they should be considered as though they were a nation in the customary sense of the word. [***] In parts of Europe Jewish life will probably be impossible for years to come. In decades of hard work and voluntary financial aid the Jews have restored the soil of Palestine to fertility. All these sacrifices were made because of trust in the officially sanctioned promise given by the governments in question after the last war, namely that the Jewish people were to be given a secure home in their ancient Palestinian country. To put it mildly, the fulfillment of this promise has been but hesitant and partial. Now that the Jews—especially the Jews in Palestine—have in this war too rendered a valuable contribution, the promise must be forcibly called to mind. The demand must be put forward that Palestine, within the limits of its economic capacity, be thrown open to Jewish immigration. If supranational institutions are to win that confidence that must form the most important buttress for their endurance, then it must be shown above all that those who, trusting to these institutions, have made the heaviest sacrifices are not defrauded.”⁷⁴¹

After the war, Zionist racists like Albert Einstein callously demanded Palestine on a *quid pro quo* basis for the human sacrifice of millions of Jews, which the Zionists had wrought.⁷⁴² But where was the logic in this? If the Europeans had murdered six million Jews, as the Zionists claimed, why should the Palestinians pay with their lives and their property for the crimes of the Zionist Nazis? In typical fashion, the Zionists exhibited their infamous dishonesty and argued both sides of the same issue as opposing and mutually exclusive arguments suited their needs.

David Ben-Gurion wrote in his *Memoirs* of 1970,

“I have called the Arab attitude towards Israel irrational. Nevertheless, the Arab world has levelled several concrete accusations against us and it might be well to answer these here.

They have said, for instance, that the Moslem portion of the globe is paying for Nazism in Europe, that without the holocaust we would never have come here as a mass and never have founded a State. And, complain the Arab propagandists, it isn’t fair that this part of the world should pay for the persecutions carried out in Europe.

I have already gone exhaustively into the reasons for our being here, reasons that I as a pioneer of 1906 can affirm have nothing to do with the Nazis! I think that Hitler did much to retard, not advance, our nationhood. In the middle thirties, it looked as though we were soon to achieve a Jewish State. But with war in Europe looming ever closer, thanks to the Nazis,

Britain cracked down on Jewish nationalist aspirations with the famous White Paper of 1939. Ripe as we were for nationhood at that time, we had the greatest difficulty in helping even a fraction of European Jewry escape the gas chambers. Certainly Israel's population contains no massive element of direct victims of Nazism or their descendants. We just were unable to save the majority of these people. And those who did escape from Germany and the other countries didn't always come here as we weren't equipped to get them in their hundreds of thousands past the British embargo on immigration or offer them a true nation once they got here.

I would agree, however, that the advent of Nazism and its consequences in Europe did have one direct effect on Israel. It indicated to us all, to every Jew, the potential danger of being without a homeland. Nazism proved that Jews could live for five hundred years in peace with their neighbours, that they could all but assimilate in national society save for a few traditions and separate religious practices. They could believe themselves integral citizens of states professing freedom of belief and granting full rights to all inhabitants. Such was the situation prevailing in Germany, France, Italy, Holland, Denmark, Norway. Yet one raving maniac could blame the world's troubles on a group constituting less than six per cent of Europe's population and the holocaust was at hand!

So, many a Jew realized that to be fully Jewish and fully a human being, and fully safe as both, one had to have a country of one's own where it was possible to live and work for something belonging to a personal cultural heritage. In this sense, Nazism did bring many Jews to Israel, from everywhere on earth. Not as victims of persecution but as believers in the positive good of a Jewish national home.

I have said that personally I was never a victim of anti-Jewish persecution. I have, however, seen and marked the 'outsider' status of the Jews in even the most enlightened countries, as opposed to their full participation in our society here."⁷⁴³

The formation of the "Jewish State" was not enough for the Zionists. They continue to exploit and dishonor the dead, whose deaths they caused, by using the Holocaust as a means to intimidate others into surrendering their rights to free speech, even to free thought, and to capture funds. On the post-Holocaust, "Holocaust industry", which has seen Jews exploiting the death and suffering of millions of other Jews to stifle debate and generate personal profits, *see*: Norman G. Finkelstein's books, *The Holocaust Industry: Reflection on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*, Verso, London, New York, (2000); and *Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-semitism and the Abuse of History*, University of California Press, Berkeley, (2005).

Racist Jews continue to segregate themselves. In Israel, racist Jews are constructing an enormous wall to seal in the boundaries of their self-imposed "World Ghetto",⁷⁴⁴ just as they did in the Holocaust. Whenever the door to integration and assimilation opens to the Jews, it is racist Jews who rush in to slam it shut. It will be

Jews who will covertly promote a rise in anti-Semitism in America. It will be Jews who will covertly promote a rise in anti-Semitism in Russia. It will be Jews who will impose a police state on the world, as they did in Bolshevik Russia and Nazi Germany. Judaism endures. It is the bane of mankind.

5.3.2 The World Awakens to the “Jewish Peril”

The title “The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion” probably stems from the official published reports of the various Zionist Congresses: *Stenographisches Protokoll der Verhandlungen des* [fill in the number of the congress] *Zionisten-Congresses gehalten zu* [fill in the place] *vom* [fill in the dates]. These official published reports are known to be incomplete and redacted, but do not resemble *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* in many important respects.

The *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* were published in Russian at least as early as 1901, by Sergei Nilus.⁷⁴⁵ They later appeared in English, German, French, Italian, and Japanese translations and led to a rapid rise in international anti-Semitism in the immediate post-World War I period. Many people feared that an international Jewish organization initiated World War I in order to force the nations of Europe to procure Palestine for the Zionists and to create weakness among European states, which would enable revolutionaries to overthrow those states, eliminate all monarchies, destroy Christianity and fully emancipate the Jews, and also to exact vengeance for the pale of settlement in Russia, the Pogroms, the Ghettoes and other offenses committed against Jews by Gentile Europeans. Typical statements of this belief are found in the writings of Henry Ford’s *The International Jew: The World’s Foremost Problem* of 1920, Adolf Hitler’s *The International Jew and the International Stock Exchange—Guilty of the World War* of 1923, and Roman Dmowski’s *The Jews and the War* of 1924.⁷⁴⁶

The conservative press made a concerted effort to inform the public that the Bolshevik revolution in Russia was part of an overall Jewish conspiracy to take over all of the governments of the world, in order to enslave humanity; and in retaliation against Christians and Gentiles for the Diaspora, the mediaeval ghettos, the pogroms and the Pale of Settlement. The role the German government came to play in fomenting dissent in Russia during World War I, so as to diminish Russia’s capacity to fight against Germany, was not generally emphasized. The involvement of the German Government came at the instigation of Jewish financiers. Both Kaiser Wilhelm II and General Ludendorff stated that they had been dupes of the Jews.

Herman Bernstein—one of many who argued that the *Protocols* are fabrications—witnessed the rise in awareness of “the Jewish Peril” following the Russian Revolution, and the Bolshevik takeover of the revolution, as early as November of 1917. Henry Ford named Herman Bernstein as one of the two Jews on the Peace Ship who explained “the Jewish Peril” to him in 1915. The other Jew was Rosika Schwimmer. Bernstein capsulized the allegations against Jews, which Ford attributed to Bernstein,

“That leading members of the Jewish faith precipitated the World War. 2.

That in the middle of the war they switched their support to the Allies, selling out to the highest bidder, and that their price was the aid of the allied nations in restoring Palestine to the Jewish people as a national home. 3. That they murdered or caused the murder of the Russian Czar and his family. 4. That most of the dangerous and destructive theories of government abroad in the world are of Jewish origin. 5. That they have debased the professions, prostituted the arts and degraded sports and corrupted commerce. 6. That they control and dominate the press, finance, resources, institutions and politics of the United States, and prostitute the same to unlawful and iniquitous purposes and to their own aggrandizement and to the great injury of the civilized world. 7. That their alleged wealth and power as a race constitutes a threat to mankind.”⁷⁴⁷

Herman Bernstein, who denied having told Ford these things, was with Ford on the famous “Peace Ship” expedition, but withdrew from the mission. Bernstein was born on the border of Germany and Russia in Neustadt-Schwerwindt in 1876 and his family emigrated to the United States in 1893. He married Sophie Friedman in 1901. He was an “insider” among the Jewish elite, who sponsored Woodrow Wilson’s presidential campaign and Zionism. Ironically, in 1906, he translated Leo Tolstoy’s anti-Zionist appeal “ZIONISM: An Argument against the Ambition for Separate National Existence. A Plea for Devotion to the Idea of Common Humanity” for *The New York Times*, which was published on 9 December 1906, on page SM2.

The explosive rise in awareness of “the Jewish Peril” in the West, which attended the disclosure of Bolshevist atrocities, alarmed Western anti-Zionist Jews. The rise in the assimilation of Jews in Russia following Kerensky’s “emancipation proclamation” and Lenin’s proscriptions against anti-Semitism, alarmed Zionist Jews who wanted the Jews to be segregated.⁷⁴⁸

This created a dynamic situation for Jewish leadership. Zionists preferred that the Russian Jews suffer from anti-Semitism, which the Zionists hoped would force Russian Jews to emigrate to Palestine and do the dirty work for the wealthier Western Jews, who would then move into palatial estates built by Russian Jewish slave labor. The Zionist knew that wealthy Western Jews were worried about a backlash against them for the atrocities committed by Jewish Bolsheviks. On the other hand, Western Jews were worried about a severe backlash, a “Holocaust”, against Russian Jews should the Bolshevik régime fail and the Russians be restored to power. This was the very thing the Zionists wanted and would achieve through the Bolshevik Zionist Nazi régime.

Jewish leaders settled on a plan. They would covertly keep the Bolsheviks in place, while publicly denouncing them in the West. At the same time, they would try to segregate Russian Jews by forming a “Jewish State” in territory under Bolshevik control. If that failed because the Jews did not want to segregate, they would cause a rise in anti-Semitism in order to prevent assimilation. In the West, they would threaten Christians with a choice between Zionism and Bolshevism, while concurrently and irrationally denying that Jews were behind Bolshevism. They accomplished this end by having Jews in high places denounce Bolshevism in

England and in America, while low level Zionists and high level Gentile and crypto-Jewish Zionist “anti-Semites” informed the public that the Jews were indeed behind Bolshevism.

On the Continent, they would install a Zionist Bolshevik dictator. Since the Jewish Bolsheviks were unsuccessful in Germany and other Western nations, and further since the Jews of Europe did not want to go to Palestine even after Jewish leaders had destroyed the Turkish Empire, Jewish leaders planned to install crypto-Jewish Bolshevik dictators on the Continent on an anti-Semitic platform, which became easier for them after the Jewish Bolsheviks and Jewish bankers had created anti-Jewish sentiments.

Things really began to heat up in 1917, after the Zionists had arranged for America to enter the war on the side of the British. The Zionists decided to bury Germany and Russia. They had to assure the British and the Americans that this fate did not await them, though it ultimately does.

As Jewish leaders have done so often in the past—in the case of Rome with Caligula and then Nero—in the English Revolution with Cromwell—in the French Revolution with Robespierre—in the Young Turk Revolution; Jewish leaders deliberately threw the Russian Nation into chaos by means of a Jewish led and financed revolution after Jews had deliberately made conditions unbearable in the nation; then, Jews and their agents loudly cried out that the only way to restore order was to install a dictator, one who would covertly do the bidding of Jewish leadership. The entire process made it appear that the Jews were moral and good to the Russian working class, and that it was the Russian Gentiles who bankrupted the nation and led the people into ruin. In fact, the opposite was the case. Jews deliberately made conditions unbearable in the nation. Jews carried out the revolution. Jews installed the dictator. Jews oppressed the masses and conducted genocide—in each instance—as they would later do in the Nazi Revolution with Hitler.

The New York Times wrote on 9 November 1917, on the front page and continuing onto page 2, in an article entitled, “Hope Strong Man Will Rule Russia”,

“Herman Bernstein, who was in Petrograd during the Maximalist riots of last July, said that he was confident that Trotzsky was only the agent of Lenine, who from his hiding had been directing this revolt, as he had done the rising of that period.

‘It can’t win,’ he said, ‘for Lenine and Trotzsky are both extremely unpopular. They had a better chance last July, when, if they had only had well-laid plans, they would have been able to dominate Petrograd. As it was, they failed at the time, and the popular execration directed against Lenine after the bloodshed of July was such as to convince me that he will never be able to dominate the Russian people.

‘But undoubtedly Kerensky cannot continue in his present position. He has tried to be gentle with the Bolsheviks, in the confidence that they would appreciate his position and treat him as he treated them. Now there must be leaders who will know how to handle them. It has been well established that Lenine is in the German pay, and there is no doubt that the present rising is

supported by German funds.

‘The ideal of Trotsky and Lenine is what Trotsky calls ‘the permanent revolution,’ a revolution continuing until the maximum Socialist program is in force throughout the world. I don’t think there is much likelihood that this program will win, but there is certain to be considerable disorder if the reports so far are correct. One thing I am afraid of is that there will be more pogroms. Trotsky is a Jew, and unfortunately there are a number of Jewish leaders among the most radical faction. Of course, it is very far from being a wholly Jewish affair. Lenine himself, whose real name is Ulyanoff, comes of an old and noble Russian family, and there are plenty of other Russian leaders. But the prominence of a few Jews is, I am afraid, likely to be avenged on the entire race.

‘One thing worthy of note is that the Bolsheviki have learned a point from the procedure of the original revolutionists. You will remember that the revolutions of March seized the telegraph and cable offices, so that after a few days of no news from Petrograd there came out of a clear sky the story of the completed revolution and the full list of Ministers of the Provisional Government.

‘This had a great effect in bringing into line the provincial cities and the country districts which might have hesitated if there had come full accounts of the indecisive fighting of the first two or three days. Lenine overlooked this point in his July revolt, but Trotsky’s promptitude in seizing the means of communication at present indicates a desire to try to swing the provinces to the support of a *fait accompli* in the same manner.’”

Note the subtle messages Bernstein was conveying to his readers—the trap he was setting for the Russian People. The terrible Germans were ultimately responsible for the Bolsheviks, though Bernstein knew that Jewish bankers were the true culprits. The noble Jew Kerensky was too good to lead. The terrible Bolsheviki left the world no choice but to install a dictator in Russia who could deal with them with a strong hand. But who would that dictator be, after the Gentiles had swallowed the tyrannical bait? Bernstein does not say, though he is suspiciously sympathetic to the Bolshevik leaders he pretends to denounce. History shows that those dictators were none other than the Bolshevik leaders Lenin and Trotsky—and they most certainly did know how to *reign* in the Bolsheviks.

Jewish leaders would use similar treacherous tactics with Hitler, a Zionist Bolshevik, whom Jewish leaders put in power on an anti-Bolshevik, anti-Semitic platform. Jewish leaders destroy Christian churches in a similar way, by putting crypto-Jews and Jewish agents in key positions in those churches to subvert them, often with an anti-Jewish Zionist agenda.

Leading Jews were worried that their Bolshevik scheme might backfire, and that the Russians would retaliate against the Jews for destroying Russia, stealing the Russians’ wealth and mass murdering the Russian people. Leading Jews also feared that Western Gentiles would awaken to the “Jewish Peril” and would organize to take back the monies Jewish bankers had been stealing from Gentiles for centuries.

The New York Times reported on 19 November 1917 on page 2,

“JEWS AGAINST BOLSHEVIKI.

Maximalists Represent ‘Dark Forces’
of Russia, Bernstein Says.

Denouncing as false reports in the European and American newspapers that Jews were leading and supporting the Bolshevik movement in Russia, Herman Bernstein, in an address before the Institutional Synagogue, at the Mount Morris Theatre, in East 116th Street, declared yesterday that the attempt to associate the Jews with the Bolshevik was merely another expression of anti-Semitic propaganda. Far from being the friends and leaders of the Bolsheviki, he said, the Jews of Russia were their avowed enemies, because the Maximalists included in their ranks representatives of the same ‘dark forces’ that had always advocated the suppression of Jewish freedom.

Mr. Bernstein, who spent three months in Petrograd after the revolution and had seen the Maximalists at work, said their aim was to bring about utter destruction not only of the freedom of the Jews, but also the freedom of all Russia. The fact that there were seven or maybe ten Jews, including Trotzky, among the leaders of the party was not to be taken as an indication, according to Mr. Bernstein, that the Jews of Russia were supporting their efforts.

‘In the first place,’ declared Mr. Bernstein, ‘these men are not Jews in the real sense of the word. They are not in the least sympathetic to Jewish culture or Jewish ideals. Most of them have been converted to other faiths, and the word Jew has no particular significance to them. The great body of Jews in Russia look upon these men, who were once of their faith, as enemies to the race. The Jews of Russia are no more proud of the Bolsheviki of Jewish descent, than the gentiles of Russia are proud of the Bolsheviki of the Christian faith.’”

Though many Jews who were Bolsheviks made an outward show of opposing Bolshevism, many Jews who were not Bolsheviks also felt obliged to do what they could to keep the murderous Bolsheviks in power for fear of retaliation against the Jews of Russia for the Bolsheviks’ atrocities. Of course, Jewish leadership put the Bolsheviks in power in Russia and wanted them to stay in power and the Bolsheviks committed their atrocities against Christians because the Jewish bankers told them to commit them. It was widely known that Bolshevism was a Jewish movement led by Jews and financed by Jews. Chaim Weizmann reported to the Fifth Meeting of the Zionist Advisory Committee, in London, on 10 May 1919,

“Bolshevism covers a multitude of sins, especially in Poland, and we pay the cost. As a result of the official statement issued by the Bolsheviks in Petrograd to join them, 2½ per cent of the Jewish population have joined, 90 per cent have refused. It is quite true that 60 per cent of the Bolshevik

officials are Jews. It is simply that they have got to find means of living, and they are the only people who can read and write.”⁷⁴⁹

The attempted Russian revolution of 1905 was also widely known to have been the work of Jews, and many Jews took great pride in that fact. *The Maccabean* of London wrote in a November, 1905, article, “A Jewish Revolution”, on page 250,

“The revolution in Russia is a Jewish revolution, a crisis in Jewish history. It is a Jewish revolution because Russia is the home of about half the Jews of the world, and an overturning of its despotic government must have a very important influence on the destinies of the millions living there and on the many thousands who have recently emigrated to other countries. But the revolution in Russia is a Jewish revolution also because Jews are the most active revolutionists in the Tsar’s empire.”⁷⁵⁰

William Eleroy Curtis delivered an address to the National Geographic Society on 14 December 1906, and stated, *inter alia*,

“THE VENGEANCE OF THE JEWS

Perhaps these reforms are the cause of the present tranquility, because the revolutionary leaders nearly all belong to the Jewish race and the most effective revolutionary agency is the Jewish Bund, which has its headquarters at Bialystok, where the massacre occurred last June. The government has suffered more from that race than from all of its other subjects combined. Whenever a desperate deed is committed it is always done by a Jew, and there is scarcely one loyal member of that race in the entire Empire. The great strike which paralyzed the Empire and compelled the Czar to grant a constitution and a parliament was ordered and managed by a Jew named Krustaleff, president of the workingmen’s council, a young man only thirty years old. He was sent to the penitentiary for life, and had not been behind the bars more than three weeks when he organized and conducted a successful strike of the prison employees.

Maxim, who organized and conducted the revolution in the Baltic provinces, is a Jew of marvelous ability. Last fall he came over here lecturing and collecting money to carry on the revolutionary campaign, but for some reason has vanished and nobody seems to know what has become of him.

Gerschunin, the most resourceful leader of the terrorists, who was condemned to life imprisonment in the silver mines on the Mongolian frontier, has recently escaped in a water cask, and is supposed to be in San Francisco. He is a Polish Jew only twenty-seven years old. I might enumerate a hundred other revolutionary leaders and every one of them would be a Jew. Wherever you read of an assassination or of the explosion of a bomb you will notice in the newspaper dispatches that the man was a Jew. The most sensational and dramatic episode that has occurred since the mutinies was on October 27, when, in the very center of Saint Petersburg, at the entrance of

Kazan Cathedral, four Jews held up a treasury wagon and captured \$270,000. They passed the package to a woman, who instantly vanished, and no trace of her has ever been found; but they were all arrested and were promptly punished. On the 8th of November a few Jewish revolutionaries entered a treasury car near Ragow, in Poland, got \$850,000 and disappeared.

Every deed of that kind is done by Jews, and the massacres that have shocked the universe, and occurred so frequently that the name ‘pogrom’ was invented to describe them, were organized and managed by the exasperated police authorities in retaliation for crimes committed by the Jewish revolutionists.”⁷⁵¹

The Bolsheviks mass murdered millions of Christian Slavs and terrorized the world. On the Jewish role in Bolshevism and in the persecution of the Russian masses, *see*: I. Shafarevich, И. ШАФАРЕВИЧ, *Трехтысячелетняя загадка*. Алгоритм, Москва, (2005) [*Three Thousand Year Old Riddle*, Algorithm, Moscow, (2005).]; and Alexander Solzhenitsyn, А. СОЛЖЕНИЦЫН, *Двести лет вместе*, Русский путь, Москва, (2001) [*Two Hundred Years Together*, Russian Way, Moscow, (2001).].

Jews around the world desperately lied and attempted to downplay the fundamental rôle Jews played in the genocide of millions of Slavic Christians. At the same time as they were denying that Jews were behind the Bolshevik movement, leading Jews did what they could to perpetuate Bolshevism until such time as they could shape the Slavic mind and make the Slavs impotent and subservient to Jewish interests. The outspoken racist Zionist Israel Zangwill provides us with a fitting example. He protested loudly in 1919 that he was against Bolshevism, but that the Allies should not confront the threat of Bolshevism because it was inevitable that there would be a world government—this while proudly avowing his rabid Zionist nationalism. The racist Zionists felt justified in demanding that the Gentile nations surrender their sovereignty to a genocidal Jewish movement, while concurrently demanding that Palestine be made a “Jewish State”, because the racist Zionists were following the racist supremacist precepts of Judaism, which demands the “restoration of the Jews to Israel” and the concurrent ruin of all other Peoples.

Jews had been calling on Western nations to intercede on their behalf in Russia for centuries. They held massive fund raisers for Russian Jews, but leading Jews discouraged the Western nations from interceding on behalf of Russian Christians after the Russian Revolution, which was funded and led by Jews—Christians who were being slaughtered in the millions at the behest of leading Jews. Zangwill tipped his hand when he proclaimed that the “ideal political aim” was to “make the world safe for minorities” and not “majorities”. He likely had in mind the destruction of Gentile nations and creation of a “Jewish State” for the Jewish minorities. On 28 March 1919 on page 11, *The Jewish Chronicle* republished an exchange of letters which first appeared in the *Morning Post*,

“Bolshevism and the Jews.

MR. ISRAEL ZANGWILL AND THE 'MORNING POST.'

The *Morning Post* of Tuesday printed the following letter from Mr. Israel Zangwill:—

In a leader of the 20th instant, you called in the *Times* as 'a witness who will not be suspected of partiality' to testify to 'the sentiments and. . . the demonstrations countenanced by Mr. Zangwill' at the Albert Hall. Suffer me to be amused your idea of the *Times*, for it so happens that this degenerate organ, once the forum of Britain, not merely forbore to publish my true sentiments, but brazenly refused to allow me to correct its suppression of the true and its suggestion of the false.

The fact is, that I was not a silent 'assistant' on the platform. I made the longest speech of the evening, but strictly in reference to the advertised object of the meeting, viz., protestation against intervention in Russia—a policy now apparently the Governmental one—and I began by repudiating Bolshevism and disavowing the irrelevant utterances that had preceded mine. Not to make the world safe for majorities, but to make the world safe for minorities, seems to me the ideal political aim. It is true that I appeared in 'compromising' company, but I would rather be compromised in a good cause than reported *verbatim* by the *Times* in a bad one. And I know no better cause than to save our soldiers and our country from a continuance of the superhumanly prolonged fighting of which Bolshevism, like the influenza plague, is the natural sequel.

That Jews should be immune from either was hardly to be expected. But that even in Russia they are not all on one side is tragically shown by the fact that the girl who wounded Lenin was of the race of Trotsky. And, oddly enough, as I was writing to you, I received a visit from an influential Russian Jew, newly escaped from Petrograd, who is planning an anti-Bolshevist crusade, and who with tears in his eyes and voice, declared he would sacrifice his last rouble, nay, life itself, to save Russia for real democracy. The thought of the thousands dying from hunger—while professional Bolsheviks banquetted royally—made him unable, he declared, to swallow his own food. According to him, there is abundant food in Russia, though disorganisation or tyranny prevents its distribution.

But since Bolshevism and the influenza mock at frontiers, it is clear that the world is increasingly becoming one place, and therefore I fail to perceive why you read a lurid Semitic significance into my view that State Sovereignty is a conception 'absurd and antiquated.' That view is surely implicit in the League Of Nations; it was indeed already implicit in Christianity, so that your phrase, 'the nationalism of the Christian nations,' seems as paradoxical to me as it doubtless would appear to Lord Hugh Cecil, if nationalism is to imply an autocratic sovereignty transcending international obligations of Reason and Justice. But whether my view be right or wrong, do, please, allow me elbow-room and breathing-space as an individual writer, without affixing the responsibility for my heresies to my race or community. Are all Christian authors in agreement with one another or with the mass of

their fellow-citizens?

Thank you for your sympathetic perception of the dignity of Jewish nationalism, I am, yours, &c.,

ISRAEL ZANGWILL.

Far End, East Preston, Sussex,
March 24th.

The *Morning Post* on Wednesday, in a leading article headed ‘Mr. Zangwill Explains,’ says: It is a little unfortunate, when he [Mr. Zangwill] saw the sort of company into which he had fallen, and saw also the symbols of Revolution flaunted under his nose, that he did not mark his disapprobation by getting up and leaving the hall. That is how a law-abiding and loyal Englishman might be expected to act in the circumstances. When a public character—as his modesty cannot prevent us regarding Mr. Zangwill—takes his place on the platform of a meeting, he suggests by his presence a certain patronage or approval of its aims. And why, by the way, did this meeting, distinctively Jewish, according to the *Times*, and undeniably Bolshevik, at one and the same time, celebrate the obsequies of Bolsheviks in Germany and protest against Allied intervention in Russia? Was it really, as Mr. Zangwill would have us believe, ‘to save our soldiers and our country,’ or was it not to save the Bolsheviks? People who hang out red flags draped in black for Rosa Luxemburg and Liebknecht are not likely to be thinking of ‘our soldiers and our country.’”

The London Times article to which the *Morning Post* referred appeared on 10 February 1919 on page 10; and note that Bertrand Russell, who advocated genocidal world population reduction, was in attendance; and note further that Sinn Fein was a Bolshevik institution which employed Jewish terrorist methods to create perpetual strife between British and Irish, Catholic and Protestant,

“SOCIALISTS AT THE ALBERT HALL.”

A Socialist demonstration was held at the Royal Albert Hall on Saturday night to protest against intervention in Russia and to demand the withdrawal of the Allied troops from that country. Mr. F. C. Fairchild presided, and among those on the platform were Mr. Israel Zangwill, Mrs. Despard, and Miss Sylvia Pankhurst. Messages expressing sympathy with the object of the meeting were read from, among others, the Hon. Bertrand Russell, Mr. Arthur Ponsonby, Mr. E. D. Morel, Mr. Austin Harrison, and Mr. Bernard Shaw.

It was stated on the programme that the cost of the meeting was at least £400. A collection was made to meet this, but the young aliens of Jewish extraction who formed a large part of the audience and corps of stewards did not appear to contribute very liberally, and it is doubtful if anything

approaching the sum stated was raised. But it is understood that substantial donations had been received previously by the organizers. The hall was not full, although on Friday it was announced that every seat had been allotted. Accommodation had been provided for the Press, and two of the speakers denounced and warned the 'scribes of the capitalist newspapers' and, incidentally, the 'camouflaged shop stewards of Scotland-yard.' A red flag draped in black commemorated Rosa Luxemburg and Liebknecht. There were also a few Sinn Fein flags on the platform.

Mr. NEIL MACLEAN, M.P., who suggested that the workers should also demand 'Hands off Glasgow,' moved a resolution in accordance with the object of the meeting, and calling on the working class of Great Britain 'to enforce this demand by the unreserved use of their political and industrial power.'

Mr. JOHN MACLEAN, the Bolshevik 'Consul' in Glasgow, demanded the immediate release of the Sinn Feiners, and conscientious objectors and all other political prisoners of 'that brazen-faced scoundrel Woodrow Wilson.'

Mr. W. F. WATSON, the chairman of the London Workers' Committee, deplored the attitude of the great majority of London workmen who were not inclined to come out on strike or remain out very long. As matters stood they must wait for the miners to move and take every possible advantage of every industrial grievance to make industry impossible."

As late as 1924, racist political Zionist Israel Zangwill wrote that the Jews feared the downfall of Bolshevism and therefore had an overwhelming incentive to perpetuate Bolshevism and destroy all Gentiles in its grasp lest they someday retaliate against Jews for the wrongs done by Jews to them,

"National politics is the realm of might, and if, as Dr. Hertz warns us, the menace of massacre still lies over the whole Russian Jewry should the Soviet Government be overthrown, we must face the sad fact that Jewish might does not exist."⁷⁵²

America is today being manipulated in the same manner. Jewish media terrifies the American People with a Moslem bogey that does not exist. Many Jews are attempting to create war between Christians and Moslems by asserting that Moslems are attacking Christians, and that elite Christians are pitting Moslems and Jews against each other. These Jews cleverly pit Moslems and Christians against each other by falsely claiming that Moslems are attempting pit Christians against Jews, and that Christian leaders are attempting to pit Moslems and Jews against each other. These Jews deceptively blame others for the strife these same Jews deliberately cause the world.

Jews, Jewish agents and Jewish dupes carry out staged "terrorist attacks" and the American People join the Jewish media's chorus clamoring for war and dictatorship. Most American Jews want nothing of this, but are deliberately being led up to a backlash against them which will force them to Palestine. Jewish war profiteers

concentrate the wealth of the world in their hands through war and irrational tax policies. The American economy is being subverted and the world is being led towards a nuclear World War III and a world-wide depression, which will result in a ruined environment, world government and a world-wide police state—Jewish goals from at least the Fifth Century before Christ. The Zionist Jews believe that by taking these steps they are fulfilling Judaic Messianic prophecies and that they will soon enjoy a world without Gentiles in a paradise God will give them on the “New Earth”. They are not concerned about the destruction of the environment or the immorality of the genocide of Gentiles, because they believe God will create a new Earth and wants the Gentiles dead, as the Jewish prophets declared. *Isaiah* 65 states (see also: *Enoch*), and note that the “elect”, the “remnant” of the “chosen”, are the Jews and only the Jews,

“1 I am sought of *them that* asked not *for me*; I am found of *them that* sought me not: I said, Behold me, behold me, unto a nation *that* was not called by my name. 2 I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, which walketh *in a way that* was not good, after their own thoughts; 3 A people that provoketh me to anger continually to my face; that sacrificeth in gardens, and burneth incense upon altars of brick; 4 Which remain among the graves, and lodge in the monuments, which eat swine’s flesh, and broth of abominable *things is in* their vessels; 5 Which say, Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou. These *are* a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day. 6 Behold, *it is* written before me: I will not keep silence, but will recompense, even recompense into their bosom, 7 Your iniquities, and the iniquities of your fathers together, saith the LORD, which have burned incense upon the mountains, and blasphemed me upon the hills: therefore will I measure their former work into their bosom. 8 Thus saith the LORD, As the new wine is found in the cluster, and *one* saith, Destroy it not; for a blessing *is* in it: so will I do for my servants’ sakes, that *I* may not destroy them all. 9 And I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob, and out of Judah an inheritor of my mountains: and mine elect shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there. 10 And Sharon shall be a fold of flocks, and the valley of Achor a place for the herds to lie down in, for my people that have sought me. 11¶ But ye *are* they that forsake the LORD, that forget my holy mountain, that prepare a table for *that* troop, and that furnish the drink offering unto *that* number. 12 Therefore will I number you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter: because when I called, ye did not answer; when I spake, ye did not hear; but did evil before mine eyes, and did choose *that* wherein I delighted not. 13 Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD, Behold, my servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry: behold, my servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty: behold, my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed: 14 Behold, my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit. 15 And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord GOD shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name: 16 That he who blesseth

himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth; and he that sweareth in the earth shall swear by the God of truth; because the former troubles are forgotten, and because they are hid from mine eyes. 17¶ For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. 18 But be ye glad and rejoice for ever *in that* which I create: for, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy. 19 And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people: and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying. 20 There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days: for the child shall die an hundred years old; but the sinner *being* an hundred years old shall be accursed. 21 And they shall build houses, and inhabit *them*; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. 22 They shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not plant, and another eat: for as the days of a tree *are* the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands. 23 They shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth for trouble; for they *are* the seed of the blessed of the LORD, and their offspring with them. 24 And it shall come to pass, that before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear. 25 The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock: and dust *shall be* the serpent's meat. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the LORD.”

Isaiah 66:22-24 states,

“22 For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I *will* make, *shall* remain before me, saith the LORD, so shall your seed and your name remain. 23 And it shall come to pass, *that* from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the LORD. 24 And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.”

5.3.3 America Becomes the “New Jerusalem”

Jewish revolutionaries destroyed Russian society in collaboration with Jewish financiers, by conducting disastrous strikes and denying the Russian economy access to investment capital, while plunging Russia into war. As Russian society collapsed, the Jews blamed the Czar for the problems the Jewish revolutionaries and financiers had caused. Some Jews may even have asked previous Czars to create the Pale of Settlement and to appear anti-Semitic, in order to prevent assimilation, and they may have manipulated the Czars' actions through carefully placed *agents provocateur* like Rasputin. During Napoleon's reign, some Jews betrayed Napoleon's philo-Semitism and encouraged all Jews to side against Napoleon and with an anti-Semitic Czar, because they feared that Napoleon's emancipation of the Jews was leading to assimilation. A Jewish leader of the time, Shneur Zalman, who hated Gentiles,

reasoned that,

“If Bonaparte wins, the wealth of the Jews will increase and their positions will be raised. But their hearts will be estranged from their Father in Heaven. However, if Czar Alexander wins, then although the poverty of the Jews will increase and their position will be lower, their hearts will cleave to and be bonded with their Father in Heaven.”⁷⁵³

Those Jewish leaders who promoted anti-Semitism were interested in preserving their own power over other Jews, as well as in preventing assimilation. Jewish leaders depend upon wealth concentration and anti-Semitism to maintain their power—just as they are today war profiteering with a false Moslem bogey in America. In 1881, the Nihilists murdered Czar Alexander II. Konstantine Petrovitch Pobiedonostsev (*also*: Constantin Pobedonostzeff), a man of Jewish appearance who won the favor of Alexander III, retaliated with pogroms against the Jews; which, while certainly bad, were exaggerated in the international press. The alleged Czarist persecution of the Jews, which did not occur, was used as a reason to sponsor the emigration of Jews to the West, which emigration had a negative impact on the Russian economy. The Jewish population in the United States steadily rose from about 200,000 in 1880, to several million by 1920. In the period of 1881-1917, the Jews of Russia had their agents, probably including Pobedonostzeff, stage anti-Semitic pogroms where crypto-Jews attacked comparatively small numbers of Jews in order to give the Jews an incentive to migrate to America, the “New Jerusalem”, while simultaneously opening up the Pale of Settlement on the West, such that the Jews were encouraged to move to America and to form an American Jewish homeland—or to prepare for one in Palestine.

It is clear that the staged attacks and the “May Laws” against Russian Jews hurt the Russian People and benefitted the Jews, especially the Zionists like Baron Hirsch, who needed bodies to fill his proposed “Jewish State”. This fits a broader pattern of Jewish behavior of deliberately instigating anti-Semitism in order to fulfill the plans of Jewish leadership. Dr. Maurice Fishberg wrote enthusiastically about the Russian Jew in “The Russian Jew in America”, *The American Monthly Review of Reviews*, Volume 26, Number 3, (September, 1902), pp. 315-318. However, this journal was created by William T. Stead to promote the views of Cecil Rhodes, who was himself a Rothschild agent.⁷⁵⁴ Though the article bears the typically anti-Russian pro-Jewish bias of such publications, it is nevertheless useful for the facts it contains. Fishberg wrote, *inter alia*, at pages 315-316,

“THE history of the Jews in America begins with the discovery of the continent by Columbus. It has been established beyond question that at least five Jews were with him on his first voyage. Among the first settlers in South America and Mexico, at the end of the fifteenth century, were many Jews, mostly refugees from Spain and Portugal. Some of these again emigrated to the colonies in North America. Many other Jews came directly from Holland, Spain, and Portugal. There are records showing that there were

German and Portuguese Jews in New Amsterdam as early as 1650. At the time of the Revolution the number of Jews in the colonies was comparatively small; in 1818, Mordecai M. Noah estimated their number at 3,000, and Isaac C. Harby put it at 6,000 in 1826. The American Almanac of 1840 speaks of 15,000. The number of Jews in the United States did not materially increase up to 1880, when a committee appointed by the Board of Delegates of the American Israelites estimated them at 230,257. The Russian Jewish immigration began at that time, and in 1888 Isaac Markens estimated the American Jewry at 400,000, nearly double that of eight years before. The American Jewish Year Book for 1901-02 shows that in 1900 there were 1,058,133 Jews in America. The largest number, 400,000, is credited to New York; Pennsylvania, with 95,000 Illinois, with 75,000; Idaho and Nevada appear as having the least,—300 Jews each. This estimate is far too low. According to a statistical investigation by Mr. Joseph Jacobs, based on the number of dead interred in Jewish cemeteries, it has lately been calculated that there are at the present time 584,788 Jews in Greater New York, which is 184,788 more than that of the American Jewish Year Book. The same is probably true of Pennsylvania, Illinois, etc. I think that 1,500,000 is nearer the truth. This means that there are more Jews in the United States than in any other country, excepting Russia and Austria-Hungary. Greater New York, with its 584,788 Jews, has more than Prussia (379,716), France (80,000), and Italy (50,000) combined. When the first Russian-American Congregation was organized in New York on June 4, 1852, it had less than two dozen members. But since 1882 the number of Russian Jews has been rapidly increasing, and at present their number in Greater New York is estimated at 367,690.

After Alexander II. was assassinated on March, 14, 1881, repeated anti-Jewish riots broke out in various parts of Russia. Thousands of Jewish homes were destroyed, and many Jews who were rich, or at least in easy circumstances, suddenly found themselves reduced to poverty. The police and the military authorities did not, in the majority of these riots, make any serious attempts to help the Jews, and in many instances it is known they even assisted in the pillaging of Jewish property. The cause of these riots is known to have been purely political. The constant discontent of the Russian peasants, due to incessant oppression by the Russian authorities and unbearable taxation, endangered the stability of the new government under Alexander III. The government and the inspired press used the Jew as a means of distracting the minds of the common people from their discontent and revolutionary tendency. They pointed out that many of the younger Jews participated in the revolutionary movement of the Nihilists, and that the Jews were consequently responsible for the death of the ‘Czar-Emancipator.’

The distressing condition of the Jews became absolutely intolerable on May 15, 1885, when the so-called ‘*May Laws*’ were enacted in Russia. These consist essentially of the establishment of the ‘Pale of Settlement’ of fifteen governments (districts) in Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania,—‘All stolen by Russia

from other people' (Harold Frederic),—in which the Jews may live, and prohibiting them from living in the interior of Russia. In the 'Pale' the Jews may live only in towns and cities, and not in the villages. All the leases and mortgages held by the Jews on landed estates were canceled by this act. These laws, in addition to older laws exacting from Jews special taxation on property, rents, legacies, breweries, vinegar factories, printing presses, etc., made it practically impossible for the bulk of the Jews to sustain themselves. Even meat killed 'kosher' is taxed in Russia, so that a Jew has to pay for a pound of meat nearly double the price for that which is not 'kosher.' Jewish children are admitted to the high schools and universities to the extent of only 5 per cent. of the population; and, as there are cities in the 'Pale' in which the population consists of more than 50 per cent. of Jews, the benches of the high schools are vacant, while hundreds of the Jewish youth are vainly applying for admission. The result of these restrictions can be easily imagined. The first relief came by emigration. Baron de Hirsch rendered some assistance. He aided many to emigrate to Argentine and to Canada. But the United States, with its great opportunities, attracted most of them, and up to date over 600,000 Russian-Jewish immigrants have settled here. Freedom from oppression was the chief attraction to this country. Then the great opportunities offered in the United States to the Jews, —whose enterprising spirit, tenacity of purpose, and inexhaustible energy are well known,—were other attractions. Here he may engage in any business, trade, follow any vocation, and as long as he does not violate the laws of the country he is not interfered with. The schools and universities are open to him,—a fact which attracted many. I personally know a goodly number who have emigrated to the United States for the last reason alone. All these, and many other minor causes, have been operative in the Jewish immigration to America, and it is predicted that if conditions in Russia keep up in the manner they have for the last twenty years, at least one-half of the Jews in Russia will emigrate to the United States within the next quarter of a century.

OCCUPATION OF THE JEWS IN RUSSIA.

It has been stated by people who have never been in Russia that the Jews never engage in any occupation requiring manual labor; that they are nearly all merchants, small traders, agents, and solicitors. How false this is can be seen from the statistics gathered by Mr. Joseph Jacobs, showing that 12 per cent. of the entire population of the 'Pale' are artisans (Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. II., pp. 115-116), which is a higher proportion than in the general communities of either France or Prussia. They work as tailors, shoemakers, furriers, bookbinders, house painters, opticians, diamond setters, gloves, tanners, watchmakers, etc. In fact, I have observed that in many cities in the Pale no work can be done on Saturdays because the Jewish artisans observe the Sabbath; and it is agreed by all who are acquainted with the conditions, that should the Jews leave in a body it would cause an industrial and commercial disaster in Russia from which it would take years to recover. In the 'Pale,' particularly, there would be no skilled artisans to replace them. It

is also agreed by all that as skilled artisans they are of the best. In fact, the Russians give them preference on account of their skill, steadiness, and sobriety, the two latter qualities being uncommon among the Russian workmen to the same extent. Besides all these, the Jews are represented in the learned professions to a greater extent than the Russians. There is a considerable number engaged in the practice of medicine, law, architecture, engineering, journalism, and the like. A great number have also achieved international fame as musicians, painters, sculptors, writers, poets, and scientists.”

Herbert N. Casson published a warmly philo-Semitic article in 1906, in which he stated,

“Zionists may dream of the return to Palestine, but the destiny of their race is turning in another direction. America is rapidly becoming the Promised Land of the Jews and New York their New Jerusalem. [***] Every anti-Semite eruption in Europe has sent thousands of refugees to Castle Garden, until to-day every fourth person in Manhattan and every sixth in Greater New York is a Jew. [***] The Jews make good raw material for citizenship, because they are the only immigrants who come to us without a country, without a flag. They have no fatherland to split their allegiance. America is their home, and their only home.”⁷⁵⁵

An article had appeared long before, in *The Religious Intelligencer*, Volume 9, Number 26, (27 November 1824), page 411, which stated,

“PROPOSED RESTORATION OF THE JEWS.

The Gazette of Spire, assures its readers, that the house of Rothschilds [an immensely rich Jewish banking house in London] has recently received proposals from the Turkish government, for a loan to a considerable amount, and an offer of the entire of Palestine as a security for the payment. In consequence, adds the paper, a confidential agent has been despatched by that house to Constantinople, to examine into the validity of the pledge offered by the Turkish Cabinet.

The N. Y. Advocate says, that the Jews will be restored to their former country, and possess it in full sovereignty cannot be doubted.

Our country must be an asylum to the ancient people of God. Here they must reside; here, in calm retirement, study laws, governments, sciences, become familiarly known to their brethren of other religious denominations; cultivate the useful arts; acquire a knowledge of legislation, and become liberal and free. So, that appreciating the blessings of just and salutary laws, they be prepared to possess permanently their ancient land, and govern

righteously.”

5.3.4 “The Jewish Peril”

On 10 May 1920, *The London Times* published a letter to the editor on page 8,

“‘THE JEWISH PERIL.’

[***]

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—In the article in to-days issue of *The Times* the writer says that the Russian Government contains a large percentage of Jews. As I have had an opportunity of perusing a list of the names and nationalities of the principal State functionaries of Russia compiled from Soviet sources, your readers may like to know the exact figures. Out of a total of 556 there are 458 Jews and 17 Russians, the remainder being made up of Letts, Germans, Armenians, and a few other of the non-Russians included within the late Empire.

As Jewry must be represented in ‘tous les partis et toutes les patries [all the parties and all the fatherlands],’ as the French say, it is interesting to inquire how the ‘opposition’ to the Bolshevists is made up. The Menshevists and other parties of the opposition comprise six Russians and 55 Jews.

Yours, &c.,

May 8,

J. H. CLARKE.”

THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT, a widely read newspaper published in Detroit, Michigan, which was owned by Henry Ford the automobile manufacturer, published a series of articles beginning in May of 1920 and continuing over the course of many years, which attempted to prove the authenticity, if not of the *Protocols* themselves, then of the alleged plot by some Jewish leaders to rule the world. Many of these articles were reproduced in book form as *The International Jew: The World’s Foremost Problem*,⁷⁵⁶ which was published in many languages (it is widely available on the internet). When Einstein visited America in 1921 with Chaim Weizmann, they participated with the Jews of Hartford, Connecticut in a parade of over 400 cars. They boycotted Ford automobiles, which had the counterproductive effect of advertising the brand.⁷⁵⁷

In 1839 and 1840, *The London Times*⁷⁵⁸ had reported on efforts by the British Government and the Anglican Church to secure Palestine for the Jews. The plans and religious competition between Protestants, Roman Catholics, Russian Orthodox Catholics and Islam spelled out in these reports foretold much of what later occurred in the First World War, and what is occurring today. These reports also demonstrate the foundations of the fanatical Protestant Christian Fundamentalist support for Israel presently found in America and England.

Though the Zionists believed that anti-Semitism played into their hands, they knew that anti-Zionism did not. The *Times* published numerous anti-Semitic statements, but few anti-Zionist statements, in the critical years following the First

World War. *The London Times* published parts of the *Protocols* on 8 May 1920, on page 15, together with a call for an investigation:

“‘THE JEWISH PERIL.’

**[Footnote to the title: THE JEWISH PERIL.
Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion.
Eyre and Spottiswoode, London, 1920.]**

A DISTURBING PAMPHLET

CALL FOR INQUIRY.

(FROM A CORRESPONDENT.)

The Times has not as yet noticed this singular little book. Its diffusion is, however, increasing, and its reading is likely to perturb the thinking public. Never before have a race and a creed been accused of a more sinister conspiracy. We in this country, who live in good fellowship with numerous representatives of Jewry, may well ask that some authoritative criticism should deal with it, and either destroy the ugly ‘Semitic’ bogy or assign their proper place to the insidious allegations of this kind of literature.

In spite of the urgency of impartial and exhaustive criticism, the pamphlet has been allowed, so far, to pass almost unchallenged. The Jewish Press announced, it is true, that the anti-Semitism of the ‘Jewish Peril’ was going to be exposed. But save for an unsatisfactory article in the March 5 issue of the *Jewish Guardian* and for an almost equally unsatisfactory contribution to the *Nation* of March 27, this exposure is yet to come. The article of the *Jewish Guardian* is unsatisfactory, because it deals mainly with the personality of the author of the book in which the pamphlet is embodied, with Russian reactionary propaganda, and the Russian secret police. It does not touch the substance of the ‘Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion.’ The purely Russian side of the book and its fervid ‘Orthodoxy’ is not its most interesting feature. Its author—Professor S. Nilus—who was a minor official in the Department of Foreign Religions at Moscow, had, in all likelihood, opportunities of access to many archives and unpublished documents. On the other hand, the world-wide issue raised by the ‘Protocols’ which he incorporated in his book and are now translated into English as ‘The Jewish Peril,’ cannot fail not only to interest, but to preoccupy. What are the theses of the ‘Protocols’ with which, in the absence of public criticism, British readers have to grapple alone and unaided? They are, roughly:—

(1) There is, and has been for centuries, a secret international political

organization of the Jews.

(2) The spirit of this organization appears to be an undying traditional hatred of the Christian world, and a titanic ambition for world domination.

(3) The goal relentlessly pursued through centuries is the destruction of the Christian national States, and the substitution for them of an international Jewish dominion.

(4) The method adopted for first weakening and then destroying existing bodies politic is the infusion of disintegrating political ideas of carefully measured progressive disruptive force, from liberalism to radicalism, and socialism to communism, culminating in anarchy as a *reductio ad absurdum* of egalitarian principles. Meanwhile Jewry remains immune from these corrosive doctrines. 'We preach Liberalism to the Gentiles, but on the other hand we keep our own nation in entire subjection' (page 55). Out of the welter of world anarchy, in response to the desperate clamour of distraught humanity, the stern, logical, wise, pitiless rule of 'the King of the Seed of David' is to arise.

(5) Political dogmas evolved by Christian Europe, democratic statesmanship and politics, are all equally contemptible to the Elders of Zion. To them, statesmanship is an exalted secret art, acquired only by traditional training, and imparted to a select few in the secrecy of some occult sanctuary, 'Political problems are not meant to be understood by ordinary people; they can only be comprehended, as I have said before, by rulers who have been directing affairs for many centuries.'

(6) To this conception of statesmanship, the masses are contemptible cattle, and the political leaders of the Gentiles, 'upstarts from its midst as rulers, are likewise blind in politics.' They are puppets, pulled by the hidden hand of the 'Elders,' puppets mostly corrupt, always inefficient, easily coaxed, or bullied, or blackmailed into submission, unconsciously furthering the advent of Jewish dominion.

(7) The Press, the theatre, stock exchange speculations, science, law itself, are, in the hands that hold all the gold, so many means of procuring a deliberate confusion and bewilderment of public opinion, demoralization of the young, and encouragement of the vices of the adult, eventually substituting, in the minds of the Gentiles, for the idealistic aspiration of Christian culture the 'cash basis' and a neutrality of materialistic scepticism, or cynical lust for pleasure.

Such are the main theses of the 'Protocols.' They are not altogether new, and can be found scattered throughout anti-Semitic literature. The condensed form in which they are now presented lends them a new and weird force.

Incidentally, some of the features of the would-be Jewish programme bear an uncanny resemblance to situations and events now developing under our eyes. Professor Nilus's book was, undoubtedly, published in Russia in 1905. The copy of the original at the British Museum bears the stamp of August 10, 1906. This being so, some of the passages assume the aspect of fulfilled prophecies, unless one is inclined to attribute the prescience of the 'Elders of Zion' to the fact that they really are the hidden instigators of these events. When one reads (page 8) that 'it is indispensable for our plans that wars should not produce any territorial alterations,' one is most forcibly reminded of the cry, 'Peace without annexations' raised by all the radical parties of the world, and especially in revolutionary Russia. And, again:—

We will create a universal economic crisis, by all possible underhanded means and with the help of gold, which is all in our hands. Simultaneously we will throw

on to the streets huge crowds of workmen throughout Europe. We will increase the wages, which will not help the workmen as, at the same time, we will raise the price of prime necessities. . . . it is essential for us at all costs to deprive the aristocracy of their lands. To attain this purpose the best method is to force up rates and taxes. These methods will keep the landed interests at their lowest possible ebb.

Nor can one fail to recognize Soviet Russia in the following:—

‘ . . . in governing the world the best results are obtained by means of violence and intimidation.’ ‘In politics, we must know how to confiscate property without any hesitation, if by so doing we can obtain subjection and power. Our State, following the way of peaceful conquest, has the right of substituting for the terrors of war, executions less apparent and more expedient, which are necessary to uphold terror, producing blind submission.’ ‘By new laws we will regulate the political life of our subjects as though they were so many parts of a machine. Such laws will gradually restrict all freedom and liberties allowed by the Gentiles.’ ‘It is essential for us to arrange that, besides ourselves, there should be in all countries nothing but a huge proletariat, so many soldiers and police loyal to our cause’ ; ‘in order to demonstrate our enslavement of the Gentile Governments of Europe, we will show our power to one of them by means of crime and violence, that is to say a reign of terror’ ; ‘our programme will induce a third part of the populace to watch the remainder from a pure sense of duty or from the principle of voluntary service.’

Bearing in mind when this was published, we see, 15 years later, a government established in Russia of which a high percentage of the leaders are Jews, whose *modus operandi* follows the principles quoted, and whose mainstay is a Communist Party, which answers to the last quotation. We see this, and it seems uncanny. The trouble is that all this fosters indiscriminate anti-Semitism. That the latter is rampant in Eastern Europe is a fact. That its propaganda in France, England, and America is growing is a fact also. Do we want, and can we afford to add exacerbated race-hatred to all our political, social, and economic troubles? If not, the question of the ‘Jewish Peril’ should be taken up and dealt with. It is far too interesting, the hypothesis it presents is far too ingenious, attractive, and sensational not to attract the attention of our none too happy and none too contented public. The average man thinks that there is something very fundamentally wrong with the world he lives in. He will eagerly grasp at a plausible ‘working hypothesis.’

What are these ‘Protocols’? Are they authentic? If so, what malevolent assembly concocted these plans, and gloated over their exposition? Are they a forgery? If so, whence comes the uncanny note of prophecy, prophecy in parts fulfilled, in parts far gone in the way of fulfillment? Have we been struggling these tragic years to blow up and extirpate the secret organization of German world dominion only to find beneath it another more dangerous because more secret? Have we, by straining every fibre of our national body, escaped a ‘Pax Germanica’ only to fall into a ‘Pax Judæica’? The ‘Elders of Zion,’ as represented in their ‘Protocols’ are by no means kinder taskmasters than William II, and his henchmen would have been.

All these questions, which are likely to obtrude themselves on the reader of the ‘Jewish Peril’ cannot be dismissed by a shrug of the shoulders unless

one wants to strengthen the hand of the typical anti-Semite and call forth his favorite accusation of the ‘conspiracy of silence.’ An impartial investigation of these would be documents and of their history is most desirable. That history is by no means clear from the English translation. They would appear, from internal evidence, to have been written by Jews for Jews, or to be cast in the form of lectures, and notes for lectures, by Jews to Jews. If so, in what circumstances were they produced and to cope with what inter-Jewish emergency? Or are we to dismiss the whole matter without inquiry and to let the influence of such a book as this work unchecked?”

Perhaps not coincidentally, this article was followed in the same column of the paper by the next article, “Zionist Aspirations. Dr. Weizmann on Future of Palestine.”

The London Times, and its principal owner, Lord Northcliffe, had been criticized in a letter from “Mentor”, which was published in *The Jewish Chronicle*, on 12 December 1919, on pages 9 and 10:

**“AN OPEN LETTER TO
LORD NORTHCLIFFE.**

By Mentor.

MY LORD,

It is many years since I had the pleasure of your lordship’s personal acquaintance. I recollect that it was in days which, although big with your future destiny, must seem to you now like tiny specks of sand from the high eminence from which you now can view them. They were days of your early life in a north-western suburb, when you inhabited a trim-built villa, the rent of which could not have been as much as £40 a year. It was in a road which, if I mistake not, gave the name to one of the numberless industries that your genius has founded. The denomination of the Pandora Publishing Company was evidence of a strong vein in your character, just as was your giving to a printing enterprise of yours the name of the Viscountess, your lady. These apparent trifles are remarkable indications of a splendid quality in you. You have never been unmindful of your own. You have always been loyal and dutiful beyond measure to the members of your family. There never was a better son than you have been to your mother, nor such a brother as you. It is a pride with you that the old friends of your early youth are your friends to-day, if you come into contact with them. Wealth, power, position—all these—have not shaken this splendid trait in you. I am credibly informed that the man who, throughout your career, has had professional charge—and has it still—of your most intimate affairs is a Jew who was one of your schoolboy chums, in the days of long ago to which I have referred. All this disposes me to feel sure that you will not raise the remotest cavil at, but will welcome, my venturing to address you as one of your long-ago friends. Our paths in life have diverged, but I have constantly and closely watched your career, always with the wonderment and sometimes—let me confess it—with

the trepidation with which one, standing upon solid earth, notes the way of the aeroplane in the sky, and which, if he had been living to-day, Agur ben Jakeh would have added as the fifth thing that was 'too wonderful' for him.

A Great Wrong.

That you will not resent this entirely friendly letter which I am venturing to address to you, I, therefore, take for granted. I believe that as you read it, you will be disposed, as was Ahasuerus when Esther approached his throne, to hold out to me your sceptre of greeting—if not of approval. For, in fact, I am in a humble way trying to fill the part that Esther played so gloriously, with such magnificent heroism, and with the bravery of which only a woman could be capable. I come to you, my Lord, because my heart is heavy and my spirit burdened for the sake of my people. I come to you, because it is in *your* power to stop a great wrong that is being done to Jews, because you possess the means, by mere work of mouth and by your mere decree, to put an end to what I conceive to be a malicious and wicked plot designed for the undoing of Israel. In your name and within your journalistic realm, the forces of your newspaper empire are being employed in a device, which it is not much exaggeration to say could be well described in the Bible terms—for our being 'sold, I and my people, to be destroyed, to be slain and to perish.' That you—at least consciously—have had a hand in this miserable business, I will not believe, and who the Haman is, who, for the purpose, is prostituting the means you have accorded him, I do not stop to enquire. That you know anything of the real meaning of the anti-Jewish campaign of which the *Times* has recently become the medium, is utterly inconceivable to anybody who knows even the little I do of you, your characteristics, and your ambitions.

An Ancient 'Stunt.'

Because the *Times* has lent itself during the last week or two, to about as mean and miserable an anti-Jewish campaign as could well be thought of; and you are not the man to do, or to countenance the doing of, anything that is paltry. The campaign, indeed, is the sort that has been indulged in for a long time by rival papers of yours, such as the *Morning Post*, the *Evening Standard*, and other smaller fry up and down the country; and you are not the man to follow journalistic 'stunts.' You are the man who leads them—with originality, courage, bravery, and acumen. To think that you, who devised the brilliant *coup* of a pound-a-week-for-life prize; who contrived the mighty problem of the missing word; upon whose brain there first flashed the idea of a daily picture paper; you, who first realised the 'snap' of saving the people a halfpenny on their morning journal; you, whose wonderful inventiveness conceived the idea of making all England eat Standard bread and plant sweet peas—that you should deign to copy a miserable, thousand times tried and thousand times failed, 'stunt' of an anti-Jewish campaign is well-nigh impossible. You are above all things and in all things up to date, and an anti-Jewish campaign is as old as the hills. Such a campaign waged round the Pyramids when they were four thousand years younger; the mighty King of Persia was worried with one, as my reference to Queen Esther will

remind you, twenty centuries ago. An anti-Jewish campaign can be carried on by such empty-headed numskulls as a Beamish or a Fraser, the defendants in the Mond case. But that you should consciously have allowed your marvellous career, your heavenward flight, of abnormal success to nose-dive to such an ancient, discredited sort of newspaper feature—that you would have copied Germans who shone in nothing so much as in their anti-Jewish attacks (and even black can be made to shine)—is to me unbelievable.

The Jew-Bolshevist Illusion.

Let me explain to you what the *Times* has been doing. Righteously wrath with the Bolsheviks in Russia and all their works; indignant at the outrages which they are said to have committed; rightly disgusted with the oppression, the looting, the murder—and worse—which has been attributed to them; correctly (to my way of thinking, at least) estimating the hollowness and impracticability of Communism as a form of government, and seeing in Russian Bolshevism (again I am in agreement, and have insisted upon it throughout) not democracy, but the cruellest, the most relentless, the most unfair of autocratic tyrannies; your chief paper has devoted itself to bringing before the English public, what it conceives to be the true nature of the Soviet Government. But by some malign influence, this quite comprehensible and perfectly commendable policy has been diverted into being made a means for whipping the Jews. It may be that this diversion has occurred solely through ineptitude, misunderstanding or even ignorance. In raking over the records of Bolshevism, Jews have been found prominent in the Bolshevik ranks. Several Bolsheviks who were not Jews in any sense of the word, but who bore German-sounding names which were commonly used among Russian Jews, were thought to be Jews, and altogether a grossly exaggerated idea of the part played by Jews in the Bolshevik movement resulted. This is a quite general experience. It takes the presences of only a few Jews among non-Jewish surroundings to cause one to over-estimate in perfect good faith the number of Jews who are actually present. Go into a railway carriage in which there are, say, ten passengers. Let four of those be Jews—persons who by feature and manner are evidently Semitic and not Anglo-Saxon—and you, or anyone else remarking upon the incident, would feel—and if narrating it would say, that you found the carriage was ‘full’ of Jews. Analogously, if from the window of the *Times* office you were watching the traffic in Queen Victoria Street, and you saw, say half-a-dozen negroes among the passers-by, you would declare that London was ‘full’ of blacks. And so you would declare it ‘full’ of Japs, if you saw a dozen natives of the Land of the Rising Sun. There is nothing to wonder at, then, that anyone looking through the records of Bolshevism in Russia, and finding a number of Jews among the Commissaries, or what not, should rush to the conclusion that the whole of Bolshevism was being carried on by children of Israel.

A Decadent Occupation.

There are, to be sure, reasons why the number of Jews identified with the

Bolshevist administrative offices are proportionately larger than the Jewish population warrants. One of the reasons is that the Jews of Russia have taken care to keep their children educated and have nurtured their intelligence, while the masses of the non-Jewish population have continued sunk in mental darkness, in the ignorance that was directly fostered by Tsarism in the interests of the Tsarist Church. You will surely not have failed to notice how Bolshevism in Russia has by all accounts ushered in an era of educational revival among the masses as part of its efforts for fighting what remains of the spirit of the old *régime*. But allowing for all this, there must have been an influence of sheer Anti-Semitism which could have induced the turning by the *Times* of the instruction—from its point of view—of the English people about Bolshevism into an attack upon the whole of the Jewish people. That a certain number of Jews are Bolsheviks is any proof that I am a relentless Shylock, is about as reasonable as to say that because some Irishmen are Sinn Feiners, you are a rebel. And, my lord, you have not reached such a height of your romantic career—the admiration of your friends, as it is the envy of your enemies—in order to reduce the greatest newspaper the world has ever seen to an unreasonable campaign fit for the mentality, perhaps, of some of your competitors or certainly of the obsessed poor-minded creatures whose decadence has reduced them to indulging in the piteous occupation of Jew-baiting. A Northcliffe—a Harmsworth—was obviously devised for something less pusillanimous, something less silly, something more original, something less banal.

The ‘Booby Trap.’

Then, my lord, just hear what the *Times* has been urging. It has been suggesting that when Bolshevism in Russia fails, the forces that are arrayed against it are going to massacre the Jews, because of the part they have taken in supporting the Bolshevik Movement. There is something, it seems to me, of the spirit of ‘don’t nail his ear to the pump!’ about the grim anticipation here set forth. But let that go. On the pretence of its being anxious to save the poor Jews from massacre, the *Times* has been asking the Jews of this country to walk into its parlour and to give themselves away by, as Jews, forswearing Bolshevism and all its works and denouncing fellow-Jews for having supported both. Having done that, what is going to happen? Does the *Times* think that the hooligans in Russia are going to stay their hands because the Jews here have denounced Bolshevism? Does it suppose that some Russian bandit who would otherwise loot a Jew’s property or murder him, would suddenly fling away all the instruments of violence that he was employing, and clasp the Jew to him in tender solicitude upon calling to mind the fact that some of his victims’ brethren in Western Europe had declared that they were not Bolsheviks and they did not like Bolshevism? One of the writers in your organ said that Jews were stupid; and, certainly, if they were altogether a wise people they assuredly would not, in the first quarter of the twentieth century, be in the position of being pilloried by your paper. Nor would they have suffered themselves to be, as they have been, the Azazel goat, upon the

head of whom the sins of every world-movement have been cast for close upon two thousand years. But so stupid as to think that the acknowledgment which the *Times* wishes to wring out of our people is demanded in the interests of our Russian coreligionists, or that it would subserve these in the least, it is no vain conceit on my part as a Jew, to tell you we are not. For us to proclaim to the world that Bolshevism and Judaism are so intimately associated that it is necessary for Jews to dissociate themselves in the public mind from the Russian Movement, and that the renunciation was going to prevent an otherwise certain holocaust [Note the use of the term “holocaust”—**CJB**—no! Lord Northcliffe!—*so* stupid even the Jews whom the writer referred to in your paper so insolently contemns, assuredly are not.

[As quoted above, *The New York Times* published articles about and quoting Herman Bernstein, a man of Jewish descent, on 9 November 1917, and on 19 November 1917, in which Bernstein said what “MENTOR” claimed no Jew would ever say. The predicted Holocaust did occur and was heinously “justified” for the reasons claimed. Bernstein’s efforts failed, as did Mentor’s refusal to act. One should also note the irony of the author’s identifying herself? with Esther, who brought on a genocide much like the vindictive mass murder of the Russian people by revolutionary agents of Jewish financiers. Ironically, Mentor speaks of Jews in general in tribalistic terms, though criticizing others for doing the same.—**CJB**]

Anyone with half an eye, anyone although bereft of half his senses, any dull fool, could see the trap that the *Times* writer was setting, in this proposal, for us Jews. It was, indeed, a booby trap; so obvious that it could scarcely be missed even by the mentally blind. It was a device without the least cleverness, the least subtlety, the least cunning—employing the words in the most complimentary sense—and no one could have regarded it as the product of a master mind, or have looked for its source of inspiration to a genius such as yours. This again, I say, is fair evidence that your influence and your power you have delegated to hands that have proved unworthy, and I hope you will thank me for calling your attention to the manner in which they have been employed.

‘Epatism.’

At the moment of writing, it doubtless appears to some that the campaign has been called off and the ‘stunt’ stopped. ‘Verax,’ has not ‘veraxed’ for some days. ‘Janus’ and ‘Philo Judæus’ *et hoc genus* have remained silent for over a week, while the contribution of ‘Ivan Ivanovitch’ read to many like a desperate, final gasp. Frankly, I regard the state of the matter at the moment in a somewhat different light. It occurs to me that the letter of ‘Verax’ like the one signed ‘X,’ which purported to be one sent by a British officer serving in Russia to his wife in England (the letter which, by the by, set the ball rolling), formed an essay in what the *Times* itself has termed ‘Epatism.’ Your paper has explained the word by reference to the phrase of Flaubert’s

circle—*épater le bourgeois*, to ‘startle John Citizen.’ It is the art of preparing the public mind by giving it a shock—‘shock tactics,’ as the German phrase had it in the war. An Epatist, as the *Times* went on to show, ‘seeking to achieve something new,’ ‘takes refuge in distortion and the misuse of colour.’ Exact contour and faithful reproduction are outside his scheme, and he deliberately flaunts his carelessness of qualities hitherto accepted as necessary. Epatism, in short, the *Times* says, is ‘an affront with a purpose.’ This, it occurs to me, gives us the key to the recent attack upon Jews in your paper. As in art, so in literature, as in literature, so in journalism; and the anxiety of those responsible for the anti-Jewish campaign in the *Times* was not, it is surely obvious, for exactness of statement, faithfulness of argument, or correctness as to alleged facts. These did not in the least count, in face of the determination to ‘achieve something new.’ ‘Refuge in distortion and misuse of colour’ were merely the manner of the Epatist. And for what purpose was this exercise in Epatism indulged in? There can remain no doubt with anyone who reads the letters which in big type are now (as I write) appearing. By the by, the type in which these contributions are printed is a remarkable contrast to the type in which the letters defending Jews that have been admitted to the *Times* have invariably, with one exception, that of the Chief Rabbi’s, been printed—another evidence that your scrupulous fairness to opponents was not in this play, and that the fine traditions of the *Times* had been set aside.

A Ridiculous Notion.

That just by the way: What is the burden of these latest contributions to which I refer? It is that Bolshevism is a movement which designs to uproot and throttle Christianity as the world has it. I do not stop to argue whether Bolshevism can, in fact, be reasonably supposed to have that as its objective, or still less whether it has the remotest chances of effecting any such moral revolution among mankind, or whether, again, the same could not have been said of the Russian religious school of thought led by Count Tolstoi, himself surely a Christian from the religious point of view *sans peur et sans reproche*. But I do call your attention to the way in which the *Times*, by means of epatism—of distortion and misuse of colour, of startling John Citizen—has first tried to shock its readers into believing that Bolshevism and Judaism are one, and then followed that up with an impeachment of Bolshevism as a force designed to undermine Christianity. The object manifestly is to ‘achieve something new’ in the way of a silly bogey—to frighten the readers of the *Times* into an attitude of bitter, relentless, unyielding enmity to the Bolsheviks by insidiously impressing upon the readers of the great paper which you own, that Jews have to-day designs against the Christian Church. The object has been to make the people who read the *Times* think that Jews desire Christianity to perish, and that they are banded together in the Russian movement we know as Bolshevism, so that they may wipe away Christianity from off the face of the earth. It would follow that in order to defend Christianity it is necessary to crush

Bolshevism. Now, if your people said that in so many words, the statement would have been greeted by a Homeric burst of laughter wherever the words were read or repeated. That is why the spurious nonsense was applied by means of 'Epatism' and insidious suggestion. I say the statement plainly made would have been met with laughter—and not least by Jews, who know so well how religious carelessness and *laissez faire* are eating into the vitals of our people. To such an extent is this so, that it is with anxiety that Jews, who care for Judaism, contemplate the religious future of their faith, and against the enormous forces of indifference are bringing to bear their mightiest efforts in every land. And the *Times* wants us to believe that side by side with this religious indifference there exists the sort of religious zeal that would seek to uproot Christianity, so that Judaism might dominate! How densely ignorant of Jews must be those who imagine this vanity! Why, I do not know of a single Jew to-day, here or abroad, from the far west to the far east, whatever may be the form of Judaism which he favours, whatever may be the politics he supports, whatever may be the shade of Judaism to which he is allied, who would lift his little finger to do damage to the religious faith that is dominant throughout the Western world. There are some Jews who dislike Christians—and will you say without good reason? But there are no Jews who hate Christianity, or indeed care about it at all to the extent of indulging in a campaign against it.

Judaism and Christianity.

All Jews, it is true, look forward to the moral prevalence of Jewish doctrine and Jewish teaching. If they did not, their Judaism would necessarily, even in their own estimation, be a poor sort of thing. If they did not think of Judaism as a faith which in God's good time, and by force of moral suasion, will become that of all the world—if they did not conceive the synagogue as a House of Prayer for all nations—we Jews would indeed be a segregated, aloof, religiously and nationally selfish, and hence debased and degraded, people. Judaism is and has always been a faith appealing to all Humanity, and Christianity, so far as it was a triumph over heathenism, was a victory for Jewish doctrine and the Jewish faith. How, then, can anyone (especially one like 'Verax' who pretends to some knowledge of Judaism and sufficient Jewish culture, not know how to transliterate correctly *Beth Hamidrash*) suggest anything so monstrously absurd as that Judaism would, in any sense whatever, fulfil its mission by destroying Christianity at this stage of the world's civilization? And how ridiculous, from a practical point of view! We Jews are a handful of people scattered up and down the Earth, a people than whom there is none more materially forlorn than is, taken as a whole, our poor folk. Of the fifteen or sixteen million of Jews existing to-day, it has been calculated that less than ten thousand can be considered rich in such a sense as, say you my Lord, would deem anybody wealthy, while more than 70 per cent are poor, inasmuch as they are without any capital. Who will believe that such a people in such a position would contemplate the smashing and killing of a religious institution which has been one of the

strongest social, moral, political, and religious pillars of the world for generations? The man who could believe it is a fit object less for laughter, when we come to think about it, than for tears of sympathy. Even if Jews could compass the destruction of Christianity in the way these silly people credit them with conniving, what sort of Jew pray would do it? The religious Jew? He certainly would never seek to hurt and destroy an institution, which rightly viewed—however much the Jew sees of fundamental error in, and however false the doctrine, as he perceives it, of Christianity—is the greatest world triumph of the Jew. Is it then the irreligious Jew? Surely he would not trouble himself to pull down Christianity to which he, in so many cases, has a proneness to assimilate for the sake of uprearing in its place Judaism of which he is sometimes so careless, sometimes renegade, and in regard to which such a Jew is always so negligent, that he will not lift a little finger to aid and support it even in his own person? And let me remind you *en passant* that the prominent Bolsheviks that are Jews are not exactly Orthodox adherents to Judaism. Really, this bogey of Christianity in danger—and in danger from Jews!—is the silliest ‘fimmel’ that ever crept into the brain of a man whose sanity was whole and unimpaired. Frankly, my lord, this cry of alarm would cause me some trepidation only if for a second I could believe it was genuine. For if Christians really imagined that Christianity was in such case that Jews to-day could destroy it, however much they tried, there would be revealed in Christianity a consciousness of inherent weakness deplorable beyond words.

Duty.

Now, my lord, I have put our case, and I doubt not what you will do with the facts thus presented to you. In the light of them you will do your duty as a worthy son of the most chivalrous and human-spirited people on earth. You will do your duty as citizen of an Empire which was founded upon Justice and upon Right. You will do your duty as one of the choicest ornaments of a profession which, in its highest and best conception, knows no fear and no favour, but is ever fast allied to public truth and public righteousness. You will, too, I feel sure, do your duty to the finest traditions of the great journal, the securing of the ownership of which was the most brilliant *coup* of your brilliant career. Your duty, my Lord, in all these aspects happily coincides and dovetails with exactly the purpose I have in writing this letter to you. Your duty is to stop at all costs, and at once, and forbid any future recurrence of the campaign of vilification and abuse, the insidious, malicious, underhand war, which someone, misusing the power of your Press, has been carrying on against my people.

Believe me to remain,

Your obedient Servant,

MENTOR.

TO THE RIGHT HON.

THE VISCOUNT NORTHCLIFFE, ETC. ETC.”

This sophisticated appeal was a reaction to a series of letters which had appeared in *The London Times* following World War I,⁷⁵⁹ many of which set forth the allegedly self-fulfilling prophecy that all Jews ought to condemn Bolshevism, because if they failed to condemn it, when Bolshevism fell a holocaust would ensue and the Jews of Eastern Europe would be annihilated—in retaliation for the vindictive Jewish destruction of Russia and the Jewish genocide of Russian Gentiles. The appeal is further evidence that some leading Jews felt a need to perpetuate the genocidal Bolshevik regime in Russia in order to shield Jews from retaliation, which genocidal regime Jewish financiers had put into power and which was disproportionately staffed by Jews, while assimilating Jews sought desperately to distance themselves from Bolshevism, Zionism and Judaism. While these letters in the *Times* may appear meanspirited, they are historically important because they evince the linkage of Bolshevism to Western Jews in general, and the planned and feared reaction that Jews would be attacked in a murderous rampage in order to protect Western Civilization from Bolshevism. This tragic attitude did indeed lead to the Holocaust. However, it was Zionist Jews who intentionally brought it about.

The “Holocaust” was planned as a threat to anti-Zionist Jews. The fulfillment of this threat was carried out by vengeful Zionists. Don Heddesheimer, in his book *The First Holocaust: Jewish Fund Raising Campaigns with Holocaust Claims During and After World War One*, Holocaust Handbook Series, Volume 6, Theses & Dissertations Press, Castle Hill Publishers, Chicago, (October, 2003),⁷⁶⁰ has proven that several newspapers published articles in the late Teens and early 1920's, which promoted fund raising campaigns for Jewish relief in Eastern Europe. These often exploited the alarmist slogan that six million Jews were on the verge of perishing in a “holocaust”. Immense sums of money were raised in these campaigns and Heddesheimer sees in them a pattern of deception and exploitation. This was further evidence of how effective fear was in mobilizing and segregating the Jewish community—in perpetuating their self-image of victimhood and separation.

The evidence supports Mentor’s assertions that the vast majority of Western Jews were not out to destroy Christianity, but instead sought to integrate into society. This fact is perhaps rendered most obvious by the many public expressions of disenchantment of the Zionists, who could not persuade a majority of Jews to join them in a march to Palestine, and by the high rates of “intermarriage” of Jews to non-Jews. However, Mentor’s motives and sincerity can be questioned based upon an article “Our ‘Abandoned’ Children” published in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 24 November 1911 on pages 20 and 31. “Mentor” was later identified as the interviewer in that article in a response published by Isaac Goldston, “A Danger that Portends a Doom”, in *The Jewish Chronicle* of 1 December 1911 on pages 18 and 27.

Though Mentor questions “Verax’s” sincerity, “Verax” was the pseudonym of a writer for the *Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens*, a Jewish organization which combated anti-Semitism and racist political Zionism; and if these “Veraxes” are one, then “Verax” was likely sincere. See: Verax, “Jüdische Rundschau”, *Im Deutschen Reich* [official organ of the Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens], Volume 16, Number 5, (May, 1920), pp. 163-171; and Verax, “Jüdische Rundschau”, *Im Deutschen Reich*, Volume 16, Number 6,

(June, 1920), pp. 196-205. *See also: Jüdische Rundschau*, Volume 25, Number 38, (11 June 1920), p. 296.

Numerous translations of *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* presented arguments and evidence that Bolshevism was a Jewish movement, celebrated by some Jews as such, and constituted the fulfilment of a long planned phase of genocidal Judaism, which prophesied the destruction of Gentile governments, religion, and, eventually, peoples. Despite protests to the contrary, there were leading Jews who sought the downfall of Christianity and Judaism teaches that all religions other than Judaism must be destroyed, and that all the governments must be destroyed and replaced by one world government ruled by the Jewish Messiah from Jerusalem.

Jewish plays and writings provide ample evidence of widespread Jewish hostility towards Christians, most especially towards Russian Christians, and the Jews were no less poor when the Jewish Frankists sought to undermine Christianity, than when the Bolsheviks sought to undermine Christianity. After all, it was the immense wealth (obtained through corrupt means) of Jewish financiers, which brought Russia to ruins, and it was the concentration of this wealth which enabled leading Jews to destroy peoples and governments, despite Mentor's suggestion that the concentration of wealth rendered such things impossible. It was the very poverty of average Jews in the East, and their minority status, which drove them to be anti-Christian, and this in no wise prevented them from seeking to undermine Christianity, but instead provided two motivating factors. The poverty of average Eastern European Jews, should they as a group desire the downfall of Christianity, made Bolshevism a necessity for their cause, because it was only by tearing down Christian society that they could terrorize Christians and suppress religion among Gentiles, as their religion taught them to do. Mentor's sophistry is most apparent in her(?) transparent efforts to flatter Northcliffe—though by insulting his intelligence and impugning his character should he find cause for alarm in facts which alarmed many a reasonable person. Try as she might to beguile and deceive Northcliffe, Mentor was no Esther. It should be noted that if the Jews had not concentrated their collective wealth in the hands of the Rothschilds and their agents, the Jews would not have had anywhere near the power they did have. This is to say that if the Rothschilds had shared their concentrated wealth with all the Jews, then there would not have been the pool of monies the Rothschilds used to undermine the governments of the world.

The Government of the United States received urgent warnings that the Bolsheviks, who were without a doubt mass murderers, were largely led and funded by Jews, and that they openly sought to destroy Christian Civilization in the manner of genocidal Messianic Judaism. This increasingly widespread awareness naturally led to generally "anti-Jewish feelings" through an unfair and unrealistic—though natural—generalization of the actions of leading Jews to all Jews.

The "Report of the Netherland Minister relating to conditions in Petrograd", *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918, Russia*, Volume 1, File Number 861.00/3029, United States State Department Publication Number 222, 65th Congress, 3d Session, House Document Number 1868, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., (1931), pp. 675-679, at 678-679;

states,

“The foregoing report will indicate the extremely critical nature of the present situation. The danger is now so great that I feel it my duty to call the attention of the British and all other Governments to the fact that if an end is not put to Bolshevism in Russia at once the civilisation of the whole world will be threatened. This is not an exaggeration but a sober matter of fact; and the most unusual action of German and Austrian Consuls General before referred to, in joining in protest of neutral legations appears to indicate that the danger is also being realised in German and Austrian quarters. I consider that the immediate suppression of Bolshevism is the greatest issue now before the world, not even excluding the war which is still raging, and unless as above stated Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately it is bound to spread in one form or another over Europe and the whole world as it is organised and worked by Jews who have no nationality, and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things. The only manner in which this danger could be averted would be collective action on the part of all powers.”

State Department Document Number 861.00/1757, 2 May 1918, states,

“Jews predominate in local Soviet Government, anti-Jewish feeling growing among population which tends to regard oncoming Germans as deliverers.”⁷⁶¹

State Department Document Number 861.00/2205, 5 July 1918, states,

“Fifty per cent of Soviet Government in each town consists of Jews of worst type, many of whom are anarchists.”⁷⁶²

United States Army Captain Montgomery Schuyler reported on 1 March 1919,

“It is probably unwise to say this loudly in the United States but the Bolshevik movement is and has been since its beginning guided and controlled by Russian Jews of the greasiest type[. . .]”⁷⁶³

United States Army Captain Montgomery Schuyler reported on 9 June 1919,

“These hopes were frustrated by the gradual gains in power of the more irresponsible and socialistic elements of the population guided by the Jews and other anti-Russian races. A table made in April 1918 by Robert Wilton, the correspondent of the London Times in Russia, shows that at that time there were 384 ‘commissars’ including 2 negroes, 13 Russians, 15 Chinamen, 22 Armenians and more than 300 Jews. Of the latter number 264 had come to Russia from the United States since the downfall of the Imperial Government.”⁷⁶⁴

The Jewish Chronicle published the following article on 11 April 1919 on page 10,

“Percentage of Jewish Bolsheviki in Petrograd.

————— COPENHAGEN [F. O. C.]

On the trustworthy authority of the well-known Zionist leader, M. Idelson (of Petrograd), I am in a position to state that only two and a-half per cent. of the Jews in Petrograd have declared themselves in sympathy with Bolshevism. Although sixty per cent. of the Bolshevik leaders are Jews, and although a declaration against Bolshevism involves serious sacrifices, the Jews of Petrograd have fearlessly stated their attitude towards the movement. We are, therefore, confronted with the anomaly of the Jews furnishing for the Bolsheviki the majority of their leaders, although a smaller percentage of Jews than of any other nationality approve of Bolshevism.”

A. Borisow wrote in an article “‘Nep’ and the Jews” in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 22 September 1922 on page 16,

“Still I repeat that the ‘Nep’ in Russia is a persecutor of the Jews. During the whole of the last two years the Jews have not suffered economically so much as they have during the few months since the introduction of the ‘Nep.’ It is not for nothing that the Jews translate the initials of the ‘Nep’ as the ‘Nestchastnaja’ (‘luckless’) Economic Policy.

What is it that the ‘Nep’ has brought us?

To begin with, it has reduced the number of officials. Many of the Soviet institutions have been closed down. In most of the others, 50 to 60 per cent. of the staff has been dismissed. Viewed on its merits, this is most welcome. It will mean a decrease in the heavy taxation which went to keep all these officials. But for the Jewish population it is a terrible blow. It is no secret that the Soviet institutions, especially in the cities, were staffed almost entirely by Jews. About three-quarters of the total number of officials were Jews. Tens of thousands of Jewish intellectuals and semi-intellectuals, lawyers, journalists and doctors, managed to earn a crust of bread in the service of the Soviet institutions. They formed the majority of the lettered population. Now they are dismissed, driven out into the streets, condemned to unemployment and to starvation. That is the first blessing which the ‘Nep’ has brought to the Jews.”

Jews tried to justify the fact that Jews ruled the Bolshevik *régimes* by claiming that the Gentiles were too stupid to rule themselves. This was odd, given that the Jewish Bolsheviks promoted Jewish intellectuals, while concurrently mass murdering Gentile intellectuals in the hundreds of thousands, if not millions. Why were not all intellectuals murdered or promoted in proportionate numbers, if there was no ethnic bias, no Jewish genocidal racism involved in the process? “Mentor” wrote in an article entitled “Peace, War—and Bolshevism” in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 4 April 1919 on page 7,

IT is not difficult to see why a people which has managed to subsist through Tsardom, because of the religious ideals and ideas which it nourished throughout all its classes, and not least among its peasantry, has been attacked by the ideals of Bolshevism, and why, released from Tsardom, it has, pendulum-like, swung into the arms of Lenin, looking to the ideals of his creed, and not to its wickedness or its excesses. The same reason obtains for the number of Jews who are to be found in the Bolshevist ranks. The Jew is an idealist. He will give much for an ideal. He thirsts for idealism as a goal of life. This may seem strange to those who associate the Jew with materialism. But the capacity of the Jew for idealism is such that he notoriously idealises even the material. The fact that there are so many of our people who have associated themselves with the ideals of Bolshevism, even although as Jews its excesses must be repugnant to them, has to be placed in conjunction with another fact. These men will be found for the most part unassociated with or dissociated from the Synagogue. In the ordinary way of speaking they are not observing Jews. Is it not patent that the Synagogue, having failed to attract them by its idealism, and no other ideal, not even a material ideal, having been provided for them—for they are not men of wealth and substance, such as are usually to be found among the *bourgeoisie*—they have ranged themselves on the side of Bolshevism, because here was no Jewish ideal to which these Jews could devote their sentiments and their energies? I cannot understand how people who for generations have, unprotesting, allowed the Jew, particularly in Eastern Europe, in Russia, to suffer pogroms, to be massacred and ill-treated, and tortured and murdered, and for two thousand years have kept our people outside the ambit of the most potent source of idealism that can appeal to men—that associated with National being—now have the hypocrisy, the soulless impertinence, to complain that so many of our people are Bolshevists! That Jews have been chosen to the extent they have to take a leading part in the movement in Russia and in Hungary, is merely because they are heavily endowed with intellectualism and capacity, as compared with the rest of the population. But the world must not be surprised that the Jew, who is an idealist or nothing, has turned to the idealism of Bolshevism, which a British writer has declared to be comparable to the idealism preached by the founder of Christianity. It were surprising, really, were it otherwise. You cannot keep a people out of their rightful place amid the nations of the world, and then complain because they take the leading part which their abilities entitle them to in the nations among whom you have scattered them. The fact that a timorous millionaire afraid, and doubtless with good cause, of Bolshevism, which he probably has never taken the trouble, or perhaps has not the capacity to appreciate in full measure, places a ban of religious excommunication upon those Jews who are Bolshevists, is a thing for the gods to laugh at!

THERE is much in the fact of Bolshevism itself, in the fact that so many Jews are Bolshevists, in the fact that the ideals of Bolshevism at many

points are consonant with the finest ideals of Judaism, some of which went to form the basis of the best teachings of the founder of Christianity—these are things which the thoughtful Jew will examine carefully. It is the thoughtless one who looks upon Bolshevism only in the ugly repulsive aspects which all social revolutions assume and which make it so hateful to the freedom-loving Jew—when allowed to be free. It is the thoughtless one that thus partially examines the greatest problem the modern world has been set, and as his contribution to the solution dismisses it with some exclamation made in obedient deference to his own social position, and to what for the moment happens to be conventionally popular.”

Chaim Weizmann reported to the Fifth Meeting of the Zionist Advisory Committee, in London, on 10 May 1919,

“Bolshevism covers a multitude of sins, especially in Poland, and we pay the cost. As a result of the official statement issued by the Bolsheviks in Petrograd to join them, 2½ per cent of the Jewish population have joined, 90 per cent have refused. It is quite true that 60 per cent of the Bolshevik officials are Jews. It is simply that they have got to find means of living, and they are the only people who can read and write.”⁷⁶⁵

The book of *Obadiah* verse 8 teaches the Jews to destroy the intellectual class of non-Jews and deprive the Gentiles of knowledge,

“Shall I not in that day, saith the LORD, even destroy the wise *men* out of Edom, and understanding out of the mount of Esau?”

The Bolsheviks mass murdered the educated among the Gentiles, but education was what was claimed to have saved those Jews who replaced them, as if that explained away the fact that Jews predominated the Bolshevik Government. What was it that caused the Jewish Bolsheviks to mass murder highly educated and intellectual Gentiles, while education and intellectualism were the reasons given for the promotion of the Jewish minority and the predominance of the Jews in leadership rôles, if Jews weren't in charge of the Bolsheviks from the outset? A 20 February 1930 article in the *Patriot* stated,

“No one who has paid the slightest attention to the course of Russian events since the Bolshevik accession to power in November, 1917, can have failed to know that, when all the important members of the Russian aristocracy, the learned profession, the Army and Navy, had been executed, or imprisoned, or driven abroad, Red Jews were in possession of the great majority of responsible positions in and under the Soviet. So clear was this that, in the past, Jewish apologists, here and in America, have explained the fact by the true statement that only among the Jews could be found any longer the brains and business experience for filling important posts. Yet in the face of this situation there have been dozens of books published in English, and

innumerable articles throughout the Press, and any number of lectures delivered, all with the astounding omission of any mention of Jewish handiwork in Russian Bolshevism. There have been public references to the sufferings of some orthodox non-Communist Jews at the hands of the Soviet.”⁷⁶⁶

As late as 1924, racist political Zionist Israel Zangwill wrote that many Jews felt a need to keep the murderous Jewish Bolsheviks in power, those Bolsheviks who came to power through the might of Jewish financiers,⁷⁶⁷

“National politics is the realm of might, and if, as Dr. Hertz warns us, the menace of massacre still lies over the whole Russian Jewry should the Soviet Government be overthrown, we must face the sad fact that Jewish might does not exist.”⁷⁶⁸

Robert Wilton published *Russia's Agony*, Longmans, Green & Co.; New York, London, E. Arnold, (1918); and *The Last Days of the Romanovs, from 15th March, 1917: Part I, the Narrative; Part II, the Depositions of Eye-Witnesses*, Thornton Butterworth, London, (1920); in French, with an ethnic analysis of leading figures, *Les Derniers Jours des Romanov. Le Complot Germano-Bolchéviste Raconté par les Documents*, G. Crès & Cie, Paris, (1920); in Russian, *Poslednie dni Romanovykh*, Grad Kitezh, Berlin, (1923); in Polish, *Ostatnie dni Romanowów*, Warszaw. Denis Fahey published a list of Bolshevik crypto-Jews, together with their true names, and revealed an abundance of evidence which proved that Bolshevism was principally led and financed by Jews, which is not the same thing as saying that most Jews were Bolsheviks—they were not.⁷⁶⁹

Many of the common myths unfairly asserted against Jews in general appeared in this era. Brazen Jewish racism typical of the political Zionists also manifested itself. Racist Zionist Jews aggressively responded to other Jews who asserted that Jewishness was a religion, not a race. “An English-Born Jew” wrote in *The London Times*, on 1 December 1919, on page 10:

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir.—Your correspondent ‘Judæus’ would seem to belong to the class of Jew satirized very recently by a Jewish writer as always anxious to cast overboard any fellow-Jews who are pointed to as inconvenient Jonahs. Today he is bent upon dissociating himself as an English Jew from his Russian brethren because the latter are involved in Bolshevism. Yesterday he was anxious to dissociate himself from his German brethren because they were involved in Prussian militarism. He is desirous of disclaiming a Trotsky as a fellow-Jew, while doubtless willing to bask in the reflected glory of an Einstein.

But I am more concerned with his curious excursus into the ethnology of the Jew. He would have us believe that the Jew is contradistinguished from his fellow-beings only by religion, and that for the rest he is Russian in

Russia, a German in Germany, and an Englishman in England—that race has no bearing upon the Jew as a product, and that we are wholly the result of the environment in which we may happen to be placed. It would be interesting, indeed, if ‘Judæus’ would tell us how soon he thinks a Skye terrier domiciled in England would become a bulldog, or how long it would take for a race of bulldogs bred in the Celestial Empire to produce Pekinese pups.

Obediently yours,
AN ENGLISH-BORN JEW.”

Such statements were exploited by anti-Semites, and by Zionists posing as anti-Semites in order to promote Jewish segregation and emigration to Palestine. A similar exchange had occurred when G. K. Chesterton gave a speech at the West End Jewish Literary Society, which an author in *The Jewish Chronicle* summarized in a derogatory way. *The Jewish Chronicle* published the following article on 1 December 1911, on pages 20-21,

“THE JEWISH POSITION

MR. G. K. CHESTERTON’S VIEWS.

A large audience gathered to hear Mr. Chesterton at the West End Jewish Literary Society last Sunday. Dr. HOCHMAN, who presided, congratulated Mr. Chesterton on his courage in coming into such a den of critics, who were going to demolish him, after he sat down.

Mr. CHESTERTON began by saying that he did not look forward to the evening’s discussion, and like the Chairman, he congratulated himself on his own courage. He felt sure that before the evening was over he would be in a minority. But he was fond of minorities and had been in them often. He had come there that evening to learn and not to teach, to know what the Jews themselves thought on the question, and to hear what solutions they had. He was convinced that the Jews understood the problem better than he. There was, however, one misunderstanding he must ask them to throw off. People thought, and said, that he was an anti-Semite, and hated Jews. Nothing could better misinterpret his views. The idea had been circulated owing to a correspondence which he had helped to keep running in the *Nation*, a paper edited by a friend of his, and owned by some of his acquaintances. Mr. Chesterton went on to say that the broad-minded Jew was a difficulty and an offence in Europe; the narrow-minded Jew was an excellent fellow, whom one admired and regarded with an amount of veneration as one did any other great relic of antiquity, such as the Pyramids. He had Jewish friends, none more staunch. He had written this to the *Nation* and was glad to say it again. The *Nation* had never taken upon itself to attack the questionable actions of the Jews. There was a type of Jew who was a traitor in France and a tyrant in England. The same could be said for a type of Englishman. But this type did not represent the Jewish race.

WHAT DID THE JEWISH QUESTION ALL MEAN?

Accusations were not so often repeated unless there were some reasons, real or imaginary. To him the explanation seemed to be this: The Jews were a people with all the component elements of civilisation. They were the only real civilised people in the world, born civilised. You never saw the Jew in the making as you did other peoples. Who had heard of a Jewish yokel or a really stupid Jew? The absolute clod was unknown among them. A Jew was either a saint or a scoundrel. He could name two saints amongst his Jewish friends (their names would not be recognised, because, saints usually passed unnoticed) and he knew a great many scoundrels (they would be known if mentioned, but they would not be recognised in that category). There was no such thing as a clown among Jews. The problem then was this: This people born civilised was scattered amongst the other nations of the world, exposed to all their moods of irritation and reaction. A race older than Rome, and more important, older than the decline of the Roman Empire, the Jews had been a definite feature in the Roman Empire. They were born out of a religion sincere and overpowering in its vividness. The Jews had been going about in a curious thing called Europe, cut up into various nationalities, that had ideals which to the Jews amounted to types of idolatry. Christian nations had, for good or for evil, settled down to the worship of mountains, rivers, towns, places, etc.: they had come to deify almost the lands of their birth. The Jews had another philosophy. They thus presented the problem of a universalist race wandering amongst peoples who were convinced that God does dwell in definite shrines. How had the problem worked? There were, roughly, two kinds of Jews, rich and poor. Speaking generally, as in most other communities,

THE POOR WERE NICE AND THE RICH WERE NASTY.

One class, in their eagerness that Judaism should endure, had erred on the side of concentration joining in things with zeal and industry, and a strict observance of tradition. Without land of their own, they had created a nationality amongst other nationalities. The other effect was the futile attempt of the heroic task inspired by enthusiasm to keep the flag flying; but there would always be a large number slipping away. If the Jew was ready for his mission it was well. But if he were not ready, what happened? He, lost all, enthusiasm for his own nation and remained indifferent to any other. How could a Jew, say in Ireland, when a Home Rule Bill is discussed, cast in his lot? He could not be a patriotic Irishman however hard he tried. Mr. Chesterton agreed in essence with the Zionistic ideal in Judaism. It seemed to him a logical solution of the question. He concluded by saying that the problem was not whether you liked Jews or not. It was this: The whole system of society is national—where are the Jews? The history of Israel showed that only two descriptions corresponded to the facts of the people's tragedy.. There was the Orthodox Christian theory and the orthodox Jewish theory.

Mr. H. S. REITLINGER, in opening the discussion, agreed in the main with Mr. Chesterton's conclusions, but differed from his premises. He thought that

if the speaker had taken up the Jewish Prayer Book he would see the Jewish love of locality and longing for Zion on almost every page. He also differed from Mr. Chesterton in his opinion on the pre-eminence of Jewish brains. The Jews were not a more clever people, but they developed earlier.

Mr. HORACE B. SAMUEL said that the criterion was race, not religion or nationality. The problem was: were the Jews an economic asset to the peoples? Mr. Chesterton had adopted the wrong standard, and had taken an obsolete view. There were, to his mind, three causes for the anti-Jewish bias: The hereditary vendetta caused by the death of Jesus, the sociological question, and the predominance of Jewish brain power.

Mr. E. LESSER was disappointed at the treatment of the subject. Mr. Chesterton's paradoxes had led him into giving expression to strange arguments. He made a plea for Zionism and traditional Judaism, but had not dealt with the large section of Jews who could not be classed among these types. He would have liked to hear Mr. Chesterton's views on intermarriage.

Mr. LEWIS said that Mr. Chesterton had left out of calculation that increasing body of Jews who found themselves out of sympathy with traditional Jewish observances.

Mr. E. LEVINE said that Mr. Chesterton had told them no new thing. He had ignored the fact that the message of Judaism, according to non-Zionists, meant the spreading of Israel among the nations of the world.

Mr. BESSO, Mr. PYKE, Mrs. FRANKLIN and Miss FRANKLIN continued the discussion.

The CHAIRMAN, in proposing a vote of thanks to Mr. Chesterton, emphasised the fact that the Jews were a national asset wherever they were. Jewish thought dominated every movement in the world. The conditions of bigotry in the Middle Ages were responsible for the Jews' aptitude for business and finance. But the Jew was necessary for the world's progress. He would like to see Jews recognised as a part of the nation, in the same way as Irish and Welsh formed a section of the English people.

A Criticism of Mr. Chesterton.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE 'JEWISH CHRONICLE.'

SIR,—Opinions may differ as to the wisdom of the executive of the West End Jewish Literary Society in inviting Mr. Chesterton to lecture on the 'Jewish Problem,' but all will agree that it was a broad-minded step.

It cannot, however, be said that the lecture proved to be its justification. It was but a feeble resurrection of the pronouncement of the late Professor Goldwin Smith about thirty years ago, which was vigorously and effectively demolished at the time by the late Chief Rabbi.

Like the Professor, Mr. Chesterton contends that religious Jews feel the attraction towards Zion so overpowering a force that should it at any time involve a course of action opposed to the interests of the British Empire those interests were, he considered, in danger of being disregarded to the peril of the State. Having regard to the recognised ability of the Hebrew race he thinks this supposed possibility a serious matter, but he did not show why the

possession of political rights by naturalised foreigners coming from other nations was not open to the like objection. It, therefore, seems clear that his attitude is based on prejudice, not on reason. It is but fair to recognise that he confessed to some ignorance of the Jewish position, and it is only such ignorance that can excuse his attitude. He pleaded for information—but on what? Thinking that he might be under some misapprehension about the meaning and aims of the movement known as Zionism, I rose with the intention of reassuring him that it makes no pretension to herald the approach of the Messiah, or the formation of an independent Jewish State. It was, however, too late for me to speak, and so I venture to crave your hospitality.

Notwithstanding imperfections, Mr. Chesterton's performance is, however, not without some interest and significance. It shows that a cultured author, who is in English politics a pronounced Radical and Home Ruler, can be as reactionary as a 'Real Russian' on the Jewish Problem, and be content to rely on his imagination for the facts. The only semblance of a solid fact which he adduced was that in his own neighbourhood in Bucks he knew of no Jewish agricultural labourer. Perhaps there are none, but if he need any, may I venture to suggest to him to advertise for some in the Jewish Press offering attractive conditions, and then 'wait and see.'

Yours obediently,

A. KISCH.

The Zionist Solution.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE 'JEWISH CHRONICLE.'

SIR,—Your correspondent 'Zionist,' in your issue of the week before last—upon the appearance of which, by-the-bye, permit me to offer you my sincere congratulations—demurs to my suggestion that the mere placing of Jews as colonists in Palestine, will result in transforming a certain number of our own people into Turks of the Jewish persuasion. He says it is 'calculated'—note the word!—that they will become Jews of Ottoman citizenship. Where, except rhetorically, is the difference? How far, if this be the aim of Zionism, does Zionism as at present pursued, help the Jewish position? I am entitled to ask this, because when I said there was no future for the Jews, several Jewish correspondents energetically protested, and triumphantly pointed to Zionism as indicating that future. Really, if 'Zionist' is correct in his interpretation of the 'aims of the present executive and those who support them,' whatever that may mean, their present-day Zionism is all I described it. What essential difference, pray, is there in being a Jew of Ottoman citizenship and of English, French or Russian citizenship? I mean, of course, in the Jew part of it—the other is obvious. Zionists complain that Jews of English, French or German citizenship sooner or later become Englishmen, German or Frenchmen of the Jewish persuasion. How does your correspondent suppose the same process will not take place in the case of Jews of Ottoman citizenship? If, as your correspondent would wish us to infer, all that Zionism aims, at is to exchange English, French or German for Ottoman citizenship in the Jew it will not get the Jew very far along the road

to a worthy future, valuable component as the movement may be preparing for the Ottoman Empire. But we are thinking of the Jewish future not of the Ottoman. That is an essential point your correspondent does not appear to perceive.

Yours obediently,
BEN YISROEL.

The Jewish Chronicle published a couple of letters to the editor in response to this exchange, on 8 December 1911, on page 38,

“THE JEWISH POSITION:

What Mr. Chesterton said.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE “JEWISH CHRONICLE.”

SIR,—I hope that others besides myself will write to you to state that Mr. Kisch entirely misrepresents what Mr. Chesterton said on the 26th November at the West End Jewish Literary Society. Mr. Kisch apparently calls Mr. Chesterton reactionary because Mr. Chesterton believes in nationality, but if this is reactionary surely the Jews are the most reactionary people in the world as they have most deliberately insisted on retaining part of their nationality. Mr. Chesterton never said a word about ‘attraction towards Zion’ ever being a possible danger to the British Empire: he saw a source of demoralisation in those rich cynical Jews who have no enthusiasm for any ideal. He also doubted whether it is possible to have two nationalities which are equal in their claims on an individual and, if anyone will think the matter out, I think they will find that in any testing crisis they could not be. Mr. Kisch may be in favour of a policy of drifting purposelessness and inconsistency: those who are not will welcome all critics who help to clear away the endless humbug of Jews who believe in their mission and are actually missionaries of nothing and do not know what their message is, and who believe in their nationality and do not want self-government.

Yours obediently,

Westbourne Terrace, Hyde Park. _____

ARTHUR D. LEWIS.

Can Jews be Patriots?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ‘JEWISH CHRONICLE.’

SIR,—It is not in the least surprising that Mr. Chesterton’s lecture to the West End Jewish Literary Society should have proved so unpalatable to the members of that body in general and to your correspondent, Mr. Kisch, in particular.

There are quite a number of ladies and gentlemen with a weathercock cast of mind—the sort of person who though he has never read a single one of M. Bergson’s books, can never say anything just now without mentioning his name—who, at prize distributions of Sabbath classes, boys’ and girls’ clubs, and other functions of the kind, makes it a constant burden of all his

speeches, that Jews besides being good Jews should always be good Englishmen. This is the message that the West is repeatedly flashing to the East. When, therefore, a gentleman of Mr. Chesterton's logical cast of mind comes along and very flatly tells them that good Jews cannot be patriotic Englishmen, it is not unnatural that the ladies and gentlemen in question should kick. The patriotism of the Jew is simply a cloak he assumes to please the Englishman and so when Mr. Chesterton is shrewd enough to detect the Jew beneath the Englishman's clothing, the masqueraders become exceedingly angry. They had hoped to placate the Englishman by saying that they loved him and agreed with him. Judge then of their dismay when he turns round and says: I can only accept your love when you hate me and differ from me. The Jew is suspect and he knows it; and in the hope that the suspicion will be drowned in the noise, he becomes most vulgarly loud in his profession of patriotism. This atmosphere of suspicion in which the Jew lives from the moment of his birth, makes him so horribly fidgety, that when he meets a Gentile, the fact that he is a Jew is either the very first or the very last thing he wants to tell him. The Jew never takes the fact that he is one as a matter of course, which shows that he is never sure of himself, since it is only the things we are sure of and easy about that we take as matters of course.

Mr. Kisch seems to think that because some thirty years ago, two eminent men had a quarrel about the question whether good Jews could be patriotic Englishmen that, therefore, the matter has been disposed of at once and for all. To the Jews of this generation, the question is more acute and insistent than ever. We Jews of the younger generation are simply being coerced and intimidated, not through the compulsion of physical force but through the more subtle and insidious compulsion of a tyrannous public opinion, into a profession of patriotism, which, in the nature of things, must always be viewed with distrust and suspicion. I think it can be laid down as a general law, that the more Jews become Englishmen the less they become Jews. That does not imply any moral censure; it is simply a statement of fact, and Jews who pretend that they can at once be patriotic Englishmen and good Jews are simply living lies.

Yours obediently,
B. FELZ."

Dietrich Eckart wrote, quoting Adolf Hitler, who capitalized on Jewish racism in order to justify anti-Jewish racism, which served to justify more Jewish racism, which served to justify more anti-Jewish racism, and so on (both Dietrich Eckart and Adolf Hitler were working for the Jewish Zionists),

"One doesn't need spectacles to see that. 'I am a British subject but, first and foremost, a Jew,' screamed a Hebrew years ago in a large English-Jewish newspaper. [*Notation: M.J. Wodeslowsky, Jewish World, January 1, 1909.*] And another: 'Whoever has to choose between his duties as an Englishman and as a Jew must choose the latter.' [*Notation: Joseph Cohen, Jewish World,*

November 4, 1913.] And a third: ‘Jews who want to be both patriotic Englishmen and good Jews are simply living lies.’ [*Notation: Jewish Chronicle*, December 10, 1911.] That they could venture things of that sort so openly indicates how overrun with Jews England already was then.”⁷⁷⁰

The letters by “Verax” and Israel Cohen address most of the issues raised by “Mentor” in her(?) open letter to Lord Northcliffe. Verax and Israel Cohen wrote in *The London Times* on 27 November 1919 on page 15,

**“JEWS AND
BOLSHEVISM.**

**THE MOSAIC LAW IN
POLITICS.**

RACIAL TEMPERAMENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—As an old student of Jewish history, Jewish literature, and of the Jewish people themselves, I have read with much interest and sad amusement the correspondence in your columns on the Jews and Bolshevism. The preponderance of Jews, renegade and other, in the development and direction of Bolshevism is too well known to need special demonstration. The letters of Mr. Israel Cohen have, however, a merit in this respect that is conspicuously absent from the letter of ‘Judæus.’ Mr. Cohen writes of the Jews as a ‘race,’ whereas ‘Judæus’ would have us, at this time of day, believe that the Jews are merely a religious ‘denomination.’ This is the kind of casuistry that so often deprives Jewish apologetics of value. The Jews are, first of all, a race, with a religion suited to their race-temperament. Temperament and religion have acted and reacted upon each other for thousands of years until they have produced a type distinguishable at a glance from any other race-type in the world. Persecution, religious, economic, and political, has had comparatively little to do with the matter. Otherwise, there would surely not exist caricatures more than 2,000 years old of the specifically Jewish types which ‘Judæus’ and his like would probably have us accept as a consequence of Christian intolerance.

But this, after all, is not the main point. I, for one, cannot find it in me to denounce Trotsky and his associates for the havoc they have wrought in Russia. Knowing something of the Jewish character, its persistence, its intensity, and its inexorable vindictiveness, I can understand that Trotsky and his fellow ‘gun men’ from New York should delight in trampling upon the Russia that oppressed their race and in destroying every vestige of the system that held millions of Jews in shameful bondage. I can understand, too, how Jews the world over, orthodox and renegade, glory in their heads at the vengeance thus wreaked by men of their own race upon Tsarism and all its works. For the inwardness of Jewry is not solely religion. It is, above all, pride of race, belief in its superiority, faith in its ultimate triumph, the

persuasion that Jewish brains are superior to Gentile brains—the attitude of mind, in short, that corresponds to the inbred conviction that the Jews are the Chosen People destined, one day, to be the rulers and law-givers of mankind.

Whether this conviction was engendered in them by religious doctrine, or whether the doctrine was fashioned to suit the conviction, I cannot say. Nor is it possible to determine whether the Law of Moses, with its eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, has given to the Jewish character its hard and tenacious revengefulness, or whether the Law of Moses itself is an expression of that peculiar race-character. Be this as it may, the Jews as a race are as proud of the Law of Moses and as persuaded of its superiority to the Law of Christ, with its doctrine of forgiveness, as they are of the superiority of their blood over that of non-Jewish peoples. Those who may wish to ponder these matters might do worse than betake themselves to the Court Theatre and see the great Jewish actor, Moscovitch, play Shylock. They may then begin to understand many things, and, among others, one thing that students of Jewry too often overlook—the apparently untamable passionateness and the apparently incurable short-sightedness of Jewish minds.

No one who knows the Jews—not a few more or less pleasant, attractive, or brilliant individuals, but Jews in the mass—can doubt that the picture Shakespeare drew of the Jewish temperament in Shylock is true to life. Nor is it doubtful that the most illuminating trait in Shylock's character is not his revengefulness and cruelty, but his stupidity. He pursues his vengeance without ever dreaming that reaction against his conduct may recoil disastrously upon himself and undo him utterly, whereas a little forgiveness, a little comprehension even of the cash value of the 'quality of mercy' would have given him assured prosperity. It is in this respect that Shylock is most typical of the spirit of Jewry—that is to say, of its inability to forgive, or, in other words, its fidelity to the spirit of the Law of Moses as distinguished from the Law of Christ. For the Jews to be revenged on Russia must be sweet indeed, and they may well have felt that no price was too high for the satisfaction of their explicable rancour. Have they not worked and plotted against Russia for generations? Were not the Marxist doctrines, that are the roots of Bolshevism, the fruit of a Jewish brain? Was not the whole revolutionary organization in Russia largely Jewish? Undoubtedly many Jews in Russia who had escaped the rigours of the old *régime*, or had even grown prosperous under it, have opposed Bolshevism and suffered the penalty. Undoubtedly Jews were influential in the Cadet Party and in the Menshevist section of the Russian Socialist Party. Undoubtedly the Zionist organizations in Russia have suffered under Bolshevism because they are an expression of Jewish national feeling and as such are obnoxious to Bolshevism. But the fact remains that the warp and woof of the Bolshevist organization has been Jewish, and that throughout Russia and, indeed, throughout Central Europe, including Hungary and what remains of Austria, Bolshevism and Jewry are regarded as practically synonymous.

Herein lies grave peril for the masses of the Jewish people in Russia. Many Jews now perceive this peril and are endeavouring, on the one hand, now to prove that the connexion between Jewry and Bolshevism is slight, and, on the other, to promote a policy in Allied countries favourable to some agreement with Bolshevism so that the danger of a general massacre of Jews after the overthrow or the collapse of Bolshevism may be averted. These tactics are transparent, short-sighted, and, indeed, stupid. The only sound policy for the Jews would have been, and would still be, for their representative leaders to dissociate themselves whole-heartedly and publicly from Bolshevism and all its works, and to use all their influence, public and private, in favour of its overthrow by the constitutional and democratic forces of Russia, with the support and under the control of the Allies. I can see no other way of escape from the appalling peril that hangs over Jewry in Eastern Europe. Otherwise the Jews may find, when it is too late, that the excess of their vengeance upon Russia has recoiled upon them in terrible fashion and that, to them who have hated much, little, too little, will be forgiven.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

VERAX.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—In your issue of to-day your correspondent ‘Janus’ gives a list of 28 ‘conspicuous Bolshevists’ who, he states, ‘are either full-blooded Jews or of Jewish extraction.’ It is only fair to your readers that they should be informed that as many as 10 names in this list are those either of non-Jews or of anti-Bolshevists or of dead Bolshevists:—

(1-3) Lunacharsky, Chernov, and Bogdanov are pure Russian Bolshevists.

(4) Zagorsky is neither a Jew nor a Bolshevist, but a Russian Radical.

(5-6) Kamkov and Bunakov are Social Revolutionaries—*i.e.*, anti-Bolshevists. Kamkov (-Katz), after his participation in the assassination of Count Mirbach, had to flee from Bolshevist Russia to Archangel.

(7-8) Dan and Martov are the Jewish leaders of the Menshevists—*i.e.*, the most determined opponents of Lenin and his group. They were referred to as anti-Bolshevists in your columns only a few days ago.

(9-10) Uritzky and Volodarsky have both been murdered, the former by the Jew Kannesgiesser.

I have no doubt that ‘Janus’ has sent you his list in good faith, but the fact that it has to be discounted to such a great extent is typical of the general misrepresentations of the Jewish share in Bolshevism.

Yours faithfully,

ISRAEL COHEN.

77, Great Russell-street, W.C., Nov. 26.”

Israel Cohen wrote in *The London Times* on 1 December 1919 on page 10,

“JEWS AND BOLSHEVISM.”

A FURTHER REJOINDER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—I am loth to trespass further upon your space, but the grave indictment

of the Jewish people contained in the letter of 'Verax,' who forms with your correspondents 'Philjudæus' and 'Janus' the third element in an accusing Trinity, impels me to invoke the courtesy of your hospitality once again. 'Verax' describes himself as 'an old student of Jewish history, Jewish literature, and of the Jewish people, themselves,' but the whole spirit and contents of his letter betray how superficial and unprofitable, or perhaps, how ancient his studies have been. His presentation of the Jewish character is a gross travesty, and his interpretation of the Jewish part in the Bolshevik movement is fanciful and unfounded. He has shifted the base of attack from the domain of facts and figures, where he finds the position of his fellow-accusers untenable, to the domain of racial psychology; but his arguments, however plausible, will be found upon examination to possess not the flimsiest shred of substance.

Burke once declared that you cannot indict a nation, but 'Verax' thinks he knows better. He maintains that Judaism is founded upon the principle of revenge, and he declares that 'Jews the world over, orthodox and renegade, glory in their hearts at the vengeance thus wreaked by men of their own race upon Tsarism and all its works.' His premise is false, and his conclusion is a calumny. He cites the principle of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, as though that were ever intended literally. Has 'Verax,' in his studies of Jewish history and literature, ever come across a single case where this was literally applied or even advocated? Does he not know that this principle has always been interpreted by all Talmudical and Rabbinical authorities without exception (*vide* talmud Baba Kama, pp. 83*b* and 84*a*), as meaning simply the rendering of just monetary compensation, an interpretation which is in complete harmony with the canons of modern jurisprudence? Or does 'Verax' also take quite literally the saying in the Sermon on the Mount, 'And if any man shall sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also?' In support of his thesis he invokes the shade of Shakespeare and points at the pitiable figure of Shylock, but Shakespeare, living in the days of Queen Elizabeth, could not have known any typical Jews, as the residence of Jews in England was then forbidden: and, as 'Verax' can learn from the commentators, Shakespeare simply imputed to a Jew the heartless bargain attributed in the original story to a non-Jew. If anything proves the un-Jewishness of Shylock it is his acceptance of Christianity to save his life. Surely, 'Verax' must know from his study of Jewish history that Jews without number have sacrificed their lives rather than accept the waters of baptism. His antithesis between a Jewish law of revenge and a Christian law of forgiveness is utterly fallacious. The Bible and the Talmud utter repeated warnings against hatred and revenge, and insist upon forgiveness as one of the cardinal bases of human conduct. The law of Moses distinctly states:—'Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' (Levit. xix., 18). And in Talmudic literature 'Verax' can find such noble sayings as:—'Be of the persecuted and not of the persecutors,' and 'Who is strong? He who turns an enemy into a friend.'

Now how does your correspondent's misreading of Jewish psychology apply to Bolshevism? Even if revenge were inculcated by the Law of Moses, we would expect it to be exercised by those to whom the Law of Moses is dear, by the pious or orthodox. But the orthodox Jews, to a man, have eschewed the pernicious doctrine; they have only suffered by it. The Jews who are Bolsheviks are opposed to orthodoxy; they are opposed to the Jewish religion in any form; indeed, they are contemptuously hostile to all religion. They will have nothing to do with Judaism

as religion, race, or nation. Nor can the Bolshevist *régime* be adduced as proof that the Jews wished to see the downfall of Tsarism and all its works, for that end was already achieved by Kerensky's revolution. When Trotsky first began to play a leading part in Bolshevism, a deputation of the Council of the Petrograd Jewish Community pleaded with him to break off his connexion with the movement, on the ground that it would lead to the shedding of innocent Jewish blood: but he refused, replying that he was not a Jew himself, and did not recognize Jews as such. Attempts have been made by the relatives of other Jewish Bolsheviks to wean them from their heresy, but without avail. 'Verax' seems to suggest that Bolshevism is a product of the Jewish mind, heedless of the fact that it was hatched in the brain of Lenin, the pure Russian, who, during the revolution of 1905, returned from Switzerland to his native country as an apostle of Jewish pogroms, by which he thought, through the massacre of the Jewish *bourgeoisie*, he could hasten his Communist paradise! And the thesis of your correspondent involves the further absurdity of supposing that the Jews in Russia would deliberately destroy the foundations of their own material existence; for the Jews in Bolshevist Russia are for the most part merchants, manufacturers, and members of the liberal professions—the very classes against which Lenin and his associates have dealt their direst blows.

'Verax' concludes by declaring that many Jews are now trying 'to promote a policy in Allied countries favourable to some agreement with Bolshevism.' What are his proofs, what are his data? Why does he not at least give one specific instance? Your correspondent appeals to the representative leaders of Jewry to use all their influence in favour of the overthrow of Bolshevism. I have no right to speak in the names of these leaders, but I cannot help recalling that when they appealed a few years ago for intervention in Russia, not for the overthrow of Tsardom, but for the suppression of pogroms, they were told that intervention was impossible. The question, I venture to think, is not one for Jewish leaders, who might afterwards be accused by some other anonymous correspondent of usurping political power—even 'Verax,' in an earlier passage, taunts the Jews with the conviction that they are destined to be the rulers of mankind—but for the Allied and Associated Governments. If these Governments, with all the resources of their collective statesmanship and immeasurable munitions, fail to solve the problem, and there should indeed be a fear of the further massacres which 'Verax' foreshadows, then I hope the Army of Liberation, when it redeems the Bolshevist-ridden country, will act not in the vindictive spirit which he predicts but in that of true Christian charity. And if the millions of Jews whose lives are now menaced have no claim to protection on the mere ground of humanity, may not the memory of the myriads of their fellow-Jews who fought and fell in the War of Liberation, and in the hope of a better era for their persecuted people, serve as a mute yet potent plea on their behalf?

Yours faithfully,

ISRAEL COHEN.

November 27."

In his desire to discredit "Verax", Cohen badly miscalculated the nature and source of the threat. The Nazis were not Christian and painted themselves as victims of the "War of Liberation". Cohen also misrepresented the Judaic proscriptions

against attacking one's neighbors, which were meant only for fellow Jews, not Gentiles.⁷⁷¹ The Talmud states in *Sanhedrin 59a* (see also: folio 57a),

“A goyim who studies the Torah must be killed.”

and,

“The Law Moses gave unto us as an heritage; it is an heritage for us, not for them.”⁷⁷²

The Talmud states in *Baba Mezia 108b*,

“[A] heathen is certainly not subject to [the exhortation], ‘*And thou shalt do that which is right and good in the sight of the Lord.*’”⁷⁷³

and in *Baba Mezia 114b*,

“Ye are called men, but the goyim (gentiles) are not men, but beasts.”⁷⁷⁴

The danger of the Jewish-Bolshevik universal generalization, which was immediately apparent to Herman Bernstein's handlers, was very real, and was later exploited by Zionists Jews in order to place their agents in power on an anti-Semitic and anti-Bolshevist platform. “Verax” wrote in *The London Times* on 2 December 1919 on page 10,

“BOLSHEVISM AND THE JEWS.

A LARGER ISSUE.

THE DANGER IN RUSSIA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—I am obliged to the Chief Rabbi for his helpful reply to my letter.

He protests ‘with all possible vehemence,’ or, as I might have said, ‘with untamable passionateness,’ against what he calls my ‘attack upon the religious doctrines of Judaism and its alleged effects upon ‘his’ ‘people.’ He avers that ‘the beginning and the end of all Jewish teaching is loving-kindness to all, even to our enemies.’ He alleges that even were he to reprint in your columns ‘a whole anthology of Bible and Rabbinical texts’ in support of his claim, I should, ‘at best merely proceed to seek new pretexts to maintain ‘my’ ‘prejudices.’ May I assure him that I have no prejudices, but some decades of experience. He adds that the ‘breadth of humanity and passion for righteousness’ which his anthology would reveal are ‘nowhere to be surpassed (even in the Gospels, which, by the way, are also the work of Jews, written by Jews for Jews).’

It is perhaps as well that the Chief Rabbi should refrain from producing

his 'Bible and Rabbinical texts,' lest your readers be moved to ask what reason there is to think that, since the Gospels, 'the work of Jews, written by Jews for Jews,' have profited Jewry so little, the Rabbinical and other texts, equally written by Jews for Jews, have been of greater avail. Incidentally, the Chief Rabbi's mention of the Gospels as 'the work of Jews' tends to substantiate both my reference to Jewish pride in the work of Jews, irrespective of their religious faith, and the argument, which 'Judæus' has sought to invalidate, that orthodoxy in Judaism is by no means essential to a Jewish status.

But these matters touch only the fringe of the grave question debated in your columns; and in any case *The Times* is not a Betha Midrash for the solving of pious conundrums or answering the riddle: 'When is a Jew not a Jew!' Nor can the testimony of your hospitable pages be invoked solely to prove that 'during these last five years Jewish citizens of every Allied country have been loyal and true and patriotic to the ideals of freedom and have fought in gladness the battle of righteousness.' To the patriotic conduct of most British and Allied Jews I, who know something of the inner history of the Jewish movement during these same five years, am glad to testify; but your columns have also recorded other things, such as the doings and the downfall of the *Bonnet Rouge* gang in France (Vigo-Almeyreda, Landau, Goldsky, and others), whose work for the Allies was of a quite peculiar sort. This merely as a reminder to the Chief Rabbi that, as I pointed out in my former letter, Jewish minds are prone to short-sightedness.

Mr. Israel Cohen's latest contribution need not detain me, save in one respect. His assertion that 'if anything proves the un-Jewishness of Shylock it is his acceptance of Christianity to save his life' makes me wonder whether he has ever read the lamentable story of the Marranos in the 14th century or that of Sabbatai Zebi, or Zevi, in the 17th. His followers, the Dönmehs, or crypto-Jews, of Salonika are with us to this day.

But, Sir, these matters are really of secondary importance. The real issue which it was the purpose of my letter to raise is: How is the Jewish people in Russia and other parts of Eastern Europe to escape from the wrath that is sure to come when Bolshevism collapses or is overthrown, unless steps be taken now to avert it? Frankly, I am anxious to see these masses of poor Jews saved from massacre. I am convinced, and have reason for my conviction, that they may pay dearly for the indisputable fact that, in wide regions of Central and Eastern Europe, Bolshevism and Jewry are regarded as practically synonymous. I do not say, and have not said, that they are synonymous, but I repeat that they are regarded as being practically synonymous, and that, when the process begins of seeking scapegoats for the unspeakable havoc that Bolshevism has wrought, the masses of poor Jews are likely to pay for the sins of Trotsky and his associates. With the fate of the rich Jews I am not so much concerned, for they usually manage to look after themselves. Therefore I repeat that the only sound policy for the Jews outside Russia, and as far as possible in Russia, would be to dissociate themselves, whole-

heartedly and publicly, from Bolshevism and all its works, and to use all their influence, public and private, in favour of its overthrow by the constitutional and democratic forces of Russia with the support and under the control of the Allies.

If this be anti-Semitism, I am an anti-Semite—in company with many prophets of Israel who were sawn asunder, stoned, and crucified for daring to tell Jewry the truth: and I again sign myself. Yours obediently,

VERAX.”

5.3.5 The Inhumanity of the Bolsheviks

As with “the Terror” of the French Revolution, the Bolshevik revolutionaries committed numerous atrocities against the monarchy and the Russian people. Many believed this genocide was revenge for the Pogroms and for the Pale of Settlement in Russia. In part it was, but in the greater part it was the fulfillment of Judaic Messianic prophecy and a means to keep Gentile empires from posing a threat to Jewish supremacy.

It is interesting to note that the Jews took revenge on the English who had expelled them, with Cromwell under the directorship of the Cabalist Jew Manasseh Ben Israel and others. The Jews also took revenge on the Germans, with Martin Luther’s purges under the directorship of Cabalist Jews, and with the slaughter of innocent Germans under Bismarck and continuing through Hitler’s régime. The Jews took revenge on the Romans and Christians by burning Rome and blaming the fire on the Christians, under the directorship of Nero’s crypto-Jewish wife Poppæa.⁷⁷⁵ The Jews took revenge on the Spanish who expelled them, with the crypto-Jewish instigators of the Spanish Civil War, and then installed the crypto-Jewish tyrant Francisco Franco. The Jews took revenge on the Turks and Armenians with the revolutionary Young Turks, who were crypto-Jews known as *Dönme*h Turks.⁷⁷⁶ Racist Jews are today taking action against the United States for daring to be a mighty nation, after the creation of the State of Israel; because Jewish mythology demands that the Jews must rule the world from Jerusalem. After the United States’ subservient rôle as the sword of this power is completed, it will be destroyed as an empire and the American People will face a genocide and tyranny.

Einstein, himself, wrote to Emil Zürcher on 15 April 1919 that he knew for certain that Bolshevik leaders were stealing the wealth of the Russian Nation and were “systematically” mass murdering everyone who did “not belong to the lowest class.”⁷⁷⁷ In addition to diminishing their ability to fight for their own interests, this also weakened the genetic stock of the Russian people,⁷⁷⁸ and left them unable to conduct a counter-revolution—with the hope of ultimately leaving them unable to fight a counter-revolution against Zionist world domination at any point in the future.⁷⁷⁹ The Talmud at *Sanhedrin 37a* teaches the Jews the importance of the fact that taking the life of an individual can also signify the genocide of countless unborn descendants of that individual. The Jews in control of the Bolshevik mass murderers sought to exterminate the better part of the Russian People and leave an inferior and easily managed “race” forever, or at least until they were completely wiped out.

Lenin fulfilled his own murderous ambitions and answered the call for merciless violence of Marxists like Georges Sorel, who published *Réflexions sur la Violence* in 1908.⁷⁸⁰ Circa 17 October 1919, Heinrich Zangger wrote to Albert Einstein that the Bolsheviks were intentionally destroying food and murdering “all who know anything”.⁷⁸¹ He wrote of their hatred, brutality and senseless destruction in their quest for power and of the danger it posed and widespread misery it caused. Trotsky made a point of declaring that the Bolshevik revolution was a world-wide revolution that would eventually touch every human being. All of this serves no other purpose than to deliberately fulfill Jewish Messianic prophecy.

On 16 March 1922 on page 12 *The London Times* published the following Letter to the Editor:

“BOLSHEVIST EXECUTIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—The *Gaulois* published on December 23 last the following statistics showing the executions which have taken place in Russia during the past four years. The figures, based on the official documents of the Soviet, are as follows:—

The following persons have been executed since October, 1917:—28 Bishops, 1,215 priests, 6,775 schoolmasters and professors, 8,800 physicians, 54,650 officers, 260,000 soldiers, 10,500 officers of the constabulary and police, 48,500 soldiers of the same forces, 12,950 land owners, 355,250 so-called ‘intellectual’ citizens, 193,350 workmen, 815,100 peasants—total, 1,766,118.

Mr. Lloyd George wishes to arrange a meeting in Genoa with the perpetrators of these terrible crimes, to discuss the means of ‘reconstructing’ Russia. He might call together on the same occasion several cannibals and discuss with them the possibilities of ‘reconstructing’ Africa by means of devouring the African people.

Yours faithfully,

H. A. VAN DE LINDE.

4, Fenchurch-avenue, E. C.3, March 15.”

Lord Sydenham of Combe informed the House of Lords in 1923 that the Bolshevik murders and the intentional starvation of populations under Bolshevik control resulted in approximately 30 million deaths since the Bolsheviks seized power.

The London Times published the following report on 14 November 1919 on page 14, which was later released as a pamphlet by *The Times* (note that the accusation that the Bolsheviks tortured people with the “human glove” was reiterated by Dietrich Eckart and Alfred Rosenberg⁷⁸² in anti-Semitic Zionist propaganda),

“THE HORRORS OF

BOLSHEVISM.
SUMMONS TO A
CRUSADE.
REMARKABLE LETTER
BY AN OFFICER.

We print below a very remarkable letter sent by a British Officer in South Russia to his wife. The letter is notable not only for its revelations of Bolshevist atrocities, but as a human document. The man who has seen what Bolshevism really means cannot rest without enlisting his wife and all his family into a crusade against it and a campaign for the enlightenment of the British public.

The letter is published exactly as sent, except that names and dates have been altered, so that the writer and his wife will not be embarrassed. We make no apology in present circumstances for publishing certain passages of a nature generally considered 'unprintable.'

DEAREST,

This should be your birthday and wedding day letter. I'll send the postal order for your hat and silk stockings and gloves along with this. M., dear, how I shall think of you on this 26th and 28th—or is it 31st by now? I wonder whether you will feel me near you—I shall dedicate these two days to my Molly.

Just fancy, Molly, they've made me a Staff officer! (acting). I shall break out in red tabs all over—that is, if I can get any. Would you draw on Cox and stagger round to the Army and Navy, and buy me a red hat band and one pair staff officer's gorget patches (red)? S-Staff officer's G-horget patches—and two little buttons? They'll take two months to reach me, Molly, but then we'll astonish the natives.

And—I'm going to another army—an army of umpty-thousand Cossacks, all irregular cavalry, splendid wild men, easily the most interesting, in fact rather exciting, crowd, and any amount of scope. And any amount of work to do. They make wild cavalry raids of hundreds of miles.

Do you remember my saying I wonder whether I'd have the chance of getting 'longside some Cossacks? And now I'm going to the one Cossack army of the four.

So I'll write you once more before I go, and I do hope I'll get another mail before I start, for it's a month from here to them, and communication by courier only.

Now, dearest, to the serious part of my letter.

I want you to do war work. WAR WORK. I want you to spend one hour, or, if you cannot, only half an hour, daily, in doing the Bolshevist *harm*. With your typewriter. In thought, word, and deed. I want you to put heart and soul

into *helping General Denikin and his cause*. For if ever there was a crusade it is this. I shall put my heart and soul into helping to organize and supply in my area, into creating good feeling and moral values, into actual fighting, and into collecting and forwarding to you such information and photos as I hope will set England blazing with indignation and disgust. Both in the rough and in the letters to Cousin Masterton. And much that is unprintable, but **MUST BE KNOWN**.

It all goes home officially and gets held up—somewhere.

And I hope and pray that I shall rouse you, and all our friends, to such a white heat of enthusiasm for this crusade and holy hatred for the Bolshevik that you will do everything in your power to enlighten people at home.

GERMANS' SUBTLE METHODS.

To start with, I want to give *you* a few points on the situation:—

1. The Boche is still fighting us, through the Bolshevik, but in a subtle way, and by underground means which it is hard to counter.

The Germans, in the beginning of the war, hoped to be at France in three months. Detached forces were to drive the contemptible (or *contemptibly*, what does it matter?) little Army into the sea. They then intended to turn on Russia, to defeat her, reconstitute her as a vassal State, firmly allied and bound over to Germany, to organize and utilize her vast resources of men and material as a means of ruling the world.

They did not succeed in breaking the French or us in a short time. They thereupon used every means of peaceful penetration in Russia and had prepared to paralyse Russia's efforts as an effective member of the Alliance. They worked through spies, agents making propaganda, the many German bankers, &c., who had always been German agents, and some unfortunately corruptible Russians. That devil Rasputin was in their pay, but arrangements for his death, merely as getting too big for his boots, were being made by them when he was killed fortuitously, but too late for Russia.

At the same time they made every effort, unfortunately with the greatest success, of discrediting the Tsar and Imperial family in Allied countries.

When it was seen that Russia could not be got out of the war under the *ancien régime*, they helped to bring about the revolution.

When it appeared that Kerensky, a fool, but not *altogether* a knave, and his Government intended to continue the war, they redoubled their efforts to undermine the Army and Navy. I have described some of the means they used often to you.

They succeeded.

They 'sent Lenin to Russia' (*vide* Ludendorff), organized Bolshevism, gained a footing in the Ukraine, commenced exploiting the resources of Russia, and were contemplating the raising of Russian troops for use on the Western front.

DENIKIN FIGHTING FOR A UNITED RUSSIA.

Since the Armistice they have not lost hope or interest in Russia. They continue to organize Bolshevism and Bolshevist propaganda in Allied countries. They hate Denikin and oppose him, because Denikin is fighting for a *united* Russia, free from German influence and exploitation.

Bolshevist Russia is a channel of communication to the Committee of Union and Progress, to Egypt, India, and Afghanistan.

2. Unless beaten by us, the Bolshies will beat us. It's a side issue for the present, but the danger of their rousing and letting loose the Chinese is not so very remote.

3. They have declared war on Christianity. The Bible to them is a 'counter-revolutionary' book, and to be stamped out.

They are aiming at raising all non-Christian races against the Christian countries.

The Bolsheviks form about 5 per cent. of the population of Russia—*Jews* (80 to 90 per cent. of the commissaries are Jews), Chinese, Letts, Germans, and certain of the 'skilled labour' artisans. The conscribed peasantry, originally captured by the catchwords mentioned in the pamphlets, now often goaded beyond endurance, is rising against them over wide districts. Still conscribed and put up to fight, under severe penalties, they form most of the 'cannon fodder' used by the Bolshies. They desert, often *en masse*, and many a peasant who marched for the Bolsheviks last week is fighting for Denikin in the Volunteer Army to-day.

Ref. Jews.—In towns captured by Bolsheviks the only unviolated sacred buildings are the synagogues, while churches are used for anything, from movie-shows to 'slaughter-houses.' The Poles, Galacians, and Petlura have committed 'pogroms' (massacres of Jews). *Not* the Russian Volunteer Armies under Denikin. Denikin has, in fact, been so strict in protecting the Jews that he has been accused by his sympathizers of favouring them.

If, however, a Commissary, steeped in murder, with torture and rape, with mutilation, happens to be a Jew, as most of them are, should he receive exceptional treatment?

The very enemies of General Denikin who have committed pogroms accuse him of all men, and his Volunteer Armies of massacring Jews. It is one more expedient to turn the sympathies of Western countries against Denikin, not very successful, on the whole, and a side issue. I don't know why I wasted so much time on this minor point of the Jews. Possibly because they are one of the largest non-Russian contingents among the Bolshies, and the most influential. The Chinese and Letts act more as executioners and torturers.

UNPRINTABLE PHOTOGRAPHS.

4. The Bolsheviks are devils. . . . I hope to send you copies of 64 official photos taken by British officers at Odessa when the town was retaken from the Bolsheviks. (The French and Greek divisions had cleared out; the Bolshies had taken the town and were finally driven out by Denikin's 'Iron Brigade.' The successful assault was made by a detachment of 413 of the

Volunteer Army.)

As no paper will print them I suggest that you should have copies done. If we're too hard up you could pay for them by sending me no parcels, or selling my Caucasian dagger, or Persian book, or something. And I suggest that you should then do with them as you think fit, to make them most widely known.

Their horror may make people realize. They must realize. By God, they shall realize!

They show men who've been crucified with the torture of the 'human glove.' The victim gets crucified, nails through his elbows. The hands are treated with a solution which shrivels the skin. The skin is cut out with a razor, round the wrist, and peeled off, till it hangs by the finger nails, the 'human glove.'

I'm not sparing you. I hope you'll show and send them to everybody we know. People at home, apathetic fools they are, do not deserve to be spared. They must be woken up. John and Katie ought to see them.

Most of the photos are of women. Women with their breasts cut off to the bone. Women with their bodies cut open. One woman with her stomach cut open and unborn twins half dragged out.

It is not surprising that such people can't stand up to Denikin's men in anything like even numbers or equipment.

General Denikin started the war with 403 officers and 200 roubles (£4 11s, 6d.).

With 4,000 he liberated a large area. With 8,000 he walked through over 80,000 Bolsheviks.

The worst of it is, that though his armies are numerous now, their equipment and supplies of all kinds are still insufficient. That's where we try to help.

And that his enemies are active in making political trouble for him everywhere. And everybody can do a bit to counteract this, surely, every little bit helps.

OUTRAGES ON WOMEN.

Two little bits, ref. Bolshevik atrocities, you might type in as many copies as you can. If you and several others left them in different tea-shops every afternoon, it might touch quite a lot of people. I shall send you chapter and verse if I can. If I haven't sent chapter and verse in a month, do your best without. Papers are no good, because papers would put it more delicately.

'We have here at H.Q. passes issued to Bolsheviks by commissaries on occupying Ekaterinodar. These passes authorize their holders to arrest any girl they fancy for the use of the soldiery. Sixty-two girls of all classes were arrested like this and thrown to the Bolshevik troops. Those who struggled were killed quite early on. The rest, when used and finished, were mutilated and thrown, dead and dying, into the two small rivers flowing through Ekaterinodar.

'In all towns occupied by Bolsheviks and reoccupied by us 'slaughter-

houses' are found choked with corpses. Hundreds of 'suspects,' men, women, and children, were herded in these—doors and windows manned and the struggling mass fired into until most of them were dead or dying. The doors were then locked and they were left. The stench in these places, I am told, is hair-raising. These 'slaughter-houses' are veritable plague spots and have caused widespread epidemics.'

I want you to proselytize Robinson and galvanize the Colonel and everybody else you can get hold of. I'd like James to see this and No. 47 and Dorothy. Above all the Mater. For I feel sure, that whatever happens, she and you will be glad that I've come out.

I shall not be able to send you, the Mater, Dorothy, or anyone else any more detailed news. I want to start the letters to the Colonel. If I make the first (to Taranto) cheery and amusing, the second (Constantinople and Black Sea) interesting, I can then start propaganda. So please get your news out of them. And share with the Mater and Dorothy and anybody else who cares.

This has been a full letter for your birthday, dearest, and just when your two dear letters had helped me to find a lighter tone. But these things do move me so.

I've been inoculated and have such a headache. I've got to stop.

Ever yours,

X.”

5.4 International Zionist and Communist Intimidation

In the early 1920's, Lord Northcliffe, principal owner of *The Times*, doubted the justice of denying the land of Palestine to its majority populations and giving it instead to the political Zionists. Northcliffe was not alone, Zionist Martin Buber capsulized Mahatma Gandhi's statement, "that Palestine belongs to the Arabs and that it is therefore 'wrong and inhumane to impose the Jews on the Arabs.'"⁷⁸³

Douglas Reed, who worked for *The London Times*, alleged in his book *The Controversy of Zion*⁷⁸⁴ that Lord Northcliffe, principal owner of the *Times* and an anti-Zionist, believed that he was being poisoned. An editor at *The Times*, Wickham Steed, wished to suppress Northcliffe's anti-Zionist views. Northcliffe sought to fire Steed, and Steed hired Northcliffe's own lawyer to defend him—Steed. Northcliffe wanted to take over as editor of *The Times*, and would have spoken out against the Palestine Mandate in the League of Nations. Some Jewish newspapers railed against Northcliffe.⁷⁸⁵ An unnamed doctor, at Steed's instigation, declared Northcliffe insane and Northcliffe died soon thereafter, on 14 August 1922. Reed presents the history of events that led to Northcliffe's demise. Lord Northcliffe's reports on Palestine were suppressed in his own newspaper, while the League of Nations ratified the Zionist mandate.

5.4.1 Suppression of Free Speech

Spoken statements and written works which criticize Zionist dogmas, as did Reed's, are increasingly being proscribed around the world under pressure from Jewish

groups, who would prohibit open debate and proscribe free speech—exactly as did the Bolsheviks and the Nazis. They insist that the public obey legislated opinions and be legally barred from doubting state-mandated views, which recalls Hitler’s policy of *Gleichschaltung* and Lenin’s “democratic centralism”. At the time of this writing, several authors are being held in prisons around the world for simply daring to voice opinions these Jewish groups want suppressed—apparently opinions these groups have a hard time refuting. This is not a new phenomenon.

In an article entitled “The Jews” in a paper published by Peter Schmidt of 80 Maiden Lane, New York, *The German Correspondent. By Hermann*, Volume 1, Number 2, (29 February 1820), pp. 9-12, at 12, it states,

“At Frankfort on the Maine, a work on *Judaism* was published, containing some severe remarks on the Jews. It was suppressed by the police.”

In 1850 and 1869, composer Richard Wagner publish an essay which criticized the Jewish influence on the arts.⁷⁸⁶ Jews organized to ruin his career, and Wagner was smeared around the world. Under the heading “Foreign Gossip”, *The Chicago Tribune* reported on 25 April 1869 on page 5,

“Richard Wagner’s pamphlet against the Jews, who he says are utterly unable to achieve distinction in any branch of art, has created a great commotion in the literary and artistic circles of Germany and France. Some critics even go so far as to assert that the composer of Tannhauser is half insane.”

Like Richard Wagner, Eugen Karl Dühring was attacked by an organized Jewish campaign to ruin his career. In 1882, Franz Mehring quoted a Jewish author who criticized other Jews for, among other things,

“the malicious gloating when veritable conspiracies deprived of their livelihoods people who were suspected of anti-Jewish feelings[.]”⁷⁸⁷

Eugen Karl Dühring wrote in the 1880’s:

“In a review which was underhanded and misleading to the public of a scholarly work (incidentally suffering from a Kantianising philosophasterish weakness) on *Judaism* (by L. Holst, Mainz, 1821),⁷⁸⁸ [Börne] made to the author of the same an explanation which is significant even today for the conduct of the Jews. He brought to his attention that he, Börne, hoped to experience still the time when every such inflammatory writing against the Jews would bring its author either into the prison or the lunatic asylum; Börne died, now, in 1837. [***] Even in my personal affairs, that is, however, on the occasion of the battle which was associated with my removal from Berlin University, I could perceive tangibly how many Jewish doctors, who were also litterateurs at the same time, had engaged the unions of professors against me and sought to degrade me before the public with

falsehoods and criticisms as well as especially with the imputation of megalomania and persecution mania. Individuals in these camps were so maliciously involved that they were publicly dismissed, even if they were protected by the Jewish papers themselves in which they had written by the nonacceptance of every settlement. In another work *Robert Mayer, der Galilei des 19. Jahrhunderts*, I have more closely elucidated these and other little pieces with the naming of names and provided many facts also on individual newspapers of the most marked Jewishness.”⁷⁸⁹

Communist Zionist Nachman Syrkin jokingly wrote in 1898, referring to the generally base nature of anti-Semitic leadership,

“At least one part of Ludwig Börne’s famous saying, that the anti-Semites of the future will be candidates either for the workhouse or for the insane asylum, has been realized.”⁷⁹⁰

In 1933, Norman Bentwich wrote in an article entitled, “Is Judaism Doomed in Soviet Russia”, *B’nai B’rith Magazine*, (March, 1933),

“The teaching of the Hebrew Prophets, ‘to set free the oppressed and to break every yoke,’ was the underlying motive of the Bolshevik revolution. It is certain that the principal prophet of the proletarian movement was the German Jew, Karl Marx, whose picture hangs in every public institution and whose book, *Kapital*, is the gospel of the Communist creed; that another German Jew, Ferdinand Lassalle, whose heroic statue adorns the Nevski Prospect of Leningrad, was one of the inspirers of the early revolutionary parties; that Jews have, from the beginning to the present day, played a part in the creation and the maintenance of the revolution; and that for no community has the revolution brought about a greater change of status than for the Jews. Under the Czars their life was outwardly a long humiliation; but it had its compensations in the inner strength of the community and in the national ideal of which the flame burnt eternally. To-day, they have been given complete civic and social equality with the rest of the population; and, indeed, Lenin’s saying is constantly quoted, that those peoples which were previously oppressed should be specially favored. [***] The essential feature about their community which strikes the visitor is that the Jews, and particularly the younger generation, feel at home, and part and parcel of the new order. They are proud of their share in the councils of the revolution: of Trotsky, who organized the Red Army (though among non-Jews he is in disgrace and his name is not mentioned), and of the Jews who hold high positions in the Foreign Office and other Ministries, in the Army and the Navy, in the economic councils and academies.

When we landed in Leningrad, our interpreters and guides from the State Tourist Organization were usually Jews and Jewesses. It is the function of the Jew to be the interpreter of Soviet Russia to the world and of the world to

Soviet Russia; for he forms the principal element in the proletarian society which has close touch with the Western European culture and languages. . . . The suppression of the Ghetto and of the Orthodox Church has brought this outward freedom; and the Government punishes severely any outward manifestation of anti-Semitism. [***] In the towns such as Kiev, Odessa, Berdichev, where the Jews are a quarter or more of the whole population, there are Yiddish law courts and Yiddish codes of law, and Yiddish is an official language. But the Rabbinical law which used to regulate Jewish family affairs may not be applied, and the Beth-Din may not function. The academy of higher learning in such centres, which has taken the place of the former university, includes a section for Jewish learning and research.”⁷⁹¹

On 1 March 1946, the *American Hebrew* quoted a sermon by Rabbi Leon Spitz at a Purim festival,

“Let Esau whine and wail and protest to the civilized world, and let Jacob raise his hand to fight the good fight. The anti-Semite. . . understands but one language, and he must be dealt with on his own level. The Purim Jews stood up for their lives. American Jews, too, must come to grips with our contemporary anti-Semites. We must fill our jails with anti-Semitic gangsters. We must fill our insane asylums with anti-Semitic lunatics. We must combat every alien Jew-hater. We must harass and prosecute our Jew-baiters to the extreme limits of the laws. We must humble and shame our anti-Semitic hoodlums to such an extent that none will wish or dare to become (their) fellow-travelers.”⁷⁹²

Börne’s vision of legislation proscribing speech which is offensive to Jews has since become a reality. After the Russian Revolution, it became illegal to criticize Jews, Jewish racism, or to point out the fact that Jewish bankers had brought about the Revolution, or to identify crypto-Jews.⁷⁹³ Sigmund Freud sought to stigmatize the criticism of Jewish racism as if it were a mental disorder, and thereby set the stage for the notorious political oppression of the Soviet psychoprisons. In America we have “Hate Crimes” laws and the *Global Anti-Semitism Review Act of 2004*. In Europe there are far more stringent laws proscribing certain speech, which include prison time and fines as sanctions against speaking freely; such as Britain’s *Race Relations Act* of 1976 Section 5A, as amended in 2000 and 2003; France’s *Gayssot law*; and Germany’s *Volksverhetzung* § 130 of the *Strafgesetzbuch*. Austria has proscribed free speech under the pretext of proscribing “Nazi revivalism” with its *Verbotsgesetz*. Canada, too, has at times sought to proscribe certain forms of political and historical speech and to impose criminal penalties against those who speak freely, if offensively, under the *Spreading False News* statute. Malta proscribes certain classes of speech under Article 82A of the criminal code. Israel also penalizes proscribed speech. Internationally famous historian David Irving languishes in prison in Austria for expressing opinions Jewish organizations want suppressed and proscribed by law. Irving is but one of many who have been imprisoned for speaking

about ideas that Jewish organizations do not want expressed. The truth is no defense in these prosecutions, nor are the defendants or their legal counsel permitted the normal due process of law. Instead, thought criminals who offend Jewish organizations are railroaded into prison through procedures which are blatant human rights violations, and the international press, governments and human rights organizations remain silent, while Jewish organizations cheer on the illegal prosecutions and call for broader powers to suppress speech. Whenever those who are persecuted by Jewish organizations dare to point out the fact that Jewish organizations are attacking them and their fundamental human rights in an organized and coordinated effort, those same Jewish organizations who pride themselves on their Jewish heritage call those they persecute “anti-Semitic” for pointing out that self-styled “Jewish” organizations attack them and seek the suppression of their human rights to free speech, freedom of association, due process of law, and liberty itself.

These laws exhibit the power of “Jewish” organizations. Jewish Messianic prophecy calls for the mass murder of those who are not “righteous”.⁷⁹⁴ Their plan is to first murder off those who do not submit to their mythology, which states that Jews are the God-given masters of the world and that Gentiles must serve the Jews as their slaves and submit to laws which emanate from Jerusalem (*Exodus* 34:11-17. *Psalms* 72. *Isaiah* 2:1-4; 9:6-7; 11:4, 9-10; 42:1; 61:6. *Jeremiah* 3:17. *Micah* 4:2-3. *Zachariah* 8:20-23; 14:9). Ultimately, though, only the Jews will be considered “righteous”,⁷⁹⁵ and only they will survive.⁷⁹⁶ Laws which are enacted at the insistence of Jews, and which make it illegal to question Jewish dogma, are laws which are deliberately “fulfilling” these Jewish Messianic prophecies (*Psalms* 72. *Isaiah* 42; 49; 50; 52; 53; 54; 60; 61, etc. *Daniel* 12. *Malachi* 4).

There is an old political tactic, employed long ago against Caligula and Nero, by which one declares an enemy insane or otherwise contemptible, in order to justify one’s pre-existing dislike of the person so smeared, or one’s desire to suppress the message the defamed person expresses. Max Nordau stated in his address to the First Zionist Congress in 1897,

“No one has ever tried to justify these terrible accusations by facts. At most, now and then, an individual Jew, the scum of his race and of mankind, is triumphantly cited as an example, and contrary to all laws of logic, the example is made general. This tendency is psychologically correct. It is the practice of human intellect to invent for the prejudices, which sentiment has called forth, a cause seemingly reasonable. Probably wisdom has long been acquainted with this psychological law, and puts it in fairly expressive words: ‘If you have to drown a dog,’ says the proverb, ‘you must first declare him to be mad.’ All kinds of vices are falsely attributed to the Jews, because one wishes to convince himself that he has a right to detest them. But the pre-existing sentiment is the detestation of the Jews.”⁷⁹⁷

Albert T. Clay documented the methods of the racist political Zionists in Palestine in 1921, in an article, “Political Zionism”, *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume

127, Number 2, (February, 1921), pp. 268-279, at 276-277 (this is an indication of what one can expect from Jewish fanatics around the world, when they anoint their Messiah),

“The old resident Jews of Palestine certainly have other than religious grounds for their indifference toward the efforts of the Political Zionists. Last winter the Council of Jerusalem Jews appointed a commission of representative men holding leading positions, to visit parents who were sending their children to proscribed schools, in order to secure their withdrawal. Among these schools, which included those conducted by the convents and churches, some of which have existed in Jerusalem for a long time, are the British High School for Girls, the English College for Boys, and the Jewish School for Girls. In the latter, conducted by Miss Landau, an educated English Jewess, all the teachers are Jewish; most of the teaching is in the English language. This school, which is financed by enlightened Jews of England, was denounced more severely than the others, because, not being in sympathy with the programme of the Political Zionists, Miss Landau refused to teach the Zionist curriculum. She was even informed that her school would be closed.

In a series of articles that appeared in *Doar Hayom*, the Hebrew daily paper, last December, it was stated that the parents who refused to comply with the requests of the Commission [of the Council of Jerusalem Jews] were to be boycotted, cast out from all intercourse with Jews, denied share in Zionist funds, and deprived of all custom for their shops and hotels. ‘Anyone who refused, let him know that it is forbidden for him to be called by the name of Jew; and there is to be for him no portion or inheritance with his brethren.’ They were given notice that they would ‘be fought by all lawful means.’ Their names were to be put ‘upon a monument of shame, as a reproach forever, and their deeds writte unto the last generation.’ ‘If they are supported, their support will cease; if they are merchants, the finger of scorn will be pointed at them; if they are rabbis, they will be moved far from their office; they shall be put under the ban and persecuted, and all the people of the world shall know that there is no mercy in justice.’

A month later the results of this ‘warfare’ were reviewed. We were informed that some Jews had been influenced, ‘but others—and the greater number, and those of the Orthodox,—those who fear God—having read the letters [signed by the head of its delegates and the Zionist Commission] became angry at the ‘audacity’ of the Council of Jerusalem Jews ‘which mix themselves up in private affairs,’ have torn the letter up, and that finished it.’

Then followed a long diatribe against these parents, boys, and girls, in which it was demanded that the blacklist of traitors to the people be sent to ‘those who perform circumcision, who control the cemeteries and hospitals’; that an order go forth so that ‘doctors will not visit their sick, that assistance when in need, if they are on the list of the American Relief Fund, will not be given to them.’ ‘Men will cry to them, ‘Out of the way, unclean, unclean.’

. . . They are in no sense Israelites.’

It is to be regretted that only these few paraphrases and quotations from the series of articles published can be presented here.

The work of the Councils Committee met with not a little success; pupils left schools, and teachers gave up their positions. Two instructors in the English College, whose fathers were rabbis, and a third, whose brother was a teacher in a Zionist school, resigned. Another refused to do so, and declared himself ready, in the interests of the Orthodox Jews, who were suffering under this tyranny, which they deplored, to give the fullest testimony to the authorities concerning this persecution. The administration, under Governor Bols, finally intervened, and at least no further public efforts to carry out their programme were made.

If, in this early stage of the development of Political Zionism, even the Palestinian Religious Jews already find themselves under such a tyranny, what will happen if these men are allowed to have full control of the government? And what kind of treatment can the Christian and the Moslem expect in their efforts to educate their children, if the Political Zionists are allowed to develop their Jewish state to such a point that they can dispense with their mandatory and tell the British to clear out? When such things happen under British administration, what will take place if the Jewish State is ever realized, and such men are in full control?”

Some relativists worship Albert Einstein as their hero and detest anyone who tells the truth about Einstein’s career of plagiarism and the irrationality of Einstein’s theorizations. These people believe that they have the right to defame anyone who disagrees with them and often invent spurious reasons to justify their hatred—and to change the subject from Einstein’s failings to a personal attack against Einstein’s critics. “The pre-existing sentiment is the detestation of” anyone who does not see Einstein as an infallible saint. It is a convenient political weapon to employ an *ad hominem* attack. The reasons for the dissent are, in this manner, disregarded, and the critic is stigmatized and forced to defend herself or himself, rather than her or his scientific findings, which are ignored and quietly removed from the public eye.

Yury Brovko has alleged that those who spoke out against relativity theory and Einstein in the Soviet Union ran the risk of severe political persecution. Yury Brovko, a critic of Einstein’s claims to have originated the theory of relativity and a critic of the theory itself, alleges that there were many secret orders which effectively forbade criticism of Einstein in the U. S. S. R., and which forbade scientific journals, science departments and scientific organizations from receiving, considering, discussing or publishing literature which was critical of Einstein’s theories.⁷⁹⁸ American physics societies have also refused to consider for publication works critical of “fundamental theories”, which is to say works critical of Einstein and “his” theory of relativity, or of quantum mechanics. Brovko refers to secret Orders of the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in 1964 and before, but does not give any specific references to such orders which your author could attempt to verify. Brovko wrote, *inter alia*,

“В 1964 году Президиум АН СССР издает закрытое постановление, запрещающее всем научным советам и журналам, научным кафедрам принимать, рассматривать, обсуждать и публиковать работы, критикующие теорию Эйнштейна.”⁷⁹⁹

V. A. Bronshten stated in 1968,

“There is a sufficiently large group of pseudoscientists, who specialize in ‘refuting’ the theory of relativity. As a rule, the efforts of these ‘refuters’ only reveals their poor scientific literacy, although among them there are people with a university education.”

“Есть довольно большая группа гипотезоманов, специализировавшихся на «опровержении» теории относительности. Как правило, усилия этих «опровергателей» лишь отражают их низкую научную грамотность, хотя среди них попадаются и люди с высшим образованием.”⁸⁰⁰

and,

“The so-called delirium of inventions and discoveries is one of the forms of paranoia. The nature of the disorder lies in the fact that the patient believes he has made an important invention or salient discovery, and that scientific-conservatives tragically cannot understand him. In this case the person remains completely normal in every other aspect of life, in the family, at work. [***] Thus, just in the year 1966, the Department of General and Applied Physics of the Academy of Science of USSR helped physicians to reveal 24 paranoiacs.”

“Одной из форм паранойи является так называемый бред изобретений и открытий. Сущность его состоит в том, что больному кажется, будто он сделал важное изобретение или выдающееся открытие, и что вся беда в том, что его не могут понять ученые-консерваторы. При этом во всем остальном—в жизни, в семье, в работе—человек остается совершенно нормальным. [...] Так, только за один 1966 г. Отделение общей и прикладной физики АН СССР помогло медикам выявить 24 параноика.”⁸⁰¹

Lifshitz stated in 1978,

“It appears to me that there are two types of pseudoscientists. One of them — people with paranoid mental lapses, who absolutely believe in what they are saying. These are not scientific afferists, but are simply not completely normal people, whom you unfortunately encounter. They, as a rule, are occupied by fundamental questions: they refute quantum mechanics, the theory of relativity and so forth. However, they are completely normal when

discussing other issues.”

“Лжеученые, как мне кажется, бывают двух типов. Один из них — люди с параноидальными психическими сдвигами, они абсолютно верят в то, что сами говорят. Это не научные аферисты, а просто не в полне нормальные люди, с которыми, к сожалению, приходится встречаться. Они, как правило, занимаются фундаментальными вопросами: опровергают квантовую механику, теорию относительности и т. д. Причем об остальных вещах они рассуждают нормально.”⁸⁰²

In the same period of time, anyone who questioned the legitimacy of the Soviet State, or wished to leave it, was also considered psychotic—often dubbed “paranoid” and imprisoned in psychiatric prisons, even if he or she behaved in a completely sane, very normal way.⁸⁰³ The same fate apparently befell many who dared to question the theory of relativity, or who called attention to Einstein’s plagiarism. This recalls Trofim Denisovich Lysenko’s tyrannical reign over the field of genetics and the murder, imprisonment and banishment of dissenting scientists in the Soviet Union.

The trial of Einstein’s friend Friedrich Adler set a bizarre precedent for the charge of *per se* insanity for disagreeing with Einstein. Adler assassinated the Austrian Prime Minister Karl Graf von Stürgkh in 1916. Alder had written a work which is critical of the theory of relativity and the defense at his murder trial used this work as “proof” that he must be insane—but even Einstein did not maintain that that was true.⁸⁰⁴ However, Einstein and his advocates did succeed in wrongfully stigmatizing any criticism of Einstein or the theory of relativity as if it were anti-Semitism, *per se*.⁸⁰⁵ Kevin MacDonald argues in his book *The Culture of Critique*,⁸⁰⁶ that Sigmund Freud planned to use psychoanalysis to rid the world of “anti-Semitism” Today, there are prominent persons in prison for the criminal offense of offending racist Jews.

5.4.2 Jewish Terrorism

In its article “Israel”, the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia: A Translation of the Third Edition*, Volume 10, Macmillan, New York, (1976), pp. 477-484, at 478, wrote,

“Thus, despite the UN resolution of Nov. 29, 1947, Israel expanded its territory to include four-fifths of the area of mandated Palestine. Both before the formation of Israel and the outbreak of the war and during the course of the war itself, Zionist terror led to the mass destruction of Arabs and the expulsion of nearly a million Arabs from the territory of Israel and from the Arab portion of Palestine that it had seized. The problem of Palestinian refugees emerged—a problem that, because of Israel’s unaltering refusal to implement the UN resolution of Dec. 11, 1948 (on the right of refugees to return to their homeland or, if they choose, to receive material compensation), became one of the most important issues complicating the

Middle East crisis. [The *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, published in the 1970's at the time when the United Nations General Assembly Resolution Number 3379 declared that Zionism is a form of racism, detailed many of the Zionists' abuses and violations of international law. Refer also to its articles: "Anti-Semitism", "Jews", "Judaism", "Middle East Crisis", "Palestine", "Poale Zion", and "Zionism". **See also:** N. S. Alent'eva, Editor, *Tseli i metody voinstvuiushchego sionizma*, Izd-vo polit. lit-ry, Moskva, (1971). Н. С. Алентьева, Редактор, Цели и методы воинствующего сионизма, Издательство Политической Литературы, Москва, (1971).—CJB.]

The political Zionists of the early Twentieth Century had a well deserved international reputation as murderers, torturers and terrorists.⁸⁰⁷ The Jews of the Nineteenth Century had a reputation as revolutionary terrorists and assassins. Jewish terrorism continued through the Zionist "Sternists"⁸⁰⁸ of the 1940's (who offered Hitler a military alliance between Zionists and Nazis based on the principle that Jews must be removed from Europe⁸⁰⁹) and Menachem Begin's terrorist Zionist Jews in the Irgun, through to the Jewish Zionist Meir Kahane,⁸¹⁰ and beyond to the present time.⁸¹¹

While the Sternists (led by Yitzhak Shamir) and the Haganah (led by David Ben-Gurion) were busy terrorizing British vessels and encampments, the Irgun (led by Menachem Begin) murdered 91 people at the King David Hotel and planned to murder the British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin. The Jews dressed up as Arabs when they bombed the King David hotel, in order to generate hatred towards innocent Arabs—not only did they murder innocent people, they blamed other innocent people for their crimes. They also planned to make the Jewish assassination of the British Foreign Secretary Ernest appear as if it had been committed by the Irish Republican Army, in order to hide the fact that Zionists were the true murderers.⁸¹²

On 9 April 1948, Sternist and Irgun terrorists committed the Deir Yassin Massacre against defenseless Palestinians.⁸¹³ They murdered hundreds of helpless men, women and children.⁸¹⁴ The Jewish terrorists then stole the land of the dead Palestinians and chased off those who survived their attack, stealing their land and property, as well. The Israelis have repeated the Jewish atrocities across Palestine, following the course laid out for them in *Exodus* 34:11-17,

"11 Observe thou that which I command thee *this* day: behold, I drive out before thee the Amorite, and the Canaanite, and the Hittite, and the Perizzite, and the Hivite, and the Jebusite. 12 Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, lest it be for a snare in the midst of thee: 13 But ye shall destroy their altars, break their images, and cut down their groves: 14 For thou shalt worship no other god: for the LORD, whose name *is* Jealous, *is* a jealous God: 15 Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and they go a whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods, and *one* call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice; 16 And thou take of their daughters unto thy sons, and their

daughters go a whoring after their gods, and make thy sons go a whoring after their gods. 17 Thou shalt make thee no molten gods.”

Jews in Lithuania and Poland had acted in the same fashion during the Second World War. Perhaps taking their cue from Old Testament orders from the Jewish God to utterly destroy other Peoples’ villages, leaving nothing left alive and no property intact (as but one example of many, *see: I Samuel* 15); Jews mass murdered the men, women, children and infants of Koniuchy (Kaniukai).⁸¹⁵ Many Jews welcomed the Bolsheviks into Poland and Lithuania and helped them to mass murder helpless Poles and Lithuanians. Jews were notorious for “denouncing” their Gentile neighbors to Communist authorities, who were often themselves Jewish. *I Samuel* 15:3 states,

“Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass.”

The ultimate goal of Judaism is to enslave and exterminate all non-Jews (*Isaiah* 65; 66).

In 1948, the Zionist Sternists, under the leadership of Yitzhak Shamir, murdered Count Folke Bernadotte, whom the United Nations Security Council had appointed to mediate Palestinian-Israeli negotiations.⁸¹⁶ Count Bernadotte had rescued tens of thousands of Jews from the Nazis. These Jewish terrorists also hanged innocent Brits and wired their dead bodies with explosive booby-traps. They also sent letter bombs to British authorities and the Sternists murdered Lord Moyne British Minister of State and his driver in cold blood in a terrorist act.

Jewish Zionist terrorists, posing as native Gentiles, terrorized Jewish populations in Egypt, Iraq, Hungary and Romania, in order to disparage those peoples and in order to force Jews to Palestine. Mossad agents infiltrated the Iraqi Government and instituted laws against Jews, and Jewish agents committed murderous terrorist acts against Jews in Iraq, in order to force the remaining Jews to emigrate to Palestine, just as Zionist Jews had put the Nazi régime into place and terrorized and murdered Jews in order to force Jews into Palestine.⁸¹⁷

The Israeli Government has committed acts of war against the United States by bombing American interests in Egypt in 1954 with Israel’s “Operation Susannah” in the “Lavon Affair”⁸¹⁸ and by attempting to sink the *U. S. S. Liberty* in 1967.⁸¹⁹ In both instances, the Israeli Government tried to lay blame on Egypt for the Israeli attacks on the United States, in an attempt to incite the United States to fight Israel’s enemies. In her book *Israel’s Sacred Terrorism*, Livia Rokach reproduced an excerpt from a 26 May 1955 entry in Moshe Sheratt’s personal diary, which recounts his impressions of Moshe Dayan’s plans to provoke the Arabs to respond by first attacking them, then stealing their land when they sought to defend themselves,

“The conclusions from Dayan’s words are clear: This State has no international obligations, no economic problems, the question of peace is

nonexistent. . . . It must calculate its steps narrow-mindedly and live on its sword. It must see the sword as the main, if not the only, instrument with which to keep its morale high and to retain its moral tension. Toward this end it may, no—it must—invent dangers, and to do this it must adopt the method of provocation-and-revenge. . . . And above all—let us hope for a new war with the Arab countries, so that we may finally get rid of our troubles and acquire our space. (Such a slip of the tongue: Ben Gurion himself said that it would be worth while to pay an Arab a million pounds to start a war.) (26 May 1955, 1021)⁸²⁰

Some Jews have long sought to destroy the Dome of the Rock and the Al Aqsa Mosque, and have recently persuaded Dispensationalist Christians to join them in the quest to destroy both so that the Jews can build a Jewish temple on the site. Under Jewish occupation, on 21 August 1969, arsonists inflicted heavy damage to the Al Aqsa Mosque. The United Nations Security Council condemned Israel for the attack in Resolution 271. In 2000, Ariel Sharon intentionally provoked Moslems by invading the Al Aqsa Mosque and Israeli police attacked Palestinians in the Mosque. Many Jews and Christian Dispensationalists have encouraged terrorist attacks against the Al Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock.

In 1968, Israel attacked a civilian airport in Beirut and destroyed numerous civilian aircraft. On 31 December 1968, United Nations Security Council Resolution 262 officially condemned the unprovoked Israeli attack on Lebanon. Numerous other United Nations Resolutions condemned Israel's repeated unprovoked and unjustifiable attacks on Lebanon, including resolutions 270, 279, 280, 285, 313, 316, 317, 332, 337, 347, 425, 427, 450, 467, 498, 501, 508, 509, 512, 513, 515, 516, 517, 518, 520, 521, and 587. In 1982, under Ariel Sharon's leadership, thousands of civilians were mass murdered in Lebanon in the Sabra and Shatila Massacre. In 1996, under Shimon Peres' leadership, Israel bombed civilians in Lebanon in operation "Grapes of Wrath". Many have accused Israel of fomenting the civil war between Christians and Moslems in Lebanon, which largely destroyed the most beautiful nation and city, Lebanon and Beirut, in the region. Israel also attacked helpless civilians in Jordan, perhaps most aggressively in 1968, and faced the condemnation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 228, 248, 256 and 265. David Ben-Gurion once stated,

"I proposed that, as soon as we received the equipment on the ship, we should prepare to go over to the offensive with the aim of smashing Lebanon, Transjordan and Syria. [***] The weak point in the Arab coalition is Lebanon [for] the Moslem regime is artificial and easy to undermine. A Christian state should be established, with its southern border on the Litani River. We will make an alliance with it. When we smash the [Arab] Legion's strength and bomb Amman, we will eliminate Transjordan, too, and then Syria will fall. If Egypt still dares to fight on, we shall bomb Port Said, Alexandria, and Cairo. [***] And in this fashion, we will end the war and settle our forefathers' accounts with Egypt, Assyria, and Aram."⁸²¹

Lieutenant General Rafael Eytan, outgoing Chief of Staff of the Israeli Army, stated on 12 April 1983,

“When we have settled the land, all the Arabs will be able to do about it will be to scurry around like drugged roaches in a bottle.”⁸²²

In an article “Begin and the ‘Beasts’”, *New Statesman*, Volume 103, Number 2674, (25 June 1982), page 12, Amnon Kapeliuk wrote of Menachem Begin, the Prime Minister of Israel,

“The war in Lebanon cannot be interpreted, even by its most devoted proponents in Israel, as a war of survival. For this reason, the government has gone to extraordinary lengths to dehumanise the Palestinians. Begin described them in a speech in the Knesset as ‘beasts walking on two legs’. Palestinians have often been called ‘bugs’ while their refugee camps in Lebanon are referred to as ‘tourist camps’. In order to rationalise the bombing of civilian populations, Begin emotively declared: ‘If Hitler was sitting in a house with 20 other people, would it be correct to blow up the house?’”

In 1982, Israelis massacred Palestinians in Beirut. The United Nations Security Council condemned Israel for the “criminal massacre” in Resolution 592. In 1986, Israeli soldiers opened fire on Palestinian students at Bir Zeit University. The United Nations Security Council condemned the attack in Resolution 592. In 1987, the Israeli Government instituted a policy under Yitzhak Rabin of smashing the bones of Palestinian demonstrators with rocks.⁸²³ Israeli soldiers held helpless children and pounded heavy, jagged stones against their bodies until their limbs were crippled with compound fractures. On 25 February 1994, Benjamin C. Goldstein, a. k. a. Baruch Kappel Goldstein, murdered several people and injured many more in his terrorist attack against innocent Moslems who were peacefully praying in the Al-Ibrahimi Mosque during the holy month of Ramadan. Goldstein was a follower of Meir Kahane and a medical doctor who refused to treat Gentiles, because Maimonides forbade a Jewish physician from treating a Gentile unless under duress, and even then declared that a fee must be charged to the Gentile (Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah*, “Idolatry” 10:1-2).⁸²⁴ More than 50 Palestinians were murdered and hundreds more were injured in the attack and its aftermath. The United Nations condemned the attack in Security Council Resolution 904.

In 1995, Yigal Amir assassinated Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin in an attempt to end the peace process. Israel has legalized governmental political murders and the Israeli Government has brutally murdered and tortured many innocents. The program “Frontline” has produced a documentary *Israel’s Next War*, which exposes the failed attempt of Jewish terrorists to set off a massive bomb at a Palestinian girls’ school in 2002.⁸²⁵ The Israeli Air Force bombed the Bahr el Bakar elementary school on 8 April 1970, mass murdering dozens of children and a teacher.⁸²⁶ These are only a few of the countless atrocities the “Jewish State” has committed against innocent

people.

Perhaps inspired by the accusations against Jews of poisoning wells in the 1300's, some Jews unsuccessfully attempted revenge against the Germans for the Holocaust after the Second World War by poisoning the water supply of Germany. They sought to kill at least six million Germans. Tom Segev wrote in his book *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*,

“Kovner therefore set six million German citizens as his goal. He thought in apocalyptic terms: revenge was a holy obligation that would redeem and purify the Jewish people. The group divided into cells, each with a commander. Their primary goal, Plan A, was ‘to poison as many Germans as possible.’ Plan B was to poison several thousand former SS men in the American army’s POW camps. Reichman succeeded in infiltrating some members of the group into the Hamburg and Nuremberg water companies. Kovner went to Palestine to bring the poison—and, he hoped, to receive the blessing of the Haganah.”⁸²⁷

Such leading figures in Israeli history as Menachem Begin, Yitzhak Shamer and David Ben-Gurion have been accused of terrorism, and/or of sponsoring terrorism, and/or of condoning terrorism. Jacob Bernard Agus wrote,

“As the horrors of the Nazi ‘final solution’ were revealed after the war, the pitch of Jewish desperation reached unprecedented heights. The terrorist movements in Palestine against the British mandatory power were totally inconceivable before the war. Even veteran Jewish leaders were unable either to understand or to restrain the fury of the young terrorists, for whom the whole of Jewish experience was summed up in the raising of a gun with the slogan, *rak Kach*, ‘Only thus!’ The struggle of the terrorists, the desperation of the concentration camp graduates, and the military know-how of the European partisans shattered Arab resistance so effectively that nearly their entire population fled in panic.”⁸²⁸

Begin brought his terrorist’s mentality with him into Israel’s top office. The racist State of Israel is the manifestation of this simplistic, genocidal and hate driven mentality, which has existed at least as long as Judaism has existed. Michael Berenbaum wrote in his book, *After Tragedy and Triumph*,

“Menachim Begin built upon this realization and constructed a usable past upon the twin pillars of antisemitism and the need for power. *Goyim* (literally, ‘the nations’) hate Jews, Begin maintained. In traditional language, Esau hates Jacob. According to Begin’s worldview, Jews are a people that dwells alone. Power is essential. Powerlessness invites victimization. Jews must determine their own morality. The world’s pronouncements toward the Jews mask—sometimes more successfully and sometimes less so—their genocidal intent. The desire to make the world *Judenrein* continues, and only

fools would allow themselves to be deceived.”⁸²⁹

The New York Times reported on 5 May 1948 on page 17,

“While Scotland Yard directed an international search for the sender of the explosive parcel that killed Rex Farran, brother of Roy Farran, former Palestine police officer who was blacklisted by Jewish terrorists, official spokesman in the House of Commons voiced the indignation of the British people today at ‘this wicked outrage.’”

Max Born wrote to the racist nationalist Albert Einstein on 22 May 1948,

“I was very sad when the Jews started to use terror themselves, and showed that they had learned a lesson from Hitler. [***] Moreover, I detest nationalism of every kind, including that of the Jews.”⁸³⁰

Zionist Jewish bankers have financed America’s worst enemies including Great Britain, the Confederacy, Imperial Japan, Bolshevik Russia, Nazi Germany, etc. Zionist Jewish bankers are responsible for more American war casualties than any other group. Zionist Jewish bankers have deliberately caused America’s worst recessions and depressions. They have corrupted the American media and American politics. Michael Collins Piper argues that Mossad agents were involved in the assassination of United States President John Fitzgerald Kennedy and that they wanted him dead because Kennedy opposed the Israeli nuclear weapons program, a program which is not in the best interests of the United States.⁸³¹ The Zionists have been a curse to America.

5.5 Attempts to Prove the *Protocols* Inauthentic

The London Times published a series of articles in 1921, which relied upon an anonymous source “Mr. X” in contact with the *Times*’ “Constantinople correspondent” Philip P. Graves. These articles set out to debunk the *Protocols* as a forgery. Graves claimed that the *Protocols* are a forgery, because they allegedly plagiarized Maurice Joly’s *Dialogue aux enfers entre Machiavel et Montesquieu: ou, La politique de Machiavel au XIXe siècle*, A. Mertens, Bruxelles, (1864). Lucien Wolf, Herman Bernstein and many others have also claimed a forgery on the basis of plagiarism.⁸³²

Advocates of the alleged authenticity of the *Protocols* countered that the fact that sections of the *Protocols* were evidently plagiarized from Joly and others does not prove that the document was a forgery, only that its authors were students of, or plagiarists of the works of others, who deemed it inappropriate—or who had not yet had the opportunity—to name the sources for some of their statements. Others argued that all of these works had older common sources and it was to be expected that they should bear a resemblance to one another. Graves’ articles and Zangwill’s letter to the *Times* were as fantastic a conspiracy theory as the *Protocols* themselves

in their allegations of Czarist conspiracies to defame the Jews, and in their reliance upon unnamed and unreliable sources.

The founder of modern political Zionism, Theodor Herzl, author of *The Jewish State* (*Der Judenstaat; Versuch einer modernen Lösung der Judenfrage*⁸³³) in 1896 was in some minds the alleged author of the *Protocols*. Herzl emphasized the fact that his book *The Jewish State* was not original, but instead drew from older sources. Herzl expressed racial mythologies found in the *Protocols* in Herzl's radical statements in his diaries and in his book *The Jewish State*. However, much that Herzl wrote was earlier published in Moses Hess' *Rom und Jerusalem*, Eugen Karl Dühring's *Die Judenfrage*, Leon Pinsker's *Auto-Emancipation*, and in the newspaper *Selbst-Emancipation*, which was published in Vienna from 1885-1886, and again from 1890-1893, and which featured the same racist anti-assimilationist Zionist rhetoric one hears to this day. The fact that it drew from older sources does not render Herzl's book a forgery, nor a complete fabrication.

The New York Times also published many articles featuring John Spargo in early 1921, with the purpose of curbing the rise in anti-Semitism caused by the *Protocols* and the anti-Jewish articles published in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT*. However, the defense against the *Protocols* was poorly managed, self-contradictory and factually incorrect; and many essays and pamphlets were published promoting the *Protocols* and arguing that they are authentic, which arguments, while sometimes unfair, exaggerated and factually incorrect, won out in the court of public opinion with tragic consequences.⁸³⁴ There was often a deliberate confusion between the actions of some particular Jews, and all Jews, which unfair generalization was again and again pointed out, unfortunately with little success.

The Zionists continued to pretend that they spoke for all Jews and that they constituted a government for world Jewry. Adolf Hitler was one of the many Zionist anti-Semite stooges in the early 1920's, who asserted that the *Protocols* are genuine and represented a vast conspiracy and a threat that must be addressed.⁸³⁵ Hitler used the *Protocols* as a means to put himself into power, so that he could fulfill the Zionist plans laid out in the *Protocols*. This was a common tactic of Zionists and Communists, who promoted a controlled opposition to their plans, which enabled them to fulfill them. Hitler was both a Zionist and a Bolshevist, and at war's end Eastern Europe, and very nearly all of Europe, turned Communist. Hitler and Stalin worked in collusion to make Europe ripe for a Communist takeover. At war's end, the Zionists were finally able to persuade the world's Jews to join them in founding a racist apartheid "Jewish State". Hitler succeeded in his goal to found this State.

5.5.1 Why Did Henry Ford Criticize the Jews?

Henry Ford's newspaper *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* brought the attention of the American public to *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. Many have noted that Ford showed no signs of bigotry before the spring of 1920, and the first anti-Jewish articles appeared in his newspaper on 22 May 1920, and 29 May 1920. It was seemingly inexplicable that Ford began so overwhelming an attack on Jews and reorganized his newspaper and his life to carry out this attack, with no chance for

personal gain and no apparent reason other than a genuine belief that the *Protocols* were authentic in their message, if not authorship, and revealed the Jewish plan for world domination through Bolshevism and Zionism.

Ford did not state whether or not he believed that the *Protocols* were genuine, but he did state that they were an accurate reflection of real events that had occurred many years after the *Protocols* first appeared. On 17 February 1921, Henry Ford was quoted in *The New York World*,

“The only statement I care to make about the Protocols is that they fit in with what is going on. They are sixteen years old, and have fitted the world situation up to this time. They fit it now.”⁸³⁶

5.5.2 Controlled Opposition and “The Trust”

Henry Ford, and the articles in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT*, repeatedly stated that Ford’s campaign to inform the public of the dangers of: Bolshevism, Jewish control of the press, Jewish “power behind the throne” of numerous governments, and the power of racist Jewish financiers; was motivated by a genuine desire to help the Jews to overcome their prejudice against non-Jews, and to benefit society at large, but not out of hatred.⁸³⁷ Some contemporary Jews believed that Ford was an *agent provocateur* for the Zionists, who had been promoting anti-Semitism for centuries as a means to keep Jews segregated from non-Jews, so as to preserve the “purity of the Jewish race”.

THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT reported on 11 September 1920 in an article entitled, “Does Jewish Power Control the Press?”:

“A sidelight on the first sentence above may be had from this Jewish statement regarding the British Declaration relating to Palestine: ‘This Declaration was sent *from the Foreign Office to Lord Walter Rothschild.* * * * It came perhaps as a surprise to large sections of the Jewish people * * * But to those who were active in Zionist circles, the declaration was no surprise. * * * *The wording of it came from the British Foreign Office, but the text had been revised in the Zionist offices in America as well as in England. The British Declaration was made in the form in which the Zionists desired it.* * * *’ pp. 85-86, ‘Guide to Zionism,’ by Jessie E. Sampter, published by the Zionist Organization of America.

3. ‘Literature and journalism are two most important educational forces, and consequently our government will become the owner of most of the journals. * * * *If we permit ten private journals, we shall organize thirty of our own, and so on. This must not be suspected by the public, for which reason all the journals published by us will be EXTERNALLY of the most contrary opinions and tendencies thus evoking confidence in them and attracting our unsuspecting opponents, who thus will be caught in our trap and rendered harmless.*’

This is most interesting in view of the defense now being made by so many Jewish journals. ‘Look at the newspapers owned and controlled by Jews,’ they say; ‘see how they differ in policy! See how they disagree with each other!’ Certainly, ‘externally,’ as Protocol 12 says, but the underlying unity is never hard to find.

Besides, one way of discovering who are the people that have knowledge of the Jewish World problem, of who can be convinced of it, or who will write about it, is just to start a paper which ‘externally’ seems to be independent of the Jewish Question. So deeply is this thought shared by even uneducated Jews that a rumor is today widespread in the United States that the reason for the present series of articles in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* is the desire of its owner to forward the Jewish World Program! Unfortunately, this scheme of starting a fake opposition in order to discover where the real opposing force is, is not confined to the Jewish Internationalists, although there is every indication that it was learned from them.”

There might have been an *agent provocateur* behind Ford—in the person of Boris Brasol.⁸³⁸ An agent who appeared from the East, Brasol, like the Zionist Nazi Alfred Rosenberg, directed attention to the *Protocols* from the East to the governments of the West. Just as the most virulent Christian zealots were often crypto-Jews, who attempted to hide their identities and use hatred of the Jews as a means to subvert Gentiles; the most virulent anti-Semites were often crypto-Jews or Jewish agents who used hatred of the Jews as means to accomplish the ends of Jewish leadership—Communist revolution and the formation of a “Jewish State”.

The New York Times published an article entitled “Spargo Denounces Anti-Semitic Move” on 6 December 1920 on page 10, and paraphrased John Spargo,

“He attacked Mr. Ford for intolerance and said he was the ‘tool’ in this matter of men more able than himself.”

The New York Times reported on 18 May 1922, on page 11, in an article entitled, “Says C. C. Daniels Aided Ford Crusade”:

“Ford’s fight on the Jews is ascribed by Hapgood to the fact that Ford was ‘tricked’ by Czarist sympathizers in the United States. He says Mr. Daniels [***] was head of the detective agency which employed Boris Brasol, former investigator for the Russian secret service Black Hundred.”

But was Brasol’s interest really in restoring the Russian Monarchy, or was he an agent of the Zionists and Bolsheviks? We know today that most of the opposition to the Bolsheviks was controlled by the Bolsheviks themselves.

Communist leadership, who were disproportionately Jewish, created a plan which came to be known as “The Trust”,⁸³⁹ whereby they sent out supposed exiles from Bolshevik Russia to found and infiltrate anti-Communist organizations. These

organizations actually served the interests of the Communists. Given that the Jews played such a disproportionate rôle in fomenting Communist revolution and in the leadership of Communist governments; anti-Communist organizations were often highly critical of the rôle Jews played in Bolshevism. We also know that crypto-Jews like “Sidney Reilly” (born Salomon Rosenblum) were agents of “The Trust”.⁸⁴⁰ Alfred Rosenberg, Boris Brasol and Paquita de Shishmareff may have been predecessors of this Jewish-Communist controlled opposition dubbed “The Trust”.

Whether or not Henry Ford was intentionally promoting anti-Semitism as means to promote the Zionist movement and ultimately a Bolshevik takeover of the United States remains an open question. It is more certain that Adolf Hitler was a Bolshevik Zionist. Rosenberg, Brasol, and Shishmareff—who wrote in defense of the authenticity of the *Protocols* and who assisted Brasol, may have sought to place Jewish Zionist Communists in power on a popular platform of anti-Communism and anti-Semitism. Such was the case with Adolf Hitler.

5.5.3 The Sinking of the “Peace Ship”

Henry Ford was a hardworking pacifist, who used his fortune to try to end the senseless slaughter of the First World War. Many criticized Ford for his pacificism.

Ford sued *The Chicago Daily Tribune* for libel on 7 September 1916 for an article “Ford is an Anarchist” published in *The Chicago Daily Tribune* on 23 June 1916 on page 6. Ford eventually won his libel suit and was awarded the nominal sum of six cents in 1919. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* had published articles claiming that Ford was ignorant of, and indifferent to, History.⁸⁴¹ The lawyers for the defense in the libel action questioned Ford about his knowledge of History and he was unable to state what rôle Benedict Arnold had played in history.⁸⁴²

Ford was ridiculed for being a pacifist during the First World War. The counsel for the defense tried to confuse Ford with the many meanings inherent in the euphemism “preparedness”, a term warmongers used as a euphemism for their build-up to war. Ford knew that the term was used to disguise aggressive preparations for war—in Ford’s mind, unnecessary war for profit brought on by Jewish bankers and Jewish controlled newspapers. Ford was not misled and the counsel for defense was frustrated in its efforts to manufacture contradictions in Ford’s statements, which contradictions were instead due to the euphemisms Ford’s critics employed to confuse and manipulate the public. They failed in their efforts to attribute their own inconsistencies to Ford.

Some Republicans ran Henry Ford as a Republican candidate for the Presidency in the Republican primaries of 1916.⁸⁴³ The Prohibition Party also wanted Ford to run as their candidate.⁸⁴⁴ Harry Bennett stated, “Henry Ford, in 1916, was perhaps better known to most Americans than their President.”⁸⁴⁵

In 1915, Henry Ford, a vocal pacifist, pledged his entire fortune to his effort to end the war on humanitarian grounds⁸⁴⁶ and organized the voyage of the “Peace Ship” on 4 December 1915, a mission to persuade the Europeans to end the war by Christmas. This vessel, which Ford had chartered, sailed to Northern Europe with a contingent of leading pacifists, who intended to meet with European leaders in order

to bring about peace. Ford did not want America to enter the war, which war needlessly slaughtered millions of Europeans. Ford sought a just and humane peace. Republican candidate Theodore Roosevelt and others ridiculed Ford for his pacifist campaign to end the suffering of the war.⁸⁴⁷ Journalist Herman Bernstein and other passengers on the Peace Ship withdrew their support from Ford's mission.⁸⁴⁸ Ford concluded that the Jewish bankers and their lackeys had torpedoed his attempt to end the war. Ford later ran for the Senate in Michigan in 1918 and lost in a race which resulted in investigations of election fraud.

Incumbent Democratic Presidential candidate Woodrow Wilson ran on the pacifistic slogan, "He kept us out of the war!" Henry Ford, the pacifist, life-long Republican and formerly Republican candidate, threw his support behind the Democrat Wilson on 27 September 1916 and eventually congratulated Wilson on his victory, confident that Wilson would keep America out of the war.⁸⁴⁹ Republican candidate Theodore Roosevelt alienated many German-Americans, and took a strongly pro-British stance and openly called for American "preparedness" for war with Mexico and the Central Powers. Roosevelt attacked the "hyphenates", German-Americans, many of them Jews, who wanted to keep America out of the war. German-Americans represented the swing vote in key states and when Wilson announced that he would keep America out of the war, the Republicans determined that Roosevelt could not win the election. Roosevelt dropped out of the race and was replaced by Republican candidate Charles Evans Hughes, who had the approval of German-Americans—the allegedly traitorous "hyphenated Americans" Roosevelt had alienated.⁸⁵⁰ Wilson, who was a Zionist, won the election and then betrayed the American People and brought them into the war at the behest of his Zionist blackmailers Louis Brandeis and "Colonel" House.

Robert Rutherford McCormick was President of *The Chicago Daily Tribune*. A staunch Republican, he had Republican roots running back to Abraham Lincoln through his maternal grandfather, *Tribune* owner and one of the founders of the Republican Party, Joseph Medill. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* did not shy away from politics. Abraham Lincoln and Joseph Medill, like Theodore Roosevelt, confronted pacifist opposition in the Civil War; so there was nothing new about their antagonism towards pacifism. Robert R. McCormick became a Colonel in the First World War, and his home and estate are now a very fine museum grounds, Cantigny, which houses the First Division Museum.

The Republican Charles Evans Hughes lost to the democratic incumbent Woodrow Wilson, who won, in part, because of his ability to peel off the vote of Americans of German descent in the Midwest based on the lie that he would keep America out of the war. Wilson soon brought America into the war against Germany, despite his campaign promises of continued non-involvement. These experiences embittered Henry Ford and he must have felt personally betrayed by President Wilson. Many of the articles which later appeared in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* from 1920-1927 took the form of personal attacks.

But was this what prompted Ford? As early as July of 1919, in his libel trial against *The Chicago Tribune*, Henry Ford agreed with the allegation that bankers and newspapers, "got [America] into the war for purposes of gain."⁸⁵¹ Ford attributed his

views to discussions he had had with the two Jews Herman Bernstein and Rosika Schwimmer on the Peace Ship expedition in December of 1915 and January of 1916. *The New York Times* reported on 5 December 1921 on page 33,

**“FORD EXPLAINS ATTACKS
Caused by Statements Made to Him
by Jews on Peace Trip.**

Special to The New York Times.

FLORENCE, Ala., Dec. 4.—Henry Ford today told reporters the fundamental reason why for the last two years he has attacked the Jew in his weekly magazine, *The Dearborn Independent*. He said that the course of ‘instruction on the Jew which he intends to give the United States will continue for five years.’

‘It was the Jews themselves that convinced me of the direct relation between the international Jew and war, in fact, they went out of their way to convince me,’ he said.

‘You remember the effort we made to attract the attention of the world to the purpose of ending the war through the medium of the so-called peace ship in 1915. On that ship were two very prominent Jews. We had not been to sea 200 miles before these two Jews began telling me about the power of the Jewish race, how they controlled the world through their control of gold and that the Jew, and no one but the Jew, could stop the war.

‘I was reluctant to believe this and said so—so they went into detail to tell me the means by which the Jew controlled the war, how they had the money, how they had cornered all the basic materials needed to fight the war and all that, and they talked so long and so well that they convinced me. They said, and they believed, that the Jews had started the war; that they would continue it as long as they wished and that until the Jew stopped the war it could not be stopped. We were in mid-ocean and I was so disgusted that I would have liked to have turned the ship back.

‘When I got back to the United States I still had in mind what the Jews had told me. In Europe, I had looked about quite a bit and I could see that a lot of the things the Jews had told me were so. Once at home, I set about investigating a bit, and the more I investigated the more I found to substantiate what the Jews had told me. I determined that the situation should be made clear to the people of the United States through publicity. But do you think I could get a newspaper to print it? Not on your life. It seemed there was no newspaper in the United States that dared print the truth.

‘Then a funny thing happened just at this juncture. An old chap in Dearborn came to my office and wanted to sell the local paper, *The Dearborn Independent*, a weekly newspaper. The thought came to me like a flash. Surely some place in the United States there should be a publisher strong and courageous enough to tell the people the truth about war. If no one else will, I’ll turn publisher myself. And I did.’

‘How long will your paper continue to deal with the Jewish question?’ he was asked.

‘We’ve got a five years’ course in sight, and we are going to tell the people, among other things, some American history that they don’t teach in the schools. We will show indisputably that one of the great factors behind the Civil War, that brought it on and made peaceable settlement of the issues impossible, was the Jew. And that isn’t the whole story either. There will be more than that.’

Mr. Ford and Mr. Edison spent Sunday morning looking over the site of dam No. 3 at Muscle Shoals, which is still to be started, and which, when built, will create a great reservoir for control of the back waters above the power plant. The afternoon was spent at a Southern barbecue at the home of E. A. O’Neal, head of the Alabama Farm Bureau.”

Ford was later sued by Herman Bernstein, who claimed that Ford had named Bernstein as the source for some of the views expressed in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT*, which Bernstein alleged included:

“That leading members of the Jewish faith precipitated the World War. 2. That in the middle of the war they switched their support to the Allies, selling out to the highest bidder, and that their price was the aid of the allied nations in restoring Palestine to the Jewish people as a national home. 3. That they murdered or caused the murder of the Russian Czar and his family. 4. That most of the dangerous and destructive theories of government abroad in the world are of Jewish origin. 5. That they have debased the professions, prostituted the arts and degraded sports and corrupted commerce. 6. That they control and dominate the press, finance, resources, institutions and politics of the United States, and prostitute the same to unlawful and iniquitous purposes and to their own aggrandizement and to the great injury of the civilized world. 7. That their alleged wealth and power as a race constitutes a threat to mankind.”⁸⁵²

Ford was quoted in an “International News Service” interview on 5 January 1922, as stating,

“The real reason why I printed these articles was because of what a Jew (Herman Bernstein) told me while I was crossing the ocean on the peace ship. He told me that if I wanted to end the war I should talk with the Jewish financiers who created it. I played ignorance and led him on. He told me most of the things that I have printed.”⁸⁵³

Rosika Schwimmer, who was a very hardworking pacifist and who prompted Henry Ford to undertake the Peace Ship mission and was a leader on the voyage, was thought to be an agent of the Germans by the Norwegians, who rejected her and the Peace Ship mission.⁸⁵⁴ This accusation reemerged in 1927.⁸⁵⁵ The Danish

Government also believed that the Ford mission was pro-German.⁸⁵⁶ A great scandal ensued during the voyage, which caused problems in Holland.

Schwimmer was later cleared of the charges made against her with respect to the monies involved⁸⁵⁷ and she claimed that she was the victim of subterfuge by Fannie Fern Andrews and Jane Addams. By all accounts Schwimmer was a brilliant and charming woman and had been an active feminist for years—as had Henry Ford.⁸⁵⁸ On Schwimmer's return, she attempted to contact Ford, who ignored her for many years.⁸⁵⁹ Since Schwimmer was the Jew who was closest to Henry Ford on the Peace Ship mission, it was alleged that she inspired much of the anti-Jewish material that later appeared in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* in two ways. First, it was alleged that she inspired the Peace Ship expedition, which failed, and Ford came to hate all Jews because Schwimmer was Jewish and Ford believed that the Jews had torpedoed the Peace Ship mission—Ford might even have believed that he was led to make the trip as means to humiliate him and discredit the pacifist movement.⁸⁶⁰ Secondly, it was assumed that Schwimmer told Ford that powerful Jews were behind the war and that the war would not end until the Jewish bankers who had caused it wanted it to end. Interestingly, Schwimmer became good friends with Albert Einstein, who called her his “saving angel”.⁸⁶¹

Henry Ford praised Schwimmer years after the Peace Ship mission, so the first accusation was probably false, but Ford had since come under the influence of Louis Marshall, a very powerful Jewish leader, and it is possible that Ford's later statements in support of Schwimmer may have been scripted.⁸⁶² Henry Ford, though asked by Schwimmer to repudiate the second tacit accusation, never did.⁸⁶³ It appears that Herman Bernstein and Rosika Schwimmer did indeed inform Henry Ford of “the Jewish Peril” on the Peace Ship voyage. The later Zionist betrayal of America and Germany, and the Bolshevik Revolution, must have confirmed for Ford that all he had been told was true.

The New York Times reported on 18 May 1922 on page 11 in an article entitled, “Says C. C. Daniels Aided Ford Crusade”:

“In quest of an explanation for Ford's continued attacks against the Jews, Hapgood says he finally went to Ford's plant, where he was told by one of Ford's employees that the motor car manufacturer was aggrieved by the failure of his peace ship expedition and further because it was suggested by a Jewess, Rosicka Schwimmer.”

On 24 July 1923, in the “Topics of the Times” section of *The New York Times*, on page 20, it stated, *inter alia*,

“MR. FORD says, the incidental, and to him highly satisfactory, effect of [the peace ship voyage of] teaching him a lot about war, its causes, the men who brought it about, and the conditions from which it emerged. [***] But who [***] gave all of these valuable lessons to [Ford]? As Mme. ROSIKA SCHWIMMER seemed to be at least second in command, the chances are that it was she, and the kind of instruction she would give might not have been

entirely trustworthy to anybody except her dear friends the Germans.”

Schwimmer fought all such accusations made against her. The issue arose again in 1927-1928, when Ford distanced himself from the articles of *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT*. When criminal Jewish leaders ganged up on Ford and attempted to assassinate him, Schwimmer filed a law suit for libel against Fred M. Marvin. Rosika Schwimmer denied that she was the source of the information and allegations published in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* and held that Ford was anti-Jewish before taking the voyage with her. She requested Ford’s help, knowing that he had been intimidated by Jewish leaders and was vulnerable.

The New York Times reported in an article, “Woman Asks Ford to Vindicate Her”, on 4 September 1927, page E1,

“Mme. Schwimmer went on to say that she had been the object of abuse that wrecked her health and that the damage to her reputation had been further added to when it was declared that she, a Hungarian Jewess, was responsible for the anti-Jewish campaign of Mr. Ford which he recently ended by apology.”

The New York Times reported in an article, “Mme. Schwimmer Gets Ford’s Reply”, on 18 September 1927, on page 9:

“Mme. Rosika Schwimmer [***] call[ed] on [Henry Ford] to exonerate her of charges [***] that she had been the original cause of his anti-Semitic campaign[.]”

Though Ford’s secretary E. G. Liebold had responded to Schwimmer’s letter, Ford did not deny that Schwimmer had been the source of his information. The 18 September 1927 article continued,

“Mme. Schwimmer said [***] that she regarded the letter as a partial vindication, but that the point of the anti-Jewish campaign had not been touched[.]”

Schwimmer stated that she would write Ford again asking for, “a ‘point blank denial’ of the insinuations relating to Jews.” Ford did not repudiate the accusation.

On 28 June 1928 *The New York Times* reported in an article, “Pacifist Disavows Influencing Ford”, on page 18, quoting Joseph T. Cashman, an attorney for the defense in a libel action Schwimmer had filed against Fred M. Marvin,

“‘Will you admit that it was a matter of common gossip that Mr. Ford’s association with you on the peace ship was the cause of his anti-Semitic propaganda?’

‘Yes,’ replied Mme. Schwimmer, ‘but I have published three open letters to show that Mr. Ford preached anti-Semitism before I met him.’”

Schwimmer was quoted in *The New York Times*, in an article, “Denies Peace Ship Led to Ford Attack”, on 5 September 1927, on page 17:

“‘At my first meeting with Mr. Ford, at his plant at Detroit, no November, 1915,’ said Mme. Schwimmer, in her apartment at 2 West Eighty-third Street, ‘he amazed me by suddenly declaring, ‘I know who caused the war—the German-Jewish bankers.’ He slapped his pocket and went on, ‘I have the evidence here. Facts. I can’t give them out yet because I haven’t got them all. But I’ll have them soon.’”

Ford did not deny this claim, but it is difficult to draw any inferences from his failure to deny it, because at this time he had recently been intimidated by an attack on his life, and a public apology bearing his name had been published repudiating *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* articles, which “apology” was manufactured by Jewish leaders and a sycophantic Jewish agent—as will be shown later on in this text.⁸⁶⁴ Ford had faced a long-standing libel suit from Herman Bernstein, who was represented by Louis Marshall.⁸⁶⁵ The suit claimed damages for the allegation that Bernstein had told Ford on the peace ship that Jews ruled the world and started the First World War. Louis Marshall boasted that Ford would sign anything Marshall told him to sign. Therefore, Ford was intimidated at the time he was asked to deny that any such statements were made to him on the peace ship, but even then failed to deny it. Perhaps Ford was constrained by the settlement of the law suits he had faced.

On the other hand, though Schwimmer’s claim could have been fabricated from Ford’s famous interview with Henry A. Wise Wood, which played a prominent rôle in his libel trial with *The Tribune*, Schwimmer’s denials become more plausible when one considers that Ford may have met with David Starr Jordan just before leaving New York on the Peace Ship (*Oscar II*, a Norwegian vessel).⁸⁶⁶ Though asked to attend the voyage, Jordan’s name did not appear on the ship’s roster.⁸⁶⁷

David Starr Jordan published *Unseen Empire: A Study of the Plight of Nations that Do Not Pay Their Debts*, American Unitarian Association, Boston, (1912); which critically analyzed the power of bankers to instigate, or to prevent, wars. Jordan was concerned that war was destroying the best genetic stock of humankind. Louis Marshall speculated that Jordan may have been the cause of Ford’s campaign.⁸⁶⁸ Both Jordan and Ford were very active in the pacifist movement. If Jordan put thoughts into Ford’s head, perhaps even evidentiary papers into his pocket, it would not preclude the possibility that others soon reinforced those beliefs.

Any claims that Herman Bernstein and/or Rosika Schwimmer told Henry Ford on the Peace Ship that there was a “Jewish” plan to create the war for profit, and to acquire Palestine, and that Jews effectively owned the major governments of the world and corrupted civilization with the wealth of Jewish financiers; would appear to have been contradicted not only by Rosika Schwimmer’s assertion that Ford was anti-Jewish before he met her, but also by Ford’s statements immediately upon his return from the Peace Ship—were it not for statements Ford made soon thereafter in an interview with Henry A. Wise Wood.

Ford was quoted in *The New York Times* on 3 January 1916 on pages 1 and 6 in an article entitled, “Henry Ford Back, Admits an Error, Denies Deserting”:

“Changes Viewpoint of War.

‘A marked change has come over my whole viewpoint since I went away,’ he said. ‘Before going to Europe I held the view that the bankers, militarists, and munitions manufacturers were responsible. I come back with the firm belief that the people most to blame are the ones who are getting slaughtered. They have neglected to select the proper heads for their Governments—the men who would prevent such chaotic conditions. In the great majority of cases the people select their rulers and then are afraid of them. They don’t write enough letters to them and let them know their views.’

Asked if he thought a republic was not a more advisable form of government than a monarchy, the pacifist replied:

‘Yes, I think that is so. But France is a republic, and it doesn’t elect the men who would prevent the nation preparing for war. And you see where France is now. The trouble is that citizens don’t take enough interest in the government. But so far as neglecting government is concerned, I am one of the worst offenders. I have been a voter for thirty-one years, and during that time I have voted but six times. Then it was because Mrs. Ford drove me to do it.

‘Formerly my idea was that in this country also the men behind the campaign for preparedness were the militarists and munition manufacturers. But I find the people who don’t elect the right men are the ones to blame; they should express their own minds.’

Mr. Ford was asked if he had obtained expressions of sympathy with his peace movement from officials in the countries visited, and whether he had successful relations with them. He replied that he had ‘seen others just as good.’

‘If necessary I will go back,’ he continued, ‘and, if it will help matters, I will charter another ship. I went to Europe to show that I was willing to give something more than money to the cause, and I will go again if it will do any good. My absence has not hurt this movement any more than my absence from Detroit hurt my motor company. And as fine a delegation as you could find went from Sweden to Norway.’

‘Get the People Thinking.’

Asked what he thought was the concrete result of his expedition he said:

‘It’s got the people thinking, and when you get them thinking they will think right.’

As to his plans for the future, Mr. Ford said:

‘I haven’t started in to work yet, but I don’t think it would be wise to tell you more.’

‘Do the newspapers think I am doing this for self-gratification or advertisement? I feel that I am simply a custodian of the money I got

together. The people who are being slaughtered helped me to get it, and what I am willing to spend for them. Anyway, I think I feel that way. I have thought of it in every way. My business doesn't need any advertising.'

Mr. Ford said that the reports of serious dissensions were not based on fact. There was much diversity of opinion, he admitted, adding: 'But you know, we took over an absolute community, and I don't think a more jolly crowd could be found in the whole world.'

Mrs. Ford and Dean Marquis were present for a part of the interview, and the Dean interrupted to explain what had been termed the squabbles.

'Being a parson, I was used to the squabbles,' he said, with a smile. 'And so I was surprised at what was published in the newspapers.'

Mr. Ford explained that he never had intended Louis Lochner to be anything except secretary, and that Gaston Plantiff was the manager. If any one did not behave, he said, Mr. Plantiff stopped the payment of bills. Mr. Ford denied that any newspaper messages had been censored. The question of preparedness arose when he was asked about the President's message, and whether, now that he was home, he intended to join with Mr. Bryan in an attack on the Wilson programme.

'I am against preparedness of any kind,' he said, 'for preparedness is surely war. No man ever armed himself even with a knife and fork unless he intended to attack something, if only an oyster or a piece of meat. The President ought to find out what the people want. If they want to arm, they know what they will get—what Europeans are getting now—a rampage some day.'"

It appeared that Ford had disavowed any belief that there were corrupt forces preparing for war for profit. However, in Ford's mind there may have been no contradiction between his belief that: newspapers, and the bankers he believed (or was led to believe on the Peace Ship) corrupted the newspapers, polluted the minds of the public; and his belief that the onus was upon the public to make better decisions when electing their government officials—and Ford was planning to provide them with what he considered to be the truth in order to aid the public in making its decisions. Note Ford's statement, "I haven't started in to work yet, but I don't think it would be wise to tell you more." Ford may already have been planning to stir things up as President, Senator, or newspaper owner. Note the *Times* text quoting Ford,

"Mr. Ford was asked if he had obtained expressions of sympathy with his peace movement from officials in the countries visited, and whether he had successful relations with them. He replied that he had 'seen others just as good.'"

Ford, who was known for making odd statements, may have been implying that there were powers behind the thrones of these governments, or that he had spoken to persons who had convinced him that the governments were corruptly controlled and

that he ought to speak to the people in charge, the bankers. Ford found it fortuitous when the owner of *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* came to him and asked for advice on how to sell it. When America entered the war, Ford considered it his patriotic duty to pause his pacifist activities and stand behind the President for the duration of the war. Ford waited until the end of the war to begin his campaign to expose “the Jewish Peril” to the American People.

5.5.4 Ford Comes Under Attack—The War Against Pacifism

Ford’s long campaign for peace angered many. On 8 May 1916, Henry Ford allegedly made statements (some of which he later denied having made—in particular, Ford denied that he stated that he would remove American flags from his factories) in an interview with Henry A. Wise Wood, a vocal advocate of “preparedness”, who was prejudiced against Ford’s pacifism⁸⁶⁹—Wood was a person who Ford stated appeared to be under the control of financiers⁸⁷⁰:

“A WILD MENTAL JOURNEY WITH FORD.

**History Is Myth, Two Bankers Invented This War, Flags Are Fatal
and Preparedness Talk Is Eastern Scare Gas.**

By HENRY A. WISE WOOD.

New York, May 15, 1916.

To the Editor of The New York Times:

On May 8, while in Detroit for the purposes of speaking on preparedness, I spent several hours with Henry Ford. I found Mr. Ford eager to talk about national defense, but unwilling to discuss it. While volleying his assertions with great rapidity, he refused to pause long enough to permit any one of them to be examined and dealt with. To facts which I submitted he responded with a brief word of dismissal or with a sweeping denial that they were facts; sometimes with the remark that he could not consider them because he himself did not know them to be facts.

In dealing with naval and military subjects his positions seemed to be that they were to be tossed aside, because a civilian in presenting them was not to be credited, nor a professional to be trusted. Therefore they were not open to discussion. By this simple mental operation Mr. Ford shut out of the conversation all naval and military affairs. The suggestion that, because of the results of this war or the situation in Mexico, we might eventually find ourselves in international difficulties from which, owing to our weakness, we might be unable easily to extricate ourselves, Mr. Ford pooh-poohed, saying that I was ‘full of Eastern scare gas.’

When in our ‘discussion’ of a nation’s need for defensive strength history was appealed to, Mr. Ford replied that he did not believe in history, that history was of the past and had no bearing upon the present, and that, there being nothing to be learned from it, history need not be studied nor considered. The American Revolution he refused to have touched upon,

saying that the Revolution was ‘tradition,’ that he did not believe in tradition.

Coming to Mr. Ford’s beliefs, which were given in fragments, with always his refusal to support them with evidence or to permit their analytical examination, these seemed to gather about a single thought. Mr. Ford’s theory of wars—he granting no exceptions—is, or was on May 8, that they are created artificially by bankers. At the moment there are two bankers, but two, he believes, who are responsible for modern wars. If these be plucked then wars in our day will cease. Mr. Ford asserts he knows who these bankers are and that he, personally, is going to see that the ‘tooth is pulled.’ He would not reveal the names of these bankers, nor explain the method by which he is to pull the tooth.

Mr. Ford asserted that he has found a permanent remedy for warfare, which he refused to reveal, saying that in due time I should learn what it is. This he said he would put into effect, but seemed unable to say when. When I sought to follow up these and other assertions equally vague I was invariably met by his refusal to divulge what he had in mind; I was abjured to wait and see. One clue to his thought may be got from his reply to my likening the external need for a defensive military force to the internal need for an armed police, which was that the police needed neither their clubs nor their revolvers; that the law could be enforced without any arms. Then, in the same breath, he asked if I was a Deputy Sheriff, saying that he and all of his men were Deputy Sheriffs, and that it was my duty also to be one.

When the word patriotism was touched upon Mr. Ford burst out with the assertion that he did not believe in patriotism, that no man is patriotic, and that the word patriotism is always the last resort of a scoundrel. To my inquiry as to what he would do in the event of war he replied that even if we were to be invaded he would not make a dollar’s worth of arms for the United States. As I wished that there should be no mistake as to his meaning I put the question three times, and three times got the same answer.

Finally, I said: ‘Mr. Ford, on your roof are three American flags. On seeing them it hurt me to think that beneath them there was a man who is spending vast sums, amassed under their protection, to ruin the defenses of his country, and lay it open to a possibly hostile world.’ To this he replied: ‘When the war is over those flags shall come down, never to go up again. I don’t believe in the flag; it is something to rally around.’

In commenting upon my visit *The Detroit Saturday Night* aptly remarks: ‘Understanding Henry Ford is more than a puzzle; it is a pursuit.’

HENRY A. WISE WOOD.”

Whether Ford’s accusations regarding bankers were true, partially true, or not at all true, Ford had revealed himself in May of 1916 to be the active enemy of some of the most powerful persons in the world—on pacifist grounds. Powerful people often have powerful friends, especially in the press, or with access to the press, or who can intimidate the press with threat of withdrawing advertising dollars. Much earlier, Arthur Schopenhauer and then Richard Wagner expressed pacifist

sentiments similar to Ford's. They accused the Jews of being warmongers and war profiteers. Schopenhauer and Wagner were not alone in this belief. Jews have always been accused of being warmongers.⁸⁷¹

Ford's aggressive attacks in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* did not go unanswered. *The London Times* made a concerted effort to discredit the *Protocols* in 1921.⁸⁷² John Spargo; whose name appeared in numerous articles in *The New York Times* in late 1920 and early 1921 attacking H. G. Wells and redressing attacks on Jews as well as discussing Bolshevism, Russia and Poland;⁸⁷³ also attacked Henry Ford. *The New York Times* reported on 6 December 1920 on page 10:

“SPARGO DENOUNCES ANTI-SEMITIC MOVE

Calls It Menace to American
Democracy and to Christian
Civilization Itself.

ATTACKS FORD AS A ‘TOOL’

Resents Propaganda Blaming Jews
for International Socialism
and Bolshevism.

The anti-Semitic movement in Great Britain and the United States was denounced by John Spargo in an address on ‘Anti-Semitism; a Menace to America,’ before the Brooklyn Civic Forum in Public School 84, Glenmore and Stone Avenues, last night. Mr. Spargo said this movement was not a menace to the Jew alone, but a menace to American democracy and American ideals and institutions and a menace to Christian civilization itself.

Mr. Spargo said that anti-Semitic propaganda had tried to make it appear that the Jews were responsible for the international Socialist movement and for Bolshevism, both of which he denied. ‘With this sort of propaganda those interested in the anti-Semitic movement hope to turn the rest of the world against the Jews,’ he said. ‘As a Socialist I resent the charge that we have consciously or unconsciously been the dupes of any conspiracy for the creation of any Jewish dictatorship.’

The anti-Semitic movement has gained headway in England and is even entrenched in the lobby of the House of Commons, Mr. Spargo said. He said he did not believe it existed in this country until he returned several weeks ago and found a copy of Henry Ford's Dearborn Independent on his desk. He attacked Mr. Ford for intolerance and said he was the ‘tool’ in this matter of men more able than himself.

‘I am not defending the Jew,’ Mr. Spargo said. ‘I would not insult the Jew by assuming that he needs a demended. Anti-Semitism must not

succeed. We shall right it until we have beaten it to its knees. We shall fight it, not for the Jew, but for America and America's value to the civilization of mankind."

Spargo was quoted in *The New York Times* on 22 February 1921 on page 10,

“SPARGO CONDEMNS RACIAL ANTAGONISM

Denounces Propaganda of Anti-
Semitism as Treason
to America.

ONLY PITY FOR HENRY FORD

Calls Him Poverty-Stricken Intellectually,
Morally and Spiritually
—Addresses Chicago Audience.

Special to The New York Times.

CHICAGO, Feb. 21.—John Spargo, Socialist author and formerly of the Industrial Relations Commission, spoke before 5,000 Chicago Jews at Sinai Temple tonight on 'The Jews and the American Ideal.' In referring to recent attacks on the Jewish race, Mr. Spargo said:

'Henry Ford is poverty-stricken intellectually, morally and spiritually. I regard him with profound and unmeasured pity. No more pitiful figure can be found in our history. With all his material wealth, he is poorer than the poorest wretch to be found in the bread lines of this city. His poverty of soul is so great that he is incapable of partaking of the American spirit.'

Mr. Spargo began his address by explaining that he was not a Jew and had investigated the anti-Semitic campaign because he felt that it was a monstrous thing which should be exposed. He sketched the history of Jewish immigration into this country, and maintained that the Jews had at no time been outranked by any other element of the citizenship in loyalty to American ideals. He continued:

'Yet we are witnessing the shameful spectacle of an organized campaign of hatred and calumny against the Jews of America, a campaign having for its object the creation of a terrible and dangerous antagonism between Americans, and antagonism founded upon racial and religious differences. Such a campaign cannot be accurately described as other than foul treason

to America and a dangerous desecration of American ideals. It is not necessary to stigmatize that campaign; it is quite sufficient to describe it accurately for what it is. In prosecuting that campaign its leaders have not hesitated to seize upon the occasion of the anniversary of Lincoln's birth to besmirch his resplendent fame and glorious memory. Instead of seeing in the war of secession the result of a conflict of economic and political systems, these men—alien to America in soul if not in speech—have spread broadcast through the land the infamous charge that the fateful struggle was deliberately brought about by Jewish agents intriguing for the accomplishment of Jewish purposes.

'I do not insult my Jewish fellow-citizens by pretending to believe that this fantastic charge needs refutation. I refer to it only that I may voice my indignant protest against the infamous insult thus heaped upon the name and memory of Abraham Lincoln. If the charge were true, he whom we have loved to honor as the noblest and fairest exemplar of American ideals would have to be regarded either as a deliberate traitor compared to whom Benedict Arnold was a very patron saint of patriotism and loyalty, or as a poor silly dupe of others, a mere moron in fact. And whichever of these verdicts was rendered against Lincoln would have to be rendered against Seward and Chase and Welle and the rest of his advisers. No foul slander of America that emanated from the gutter press of Berlin during the war matched the infamy of this.

Pity for Henry Ford.

'I do not abuse or condemn Mr. Henry Ford here today. On the contrary, I regard him with profound and unmeasured pity. No more pitiable figure can be found in our history. With all his material wealth he is poorer than the poorest wretch to be found in the bread line of this city. His poverty of soul is so great that he is incapable of partaking of the American spirit. He is poverty-stricken intellectually, morally and spiritually. I would rather be starving so that I envied the dogs their crusts, and homeless so that I envied the very rats their holes, but with an understanding love of American ideals in my heart, than be the responsible owner of The Dearborn Independent.

'In its attempts to poison the well-springs of American faith and inspiration The Dearborn Independent has retrieved from the sewers of the reactionary politics of Europe the so-called Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion. It professes that in publishing and distributing widely this notorious forgery it has only a patriotic motive, and that it is no part of its purpose to promote that hideous evil which we unscientifically call anti-Semitism, that evil of prejudice and hatred against the Jew as Jew. So professed the Bessarabetz of Kishinev, but pogroms resulted from its propaganda nevertheless. The success of the indecent and traitorous campaign of The Dearborn Independent would mean pogroms against the Jews in America, let there be no mistake upon that point. Fortunately, there is no likelihood of that success occurring, for the good sense of the gentle population of America is a bulwark against which the prostituted hirelings of the ignorant man of

millions will spend themselves in vain. We shall beat anti-Semitism to its knees and crush it, because it is a menace to the America we love and an affront to everything in which we take pride.

History of the Protocols.

‘As many of you are aware, I have taken great pains to trace the origin and history of the so-called ‘Protocols.’ There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that they were deliberately concocted in the headquarters of the old secret police of Russia under Czarism as one of the means of combating the great struggle for democracy and self-government. This is made evident by the testimony of no less a person than the mysterious Nilus, reputed author of the book in which the protocols were first given to the world. Nobody has been able to produce this mythical personage; no responsible person has been found to testify to the actuality of his existence. If he could only be found and placed upon the witness stand and cross-examined, what a sight it would be for gods and men!

‘In 1903 the first edition of a little book bearing his name appeared, a diatribe of such fanatical mysticism as Rasputin, of malodorous memory, might have written. In that book, despite its anti-Semitism, there was no reference to the protocols. In 1905 a second edition appeared containing the protocols. In that edition he tells us that the protocols came into his possession in 1901. He offered no explanation of his failure to use them or even to mention them in the first edition of his book in 1903, though they served his purpose so wonderfully well and had been in his possession for two years prior to its publication. I know the reason and will presently explain it to you.

‘In that edition of 1905 Nilus told how the protocols came into his possession. He said that the protocols had been stolen by a woman from ‘a highly initiated Freemason.’ He said that the protocols were signed by representatives of the Thirty-third Degree of the Masonic Order of Zion. The name of the Freemason from whom the documents had been stolen was not given: the name of the woman thief was not given: the names of the Freemasons who signed them were not given. Not so much as a facsimile of a single page was offered as evidence of the authenticity of the documents. Indeed, Nilus naively admitted that he never saw the originals; that what had been handed to him was a manuscript purporting to be an ‘authentic translation’ of the documents stolen by the woman from the careless Freemason conspirator — evidently in some Swiss cabaret where the wine flowed freely. On the basis of such a flimsy story as that no judge or jury in the United States would convict a pickpocket. Yet The Dearborn Independent would convict three millions of our citizens of treachery to this republic upon that testimony.

‘In 1917 appeared a new edition of the protocols, with a new introduction by the mysterious Nilus. Keep the date well in mind, together with that of the first publication of the protocols in 1905, for the dates are of the utmost significance. In this edition Nilus says of the protocols: ‘This manuscript was

called, 'The Protocols of the Zionist Men of Wisdom,' and it was given to me by the now deceased leader of the Tshernigov nobility, who later became Vice-Governor of Stavropol, Alexis Nicholaievich Sukhotin. I had already begun to work with my pen for the glory of the Lord, and I was friendly with Sukhotin because he was a man of my opinion, i. e., extremely conservative, as they are now termed.

'Sukhotin told me that he in turn had obtained the manuscript from a lady who always lived abroad. This lady was a noblewoman from Tshernigov. He mentioned her by name, but I have forgotten it. He said that she obtained it in some mysterious way, by theft, I believe. Sukhotin also said the one copy of the manuscript was given by this lady to Sipiagin, then Minister of the Interior, upon her return from abroad, and that Sipiagin was subsequently killed.

Evidence Against Nilus.

'This story comes pretty close to convicting Nilus of being an agent of the Czar's Secret Police. Sukhotin, from whom he claims to have obtained the manuscript, was a notorious anti-Semite and leader of the Black Hundreds. Sipiagin, who is mentioned as having also had a copy of the manuscript, was also a bitter anti-Semite and one of the most infamous of the late Czar's bureaucrats. He was assassinated by Stephen Balmashev in 1902. Thus, if this story is true, Nilus is linked up in a very definite way with the secret agencies of the old regime. At the same time, it is worth while noting that Nilus names Sukhotin and Sipiagin only when they are dead and beyond questioning. He presents no evidence to substantiate his tale. He has 'forgotten' the name of the 'noblewoman from Tshernigov.' Criminologists would deduce from these two stories that the author belongs to a well-known criminal type.

'Let me call your attention to two interesting facts in connection with this story of 1917. The first is that Nilus omits all reference to his previous statement that the protocols were 'signed by representatives of Zion of the thirty-third degree.' The second is that having told us in 1905 that the friend who gave him the protocols in 1901 assured him that they had been 'stolen by a woman,' and told us in the introduction of 1917 that the friend from whom he received the documents was Sukhotin, who told him the name of the woman thief, which, however, he managed to forget, he adds an epilogue to the story in which he tells us that the protocols were actually stolen, not by a woman at all, but by Sukhotin himself! And that instead of having been stolen by a woman from a careless Freemason, Sukhotin stole them from a safe in Paris. His words are that the protocols 'were stealthily removed from a large book of notes on lectures' and that 'my friend found them in the safe of the headquarters office of the Society of Zion, which is situated at present in France.'

'Was ever liar more confused? First we have an unknown woman stealing the documents from 'one of the most highly initiated leaders of Freemasonry; next we have the documents presented as having been obtained

by Sukhotin from a 'noblewoman from Tschernigov' whose name Nilus has forgotten; finally, we have this friend—i. e., Sukhotin—named as the thief. The woman thief disappears and the 'highly initiated Freemason' disappears. It is Sukhotin who is the thief, and he steals the protocols from a safe in Paris. So much for Nilus. I may add that I am assured—though I cannot vouch for the statement—that Sukhotin was not outside of Russia between 1890 and 1905.

'And now let me explain the significance of the dates of publication to which I have already referred: When the first publication of the protocols took place, in 1905, Russia was seething with revolution. When the second publication took place, in January, 1917, Russia was again seething with revolution. No one who is familiar with the history and practices of the Russian secret police and the Black Hundreds can have the slightest doubt that the publication of the protocols was in each case designed to create anti-Jewish uprisings to divert the minds of the Russian people from revolutionary agitation. That was a familiar method of the Czarist police and Black Hundreds. It was a backfire.

Suppression of Evidence Charged.

'This then is the history of the protocols, a history of indecent forgery by the unscrupulous, conscienceless agents of Russian Czarism. It is upon materials so rotten and reeking with dishonor that this elaborate campaign is erected. I regret to have to say that those who are responsible for the publication and distribution of the protocols in this country—which includes not only Mr. Ford's paper, but publishing firms hitherto regarded as reputable—have been guilty of conduct as dishonest and dishonorable as the original concoctors of the protocols themselves. They have suppressed, deliberately and without the slightest explanation to the reader, passages from the original Russian publication of the protocols which would have made them the laughing stock of the English-speaking world.

'In 1895 a book was published in France which attempted to prove the existence of a world-wide conspiracy against Christian civilization. In that book the theory was advanced that the English people are all of the Jewish race, and that the British Government is the central force of this worldwide Jewish conspiracy. In his book Nilus reproduced this fantastic theory but, recognizing that it would cause the protocols to be laughed out of court, *The Dearborn Independent*, *The London Morning Post* and all the other publishers of the protocols in England and America have carefully deleted this part of the book by Nilus. The reason for the deletion is as obvious as the dishonor of it.

'Upon the strength of statements made in the protocols, *The Dearborn Independent*, *The London Morning Post*, and other organs of anti-Semitism have charged that the international Socialist movement is part and parcel of this vast conspiracy of Jewish world imperialism. Neither in the protocols themselves nor in any of the numerous comments upon them has any shred of evidence been adduced in support of this charge. As one who has given

practically all his life to the Socialist cause, I indignantly repudiate the charge that I have either consciously served such a conspiracy or been ignorantly duped by it.

‘The ignorance of Henry Ford upon all that pertains to American history is a matter of court record, and needs no demonstration here and now. Were he less ignorant of history, he would know that the charge thus leveled against the Socialist movement has been leveled against almost every great modern movement of protest. It was made against the Protestant Reformation, against the French Revolution, against Mazzini and his followers in Italy, against the German revolutionists of 1848, against trade unionism in England. Whether socialism is right or wrong, desirable or undesirable, is a question upon which honest men and woman may differ. It is a question to be answered upon its own merits in the American way. Whoever injects into the discussion of that question the passion engendered by racial and religious prejudices and hatreds is unworthy of America. He who propagates in this country antagonism to any race or creed represented in our citizenship, whether it be against Jews, Poles, Germans, Irish, English or negroes; or against Judaism, Catholicism or Protestantism, assails the very foundations of our most cherished and characteristic American institutions.

‘Majority of Bolsheviki Not Jews.’

‘The Dearborn Independent, like all the rest of the anti-Semitic press of both hemispheres, charges that Bolshevism in Russia and elsewhere is a movement instigated and led by Jews as part of the conspiracy to bring about the Jewish domination of the world. In support of this charge, the protocols are offered in evidence. The reasons for making the charge are quite obvious—Bolshevism is repugnant to the moral sense of the great mass of civilized mankind. It is the negation of virtuous principals which the enlightened of all races and all religions hold in reverence. It denies the ideal of government based upon the sanction of the governed and accepts that of government by brute force wielded by a few. To persuade the people of America that Bolshevism is essentially a Jewish movement, part of a conspiracy to reduce civilization to chaos and to prepare the way for a Jewish super-government of the world, would mean the uniting of all the rest of our population against the Jews. That is the object.

‘In support of this most serious charge not a scintilla of credible evidence has been offered. It is true, of course, that there are Jews among the Bolsheviki in Russia, but it is equally true that the overwhelming majority of the Bolsheviki are not Jews, either racially or by religious faith and affiliation. It is also equally true that the anti-Bolshevist movement in Russia, that heroic struggle of democracy against an unspeakably brutal despotism, is very largely carried on by Jews.’

Mr. Spargo contradicted the statement of The Dearborn Independent that ‘every commissar in Russia today is a Jew.’ Enumerating Lenin, Tchitcherin, Krassin, Dzerzhinsky, Umarcharsky, Rykov, Kolontal, Borch-Brouyevich as non-Jews, he went on to assert that of the seventeen members of the Council

of Peoples' Commissars only one, Trotsky, was a Jew, and while there were many Jews holding minor places in the Bolshevist régime, there were also serving in it many ex-officers of the Czar's army who were of Christian faith and for the same reason—because 'what else could they do?'

He went on to point out that Bolshevism was the negation of the faith and morals which constitute the strongest bond of the Jewish people, and cited the fact that the use of the Hebrew language had been prohibited under the Soviet, adding:

'There is not a single Jew connected with the Bolshevist movement in Russia in any prominent capacity who is not an apostate, having renounced all the faith and ties of Israel. There is not one of them who ever took the slightest part in the affairs of the Russian Jewry. As against this mere handful of apostate Jews, for every one of whom there are a hundred non-Jews among the Bolsheviki, we have the many millions of the Jewish population of Russia who are the innocent victims of Bolshevism. Hundreds of thousands of Jewish merchants and small business men, comprising a large part of the hated and persecuted bourgeoisie, have been ruined by the Bolsheviki, thousands of Jewish families have been deported from Soviet Russia, and are now dragging out a miserable existence as refugees in Siberia and elsewhere. Billions of Jewish wealth have been confiscated by the Bolsheviki. The Soviet Government has shot and is still shooting Jewish public men, lawyers, engineers, physicians, teachers and workmen, for participation in the struggle against Bolshevism. In view of these facts is it less than ridiculous to charge that Bolshevism is part of a Jewish conspiracy? Surely any intelligent person must see that the only hope for the success of any such conspiracy must lie in maintaining a Jewish solidarity in Russia which could only be attained, if at all, by devising some means of exempting the Jews from the suffering and oppression imposed upon the non-Jewish population.

'For the problems which arise from the presence in the same land of Jews and non-Jews, in large masses, solution must be sought and found by the best and ablest minds, Jewish and non-Jewish, working together in earnest co-operation, united by love of America and loyalty to its ideals and institutions. Because anti-Semitism makes that impossible, and thereby prevents the peaceful, wise and speedy solution of these difficult problems, I denounce it as treason to America and all that America stands for in our affections.'"

The New York Times reported on 26 November 1921 on page 9,

“SPARGO WOULD LET FORD GO ON TALKING

Invite Him Here to Tell Why He
Opposes the Jews, Lecturer

Tells Audience.

SEES ORGANIZED CAMPAIGN

Socialist Author Says It Is Part of
International System With
Headquarters in Berlin.

Speaking on 'The Anti-Semitic Spirit in America,' at a meeting of the League for Political Education in the Town Hall yesterday morning, John Spargo, Socialist author and lecturer, said there was a campaign of organized anti-Semitism in this country which was part of an international system, with headquarters in Berlin, in so far as he was able to learn. It was not the business of the Jew as such but the duty of Jew and Gentile to combat this prejudice, he said. The situation called for diligence by the Christian in exposing the fallacies of the propaganda because he owed to the Jew precisely that measure of justice he would want to be shown to others who come to America to make their homes, Mr. Spargo argued.

Mr. Spargo reviewed the race prejudices which had existed in America in other years, and in his analysis of them said: 'It is always difficult to avoid suspicion of the different groups we have drawn from other countries where there has been a barrier of language, creed or customs.'

At the close of his address Mr. Spargo answered questions from the audience. One person asked what should be done with Henry Ford.

'Leave him alone,' replied Mr. Spargo, 'let him talk. Invite him to the Town Hall and let him tell you why he is opposed to the Jews, if he will.'

On the main topic of his lecture, Mr. Spargo said:

The Jews and Columbus.

'We have always had the Jew with us, because essentially he is a wanderer. In years gone by we had the Jew only in numbers capable of assimilation. There were Jews interested in the voyage of Columbus, if we are to believe history. Certain there were Jews interested in the American Revolution. Washington knew several on whom he could depend and whose fortunes were at his disposal.

'It is a good thing to remember that there never was any time in the history of the country when it was possible to distinguish a citizen of Jewish birth from a citizen of non-Jewish birth. I say that, bearing especially in mind the accusation made against the attitude of the Jew in the great World War. I went with Premier Clemenceau to visit the wounded of our men and one could distinguish no distinction of service to our country among them.

'We forget that the Jew comes to us virtually helpless. He doesn't speak our language; he doesn't understand our laws and customs. How is he going to know? He takes up his home among his own people who have preceded him. If he becomes successful and learns the ways of America he is likely to move elsewhere. Your task and mine is to see that in the administration of cities we do not permit our politicians to take advantage of the temporary

condition of the peoples evolving into American citizens.’

Mr. Spargo dwelt on some of the hopeful signs of amicable relations among the people of America, in telling of Thanksgiving service in which Jews and Christians took part.

Taking up the existence of anti-Semitism in American, as already told, Mr. Spargo also said:

‘I dislike to hear of Jewish organizations going to court for injunctions against Henry Ford and his Dearborn Independent. We cannot save ourselves from anti-Semitism by suppressing free speech. The only safe thing for Jew and Gentile to do is to let them come out in the open and not compel them to operate in subterranean channels.

Pamphlets from Germany.

‘A few days ago a man came to New York from Yokohoma by way of San Francisco. He was introduced to a friend of mine to whom he said, ‘See what I have come to do.’ He exhibited pamphlets printed in most of the modern languages accusing the Jews of most every untoward event that has ever happened. He admitted that he had brought the pamphlets here for distribution. The pamphlets were printed in Yokohoma through funds provided by monarchist groups in Germany.

‘This group desires the restoration of the old régime in Germany and Russia. If they are to succeed in Russia by a coup d’état they must turn the peasant Russian men and women against those in authority. Nobody has suffered under Bolshevist rule quite as hard as the Jews, for they belonged to the small trading class which those now in authority set out to destroy. It is a libel against the Jews and a treason against America when people try to foster hatred because of what the Bolsheviks did in Russia.’

‘You and I as Americans worthy of Washington, Lincoln and Roosevelt must set ourselves against this attempt to divide our citizenry along the lines of religious and racial hatred. Let it go out to the world that every manifestation of this evil spirit will be deemed treason.’”

Spargo’s efforts to discredit Ford and the *Protocols* were not very successful, and there are many reasons why he failed to achieve his aim. It must be borne in mind that Spargo’s emotional flag-waving appeals to patriotism and his desire to link Henry Ford’s activities to Germany came soon after the end of World War I, and many Americans had come to hate Germany. As a Marxist, Spargo was well aware of the value of “false consciousness” in appealing to the emotions of the public in order to avoid legitimate accusations of corruption. Americans knew that corruption was rampant and Spargo should have made a less shallow, more substantive appeal to the public. Spargo should have recognized that Ford expressed legitimate concerns about the corruption that was occurring, and Spargo should have distinguished the criminal actions of the few, from the innocence of the many, and joined Ford in condemning the corruption, while chastising him for his overly general attacks on Jews.

John Spargo was long a socialist revolutionary, which put him in close company

with many Jews. Spargo protested a little too loudly that he was not an apologist for the Jews, which revealed that he was not only an apologist, but a hypocrite as well—a man who could not be trusted.

It is interesting to note that Spargo places great emphasis on the dates of 1905 and 1917, but does not address the Jewish bankers' deliberate destruction of the Russian economy, their financing of the Japanese war against Russia and concurrent collusion to bankrupt Russia, their distribution of revolutionary propaganda to the Russian Army, and their funding of Bolshevik revolutionaries—all of which gave the Czar just cause to fight back against these Jewish bankers' war against him and the Russian State.

We know that the Jewish bankers attacked the Czar and the Russian people, because Jacob Schiff, a German Jewish financier who had emigrated to America and who headed the banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., bragged that he had destroyed Russia, in *The New York Times* in 1917. These facts were well-known at the time.

Instead of simply making an *ad hominem* attack on Henry Ford, Spargo could have taken the opportunity to point out the injustice of generalizing the behavior of a few to the many innocent; and at the same have criticized Jacob Schiff's attack on the Russian People, which ultimately led to mass murder and countless other Bolshevik atrocities. Spargo did not mention the fact that Nilus complained in his book of 1905 that his earlier attempts to make the *Protocols* widely known were unsuccessful. Nilus only succeeded in popularizing the *Protocols* after events had fulfilled the plans set forth in the *Protocols*. Spargo was mistaken to believe that the *Protocols* appeared for the first time in 1905.

A more honest inquiry into the facts might have more successfully combated the harm the exposure of the *Protocols* caused to many innocent Jews. Instead of addressing the issues which were known to anyone who had read *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT*, Spargo largely relied upon personal attack to discredit people and alleged that there was a vast conspiracy to deceive the public with lies, allegations he tried to magically wave away with the American flag. It did not work. It was a poor attempt and both Spargo and *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* played into the hands of the political Zionists, who savored the rapid rise in political anti-Semitism.

Spargo pointed to contradictions in the allegations that Jews were behind Bolshevism, whilst Jews suffered along side Gentiles from Bolshevik atrocities. He was right to assert that the majority of Jews were not Bolsheviks and that Jews could not be classified so narrowly by a single political stance. However, political Zionists saw the emancipation of the Jews of Russia by the Russian Revolution, which was soon taken over by the Bolsheviks, as a threat to the supposed purity of the Jewish "race". The Zionists had an incentive to attack Jews and cause their concentration and deportation in Bolshevik dominated lands, because the Zionists believed that Bolshevism potentially provided Jews with a sanctuary, which would result in assimilation that would be fatal to the "Jewish race". The Zionists and their anti-Semitic allies issued an international threat, that if the governments of the world failed to sponsor Zionism, all nations would suffer the terror of Bolshevism. The political Zionists viewed the anti-Semitism the terrors of Bolshevism provoked as a positive force which helped the Zionists to keep the Jews segregated against their

will. Jews were indeed behind Bolshevism and it provided them with a means to oppress Gentiles and Jews in a way that would force segregation.

It was irrational to assert that the *Protocols* were the product of vast anti-Semitic conspiracy, and to concomitantly argue that the *Protocols* were forgeries on their face because they alleged a vast conspiracy of Jewish forces. Why was it that Gentiles were allegedly capable of conspiracies, but Jews were not? Such an argument left the public with no choice but to choose between two conspiracy theories. Many people decided that if this is way of the world, they had better side with their own kind. Most people were Gentiles.

John Spargo failed to note the fact that the United States Government took an active interest in the *Protocols* long before Henry Ford learned of their existence and the U. S. Government took the *Protocols* very seriously, because it believed that many of the events foretold in the *Protocols* had since come to pass, and that the world was in danger. The fantastic nature of the *Protocols*, which makes them appear to be fabrications on their face, is what convinced so many of their authenticity when actual events mirrored those foretold in its pages—for how else could anyone have known that such unprecedented things would come to pass, unless someone had planned them? Many asked, “Even if forgeries, forgeries of what?” It was difficult for many to believe that the *Protocols* were simply fabrications with no basis in fact. Though Spargo focused on discrediting Nilus, later attempts to debunk the *Protocols* considered Nilus to be an honest man who was duped by the Czar’s secret police.

Henry Ford stated that he would not be persuaded to change his mind about the facts by emotional attacks aimed at discrediting him and the sources of his information, but which avoided addressing the indisputable factual record of events and published statements. Ford claimed that he was not motivated by prejudice and that should anyone be able to disprove the underlying facts and circumstances alleged in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT*, or to discredit the logic used to draw the conclusions which were there drawn, he would disavow those contentions.⁸⁷⁴

John Spargo was initially a vocal and dogmatic advocate of Marxism. Spargo wrote *Karl Marx: His Life and Work*, B.W. Huebsch, New York, (1910), National Labour Press, Manchester, (1910); as well as many other books advocating Socialism and Marxism. He described himself as being far redder than the pink H. G. Wells.⁸⁷⁵ Like “Colonel” Edward Mandell House, he publicly advocated many much needed social reforms and strongly supported women’s rights. However, he did this as a means to gain the public’s trust and later revealed that his true objective had always been to tear down society and make life unbearable for people so as to force them into revolution.⁸⁷⁶

While other Socialists went to prison for protesting the war that they alleged was fought not for the people of America but for the wealthy elites, Spargo took a turn to the right in 1917—the year the Zionists turned on Germany and brought America into the war—and began to support American intervention in the First World War on the side of the British. Though a member of the Socialist Party of the United States, he abandoned the Party in 1917, because it opposed American intervention in the European war. Spargo wrote in 1929, “I resigned from the Socialist Party, in 1917, because of the adoption by it of a policy of active opposition to the war.”⁸⁷⁷ He

gave no reason for this move other than to say that the anti-war policy was “shameful”, “stupid” and “thoroughly bad”—why he deemed it so, Spargo did not say—again he waved his hands and hoped the show was enough to end an argument.

Spargo’s public statements were often emotional, not logical. He may simply have been a supporter of Zionism, which movement led America into the war. He may have felt a loyalty to England—he originally hailed from Great Britain. In any event, his primary interests were not those of the American proletariat. Some believed he was a crypto-Jew and he had a very Jewish appearance, though he asserted that he was a Gentile.

While Spargo began to support the war, most Socialists in America vocally opposed the “Imperialists’ War”. In order to suppress any expression of anti-war sentiment, President Wilson passed the Espionage Act, the Sabotage Act and the Sedition Act, which restricted free speech. Socialists were prosecuted under these laws, which obviously violated the First Amendment, despite the fact that Wilson’s Supreme Court upheld their alleged constitutionality. Socialist leaders like Eugene V. Debs were sentenced to long prison terms under these illegal Acts. Others, like Emma Goldman, were deported to Russia.

Emma Goldman was a Russian Jew who had emigrated to America, where she agitated for anarchy and assassination. Her lectures inspired Leon F. Czolgosz to assassinate President McKinley. She disseminated Frankist⁸⁷⁸ Nihilism in the United States. Her lectures discussed the sterilization of criminals, the alleged need for woman to not have children, the alleged need to end patriotism, the alleged need to destroy all government and the alleged need to destroy Christianity. She later agitated for Bolshevism in the United States. Bolshevism fell out of favor with Western Jews after the war when it became apparent that it did indeed lead to assimilation. When Goldman was deported back to Russia, she claimed that she had become disenchanted with the Bolshevik movement and with the tyrant Lenin’s oppression of free speech.⁸⁷⁹ She ended her years in luxury sponsored by the patronage of the immensely wealthy heiress Peggy Guggenheim. The rejection of Bolshevik brutality and the disenchantment of many Russians who had lived through the Revolution in Russia is captured in Alexander Blok’s poem *The Twelve*. For Communists, Liberalism was only a means to attract initiates. They had no real desire to liberate the working class. Their desire was to destroy. Emma Goldman admitted that she had always known that Marxism would lead to tyranny. John Clayton quoted Emma Goldman in *The Chicago Tribune* on 18 June 1920 on the front page, in an article entitled, “Russian Soviet ‘Rotten,’ Emma Goldman Says”,

“‘You’re right, it is rotten,’ she said. ‘But it is what we should have expected. We always knew the Marxian theory was impossible, a breeder of tyranny. We blinded ourselves to its faults in America because we believed it might accomplish something.’”

“Big” Bill Haywood was sentenced to twenty years in Federal prison for encouraging workers to strike during the war. Robert Goldstein was sentenced to ten years in Federal prison for a making a movie about the American Revolution, *The*

Spirit of '76, which depicted British soldiers firing upon Americans. Since Britain was our ally in the First World War, the Government held that Goldstein's historically correct film was against the law. Goldstein, a man who exhibited great strength of character and the finest of American values, spent three years in prison and his career was destroyed. Pacifists like Henry Ford faced Federal Criminal prosecution if they continued to speak out against the war. Crypto-Jewish Communists/Socialists; including "Miss Rose Pastor", a Russian Jew, and Morris Hillquit, born Moses Hillkowitz in Riga, Latvia; were also prosecuted.⁸⁸⁰ Note that most Americans were pro-German and anti-British, given the England was America's most common enemy in war, until Zionist propagandists turned America against Germany with lies and unconstitutional laws which made it illegal to be pro-German, Zionist laws which made it illegal to be honest.

Woodrow Wilson's actions were seemingly inexplicable, given that Wilson was long a pacifist, as was his first wife Ellen Axzon, who died on 6 August 1914. Wilson's Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan, was also a pacifist, and he advocated American neutrality. Bryan helped Wilson to win his Presidential election. Wilson betrayed Bryan pacifism and his long terms efforts to prevent the Rothschilds from gaining control over America's money. On 9 July 1896 William Jennings Bryan gave a speech before the Democratic National Convention while running for President. He opposed the Jewish bankers who wanted control over America's money and spoke in expressly Christian terms,

"No, my friends, that will never be the verdict of our people. Therefore, we care not upon what lines the battle is fought. If they say bimetallism is good, but that we cannot have it until other nations help us, we reply that, instead of having a gold standard because England has, we will restore bimetallism, and then let England have bimetallism because the United States has it. If they dare to come out in the open field and defend the gold standard as a good thing, we will fight them to the uttermost. Having behind us the producing masses of this nation and the world, supported by the commercial interests, the laboring interests and the toilers everywhere, we will answer their demand for a gold standard by saying to them: You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns, you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."⁸⁸¹

Wilson's second wife, Edith Bolling Galt, whom he married on 18 December 1915, was a strong interventionalist. Wilson's friends won the Balfour Declaration and made great fortunes from the wars Wilson conducted⁸⁸²—wars anticipated in Zionist "Colonel" House's book *Philip Dru: Administrator*, B. W. Huebsch, New York, (1912). "Colonel" House was the Zionist agent who ran the Wilson administration.

Silas Bent published a review of the books *The Life of Woodrow Wilson*⁸⁸³ by Josephus Daniels and *The True Story of Woodrow Wilson*⁸⁸⁴ by David Lawrence under the caption "Career of the Creator of 'International Conscience'" in *The New York Times Book Review* 22 June 1924 on page 3, in which Bent wrote, among other

things,

“Mr. Lawrence quotes [President Woodrow Wilson] as calling the Colonel ‘a monumental faker.’ That was in private conversation. Mr. Wilson did not reply to his predecessor’s attacks on him as a candidate.

To Colonel E. M. House Mr. Lawrence gives credit for influence in naming the greater part of the first Wilson Cabinet. Mr. Daniels mentions Colonel House only in reference to the appointment of Albert. S. Burlison as Postmaster General. It was Colonel House, so Mr. Lawrence says, who first interested Mr. Wilson in banking reform. It was Colonel House who made a trip to Wall Street before the inauguration and reassured the most powerful bankers in this country about Mr. Wilson’s views, telling them his intentions toward business and finance, so as to avert a threatened panic.

The second Mrs. Wilson, according to Mr. Lawrence, was chiefly responsible for the break between her husband and Colonel House. She exercised an extraordinary influence and thought the Colonel was too much in evidence at Versailles. It was she, according to the same writer, who caused the break with Secretary Tumulty; but some of those who read Mr. Tulmuty’s about himself and the President regarded that as abundant provocation.”

Wilson, himself, stated in a campaign speech before he was elected for his first term as President,

“Since I entered politics, I have chiefly had men’s views confided to me privately. Some of the biggest men in the United States, in the field of commerce and manufacture, are afraid of somebody, are afraid of something. They know that there is a power somewhere so organized, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they had better not speak above their breath when they speak in condemnation of it.”⁸⁸⁵

After the war, Spargo wrote numerous books and articles condemning the Bolsheviks in Russia. Former pacifist and Marxist John Spargo was not alone in his post-war attacks on Bolshevism. Many Zionists were concerned that Bolshevism was leading to assimilation—and many Zionists like Einstein and Weizmann resented Rathenau for his assimilationist views. In Germany, vitriolic anti-Semite Theodor Fritsch alleged in 1922 that,

“The Soviet government boasts in its own newspapers that since 1917 no fewer than 1,764,875 people have been slaughtered by [Bolshevism], among them 192,350 workers, 260,000 soldiers, 815,000 peasants, 155,250 intellectuals. The whole of Russian economic life has been destroyed; part [of the country] is transformed into a desert; and further millions have been consigned to starvation. We have never heard that Rathenau raised the slightest objection to the criminal regime. Rather, he entertains friendly

relations toward the Soviet tyranny, . . . ”⁸⁸⁶

In 1929, John Spargo, the man who had protested so loudly against any implication that he had been duped into Socialism, published an article entitled, “Why I Am No Longer a Socialist”, in the magazine *Nation’s Business*. Though not attributing Socialism to a Jewish conspiracy, and maintaining that his motives had always been noble and pure, Spargo nevertheless believed that international Socialism was a dangerous delusion:

“More than 20 years of my life were given to the advocacy of international Socialism and the work of upbuilding the Socialist movement. Today I am thoroughly convinced that the Socialist philosophy is unsound, the Socialist program dangerous and reactionary, and the Socialist movement a mischievous illusion. As sincerely and earnestly as I formerly proclaimed Socialism to be the greatest hope of mankind, though with less energy and strength, I now proclaim my conviction that only disaster could result from a serious and comprehensive attempt to carry the Socialist program into effect. [***] Deluded and misdirected in their aim as I believe them to be, the men and women who make up the Socialist movement are, by and large, as intelligent and as decent as other people, possessing their full share of the virtues and no more than their share of human frailty.”⁸⁸⁷

The emotional and polemic nature of Spargo’s attacks were typical of the religious zealotry and arrogance he affirmed were a part of his Socialist upbringing and propagandizing,

“The comprehensiveness of the Marxian philosophy and the completeness and finality of its explanation of the social structure endowed the movement as a whole, and individual Socialists, with the superb audacity and splendid arrogance universally characteristic of the propaganda of the movement. [***] Like countless thousands of others, my life was consecrated to the cause as to a priesthood.”⁸⁸⁸

Jean Paul Marat offered a model for these Socialist propagandists. Marat published the journals *L’Ami du Peuple* (*The Friend of the People*) and *Journal de la République Française* (*Journal of the French Revolution*) during the French Revolution and used them to make vitriolic personal attacks, which were effectively death warrants. Marat called for mass murder in the name of the people. He called for brutality and tyranny in the name of liberty, equality and fraternity.

Though Spargo wrote passionately of the alleged high morality which drove him to embrace Socialism with a religious devotion to its cause, he admitted that Socialism actively worked to undermine all that was good in society. He openly admitted that he was a part of this effort to inflict misery on the masses. Just as some political Zionists sought to subvert all good will toward Jews and to make the lives of Jews miserable in order to force them to Zionism, some Socialists deliberately

subverted everything good in society in order to bring about its ruin and make way for their allegedly benevolent and Utopian tyranny. Burton J. Hendrick, who had just recently completed a series of articles on Jews in *The World's Work*,⁸⁸⁹ warned in the early 1920's of the fact that the Polish and Russian Jews, who had emigrated to America, posed a threat to the American system and attempted to take over trade and labor unions in order to use the unions' membership to destroy the United States and make it a part of a world-wide soviet system run by Jews,

“There are three divisions of Jews in the United States. These are the Sephardic Jews, the German Jews, and the Eastern or Polish Jews. The first two make up perhaps 500,000 of the more than 3,000,000 Jews in the United States. The last comprise more than 2,500,000; they comprise the vast bulk of our Jewish population. In previous articles the present writer has emphasized the fact that about the only quality the Sephardic and German Jews have in common with the Polish Jew is a common religion. In all other respects, in history, ethnology, in physical and mental characteristics, they are absolutely different. Practically all students of Jewish history maintain that the Jews of Western and Eastern Europe are distinct races—as different as is an Englishman from a Sicilian or a German from a Slav. That the Western Jews represent a vastly higher stage of achievement in business, in politics, in literature and the arts than the Eastern, is the plain historic record. Practically all the great Jewish names that have become familiar to cultivated people—Spinoza, Mendelssohn, Heine, Disraeli, Ehrlich—are those of Western Jews. Such success as has come to American Jews in business and finance is confined, almost exclusively, to Jews of Western origin; such are the Seligmans, the Schiffs, the Kahns, the Warburgs, the Guggenheims. Is it true that in this matter of ‘Americanization’ this same distinction must be made? Is it a fact that, as a mass, the Spanish and German Jews become good Americans and that, as a mass, the Polish Jews do not? [***] [Polish Jews] always resented—as they do to-day—the idea that they were Poles or a part of the Polish State; they insisted on being Jews and nothing else. Nor does it seem to be the case that the Jews in Poland were compelled to lead a distinct existence by the Government as a part of an anti-Jewish policy; the Ghetto was their own creation and their own choice; the fact that they were able to enjoy this privilege and many others, was what made their sojourn in Poland so agreeable and so free from the persecutions to which they were subject in other countries. This seems to indicate that the lack of national feeling which the Polish Jews evince to-day is not the product of Russian persecution, but that it is a deep lying racial trait. Poland was perhaps the greatest ‘melting pot’ of the Middle Ages; it found no difficulty in absorbing Germans, Frenchmen, Englishmen, and Irish; but it never absorbed its Jews. For it seems the fact that the Polish Jews care no more for Poland to-day than did their medieval ancestors. As a mass they have shown no interest in a regenerated Poland; in the World War their support was thrown to Germany; and the present bitter anti-Jewish feeling in Poland to-day is explained by this

pro-Germanism. Why is it that, whereas German, French, Spanish, and French Jews have demonstrated this nationalistic impulse, the Polish Jews have seemed to be so devoid of it? That is a question for the historian and the student of racial psychology. The training of this mass Polish mind, therefore, is not favorable to a quick understanding of and enthusiasm for American principles. Are there any manifestations of indifference and even unfriendliness in the daily life of the Polish Jews in New York? The first fact that impresses the inquirer, as he attempts to glance into the composite mind of metropolitan Jewry, is its reading matter. The thing that startles is that the Yiddish press of New York City is extremely socialistic. The great newspapers edited by Jews, published by Jews, and read by Jews, are preaching political principles whose success means the destruction of the American system of government. The great Yiddish newspaper of New York's East Side is *Vorwarts* (The Forward), edited by Mr. Abraham Cahan, a Russian Jew of romantic personal history and of literary attainments of a high order—he has won wide recognition as a short story writer in English. *The Forward* has a daily circulation of 160,000 copies. It is one of the most successful and one of the most profitable newspapers in New York or in the United States. It is found in practically every Yiddish reading home and wields with its clientele an influence such as few English papers can boast with theirs. Its political principles are not found in the platform of the Republican or Democratic parties, in the Declaration of Independence, or in the Constitution of the United States. It draws practically no inspiration from American history. The lives of Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Lincoln, and the other American immortals furnish its writers no examples. Its principles are derived from *Das Kapital* of Karl Marx. The wisdom or the folly of Socialism are not the issue here. The only point insisted on is that Socialism is not Americanism; it may be better or worse; but it is not the same. The triumph of Marxism means the destruction of every principle upon which the American state rests, and it makes ridiculous a century and a half of American history. It substitutes 'internationalism' for a robust American nationalism, 'the solidarity of the working classes' for the American allegiance to the central government, 'the dictatorship of the proletariat' for representative institutions. That a newspaper should exist advocating these doctrines is not especially significant; every opinion, in politics or theology, necessarily has its spokesman in so large and diversified a country as the United States; what is significant is that the newspapers preaching such doctrines, especially *The Forward*, should be the most widely read of all publications on the East Side. That, in order to obtain a large circulation with the Yiddish reading public, a newspaper should be obliged to preach the same principles that produced the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia is the thing that gives one pause. Let us imagine, for example, that the *New York Times*, the *Tribune*, and the *Evening Post* were constantly advocating the overthrow of the American Government and its substitution by a Socialistic state; that they were constantly denouncing American 'nationalism' and

praying for the day when it would be superseded by international ‘solidarity.’ This would not necessarily mean that these newspapers represented a perverted mentality, for any man is free to believe these doctrines and to advocate them and need not be regarded as an abandoned soul because he does so. Such a policy would merely show that these journals, hitherto the upholders of American constitutionalism, had given up American principles and that they hoped for the overthrow of the American Government. Moreover—and this is the point—it would show that the English reading masses in New York City regarded Socialism as a better political system than the American Democracy. This one fact therefore, that the most influential and most largely circulated Jewish press of New York is devoted to Socialism, gives us that insight into the mass mind of the Polish Jew which is essential to any adequate comprehension of his present attitude toward the American state. If any one of the big English papers of New York should advocate such political principles, they would immediately lose their readers and pass out of existence; evidently the Yiddish press can keep its readers only by taking this stand. To those who still believe in the Constitution this fact is really appalling. This enthusiasm for the doctrines of Karl Marx, in preference to the doctrines of Washington and Jefferson and Franklin and Lincoln and Roosevelt, appears in other directions than in the daily press. Any one who attends a Socialist meeting in New York is immediately impressed by the fact that the audience is almost exclusively composed of East Side Jews. The great public meeting place established by Peter Cooper is a favorite headquarters for East Side radicalism. Practically all the orators of discontent who occupy soap boxes in the New York streets are unmistakably Eastern Jews. The mass meetings that are occasionally called in the interest of American recognition of the Russian Soviet Government are overwhelmingly Jewish in their composition. The behavior of European and American Socialists, when face to face with the European War, strikingly brings out the alien quality of American radicalism. Ever since the days of Karl Marx it has been a Socialist tenet that all wars are the products of capitalism; from this it necessarily follows that it is the duty of all Socialists in all countries to refuse to support their governments in war. This had been a doctrine of the First Internationale, but it went to pieces when the Franco-Prussian War broke out in 1870. The Second Internationale, organized on the ruins of the First, similarly made this rule of non-participation in nationalist wars one of the fixed stones in its edifice. Again the existence of such a principle did not affect the Socialists of Europe when the war began in 1914. The followers of Marx proved that their devotion to this idea was merely lip service; and that it had never seized their minds and their consciences. [***] There was one country, that is, in which the Socialists refused to support their government, and in which they actually took up a position of hostility. That country was the United States. The test of conflict disclosed that American Socialists were the only kind who remained faithful to their Socialistic creed. The American Congress declared war on Germany on April

6, 1917; the very next day the Socialist party of America met in congress at St. Louis and adopted a manifesto calling upon its followers to oppose the war. 'The Socialist party of the United States in the present grave crisis,' so read its proclamation, 'solemnly reaffirms its allegiance to the principle of internationalism and working class solidarity the world over and proclaims its unalterable opposition to the war just declared by the Government of the United States. . . . As against the false doctrine of national patriotism we uphold the ideal of international working class solidarity.' That the war was the handiwork of the capitalists, that American capitalists had forced the United States in, that German submarine warfare was not an invasion of American rights and that, 'in modern history there has been no war more unjustifiable than the one in which we are about to engage'—such were only a few of the sentiments contained in this document. These assembled Socialists pledged themselves to 'continuous, active, and public opposition to the war through demonstrations, mass petitions, and all other means in our power.' They voted to oppose 'all legislation for military or industrial conscription,' 'any attempt to raise money for payment of war expenses by taxing the necessaries of life or issuing bonds,' to organize workers 'into strong, class conscious, and closely unified political and industrial organizations, to enable them by concerted and harmonious mass action to shorten this war and establish lasting peace. [***] Thus the arrival of these Polish and Russian Jews introduced a new fact into the American population. For the first time the Socialists became powerful enough to elect an occasional member of Congress or of a state legislature. Even with these accessions Socialist voters have not been very numerous; yet the fact remains that the only considerable Socialistic bloc in this country is composed of these same Eastern Jews. [***] [Allen Benson], who had been the Socialist candidate for President in 1916, publicly explained the cause of his departure. 'The present foreign born leaders of the Socialist party,' he said, 'if they had lived during the Civil War, would doubtless have censured Marx for congratulating Wilson . . . I therefore resign as a protest against the foreign born leadership that blindly believes a non-American policy can be made to appeal to many Americans.' [***] these radical teachings are part and parcel of the massmind of the Polish Jew. [***] They prove that the only sections of New York City which contain a large socialistic population are those in which the Polish Jew is the predominant element. The local election returns for fifteen years demonstrates the same fact. Whenever a Socialist is sent as a Congressman to Washington, an assemblyman to Albany, or an alderman to the City Hall, he always represents a district in which the population is almost exclusively composed of Polish Jews. [***] [T]he fact remains, however, that the chief opposition [Gompers, himself a Jew,] has met in his attempt to keep American Labor free from radicalism has come from Jews—almost exclusively of the Polish and Russian type. Up to 1914 the working classes in the clothing trades had never been very closely organized. The unions had existed for years and had engaged in many fierce

strikes, but that lack of cohesion which is one of the failings of Jewish mentality had caused the members to hold their allegiance lightly and to become backward in paying dues. The great labor group in the clothing trades was the United Garment Workers of America, a union whose form of organization followed the accepted American standard. It was a union, that is, on simple craft lines; it existed to improve the general economic conditions of the workers; it proclaimed no political purpose, and certainly cherished no Socialistic or subversive programme. As such the United Garment Workers of America was affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and participated in all its conventions. It had accomplished many beneficial reforms, especially in the abolition of the sweatshop and improved working conditions. Its membership, naturally, was overwhelmingly Jewish, though there was then, as there is to-day, a considerable representation of Italian workers. For years the forces of radicalism had been seeking to capture the garment workers; in the year 1914 these elements, under the leadership of Sidney Hillman, one of the most revolutionary labor captains in New York, succeeded so far as to elect a group of radical delegates to the convention of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Gompers's convention refused to admit these gentlemen because their announced programme was revolutionary and un-American. The Hillman cohorts therefore withdrew from the Hall, started a rump convention in another building, and organized a new union, called the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. The purpose of the new group was not disguised. It was blatantly radical. Its aim was to organize the clothing workers for political action; and it proposed to use the men of the clothing trades as a voting unit to destroy the present system of government as well as the present economic order and to plant in their place a condition not unlike that which prevails in Russia. Its constitution is full of the now familiar talk about 'class consciousness,' 'capitalism,' the 'ruling class' and the 'ruled class,' 'the constant and unceasing struggle,' 'craft unionism,' and the like. Its whole purpose is summed up in this section: 'The industrial and inter-industrial organization, built upon the solid rock of clear knowledge and class consciousness, will put the organized working class in actual control of the system of production and the working class will then be ready to take possession of it.' That is, the plan is for the one big union—the organization of all the workers, not on craft lines, but on class lines—this as the preparation for the day when the workers will themselves take possession of industry. The programme is thus that of the Soviet. [***] The attitude of the Amalgamated towards the American Government was sufficiently indicated by a banner borne in the streets of Boston during one of their strikes, with the following legend: 'To hell with the United States.'"⁸⁹⁰

John Spargo wrote that the Communists took a different tack in England where they simply sought to make life unbearable in order to make way for revolution,

“[T]he sooner the process of degradation is effected the better, for the sooner will the agony be over and the glorious consummation of Socialism be realized. [***] Haters of All Social Reforms. That logic controlled the policy of British Socialism in the days of my youth. That is why we busied ourselves distributing leaflets bearing the significant title, ‘To Hell With Trade Unionism!’ and appropriately printed in red. That also is why we inveighed against life insurance in our propaganda with all the bitterness of which we were capable. Life insurance was a protective device against poverty, an ameliorative measure designed to avert the poverty and degradation without which our Utopia could not be reached. In the same spirit and under the compulsion of the same Marxian dogma we opposed every form of thrift, all philanthropy and social reforms calculated to lessen social misery and improve the conditions of life and labor. We regarded all these things with the hate and horror which religious fanatics might feel towards deliberate human thwarting of the clearly manifested design of God.”⁸⁹¹

The Communists used underhanded means to destroy Capitalistic society, and then criticized the Capitalists for the alleged failure of Capitalism to provide for the needs of the people, which the Communists had deliberately caused. The Communists did not care how many people they murdered, nor how much suffering they caused. They had no morals. Their only goal was to destroy society and in order to put their inhuman leaders into power.

5.5.5 Zionists Proscribe Free Speech

Most Americans initially opposed American involvement in the First World War and bore no ill will toward Germany. There were millions of German-Americans, many of them Jews. In addition, Americans did not like the British, against whom Americans had fought more wars than any other nation.

The Zionist Wilson administration opened a propaganda department aimed at vilifying Germany and any American who spoke out against America’s intervention in the war on behalf of the Allies—truly on behalf of the Zionists. Many pacifists, Socialists and Germans in America suffered terribly as a result. H. C. Peterson and G. C. Fite detailed much of the tyrannical abuse in their book, *Opponents of War, 1917-1918*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, (1957). *The New York Times Current History: The European War*, In 20 Volumes, The New York Times Co., New York, (1914-1920), republishes many examples of the propaganda disseminated during the war to govern public opinion in America, and reproduces many contemporary cartoons from both sides of the conflict. Especially noteworthy are the anti-German, anti-Pacifist and anti-German-sympathizer cartoons of the era. The Zionists converted America from a pro-German, anti-British nation; to a rabidly anti-German, pro-British nation.

George Creel, a muckraking journalist, headed the propaganda ministry in the United States, the so-called “Committee on Public Information”. Libraries removed

German books from their shelves. Orchestras refused to play Beethoven or Bach. Schools could no longer teach the German language to their students. Robert Paul Prager, a German, was lynched in Collinsville, Illinois, on 5 April 1918. By official decree, sauerkraut was to be called “liberty-cabbage”. Iowa Governor William Harding issued a proclamation ordering that the speaking of any language other than English was forbidden on trains, in telephone conversations, or in public.

The propagandists published anti-German booklets and movies. From the beginning of the war, American and British newspapers and books published falsehoods accusing Germany of atrocities, which Germany had not committed.⁸⁹² The propaganda employed was extreme. For example, American pro-war propaganda posters, which urged Americans to buy war bonds, depicted a German soldier crucifying an Allied soldier. The scare tactics began early in the conflict. For example, on 3 September 1914, *The London Times* published a letter to the Editor from A. J. Dawe, which the *Times* captioned, “The Crime Of Louvain. Vivid Account By An Eye-Witness. A Ruthless Holocaust. The Real Horrors Of War.” Note that the term “holocaust” was employed to vilify and dehumanize the Germans. The British sent over a lying propagandist Lord James Bryce to smear the Germans in America with his book J. Bryce, *Report of the Committee on alleged German outrages appointed by His Britannic Majesty's Government and presided over by the Right Hon. Viscount Bryce. Evidence and Documents laid before the Committee on alleged German outrages: (appendix to the Report).*, Printed Under the Authority of His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, (1915); which was reprinted in several languages and which was published in several English speaking nations including England, America, Canada and Australia.⁸⁹³

5.5.6 President Woodrow Wilson Becomes a Zionist Dictator

In America, Creel's propaganda office recruited 75,000 “four minute men” to give short propaganda speeches wherever crowds could gather. Seemingly unbiased Americans speaking their genuine beliefs, these propagandists promoted the war and vilified pacifists and Germans. The Zionist Wilson administration passed the Espionage Act, the Sabotage Act and the Sedition Act, which made it illegal to speak out against American involvement in the war. These acts were still enforceable when Spargo attacked Ford's patriotism, leaving Ford at a disadvantage when defending himself. In addition, the propaganda campaign against pacifists had had its effect on the American public. Both of these factors gave Spargo the courage to attack Ford in the underhanded way that he did.

The propaganda tactics Spargo used to attack Ford were reminiscent of Creel's “advertising” agency, though far less successful. Creel published propaganda all over the world and then he wrote a book about it in order to advertise himself, *How We Advertised America: The First Telling of the Amazing Story of the Committee on Public Information That Carried the Gospel of Americanism to Every Corner of the Globe*, New York, London, Harper & Brothers, (1920).

Creel's Committee on Public Information received the support of the head of British propaganda in America, Rt. Hon. Sir Gilbert Parker, Bart. Note that Parker

admits that when the war started, Americans had little love for the British, who were America's most frequent enemy, and Americans felt no animosity towards the Germans. Parker boasts of the new unanimity of pro-Ally sentiment that he and Creel achieved in the United States. Parker does not mention the fact that the appearance of unanimity was achieved by undemocratic means—by making it illegal to speak out against the Allies, against the war, or on behalf of Germany. Note the statement that America stands nothing to gain by entering the war. Note also that the timing of these events appeared so fortuitous as to have been planned long in advance, and that Wilson had to trick the Democrats into going to war, and that Democrats would never have allowed the Republicans to have led them into the war. Zionists have an easy time controlling both sides in a two party system for the simple reason that politics is driven by money and media and the Zionists control both means to victory. In addition to being able to bring victory to one side, they often sponsor a controlled opposition and commit subterfuge of that opposition. Parker vilified Germany, but made no mention of the illegal Allied naval blockade of Germany, that resulted in the deaths of about 750,000 German men, women and children by starvation.⁸⁹⁴

Just as British propaganda made it appear uncivilized and unpatriotic to speak out in favor of peace (as Ford had done) and on behalf of the civil treatment of Germany, or to voice America's own interests; Relativists made it appear unethical and unscientific to speak out in favor of Einstein's predecessors and the open expression of the true history of the theory of relativity, or to express scientific arguments in opposition to Einstein's metaphysical mythologies. The same tactics and style of attack were often apparent among Communists, Zionists and "Relativists".

Parker published some of his propaganda in *Harper's Magazine*, Volume 136, Number 814, (March, 1918), pp. 521-531:

“The United States and the War

BY RT. HON. SIR GILBERT PARKER, BART.

FOR the first time in its history the United States is engaged in a World War. It must be remembered that her only wars have been with Great Britain, with the Barbary pirates, with Mexico, with Spain, and with her own population. Idealistic always, her very first war had behind it the spirit of a great people; on the whole, it was a conflict between Britons and Britons. It was the principle of British freedom and independence in action; it was the soul of Hampton and William Penn and all the democratic nobility of the United Kingdom, which under distant skies was reasserting itself, reaffirming its faith in the ancient doctrine laid down by the barons when they wrested Magna Charta from King John. No one doubts now—and great numbers of British people in the time of the war, and most important statesmen of that day did not doubt, and said so in Parliament at Westminster, that the thirteen States were right in the action they took in

the Revolutionary War; though great doubt is felt as to justification for the War of 1812.

Always firm and decisive, always alert and progressive, it was the United States that taught Europe how to subdue barbarism and sea-brigandage in the overseas expedition against the Barbary pirates. Of the rightness of heart and the strength of will of the American people, their whole history has been proof. They have lost nothing of their ancient qualities, even though they admit yearly to their shores a million aliens, of whom they absorb and train to American uses and principles the immense majority. Nothing is so remarkable as the power of the American commonwealth to absorb and inspire alien elements and heterogeneous peoples. Is it not wonderful to think that, with one-half at least of the whole population foreign in origin and descent, there is behind President Wilson and his Government a compact and loyal people?

And why? Because at bottom the intelligence and the spirit of the American people are idealistic, humane, and aspiring. I do not mean to say that the hundred millions of people of the United States are all moved by an immense humanitarian spirit; but I do, say that the majority are, or else the declaration of war against the Central Empires would never have been received with approbation. I believe profoundly that something far deeper than national, profit has moved the people of the United States to enter this war. Whatever may be thought of the motives of other nations fighting, only one thing can be thought of the motive of the United States. The Americans have, nothing to gain by success in this war, except something spiritual, mental, manly, national, and human. They are in this war because they believe that the German policy is a betrayal of civilization. From August, 1914, there was a considerable percentage of the public who believed that the United States should, in the name of civilization, have officially resented the invasion of Belgium. Personally, I believe that it would have been extremely difficult for the United States to enter the war six months before she did. I was in the United States for some months on this trip. I have been from New York to San Francisco. I was at Washington when President Wilson dismissed Count Bernstorff and heard him do so, and I am firmly convinced of this—that President Wilson committed his country to this war at the right moment—neither too soon nor too late. He had stopped up every avenue of attack by the pacifists and the jurists and the pedants and the pettifoggers.

Perhaps here I may be permitted to say a few words concerning my own work since the beginning of the war. It is in a way a story by itself, but I feel justified in writing one or two paragraphs about it. Practically since the day war broke out between England and the Central Powers I became responsible for American publicity. I need hardly say that the scope of my department was very extensive and its activities widely ranged. Among the activities was a weekly report to the British Cabinet on the state of American opinion, and constant touch with the permanent correspondents of American newspapers in England. I also frequently arranged for important public men in England

to act for us by interviews in American newspapers; and among these distinguished people were Mr. Lloyd George (the present Prime Minister), Viscount Grey, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Bonar Law, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Sir Edward Carson, Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Walter Runciman, (the Lord Chancellor), Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Lord Cromer, Will Crooks, Lord Curzon, Lord Gladstone, Lord Haldane, Mr. Henry James, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Selfridge, Mr. Zangwill, Mrs. Humphry Ward, and fully a hundred others.

Among other things, we supplied three hundred and sixty newspapers in the smaller States of the United States with an English newspaper, which gives a weekly review and comment of the affairs of the war. We established connection with the man in the street through cinema pictures of the Army and Navy, as well as through interviews, articles, pamphlet etc.; and by letters in reply to individual American critics, which were printed in the chief newspaper of the State in which they lived, and were copied in newspapers of other and neighboring States. We advised and stimulated many people to write articles; we utilized the friendly services and assistance of confidential friends; we had reports from important Americans constantly, and established association, by personal correspondence, with influential and eminent people of every profession in the United States, beginning with university and college presidents, professors and scientific men, and running through all the ranges of the population. We asked our friends and correspondents to arrange for speeches, debates, and lectures by American citizens, but we did not encourage Britishers to go to America and preach the doctrine of entrance into the war. Besides an immense private correspondence with individuals, we had our documents and literature sent to great numbers of public libraries, Y. M. C. A. societies, universities, colleges, historical societies, clubs, and newspapers.

It is hardly necessary to say that the work was one of extreme difficulty and delicacy, but I was fortunate in having a wide acquaintance in the United States and in knowing that a great many people had read my books and were not prejudiced against me. I believed that the American people could not be driven, preached to, or chivied into the war, and that when they did enter it would be the result of their own judgment and not the result of exhortation, eloquence, or fanatical pressure of Britishers. I believed that the United States would enter the war in her own time, and I say this, with a convinced mind, that, on the whole, it was best that the American commonwealth did not enter the war until that month in 1917 when Germany played her last card of defiance and indirect attack. Perhaps the safest situation that could be imagined actually did arise. The Democratic party in America, which probably would not have supported a Republican President had he declared war, were practically forced by the logic of circumstances to support President Wilson when he declared war, because he had blocked up every avenue of attack.

There were some who said—and I heard them say it—that the breakage

of diplomatic relations with Germany would not mean actual war. My reply was: 'It won't be the will of the United States to enter the war; it won't be a desire to fight. It will be the action of Germany—in stinging and lacerating the conscience of a great people.' The record was a terrible one. Every one knows that the Prussian military organization had thrown overboard all rules of war which centuries of civilization had produced and imposed; a solemn treaty, signed, was 'a scrap of paper,' hospitals and hospital-ships were proper food for the metal of guns and torpedoes. Gas and fire were used as war weapons—to the final injury of those who initiated their use. Prisoners, not by tens, but by thousands and scores of thousands, were treated shamefully, and the Belgian people, to the number of 300,000, were driven under the lash of slavery to the mines and factories of Germany and France, to set free men who could do duty in the German armies. The chambers of the German embassy in America were the breeding-places of crimes against the civil life of the United States, passenger-ships were sunk, factories were bombed or set on fire, all kinds of tricks were used to influence American opinion in England, and innocent lives by the scores of thousands were sacrificed. In France and Belgium towns and villages were wiped off the map for no military purpose, with no strategic intention, but with a vile and polluted barbarity, to break the spirit of a people or of peoples. America was shocked at the bombardment of helpless and undefended towns of England and Scotland by airships. Her spirit was abashed and shaken by the sinking of the *Lusitania*. She endured and yet endured. She waited and still waited, vainly believing that some spirit of remorse might stir Germany and change her course of action.

She awoke, however, to the fact that Germany's promises of reform, given to President Wilson after the sinking of the *Sussex*, in regard to the submarine were only given to gain time, to manufacture new types of submarines more powerful, and then with an insolence and a disdain worthy of Attila the Hun they announced indiscriminate attacks upon all shipping within the war zone. Also, Germany declared that she could allow only certain ships of the United States to sail, and on certain specified terms and conditions—and that only after a cry of indignation had gone up from the press of the United States. This was the final act which turned President Wilson from a pacifist into a warrior. And it is wholly in keeping with the spirit of Prussianism, that the Zimmerman note to Mexico, with its evil suggestions of treachery of Japan, and its declaration that New Mexico, Texas, and other American States and territory would be acquired again by Mexico, should have come at the critical moment when war was inevitable.

I had been in America through all these months of developing purpose and sentiment, and I had seen a whole people, who in January last had appeared to have grown indifferent to horror, suddenly amalgamate themselves, strip themselves of levity and indifference and the dangerous and insidious security of peace, into a great fighting force, which is not the less a fighting force because down underneath everything in the United States is

a love of peace and devotion to the acquisition of wealth. None but a great fighting people could have, or would have, imposed conscription at the very beginning of the war. None but a skilled fighting people could have produced a Navy which silently and swiftly entered the war in the war zone within a week, and landed an army on the coast of France, with submarine-destroyers in those perilous seas, within two months of the declaration of war.

I speak of the Americans as a fighting people; I believe that this war will prove them to have everything that they have always had—courage, swiftness of conception, capacity to perform, and a lightning-like directness. The American nation has never been conquered. Like all democratic peoples, they are quick to anger, but slow to move; yet it must be remembered that out of the mass of conflicting views one great purpose can seize and hold the imagination and the capacity of the American people, just as the same elements seize and control the spirit of the people of England and France. I heard on many hands in the United States angry criticism of those in authority, but I heard it in England, and I saw it in France; and I know that England and France have renewed in this war the ancient great qualities of their peoples.

There has never been a war in the whole history of the world where so much courage was needed, and there has never been a war where so much dauntless courage has been shown. Think of what France was at the beginning of this war! Think of what England was! Officially, France was rotten when war broke out; officially, England was supine when war broke out, with this difference, however, that the small English Army was perfectly equipped and admirably appointed. The big English Navy was in perfect condition, while in France, as Germany knew, there was inadequacy of equipment for the army, and there were political difficulties which made the task of government and fighting Germany almost impossible. Where, I ask, is the official rottenness of France or England now? The truth is that nothing was rotten at the core.

England is not a republic, but she is the most democratic nation on earth, and that is saying much. What I mean is this: the British people can turn a Government out of office at a moment's notice, and king or monarchy cannot prevent it. The same thing exists in France; but here in America, with your written Constitution, your President and his Cabinet cannot be turned out in under four years. It may be that you are right in your system, but if the will of the people is the spirit of democracy, England, at any rate, is as much a democratic community as this country of the United States.

Now the United States is in the war, and I prophesy, with faith and confidence, that all that has made America great will make her do in this war what France and England and have done. Let me be a little explicit. I have heard many criticisms of the American Government from Americans themselves, but my comment has always been, Judge of a Government by what it does, and judge the American Government in time of war by what it does in time of war. It is well known that there had been no preparation on

the part of the Army or Navy the United States for entrance into the war. Yet, when war was declared, there was instant and decisive action in both departments of the Army and the Navy.

The American Navy has done splendid work in relieving the British Navy from patrol work on the western side of the Atlantic, in the convoying of freight-ships and passenger-ships, and by sharing in the attacks upon the German U-boats in the war zone. The material assistance has been great—the moral assistance has been immense. No one could overestimate the moral effect of the entrance of the United States into the war. It must not be forgotten that she is the one nation about whose motives there could be no suspicion. She is in the war with no territorial or national ambitions—with nothing except the aspiration to fulfil the democratic principle: that all nations shall be allowed to work out their own salvation without fear or trembling—fear of punishment for right doing, and without trembling before the lash of tyranny.

The United States, true to its ancient faith, is out to defeat the loathsome purpose of Germany, which is the control of the world, the warping and suppression of small countries, and the application of the accursed Prussian doctrine of *Kultur* to all the rest of the world. The United States is in the war in the interests of civilization and humanity—for the right of every nation to live and have its being according to conscience and the laws of humanity. The United States is in the war because she believes she has the right to traverse the high seas, obeying the laws of warfare as laid down by the continued practice of many countries until the final codification by the Hague Conference. The United States is in the war in the protection of her own individual national rights; and those individual national rights are the properties of all countries; but the United States is also in the war because she believes that a republic which is the supreme democracy of the world should take her stand for the cause of civilization, which has been abused and despoiled by Germany. The United States is in the war for the cause of humanity. At the beginning she disbelieved that the German nation meant what Great Britain declared she did mean. But now, after every known law of warfare has been broken by Germany, she realizes the truth. And what is the truth? It is that the German people believe that Prussia and Prussian civilization should control the universe, and that it does not matter how that control is secured so long as it is got.

No more pernicious doctrine ever moved Pope or potentate in the Middle Ages. It is, in effect, Never mind how you do it so long as it is done! On that basis assassination would be a virtue. The United States has come to understand that when Germany passed a law preserving perpetual citizenship to her people, whatever other nationality they adopted, she was aiming at the heart of civilization. I have a brother who has become an American citizen. I think I should curse him to the uttermost death if he declined to take up sword or rifle to defend the United States in a war with Great Britain. I believe that is what all Americans feel. I did not know that my brother had

become an American citizen until a year ago. It gave me a pang; but he did what was right. He was not entitled to make the United States his home, live by American energy, profit by American enterprise, and remain a Briton. Think, then, of what this foul principle of Prussia is. It would have me say to my brother, 'Be an American citizen, but remember that your real duty lies with the land of your birth, and when she calls, you must tear up your pledge and compact and sworn word and come back to the Union Jack.'

I wonder how many Americans know that all German-Americans are still Germans by law; and if they do know it, how they must resent the iniquity of the nation that makes of the law of naturalization a scrap of paper, to be torn up, like the sacred compact for the neutrality of Belgium!

The first act of Germany in this war was an act of perfidy, and I firmly predict that the last act will be an act of shame. She may succeed against Rumania, she may succeed against Russia, she may enter Petrograd with her armies, but so did the army of France in the time of Napoleon; and when I think of the millions of people in Russia, chaotic, undisciplined, uncontrolled, and yet aspiring, I still have a grim kind of satisfaction in knowing that if Russia has to be the momentary sacrifice, it is Germany that will be sacrificed in the end.

Lately I saw on a screen, at a theater in New York, pictures of hundreds of thousands of Russians accompanying victims of the Revolution to unconsecrated graves and without religious rites or ceremonies. However depressing such a scene may have been, the really startling effect produced upon my mind by this photography was that Russian life is without system, and that the poetic aspiration for a freer constitutional life is horribly handicapped by lack of knowledge and experience and the habit of control. The faces of the revolutionary leaders have few claims to consideration.

The Duma is as yet no more than a place of oratory. It has never had power or real authority, and, however great Kerensky or any other civilian leader may be, it must first be an army leader that will discipline that great nation into form. No civil dictator will be adequate for the task. I do not know what Mr. Root's views are, save from his public utterances, but I am quite certain that he realizes the truth of what I say—that Russia is in the melting pot, and from the crucible it must be the strong hand of a soldier that will pour out the liquid of order and civilization.

During the days I was in America I saw from my hotel window in New York two processions or parades of American regiments. The main effect upon my mind was a sense of lithe fitness and splendid discipline, which is much out of harmony with the general view of American organized life. I have known the United States for a great many years, and from the standpoint of acquaintance I should be able to judge of her with fairness and accuracy. The thing that has amazed and interested me most in my whole association with American life has been a sense of undiscipline in all the ordinary movements and activities in casual circumstances. But I believe there is no nation on earth that, in unusual circumstances, can pull itself

together and get what it wants with precision and definiteness more than the United States. After all, the reason for this is simple. The American hates convention and is opposed to what he considers unnecessary discipline in ordinary life, but given the necessity for discipline in hazardous circumstances, he conforms to its rigidity with rare and manly skill.

I once stood between two Socialist labor members of the House of Commons at the Bar of the House of Lords, when King Edward VII. was opening Parliament with Queen Alexandra. One of these Socialist members had been very rebellious against the whole ritual of British legislative life, but on this occasion, at the moment when King Edward said in a quiet, conversational tone: 'Pray, my Lords, be seated,' and peers and peeresses in ermine and silks and coronets sank to their seats, this Socialist member turned to his friend and said, 'Jimmy, this'll take a lot of moving!'

To-day this Socialist member is a colonel in the British Army, and has bent to the logic of events all prejudice and spurious independence. His Socialistic principles are what they always were, but he has learned that traditions of a thousand years are powerful moral elements in the government of a people. So the average American. He is out against unnecessary form and discipline, but show him the necessity for it and his native independence makes his obedience to the necessity a very gallant and superbly confident thing. Democratic as the American citizen is, he bends to the pressure of events with a dignity and a vigor which make him a superb partner in international activity.

When people tell me that the United States can be of little use in this war I ask myself, 'What is *use*?' If the United States had not sent a man to France, her financial support of the Allies alone would be a throat-grappler for Germany. I believe the United States is spending twenty-four million dollars a day, but only eight millions of that is for her own military equipment—the other sixteen millions are for loans to the Allies. And if the test of the belligerents is power to endure, surely the wealth and resources of the United States settle that point.

If war is the test of endurance, only three things are necessary—men, money, and equipment. Unless Germany was able to defeat England and France before December of last year (1917), the *débâcle* of that country was sure. The United States can supply men, money, and equipment. She has over one hundred millions of people; she cannot be attacked by the armies of the enemy on her own soil; she has unlimited resources; her supply of men can be twelve millions, if necessary; her supply of money can be boundless, and there is no nation on earth that can excel her in organization for equipment.

Now, there is no chance, or there is the millionth chance, of Germany defeating France and England this year. She cannot do it in the winter-time, and when the summer has come the United States will have great numbers of men ready to take the field—probably 700,000. She has food, raw materials, and constructive skill. She has a capacity for applied science greater than any other nation fighting. I believe that with her aid the Entente

Allies are as sure of winning this war as we are certain that the sun will rise and set to-morrow.

Great Britain has increased her acreage under wheat by one million acres, and all the products of her soil have been vastly increased. The United States has tremendously increased her production of foodstuffs, and when that genius for economic administration, Mr. Hoover, has been at work for another three months there will be an enormous curtailment of wastage in the Union. With one hundred millions of people, if there is a saving which represents five dollars per person for a year, there are five hundred million dollars contributed to the food-supply of the Allies.

The United States has not begun to appreciate her responsibilities and the dire necessity that faces her, but there is a quickness of apprehension in the American mind which is as good as brawn and muscle and the stolid and rigid insistence of the British people. It took us in Great Britain two and a half years to achieve conscription. It took the United States about two and a half months. There never was any real fight over the principle, and please to remember that this is a democratic country, and that when the Republic applied conscription in her Civil War there were bloody riots and an uprising of sections of New York. If it is true, and I know it is, that over seventy per cent. of the population of New York City is foreign-born, what a magnificent demonstration of democratic responsibility this application of conscription has been!

America is building ships in great quantities for the war service. She once had, proportionately to her population, the second greatest mercantile marine of the world. She lost that mercantile marine through no incapacity, but because she could make more money by investing her capital in industries and railway transportations. Now she is building 1,270 ships of 7,968,000 total tonnage, at a cost of \$2,000,000,000, and by the middle of this year she will have a really great mercantile marine. This is in addition to almost 2,000,000 tons of shipping now building in American yards which has been commandeered by the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

Meanwhile, it must not be forgotten that all her shipping and all the German shipping that was in her ports have been seized for the use of the Entente Allies. Every day that passes strengthens and solidifies the Allies' engines of attack and defense. Every day that passes accelerates the intrepidity and the force of Allied aggression. Every day that passes lessens old antagonisms between Great Britain and the United States, and deepens in the American mind an appreciation of Britain's worth and valor.

The American is beginning to understand that in 1914 France—as France—might have been wiped from the international map had it not been for Britain and Britain's Navy and her 'contemptible little Army.' It is beginning to dawn upon the most prejudiced American mind that, in all the main departments of the war, Great Britain has borne, and is bearing, the overwhelming burden. France could not have fought so well without British money and British steel, British cloth, and the British Navy and Army; and

Italy and Russia could not have carried on.

One does not need to say now that Great Britain was forced into the war by a spirit of honor, by the dictates of humanity and civilization, and not for commercial purposes. One does not need to say that if Great Britain had intended war she would not have rejected during so many years Lord Roberts's appeal for a national service army. All the records published prove that Great Britain was meant to be the victim of Prussian aggression.

Does the American public stop to remember who were the people in Great Britain who declared war? The Government in power at Westminster was a peace-loving Government, which had fought military and naval preparation with constant vigor and hatred. Who is Lloyd George, the present Prime Minister of Great Britain? He is a man whose life was in danger and who was assailed during the South African War because of his anti-war sentiments. I am certain that no intelligent human being will believe that the present Prime Minister of England is militaristic, just as I am certain that no sane American would call President Woodrow Wilson a man of war.

If the United States had not believed in Great Britain's *bona fides*, she would not have committed herself to this stupendous enterprise. Let all the world remember that Great Britain was the ancient enemy of the United States. Let the doubter recall that the United States has now linked hands with a nation whom at her Revolution she regarded as a tyrant and oppressor, as the ancient foe of liberty and democracy.

The War of the Revolution, that of 1812, and the American Civil War deepened the gulfs between the two great peoples, but, blessed be Providence, there are now no outstanding questions vexing England and the United States. We have settled the Maine boundaries dispute, the persistent Newfoundland fisheries question, the Oregon trouble, the Venezuela difficulty, the Civil War claims, the Panama anxiety, and now no vexed subject keeps us apart. What was accomplished at Manila toward making America a world power was exceeded infinitely there by the splendid action of Admiral Chichester and Britain's Navy in threatening the German naval forces, which drew the two nations together in a spirit of comradeship. If the United States disbelieved in Great Britain she would not be fighting in France and on the high seas. Never, in all the history of the two countries, was there such a demonstration of understanding and friendship as when Mr. Balfour was received in Washington, New York, and elsewhere. And let it here be said that Great Britain could have sent no one who would so have won the confidence of the American Government and people in the same way or to the same extent as Mr. Balfour. Whatever else this war may do, the greatest thing done for humanity and civilization has been to make these two nations one in the brotherhood of battle. Of this let every American be sure, that the closer comradeship of the two great peoples has not a single foe in Great Britain. Jealousy, envy, and a little malice there would always be between two great friendly rivals speaking the same language, but envy, jealousy, and a little harmless malice exist between States and cities of this

Union and between countries of the British Empire. Never since the War of the Revolution had a British flag been hoisted on an American official building till last spring, and never had the same friendly compliment been paid to the American flag in England. But now they have waved together over Washington's tomb and over the House of Commons. Also, it should be remembered that the Society of Pilgrims, whose work of international unity cannot be overestimated, has played a part in promoting understanding between the two peoples, and the establishment of the American Officers' Club in Lord Leconfield's house in London with H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught as president, has done, and is doing, immense good. It should also be remembered that it was the Pilgrims' Society, under the fine chairmanship of Mr. Harry Brittain, which took charge of the Hon. James M. Beck when he visited England in 1916, and gave him so good a chance to do great work for the cause of unity between the two nations. I am glad and proud to think that I had something to do with these arrangements which resulted in the Pilgrims taking Mr. Beck into their charge.

I have sometimes been amazed at the hostility to Great Britain in certain portions of the United States and among certain sections of the people. Perhaps the real cause of this misunderstanding—for it is nothing else—is ignorance or forgetfulness of the facts of history. It is true that George III. endeavored to impose upon the American people the Stamp Act, just as the kings of France and Spain and Holland had imposed upon their colonies impositions for revenue, but it should not be forgotten by any American that King George III. failed, not only in America, but in Great Britain, his own country. Among his greatest enemies in this wretched business were Pitt, Fox, Rockingham, and Shelburne, and the operations of war in the United States on behalf of England were conducted by German mercenaries and a handful of the British professional Army, of whom a great many officers of standing and eminence refused to serve. It was impossible to raise an army of volunteers in England, and King George dared not attempt to raise a conscript army. Pitt declared in the House of Commons, when America refused to submit to the Stamp Act, that he rejoiced she had resisted. There was as great a fight in the British Parliament over the American war as there was in America itself on the field of battle. There is no British man to-day who is not opposed to George III. in what was perhaps the most insane and unwise national task ever undertaken by a British king.

It must not be forgotten that Benjamin Franklin, the representative of the United States in Paris, was in constant correspondence with British statesmen during the Revolutionary War, and the leaders of the opposition to King George in the British House of Commons were eager to give to the United States, as she was given in 1783, a status as a nation and not a province on the seacoast. The United States was given the Northwest Territory and the basin of the Ohio River to the Mississippi, so making possible the wonderful extension of power which has given to the American national life forty-eight States instead of the thirteen which fought King George. It should also be

remembered that the Revolutionary War of the United States was a struggle of British men for rights which were being fought for in the British Parliament and against the last stand of British monarchical autocracy.

The United States is a warm friend of France, and properly so; but it must not be forgotten that the greatest enemy of American development was Napoleon Bonaparte, who considered all parliaments as chattering concerns, and, having grabbed from Spain the coast of the Gulf of Mexico, with New Orleans, the Middle West from the Mississippi to the Rockies, and established a base at Santo Domingo, ordered his Minister of Marine to furnish him with a full plan of conquest, and commanded the combined fleets of France and Spain to carry a French army to the shores of Louisiana. It must be remembered that the man who planned this maneuver was one of the greatest soldiers in history, and had an army which at that time was greater than any army in the world.

What saved the United States from this attack? Great Britain, and Great Britain only. The report of Mr. Rush, the American minister in London, contained the statement of Henry Addington, the British Prime Minister, that in case of war Great Britain would take and hold New Orleans for the United States. This is history. Who was the American President at the time? It was Thomas Jefferson, the great pacifist, whose firm despatch to Robert Livingston, in Paris, contained these words: 'The day that France takes possession of New Orleans we must marry ourselves to the British fleet and nation.' What was the result of this? Napoleon decided it was better to sell to the United States what would be certain to be lost, because he believed that the British fleet, supporting the United States, would take Louisiana from France—Louisiana, which he had forced from Spain.

The main cause of the War of 1812 was not the impressment of seamen from American boats by the Royal Navy, as is generally supposed, but the fact that both France and England had forbidden any neutral nation to trade with the other, and because of England's preponderating fleet she could make her blockade effective and Napoleon could not. The United States, therefore, joined what she considered the lesser of her enemies, France, in attacking the greater, England.

I have no doubt that many Americans regret the War of 1812 as most Britishers regret the acts of George III. which precipitated the Revolutionary War; but for nearly a hundred years the British Navy, and behind it the British Government, has been the best friend that the United States ever had in its history. What Lafayette did for the United States was great and good, and what Great Britain did in 1824 was, in one sense, greater and better. It was George Canning, the British Foreign Minister, who informed the American minister of the intention of the Holy Alliance to attack representative government in both hemispheres, and offered the assistance of the British fleet in defending institutions won by valor, devotion, and power. It is remarkable that, when the purpose of the Holy Alliance was made clear, that the high contracting powers should 'use all their efforts to

put an end to the system of representative government,' the Duke of Wellington immediately left the Congress at Verona. Soon after it was announced, Great Britain and the United States proclaimed that they could not see with indifference any South American territory transferred to any Power.

Then it was that the Monroe Doctrine became an accepted fact, but the United States could not have made it a fact unsupported and unprotected by the British Navy. It is no exaggeration to say that the policy and prosperity of the United States have had a free and fair run for over the last ninety years, because Great Britain, which had learned her great lesson in the American Revolutionary War, made her Navy the defender of the Monroe Doctrine. Perhaps the aged Jefferson's counsel to President Monroe on this matter is the best evidence of what I say. These were Jefferson's words:

The question presented by the letters you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence. . . . America, North and South, has a set of interests distinct from those of Europe. She should, therefore, have a system of her own, separate and apart from that of Europe.

One nation, most of all, could disturb us in this pursuit; she now offers to lead, aid, and accompany us in it. By acceding to her proposition, we detach her from the bands, bring her mighty weight into the scale of free government, and emancipate a continent at one stroke which might otherwise linger long in doubt and difficulty. Great Britain is the one nation which can do us the most harm of any one on all the earth; and with her on our side we need not fear the whole world. With her, then, we should most sedulously cherish a cordial friendship, and nothing would tend more to unite our affections than to be fighting once more, side by side, in the same cause.

It is wonderful to think that after these ninety-odd years the hope of Jefferson has been fulfilled. We are at last fighting once more 'side by side' in the same cause on the battle-fields of Europe, and against an enemy whose whole ambition has been to establish German control in the Western Hemisphere, as in Europe and in the East. No one knows better than President Wilson, who is a historian of high capacity, that what I say here is true. Monroe's letter to Jefferson, again quoted by Mr. Page, clearly indicates the initiative of Great Britain in the matter of the Monroe Doctrine. These are President Monroe's words:

They [two despatches from Mr. Rush, American minister in London] contain two letters from Mr. Canning suggesting designs of the Holy Alliance against the independence of South America, and proposing a cooperation between Great Britain and the United States in support of it against the members of that alliance. . . . My own impression is that we ought to meet the proposal of the British Government.

Well, the Monroe Doctrine has been a success, and, at the tomb of Washington, Mr. Arthur Balfour, in effect, reaffirmed the friendly doctrine of George Canning, in which the British nation has as much interest, and for

which it has as much honest affection, as the hundred millions of population of the United States.

I repeat that Great Britain is a friend of the United States in all that matters, and I believe that the present war, if it failed in everything else, will succeed in this it will bring shoulder to shoulder with a handclasp of understanding and a spirit of co-operation two great peoples without whom there is no real future for democracy in the world. The monarch of Great Britain has infinitely less power than the President of the United States, so far as the policy of his country is concerned. He is the head of the clan, as it were, the patriarch of the tribe, but his power is limited to a point where even Socialism says, 'This man cannot hurt his people politically; he can only hurt them socially and morally by his example.' It is impossible to discuss here the merits of our two systems of government; but one thing is clear, that the British Constitutional Monarchy is as democratic as the republican Constitution of the United States.

Of this thing I am sure: that the days of wilful misunderstanding between Great Britain and America are gone forever! And I like to think that when these banners of war are rolled up, and the terms of peace are signed, that the two most democratic nations on earth, the two most advanced in civilization and enterprise, will be working hand in hand for the political good of all the world.

For some months I saw the United States from many corners of the compass, and I state with unvexed confidence that a new spirit has entered the mind of the American people where Great Britain is concerned. They realize that England's severest critics are within her own borders; that her sternest monitors are patriotic Britons; and that the burdens she has borne in this struggle to preserve civilization from disruption are beyond all comparison with those of the other belligerents. The thousand years' traditions of Great Britain belong also to the United States, because the foundations of American liberty and freedom had their origin in the principles embedded in the British Constitution. That is why members of the British Empire to-day can be proud of Washington, glad of Alexander Hamilton and Jefferson and Adams and Franklin, and be the faithful friend of President Monroe, whose doctrine could never have become valid and continuous without the British Navy. I feel bold enough to say that there is not a home in Great Britain that is not happier because the United States, the chief republic of the earth, is linked with us in the struggle for freedom and the small nations.

I was in the United States when all the great missions of the Allies arrived— Great Britain, France, Italy, Russia, Belgium, and now Japan. *And now Japan!* I emphasize these words because east and west in the United States, in San Francisco, in New York and Washington, I had found until very lately the most consuming distrust of the Government at Tokio and the people of Japan. It is, however, comforting to think that this mission of friendship from Japan is the direct result of the Zimmerman note. Whatever

Japan's far purposes may be—laying aside all other considerations—it pays her better to be the friend of the Allies than the friend of Germany. I say it pays her better only because there are those who think that Japan in the politics of the world is out for gain. What could she gain by becoming the enemy of the United States, and, therefore, the enemy of England? Because, let this be understood, Japan knows her treaty of alliance with Great Britain does not include the possibility of war with the United States on the part of this Oriental Power. If Japan occupied the Pacific coast, her first immediate foe would be Great Britain, because British Columbia is on the Pacific coast, and Great Britain could not permit Japan or any other nation except the United States to seize or hold any portion of that littoral.

I believe that the anxieties of America have not been well based. I believe that the Japanese nation is as friendly to the United States as she is to Great Britain; and I also believe that, even on the lowest grounds of material benefit, Japan is true to her friendship with Great Britain and the Allies in this war. Far more dangerous is the German menace against the United States than the Japanese menace. And it must not be forgotten that the American Navy, whatever it is, exists to-day because Mr. William C. Whitney, the Secretary of the Navy in Mr. Cleveland's Cabinet, saw in German commercial invasion of South America a peril to the United States.

What the United States will do in this war is being shown from day to day—and this thing is sure, that even the German-American no longer believes that Germany is fighting a war of defense; but rather that she precipitated the war, and is only 'defending' herself because she failed in her first enterprise. I do not know to what extent the activity of the United States will expand, but I do know that if the war continues for another year the pinch of administration and losses in the field will stiffen the backs of the American people to the greatest effort that has ever been made in the history of the world."

Note that Parker, like "Colonel" House, advocated the instillation of a military dictator following a revolution (in Parker's case, in Russia) on the grounds that only a dictator could restore order. This was common practice in American and British foreign policy throughout the Twentieth Century. America installed many military dictators favorable to America and England. It justified the coup d'états by the notion that only a dictator could bring about a proposed democracy—a democracy that was often covertly suppressed by the intelligence agencies of both countries. The real goal was often to free up the natural resources and industry of the subject nation for exploitation by American and British corporations. "Lord Protector" Oliver Cromwell provided a model for the "logic" of installing a dictator in order to establish order.

Adolf Hitler expressed himself in an interview with Anne O'Hare McCormick published in *The New York Times* on 10 July 1933 on pages 1 and 6 in the same terms House used in his book on dictatorship. Hitler banned all political parties other than National Socialism, destroyed the parliament and passed the *Gleichschaltung*

and the *Ermächtigungsgesetz* laws, all in the name of restoring and maintaining order. This was a common tactic of Zionist dictators including Cromwell, Napoleon, Wilson and Hitler—and George Bush. When asked which historical figure he most admired, Caesar, Napoleon or Frederick the Great, Hitler responded,

“No, I admire Oliver Cromwell. I do not think the Commoner the greatest man that ever lived, but he saved England in a crisis similar to ours and saved it by obliterating Parliament and uniting the nation.”

Cromwell, under petition from the Marrano Jews Menasseh ben Israel, David Abrabanel, Abraham Israel Carvajal, Abraham Coen Gonzales, and Jahacob de Caceres, permitted Jews to re-enter England over the objections of the Parliament. Hitler used his dictatorial power, enhanced by Jewish financiers and in cooperation with political Zionists, to force Jews to leave Germany. England would not then take Europe’s Jews and it was the Zionists’ hope that England would give them Palestine, which it eventually did do.

In reality most dictators after the French Revolution followed the example of Maximilien Marie Isidore Robespierre. Revolutionary dictators committed mass murder in the fascist governments the C. I. A. created and sponsored around the world, and in the Bolshevik nations of Europe and Asia. It should not be forgotten that Hitler was a socialist revolutionary, who began his political career as a Bolshevik. Hitler and Goebbels called for a worker’s world revolution throughout the duration of the Nazi regime, and their speeches were often derivative of those of Trotsky (Bronstein). Apparently, the dictatorship of the proletariat could not be trusted to the proletariat and required an iron fisted tyrant in a totalitarian state. It is tragic that dictators promoted the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity in order to gain power, and then subjugated the masses, promoted ignorance and suppressed dissent through violent means. However, it was perfectly in keeping with the Messianic prophecies of Judaism.

5.6 Why Did the Zionists Trouble the Jews?

In 1903, racist Zionist Israel Zangwill stated that the Jews’ enemies were the Jews’ friends. Zangwill implied that anti-Semitism would rescue the Jewish race from fatal assimilation and that the Zionist conferences signaled the Messianic Era,

“ZIONISM AND THE FUTURE OF THE JEWS

THE SIXTH ZIONIST CONFERENCE GRAPPLING WITH
POLITICAL QUESTIONS — A PASSION FOR PALESTINE THE
JUDAIC ROMANCE — THE TENDENCY TOWARD
DENATIONALIZATION AND THE HOPE OF
RENATIONALIZATION.

BY

ISRAEL ZANGWILL

IN August the Sixth Zionist Congress met at Basle, and gathering strength with the years, and quickened by the horrors of Kishineff, this international Jewish parliament, numbering envoys from 'the four corners of the earth,' for the first time grappled with practical political proposals for the solution of the Jewish question. Delegates of South African millionaires took counsel with representatives of the rich American Jewry, and with these modern spirits conferred caftaned rabbis from Russia and sages from India and Persia. In the mere coming together of such an assembly the promised regathering of Israel is already literally accomplished. Eighteen centuries of dispersion have not succeeded in breaking the cohesion of the race; eighteen centuries of exile have not eliminated the passion for Palestine.

Here, surely, is a phenomenon unique in history. It may be profitable to examine briefly into the causes and conditions of this apparent miracle.

I

There is a many-sided symbolism in the dramatic picture of Jochanan ben Zakkai escaping from Jerusalem in a coffin, what time Titus and his legions hovered at the gates of the Holy City. For Jochanan bore in his own breast the seeds of the future, and saved Judaism from the fall of the Jewish State. The zealots of nationality preferred to meet the conquering Roman with grim suicide; Jochanan founded a school at Jamnia, under the protection of Titus. That disentanglement of religion from a *locale* which Jesus had effected for the world at large was in a minor degree effected, a generation after Him, for the Jews themselves by the mailed hand of Titus and the insight of the prudent sage. Possibly Jochanan had already outgrown 'the burnt offerings' which tied Judaism to the Temple; he may have felt already that Israel's greatness was spiritual, belonged to a category of force that could not, and should not, be measured against Rome's material might. However this be, his reconstruction of the Synhedrion, even in the absence of the hewn-stone hall of the Temple for it to meet in, and the subsequent conversion of the substantial sacrifices into offerings of prayer, made the salvage of Judaism more spiritual than the original totality. The unifying centre was no longer geographical, and the Jews became 'the People of the Book' in a far profounder sense than when they were the people of a soil, too. The law was never so obeyed in Bible times as it was when the record of these times became the all-in-all.

But this transformation was not achieved in one generation, nor without violent reactions. Scarce half a century after Jochanan ben Zakkai, the great rebel, Bar-Kochba (Son of a Star), beat back for a time the whole might of Rome, even the great general, Severus (hastily summoned from his task of quelling the less important revolt in Britain). And in the monstrous régime of religious persecution by which Hadrian avenged the difficult suppression of the uprising, the transformation of Judaism might well have been into paganism.

Nor was the transformation into mere spiritual Judaism ever effected

radically. Two reactionary influences remained. Palestine still retained a certain authority over the Diaspora. Babylon soon asserted itself as the peer of Jerusalem, and later, with the movement of history and the great teachers, the spiritual hegemony shifted to Spain, to Cairo, to Poland. But underneath all this flux Jerusalem was still the Holy City. Secondly, the literary ritual substituted for the literal sacrifices did not profess to be more than a temporary necessity. The stubborn national spirit clung to the hope of glorious restoration. Rachel wept for her children, and comforted herself by the belief that they were not dead, but sleeping. As little as possible was changed of a liturgy enrooted in the Holy Soil, and thus it came to pass that in the narrow, sunless, stony streets of European ghettos shambling students and peddlers offered metaphorical first-fruits in ingenious lyrics, and celebrated the ancient harvest festival of Palestine in pious acrostics. Never was there such an example of the dominance of the word. Life was replaced by Literature. What wonder if the love of Zion grew mainly literary, so that even the passion of a Jehuda Halvei for Palestine has been dubbed more of the passion of a troubadour for a visionary mistress than a patriotism with its roots in reality.

Fantastic and factitious though this love of Zion was, yet, supplemented by eschatological superstitions, it made Jerusalem still the mystic City of God, still the capital of the Millennium, still the symbol of Israel's misery and Israel's ultimate regeneration. And, to this day, in the ghettos of New York and Philadelphia, the 'messenger of Zion' may be met on the trolley car, going his rounds, collecting the humble cents which enable graybeards to pore over moth-eaten Talmuds in the Holy City.

Thus, although Jerusalem has remained throughout the entire Christian era in the hand of foreign conquerors, the Jews have always retained some sense of being colonists whose mother city was in Asia. Some day it would be their own city again—but in God's good time, in a whirl of miracles! Hence, except under the ephemeral inspiration of pseudo-Messiahs, Zionism was never a matter of practical politics: it was a shadowy, poetic ideal, outside life; a romantic reminiscence. Old men went to Jerusalem to die—not to live. Its earth was imported—but to be placed in coffins. In practice, Jews have always been ardently attached to the country of their birth, and if they have seemed to remain apart, Ezra and Nehemiah are largely responsible, those zealots (more Mosaic than Moses) who stamped out marriages with other peoples, even when the strangers accepted Judaism. The very rabbis of the Talmud could not endorse this principle of compulsory mutual intermarriage, yet in practice it became the rule, and an institution designed in the fifth century before Christ to preserve the religion served in the Dark Ages of Christendom to preserve the race. Religion and race have, indeed, come to seem one and the same thing. And against this people, already doubly cut off from mankind, the Christian raised his material wall of separation, and created the ghetto.

But the ghetto fell at last, and separatist legislation tottered, and

emancipation brought another development. With the liberal movements of the eighteenth century, Jews began to form part of the general life. The aspiration for Palestine was felt to be incongruous, even as a far-off religious ideal. Again it was proclaimed—by Moses Mendelssohn this time—that Judaism is larger than a land: that its future realm must be that of spiritual conquest. But in America, whither this doctrine spread in its broadest form, it was not followed by its logical outcome—by marriage outside the faith and the welcome of converts. Jewish life in the United States, instead of becoming expansive and spiritual, has drawn itself together in secular clubs. In Australia, on the other hand, where orthodoxy is still the professed creed, outside marriage has become frequent. In Germany, the notion that modern Judaism and Christianity are not very far apart has led many to baptism. A large minority everywhere—cultured, or rich, or callous—has succumbed to the general indifferentism of the modern world.

Thus, today Israel is face to face with a menace of disintegration more formidable than the legions of Titus.

To read the history of Israel is like reading a romance of perilous adventure written in the first person. Again and again the hero may be divided from death by a hair's breadth, yet we know that he will always come through safely, since is he not here, narrating? During the thirty centuries or so of his national existence, Israel has been perpetually stumbling on the verge of the abyss of annihilation, yet always he has recovered his footing. But Israel's serial is 'to be continued,' and who can say it will not 'end happily' after all?

II

As the century of Israel's disintegration closes, however, a new phenomenon meets our astonished eyes. It is 'Zionism.'

Zionism, in its latest official exposition, aims at securing a public legally assured home in Palestine for those Jews who are unable or unwilling to assimilate. It is not the movement that George Eliot's Mordecai dreamed, nor that which Rabbi Mohilewer of Russia initiated. The advent of Doctor Herzl has stamped Zionism with 'modernity.' In the Austrian journalist's first published scheme of a Jewish State, indeed, Palestine played no necessary part. Herzl, whose instrument of national regeneration is the bank, for dealing with the Sultan and subsidizing the selected immigrants, was never, despite the date of his advent, *fin de siecle* (which seems to imply a certain flippancy), but prophetically twentieth century. He would, if it were possible, lead back his people to Palestine by the moving sidewalk of the Paris Exposition. Withal a charming, magnetic, even poetic personality, a more diplomatic and domesticated Lassalle.

But the deeper issues and sequels of the movement will develop themselves with the material success, and the present leaders might quite conceivably be swept away by spiritual floods they have themselves let loose. The Orthodox Jewish Congregational Union of America, at the convention of June 8, 1898, while maintaining that 'the restoration to Zion

is the legitimate aspiration of scattered Israel,' likewise declared, 'we reaffirm our belief in the coming of a personal Messiah.' The agents of political Zionism—men like Max Nordau, or Mandelstamm, the great Russian oculist, or Marmorek, of the Pasteur Institute—can no more control the religious future of Judaism than they can control the mystic interpretation which Christendom would put upon their success. Men are only instruments. And each must do the work he sees to hand.

At present, though orthodox rabbis are working amicably with ultra-modern thinkers, the movement is political, and more indebted to the pressure of the external forces of persecution than to internal energy and enkindlement. Yet in truth could any but a political cause unite the Jew of the East with the Jew of the West? And, viewed merely on its prosaic side, Zionism is by no means a visionary scheme. The aggregation of Jews in Palestine is only a matter of time—already they form a third of its population—and it is better that they should be aggregated there under their own laws and religion and the mild suzerainty of the Sultan than under the semi-barbarous restrictions of Russia or Rumania, and exposed to recurrent popular outbreaks. True, Palestine is a ruined country, and the Jews are a broken people. But neither is beyond recuperation. Palestine needs a people; Israel needs a country. If, in regenerating the Holy Land, Israel could regenerate itself, how should the world be other than the gainer? In the solution of the problem of Asia which has succeeded the problem of Africa, Israel might play no significant part. Already the colony of Rishon le Zion has obtained a gold medal for its wines from the Paris Exposition—which is not prejudiced in the Jew's favor. We may be sure the spiritual wine of Judea would again pour forth likewise—that precious vintage which the world has drunk for so many centuries. And, as the scientific activities of the colonization societies would have paved the way for the pastoral and commercial future of Israel in its own country, so would the rabbinical sing-song in musty rooms prove to have been but the unconscious preparation of the ages for the Jerusalem University.

But Palestine belongs to the Sultan, and the Sultan refuses to grant the coveted Judean Charter, even for dangled millions. Is not this fatal? No; it matters as little as that the Zionists could not pay the millions, if suddenly called upon. They have collected not two and a half million dollars. But there are millionaires enough to come to the rescue once the charter was dangled before the Zionists. It is not likely that the Rothschilds would see themselves ousted from their familiar headship in authority and well-doing. Nor would the millions left by Baron Hirsch be altogether withheld. And the Sultan's present refusal is equally unimportant because a national policy is independent of transient moods and transient rulers. The only aspect that really matters is whether Israel's face be or be not set steadily Zionward—for decades, and even for centuries. Much less turns on the Sultan's mind than on Doctor Herzl's. Will he lose patience? For leaders like Herzl are not born in every century.

III

Apart from its political working, Zionism forces upon the Jew a question the Jew hates to face.

Without a rallying centre, geographical or spiritual; without a Synhedrion; without any principle of unity or of political action; without any common standpoint about the old Book; without the old cement of dictory laws and traditional ceremonies; without even ghetto walls built by his friend the enemy, it is impossible for Israel to persist further, except by a miracle—of stupidity.

It is a wretched thing for a people to be saved only by its persecutors or its fools. As a religion, Judaism has still magnificent possibilities, but the time has come when it must be denationalized or renationalized.”⁸⁹⁵

Racist Zionists were troubled by the fact that the Jews of Western Europe and America were assimilating into Gentile society. The Zionists feared that within a few generations the “Jewish race” would become impure and then extinct. Kerensky immediately emancipated the Jews after the Russian Revolution of 1917, and Lenin made anti-Semitism an offense punishable by death.⁸⁹⁶ This opened the door to Jewish assimilation in the East and the further dilution of holy Jewish blood.

The Zionists believed that if they could form a racist apartheid “Jewish State” they could preserve the integrity of the “Jewish race”. However, most Jews were not Zionists and few Jews were foolish enough to abandon their homes around the world and move to the desert in order to gratify the Rothschilds’ desires to become King of the Jews. Most Jews did not oblige the racist Jews’ desire to segregate them from the rest of humanity.

The Zionists believed that the only hope they had to keep the Jews segregated and to preserve the “Jewish race” was to put a virulently anti-Semitic dictator in charge of Europe, who would remind the Jews that they were Jews and force them into segregation so that they could then be forcibly expelled to Palestine.

5.6.1 The Zionist Myth of the Extinction of the “Jewish Race” Through Philo-Semitism and Assimilation

Hitler’s propaganda asserted that both Capitalism and Communism were Jewish conspiracies to rule the world—Capitalism through alleged Jewish monopolies, high finance and decadence, and Communism through alleged Jewish revolution which destroyed the fabric of Western Civilization. Most Communists saw Socialism as an intermediary stage between Capitalism and the alleged true democracy of Communism. As an ideology, National Socialism, itself a socialist revolutionary movement, had much more in common with Communism than it did with Capitalism. Hitler was not bent on destroying Socialism, but rather promoting it in the undemocratic form of pure and final nationalistic racist Fascism—much like the Zionist David Ben-Gurion; and Hitler was determined that Germans should lead the world revolution as its alleged natural masters—much like Ben-Gurion’s call for Jews to lead the world revolution, as God allegedly intended. *Racism* was the

primary *ism* in Hitler's propaganda. For him, the state's primary function was the preservation of the "race". Much like racist Zionist Moses Hess, Hitler believed that the democratic and artificially international aspirations of Communism made it weak and diminished individual greatness for the sake of a sentimental and self-defeating idealism that largely only resulted in the "degeneration" of "pure" races. Hitler, like Stalin, wanted the masses to be uneducated and subjugated. He believed the masses are destined to be led, not to lead.

Max Planck was one of many leading scientists who dreaded Hitler's attacks on the German educational system. It seemed Hitler was out to destroy Germany by undermining the future of its youth and by leading Germany into perpetual war with nation after nation under the worst of conditions with almost no hope of ultimate victory. The Zionists had long hoped to destroy Germany, in which Jewish assimilation found its most comfortable home. Hitler provided the horrific stimulus which led a significant number of Jews into Zionism, a goal the Zionists, Christian and Jew, had not until then achieved, and which had remained as the only stumbling block to the fulfilment of their Apocalyptic dreams of a "restored" Israel—they did not care about what the majority of Jews wanted for themselves—as David Ben-Gurion stated in 1944 in the darkest days of the Holocaust in full knowledge that European Jewry (the Eastern "Red Assimilationist" and Western "rich assimilationist" Jews Ben-Gurion hated) had been decimated by the Nazis,

"One Degania [resident of the first communal settlement of Zionists in Palestine] is worth more than all the 'Yevsektzias' [Jewish Bolsheviks who sought to secularize Jews] and assimilationists in the world."⁸⁹⁷

In 1937—one year before *Kristallnacht*, Zionist Chaim Weizmann had fatalistically welcomed the idea that "only a remnant shall survive" and had called "The old ones[. . .] dust, economic and moral dust in a cruel world."⁸⁹⁸ *Amos* 9:8-10 states,

"8 Behold, the eyes of the Lord GOD *are* upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth; saving that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith the LORD. 9 For, lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as *corn* is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth. 10 All the sinners of my people shall die by the sword, which say, The evil shall not overtake nor prevent us."

See also: Isaiah 1:9; 6:9-13; 10:20-22; 11:11-12; 17:6; 37:31-33; 41:9; 42; 43; 44. *Ezekiel* 20:38; 25:14. *Daniel* 12:1, 10. *Obadiah* 1:18. *Micah* 5:8. *Romans* 9:27-28; 11:1-5. Zionist Nazis provided the Palestinian Zionists with a screen with which to sift out the assimilationist and Orthodox Jews of Continental Europe, and a sword with which to kill them.

Zionists feared that Capitalism was leading wealthy Jews to assimilate and that Communism would provide Jews with a sanctuary in which they would assimilate.

Some had already argued in 1917 that the Russian Revolution made Zionism obsolete—a thought that terrified Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann, who otherwise had Socialist leanings. *The New York Times* reported on 23 December 1917 on page 7,

“JERUSALEM FOR IDEALISTS.

Rev. Dr. Harris Discusses Effect of
Its Capture on Zionism.

The cause of Zionism as promoted by the capture of Jerusalem by the British was discussed by the Rev. Dr. Maurice H. Harris at the Temple Israel in Harlem yesterday.

‘There will be less need now of a Jewish homeland,’ said Dr. Harris, ‘because the days of Jewish persecution are over. Whatever may happen in Russia and Rumania, we are satisfied that the era of the pale of settlement, anti-Jewish laws and pogroms has come to an end. Palestine will not appeal to the enterprising on economic grounds, although it is offering opportunities to the farmers in the cultivation of oranges, barley, and olive oil. New harbors have been planned at Jaffa and Haifa, and a new railway is being carried to Port Said. With intensive cultivation, Palestine could maintain a population of 2,000,000 where there reside now but 600,000. But opportunities such as these can be found elsewhere and in greater abundance in this great Western Continent of North and South America.

‘The Jew who bends his steps to Judea today will be the idealist who feels that ‘not on bread alone doth man live.’ He will not go there to make money, but because it is the Holy City. Jerusalem is still a name to conjure with. This great offer, whatever be its ultimate form, whether a dependent colony or an independent State, will enable our brethren to create for themselves a wholly Jewish environment. No longer a small minority living more or less on sufferance among an overwhelming majority of alien faiths, they will be able to impress their particular genius on the institutions of the country that will become theirs.’”

Even before World War I, racist Zionist Israel Zangwill voiced his concern that the emancipation of Russian Jews would lead to the “degeneration” of the Jewish race through interbreeding with allegedly inferior Slavs. Zangwill reiterated the common political Zionist theme, which alleged that anti-Semitism benefits Jews by maintaining their racial purity, and that philo-Semitism among Gentiles is destructive to the “Jewish race”. Zangwill wrote in his booklet *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judean Publishing Company, New York, (1914), pages 7-8, 10-11, and 17-20,

“But if from the Gentile point of view the Jewish problem is an artificial creation, there is a very real Jewish problem from the Jewish point of view—a problem which grows in exact proportion to the diminution of the artificial problem. Orthodox Judaism in the diaspora cannot exist except in

a Ghetto, whether imposed from without or evolved from within. Rigidly professing Jews cannot enter the general social life and the professions. Jews *qua* Jews were better off in the Dark Ages, living as chattels of the king under his personal protection and to his private profit, or in the ages when they were confined in Ghettos. Even in the Russian Pale a certain measure of autonomy still exists. It is emancipation that brings the 'Jewish Problem.' It is precisely in Italy with its Jewish Prime Minister and its Jewish Syndic of Rome that this problem is most acute. The Saturday Sabbath imposes economic limitations even when the State has abolished them. As Shylock pointed out, his race cannot eat or drink with the Gentile. Indeed, social intercourse would lead to intermarriage. Unless Judaism is reformed it is, in the language of Heine, a misfortune, and if it is reformed, it cannot logically confine its teachings to the Hebrew race, which, lacking the normal protection of a territory, must be swallowed up by its proselytes. [***] Nor is there anywhere in the Jewish world of to-day any centripetal force to counteract these universal tendencies to dissipation. The religion is shattered into as many fragments as the race. After the fall of Jerusalem the Academy of Jabneh carried on the authoritative tradition of the *Sanhedrin*. In the Middle Ages there was the *Asefah* or Synod to unify Jews under Judaism. From the middle of the sixteenth to the middle of the eighteenth century, the *Waad* or Council of Four Lands legislated almost autonomously in those Central European regions where the mass of the Jews of the world was then congregated. To-day there is no center of authority, whether religious or political. Reform itself is infinitely individual, and nothing remains outside a few centers of congestion but a chaos of dissolving views and dissolving communities, saved from utter disappearance by persecution and racial sympathy. The notion that Jewish interests are Jesuitically federated or that Jewish financiers use their power for Jewish ends is one of the most ironic of myths. No Jewish people or nation now exists, no Jews even as sectarians of a specific faith with a specific center of authority such as Catholics or Wesleyans possess; nothing but a multitude of individuals, a mob hopelessly amorphous, divided alike in religion and political destiny. There is no common platform from which the Jews can be addressed, no common council to which any appeal can be made. Their only unity is negative—that unity imposed by the hostile hereditary vision of the ubiquitous Haman. [***] The labors of Hercules sink into child's play beside the task the late Dr. Herzl set himself in offering to this flotsam and jetsam of history the project of political reorganization on a single soil. But even had this dauntless idealist secured co-operation instead of bitter hostility from the denaturalized leaders of all these Jewries, the attempt to acquire Palestine would have had the opposition of Turkey and of the 600,000 Arabs in possession. It is little wonder that since the great leader's lamentable death, Zionism—again with that idealization of impotence—has sunk back into a cultural movement which instead of ending the Exile is to unify it through the Hebrew tongue and nationalist sentiment. But for such unification, a religious revival would

have been infinitely more efficacious: race alone cannot survive the pressure of so many hostile milieux—or still more parlous—so many friendly. [***] In the diaspora anti-Semitism will always be the shadow of Semitism. The law of dislike for the unlike will always prevail. And whereas the unlike is normally situated at a safe distance, the Jews bring the unlike into the heart of every milieu and must thus defend a frontier-line as large as the world. The fortunes of war vary in every country, but there is a perpetual tension and friction even at the most peaceful points, which tend to throw back the race on itself. The drastic method of love—the only human dissolvent—has never been tried upon the Jew as a whole, and Russia carefully conserves—even by a ring fence—the breed she designs to destroy. But whether persecution extirpates or brotherhood melts, hate or love can never be simultaneous throughout the diaspora, and so there will probably always be a nucleus from which to restock this eternal type. But what a melancholy immortality! ‘To be *and* not to be’—that is a question beside which Hamlet’s alternative is crude. [***] But abolition of the Pale and the introduction of Jewish equality will be the deadliest blow ever aimed at Jewish nationality. Very soon a fervid Russian patriotism will reign in every Ghetto and the melting-up of the race will begin. But this absorption of the five million Jews into the other hundred and fifty millions of Russia constitutes the Jewish half of the problem. It is the affair of the Jews. [***] Moreover, while as already pointed out the Jewish upper classes are, if anything, inferior to the classes into which they are absorbed, the marked superiority of the Jewish masses to their environment, especially in Russia, would render *their* absorption a tragic degeneration.”

As early as 1903, Zangwill wrote,

“At present, though orthodox rabbis are working amicably with ultra-modern thinkers, the movement is political, and more indebted to the pressure of the external forces of persecution than to internal energy and enkindlement. [***] Apart from its political working, Zionism forces upon the Jew a question the Jew hates to face. Without a rallying centre, geographical or spiritual; without a Synhedrion; without any principle of unity or of political action; without any common standpoint about the old Book; without the old cement of dictory laws and traditional ceremonies; without even ghetto walls built by his friend the enemy, it is impossible for Israel to persist further, except by a miracle—of stupidity. It is a wretched thing for a people to be saved only by its persecutors or its fools. As a religion, Judaism has still magnificent possibilities, but the time has come when it must be denationalized or renationalized.”⁸⁹⁹

Zangwill was not alone in his beliefs. Racist Zionist Ignatz Zollschan worried that intermarriage and the emancipation of Russian Jews would tragically put an end to the “Jewish race”. Zollschan stated at least as early as 1914,

“These four classes, however, which I have attempted to portray with a few bold strokes, are not fixed groups, but cross-cuts at different positions, of a constantly flowing stream whose source to-day is in orthodox Judaism of eastern Europe, and which wends its way into the sea of Christianity. The process of infiltration of modern culture into Judaism goes on incessantly, and in the same manner, orthodox Judaism constantly yields to the members of the second tolerant class. The latter gradually yields to the class of reformers and freethinkers, and finally baptism, and especially intermarriage, leads the Jews to Christianity. These four classes can also be represented as four consecutive generations. Four or five generations intervene between our own age and the time of Mendelssohn. It is a melancholy reflection, that hardly one of the Jews who lived at that time in Berlin has any Jewish descendants.

This process would also assume equally large dimensions in Russia, if the Jews were granted equal rights and if the Pale of Settlement were removed. The amelioration of the material conditions would remove the Ghetto environment which is one of the factors in preserving orthodox Judaism. But still more important would be the elimination of the second factor, namely, the keeping together of the Jews in one compact mass. If it were possible for the Russian Jews to spread themselves over the immense Russian Empire, the Jewish population in that country would not be denser than in western Europe. Thereby the progressive changes which exercise their destructive influences upon the western Jews would also apply to their Russian brethren. For the country that is more developed, serves as a picture of the future of the one that is less developed. Accordingly, eastern Jews will after some time apparently find themselves in the same position as the western Jews are to-day.

We may epitomise our conclusions from the processes described above, as follows: When the Jews in the diaspora became prosperous, assimilation which appears on the scene takes them away more or less from Judaism. It is mainly when they are oppressed, when they are in economically unfavorable conditions, that the Ghetto environment, in its old sense, is still retained. And although conditions to-day are not favorable in all countries, the beginning of this development can be recognized everywhere. Under favorable material conditions, and through the prevalence of secular education, Judaism, on account of its being scattered among nations of an alien race, is in danger of being disintegrated and destroyed, since the influence of ceremonial religion is waning.”⁹⁰⁰

Jabotinsky advocated a racist *Blut und Boden* policy, before Hitler. In 1904, racist Zionist Vladimir Jabotinsky wrote, arguing that emancipation in Russia without the formation of a Jewish state would be a mistake and that he would rather see the Jews in a Ghetto, than see the Jews emancipated without a Jewish state,

“[I]t is clear that the source of national feeling to be sought not in a man’s

education. And what is that? I contemplated this question and arrived at the conclusion that it lies in a man's blood. And I abide by this outlook even at present. That feeling of national ego is deeply ingrained in a man's 'blood'; in his racio-physical type, and in that alone. We do not believe that the independent spirit lies in the body; we believe that a man's spiritual outlooks are primarily determined by his physical structure. No education—neither the family or the surroundings, can transform a man on whom nature has bestowed a calm temperament into a stormy and tempestuous character and vice versa. The spiritual structure of a people reflects the physical type in a more pronounced and full-form than the spiritual outlook of the individual. The nation molds its national and spiritual character in that it adapts that character to its physical-racial type, and no other spiritual outlook on the basis of the physical type is possible. From the point of view of customs and manners, form of life changes of course as time goes on, but the national ego is to be traced not in customs and manner. And when we speak of the structure of a spiritual ego, we obviously have in mind something deeper. This something expresses itself at different times in various external manifestations, dependent on the period and on the social surroundings, but this 'something' in itself remains unchanged and immutable so long as the physical-racial type is preserved. For that reason we do not believe in spiritual assimilation. It is unconceivable, from the physical point of view, that a Jew born to a family of pure Jewish blood over several generations can become adapted to the spiritual outlooks of a German or a Frenchman. A Jew brought up among Germans may assume German customs, German words. He may be wholly imbued with that German fluid but the nucleus of his spiritual structure will always remain Jewish, because his blood, his body, his physical-racial type are Jewish. The basic features of his spirit are a reflection of the basic traits of his body. And a man whose body is Jewish cannot possibly mold within himself the soul of a Frenchman. The spiritual assimilation of peoples whose blood is different is impossible of effectuation. It is impossible for a man to become assimilated with people whose blood is different from his own. In order to become truly assimilated he must change his body. He must become one of them in blood. In other words, he must bring into the world through a whole string of mixed marriages, over a period of many scores of years, a great-great-grandson in whose veins only a minute trace of Jewish blood has remained, for only that great-great-grandson will be a true Frenchman or a true German by his spiritual structure. There is no other way. So long as we are Jews in blood, the sons of a Jewish father and mother, we may lie open to oppression, degradation and degeneration but not to the dangers of assimilation in the true sense of the word—assimilation in the sense of a complete disappearance of our spiritual ego. Such danger does not threaten us. There can be no assimilation so long as there is no mixed marriage. But the moment that the number of mixed marriages is on the increase, and account for the majority of marriages, only then will the children be half Jews in blood and so the first breach will be created for the

inception of true and complete assimilation which can never be remedied. An increase in the number of mixed marriages is the only sure and infallible means for the destruction of nationality as such. All the nations that have disappeared in the world (apart from those, of course, who were completely massacred or who disappeared as a result of abnormal conditions of existence) were swallowed up in the chasm of mixed marriages. [***] In the First place, they said the Jews, at any rate in Russia, densely populate certain towns so that there is no ground to believe that they will all arise and scatter over the length and breadth of Russia when they will be allowed to do so. Large Jewish masses will remain living within the present 'pale of residence' and there they will by no means be such a negligible minority which will necessarily lead to an overwhelming increase of mixed marriages. I should like to reply to this argument as follows: Even at present, the Jews constitute only about 14% of the general population in the 'pale of residence.' If the gates of exit should be opened, this percentage would obviously be considerably reduced through emigration to other regions. True, the Jews constitute a much larger percentage of the urban population, nonetheless they are a minority also there. However, with the industrial development of the country, the stream of large numbers from the villages to the towns will increase, so as to double, or perhaps treble the number of non-Jewish residents in the towns, with the result that the Jews are likely to become a minority even in Berditchev. [***] [Y]our call will lead to the ancient grave of assimilation[.]”⁹⁰¹

Before Zollschan, Zangwill and Jobotinsky, Communist Zionist Nachman Syrkin worried that Liberalism and Socialism were murdering the Jewish nation through assimilation. He feared that liberty, equality and fraternity led to a patriotic spirit in Jews for nations other than Israel. Syrkin dreaded the process of assimilation, which he saw stemming from the emancipation of Jews in the French Revolution and Napoleon's conquests, and accelerated by the loss of religiosity of the modern Jews of his day, as well as by Jewish involvement in Socialism. Indeed, Napoleon at one point appeared to mandate assimilation.⁹⁰² Syrkin advocated, “a true Jewish socialism, free of every servile trace of assimilation.”⁹⁰³ Syrkin stated in 1898, long before “Red Assimilation” in the Soviet Union became a reality,

“To the Jewish socialists, socialism meant, first of all, the abandonment of Jewishness, just as the liberalism of the Jewish bourgeoisie led to assimilation. And yet, this tendency to deny their Jewishness was unnecessary, being prompted by neither socialism nor liberalism. It was a product of the general degeneration and demoralization of the Jews; Judaism was dropped because it conferred no benefits in the new world of free competition.”⁹⁰⁴

The Zionists crafted an alleged tautology of Jewish options in the age of enlightenment in order to justify their pre-existent racial prejudice. Non-Zionist Jews

argued that the enlightenment would eventually end anti-Semitism. Zionists promoted anti-Semitic agitation to prevent the assimilation they believed followed from the enlightenment and emancipation. Moshe Leib Lilienblum succinctly iterated the three option theme of the Zionists at least as early as 1883:

“1. *To remain in our present state, to be oppressed forever, to be gypsies, to face the prospect of various pogroms and not be safe even against a major holocaust* [Note the term—**CJB**].

2. *To assimilate, not merely externally but completely within the nations among whom we dwell: to forsake Judaism for the religions of the gentiles, but nonetheless to be despised for many, many years, until some far-off day when descendants of ours who no longer retain any trace of their Jewish origin will be entirely assimilated among the Aryans.*

3. *To initiate our efforts for the renaissance of Israel in the land of its forefathers, where the next few generations may attain, to the fullest extent, a normal national life.*

Make your choice!”⁹⁰⁵

The Zionists saw the Nazis as their salvation. Since most Jews were choosing assimilationist option number two after the First World War, option three could only be achieved through option number one. Lenni Brenner wrote,

“Only the defeat of Nazism could have helped the Jews, and that could only have happened if they had united with the anti-Nazi working class on a programme of militant resistance. But this was anathema to the ZVfD [Zionist Federation of Germany] leadership who, in 1932, when Hitler was gaining strength by the day, chose to organise anti-Communist meetings to warn Jewish youth against ‘red assimilation’.”⁹⁰⁶

Karl Kautsky wrote in the second edition of *Rasse und Judentum*, published in English as *Are the Jews a Race?*, Chapter 11, “Pure Races and Mixed Races”, International Publishers, New York, (1926):

“WE cannot take leave of Zionism before discussing another one of its arguments, its last argument, which will lead us back to the question of race.

It may appear to be a paradox, but it is a fact, that not a few Jews look with some misgiving on the emancipation of the Jews in Eastern Europe. They understand, and rightly so, that this emancipation will extend into the east of Europe the assimilation of the Jews that has been going on in the west for some time. For when the artificial exclusiveness of the Jews is terminated, when the ghetto ceases to exist, their assimilation will become everywhere inevitable.”

In 1922, Max Grunwald addressed Kautsky’s work and reviewed several racial theories of Zionism in a series of articles, “Rasse, Volk, Nation” in the Jewish

newspaper *Die Wahrheit* (Wien/Vienna).⁹⁰⁷

Kautsky noted in 1914 that the Zionists depended on the anti-Semite Houston Stewart Chamberlain for their racist Zionist ideology; referring to racist political Zionist Ignaz Zollschan's book *Das Rassenproblem unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der theoretischen Grundlagen der jüdischen Rassenfrage*, W. Braumüller, Wien, (1910). Constantine Brunner later emphasized the same point. Zollschan called for a "World Ghetto" (Theodor Herzl's phrase⁹⁰⁸) in Palestine in order to preserve the alleged racial purity of Jews. Though criticized by Kautsky, Zollschan's stance was lauded by the anti-Semitic segregationist Heinrich Class in 1912, further evincing the long-standing alliance between anti-Semites and Zionists,

"The Jews are members of an alien race who, despite partaking in the blessings of our culture, have not become Germans; they cannot do so in consequence of a fundamentally different outlook. Whoever sees Jews in this way will welcome the fact that among the Jews themselves a nationalistic movement, so-called Zionism, is gaining more and more adherents. We can only respect the Zionists. They admit openly and honestly that their nation is a nation whose basic traits are unalterable, surviving almost two thousand years of statelessness among other nations. They declare unconditionally that a real assimilation of the Jewish foreigners to the host peoples is impossible because of the natural law of race. This law is stronger than the outward will to adapt to the conditions of a foreign environment.

The Zionists fully confirm what those who oppose the Jews on the standpoint of race have long maintained. Even though they are but a small troop in relation to the totality of their racial comrades, the truth that they proclaim can no longer be condemned to silence. *German and Jewish nationalists are of one opinion when it comes to the ineradicability of the Jewish race. Who will then contest the right of the Germans to draw the necessary political consequences?*"⁹⁰⁹

Lenni Brenner noted,

"What was needed was a popular Zionist version of the social-Darwinism which had swept the bourgeois intellectual world in the wake of Europe's imperial conquests in Africa and the East. The Zionist version of this notion was developed by the Austrian anthropologist Ignatz Zollschan. To him the secret value of Judaism was that it had, albeit inadvertently, worked to produce a wonder of wonders:

a nation of pure blood, not tainted by diseases of excess or immorality, of a highly developed sense of family purity, and of deeply rooted virtuous habits would develop an exceptional intellectual activity. Furthermore, the prohibition against mixed marriage provided that these highest ethnical treasures should not be lost, through the admixture of less carefully bred races. . . there

resulted that natural selection which has no parallel in the history of the human race. . . If a race that is so highly gifted were to have the opportunity of again developing its original power, nothing could equal it as far as cultural value is concerned.”⁹¹⁰

Kautsky predicted that the Jews would disappear due to their assimilation following World War I, which emancipated the Jews of Russia. The First World War, which the Zionists planned would fulfill their dream of a Jewish state, instead rendered it obsolete, and they were the only group that had a vested interest in promoting discord in Europe, anti-Semitism and the segregation and expulsion of Jews. Others had learned that the emigration of large numbers of Jews from their country resulted in economic hardship, so the Zionists unwisely promised profits for all from racism. In 1881, the Nihilist Jews murdered Czar Alexander II, the great emancipator. Konstantine Petrovitch Pobiedonostsev (*also*: Constantin Pobedonostzeff), a man of Jewish appearance, won the favor of Alexander III and “retaliated” with pogroms against the Jews, which, while certainly bad, were exaggerated in the international press. The alleged Czarist persecution of the Jews was used as a reason to sponsor the emigration of Jews to the West, which had a negative impact on the Russian economy. The Jewish population in the United States steadily rose from 200,000 in 1880, to several million by 1920. These were “Polish Jews” from the old Polish Empire, which had since been taken over by Russia—after the Shabbataian and Frankist Jews had largely destroyed Poland. The Sephardic and German Jews, who had settled in America, did not like these Eastern Jews, and sponsored legislation to prevent them from entering the country. They considered them to be of an inferior race and disposition, and would not intermarry with them.⁹¹¹

Albert Einstein’s racist anti-assimilationist beliefs hailed from an ancient Jewish tradition of racism. Simon Dubnow wrote in 1905,

“Assimilation is common treason against the banner and ideals of the Jewish people. [***] But one can never ‘become’ a member of a natural group, such as a family, a tribe, or a nation. One may attain the rights or privileges of citizenship with a foreign nation, but one cannot appropriate for himself its nationality too. To be sure, the emancipated Jew in France calls himself a Frenchman of Jewish faith. Would that mean, however, that he became a part of the French nation, confessing to the Jewish faith? Not at all. Because, in order to be a member of the French nation one must be a Frenchman by birth, one must be able to trace his genealogy back to the Gauls, or to another race in close kinship with them, and finally one must also possess those characteristics which are the result of the historic evolution of the French nation. A Jew, on the other hand, even if he happened to be born in France and still lives there, in spite of all this, he remains a member of the Jewish nation, and whether he likes it or not, whether he is aware or unaware of it, he bears the seal of the historic evolution of the Jewish nation.”⁹¹²

Dubnow argued from his Social Darwinist perspective that assimilated Jews were

weeded out of the wonderful racist and tribal Jewish community in a process of natural selection, which strengthened the allegedly natural tendency of the Jewish community to be racist and tribal. Since assimilated Jews did not breed with racist Jews, but rather wandered off into other communities, only racist Jews would perpetuate the Jewish community, thereby creating a natural proclivity in the Jewish community to produce genetically racist Jews—which was a very good thing in Dubnow’s mind. It is, therefore, easy to believe that these racist Jews organized to exterminate the assimilated Jews of Europe, thereby pruning off what they believed was a rotten limb of the Jewish family tree. Dubnow wrote in 1897,

“While the mass of old-type orthodox Jews sees itself in practice as a religious nation and resists assimilation in the surrounding nations by the force of its faith, the assimilationist intelligentsia, on the other hand (mostly freethinkers or the neo-orthodox of the West), sees in Judaism only a religious community, a union of synagogues which imposes no national duties or discipline whatsoever on its members. According to this view, the Jew can become a member of another nation and remain a member of the Mosaic faith. He is a German Jew, for example, in the same way that there are German Protestants or German Catholics. It follows logically from this premise that a freethinking or non-religious Jew must be excluded from the community of Jews of the Mosaic faith. This corollary is usually glossed over so that whatever remains of Jewish ‘unity’ may not be disturbed. I shall discuss this doctrine, which was in vogue only a short time ago but has recently lost ground among its adherents, in greater detail in the following Letters. Here I only wish to point out that it contradicts both the traditional view of many past generations that the ‘religious nation’ must be kept pure, and the scientific view of the non-assimilability of the spiritual or cultural nation. This kind of doctrine comes neither from religion nor from science. It is the invention of naive ideologues, or calculating opportunists, who seek to justify by means of this artificial doctrine their desire to assimilate into the foreign environment in order to benefit themselves and their children. This is but a repetition of the process of natural selection and of the weeding out of those weak elements of the nation which are unable to bear the pressure of the alien environment.”⁹¹³

Long before the First World War, Voltaire stated in the end of Chapter 104 of his *Essai sur les Moeurs et l’Esprit des Nations, et sur les Principaux faits de l’Histoire Depuis Charlemagne Jusqu’à Louis XIII*, (1769); that should Gentiles—in Voltaire’s view—become wise to the ways of Jews and prevent Jews from exploiting them, then rich Jews would abandon their religious superstitions and assimilate and the poor Jews would become thieves like Gypsies. According to Voltaire, whose work was well known, Jews would disappear through assimilation.⁹¹⁴ Again, the emancipation of Jews in Bolshevik lands, and the assimilation of affluent Jews in capitalistic societies, greatly concerned the Zionists, who feared it would be the end of all Jews.

Before Voltaire, Spinoza noted that assimilation was causing the Jewish ethnicity to disappear. After Voltaire, Wellhausen, relying on Spinoza's observations, noted that emancipation was leading the Jews to assimilate and therefore to disappear—a fact that terrified the racist Zionists. Julius Wellhausen wrote in 1881,

“The Jews, through their having on the one hand separated themselves, and on the other hand been excluded on religious grounds from the Gentiles, gained an internal solidarity and solidity which has hitherto enabled them to survive all the attacks of time. The hostility of the Middle Ages involved them in no danger; the greatest peril has been brought upon them by modern times, along with permission and increasing inducements to abandon their separate position. It is worth while to recall on this point the opinion of Spinoza, [*Footnote: Tract. Theol. Polit. 0. 4, ad fin.*] who was well able to form a competent judgment :—‘That the Jews have maintained themselves so long in spite of their dispersed and disorganised condition is not at all to be wondered at, when it is considered how they separated themselves from all other nationalities in such a way as to bring upon themselves the hatred of all, and that not only by external rites contrary to those of other nations, but also by the sign of circumcision, which they maintain most religiously. Experience shows that their conservation is due in a great degree to the very hatred which they have incurred. When the king of Spain compelled the Jews either to accept the national religion or to go into banishment, very many of them accepted the Roman Catholic faith, and in virtue of this received all the privileges of Spanish subjects, and were declared eligible for every honour; the consequence was that a process of absorption began immediately, and in a short time neither trace nor memory of them survived. Quite different was the history of those whom the king of Portugal compelled to accept the creed of his nation; although converted, they continued to live apart from the rest of their fellow-subjects, having been declared unfit for any dignity. So great importance do I attach to the sign of circumcision also in this connection, that I am persuaded that it is sufficient by itself to maintain the separate existence of the nation for ever.’ The persistency of the race may, of course, prove a harder thing to overcome than Spinoza has supposed; but nevertheless he will be found to have spoken truly in declaring that the so-called emancipation of the Jews must inevitably lead to the extinction of Judaism wherever the process is extended beyond the political to the social sphere. For the accomplishment of this centuries may be required.”⁹¹⁵

Spinoza's observations are antedated by Biblical writings, which tell that God will punish assimilated Jews and pious Jews to remind all of Israel who God is. God punishes them with the sword and with fire and renders them ash. The punishment of the Jews through murderous anti-Semitism in order to drive them back to God is perhaps most strongly advocated in the books of *Deuteronomy* and *Ezekiel*, and in *Malachi* 4:1-6 it states,

“1 For, behold, the day cometh, that *shall* burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the LORD of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. 2 But unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall. 3 And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I *shall* do *this*, saith the LORD of hosts. 4 Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, *with* the statutes and judgments. 5 Behold, I *will* send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the LORD: 6 And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth *with* a curse.”

American Zionist Richard Gottheil stated in 1898,

“I KNOW that there are a great many of our people who look for a final solution of the Jewish question in what they call «assimilation.» The more the Jews assimilate themselves to their surroundings, they think, the more completely will the causes for anti-Jewish feeling cease to exist. But have you ever for a moment stopped to consider what assimilation means? It has very pertinently been pointed out that the use of the word is borrowed from the dictionary of physiology. But in physiology it is not the food which assimilates itself into the body. It is the body which assimilates the food. The Jew may wish to be assimilated; he may do all he will towards this end. But if the great mass in which he lives does not wish to assimilate him — what then? If demands are made upon the Jew which practically mean extermination, which practically mean his total effacement from among the nations of the globe and from among the religious forces of the world, — what answer will you give? And the demands made are practically of that nature.”

Communist Zionist Nachman Syrkin wrote in 1898, referring to civil assimilation as “national suicide”,

“The national suicide of the Jews would be a terrible tragedy for the Jews themselves, and that epoch would certainly be the most tragic in human history.”⁹¹⁶

The Zionists often repeated their alarmist rhetoric that Jews were in danger of extinction, not from anti-Semitism, but from philo-Semitism. At the turn of the century, Micah Joseph Berdichevski stated,

“To be or not to be! To be the last Jews or the first Hebrews. Our people has come to its crisis, its inner and outer slavery has passed all bounds, and it

now stands one step from spiritual and material annihilation. Is it any wonder that all who know in their hearts the burden, the implications, and the ‘dread’ of such an hour should pit their whole souls on the side of life against annihilation?”⁹¹⁷

Ahad Ha’Am captured the spirit of panic some Zionists felt, in 1909,

“To adopt a negative attitude toward the Diaspora means, for our present purpose, to believe that the Jews cannot survive as a scattered people now that our spiritual isolation is ended, because we have no longer any defence against the ocean of foreign culture, which threatens to obliterate our national characteristics and traditions, and thus gradually to put an end to our existence as a people. [***] We must secure our future by gathering the scattered members of our race together in our historical land (or, some would add, in some other country of their own), where alone we shall be able to continue to live as a people.”⁹¹⁸

Joseph Chaim Brenner stated in 1914,

“And when we cry nowadays: ‘If we do not become different—if now, the circumstances of our environment having changed, we do not really become a Chosen People—become, that is, like all other nations, each of whom is Chosen by itself—then we shall soon perish’; then what we mean is that we *shall* perish as a people—we *shall* die as a social entity.”⁹¹⁹

In 1917, Elisha Michael Friedman published the following article, which evinces the panic that had overtaken the Zionists, the belief that the Jewish ‘race’ would become ‘extinct’ through a process of assimilation, which had begun with the emancipation of the Jews in the French Revolution, and was continuing following the Russian Revolution. Friedman’s article further evinces that the Zionists planned to use the First World War as an opportunity to argue that Jews were a nation deserving of official national status, not unlike many other small nations—and that it was the war which made Zionism appealing (note the common Zionist phrase “solution of the Jewish Question” to mean Zionism, which phrase the Nazis allegedly adopted in 1942—note further that it was the majority of Jews themselves who most strongly opposed Zionism and that the Zionists simply disregarded their wishes and sought to impose Zionism upon them through any and all means including war—note still further the Messianic belief that the Jews were inhibited from dominating humanity until restored to Palestine, at which time they would issue forth the Lord’s proclamations onto humanity⁹²⁰ in the same dictatorial fashion with which they demanded that Jews submit to Zionism, though they masked this desire with the more appealing assertion that they would offer benefits to humanity if only they were restored to Palestine, the benefit of their dictatorship over humanity—note even further still, the longing for segregation and the view that the Ghetto and enmity towards the Jew is the salvation for which the Zionists sought, that is to say that the

Zionists created Nazism as a means to preserve the Jewish “race”):

“ZIONISM AND THE AMERICAN SPIRIT

(A New Perspective)

ELISHA M. FRIEDMAN

ZIONISM, for twenty centuries a religious yearning, and since twenty years a social program, did not appeal to the world at large until the advent of the great war. However, the attention that the minor peoples attracted during the course of the conflict set up a new standard in terms of which the Jewish problem might be reasoned out. Some, at least, of the blunders made in the treatment of the Jewish problem since the breaking up of the Ghetto, came from viewing it entirely as a theological problem instead of more broadly as a sociological one. But the tragedy of Belgium, the fate of Poland and the plea of the small nations, has furnished a new measure to apply to the whole Jewish problem.

Recent events have served to accentuate Zionism as an attempt at the solution of the Jewish question. The campaign in Palestine has dramatically brought the land of ancient Israel to the fore. Our own entry into the war, and the voice that we are to have at a coming peace conference, has given a peculiar turn to America’s interest in the Zionist question.

Specifically, what is Zionism? Dating back as a hope, to the destruction of the Temple, and resuscitated as a project by its gifted leader, Theodore Herzl, Zionism was formulated at the first International Zionist Congress in 1897 as a movement, aiming to secure for the Jewish people a publicly and legally assured home in Palestine. Much water has flowed to the sea since then. Ink has been spilled at and for the movement. However, the opposition was never on the part of non-Jews, strange to say, but only on the part of Jewish anti-Zionists, who either mistook the aims of the movement or had selfish fears as to their own status. However, twenty years of discussion have clarified thought on the subject, so that to-day it might be said that, regardless of political form, Zionism aims to preserve the Jewish people in their ancestral home that they may contribute, along with the other peoples of the world, to the enrichment of the world’s culture. The Zionist community will affect not only the Jews who will return to Palestine after the war, but far more vitally, will it concern their scattered brothers in the various political states.

Not only because America numbers over a million Jews among her sons does the question interest us as Americans. In a more than selfish sense, America has a stake in the Zionist ideal. The righteous nation that fought for Cuba and then set her free, that alone of all the powers refused an unjust indemnity from China, that newly set for the world another example in high-minded rather than high-handed diplomacy in Colombia, that refused under powerful provocation to interfere with the liberty which the Mexican people

were working out for themselves, and that entered the great war that ‘the world might be made safe for democracy,’ this friend of the small peoples has translated the square deal in terms of international affairs. It would be counter to every noble impulse to which America has given birth if she did not at an opportune moment, generously offer her aid toward the restoration of the Jewish people to a home and a center in Palestine. Because the ancient Hebrews were the first people that wrote democracy into its charter of government—the Bible, and because our republic was influenced at its birth by the Hebraic traditions that dominated New England, therefore when this ancient people is struggling to regain its position in the brotherhood of the world, America’s interest in the freedom of small nations finds an added sanction.

ZIONISM IN A NUT-SHELL

The emancipation of the Jew in Russia, while it may ameliorate the condition of the individual Jew, will not solve the problem of the Jewish people. Kicked and buffeted about for twenty centuries, it is now in danger of dissolution. The Jewish problem is not alone one of persecution. It involves as well the loss by an historic social group of its distinctive personality. The people that on its own soil produced the Bible has contributed nothing objective during two thousand years of dispersion, although it may have been the subject of an inspiring picture of persistence and martyrdom. It merely preserved itself. And when history brought to it political emancipation, it entered into spiritual sterility. Creature of persecution, the Jew, adaptable and imitative, assumed the hue of his surroundings with its decidedly materialistic tinge.

To-day, the Jewish people is slowly dying, culturally and socially. Lacking a home and a center of life, its religious reserves are being exhausted. The Jewish people may be contributing as individuals to the advance of civilization, but as a living, active, social group, they count for naught. In France, Italy and Spain, they have almost ceased to be. The Jews of England and Germany are following a similar course. Only the immigration from eastern Europe, hitherto the arena of persecution, is temporarily postponing—for but a few generations—the processes of decay of Jewish life in our own country.

The absorption of a scattered minority people is the inexorable law of history. Can the Jews hope to escape it? And if they will not, as they cannot, then emancipation will mean the complete dissolution, in Russia as well as in France, in the United States as well as in Italy, of this dispersed minor group.

Well, what of it? asks the anti-Zionist. The answer is—the harmony of world cultures. The world is the richer for the existence of a Belgian or a Polish people. Scatter them, and they will cease to produce Maeterlincks or Chopins, as the Jews have ceased to produce Isaiahs. Give the Jewish people Palestine, and a portion of them will produce distinctive and essential values to beautify and enrich human life. History proved it, when only forty-two

thousand Jews returning to Palestine with Ezra, edited the Bible, and preserved the God idea, without which there would be to-day neither Christianity nor Mohammedanism. Indeed, the rest of the Jews, scattered over the world of that time were assimilated, but the nucleus in Palestine survived.

Without Zionism, without a center in Palestine, the Jews will, until they cease to exist, constitute an international irritation, as in the past—a problem in Germany as well as in Russia, or in any country where they as a scattered minority refuse to merge themselves completely and without qualification of blood or culture with the majority in every political state. And when they cease to be, as, without a center, they must, when the student will view them only as history, then the world will be the poorer, as it is for the passing of Greece and its art, or of Rome and its law, yes, poorer even as the world for the passing of the red man from this continent. At this perilous stage of his existence, the Jew has no other avenue of escape from dissolution but the reestablishment by a portion of the people of a home and a center in Palestine. The disappearance of the non-Palestinian Jew will then be no loss to the world's cultures nor will his continued survival outside of Palestine be attended by any friction, as little as is the life of the Belgians in Russia or the Poles in England.

If only as a large social experiment Zionism should be tested out for its potentialities. For less than a century, the Jewish people have been freed from civil and political disabilities. Yet, in the train of emancipation, there followed various dangers. Released from pressure, the Jewish people have lost their distinctive spiritual bent, so that they no longer produce peculiar and essential social values, of any kind.

Worse, still, they are dying out. They are losing forever the power to create in a future new cultural values such as every people is capable of producing. The process of disintegration began in France after the French Revolution and in Germany after the razing of the Ghetto walls. The result is not sporadic or accidental in France or Germany, but continuous and inevitable everywhere—in England, in the United States, and, from now on, in Russia. The ferment of liberty will not spare the people that was hitherto encased within the walls of the Pale. During the process of disintegration, even, the Jews incur the prejudice of their fellowmen. Their death as a group is accompanied by all the pains of mortal dissolution—economic boycott in Poland, academic and military discrimination in Germany and social ostracism everywhere.

As a people, it is dying hard—a long, drawn-out and lingering death, for the basic law of existence is self-preservation. When a group becomes aware of approaching dissolution, it makes desperate efforts to live. Except for isolated cases, the scattered Jews will not readily merge their identity with the other peoples of the world: for, to do so would mean extinction, unless they previously established a center. This condition is unique with the Jews and does not hold for the members of any other people, for, when a

Frenchman, Belgian, Pole or Irishman gives up his old connections, he leaves behind a great source of national life which can survive without his allegiance. Not so with the Jew or with any other dispersed group that has no territory.

Because his group is in continuous danger of dissolution, the Jew exhibits at all times a social psychology exhibited by other peoples only in times of war or other great dangers to the group. The lack of a center, *coupled* with the desire to continue to live, is the cause of the singular characteristics of the Jew. Loyalty in times of distress is a beautiful trait which is apotheosized in human relationships. Because the Jewish people, as a people, has always been in distress, down to this very day, its members have been keenly loyal to the group. Even though this loyalty is generalized and exhibits itself in many directions in relation to an employer, to an institution or to his native land, yet this trait in him alone is stigmatized as clannishness. Because, as a people, it dare not give up its identity, there has arisen against the entire group, regardless of the nobility of the character of any individual in it, a prejudice which varies in the degree of severity only with the breadth of vision of his neighbors. This anti-social feeling, in turn, develops a keen sensitiveness to criticism, a consciousness of self, and a lack of poise that is embarrassing. The Jew is also unique for his pride in his past. This is directly due to the fact that, as a creative social group, the Jewish people has a barren present, in striking contrast with its past. As individuals, baptized at times, the Jews may have enriched civilization out of all proportion to their number, in every field of human activity and in every country—in England, the Hersehels in astronomy, and Disraeli in statesmanship; in Germany, Marx in social reform, Herz in electricity, Ehrlich and Wasserman in medicine, and Mendelssohn in music, Ballin in commerce, and Harden in journalism; in Russia, Mendeleef in chemistry and Anotokolsky in art; in Holland, Spinoza in philosophy and Israels in painting—and so on, in France, Bergson; in Denmark, Brandes, and in Italy, Luzatti. [Jewish tribalism and racism caused more harm to progress than the individual contributions of Jews could compensate. Jewish self-aggrandizement and dogmatic insistence that their beliefs and heroes be worshiped set science, art and politics back throughout European and American History. Jews also have slackened the progress of humanity by promoting decadence and laziness in America and Europe—one must wonder if they fear competition, for their clannish in universities and the press clearly indicates that they, in general terms, do.] But, because as a people, as a social entity, it has produced little in the past two thousand years of dispersion, it harks back continually to a rich past as a source of pride. And, as Lyman Abbott put it, 'It is a poor present which shines only by the reflected glory of the past.' The Jew is singular in all these psychological traits, as he is peculiar also in the fact that his is the only living social group that has no center. If the Jewish people is permitted to reestablish a normal group life in Palestine to save it from the ever-present threat of dissolution, its members will become normal like the rest of men.

The nations of the world have a selfish stake in the Zionist movement. If they would solve their Jewish problem, they must recognize the law of self-preservation of the group and aid in the restoration of a Jewish community in Palestine. If they fail to restore a part of the Jewish people to their ancestral home, they fail to get to the root of the problem, and leave unremoved, the international irritation of a homeless people that does not want to die, and therefore refuses to merge with the rest of the population. Diplomatic diletantism, dallying with the symptoms of social maladjustments by legislating equality, or giving the Jew merely individual liberty, political or economic, will not solve the collective problem—the freedom of a group to live and express itself in accordance with its historic bent or its inherent inclinations.

THE PROBLEM OF AMERICAN JUDAISM

The problem of American Judaism, as a writer in the magazines recently saw it, is not an isolated problem in itself. For it cannot be separated from the problem of the American Jew, just as one's opinion of a poem or a painting involves a judgment of its creator. One may decry this statement as a 'narrow racialism,' However, this would be absurd, for a world-noted scholar, Benjamin Kidd, in his 'Social Evolution,' calls attention to the generalization, that religion is the function of a social group. The 'people of the book' reflected its aspirations in the religion. Likewise the hopes for a restoration of his people are among the sublimest ideals which the prophets pictured.

If the Jewish religion in America is now colorless, it is because there is no unified Jewish community which can idealize its social aspirations. The contribution of the Jews, to the spiritual advance of humanity was made during the few hundred years when Israel was on its own soil and living a full, normal, social life. Twenty centuries of exile cannot boast of a single Moses, an Isaiah, or a Jesus, the products of a united people. For two thousand years the Jew has hibernated culturally. He has been living off his past. But now that all religion is being revalued and reinterpreted, the Jewish people, dismembered and scattered all over the globe, is powerless to adapt its spiritual heritage to modern life. The result is disintegration. The Jew cannot justify his further separate existence in a state of dispersion, except for the hope that he may be preserved until the day when his children again rebuild the Jewish group life. Reject Zionism as a future hope, not only to be prayed for, but to be realized at the earliest opportunity, and there cannot be found any justification for the persistence of a separate people.

Reform Judaism, was at one time anti-Zionistic. In rejecting the Palestine that either as a fact or as a hope united four thousand years of Jewish history, the theological reformers, in the flush of the cosmopolitanism of the early nineteenth century, had to find some justification for a further separate existence. So they constructed a 'mission theory,' by virtue of which the Jew was to act as a missionary to his fellow citizens and therefore the dispersion was interpreted to be a blessing and a state to be made permanent. This

scheme is a perversion of Jewish history, for in thirty-five centuries there never arose a party that rejected Palestine as a fact or as a hope and yet survived. Time, the deadly foe of all error, has, in fifty years, shown the unreality of this excuse for a further separate existence of the Jewish people. So far from justifying a separate existence of the Jewish people, anti-Zionistic Reform Judaism has convincingly proven the logic and inevitableness of its disappearance, for, contrary to its intended aim, it has succeeded in cutting off from the Jewish people some of its finest families as the history of the Reform movement testifies.

History cannot furnish a single example of a people scattered among many others that has maintained its identity. The Jews were an apparent exception to this sociological law. The bonds of religion as an internal influence and the pressure of persecution as an external force, made possible for the Jew a sort of hot-house existence during twenty centuries of an immobile civilization. But formal religion is a weakening institution in a modern life, whose spirituality is universal and transcends geographical, racial or theological limitations. Correspondingly, persecution is lessening its rigors, and, since the beginning of the scientific era, life on this planet, far from remaining rigid, is become accelerated in its mobility. As a result, the Jewish people is rapidly undergoing the normal processes of assimilation, the merging of blood and the amalgamation of culture. It is following its erstwhile Greek and Roman contemporaries into oblivion.

Some anti-Zionists, and they never have been non-Jews—say that this dissolution is a desired consummation. Is it? Let us see. In the international harmony of cultures, each nation plays a distinct part. Eliminate from civilization the contributions of the English, French or German peoples and you impoverish it. Because Belgium gave birth to her characteristic literature, it is for the weal of civilization that she be regathered from exile. Because Poland produced her peculiar poetry and music, the world will be enriched, if she is reëstablished. And so, because Israel, on its native soil and as a normal group, bore a Moses, an Isaiah and a Jesus, she should, if restored to her ancestral home, again produce leaders after her own kind to add her nuance to the harmony of the nations.

The intrinsic truth of Zionism may be seen in the fact that alone of all the movements in Jewry it was able, ultimately, to attract every section and party among the Jews, the Orthodox, the Conservative, the Reform Jew, the unchurched, nay, even the assimilationist, who believed that the destiny of the Jews lay in his disappearance. Many thoughtful non-Jews, among whom are Charles R. Crane, Norman Hapgood, and Alice Stone Blackwell, in this country, and H. G. Wells, Maxim Gorky and Bjornstjerne Bjornsen, abroad, viewed the matter as a social problem, which it largely is, and have come to the support of the Zionist movement. The Rev. Dr. Alexander Blackstone, an Episcopalian divine, antedated Herzl by several years in advocating the restoration of the Jews to Palestine.

Now, every new thought must fight its way to acceptance. The degree of

opposition to it is a measure of its potency. But time is the ally of truth. 'The eternal years of God are hers.' So, while early Zionists preached against tremendous forces and under penalties which would ordinarily suppress all but those imbued with a great ideal, the last ten years have brought about a great change. When Louis D. Brandeis, who was fighting for justice in industrial relations, and who was all his life aloof from any Jewish interests, approached the problem, he viewed it not with the sentiment born in childhood associations and not with the bias of training, but as a problem of spiritual freedom, of the right of a fallen people again to stand erect with its fellow-peoples. Zionism appealed to him not from within, but from without; not as a personal affection, but as an abstract proposition. The winning in 1913 of Brandeis, the advocate of the 'square deal' in industry, was the turning-point in the struggle of Zionism for recognition. There had been won, in addition, Nathan Straus, among philanthropists, Julian W. Mack and Hugo Pam, of the bench, Eugene Meyer, Jr., in finance, and Stephen S. Wise and hosts of others in the Reform rabbinate. The tide had turned. Jacob H. Schiff, by reason of his prestige and leadership, was at one time the most damaging foe of Zionism. However, even he recently pinned his faith *in the hopes and aims* of Zionism. It is a tribute to the man that, in his advanced years, he retains the vigor of thought and the freshness of mind which enabled him to perceive the essential soundness of the movement he had been opposing and to re-adjust his views on it. And only yesterday, as it were, Adolph Lewinsohn, whose activities transcend creed, has likewise joined those that see in Zionism a solution to the Jewish question. The only opponents of Zionism left are a diminishing number of the radical rabbis, who, though not old, are of set mind, and with an unworthy consistency refuse to face the facts—the danger of disintegration of the scattered Jewish people in the present world ferment.

IF THE BELGIANS OR POLES WERE DISPERSED

'Well,' says the man in the street, 'how does the matter affect me?' To this extent. If the Belgians or Poles were scattered from their ancestral hearths, they, too, would strive to maintain their group life. They, too, would become sensitive to criticism, self-conscious, proud of their past. They, too, would refuse to give up their identity among all the peoples in whose midst they were scattered, and they, too, would constitute a series of international irritations—problems to perplex statesmen and sociologists. And in this state of dispersion, there would form in their midst three parties—the assimilation party, the *status quo* party and the restoration party.

The assimilants, ever aware of the social maladjustments, would have the century-old struggle for survival end, by themselves disappearing as a people. This is a cult of cowardice and a program of flight from battle. Yet, even this policy has no significance unless it is carried out by all. But this is absurd, for you cannot expect millions of persons to abandon a tradition and deny a history which at one time was able to mould the life of mankind. Nor will a whole people reject the hope in its future—the prerequisite to social

suicide. And here is the fundamental fallacy in the policy of Jewish assimilation. For, if only some advocate the dissolution of the group as the solution of the problem, they seem deserters of a losing cause, which needs their support. They are regarded as renegades by the world at large and by those that remain loyal, whose devotion is thereby intensified. Further, regardless of his own attitude in the matter, the outside world continues to identify the assimilationist Jew with his fellows. He is blamed for their faults, and pays the penalty in common with the rest of the group. Insofar as it affords no relief to the assimilationist and intensifies the loyalty of the great mass of a dispersed people, the policy of partial assimilation defeats its own ends. It is purposeless. It has been tested out, as a solution of the Jewish question, and has proven an eloquent failure.

Again, if the Belgians or Poles were scattered over the face of the earth, and, after centuries of persecution, were sharpened mentally to eke out a livelihood under difficult conditions, they, too, would, with the advent of a more humane era, become economically rooted to their native lands. Now, Prof. Seligman showed that the economic interpretation of history holds even in spiritual affairs. Accordingly, there should then develop a *status quo* group with a theory of living to fit in with the economic status of the established fugitives. Their leaders should, as did anti-Zionistic Rabbis, conveniently construct for them a philosophy to justify their dispersion. In view of the prejudice against them, they also might convince themselves about a destiny of spreading a mission of tolerance to the weak, which would possibly appeal to the original generation that escaped persecution, but not to their unscathed children. The subsequent generations would lose their attachment to the history and traditions of the group, and would desert it. In the scattered state, the hypothetical Belgians and Poles would no longer produce leaders and heroic figures, as the Jews have ceased to do so. Their cultural development would end. For a time they might move by the accumulated momentum of previous centuries. But, eventually, they would find themselves spiritual bankrupts and cultural anachronisms. And, reasoning theologically instead of sociologically, many people would overlook the fact that a scattered people is spiritually stagnant, that, at best, it can only preserve itself, and that only a normal group on its soil can generate its inherent and distinctive social values. And, possibly, some romantic and regretful young writer might also ask why some one of the scattered Belgians 'is not fired with that spirit which comes into the hearts of men' on their native Flemish soil, to thrill the world with a message of Belgian ideals.

And, finally, the hypothetical dispersed Belgians or Poles might develop a third party—the restorationists. In part, they might be idealists, who loved the history and traditions of a once-free Belgium. In part, they might be the persecuted Belgians or Poles in some benighted lands. Or they might even be righteous men and women, whether Belgian or not, who viewed the problem as one of social freedom or of the liberty of a repressed group. Then there might appear the scientist, to analyze the problem as one of an

abnormal type in sociology, and to show that all the difficulties of the dispersed Belgians and Poles, the social maladjustments and the international irritations were due not to differences in belief, but to the attempt of a people to persist in a permanently scattered state, indeed, were due to the lack of a center and of a home.

This sociologist might show how all the parties, the assimilants, the *status quo* section, as well as the restorationists, would benefit by the reestablishment of an unfettered community in their ancient home in Belgium or Poland. The restorationists among the Jews are the Zionists. They desire the rehabilitation of Palestine as a self-renewing and inexhaustible reservoir of Jewish life. This community could and would assume the responsibility of saving the people from dissolution. The non-Palestinian Jew could then merge, if he so chose, with any new social group, as completely as does the expatriated Dane or Swiss. Zionism would solve the assimilationist's problem, for it would relieve him of the 'back pressure' which now identifies him with his people and prevents his assimilation. The assimilationist Jew will under Zionism be an expatriate without the stigma of deserting a losing cause, for it will then no longer need his support.

For the status quo Jew, living in the present scattered state, who may want to maintain his historic connections, the center in Palestine, with its newly-developing normal life, will invigorate the spent spiritual forces of Jewish life elsewhere. The status quo Jew may be the member of a free spiritual empire. Just as the Briton, 'overseas,' carried the English idea to the farthest corner of the globe, and in return brought back to his island home that broad tolerance for foreign cultures that has made England the world's colonizer, so also the Jew 'overseas' might be consuls of the spirit. He might justify his further scattered existence if he could exchange the products of a reinvigorated people in Palestine for all the cultural wealth of the nations to their mutual benefit. Further, a center in Palestine would serve as a potential alternative, the existence of which would create self-confidence and poise, the absence of which traits constitutes the common defect of the Jewish psychology to-day. Zionism will take the non-Palestinian Jew out of the class of social anomalies, and put him on a basis similar to that of the Swiss or the Dane, residing abroad, who lives unnoticed among all peoples and is never singled out either for blame or praise.

To the Palestinian Jew, nay, to the Jewish people, Zionism means the restoration to a free environment, with latitude for the development of any race endowments it may possess, To the progress of man it means the adding of another instrument to enrich, be it by ever so little, the cultural harmony of the nations. To the nations of the world it means the opportunity for atoning in one generous moment for the wrongs inflicted upon an unfortunate people for twenty centuries.

To us, as Americans, Zionism means the expression on the shores of the Mediterranean of the American spirit of fair play, of liberty for men and for nations. As the American chart of government inspired the leaders of the

Latin-American republics, and guided the founders of the Commonwealth of Australia, so also the torch of civilization, burning so brightly on this hemisphere, may yet lend its light to the restored commonwealth at the junction of three continents. The Hebraic spirit of democracy was realized by the Puritans in our federation of states. Enriched by the genius of a great free people, the American idea may reinspire the cradle whence civilization sprung.

The great war, admittedly conceived in economic rivalries, has, however, taken on a higher aspect. It has stirred deep into the springs of human progress, A democracy, not only of individuals, but of groups and of nations, is the destiny toward which the struggle seems to be pointing, with statesmen as the pawns of a Higher Power. We may think Benjamin Franklin out of date, because he saw the finger of Providence in our Revolution. But that is the fault rather of our modern scientific spirit carried to an extreme. Our vision is narrowed to the field of the microscope. To many of us, however, there is something superhuman in the events that are shaping themselves under our near-sighted eyes. Time is fulfilling prophesy. In an off-corner of the stage, on which this mighty world drama is acting itself out, there is the Jewish people, just liberated in Russia, but about to be saved from the extinction that has been the counterpart of Jewish emancipation, by the 'remnant that will return' to the land of its fathers. The world may well join in the ancient prayer, 'May it come speedily in our days.'"⁹²¹

Zionist Jacob Klatzkin stated,

"This belief in the impossibility of complete assimilation is one of the basic tenets of Zionism. Lately this belief has sought support in the theory of race, which has been revived in certain scholarly circles. Even before the validity of this theory has been demonstrated, it has become the basis of many speeches on Zionism, which now use it as a quasi-scientific premise. [***] Our long survival in the Galut is certainly no proof of the impossibility of assimilation. The hold of the forms of our religion, which have served as barriers between us and the world for about two thousand years, has weakened and there are no longer any strong ghetto walls to protect a national entity in the Galut."⁹²²

5.6.2 The Zionists Set the Stage for the Second World War. . . and the Third

On 28 May 1921, *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* published an article "Will Jewish Zionism Bring Armageddon?" which stated, *inter alia*,

"Zionism is challenging the attention of the world today because it is creating a situation out of which many believe the next war will come. To adopt a phraseology familiar to students of prophecy, it is believed by many students of world affairs that Armageddon will be the direct result of what is now

beginning to be manifested in Palestine.”

Jews dominated the Paris Peace Conference which imposed unjust terms on Germany. Leading and highly influential Jews in Germany stabbed Germany in the back and insisted that Germany accept the terms and pay the “reparations”. The Jews who imposed severe and unjust sanctions on Germany at the end of the First World War knew that this would provoke a second world war and the rise of a Bolshevist régime in Germany, which would make a pact with the Soviets to destroy Eastern Europe. Racist political Zionist Israel Zangwill predicted in 1923 that Zionism would lead to an unprecedented world-wide conflagration.⁹²³ He knew whereof he spoke. “Mentor” wrote in an article entitled “Peace, War—and Bolshevism” in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 4 April 1919 on page 7,

“It is a challenge to all the nations including the peoples who nourish liberty and freedom as precious principles, but who have passively allowed a state of affairs to grow and putrefy into the infamies of Russian Tsarism, the iniquity of Hungary, and the wickedness of German militarism; to the world that has suffered Society to fester into these and to break out into the prurient, gaping, sloughing, agonising tumour of such a war as that which is not ended, though it is suspended.”

Lloyd George followed the Jewish method of calling on a war weary world to move towards world government as a means to secure peace, though world government was in truth, and in Jewish prophecy, a means for the Jews to secure the destruction of all Gentile Peoples. Note that Lloyd George’s Zionist call for world government is speciously justified as a reaction to the Bolshevik quest for world government, such that the People of the world are left to choose between two paths to the same ultimate result, a Jewish dominated world government. The groundwork was also prepared for another world war, in that the battle lines were drawn and the alliances made to draw England and the United States into war with Germany on France’s behalf—though ultimately when the Second World War came it was allegedly begun on Poland’s behalf. Note that England, the United States and France were encouraged to be weak, such that when war came the Zionist Bolshevik Nazis would have the ability to overtake Continental Europe and herd together its Jews for forced deportation to Palestine. This also ensured a long and costly war the profits from which would pay for the rise of the “Jewish State”. Note that Jews essentially bought up Germany after the First World War with the profits they had made during that war, and their economic advantage was especially strong because they had so viciously crippled the Gentile Germans. *The New York Times* wrote on 26 March 1922 on page 33 in the Editorial Section,

“1918 PEACE VIEWS OF LLOYD GEORGE

Memorandum Written for Paris
Conference Published as
White Paper.

URGED JUSTICE TO ENEMY
Premier Also Insisted on Dealing
With Russian Situation—Bearing
on Genoa Conference.

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

LONDON, March 25.—An interesting document dating back to the time of the Paris peace negotiations was issued officially today in the form of a White Paper. It is a memorandum headed ‘Some Considerations for the Peace Conference Before They Finally Draft Their Terms,’ which was circulated by Premier Lloyd George at the Paris Peace Conference on March 25, 1919.

Extracts from this memorandum have been published, here and abroad, at various times in the form of quotations, and there is some speculation as to the reasons for its publication now, after the lapse of three years. The official explanation is that it is issued in response to repeated requests for its publication.

The memorandum opens by pointing out that it was comparatively easy to patch up a peace which would last for thirty years. What was difficult, however, was to draw up a peace which would not provoke fresh struggle when those who had had practical experience of what war meant had passed away.

Plea for a Just Peace.

‘You may strip Germany of her colonies, reduce her armaments to a mere police force and her navy to that of a fifth-rate power,’ says Mr. Lloyd George. ‘All the same, in the end, if she feels she has been unjustly treated in the peace of 1919, she will find means of exacting retribution from her conquerors. To achieve redress our terms may be severe; they may be stern and even ruthless; but at the same time they can be so just that the country on which they are imposed will feel in its heart it has no right to complain. But injustice and arrogance displayed in the hour of triumph will never be forgotten or forgiven.’

The memorandum goes on to urge the danger of transferring more Germans and Magyars to the rule of some other nation than can possibly be helped. Such action, it says, must sooner or later lead to a new war in the East of Europe.

‘Secondly, I would say that the duration for the payments of reparation ought to disappear, if possible, with the generation which made war. The greatest danger that I see in the present situation,’ Mr. Lloyd George proceeds, ‘is that Germany may throw in her lot with the Bolsheviki and

place her resources, her brains, her vast organizing power at the disposal of revolutionary fanatics whose dream it is to conquer the world for Bolshevism by force of arms. If Germany goes over to the Spartacists, it is inevitable that she should throw in her lot with the Russian Bolsheviki. Once that happens, all Eastern Europe will be swept into the orbit of the Bolshevist revolution, and within a year we may witness the spectacle of nearly 300,000,000 people organized into a vast Red army under German instructors and German Generals, equipped with German cannon and German machine guns and prepared for the renewal of the attack on Western Europe.

‘I would, therefore, put it in the forefront of the peace that, once she accepts our terms, especially reparation, we will open to her the raw materials and markets of the world on equal terms with ourselves and will do everything possible to enable the German people to get upon their legs again. We cannot both cripple her and expect her to pay. It must be a settlement which will contain in itself no provocations for future wars, and which will constitute an alternative to Bolshevism because it will commend itself to all reasonable opinion as a fair settlement of European problems.

‘The essential element in the peace settlement is the constitution of a League of Nations as an effective guardian of international right and international liberty throughout the world. The first thing to do is that the leading members of the League of Nations should arrive at an understanding between themselves in regard to armaments. It is idle to endeavor to impose permanent limitation of armaments upon Germany unless we are prepared similarly to impose limitation upon ourselves. The first condition of success for the League of Nations is a firm understanding between the British Empire and the United States and France and Italy that there will be no competitive building up of fleets or armies between them.

I believe that until the authority and effectiveness of the League of Nations has been demonstrated, the British Empire and the United States ought to give to France a guarantee against the possibility of a new German aggression.’

Insists on Treating With Russia.

The concluding paragraph of the memorandum declares that the Peace Conference must deal with the Russian situation.

‘Bolshevist imperialism does not merely menace the States on Russia’s borders; it threatens the whole of Asia and is as near to America as it is to France. It is idle to think the Peace Conference can separate, however sound a peace it may have arranged with Germany, if it leaves Russia as it is today.’

Timed for Genoa Conference?

As to the significance of the publication of the memorandum at the present time, one paper asks:

‘Does the Prime Minister by publishing his memorandum after the lapse of three years and on the eve of the Genoa conference mean to indicate that there he is about to ‘deal with the Russian situation’ and to assist Germany ‘to get upon her legs again’?’ The Lloyd Georgian Daily Chronicle provides

the answer. It says:

‘The time has now come when the ideas of 1918 have a chance of being carried through. What seemed so original then is rapidly becoming common ground among those who are thinking seriously about politics, and Genoa points out the way.

‘The document is remarkable in its anticipation of what has become the dominant sentiment among thoughtful people about the conditions of permanent peace in Europe. It is, in fact, an ideal introduction to the policy of Genoa. It proves that the Prime Minister’s peace policy has been consistent, and that the principles of settlement for which he is working now are the same as those for which he was working three years ago.’

The Daily News, however, dissents from this view. It says:

‘The contrast between the policy of December, 1918, and the policy for April, 1922, or between the policy proposed to the Allies and the policy ultimately adopted by them and vehemently defended by Mr. Lloyd George would be actually comical if its effects were not so appalling. Who shall say how great a share of the present ills of Europe and the world are due to this amazing instability of policy on the part of Britain’s representative. If the policy of the memorandum, backed by America, had been adhered to by this country, what chance would the chauvinism of France have had against such a combination.’”

Racist political Zionist Israel Zangwill predicted in 1923 and in 1924, that Zionism would lead to an unprecedented world-wide conflagration.⁹²⁴ He knew whereof he spoke. The Zionists Lloyd George and “Mentor” also realized at the end of the First World War that there would be second.⁹²⁵

In 1934, Zionist Marxist Berl Katzenelson warned against the nihilistic destruction sought by many Marxists,

“History tells of more than one old world that was destroyed, but what appeared upon the ruins was not better worlds, but absolute barbarism.”⁹²⁶

Henry Ford sought to curb the abuses of Bolsheviks, Socialists and financiers against the masses, which inevitably lead to depressions. Ford also sought to enlighten the public about the exploitation of the impoverished by financiers in periods of depression.

Years later, the Jewish financier Bernard Baruch, the descendant of slave traders and son of a member of the Klu Klux Klan, wrote passionately about the opportunities awaiting financiers during a depression and of the stupidity of the poor who failed to invest what they didn’t have. Baruch wrote in his autobiography, in reference to the Depression of 1893,

“I had never experienced a depression before. But even then I began to grasp dimly that the period of emergence from a depression provides rare opportunities for financial profit.

During a depression people come to feel that better times never will come. They cannot see through their despair to the sunny future that lies behind the fog. At such times a basic confidence in the country's future pays off, if one purchases securities and holds them until prosperity returns.

From what I saw, heard, and read, I knew that was exactly what the giants of finance and industry were doing. They were quietly acquiring interests in properties which had defaulted but which would pay out under competent management once normal economic conditions were restored. I tried to do the same thing with my limited means.”⁹²⁷

It was the depression of 1893 that made Jacob H. Schiff and Otto H. Kahn, of the banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., immensely wealthy men. It led to Schiff's purchase, together with Edward H. Harriman, of the Sante Fe, Union Pacific, Northern Pacific, and Southern Pacific Railroads, among others.⁹²⁸ Schiff used his ill-gotten gains to destroy the Russian Nation and bolster Imperial Japan, which soon became two of the most virulent enemies of the United States. The Harrimans used their fortune to finance the Nazi régime, a régime that killed many Americans.⁹²⁹ Jewish financier Felix M. Warburg married Jacob H. Schiff's daughter—most of the Jewish bankers were related to each by blood and/or marriage.⁹³⁰ The Warburgs also financed Hitler. Baruch owed much to Schiff, and to American depressions, from which they profited. The Zionists and Jewish bankers have been a curse to America.

Baruch was very powerful in the Wilson administration, and he, Wilson and “Colonel” Edward Mandell House were children of the Reconstruction South. Wilson betrayed and degraded the blacks who helped him to win the Presidency. The banking system Wilson created was one of the causes of the Great Depression. Bernard Baruch, Chairman of the War Industries Board, revealed in his autobiography that Nathan Rothschild's profiteering at Waterloo taught Baruch a method by which he could profiteer from war and that he was proud to have done so in the Spanish-American War.⁹³¹ Baruch also claimed that his involvement in the foreign currency markets inspired him in his work with the League of Nations.⁹³² Baruch boasted of his manipulation of the stock market and told of the corrupt profits he made riding stocks up and down and of his ability to create monopolies by corrupt methods which are illegal today.⁹³³ Smedley D. Butler demonstrated the enormous profits earned from war during the Wilson administration in his book *War Is a Racket*.⁹³⁴

Franklin Delano Roosevelt's son-in-law, Colonel Curtis B. Dall, wrote extensively on the subject of the Great Depression and Pearl Harbor and alleged that corruption by money interests was involved in both catastrophes.⁹³⁵ Ron Grossman capsulized newspaper publisher Colonel Robert R. McCormick's views on the subject,

“Long after the defeat of Hitler and the Nazis, the Colonel told radio listeners that our GIs had fought and died in World War II ‘not for the salvation of the United States’ but because FDR had been hoodwinked by the British and Russians. Although he recognized the evil of Hitler, he opposed the U.S.

getting involved overseas, right up to Pearl Harbor. He held that ‘the United Nations was formed as a fake to fool people as to Roosevelt’s real reason for going to war,’ which was to make the world safe for British imperialism and Soviet communism.”⁹³⁶

Former Communist Douglas Hyde wrote in his book *Dedication and Leadership* of 1966,

“When, therefore, the Communists speak of launching the world on the way to Communism in the period in which we are living, it is this that they mean—not the whole world with the exception of the United States, or the United Kingdom or whichever country, being your own, you may feel is proof against assault.

Their aim is quite clear. They have never concealed it and it is something that is immensely meaningful to every Communist. It is a Communist world. In the past half-century they have achieved one-third of that aim. On any reckoning, that is a remarkable achievement, probably an unprecedented one. Nonetheless the world in which we live is still predominantly non-Communist. Twice as many people live in the non-Communist world as live under Communism. There is no basis here for defeatism.”⁹³⁷

Former Communist Whittaker Chambers wrote in his book *Witness* of 1952,

“Few Communists have ever been made simply by reading the works of Marx or Lenin. The crisis of history makes Communists; Marx and Lenin merely offer them an explanation of the crisis and what to do about it. Thus a graph of Communist growth would show that its numbers and its power increased in waves roughly equivalent to each new crest of crisis. The same horror and havoc of the First World War, which made the Russian Revolution possible, recruited the ranks of the first Communist parties of the West. Secondary manifestations of crisis augmented them—the rise of fascism in Italy, Nazism in Germany and the Spanish Civil War. The economic crisis which reached the United States in 1929 swept thousands into the Communist Party or under its influence. The military crisis of World War II swept in millions more; for example, a third of the voting population of France and of Italy. The crisis of the Third World War is no doubt holding those millions in place and adding to them. For whatever else the rest of the world may choose to believe, it can be said without reservation that Communists believe World War III inevitable.”⁹³⁸

5.7 Henry Ford for President

Though John Spargo and others loudly decried Henry Ford, and though some had sued Ford and sought court injunctions to prevent the publication and distribution of *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* and the book *The International Jew: The World’s*

Foremost Problem, which republished many of the anti-Jewish articles which appeared *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* in the years 1920-1922, Ford's popularity steadily increased. In 1923, Henry Ford was becoming a serious contender for the Presidency of the United States of America. Ford made it quite clear that he intended to end the undemocratic power of the financiers and monopolies. It was then that Herman Bernstein, Samuel Untermyer and Louis Marshall began an all out war on Ford. If they had not succeeded, it is possible that Ford would have been elected President in 1933 following the stock market crash of 1929, and that Adolf Hitler would have had an ally in the White House.

Huey Long was another opponent of American involvement in the First World War. As a lawyer, Long successfully defended a man prosecuted under Wilson's "Espionage Act". Huey Long emerged as a Presidential candidate, who promised to curtail the corrupt power of the financiers, and who promised to defeat Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Roosevelt was a darling of the Communists.⁹³⁹

Long pledged to distribute the wealth. He directly and personally attacked the selfish power of Bernard Baruch and other top financiers. Though many of his liberal views mirrored those of the Socialist and Communist Parties, both parties denounced Long as a Fascist and smeared him as if he were another Adolf Hitler. They objected to Long's plan to distribute the wealth through the income tax, while maintaining the productive capabilities of Capitalism. They also objected to Long's alleged dictatorial control of the Government of the State of Louisiana. The Communists wanted to abolish private property, which is to say that they wanted to place property under the control of the Jews, as was prophesied in the Old Testament. Huey Long sincerely represented the interests of the working class and the Communists sincerely represented the interests of Jewish financiers.

In 1946, Robert Penn Warren (author of the racist and segregationist essay *The Briar Patch*,⁹⁴⁰ which sought to prevent blacks from entering into competition with whites in the labor markets) posthumously attacked Huey Long in a novel entitled *All the King's Men*.⁹⁴¹ The highly-talented Communist film director of Jewish descent, Robert Rossen, made Warren's book into a movie in 1949. As a "former" member of the Communist Party, Rossen was called before the House of Un-American Activities Committee and eventually told them the names of 57 other Communist Party members.⁹⁴²

In 1935, Dr. Carl Austin Weiss allegedly shot Huey Long and Long died soon thereafter due to the failure of his doctors to properly treat the gunshot wounds Weiss, and Long's own bodyguards, allegedly had inflicted on him. Immediately after Weiss allegedly shot Long, Long's bodyguards shot Weiss with at least 20 large caliber handgun rounds—perhaps as many as 60 rounds.⁹⁴³ Weiss was very dead and very quiet.

It was alleged that Weiss had shot Long because Long had threatened to reveal Weiss' interracial family secrets.⁹⁴⁴ If true, it is odd that Weiss believed he could save his family from embarrassment and keep secret facts hidden by shooting Huey Long, which was certain to embarrass Weiss' family and call attention to his family's secrets. Some believe that Huey Long's own bodyguards shot Long⁹⁴⁵ and used Dr. Weiss as a "patsy".

THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT succeeded in bringing political criticism of Jews to America, which had been relatively free of it until that point. The *Protocols* were derivative of the work of Adam Weishaupt (Marx plagiarized much of “his” philosophy from Plato, Weishaupt and Feuerbach⁹⁴⁶), Robespierre, Jean Paul Marat, Prince Klemens Lothar Wenzel Von Metternich, Marx, Maurice Jolly, Gougenot Des Mousseaux, Hermann Goedsche, Eugen Karl Dühring, Chabauty, Nietzsche, etc.⁹⁴⁷ This was essentially already noted by Aylmer Maude in 1920 in his response to the *Times* article “The Jewish Peril”.⁹⁴⁸ This, however, was to be expected even if the *Protocols* were genuine.

The Jewish mafia attempted to murder Henry Ford in 1927. The assassination attempt ended Ford’s political ambitions. The murder of Huey Long was equally successful in ending his political ambitions. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a Communist and pathological liar, enjoyed four terms as President of the United States.

5.8 The “Jewish Mission”

The Eighteenth Century philosophy of Moses Mendelssohn was seen by Jews and Gentiles alike as proposing a “Jewish Mission” or “Mission of the Jews”⁹⁴⁹ to proselytize monotheism and the Jewish moral code to all the world. Mendelssohn stressed that Judaism was a religion, not a nation. Both Protestants and Jews were increasingly taking a “rationalist” approach to their religions, and attempted to distill their beliefs down into fundamental spiritual elements, which could be applied to all peoples and all times and which did not conflict with scientific facts.

Many Gentiles saw the “Jewish Mission” at its best as distasteful self-glorification by Jews, and at its worst as a movement for Jewish world domination.⁹⁵⁰ Racist Zionists saw the Mendelssohnian “Jewish Mission” as an act of assimilation and Jewish racial suicide, which had to be restated in racial terms with the Jews as the dominant race. Mendelssohn’s “Jewish Mission” became even more worrisome to those who did not wish to be governed by a universal tyranny of Jewish mysticism, when Moses Hess revealed that the “Jewish Mission” was to Zionists a racist biological theory in which Jews would reign as the brain of humanity and subjugate all the other inferior “races”, who would be obliged to obey the Jews as mere organs of an allegedly divinely inspired Jewish will.

There was really nothing new in this racist Messianic vision dubbed the “Jewish Mission”. It appeared in the Old Testament and its most vocal advocates have often been Christians, who have already fallen under the influence of the “Jewish Mission”, and who too often view non-Christians as damned and evil. The movement for utopian Communism revealed itself in the Zionists’ hands to be the proposed fulfillment of Jewish prophecies of Jewish world domination in the joyous millennium to come—a theme taken up by David Ben-Gurion, who spoke of world revolution, but who also spoke of certain Communists—apparently those who genuinely believed in its liberal and humanitarian precepts—as a threat to Zionism, which is a blatantly racist belief system.⁹⁵¹

Ben-Gurion believed that politics fulfilled the role of Messiah in the modern

world, in other words, that the Jewish people fulfilled the role of Messiah—a thought which had occurred to Moses Hess long ago. Ben-Gurion stated,

“My concept of the messianic ideal and vision is not a metaphysical one but a socio-cultural-moral one. . . I believe in our moral and intellectual superiority, in our capacity to serve as a model for the redemption of the human race. This belief of mine is based on my knowledge of the Jewish people, and not some mystical faith; the glory of the divine presence is within us, in our hearts, and not outside us.”⁹⁵²

David Ben-Gurion shared another of Moses Hess’ convictions, the belief that only the Greeks and the Jews were great peoples, that the Greeks were lost, and that the Jews were superior to all the living. David Ben-Gurion was interviewed in 1948, and was asked if he believed that the United Nations boundaries of Israel would suffice to house the ten million Jews Ben-Gurion estimated would occupy Israel. Ben-Gurion doubted that it would, and the interview continued,

“‘We would not have taken on this war merely for the purpose of enjoying this tiny state. There have been only two great peoples: the Greeks and the Jews. Perhaps the Greeks were even greater than the Jews, but now I can see no sign of that old greatness in the modern Greeks. Maybe, when the present process is finished we too will degenerate, but I see no sign of degeneration at present.’

His voice took on a deeper tone:

‘Suffering makes a people greater, and we have suffered much. We had a message to give the world, but we were overwhelmed, and the message was cut off in the middle. In time there will be millions of us—becoming stronger and stronger—and we will complete the message.’

‘What is the message?’ the reporter asked.

‘Our policy must be the unity of the human race. The world is divided into two blocs. We consider that the United Nations’ ideal is a Jewish ideal.’”⁹⁵³

Moses Hess and the other Jewish revolutionaries of 1848, to whom Benjamin Disraeli referred in 1844, were attempting to fulfill Judaic Messianic prophecy through political means. The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* writes in its article “Messianic Movements”:

“In his letters Leopold *Zunz referred many times to the European revolution of 1848 as ‘the Messiah.’ Even many Jews who left the faith tended to invest secular liberation movements with a messianic glow. Martin *Buber expressed the opinion that the widespread Jewish activity in modern revolutionary movements stemmed both from the involvement of the Jew with state and his criticism of it through his messianic legacy (see *disputations).

Zionism and the creation of the State of Israel are to a large extent secularized phenomena of the messianic movements. The ideology of the Zionist religious parties, *Mizrachi and *Ha-Po'el ha-Mizrachi, tends to regard them—in particular the achievements of the State of Israel—as an *athalta di-ge'ulla* ('anticipating and beginning of redemption'), thus retaining the traditional concepts held by messianic movements in conjunction with the new secularized aspects of the State and its achievements."⁹⁵⁴

One must bear in mind that in Judaic prophecy the Jewish Messiah is a king who destroys the nations and religions with an iron scepter, and mass murders assimilated Jews and non-compliant Christians. According to the prophets, the Messiah would rule from Jerusalem, and demand the obedience of the enslaved Gentiles of the world. All of this would occur after a war to end all wars, the Holocaust of assimilated Jewry, and ingathering of Jews to Israel. The Communist, terrorist and racist Zionist first Prime Minister and Messiah of Israel David Ben-Gurion predicted in 1962 what he believed the world would be like in 1987. Ben-Gurion stated, among other revealing comments,

“With the exception of the USSR as a federated Eurasian state, all other continents will become united in a world alliance, at whose disposal will be an international police force. All armies will be abolished, and there will be no more wars. In Jerusalem, the United Nations (a truly *United Nations*) will build a Shrine of the Prophets to serve the federated union of all continents; this will be the seat of the Supreme Court of Mankind, to settle all controversies among the federated continents, as prophesied by Isaiah.”⁹⁵⁵

Communist dogma has many Messianic elements and proffers the ancient Jewish promise of an end to human struggles by the destruction of all nations and peoples but Israel. Meyer Waxman wrote in the “Translator’s Introduction” to his English translation of Moses Hess’ *Rome and Jerusalem*,

“Hess’s emphasis of creation gives to his philosophy an entirely new aspect, far exceeding in importance that of Spinoza. Spinoza, though employing the word creation, never conceived God as a real Creator, but endorses the mechanical view of the world, which sees in the universe a huge machine, working according to fixed laws, without aim and purpose. Hess, on the contrary, protests bitterly against this mechanical conception, and sees in the world a constant tendency toward creation, namely, the forming of things anew. The life of the world is not a mere blind operation of forces, but a development with a purpose and aim which will finally be realized. This aim is the harmony of all antagonistic elements, the reconciliation of all opposing forces, and the final peaceful cooperation of all for perfection and development. In this conception of reconciliation Hess shows the influence of Hegel’s philosophy or *Synthesis*, which sees in the world of thought and

life a constant process of opposition and reconciliation; but he employed it to better advantage than the master.

The creative force of the universe is a vital force, and the entire universe a live being which is divided into three life spheres: the cosmic, organic and social or the human. There are no hard and fast lines separating them, but they are all parts of a great whole, one creative force called them into being. The world is all movement; there is nothing stable in it; all things were formed anew. Hess does not believe in the eternity of matter, nor in the constancy of atoms. The atoms were created as all other things in this world and are subject to growth and decay. Atoms are only centers of gravity from which creation proceeds, and corresponding to them, in other spheres, are the germs in the organic, and revelations of creative ideas in the social.

Hess believes that this genetic conception is the real Jewish conception and points to the Biblical theory of creation. He was certainly right in his assertions. To look upon the world as a process of becoming and upon the creative force as vital, is a primary quality of Jewish thought and is best illustrated in Bergson. Comparing the view of Hess with that of the brilliant French-Jewish philosopher, we are struck with the similarity. Bergson, like Hess, struggles against the mechanical view of the world, and teaches a creative evolution constantly forming new productions, which are incalculable beforehand. Like Hess, he teaches the unity of the vital force which, though dividing itself into different forms, remains essentially one. There are undoubtedly differences between the two, but the fundamentals are the same with both of them; and, from a practical point of view, Hess's conception is far deeper and more fertile. Hess applies his philosophic thought to the social world, while Bergson remains in the middle of the road.

On the basis of the principles laid down by him in his view of the world, Hess constructed his philosophy of history. History, which embraces the social sphere of life is, according to him, not subordinate to Nature but on a par with it; it is dominated by the same laws and permeated with the same unified creative force. God reveals himself in history no less than in Nature; in this, he reminds us of the first Jewish national philosopher, Halevi, [*Footnote: See the writer's article on Halevi in The American Hebrew, November 10, 1916.*] and there is a divine plan in human affairs which is gradually unfolding itself in time.

Hess, like all thinkers of his time, was influenced in his conception of history by Hegel, whose principles he applied. History, like Nature, is a constant development, and is, of course, dominated by law, yet human freedom is preserved by the consciousness of our action. The development of history goes on in *dialectic* form, namely, forces opposing each other in earlier historical epochs are ultimately reconciled by a new synthetic epoch. Hess, viewing history as a part of the universal scheme, sees in its development an analogy to the development of Nature. In the former, as in the latter, there are three periods: rise, growth, and maturity, and there is also a corresponding similarity between the periods of these two spheres, which

he elaborates fancifully in the tenth letter. The difference lies in this: that while Nature has already entered upon the third phase of its development, history is still striving toward it. Hess employs, as the means of conveying his ideas, the Biblical conception of Sabbath, which signifies 'rest' as well as 'completion.' Nature has already attained its Sabbath, but History is yet to attain it. The Sabbath of history, the period of maturity of human development, is the Messianic era of the Prophets. It is a time when all opposing and struggling forces of the social sphere will be harmonized and men will become morally free. But in order to comprehend the full significance of Hess's historical conception and his grand vision of the future, we must understand his view of Society and its strivings.

In his youth, when, in response to the impulses of his warm heart, he threw himself in the Socialist movement in order to attempt to alleviate human misery, Hess had no definite conception of human Society. He was swayed too often by different motives. Social life to him was only a constant antagonism between the collective body of society as a whole and its individual constituent members. Human history, he says somewhere in his writings, is a struggle actuated by two motives, egoism and love. In other words, there are two forces in Society, the disintegrating one, egoism, and the cementing force which binds one human being to the other, love. Hess always retained his belief in love as a moral factor and opens his book *Rome and Jerusalem* with a eulogy of it. As an escape from this eternal struggle, he proposed Communism, a state of Society which is bound to curb egoism and foster love. For a time, he swayed to Individualism. Under the influence of Feuerbach and Bauer, he wrote his *Philosophy of Action*, which advocated the freedom of the individual. But, even then, he was not an egoist. Later, again, under the influence of Marx, he became more a class-struggle socialist. But in all these social changes of his, Hess conceived Society only as an aggregate of individuals.

It was only later, as a result of his anthropological studies, that Hess came to the conclusion that Society is not a mere abstract idea but is composed of definite subdivisions known as races, each of which has definite hereditary mental and physical traits which are unchangeable. He then formed his organic conception of Society, entirely independently of Spencer, which is the corner-stone of his social and Jewish philosophy. Society, according to this conception, is an organic body composed of organs, the races. Each of these organs or races has a different function to perform for the benefit of the whole. It is in the performance of this function that the purpose of existence of the organ is realized; and there exists in every organ a natural tendency to perform the function.

Hess developed an elaborate historical scheme, according to which every historical race had or has a certain mission or function to perform. The important places in this scheme are reserved by him for the two antithetical nations, the Greeks and the Jews. To the Greeks, the world presented multiplicity and variety; to the Jews, unity; the former conceived Nature and

life as *being*, namely, as an accomplished thing; the latter, as *becoming*, as a thing constantly being created. The Greeks, like Nature, which they represented, had reached their aim in life and had, therefore, disappeared from the world. The Jews, on the other hand, representing History, the constantly striving force, are still in existence, endeavoring to carry out their aim, to bring about in this sphere of social life the historical Sabbath, namely, the harmony of all social forces.

Judaism is a historical religion, a religion which has for its field of operation the social sphere, and which has discovered God in history, namely, the creative and reconciling principle in the life of humanity. The most characteristic point of Judaism, says Hess, in one of his later articles, [*Footnote: Die Einheit des Judenthums innerhalb der heutigen Religiösen Anarchie*, in the *Monatsschrift*, 1869.] is that it placed before human history its highest goal, the realization of universal law in Society. Judaism, he says in another place, is a humanitarian religion. According to its teachings, the life of the human genus is an organic process; it began with the family of the individual and will finally end with a family of nations. This, then, is the Jewish mission or function in Society, to realize the teachings of its great religion in practical life. The Jewish nation belongs to the creative organs of humanity. The Jews have taught humanity true religion, a religion which is neither materialistic nor spiritualistic, which has for its aim, unlike Christianity, not the salvation of the individual in the other world, but the perfection of social life in this world. And it is this function which they have to discharge to create for humanity new social values.

This function of Israel which, as a member of a great organism of Society, he is to perform, cannot be discharged anywhere else but in Palestine, where he will again be a nation possessing his own soil, a fundamental condition for living a regular normal social life. The regeneration of Judaism and Jewry is impossible in exile where it lacks the soil, the basis of a political life, and where there exists constant fear of disintegration. In exile, the Jews are unfruitful in all spheres, spiritually and economically. Jewish economic life, no matter how prosperous it may be in some countries, is abnormal; it lacks a basis, the soil; the Jews, therefore, cannot be creators and are only middlemen. It is only in their own land, where they will be able to produce new economic and social values, that they will continue to develop their greatest creation—Religion, which as a moral force will exert great influence upon humanity and thus bring about the realization of social harmony. In his attempt to lay the foundations of a positive view of Jewish life, Hess devoted considerable space to negative criticism of existing conceptions of Jewish life. His bitterest attacks are directed against the reformers and assimilators who deny Jewish nationality and substitute in its place an abstract indefinite teaching which they term, 'Mission.' Hess believes in a Jewish mission, but his mission is a natural function based on history and social life, while theirs is only a product of imagination and narrow vision. He attacks their ignorance of Jewish history

and the misconception of the nature of Judaism as well as of Society in general, and ridicules their self-assumed rôle as the teachers of the nations. Their Judaism is only an empty shell, after the most important principles have been abandoned by them. The Orthodox Jews have, in his opinion, a much higher and truer conception of Judaism. They have retained in their ceremonies and prayers the kernel of Nationalism and the desire for Jewish restoration. Yet even they do not satisfy him entirely. Their inactivity and fossilized state irritate him. But he is optimistic. He believes that the spirit of regeneration will revive them and that they will finally furnish the material for a great National Movement. Hess also laid great hopes on Jewish science and expected it to become a great factor in the Jewish revival.

Hess developed a practical plan for the realization of his dream of Jewish restoration. He advocated the colonization of Palestine and the foundation of a Jewish Colonization Association. He dreamed that Jews, having been settled on the road to India and China, will become the mediators between Asia and Europe. For political support, he looked to his beloved France, the embodiment of freedom and the champion of oppressed nations. But he also dreamed of a Jewish Congress, demanding the support of the Powers for the purchase of Palestine, a dream quite prophetic in view of recent developments. He also foresaw a political situation resembling in its features the present state of affairs created by the war; he called it the last struggle between reaction and freedom. In some of his articles there are strikingly modern features.

Some of the dreams of this great visionary have partly come true. Let us gather confidence from the words of this modern seer, and hope that the glorious vision he foresaw for Israel will be realized in the coming period of history.”

If we assume that there are no prophets who are divinely inspired to see into the future, we are led to conclude that it was the corrupt actions of disloyal Zionists which led to the fulfillment of Hess’ “visions” through war and through genocide.

Some saw the “Jewish Mission” and Protestant Christian Evangelism as one movement toward fanatical degradation into a slavish mentality, or the worship of evil as the Frankists worshiped evil. The anti-Semites and Zionists found common joined forces to criticize the “Jewish Mission”. Both resented the melding of the Jewish reformation with the Christian reformation, and both anti-Semites and political Zionists asserted that Jews were a “racial type” and a distinct nation, not a religion. In the introduction to the English translation of Moses Hess’ racist treatise on *Zionism Rome and Jerusalem*, Meyer Waxman wrote,

“Emancipation was obtained, though not by means of Reform. It was achieved through the political and social circumstances of the revolutionary year 1848. But assimilation was not stemmed. The extreme spiritualization of Judaism of the radical reformers and the elimination of the National element, brought the new type of Judaism within dangerous approach to

reformed Christianity, the line of demarcation between them becoming almost imperceptible. Many did not hesitate, therefore, to cross this line and enjoy the social advantages which the crossing afforded.”⁹⁵⁶

Mendelssohn’s “Jewish Mission” became the reform movement in German Jewry, which community of Jews had been experiencing turbulent times. Napoleon emancipated the Jews of what was to become the German Nation. This emancipation resulted in assimilation. The liberation of Germany from Napoleon resulted in the re-institution of discriminatory laws against Jews, which favored Jewish nationalism. The revolutions of 1848 again largely emancipated the Jews. Jewish racists were frustrated because they resented the indignity of discriminatory laws, but would not allow Jewish emancipation without a Jewish State, because emancipation resulted in assimilation.

During Napoleon’s philo-Semitic reign, some Jews betrayed him and encouraged all Jews to side against Napoleon and with an anti-Semitic Czar, because they feared that Napoleon’s emancipation of the Jews was leading to assimilation. The question naturally arises if Russian anti-Semitism was the work of such Jews and if the alleged anti-Semitism of some of the Czars came at the request of Jewish leaders—immensely wealthy Jewish leaders who held Russia’s fate in their hands. A Jewish leader of the time, Shneur Zalman, who hated Gentiles, reasoned that,

“If Bonaparte wins, the wealth of the Jews will increase and their positions will be raised. But their hearts will be estranged from their Father in Heaven. However, if Czar Alexander wins, then although the poverty of the Jews will increase and their position will be lower, their hearts will cleave to and be bonded with their Father in Heaven.”⁹⁵⁷

Revolutionary forces battled Aristocratic forces in what was to become Germany, resulting in the Revolution of 1848 and both sides employed anti-Semitism as a means to garner popular support. Karl Marx and Moses Hess used anti-Semitism as a means to promote themselves and subvert Gentile society. Both Marx and Hess were Hegelians in the spirit of Feuerbach—and Bruno Bauer. Feuerbach taught that religion should be supplanted by the humanitarian view that mankind can, by its own nature, achieve the status formerly attributed to the “divine”. For the Jews, this divine status meant the Messianic Era, when they would destroy the Gentile world. It occurred to them that they could attain Judaic prophetic goals by political means. These Socialists and Communists feigned atheism and Bauer and Marx while discussing the emancipation of Jews attacked Jews in general as religious, segregationist wealth accumulators. Like so many before them, they used anti-Semitism as means to control Gentile behavior which enabled them to accomplish Jewish ends. The German Revolution improved the condition of Jews in what was to become Germany and tended toward the amalgamation of the German Nation.

Another Hegelian, David Friedrich Strauss, published an influential treatise, *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet*, Tübingen, C.F. Osiander, (1835-1836); which taught that the Gospels are a mythology derived from Judaism. Communist⁹⁵⁸ Mary Brabant

Hennell began work on an English translation of Strauss' *Das Leben Jesu*, but she died in 1843. Charles Christian Hennell published *An Inquiry Concerning the Origin of Christianity*⁹⁵⁹ in 1838 which, like many other works before and since, disputed the existence of Jesus Christ. Charles Hennell's sister Caroline Bray was married to the anti-Christian Communist Charles Bray. This group of intellectuals, which also included Robert Brabant and Elizabeth Rebecca Brabant Hennell and Sara Sophia Hennell, became close and influential friends to Mary Ann Evans, who published under the pen name "George Eliot", and who completed the English translation of Strauss' *The Life of Jesus: Or a Critical Examination of His History* in 1844-1846. "George Eliot" may have had love interests in Robert Brabant and Charles Bray.

"George Eliot" later published the Zionist novel *Daniel Deronda* in 1876,⁹⁶⁰ which argued that Christians are essentially Jews—though not as noble. "George Eliot" was persuaded to write the Zionist novel by the racist Zionist Moses Hess, who was a very good friend of "George Eliot's" long term lover George Henry Lewes. "George Eliot" was an anti-Christian who studied Hebrew and the Talmud with her close friend, the noted scholar of the Talmud and of the Middle East, Emanuel Oscar Menahem Deutsch. She greatly enjoyed Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's *Nathan der Weise*, and her novel had many Frankist-like undertones, as did Lessing's work, which was based on the life of Moses Mendelssohn. One wonders if "George Eliot", whose ancestry was allegedly uncertain, discovered one day that she was of Jewish descent, or was told that she was—or had always known it. She privately rebelled against Zionism and may have discovered that Zionism ultimately means the destruction of all peoples but Jews.

In this era, Deist and Protestant Gentiles moved increasingly toward Judaism. Jewish reformists and Socialists, coming from the tradition of the Frankists, took the opportunity to promote the unity of reformed Judaism and reformed Christianity—Protestantism⁹⁶¹ as a unified front against Catholicism in the *Kulturkampf*; and, like the Frankists, many Jews pretended to convert to Christianity in order to gain rights and in order to subvert the Christian religion, which was increasingly returning to Judaism. Racist Zionists dreaded all of these forces which resulted in assimilation.

Mendelssohn was not out to advance the interests of the Gentiles, but to accomplish Judaic Messianic prophecies through the use of modern politics and modern science. All these Frankist movements, the Illuminati, "reformed Judaism", Communism, Bolshevism, etc. backfired on the Jewish racists. The Frankists kept their agenda well hidden, so well hidden that in the course of time even many Jews lost track of their original intentions. The Zionists reacted against the assimilation the Frankist movements had unintentionally caused, though they either misrepresented or misunderstood the racist intentions of the founders of those movements. Zionist Max Nordau wrote of the "Jewish Mission" of reformed Judaism,

"This gradually changed about the middle of the eighteenth century, when enlightenment first began to find its way into Jewdom, in the person of its first herald, Moses Mendelssohn, the popular philosopher. The faith of the

Jews became more lukewarm; the educated classes, where they did not simply convert themselves to Christianity, began to regard the doctrines of their religion in a rationalist manner; for them the dispersion of the Jewish people was a final and unalterable fact; they emptied the conception of the Messiah and of Zion of every concrete meaning, and arranged for themselves a singular doctrine, according to which the Zion promised to the Jews was to be understood only in a spiritual sense, as the setting up of the Jewish monotheism in the whole world, as the future triumph of Jewish ethics over the less sublime and less noble moral teaching of the other nations. An American rabbi reduced this conception to the striking formula, 'Our Zion is in Washington.' The Mendelssohn teaching logically developed in the first half of the nineteenth century into the 'Reform,' which deliberately broke with Zionism. For the Reform Jew, the word Zion had just as little meaning as the word dispersion. He does not feel himself in any diaspora. He denies that there is a Jewish people and that he is a member of it. He desires only to belong to the people in whose midst he lives. For him Judaism is a purely religious conception which has nothing whatever to do with nationality. The land of his birth is his fatherland, and he will know of no other. The idea of a return to Palestine excites him either to indignation or to laughter. He answers it with the well-known, silly, would-be witticism, 'If the Jewish state is again set up in Palestine, I will ask to be its ambassador in Paris.'

The thinking Jew did not fail, however, to perceive, in the course of time, that Reform Judaism is a half measure, a compromise, which like every compromise, contains the germ of destruction, as it cannot for one instant resist logical criticism. Whom shall the Reform Judaism satisfy? The believing Jew? He rejects it with the greatest abhorrence. The unbelieving Jew? He despises it as hypocrisy and phrase-mongering. The Jew who really desires to break with his national past and to be absorbed by his Christian surroundings? For that Jew, Reform Judaism does not suffice; he goes a step farther, the step that leads to the baptismal font. Still less does it satisfy the Jew who desires to guard Jewdom against destruction and to preserve it as an ethnical individuality. For to him an openly expressed abandonment of all national aspirations is synonymous with a self-condemnation of the Jewish people to a perhaps slow, but sure, death. Reform Judaism without Zionism, that is to say, without the wish and the hope for a reassembling of the Jewish people, has no future. At the best, it can only be regarded as a somewhat crooked path that leads to Christianity. He who desires to reach that goal can find straighter and shorter routes.

II.

And so it has come about that the generations which had been under the influence of the Mendelssohnian rhetoric and enlightenment, of reform and assimilation, have, in the last twenty years of the nineteenth century, been followed by a new generation which seeks to take up a standpoint other than the traditional towards the question of Zion. These new Jews shrug their shoulders at that twaddle which has been the fashion among rabbis and

literati for the last hundred years, and which boasts of a ‘Mission of Jewdom,’ said to consist in this, that the Jews must live forever in dispersion among the peoples in order to act as their teachers and models of morality, and to educate them gradually to pure rationalism, to a general brotherhood of mankind, and to an ideal cosmopolitanism. They declare the mission swagger to be either presumption or foolishness. They, more modest and more practical, demand only the right for the Jewish people to live and to develop itself, according to its abilities, up to the natural limits of its type. They have become convinced that this is not possible in dispersion, as, under that condition, prejudice, hatred, and contempt continually follow and oppress them, and either stint their development, or force them to an ethnical mimicry which necessarily makes of them, instead of original types with a right, to existence, mediocre or bad copies of foreign models. They therefore work methodically with a view to rendering the Jewish people once more a normal one, which lives on its own soil, and accomplishes all economical, intellectual, moral, and political functions of a civilized nation.”⁹⁶²

Ardent Zionist spokesman Israel Zangwill wrote down many commonplace Zionist beliefs in 1914,⁹⁶³ before World War I had begun: that Jews have a mission to convert the entire world to their beliefs, that the Jews are a superior race of God’s chosen, that the emancipation of Jews in Russia would destroy the race and constitute a degeneration of a superior race into an inferior one by blending Jewish blood with Slavic blood, and that the persecution and antagonism of anti-Semitism were essential and necessary elements to the survival of the Jewish race and the creation of a Jewish nation-state and the loss of anti-Semitism increases the “problem” of maintaining a pure Jewish race. Zangwill holds that Jews were better off segregated in the Ghettoes of the Middle Ages, than in emancipated Europe where they could assimilate. The mythologies of a master race and of racial degeneration through intermixing had both Jewish and Gentile adherents long before Zangwill, among them the early intellectual political critics of the Jews including Kant, Fichte, Bauer, Herder, Frege, Ghillany, Hegel, etc.⁹⁶⁴ Later came Jewish and Gentile racists who promoted the idea of distinct Aryan and Jewish “races” including Disraeli,⁹⁶⁵ Hess,⁹⁶⁶ Gobineau,⁹⁶⁷ Lassen,⁹⁶⁸ Renan,⁹⁶⁹ Hellwald,⁹⁷⁰ Chamberlain,⁹⁷¹ List,⁹⁷² Liebenfels,⁹⁷³ Zollschan⁹⁷⁴ and Rathenau.⁹⁷⁵ Hitler’s *Lebensraum* plan carried out under the supervision of the Nazi Governor-General Dr. Hans Frank (who was Hitler’s lawyer and was of Jewish descent) to depopulate Slavic lands was not far in its hatred from the Zionists’ hatred of the Slavs—the Zionists used the Germans as Esau’s sword to kill off tens of millions of Slavs, under the guise of “anti-Semitism” the Jews had the deluded Germans kill off the Jews’ Slavic enemy—under the guise of “anti-Bolshevism” the Jews had the deluded Germans kill off the Jews’ Slavic enemy. The Jews had put both the Bolsheviks and the Nazis into power and led the Germans to believe that they were fighting Jewish interests, when all the while they were serving them.

5.9 Jewish Bankers Destroy Russia and Finance Adolf Hitler

The New York Times reported on 18 March 1917, in Section 2, on page 2,

**“JACOB H. SCHIFF REJOICES.
A Great and Good People Have Come
Into Their Own, He Says.**

By Telegraph to the Editor of THE NEW YORK TIMES.

WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, W. Va., March 17.—May I through your columns give expression to my joy that the Russian nation, a great and good people, have at last effected their deliverance from centuries of autocratic oppression and through an almost bloodless revolution have now come into their own? Praised be God on high.

JACOB H. SCHIFF.”

In *The New York Times* on 24 March 1917 on pages 1-2, George Kennan explained how Jacob Schiff assisted Russia’s enemies and how Schiff financed and trained Russian revolutionaries —Japan and the Soviet State which Schiff created became virulent enemies of the United States—enemies who came to power under Jacob Schiff’s tutelage and financial patronage—Jewish bankers created the enemies of the United States and financed their wars against Americans,

**“PACIFISTS PESTER
TILL MAYOR CALLS
THEM TRAITORS**

Socialists at Carnegie Hall Fail
to Make Russian Celebration
a Peace Meeting.

RABBI WISE READY FOR WAR

**Sorry We Cannot Fight with the
German People to Overthrow
Hohenzollerism.**

KENNAN RETELLS HISTORY

Relates How Jacob H. Schiff

**Financed Revolution Propaganda
in Czar's Army.**

The most violent clash between patriots and pacifists that has occurred in New York City since relations were broken with Germany marked the celebration of the Russian revolution held last night in Carnegie Hall. It was precipitated by Mayor Mitchel, whose declaration that we were about to go to war in behalf of the same kind of democracy that had freed Russia was met with a determined demonstration by pacifists, evidently previously organized, which threatened for a time to break up the meeting.

After the uproar had lasted for fifteen minutes, the Mayor, white with anger, stepped to the edge of the stage and shouted:

'This country is on the verge of war—' A loud chorus of 'No' greeted him, but above the tumult he made his voice heard with: 'And I say to you in the galleries that tonight we are divided into only two classes—Americans and traitors!'

'I hope they put you in the first ranks,' shouted a leader of the pacifists.

'You do me the greatest honor,' replied the Mayor, and the applause which followed, coupled with the ejection of some of the trouble makers, gave the Mayor's supporters the majority.

The meeting started in orderly fashion. The century old fight of Russian revolutionists was pictured in glowing words, matched by the promise of the Russia to be.

On the front of the speaker's stand hung a pair of leg irons, from a Siberian prison. They were unlocked. An authority on Russian affairs, George Kennan, told of how a movement by the Society of the Friends of Russian Freedom, financed by Jacob H. Schiff, had at the time of the Russo-Japanese war spread among 50,000 Russian officers and men in Japanese prison camps the gospel of the Russian revolutionists. 'And,' said Mr. Kennan, 'we know how the army helped the Duma in the bloodless revolution that made the new Russia last week.'

The galleries were largely filled with Socialists, downstairs an admission fee had been charged and the crowd was more orderly until awakened by the protestations of the pacifists.

Mayor Mitchel was introduced by Herbert Parsons, President of the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom, as a 'man of a race that has also struggled for freedom.' There were rumblings of trouble when a few voices in the galleries started to hoot the Mayor.

'We are gathered here,' the Mayor began, 'to celebrate the greatest triumph of democracy since the fall of the Bastille.' There were some cheers. 'America rejoices,' he said. 'How could she do otherwise when she sees power in Russia transferred from the few to the many, and in the country where there seemed the least hope of the cause of democracy triumphing.

'America, the great democracy, is proud tonight because democracy in

Russia has supplanted the greatest oligarchy that remained on the face of the earth.' Then the Mayor stepped back and said:

'But I submit we have another reason to be proud. It is now inevitable, so far as human foresight can make a prediction, that the United States is to be projected into this world war and—'

'No! No!' rolled the chorus from the galleries.

There was quiet for an instant. Then the audience downstairs and in the boxes began to rise and a shout of 'Yes! Yes!' answered the galleries.

'The United States is for peace!' a voice from the gallery cried, and the tumult started anew. The ushers escorted some of the leaders of the disturbance out of the arena, and when the Mayor got partial order he said:

'We are to be projected into the war through no fault of ours, but because of conditions which have been thrust upon us—'

'No! No! No!' the galleries started again. Some one shouted an epithet at the Mayor, which brought, even from the galleries, shouts of 'Put him out! Choke him!'

'And when America does enter the contest,' shouted the Mayor, 'it will be to vindicate certain ideas as fundamental as those on which the Republic was builded, and among them will be the cause of democracy throughout the world. Let us be glad that, instead of fighting side by side with autocratic Russia, we shall be fighting side by side with democratic Russia.'

It was at this point that the galleries became so demonstrative that Mr. Mitchel told them they must be Americans or traitors.

'You are for America or you are against her,' he said, and here the Mayor made an indirect reference to the accusations he made against Senator Wagner. 'You are for America or against her, whether in private life or in legislative halls,' he said.

The Mayor then left the hall, followed by shouts of condemnation and of praise.

When the tumult had died down Rabbi S. S. Wise, a worker for world peace but not an extreme pacifist, was introduced.

'I feel it is my duty to say one word in support [hisses] and in reply to the Mayor. I would have this great audience know that I believe the Mayor was right—[This brought shouts of 'No. You're as bad as he is.']

'I am here to talk, and I'm going to talk,' shouted the Rabbi. 'If you don't like what I say, go; I am going to stay. The Mayor is right when he says we are on the verge of war. I pray God it may not come, but if it does the blame will not rest upon us, but upon that German militarism, which may it be given to the German people to overthrow as the Romanoffs have been forever overthrown.'

'God knows we want peace. No man has ever fought and stood for peace as has Woodrow Wilson. [Cheers.] I do not believe that war is absolutely inevitable, but I thank God I am a citizen of a republic that has been patient.'

'I am for peace, I say, but I would to God it were possible for us to fight side by side with the German people for the overthrow of Hohenzollernism.'

Then the rabbi praised the Russian revolution, but he ran into opposition when he said:

‘At the risk of incurring the displeasure of those of you who have such bitter memories I hope that amnesty will be extended to the Czar himself. May God forgive the Czar.’ [Shouts of ‘No, never!’] ‘May God forgive the monarch who never knew what mercy was.’

This was followed by shouts by a man in the gallery.

‘I cannot forget,’ continued the Rabbi, ‘that I am a member and a teacher of a race of which half has lived in the domain of the Czar and as a Jew, I believe that of all the achievements of my people, none has been nobler than that part the sons and daughters of Israel have taken in the great movement which has culminated in the free Russia.’

It was after a review of the struggle of the Russian revolutionists, of whom he has been the leading American writer, that Mr. Kennan told of the work of the Friends of Russian Freedom in the revolution.

He said that during the Japanese-Russian war he was in Tokio, and that he was permitted to make visits among the 12,000 Russian prisoners in Japanese hands at the end of the first year of the war. He told how they had asked him to give them something to read, and he had conceived the idea of putting revolutionary propaganda into the Russian Army.

The Japanese authorities favored it and gave him permission. Later he sent to America for all the Russian revolutionary literature to be had. He said that one day Dr. Nicholas Russell came to him in Tokio, unannounced, and said that he had been sent to help the work.

‘The movement was financed by a New York banker you all know and love,’ he said, referring to Mr. Schiff, ‘and soon we received a ton and a half of Russian revolutionary propaganda. At the end of the war 50,000 Russian officers and men went back to their country ardent revolutionists. The Friends of Russian Freedom had sowed 50,000 seeds of liberty in 100 Russian regiments. I do not know how many of those officers and men were in the Petrograd fortress last week, but we do know what part the army took in the revolution.’

Mr. Parsons then arose and said:

‘I will now read a message from White Sulphur Springs sent by the gentleman to whom Mr. Kennan referred.’ This was the message:

‘Will you say for me to those present at tonight’s meeting how deeply I regret my inability to celebrate with the Friends of Russian Freedom the actual reward of what we had hoped and striven for those long years! I do not for a moment feel that if the Russian people have under their present leaders shown such commendable moderation in this moment of crisis they will fail to give Russia proper government and a constitution which shall permanently assure to the Russian people the happiness and prosperity of which a financial autocracy has so long deprived them.

‘JACOB H. SCHIFF’

This message from President Wilson was read:

‘The American Ambassador in Petrograd, acting under instructions from this Government, formally recognized the new Government of Russia. By this act the United States has expressed its confidence in the success of and its natural sympathy with popular government. WOODROW WILSON’

Vladimir Resnikoff, the blind Russian baritone, sang a number of folk songs and the Symphony Orchestra, directed by Nikolai Sokoloff played Tchaikowsky’s Symphony No. 4 in F minor and other selections. Miss Lillian D. Wald delivered a eulogy of Mme. Catherine Breshkovskaya, the Russian revolutionist, who had visited this country and who is now in Siberia, to be brought back at the age of 70 years to see in Petrograd the triumph of the cause for which she worked and suffered.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the Mayor of the City of New York be requested to transmit the following cable to Professor Paul N. Milyoukoff, Minister of Foreign Affairs in the new Russian Government:

‘Citizens of New York having at the call of the Society of the Friends of Russian Freedom assembled in mass meeting at Carnegie Hall on this 23d day of March, 1917, extend their congratulations to the Russian people upon the success of the revolution in Russia, and express their admiration for those who in the years gone by and those who in recent days have fought so bravely for liberty. They convey their earnest wishes for Russia’s complete realization of self-Government, and declare their conviction that it will mean enduring friendship and co-operation between the Governments and peoples of Russia and the United States of America.’

At the close of the meeting the pictures of the revolutionary leaders were shown upon a screen, together with a picture of George Grey Bernard’s statue of Lincoln which is to be placed in Petrograd.

BREAK UP PACIFIST MEETING

Police Disperse Crowd Around Auto
of Orators in Wall Street.

The police stopped a pacifist street meeting in the Wall Street district yesterday afternoon after a big crowd had surrounded the speakers and had begun to dispute with them. Benjamin C. Marsh and other pacifist orators had been telling the crowd that the firm of J. P. Morgan & Co. and other financial interests were engineering a ‘go-to-war’ movement. Mr. Marsh spoke from an automobile.

‘I am engaged in a fight against surrendering the Government to Wall Street,’ he said. ‘If the privileged class and their wealth were to be conscripted in case of war there would be no possibility of this country becoming involved.’

‘What are you going to do about the German submarines?’ some one in the crowd asked.

‘I consider it more important to fight against special privileges than to engage in a war against poor, beaten Germany,’ was the reply.

The crowd became unruly, and a police Lieutenant in charge of reserves made them move on before Mr. Marsh had finished speaking.

Dr. David Starr Jordan spoke against war yesterday at a meeting in Horace Mann Auditorium, Broadway and 120th Street, under the auspices of the Collegiate Anti-Militarism League and the Institute of Arts and Sciences.

Dr. Jordan, the Rev. Judah L. Magnes, Morris Hillquit, Arthur Le Soeur, James P. Maurer, and others will speak at a mass meeting of the Emergency Peace Federation in Madison Square Garden tonight. John F. Moors, President of the Boston Associated Charities, yesterday joined the 'unofficial commission' which is trying to find 'a way out' without war."

Rabbi Stephen S. Wise had been a member of the "Anti-Militarism Committee" which was formed to combat the "cult of preparedness" that sought "to stampede the nation".⁹⁷⁶ He had been opposed to any talk of war.

The New York Times reported on 30 December 1917 on page 4 in an article entitled "KAHN ASKS ARMY OF 6,000,000 MEN":

"Jacob H. Schiff said that it now appeared reasonably sure that, at the end of this war, nationalities formerly subject would be freed and that, among them, Palestine would be restored to the Jews. He said that, although there had been much disagreement among the Jews of the world as to what was desirable for their future, they were now nearing an agreement and were preparing for the restoration of the Jewish State. In this situation he said that it was the duty of Jews to inquire into the reason why the Jewish nation had formerly fallen and been shattered, in order that the new Jewish State would stand. He asserted that their loss of country was originally due to their abandonment of their religion, and that a religious revival was the means of insuring the national future."

The Jewish Communal Register of New York City 1917-1918 wrote of Jacob H. Schiff,

"**Schiff, Jacob Henry**, was born in 1847, at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, Germany. He received his education in the schools of Frankfort. In 1865 he came to America, where he settled in New York City. Here, he joined the staff of a banking house. In 1873, he returned to Europe where he made connections with some of the chief German banking houses. Upon returning to the United States, he entered the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb and Company, New York, of which he later became the head. His firm became the financial re-constructors of the Union Pacific Railroad, and since then is strongly interested in American railroads. Mr. Schiff's principle of 'community of interests' among the chief railway combinations led to the formation of the Northern Securities Company, thus suppressing ruinous competition. The firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., floated the large Japanese War loans of 1904-05, thus making possible the Japanese victory over Russia. Mr.

Schiff is director of numerous financial companies, among them the Central Trust Company, Western Union Telegraph Company, the National State Bank of New York. He is also vice-president of the New York Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Schiff is widely known for his many philanthropic activities and for his interest in education. Of his numerous philanthropies only a few can be mentioned here. He founded the Chair in Social Economics at Columbia University; he presented the fund and the building for Semitic studies at Harvard, he is chairman of the East Asiatic Section of the Museum of Natural History of New York, which has sent out many expeditions for the study of Eastern history and conditions; he made donations to the various museums of the city, and presented the New York Public Library with a large number of works, dealing with Jewish subjects.

Mr. Schiff is the Jewish philanthropist par excellence. His philanthropies embrace every phase of the Jewish life. He is intensely interested in hospital work and is the president of the Montefiore Home, and a contributor to Mount Sinai Hospital and all other important Jewish hospitals of the city. He is profoundly interested in Jewish education and took a leading part in the reorganization of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America; he is also the founder of the Bureau of Education. In addition Mr. Schiff is trustee of the Baron de Hirsch Fund and the Woodbine Agricultural School. He has provided the building and funds for the Young Men's Hebrew Association of New York City.

Mr. Schiff has always used his wealth and his influence in the best interests of his people. He financed the enemies of autocratic Russia and used his financial influence to keep Russia from the money market of the United States.

When last year, Mr. Schiff celebrated his seventieth birthday, all the factions of Jewry in the United States and elsewhere united in paying tribute to him."⁹⁷⁷

Elinor Slater and Robert Slater wrote in their book *Great Jewish Men*:

“Schiff also served as a director or advisor for many banks, insurance firms, and other companies. He helped float loans to the American government as well as to foreign countries. The most important was the two-hundred-million-dollar bond issue for Japan at the time of the 1904-1905 Russo-Japanese War. Furious with the Russians over their anti-Semitic policies, Schiff called the czarist government ‘the enemy of government.’ He was pleased to support the Japanese in their war effort. He also encouraged an armed revolt against the Czar. When the Japanese won the war, Schiff was presented with the Second Order of the Treasure, becoming the first foreigner to receive an official medal at the imperial palace.

In 1910 Schiff was one of several Americans who campaigned to revoke a commercial treaty with the Russians over their mistreatment of Russian

Jews. Although the Russians sought him out for loans as well, he was steadfast in his refusals to grant them. Schiff made sure that no one else at Kuhn, Loeb underwrote Russian loans either. He did provide financial support for Russian-Jewish self-defense groups. It was only with the fall of the Czar in 1917 that Schiff dropped his opposition to underwriting the Russian government; he provided some support for the Kerensky government. But, angry at the Russians for refusing to honor the passports of American Jews, he successfully campaigned to abrogate the Russian-American Treaty of 1932. [***] During World War I Schiff and some of his American Jewish peers were assailed by the newer generations of Zionist leaning leaders for their indifference to Zionism. Schiff had indeed been a strong foe of Zionism, believing it a secular, nationalistic perversion of the Jewish faith and incompatible with American citizenship. He gave some funds to agricultural projects in Palestine, however, and by 1916 he had shifted his beliefs to be in favor of Zionist efforts, openly supporting the notion of a cultural homeland for Jews in Palestine.”⁹⁷⁸

Israel Zangwill wrote in 1914,

“[. . .]Mr. Jacob Schiff financing the Japanese war against Russia and building up the American Jewry[.]”⁹⁷⁹

Jacob Henry Schiff was a financier who appeared to become a Zionist only after being intimidated by a Zionist smear campaign against him. However, Schiff had sponsored the rabid Zionist Rabbi Judah Magnes. Schiff funded the Russian Revolution and funded the Japanese against the Russians in their war. Schiff obstructed the Russians’ access to international financing with which to fight the war, feed the Russian people and maintain the Russian economy. Many were amazed by Japan’s ability to defeat mighty Russia. Schiff later showed no loyalty to anything other than the Zionists’ cause.

He initially favored Germany in the First World War, since Schiff, like many American Jewish financiers, was born in Germany; and since Germany agreed to work toward the emancipation of Russian Jews and secure Palestine for the Zionists—actions Zionist Israel Zangwill defended in spirit, while Zangwill concurrently tried to bring America into the war on the side of England.⁹⁸⁰ *The New York Times*, 22 November 1914, Section 5, page SM4, published a long article on, and interview with, Jacob Schiff together with a large portrait of the man glorifying him as a visionary of the war to end all wars; which article was entitled, “JACOB H. SCHIFF POINTS A WAY TO EUROPEAN PEACE; He Sets Forth the Disastrous Results to America That Would Follow the Complete Humiliation of Either Germany or England and Believes We Can Do Much to End This War and with It All War.”⁹⁸¹ *The London Times* portrayed the interview with Schiff as pro-German propaganda on 23 November 1914, on page 8, and note the statement, “their line of attack is to secure a lasting peace”, further note Schiff’s call for a peace conference, long the ambition of the Zionists:

“GERMAN PRESS CAMPAIGN

ADVANCE ON THE OLD METHOD.

MR. JACOB SCHIFF’S VIEWS.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

WASHINGTON, Nov. 22.

There are signs that the Germans are again planning to make a bid for American sympathy by peace talk. The *New York Times* publishes a long interview with Mr. Jacob H. Schiff, one of the leading German-American bankers, and a close friend of the German official representatives in the United States, which shows clearly that their line of attack is to secure a lasting peace.

Mr. Schiff argues that neither the Allies nor Germany should be allowed to score a smashing victory. A complete triumph for the Allies would hand over the world to England and her navies, while ‘in the *rôle* of world-conqueror Germany would be a world-dictator and would indulge in a domination which would be almost unbearable to almost every other nation.’ For the United States a complete British triumph would be especially disastrous. Probably the permanence of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance would saddle upon Americans the burden of a defensive militarism. If Germany won, the Monroe doctrine might, among other things, become a scrap of paper. Both England and Germany are patriotically resolved to fight until exhaustion supervenes. That means for Europe a prolonged period of bloodshed and misery. Hence for humanitarian and selfish reasons alike the United States is interested in ending the conflict. The United States should see whether she could not devise some sort of conference at which the belligerents could talk things over. It might perhaps be managed without an armistice.

I believe it to be not beyond the bounds of possibility that if this course could be brought about a way out of this struggle and carnage might be found, and I know I am not alone in this belief. The situation is unprecedented. . . . The peace must not be temporary. It must mark the ending of all war. . . . Towards this end America may help tremendously, and herein lies, it seems to me, the greatest opportunity ever offered to the American Press. Let the newspapers stop futile philosophizing on the merits and demerits of each case. . . . Let them begin stimulating public opinion in favour of rational adjustment of the points at issue. . . . Have we not the right to insist that the interests of neutral nations should be given some consideration by the nations whose great quarrel is harming us incalculably?

The moderation of Mr. Schiff’s brief for Germany, his lamentation over

the misery of the war, annotated as it is by accounts of suffering Flanders, his appeal to the humanitarian instinct of the American people, to their sympathy with the under-dog, to say nothing of his other points, all show a considerable advance of the Teutonic grasp of the American point of view since the Bernstorff manœuvres at the end of the summer. Even the *New York Times*, whose grasp of the basis of the issue, I have often pointed out, is particularly clear-visioned, while it thinks the plea is rather premature, hopes that in a few months, should one side or other score decisively enough to snatch from its enemies the hope of ultimate victory, the proposal of a conference might be opportunely pressed. It also expresses what is undoubtedly the general opinion over here, when it says:—

Whatever aims the belligerents in moments of heat and passion may profess, we here in America do not want to see Germany crushed; none of us want to see England crushed, or France or Russia. We have no wish to see any great people crushed. Such a result of the war would be an almost irreparable disaster, and we should share the loss.

The lessons of the above are fairly obvious. The peace campaign already launched by enterprising journalists, amiable pacifists, financiers worried by heavy German commitments, and by German propagandists, will sooner or later gain inconvenient strength. No pains must be spared to continue to advertise above-board our conception of the fundamental issues. It must be continually made clear that we are fighting against German militarism and not against the German people; that no peace can be lasting until the present German régime is crushed. Nor, judging from comment current here, is it enough simply to proclaim the fact.

Privately, Germans are trying to capitalize what they call the vindictive tone of certain British utterances. They draw attention, for instance, to the indiscriminate abuse of Germans as ‘Huns’ and of the way in which not only the Prussian contingent but the Bavarians, Wurtembergers, &c., are bespattered with sneers. If, argue the German propagandists, such things really represent British opinion, how much reliance can be placed on British protestations that Prussian militarism is the only enemy? Does it not rather seem that Great Britain is embarked on a jealous crusade to crush utterly its dangerous rivals in the race for world supremacy?

* * Mr. Jacob Henry Schiff, whose views are given above, is a native of Frankfurt-on-Main, where he was educated. He went to the United States in 1865 at the age of 18 and settled in New York. He is a member of the banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb, and Co., of which his son, Mortimer Schiff, is a partner.”

Zionist spokesman Israel Zangwill, who was British but felt no loyalty to Great Britain because his only loyalty was to his fellow Jewish Zionists and their money—Zangwill ran to Schiff’s defense. (In an aside, anti-Semite Eugen Karl Dühring had argued that Lessing was a poor writer and a plagiarist and that his promotion in Jewish circles was overblown and contrived.) Schiff proposed that the First World War be the war to end all wars, which became an international mantra after the war. The absolute end of all war heralded the Jewish Messianic Era in

which the Jews would be “restored” to Palestine, where they would rule the world from Jerusalem. *Isaiah 2:1-4* states,

“1 The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem. 2 And it shall come to pass in the last days, *that* the mountain of the LORD’s house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. 3 And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem. 4 And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.”

The London Times printed a letter from Zangwill on 25 November 1914 on page 9,

“MR. SCHIFF ON PEACE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—The interview with Mr. Jacob Schiff reported by your Washington Correspondent—the proposal for a permanent peace that shall end not only this war, but war—comes as the one gleam of light in the world’s darkness. But why almost extinguish it under the head of ‘German Press Campaign’? And why does he speak of Mr. Schiff’s ‘brief for Germany’? As one associated for many years in philanthropic work with this noblest of millionaires, I should like to testify that, despite his early associations with Germany, he is one of the most patriotic Americans I have ever known. Descended from a long line of Jewish Rabbis and scholars—one of his ancestors was Chief Rabbi of the Great Synagogue, London, in the 18th century—Mr. Jacob Schiff might himself have sat to Lessing for the portrait of ‘Nathan der Weise,’ and in proposing a conference to end Prussian militarism—and every other—he speaks not as the mouthpiece of Berlin, but with the voice of Jerusalem.

Yours faithfully,

Israel Zangwill

Jewish Territorial Organization, King’s-chambers, Portugal-street,
Nov. 23.”

Zangwill was indeed familiar with Schiff’s “philanthropy”. Zangwill mentioned Schiff’s involvement in the war between Russia and Japan in Zangwill’s book, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judean Publishing Company, New York, (1914), on page 14, “[. . .]Mr. Jacob Schiff financing the Japanese war against Russia and building up the American Jewry[.]” Schiff provided approximately \$200,000,000.00USD (non-adjusted) for the Russian Revolution.⁹⁸² Jacob Schiff’s

“philanthropy” ultimately cost the lives of tens of millions of Russians and subjected hundreds of millions more to Jewish repression which has yet to subside. The *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 14 RED-SL, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 960-962, at 961, states,

“Schiff was prominently involved in floating loans to the government at home and to foreign nations, the most spectacular being a bond issue of \$200,000,000 for Japan at the time of the Russo-Japanese War in 1904-05. Deeply angered by the anti-Semitic policies of the czarist regime in Russia, he was delighted to support the Japanese war effort. He consistently refused to participate in loans on behalf of Russia, and used his influence to prevent other firms from underwriting Russian loans, while providing financial support for Russian Jewish *self-defense groups. Schiff carried this policy into World War I, relenting only after the fall of czarism in 1917. At that time, he undertook to support the Kerensky government with a substantial loan.”

The “anti-Semitic policies of the czarist regime in Russia” were the prohibition of racist Zionism, which the Czar prohibited because the Czar asked the Jews to integrate not segregate. The racism was Jewish, not Russian. The Czar was also confronted with murderous Jewish revolutionaries and Jewish led strikes that crippled the Russian economy and caused the Russian people to suffer and starve. But then, as now, Jews largely controlled the media and so Jews were able to blame the Czar for the wrongs Jews had done and for the racist segregationism Jews had insisted upon. In the Jewish media, the Czar became a racist for opposing Jewish racism and an enemy of the Russian People for trying to rescue them from the Jews who were out to destroy the Russian People.

Prominent Jews had long advocated the use of tyrants following revolutions. The Bolsheviks Schiff put into power, after Kerensky, who was Jewish, failed to rule with an iron scepter, the Jewish Bolsheviks mass murdered millions of Russian Christians, destroyed Russian Orthodox Churches while leaving synagogues intact and pillaged, plundered and destroyed Russia for most of the Twentieth Century. Those many Jews who hated Russians had their revenge. Russian culture was largely destroyed in the process. Irreparable harm was done to the Russian people as a result of the mass murder of their best people and the introduction of carcinogens into their living environment. The famines and unemployment that the Jews blamed on the Czar, so as to cause the unrest which broke out in 1905, were instead due to Schiff and his Jewish financier friends. After Schiff’s puppets came to power, they plundered Russia’s vast wealth and sent back to the Jewish financiers, a process which continues to this very day. Such was Jacob Schiff’s “philanthropy”.

Before the Balfour Declaration, Jacob Schiff, a German-Jew who had emigrated to America, stated that he was not a Zionist, though he contributed to Jewish causes in Palestine in 1910,⁹⁸³ and sponsored the rabid Zionist Judah Magnes. When the Zionists made a deal with the British Government to bring America into the war on the side of the Allies, Schiff found himself caught in several conflicts of interest. He

did not commit wholeheartedly to Zionism. As has happened to so many, Jacob Schiff then became the victim of a Zionist smear campaign in the press, which included deliberate lies and threats. After being smeared with lies and distortions, and after being threatened, Schiff then assisted the Zionists and later became an ardent Zionist.⁹⁸⁴ Whether or not this was mere theater is an open question. Einstein was told that Schiff was unreliable, apparently because Schiff was not an open Zionist and may have had some sentimental attachment to Germany. Einstein was told that the Warburgs, German Jewish financiers who later financed Hitler, were more reliable than Schiff the seemingly reluctant Zionist.⁹⁸⁵ But Jacob Schiff, as fantastically wealthy as he was, had little wealth or influence compared to the Rothschilds who ruled over him. The Rothschilds were the true force behind all of these inhuman intrigues.

Samuel Untermyer called for a boycott of Germany in 1933, and chastised Jewish bankers for financing Adolf Hitler and Nazism,

“Revolting as it is, it would be an interesting study in psychology to analyze the motives, other than fear and cowardice, that have prompted Jewish bankers to lend money to Germany as they are now doing. It is in part their money that is being used by the Hitler régime in its reckless, wicked campaign of propaganda to make the world anti-Semitic; with that money they have invaded Great Britain, the United States and other countries where they have established newspapers, subsidized agents and otherwise are spending untold millions in spreading their infamous creed.

The suggestion that they use that money toward paying the honest debts they have repudiated is answered only by contemptuous sneers and silence. Meantime the infamous campaign goes on unabated with ever increasing intensity to the everlasting disgrace of the Jewish bankers who are helping to finance it and of the weaklings who are doing nothing effective to check it.”⁹⁸⁶

Fritz Thyssen,⁹⁸⁷ Averill Harriman, George Herbert Walker and Prescott Bush (President George Herbert Walker Bush’s father), also financed Hitler and Nazism.⁹⁸⁸

The attacks on Schiff no doubt intimidated other powerful and influential American and German Jews who were initially not Zionists—such as Louis Marshall. *The New York Times* reported Schiff’s initial defiance on 5 June 1916,

“JACOB SCHIFF QUILTS JEWISH MOVEMENTS

Hurt by Unjust Criticism, He
Tells Kehillah He Will Work
Alone for Reforms.

SPEAKS HIS VALEDICTORY
Says Attacks Were Based on
Misquotations That Made Him

Condemn Those He Defended.

Jacob H. Schiff informed the Kehillah at its seventh annual convention at the Hebrew Technical School for Girls yesterday that he had been hurt by recent attacks made upon him in connection with his efforts to help to solve the problems of his co-religionists, and that hereafter 'Zionism, nationalism, the Congress movement and Jewish politics in whatever form they may come up' would be a 'sealed book' to him.

'I shall continue to work for the uplift of my people,' he said in what he termed his valedictory. 'I shall continue to co-operate in all constructive work that is needed, and I shall continue to co-operate as far as I can in procuring full civic rights for our brethren in the war zone, especially in Poland, Russia, Rumania, and Palestine, for they are all flesh of my flesh and bone of my bone. But beyond this, my friends, my duty ends.'

Some of the criticism complained of by Mr. Schiff grew out of a speech made by him at the Central Jewish Institute recently, in which he was reported as having said that Jews in Russia brought many of their troubles on themselves because they kept apart as a separate people. Mr. Schiff later announced that he had not been correctly quoted, but the criticism continued. A minority group within the Kehillah, and certain Jewish newspapers, were charged with having made especial use of the speech at the Jewish Institute, largely because of their disagreement with the policies of the American Jewish Committee, of which Mr. Schiff is a member and of which Louis Marshall is President.

Favored Quieter Plan.

This minority group favored the calling of a 'Democratic Congress' of Jews in the United States to give immediate attention to the problems of Jews in the warring countries. The American Jewish Committee, on the other hand, advocated a quieter method and the approach of the subject through a conference which would not complicate existing troubles with hasty utterances.

Mr. Schiff was visibly affected while addressing the convention, and his voice trembled as he recounted the years of service he had devoted to the Jews of the United States and of other countries. He received a remarkable ovation at the conclusion of his speech, and ex-Justice Leon Sanders sprang to his feet with a resolution voicing complete confidence in Mr. Schiff, whom he described as 'the greatest Jew alive today.' This resolution was adopted on a rising vote, with only Z. Cutler, a delegate and a representative of a Jewish newspaper, opposing it. Mr. Cutler insisted on having his vote recorded, and was hissed.

A resolution to sever relations between the Jewish Kehillah and the American Committee was not adopted. Another resolution, also introduced by the minority group, providing for a discussion by the Kehillah of the movement to consider Jewish problems at a congress, was voted down. This was a double victory for those who agreed with the policies of the American

Jewish Committee.

Mr. Schiff told the delegates that it was with the greatest regret that he had found it necessary to speak of himself to Jews of New York, and to the Jews of the country before whom he had been ‘so maliciously maligned.’

Mr. Schiff’s Address.

‘I have come here to deliver up the sword of dissension,’ he said. ‘I have lived for fifty-one years in New York. I am now almost at threescore and ten, and I believe ever since I have grown into manhood there has not a day passed that I have not been seeking the good of my people. Unfortunately, perhaps, the people of the City of New York and elsewhere have been, contrary to my bidding and even contrary to my protest, making a Jacob’s coat for me. I say unfortunately because Jacob’s coat, ever since the days of Joseph, has borne ill results, and, in my case, it is bearing ill results now. I hope the Yiddish press has able reporters here today, and I would ask them, if I may ask them anything, that they print in extenso what I am saying, if their reporters, as was their duty, at that meeting two weeks ago at the Central Jewish Institute, had taken down exactly what I said then instead of taking it secondhand from the secular press, there would, I believe, have been no need for me to stand before you here today. I want to read to you from a stenographic report exactly what I then said. It is not long. I shall read you only one paragraph, and I ask your patience:

Mr. Schiff, in speaking of the Jews in Russia and Poland, said: I am second to none in my feeling over oppression in Russia and Poland, not only for what they are suffering now, but for what they have suffered for the last fifty years. But it has occurred to me and it is considerable thought that I have given to this—that if the Jews of Russia and the Jews of Poland would not have been kept as a separate people by themselves, by discriminatory laws, the prejudices of persecution to which they have been subjected would not have reached the stage to which we all regret it has unfortunately come.

Fight of Long Years.

‘Now, my friends, there is not a word in this that I am not prepared to stand by. But instead of this, because one single reporter who probably—and who has since said so, I understand—did not grasp what this meant, represented that I made the Jews of Russia and Poland responsible for their persecutions, the Yiddish press launched against me a campaign of attack, maligned me, even threatened me, and continue it even now, although two or three days after that meeting, the correct stenographic report appeared, as I understand, in Yiddish in the Day, and in English in the American Hebrew. It made no difference to them; they ignored it, and they continue to ignore it now.

‘Now, just think, to accuse me of such a crime. Think of it! I, who have for twenty-five years singlehanded struggled against the invasion of the Russian Government into American money markets, and to this day stave them off. Think of it! Who, as I, have been foremost in the past for agitation and insisted to the President of the United States—as some of you must

know—that our treaty with Russia must be abrogated. Why did I say this treaty must be abrogated? Not that any one of us wants to go to Russia, but because others knew—and I knew—that whenever Russia would be compelled to open its doors free to the Jew, to the American Jew, and to the Jew of all nations, it would not be able to continue the restrictions against its own Jews, and to continue the Pale of Settlement which is at the bottom of all misfortune; and even if it has not come to it yet, friends, that will be the consequence.

‘And these my accusers, not of this Yiddish press, but men who are here on sufferance, men who are refugees here because, unfortunately for them—and I am sorry for it—they cannot return to their homes at present as intended, and they write to the Jewish papers that I have furnished by my address munition to the Russian Government, which will be of more value to it than the munition which is furnished to them now, and the Russian Government will rejoice. No, my friends! The Russian Government will rejoice because you are battering down the man who has stood between persecution,—between anti-Semitism as far as his power goes—and the Russian Government.

Attack Long Planned.

‘Why am I attacked? I know, because I have been warned of it, and I have been warned from the inside of the Jewish press. I have been told time and again, and I have every reason to believe correctly, that if I did not stop my opposition to the Congress movement I would be first attacked, as perhaps the most conspicuous member of the American Jewish Committee, that the confidence of the Jewish people in me would be undermined, and I would be broken down, and this whole attack is only part of a very well conceived plan, and whatever I would have said, and if God Almighty would have laid the words in my mouth, I would have been maligned and attacked because it was part of a plan which has been very carefully worked out.

‘Whosoever can assert that for the time he knows me, or who knows of me, I have ever denied myself to my people, have denied myself to their wants, have denied myself to any cause, that I have waited until Jewish problems have been brought to me instead of going after them in my desire to co-operate, that I have not given not only of my means, but day in and day out—and I may say night in and night out—have not given of myself, let him rise and accuse me.

‘I may say this by way of valedictory: I have been hurt to the core, and hereafter Zionism, nationalism, the Congress movement, and Jewish politics in whatever form they come up, will be a sealed book to me. I shall continue to work for the uplift of my people; I shall continue to co-operate in all constructive work that is needed, and I shall continue to co-operate as far as I can in procuring full civic rights for our brethren in the war zone, especially in Poland, Russia, Rumania, and Palestine, for they are all flesh of my flesh and bone of my bone. But beyond this, my friends, my duty ends. I thank you for so patiently having listened to me, and I thank you for having encouraged

me by your applause given to me.’

Convinced in Sincerity.

Mr. Sanders, in introducing the resolution commending Mr. Schiff, said no one present could help being touched by or could question the sincerity of the statements made by Mr. Schiff. He said he had known Mr. Schiff for many years, and was convinced Mr. Schiff had not made the statement with which he was originally credited in the speech at the institute.

The Kehillah, before adjourning, adopted the following resolution, introduced by Maurice Simmons, Chairman of the Committee for the Protection of the Good Name of Immigrant Peoples, condemning discriminations in the National Guard because of religion or race:

Resolved, That the Kehillah of New York City strongly condemns discrimination on account of race or religion in the National Guard of the State of New York, in the recruiting of members, or in the designation or election of its officers. Such discrimination is un-American and utterly opposed to the principles of the State Militia; and, further

Resolved, That the National Guard of the State of New York should be regulated by necessary legislation or executive orders so that its membership and government should absolutely exclude any idea of private proprietorship or social club and the right to discriminate against men on account of their race or religion.

Mr. Schiff received many personal expressions of confidence and goodwill after his address.”

The Congress Movement favored by Zionist Louis Dembitz Brandeis—was an attempt to unify Jews behind the Zionists, who were then unpopular among Jews. The Zionists created this Congress Movement so that at the close of the First World War the Zionists would have an organization in the name of which they could petition for the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine at the peace conferences they planned would follow the war. The American Jewish Committee, and with it Jacob Schiff and Louis Marshall, seemingly opposed the Zionists’ strategy in the war, but were intimidated into following their course and were later converted to the cause. In 1918, Max Senior and Rabbi David Philipson organized a public meeting to oppose Zionism and the Balfour Declaration. Jacob H. Schiff, Oscar S. Straus⁹⁸⁹ and Louis Marshall⁹⁹⁰ asked Rabbi David Philipson and Max Senior not to oppose the Zionists. Schiff’s letter to Philipson was quoted in *The New York Times* on 12 September 1918, on page 8:

**“SEES REFUGE FOR JEWS.
Schiff Declines to Join Conference
to Oppose Zionism.**

The Zionist Organization of America gave out yesterday a letter written by Jacob H. Schiff to Dr. David Philipson of Cincinnati, Ohio, in which Mr. Schiff declared his opposition to anti-Zionist movements. Mr. Schiff asserted that even more than when he first ceased his opposition to the Zionist

movement, he now felt that the creation of a Jewish homeland in Palestine was desirable. Declining Dr. Philipson's invitation to join a conference to organize an opposition to Zionism, Mr. Schiff said:

'I am very much afraid that conditions in Russia, Poland, Rumania, Austria, perhaps even Germany and elsewhere, are such that the outlook for the Jews there—and these form a vast majority of the Jewish population of the world—is far from being a favorable one, and that for reasons which would lead too far to go into here, but which by all those who want to use their eyes can be seen, considerable unhappiness, if not suffering, is likely in store in the countries I have named for the Jewish populations.

'American Israel alone, in co-operation with its English and French co-religionists, is in a position to effectually help this proposed creation of a centre where the Jew forced out by impossible conditions under which he may have to live in the Diaspora, shall be able to go with the assurance that he shall find very sympathetic surroundings and conditions under which he and posterity shall be willing to live.

'There can be no doubt that the success of these endeavors will have the most healthy and refreshing effect upon entire Israel, wherever in the world its members may be located, and the proposition which you bring forward that American Israel combine to oppose these efforts is in my opinion nothing less than preposterous.'

Mr. Schiff in the concluding paragraphs of his letter paid his respects to Dr. Philipson, but said that in organizing an opposition to Zionism Dr. Philipson was about to place himself at the head of a movement that is certain to fail.

The Zionist Organization of America announced yesterday a contribution by Bernard M. Baruch of the War Industries Board of \$10,000 to the Palestine Restoration Fund."

Another source quotes more of the letter,

"I believe I have heretofore explained to you the reasons which, soon after the outbreak of the Russian revolution, have induced me to change my former attitude towards the Zionist movement, and I have since become more and more convinced that it was in the best interests of our people that I did this."⁹⁹¹

With the most powerful men in the American Government against him, "Colonel" House, President Wilson, Louis Brandeis and Bernard Baruch; and with the most powerful family in the world against him, the Rothschilds; one wonders what threats were used against Schiff and what offers were made to him to persuade him to change his mind.

The immense sums of money the financiers had at their disposal is mind boggling, and one wonders what could have been achieved had those funds been put to constructive purposes instead of ill purposes, or, had they been equitably

distributed in a real democracy. Schiff, who headed the banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., had given some \$200,000,000.00USD (non-adjusted) of his own money to fund the destruction of the Russian government. He was also able to corrupt the money markets of the world to prevent Russia's access to monies, which destroyed the Russian economy. Schiff achieved what Napoleon and Hitler could not—régime change in Russia followed by a replacement government of his choice. He did it with Jewish banks, not German tanks. Schiff accomplished his aim through an inhumane deception. Schiff destroyed the Russian economy, then, through propaganda, blamed the Czar for the terrible economic conditions Schiff, himself, had imposed upon the people of Russia. The financiers who corrupted governments and human affairs on an international scale produced the political climate which deliberately resulted in mass murder on the scale of tens—even hundreds—of millions of innocent lives lost. Schiff's Russian Revolution led to Stalin, and the financiers and Zionists behind "Colonel" Edward Mandell House and his Zionist League of Nations led to Hitler. These men, who were in complete control of the American Government, were all enemies of the United States—just as Hitler, Goebbels and the other crypto-Jews who took over Germany were enemies of Germany. The "philanthropy" of Jewish financiers achieves their Messianic objectives. Jewish Messianic prophecies call on Jews to destroy all Gentile life, and to destroy the Earth. But what could humanity achieve if these Jewish financiers weren't so good to us?

These German-Jewish bankers installed a crypto-Jewish government in Germany, which not only ruined the lives of countless European Jews, but which infected the minds of innocent German children with hatred and a thirst for war which would ultimately result in their deaths, the death of their nation, their national heritage and their national honor. These Jewish bankers were a curse to all the nations and blessed none. While they stole the wealth of America, England, France, Germany, Russia, China, Japan, etc., they lived side by side with non-Jews in these countries and continually plotted to destroy them and placed their agents in power to subvert their economies, governments and religions. Germany could well have been the most productive and beneficial nation humankind has yet enjoyed—with the benefit of many well-meaning German Jews—had not ill-intentioned Internationalist and Zionist Jews deliberately destroyed it and corrupted it in their quest for Isaiah's "new earth", the Zionists' so-called "New World Order" (*Isaiah* 65:17; 66:22). Dare I say it, Germany was a victim of the Jewish religion and its mad adherents, and America will be next.

In addition to Jacob Henry Schiff and his son Mortimer; the family of Max, Paul, Felix and Fritz Warburg, were manipulative Jewish financiers in both World Wars, on both sides of both conflicts. Felix M. Warburg and Paul Warburg created and then headed the Federal Reserve⁹⁹² under President Woodrow Wilson.⁹⁹³ Wilson's Svengali, "Colonel" House, wrote of how he would place a puppet dictator into power in 1912 in order to achieve this end in his book *Philip Dru: Administrator*.⁹⁹⁴ That puppet dictator was Woodrow Wilson. The bankers made their plans for the Federal Reserve on Jekyll Island, Georgia, in 1910, and House helped to carry them out.⁹⁹⁵ The man who drafted the bankers' Jekyll Island plan, Paul Warburg supported the campaign of Wilson and Felix Warburg that of Taft, such that no matter who won

the election the President would be friendly to the Warburgs. Max Warburg headed the German banking house of M. M. Warburg in Hamburg. Eugene Meyer was head of the War Finance Corporation.⁹⁹⁶ Bernard Baruch was the Chairman of the War Industries Board. Many of the institutions and laws Wilson brought about under the influence of the financiers were quite similar to the institutions and laws Napoleon had begun under the influence of the Rothschilds.⁹⁹⁷ These markets and laws again and again led to immense profits for financiers and to economic ruin for entire societies—even for humankind. Napoleon immediately faced opposition to his changes to the usury laws.⁹⁹⁸

The Warburgs and the Schiffs were related through marriage. The Warburgs and Jacob Schiff financed Trotsky and the Communist Revolution in Russia, as well as general revolution which led to Kerensky's rise and fall and the rise of Lenin's dictatorship and the Bolsheviks in 1917.⁹⁹⁹ The Warburgs also financed Hitler in 1932,¹⁰⁰⁰ and the Hungarian Jew Moses Pinkeles, a. k. a. Trebitsch-Lincoln,¹⁰⁰¹ financed Hitler, the NSDAP and its newspaper organ the *Völkischer Beobachter*, and many other Jewish financiers including Baron von Schroeder financed Hitler.¹⁰⁰² The NSDAP, after doing very poorly in an election, suddenly covered the nation with banners, posters and flags and advertised itself throughout the land in 1932. Their propaganda, uniforms, etc. must have cost a fortune. That fortune was provided by Jews who wanted to persecute other Jews and force them to Palestine against their will. Though the rise of the German economy in the early Nazi period is sometimes mistakenly attributed to the efficiency of Fascism, it was in fact due to a massive influx of investment capital provided by Jewish bankers. If anything, Hitler's régime was terribly corrupt and mismanaged the funds. *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1918, Russia*, Volume 1, File Number 862.20261/53, United States State Department Publication Number 222, 65th Congress, 3d Session, House Document Number 1868, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., (1931), pp. 373-376; bears witness to the Warburg transactions:

“DOCUMENT NO. 3

Circular November 2, 1914, from the Imperial Bank to the representatives of the Nya Banken and the agents of the Diskonto Gesellschaft and of the Deutsche Bank.

At the present time there have been concluded conversations between the authorized agents of the Imperial Bank and the Russian revolutionaries, Messrs. Zenzinov and Lunacharski. Both the mentioned persons addressed themselves to several financial men who, for their part, addressed themselves to our representatives. We are ready to support the agitation and propaganda projected by them in Russia on the absolute condition that the agitation and propaganda (carried on ?) by the above-mentioned Messrs. Z and L. will touch the active armies at the front. In case the agents of the Imperial Bank should address themselves to your banks we beg you to open them the necessary credit which will be covered completely as soon as you make demand on Berlin.

RISSER

Addition as part of document:

Z. and L. got in touch with Imperial Bank of Germany through the bankers (D?) Rubenstein, Max Warburg, and Parvus.

Note: L. is the present People's Commissioner of Education. Z. is not a Bolshevik, but a right Social Revolutionist and in the discard, whereabouts unknown. Parvus and Warburg both figure in the Lenin and Trotsky documents. P. is at Copenhagen. W. chiefly works from Stockholm.

[***]

DOCUMENT NO. 9

MR. RAPHAEL SCHOLNICKAN,
HAPARANDA.

Dear Comrade: The office of the banking house M. Warburg has opened, in accordance with telegram from the Rhenish Westphalian Syndicate, an account for the undertaking of Comrade Trotsky. The attorney [?] purchased arms and has organized their transportation and delivery track Luleå and Vardö to the office of Essen & Son in the name Luleå receivers and a person authorized to receive the money demanded by Comrade Trotsky.

J. FÜRSTENBERG

Note: This is the first reference to Trotsky. It connects him with banker Warburg and with Fürstenberg. Luleå is a Swedish town near Haparanda."

It was well known that financiers could affect the outcome of a war. The eleventh edition of *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1910) stated in its article "Anti-Semitism":

"Prince Bismarck himself confessed that the money for carrying on the 1866 campaign was obtained from the Jewish banker Bleichroeder, in face of the refusal of the money-market to support the war."

The London Times published a letter from "a member of the Vigilance Committee" on 26 November 1914 on page 9,

"GERMAN-AMERICAN FINANCIERS AND THE WAR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—Mr. Zangwill, in his praise of his co-religionist Mr. Jacob Schiff, of New York, in *The Times* of to-day, omits to point out that this is the second time that Jewish financiers have intervened at moments when Germany is in difficulties. It will be remembered that when the German

attempt at Paris failed, Mr. James Speyer and his satellites began calling loudly for peace, and it is curious that just now, when the Germans have failed to take Warsaw and are still many miles from Calais, Mr. Jacob Schiff should be on the same tack.

The British public are getting alive to the operations of these financiers. It is fortunate that their machinations occasionally come to light, and one is grateful to Mr. Zangwill for the extra illumination he has cast upon their dark ways.

One knows now that every time the German cause is in difficulty we shall have fresh attempts to influence American neutrality. So far the pro-Germans in England and their organs in the Metropolitan Press have been wisely quiet. They are none the less being closely watched.

Yours faithfully,
A MEMBER OF THE VIGILANCE
COMMITTEE.

November 25.”

Israel Zangwill published another letter in *The London Times* on 2 December 1914 on page 9,

“THE VOICE OF JERUSALEM.
TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—If my friend Mr. Schiff speaks, as you say, with the voice of Berlin, then how splendid! For in that case what Berlin wants is ‘the ending of all war.’ Those are the words of Mr. Schiff which you report in your issue of the 23rd inst.—I have no other source of information. In your correspondent’s own language:—‘The line of attack is to secure a lasting peace.’ In short, the admirable ultimatum of our statesmen is to be accepted:—
‘No patched-up truce that would expose our children to a revival of the German menace.’ Alas, I am only afraid that it is the voice of Jerusalem, and not the voice of Berlin.

Yours faithfully,
ISRAEL ZANGWILL.
Far End, East Preston, Sussex, Nov. 26.”

Schiff was again in the foreground in 1917, when Jews lionized him as an instigator, and the financier, of the Russian Revolution, which succeeded just before President Wilson pushed for an American declaration of war against Germany. Benjamin Freedman asserted that there had been a meeting between the Zionists and the British government in October of 1916 and it was then that a deal was struck between them—Palestine for the Jews in exchange for America’s involvement in the war on the side of the Allies. Louis Brandeis blackmailed President Wilson into accepting this deal, which cost countless American lives and prolonged the war, costing millions more lives, and which resulted in an unjust peace that led to the Hitler régime, which cost millions more lives. The Zionist Jews deliberately

murdered some one hundred million people in the Twentieth Century, deliberately disrupted and in many instances ruined the lives of billions of human beings, wasted vast resources which could have solved most of problems of the world had they been put to good use instead of applied to evil ends, all in order to force some few four or five million Jews into a land where they did not want to live. They are not done yet. Jewish prophecy demands that all other religions be prohibited, that all other cultures disappear, and eventually that all non-Jews and assimilated Jews be murdered. They will never lose sight of these goals.

The deal made between Zionist Jews and Arthur Balfour was an illegal act, in that England had no right to determine the fate of Palestine and the Zionist Jews did not represent the will of the American People. Benjamin Freedman was a witness to the fact that Americans had been very pro-German up until that time, in part because German Jews did much to shape public opinion to make it pro-German. Freedman observed that after the Zionist Jews betrayed Germany and allied themselves with England, the German Jewish community and the Wilson Administration slandered and smeared the Germans with lies and distortions and criminalized pro-German sentiments in America.

Benjamin Freedman's charges are borne out by the historic record. As but one example among many, *The New York Times* reported on 18 January 1919 on page 4 (note that poet and Hitler apologist George Sylvester Viereck lived with, and had a homosexual relationship with the Jewish Zionist Ludwig Lewisohn.¹⁰⁰³ Viereck was reputedly the grandson of Kaiser Wilhelm I and Edwina Viereck, and was the son of the Marxist Louis Viereck. George Sylvester Viereck was one of the chief pro-German propagandists in America during World War I, defended the Kaiser after World War I, was a devoted friend to Sigmund Freud and promoted Albert Einstein—as well as Adolf Hitler. Eustace Mullins stated that Viereck was flattered and pleased when Mullins told Viereck that Viereck had cost Germany victory in both world wars.¹⁰⁰⁴ Just as the poet Ezra Pound propagandized for the Fascists in Italy, Viereck propagandized for the Nazis from the 1920's through the 1940's and served time in prison in America for his pro-Nazi activities. Viereck and Lewisohn remained friends after the Second World War—and the Holocaust.¹⁰⁰⁵ William Jennings Bryan was Secretary of State under President Wilson. Both Bryan and Wilson, as well as Bryan's wife, and Wilson's first wife, were avowed pacificists, and advocated American neutrality. Wilson betrayed Bryan and America and brought the United States into the war as a result of Zionist blackmail.),

“QUESTION DICKINSON, AGENT OF VIERECK

Senators Hear Letters Assailing
Wilson, Tumulty, Lansing,
and Others.

TOLD NAVY ‘SECRET ORDERS’

Writer Asserted They Were Against

Teutons—Explains ‘Leak’
of Peace Note.

Special to The New York Times.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 17.—There was read today into the records of the Senate committee which is investigating German propaganda a large number of letters written by J. J. Dickinson, until Nov. 15 last a Captain in the army, to George Sylvester Viereck of New York, who during the period of American neutrality was one of the most active German propagandists in this country.

Most of these letters, according to the Army Intelligence Service, were really intended for Dr. Karl A. Fuehr, one of the propaganda chiefs sent to this country by the German Foreign Office. The Military Intelligence Service further alleges that the letters as a result were promptly transmitted by wireless to Berlin. The letters were all signed ‘Josiah Wingate,’ which Dickinson admitted was a nom de plume.

In his testimony before the letters were produced by Major E. Lowry Humes, Dickinson swore that at no time did he have reason to believe that he was employed by agents of the German Government. Until Bernstorff was ordered out of the country he had no inkling that Fuehr was one of the important cogs in the German propaganda machine. He said he worked simply as a Washington correspondent of Viereck’s weekly, *The Fatherland*, and subsequently for the Transocean News Service, the German semi-official news organization, of which Dr. Fuehr was directing head in this country.

Dickinson was on the stand several hours. It never dawned upon him, he swore, until just before this country entered the war, that he had been ‘duped.’ After we entered the war, he said, he did all he could to help the Government build up a case against Viereck. Referring to the so-called ‘peace note leak’ [*The New York Times* reported on Bernard Baruch’s involvement in this scandal at the time.¹⁰⁰⁶—CJB] of January, 1917, he said he was led to believe that he was in a way responsible.

He said he ‘doped out’ the situation correctly, and gave his deductions to John F. Harris of Harris, Winthrop & Co., 15 Wall Street, New York. He added that Bernard Baruch, who, he said, made \$300,000 on steel common a result of his (Mr. Baruch’s) foresight, had figured the situation out as he himself had done.

Dickinson said that in the controversy that followed the ‘leak’ he went to Chairman Henry of the House Committee on Rules and told him what he knew of the matter. He also communicated, he said, with Secretary Tumulty.

Various letters read into evidence were written in 1916. Dickinson admitted the authorship of all except one, which purported to report an interview with President Wilson at Shadow Lawn in October, 1916. Major Humes said that only a part of the letters were put into records.

First Letter to Viereck.

The first letter from Dickinson to Viereck which was read into the record, dated June 4, 1916, bore a reference to Captain Guy Gaunt, then Naval

Attaché of the British Embassy at Washington. In part it read:

‘National Press Club,

‘My Dear Mr. Viereck:

‘Please note by the above that I am now receiving my mail at the National Press Club instead of the Army and Navy Club, as heretofore, the reason being that I find it more convenient to use the first-named club in doing my work than the latter.

‘I learned yesterday from an authoritative source that the President has been informed that Secretary Lansing’s attitude toward every newspaper man in Washington, who exhibits by his questions when calling at the State Department even a sense of fairness toward German interests, is growing more insulting every day. It is particularly marked in the case of the representatives, whether foreign or domestic, of the German-language press.

‘Wilson, I know, is in a near-panic over the coming campaign. His desperation is perceptibly growing daily. This frame of mind may lead him to almost any outburst against Lansing or other Cabinet officers who may fall under just criticism because of their unneutral attitude toward Germany. I had a long talk, somewhat startlingly frank, this morning with a Cabinet officer on this whole subject.

‘In spite of denials from the White House recently of friction between Lansing and Wilson, I would not be at all surprised if Lansing would leave the Cabinet, possibly because of ‘failing health,’ within a few weeks. The Republican campaign managers are raking his Mexican relations and activities, past and present, with a fine-tooth comb. This the President knows, too. I confidently expect to have photographic copies of certain of his financial transactions with the Huerta Government at the City of Mexico within a couple of weeks. At any rate, I have been faithfully promised this by responsible Mexican representatives.

‘Exposure of the Britisher.’

‘I have been expecting to receive from you the promised resolutions on the Captain Gaunt affair. I have spoken to several members of Congress about the matter, men who have read with interest your exposure of the Britisher and who hope that the subject matter may be so presented in resolutions that they can handle them in some form in Congress.

‘Schrader was with me several hours yesterday and doubtless will discuss with you several very interesting pointers I gave him for his next letter.

‘I was not here when Bryan was last in Washington, but I have learned from two or three of his intimates who talked with him that he will give the Wilson cause only the most perfunctory support in the campaign. This will also mark the course of Speaker Clark. I do not know whether I told you in one of my last letters the story related by Mrs. Bryan to T. H. Pickford, a local Democratic magnate, of the immediate cause of her husband’s precipitate retirement from the Cabinet. It was that Tumulty told a prominent German-American that Bryan was the sole cause of the Administration’s anti-German policy. Pickford went to Tumulty with the story, and the

atmosphere of the White House was blue with curses of the Bryans all the time Pickford was there. Pickford has since written to Mrs. Bryan a full account of his interview with Tumulty.

‘This matter could be so worked up as to force Wilson to rid himself of Tumulty. What suggestions have you to make as to its handling? I believe it is too big an opportunity to be neglected. Mrs. Bryan possibly would be willing to come out in an open statement. She is a very able and a very determined woman. She loathes the whole Wilson outfit and especially Tumulty, the tumultuous. Faithfully yours,

‘JOSIAH WINGATE.’

On Eve of Convention.

Three days later, on June 7, Dickinson wrote that the Administration would ‘remain excessively quiet on everything of domestic or international concern,’ until after the result of the Republican National Convention in Chicago was known.

The next letter, dated June 8, 1916, contained an invitation to Viereck to come to Washington and meet Burleson, Tumulty, and Daniels. The letter indicated that the President would not receive the visitor, but ‘Wingate’ could introduce him to Tumulty, who would report everything he said to the President. He also touched on the punitive expedition into Mexico under Pershing in this letter.

In a letter of June 9, 1916, which also referred in the main to the impending Presidential campaign, Dickinson reported that he had talked with Secretary Tumulty, who ‘manifested an unusually keen concern, asking me if I thought you would support the President or the Republican nominee at Chicago if he were other than Roosevelt.’ Dickinson said he had been unable to answer so pointed a question, and added that he had also been unable to answer when Tumulty asked him ‘whether or not you would direct the Fatherland (the pro-German Weekly of which Viereck was editor) along a neutral course in the campaign.’ Continuing, Dickinson wrote:

‘This only demonstrates how anxious the Administration people are growing over the question of the attitude of the German-American element in the forthcoming campaign. When I told Tumulty that you probably might make a visit to Washington shortly and that I should want to have him meet you and two or three others at luncheon, he was silent for a moment and said that it might be embarrassing all around, should he be seen with you. I ridiculed this strange declaration, and he finally said without explanation that you certainly ought to meet and talk with Burleson when you come here. However, I dare say that all he meant was that he would take the subject up with the President and be governed wholly by his chief’s instructions.’

In Doubt Over President.

In a letter of June 11, Dickinson wrote that he was still without information as to what the President would write into the Democratic platform ‘on this subject,’ his reference apparently being to the ‘Americanism’ question.

‘He, (the President),’ the letter continued, ‘is naming the officers of his convention, is writing its platform, will man the National Committee through Tumulty and his son-in-law, McAdoo, and will run his own committee. What Bryan thinks of all this or intends to do about it I do not know now. I wrote Mrs. Bryan a letter today in the hope of obtaining some expression from her that might reflect her husband’s mind.’

In this same letter, Dickinson prophesied that the Morgans would finance the Wilson campaign through Cleveland H. Dodge. He said that the politicians believed that the Standard Oil and Cowdray Oil interests would back Hughes.

On June 14, 1916, Viereck was informed by letter that ‘by order of the President the War Department is preparing advertisements for 9,000 army trucks, in addition to 2,000 already to be bid for at the Depot Quartermaster’s headquarters in New York on June 30.

‘This is,’ he observed, ‘one of the most positive signs observable of Wilson’s purpose to do something sensational before the Presidential campaign closes.’

On June 18, 1916, in a letter to Viereck, Dickinson wrote:

‘* * * if you want to meet any of the folks here in high and responsible place I will attend to this end of the negotiations with pleasure. I would suggest that Untermeyer, whom I know very well, be approached on the subject at once. I have no doubt at all that he would promptly and gladly respond. Fred Lynch told me recently that he had met you at Untermeyer’s Yonkers place several weeks or months ago. Samuel is a shrewd citizen and knows how to do things.’

Suspected a Wilson ‘Scheme.’

In a letter of June 23 Dickinson made reference to what he termed was ‘further evidence of my conviction of a shrewdly devised scheme to tie us to the body of a corpse—England,’ adding that this was propaganda ‘started by the Wilson forces to place the blame for the extremely embarrassing situation in Mexico upon Germany.’

‘Let us do something to reveal this whole damnable business and do it quickly,’ he added. ‘I am willing and anxious to serve in this cause in any capacity to which I may be assigned.’

‘Nothing of the same relative importance has occurred since the opening of the war in Europe as the U-boat inquiry at Baltimore promises. If the Deutschland shall be captured or destroyed by a vessel of the allied powers the fault will be ours.

‘Our navy has been secretly instructed to work against the interests of the Central Powers. A considerable element of the navy, whom I happen to know personally, is opposed to discrimination between the nations; but most of the element is favorably inclined toward the Teutonic element.

‘If we can arrange to get together the various elements which in detail may be opposed to the British program, but which may indorse our general program, without admitting that they do so, I am confident that we may

accomplish something worth while.’

Dickinson wrote on Aug. 20 that he knew that ‘the Administration is anxious to catch Germany in a trap on the submarine question, and that we shall probably hear a great deal on this question before the votes are cast in November.’ In this letter he also made reference to a conference the President had the previous day with the railroad executives.

Wilson’s ‘Cunning and Craft.’

‘Before he called these men of affairs into the conference,’ he wrote, ‘the President had prepared his statement, and he gave it to the newspapers through Secretary Tumulty while the conference was in session. In other words the President ‘put one over’ on the railroad executives and caught them napping. * * * This incident savors so of Wilson’s cunning and craft that I think it could be used as a good text for an article in *The Fatherland*.’

Under date of Aug. 23, 1916, ‘Wingate’ wrote to Viereck:

‘Here is a narrative that would be almost unbelievable if it were not for the fact that so many strange things have attended the Wilson foreign policies—not to say have influenced them. I obtained it recently from two Democratic members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

‘When the President was recently hard pressed by them to let them know what he was up to in Mexico—whether or not he intended eventually to intervene should he be re-elected—he told them that that eventuality would depend almost wholly on the conditions in Europe. He pointed out to them that he had announced a policy of broad and far-reaching neighborliness with all Latin America in his able speech two years ago, when he declared that never again, or at least so long as he was the responsible head of the Government, would the United States take a single foot of territory by conquest. * * *

‘Now, said the President to my two friends at different times—I mean they were not with him at the same time—our word on this pledge has gone forth to the whole world, and it is doing us good in Latin America. Therefore, should be forced to intervene in Mexico, which would mean war, we could not in plain honor take a foot of Mexican territory as indemnity after we had overrunk and conquered the country. We could only demand and levy a money indemnity.

‘More than 50 per cent. of the productive wealth of Mexico, Wilson pointed out from statistics which he held in hand, was owned by foreigners, largely Americans, the next in holdings being the English and French. The levying of a money indemnity, therefore, would wring from ‘our friends’ the bulk of the extra taxation imposed through which to pay the indemnity. That would place a burden upon corporations in this country which own mines, ranches, &c., which it would be bad domestic politics to impose. It would also cause irritation in England and France.

‘The Morgan-Guggenheim group are the largest owners of productive wealth in Mexico. Next to them comes the Lord Cowdray outfit in England.

‘Need I tell any more of this remarkable story to enlighten you on the

Wilson Mexican policy?'

Disavows Shadow Lawn Letter.

The so-called Shadow Lawn letter, the authorship of which Dickinson denied, advancing the theory that it had been written by Viereck, was the last of the documents read into the record. It read in part as follows:

'Oct. 24, 1916.

'My Dear Mr. Viereck:

'At Shadow Lawn last Saturday the President initiated a conversation with me about you, which at least I regard as curious if not significant and of importance to you.

'He started the conversation by asking me how long I had known you personally and how well I knew you. I told him that while our personal acquaintance intercourse had extended over only two months, still I thought I knew you pretty well, mainly because I had for several years been very intimately associated with a German of your general type—the late Count Seckendorff—who temperamentally was a great deal like yourself, in that he was a man of punctilious honor and hence with strong inclinations always to be fair.

'Then the President asked me if I thought you were judicial-minded. I facetiously replied that you were a poet and that I had never known a poet of judicial mind.

'He then inquired with very apparent interest about what he called your 'equipment.' I dwelt upon your culture in a broad literary sense.

'While he was discussing your 'apparent' sense of fairness I related to him briefly the genesis of your statement for the press. I told him that you had in the original statement this assertion, 'an ounce of performance is better than a pound of promise,' and that you had elided this without any request or hint from me. This obviously pleased him very much.

'I infer—and my inference may be wide of the mark—that he has determined to appoint some sort of neutrality board after the election to aid him in reaching some new judgment in regard to our international relations in order that he may act within the new lights which may be thrown upon the subject.

'I was strongly tempted, of course, to ask him what he had in mind, but you can understand the sense of delicacy I felt when that thought was evolved in my mind.

Attitude of Hyphenates.

'On the general subject of the hyphenates he seemed wholly at ease. He said he believed a year ago that their blood had been so heated against him that they were violently against him en masse. He added, however, he was convinced that their blood had cooled and that only their exclamatory leaders were in the main the only element that persistently took an unfair view of his conduct.

'He had on his desk while talking to me about you, a full copy of the statement you had prepared for the press in re the Ridder statement

concerning Stone and Burluson. He remarked upon the fairness of its tone as illustrated by your assertion that you did not regard his Americanism as inferior to that of Hughes. Before I left him he looked around and said that he was sorry no stenographer had been present while he was talking to me so that what I had said concerning you might have been taken down.

‘I remarked again that I was sorry he had replied at all to ‘that crazy man O’Leary,’ and he said that he had not dictated that statement in haste or heat, but that it was the result of very cool and careful thought on his part.

‘I had almost forgotten to tell you that during the conversation the President said in effect that he wanted to know about you and others, who like yourself have individualized themselves in these troublesome times, because you might be useful ‘when settlement time comes.’

Dickinson, in a statement to the committee, said he had served as a Major in Cuba in 1898 and had been commissioned soon after this country entered the European war as a Captain in the National Army. He said that his resignation became effective on Nov. 15 last.

The report of an investigation of his record was placed in evidence by Major Humes. In this report, signed by Brig. Gen. Marlborough Churchill of the Military Intelligence Service, General Churchill recommended that Dickinson be discharged from the service by the President. His resignation followed and was accepted by President Wilson. Dickinson read into the record a letter which vouched for his loyalty and which was signed by Major Gen. Frank McIntyre of the General Staff.

J. M. Kennedy of Montana followed Dickinson on the stand. His testimony had to do with brewery and German activities, he said, had been active.”

Jacob Schiff destroyed the Russian economy and caused Russia to lose its war with Japan in order to foster a revolution in 1905 which would bring about Jewish emancipation and Jewish domination of the Russian People. Schiff financed the Russian Revolution of 1917 towards the same end. When the Jews obtained dominion over Russia, the Jews oppressed and committed genocide against Russian Gentiles.

The Jewish revolutionaries behind the Russian Revolution believed that only a Communist Revolution would achieve the desired goal of emancipating the Jews of Russia, because Jews would dominate the Communist régime they would impose on the Gentile majority. In reality the only impediment to Jewish emancipation was Jewish racist nationalism. The Czar did not want an enemy State within Russian territory and the Czar offered the Jews complete freedom if only the Jews would abandon their racism and segregationism. Jewish Communist Zionist Nachman Syrkin stated in 1898,

“In Russia, where Jews are not emancipated, their condition will not be radically altered through an overthrow of the present political regime. No matter what new class gains control of the government, it will not be deeply

interested in the emancipation of the Jews. That emancipation will come to the Jews of Russia as ‘manna,’ or as a result of idealism and humanitarian principles, is inconceivable. Russian Jewry will attain its emancipation only in the future socialist state.”¹⁰⁰⁷

Syrkin got his totalitarian Jewish Socialist State in Russia—much to the detriment of the majority of Russians and to the world, but ironically it led to “Red Assimilation”, the assimilation of the Jews the Czar had wanted and the racist Jews had dreaded. Syrkin knew that assimilation followed emancipation in Western Europe, but he apparently pinned his hopes on the presumption that anti-Semitism would become so strong in Russia after the Jews had ruined the nation and mass murdered its People, and Russian Jews were so racist and segregationist, that the assimilation he knew followed emancipation after the French Revolution and Socialism in France, would not occur in Russia. When “Red Assimilation” did take place, Zionists again believed that they had the right and the duty to further ruin Russia and “rescue” Jews from themselves by putting Hitler in power and keeping Hitler in power.

In Russia itself, the man behind Stalin’s genocide and anti-Semitism, which caused the deaths of tens of millions of Christians and attempted to keep the Jews segregated, was an alleged “self-hating Jew”,¹⁰⁰⁸ Lazar Moiseyevich Kaganovich. American Communists, many of whom were ethnic Jews, largely turned a blind eye to these atrocities. Kaganovich was a Zionist who wanted to both punish assimilatory Jews and develop in them a keen interest in Zionism due to artificial anti-Semitism. Kaganovich was the power behind the throne of the Stalinist Regime, and he directed the genocide of the Ukrainians, as well as “Stalin’s purges” and anti-Semitic campaigns. He was one of the world’s worst genocidal Jewish mass murderers, worse even than the Zionist Bolshevik Adolf Hitler. The artificial anti-Semitism of Kaganovich and Hitler was part of the Zionists’ strategy to force Jews to return to their roots.

Jewish Zionist Joachim Prinz wrote in his book *The Secret Jews*,

“In Hitler’s Germany, as so often before in Jewish history, persecution stimulated Jewish resilience and inspired a return to Jewish values. Oppression has repeatedly awakened the Jews’ dormant resources and created contempt for the persecutor; the result has often been a renaissance of Judaism. This is not to deny that many Jews did convert under the pressure of the Inquisition and the terror of the Gestapo. There were certainly many thousands of sincere converts who became devout Christians and totally gave up their Judaism. But the phenomenon, which may contain at least a partial answer to the riddle of the survival of the Jewish people, is that through centuries of persecution in each generation there have always been Jews who maintain their Jewishness in some way, and that to the present time their descendants manifest the memory of their ancestors’ faith in their rituals and their lives.

A more complicated aspect of this phenomenon occurred recently in

Russia. At the turn of the century young Russian Jews, whose forefathers had suffered for decades under the czar's savage pogroms, were among the early converts to Communism and followed the lead of Marx, Trotsky and the other early Communist theoreticians—who themselves were Jews, though, of course, not observant Jews. To rid themselves of every vestige of their Jewish heritage and to demonstrate their allegiance to the new system, which scorned religion of any kind, some staged wild parties on the Day of Atonement, while the remnant of the faithful Jews were saying their prayers. (For those who wanted to retain their Jewish identity, early Communism provided a measure of religious freedom; some schools still taught Yiddish, many synagogues remained open.) The young Jewish students, marching under the red banner with their fellow Russians, were ecstatic about their sudden and glorious emancipation from the Pale of Settlement, those areas of the country to which Jews had been confined since the end of the nineteenth century. They became super-Communists, freed from the daily degradation, the insults and the recurrent pogroms which had become part of the history of the Russian Jews under the czars. The new political dogma seemed to promise that this sort of persecution would never occur again.

The anti-Semitic brutality of the Stalin regime showed this Jewish euphoria to have been a fool's paradise. The Jewish schools were closed; most of the synagogues were boarded up. Hundreds of Jewish intellectuals and professionals, all fervent Communists, were exterminated in the purges. Soviet Jewry's Marranic period had begun. But it remained a rather quiet, even dormant form of secret Judaism until the creation of the State of Israel."¹⁰⁹

Prinz appeared to strongly resent assimilated Jews, even at the late date he published *The Secret Jews*,

“The assimilated Jew of whom we speak is one of ‘Jewish descent,’ who may deny it, hide it or be ashamed of it. Like the Marrano, his Jewishness is the skeleton in his closet. He would prefer to associate with ‘others’ rather than cultivate his Jewishness. In many respects he is very much a modern Marrano. For although he is trying to keep his Jewish origin secret, he remains latently Jewish. There was a time when this type of Jew was a rarity. We are approaching the time when he may represent a majority of the Jewish community. Religious and secular ties are becoming less binding. A very large number of young Jewish people throughout the world have only tenuous ties with their Jewishness. But—and this is the problem which reminds us so much of the Marranos—*can Jewishness be forgotten?*”¹⁰¹⁰

Perhaps the most compelling evidence that Soviet anti-Semitism was a ploy meant to force reluctant, assimilating Jews into Zionism against their will, was the fact that the most virulent anti-Semitic purges began after the failed attempt to create a “Jewish State” in the far Eastern regions of the Soviet Union, the Jewish

Autonomous Oblast in Khabarovsk Krai in the districts of Birobidzhansky, Leninsky, Obluchensky, Oktyabrsky and Smidovichsky.¹⁰¹¹ This plan failed, in part, due to the interference of some Zionist Socialists, who insisted that Palestine was the Jews' national home. An even earlier attempt to found a Jewish State in Russia in the districts of Homel, Witebsk and Minsk,¹⁰¹² also failed, largely due to a lack of Jewish interest. The Zionists insisted that anti-Semitism alone could force the Jews to segregate. When the Zionists put Hitler in power, they had the needed impetus to force Jews to flee Europe and the Zionists attempted to steal Chinese territory for a "Jewish homeland" with the help of the Imperial Japanese under the "Fugu Plan". Zionist Jews sought to establish a "Jewish State" in China, which had been taken over by the Imperial Japanese whom the Jews had been financing since the days when Jacob Schiff loaned them \$200,000,000.00 in the Russo-Japanese War. The Zionists used the Imperial Japanese to destroy the Chinese government in preparation for the formation of a Jewish nation in China under the "Fugu Plan" in Manchuria or Shanghai. The Jews even promoted the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* to the Japanese as evidence as to how powerful they were. The "Fugu Plan" failed to attract enough Jews, even under Nazi pressure, and the hard Zionists wanted Palestine. The Zionists then arranged for war between the United States and Japan. When America declared war on Japan, Hitler, seemingly inexplicably, declared war on the United States ensuring the ultimate defeat of Germany. Hitler also went to war with the Soviets, which gave him access to large numbers of Jews the Zionists could then segregate and ready for deportation to Palestine.

Schiff's and the Zionists' war on Russia has caused the Russian people, Jew and Gentile, great suffering and loss of life for over a century. Both the Nazis and the Communists caused the Russians, and Slavs and Jews in general, to suffer genocide and prolonged tyranny at a time when the enlightenment promised far better things for humanity. In the minds of Cabalistic Jews, evil is good, and they celebrate the fact that they formed a racist apartheid "Jewish State" in Palestine by spilling oceans of blood. This racist State continually troubles the world and consumes vast resources which could otherwise be put to productive uses. The Jews in Israel regularly steal from the Palestinians and degrade and murder them. For Cabalistic Jews, evil is goodness.

Israel Zangwill was a prominent racist Zionist in Britain, who devoted his life to segregating Jews. Zangwill's statements prompt many questions regarding the motives and involvement of the Zionists in the persecution and concentration of Jews shortly before, during, and after the First World War. One might dismiss Zangwill's statements as rhetorical exaggeration expressed for effect, were these same points not so often repeated by Jewish racist political Zionists, both publicly and privately. Zangwill also states that most Jews of the period (unlike him) considered the notion of a Jewish state to be a "political perversion"; and, in the knowledge that the race-concept does not apply to humans, Zangwill maintains it anyway, for political purposes. The bragging of the Zionists was perhaps in small part a reaction to the denigration Jews had endured from Richard Wagner (who was perhaps himself of Jewish descent), Eugen Karl Dühring, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, and a host of others, though before Zangwill, Disraeli had made similar boasts, and there is no

shortage of self-glorification in the Old Testament. Zangwill wrote:

“The Problem of the Jewish Race

To sum up in a few thousand words a race which has energized for 4,000 years is a task which can only be executed, if at all, by confining oneself to elementals. And of these elementals the first and most important is the soul of the people. The soul of the Jewish race is best seen in the Bible, saturated from the first page of the Old Testament to the last page of the New with the aspiration for a righteous social order and an ultimate unification of mankind of which, in all specifically Jewish literature, the Jewish race is to be the medium and missionary. Wild and rude as were the beginnings of this race, frequent as were its backslidings, and great as were—and are—its faults, this aspiration is continuous in its literature even up to the present day. There is every reason to believe that the historic texts of the Old Testament were redacted in the interests of this philosophy of history, but this pious falsification is very different from the self-glorification of all other epics. Israel appears throughout not as a hero but as a sinner who cannot rise to his rôle of redeemer, of ‘servant of the Lord’—that rôle of service, not dominance, for which his people was ‘chosen.’ The Talmud, the innumerable volumes of saintly Hebrew thought, the Jewish liturgy, whether in its ancient or its mediæval strata, the ‘modernist’ platforms of reformed American Synagogues, all echo and re-echo this conception of ‘the Jewish mission.’ Among the masses it naturally transformed itself into nationalism, but even this narrower concept of ‘the chosen people’ found poetic expression as a tender intimacy between God and Israel.

‘With everlasting love hast Thou loved the house of Israel, Thy people; a Law and commandments, statutes and judgments, hast Thou taught us. . . . Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who lovest Thy people, Israel.’

Such is the evening benediction still uttered by millions of Hebrew lips.

And the performance of this Law and these commandments, statutes and judgments, covering as they did the whole of life, produced—despite the tendency of all law to over-formality—at domestic ritual of singular beauty and poetry, a strenuous dietary and religious régime, and tender and self-controlling traits of character, which have combined to make the Jewish masses as far above their non-Jewish environment as the Jewish wealthier classes are below theirs. No demos in the world is so saturated with idealism and domestic virtue, and when it is compared with the yet uncivilized and brutalized masses of Europe, when, for example, the lowness of its infantile mortality or the heathiness of its school children is contrasted with the appalling statistics of its neighbors, there is sound scientific warrant for endorsing even in its narrowest form its claim to be ‘a chosen people.’

This extraordinary race arose as a pastoral clan in Mesopotamia, roved

to Palestine, thence to Egypt, and after a period of slavery returned to Palestine as conquerors and agriculturists, there to practice the theocratic code imposed by Moses (perhaps the noblest figure in all history), and to evolve in the course of the ages a poetic and prophetic literature of unparalleled sublimity. That union of spirituality, intellectuality and fighting-power in the breed, which raised it above all ancient races except the Greek, was paid for by an excessive individualism which distracted and divided the State. Jerusalem fell before the legions of Titus. But—half a century before it fell—it had produced Christianity and thus entered on a new career of world-conquest. And five centuries after the destruction of Jerusalem, its wandering scions had impregnated Mohammed with the ideas of Islam. Half the world was thus won for Hebraism in some form or other and the notion of ‘the Jewish mission’ triumphantly vindicated. A nucleus of the race, however, still persisted, partly by nationalist instinct, partly by the faith that its doctrines had been adulterated by illegitimate elements and its mission was still unaccomplished, and it is this persistence to-day of a Hebrew population of twelve millions—a Jewdom larger than any that its ancient conquerors had ever boasted of crushing—which constitutes the much-discussed Jewish problem.

But there was a Jewish diaspora even before Jerusalem fell; settlements of Jews all around the Mediterranean, looking, however, to Jerusalem as a national and religious center. The Book of Esther is historically dubious, but it contains one passage which is a summary of Jewish history: ‘And Haman said unto King Ahasuerus, There is a certain people scattered abroad and dispersed among the people in all provinces of thy Kingdom, and their laws are diverse from all people; neither keep they the King’s laws; therefore, it is not for the King’s profit to suffer them. If it please the King, let it be written that they may be destroyed.’ The Jewish problem in fact, from the Gentile point of view, is entirely artificial. It springs exclusively from Christian or heathen injustice and intolerance, from the oppression of minorities, from the universal law of dislike for the unlike. In Russia, which harbors nearly half of his race, the Jew is confined to a Pale and forbidden the villages even of that Pale, he is cramped and crippled at every phase of his existence, he must fight for Russia but cannot advance in the Army or the Navy or the Government service, except at the price of baptism. Occasionally bands of Black Hundreds are loosed upon him in bloody pogroms, but his everyday existence has not even this tragic dignity. It is a sordid story of economic oppression designed to keep this mere four per cent. of the population from dominating Holy Russia. Ten years ago Count Pahlen’s Commission reported that ‘ninety per cent. of the Jews in the Pale have no stable occupation,’ and if the Government enforces the Sunday Law recently passed by the Duma, it means that they will in many cases be forced to choose between their own Sabbath and semi-starvation. Already the ancient hope and virtue of the most cheerful of races are slowly asphyxiating in the never-lifting fog of poverty and persecution. A similar situation in Roumania,

if on a smaller scale as affecting only a quarter of a million of Jews, is accentuated in bitterness by Roumania's refusal to fulfil the obligation of equal treatment she undertook at the Berlin Congress, and the passivity of the Powers in presence of violated treaties adds to the Jewish tragedy the tragedy of a world grown callous of its own spiritual interests. The Jews, whose connection with Roumania is at least fifteen centuries old, are not even classed as citizens. They are 'Vagabonds.' In Morocco the situation of the Jews is one of unspeakable humiliation. They are confined to a Mellah, and as the Moroccan proverb puts it, 'One may kill as many as seven Jews without being punished. The Jews have even to pickle the heads of decapitated rebels. Tested by the Judaeometer, Germany herself is still uncivilized, for if she has had no Dreyfus case, it is because no Jew is permitted military rank. Even in America with its lip-formula of brotherhood, a gateless Ghetto has been created by the isolation of the Jews from the general social life.

But if from the Gentile point of view the Jewish problem is an artificial creation, there is a very real Jewish problem from the Jewish point of view—a problem which grows in exact proportion to the diminution of the artificial problem. Orthodox Judaism in the diaspora cannot exist except in a Ghetto, whether imposed from without or evolved from within. Rigidly professing Jews cannot enter the general social life and the professions. Jews *qua* Jews were better off in the Dark Ages, living as chattels of the king under his personal protection and to his private profit, or in the ages when they were confined in Ghettos. Even in the Russian Pale a certain measure of autonomy still exists. It is emancipation that brings the 'Jewish Problem.' It is precisely in Italy with its Jewish Prime Minister and its Jewish Syndic of Rome that this problem is most acute. The Saturday Sabbath imposes economic limitations even when the State has abolished them. As Shylock pointed out, his race cannot eat or drink with the Gentile. Indeed, social intercourse would lead to intermarriage. Unless Judaism is reformed it is, in the language of Heine, a misfortune, and if it is reformed, it cannot logically confine its teachings to the Hebrew race, which, lacking the normal protection of a territory, must be swallowed up by its proselytes.

The comedy and tragedy of Jewish existence to-day derive primarily from this absence of a territory in which the race could live its own life. For the religion which has preserved it through the long dark centuries of dispersion has also preserved its territorial traditions in an almost indissoluble amalgam of religion and history. Palestine soil clings all about the roots of the religion, which has, however, only been transplanted at the cost of fossilization. The old agricultural festivals are observed at seasons, with which, in many lands of the Exile, they have no natural connection. The last national victory celebrated—that of Judas Maccabaeus—is two thousand years old, the last popular fast dates from the first century of the Christian era. The Jew agonizing in the Russian Pale rejoices automatically in his Passover of Freedom, in his Exodus from Egypt. Even while the tribal traits

had still the potential fluidity of life, neither Greeks nor Romans could change this tenacious race. Its dispersion from Palestine merely indurated its traditions by freeing them from the possibility of common development. The religious customs defended by Josephus against Apion are still the rule of the majority. Even new traits superimposed by their history upon fractions of the race are conserved with equal tenacity. The Jews expelled from Spain in 1492 still retain a sub-loyalty to the King of Spain and speak a Spanish idiom, printed in Hebrew characters, which preserves in the Orient words vanished from the lips of actual Spaniards and to be found only in Cervantes.

This impotency to create afresh—which is the negative aspect of conservatism—translated itself after the final revolt of Bar-Cochba against the Romans early in the second century, into a pious resignation. The Jewish Exile was declared to be the will of God, which it was even blasphemous to struggle against, and the Jews, in a strange and unique congruity with the teachings of the prophet they rejected, turned the other cheek to the smiter and left to Caesar the things that were Caesar's, concentrating themselves in every land of the Exile upon industry, domesticity and a transmuted religion, in which realities were desiccated into metaphors, and the Temple sacrifices sublimated into prayers. Rabbinic opportunism, while on the one hand keeping alive the hope that these realities, however gross, would come back in God's good time, went so far in the other direction as to lay it down that the law of the land was the law of the Jews. Everything in short—in this transitional period between the ancient glory and the Messianic era to come—was sacrificed to the ideal of mere survival. The mediaeval teacher Maimonides laid it down that to preserve life even Judaism might be abandoned in all but its holiest minimum. Thus—under the standing menace of massacre and spoliation—arose Crypto-Jews or Marranos, who, frequently at the risk of the stake or sword, carried on their Judaism in secret. Catholics in Spain and Portugal, Protestants in England, they were in Egypt or Turkey Mohammedans. Indeed the *Dönme* still flourish in Salonika and provide the Young Turks with statesmen, the Balearic Islands still shelter the *Chuetas*, and only half a century ago persecution produced the *Yedil-al-Islam* in Central Asia. Russia must be full of Greek Christians who have remained Jewish at heart. Last year a number of Russian Jews, shut out from a university career, and seeking the lesser apostacy, became Mohammendans, only to find that for them the Trinity was the sole avenue to educational and social salvation.

Where existence could be achieved legally, yet not without social inferiority, a minor form of Crypto-Judaism was begotten, which prevails today in most lands of Jewish emancipation, among its symptoms being change of names, accentuated local patriotism, accentuated abstention from Jewish affairs, and even anti-Semitism mimetically absorbed from the environment. Indeed, Marranoism, both in its major and minor forms, may be regarded as an exemplification of the Darwinian theory of protective coloring. The pervasive assimilating force acts even upon the most faithful, undermining

more subtly than persecution the life-conceptions so tenaciously perpetuated.

Nor is there anywhere in the Jewish world of to-day any centripetal force to counteract these universal tendencies to dissipation. The religion is shattered into as many fragments as the race. After the fall of Jerusalem the Academy of Jabneh carried on the authoritative tradition of the *Sanhedrin*. In the Middle Ages there was the *Asefah* or Synod to unify Jews under Judaism. From the middle of the sixteenth to the middle of the eighteenth century, the *Waad* or Council of Four Lands legislated almost autonomously in those Central European regions where the mass of the Jews of the world was then congregated. To-day there is no center of authority, whether religious or political. Reform itself is infinitely individual, and nothing remains outside a few centers of congestion but a chaos of dissolving views and dissolving communities, saved from utter disappearance by persecution and racial sympathy. The notion that Jewish interests are Jesuitically federated or that Jewish financiers use their power for Jewish ends is one of the most ironic of myths. No Jewish people or nation now exists, no Jews even as sectarians of a specific faith with a specific center of authority such as Catholics or Wesleyans possess; nothing but a multitude of individuals, a mob hopelessly amorphous, divided alike in religion and political destiny. There is no common platform from which the Jews can be addressed, no common council to which any appeal can be made. Their only unity is negative—that unity imposed by the hostile hereditary vision of the ubiquitous Haman. They live in what scientists call symbiosis with every other people, each group surrendered to its own local fortunes. This habit of dispersed and dependent existence has become second nature, and the Jews are the first to doubt whether they could now form a polity of their own. Like Aunt Judy in ‘John Bull’s Other Island,’ who declined to breakfast out of doors because the open air was ‘not natural,’ the bulk of the Jews consider a Jewish State as a political perversion. There are no subjects more zealous for their adopted fatherlands: indeed they are only too patriotic. There are no Otto mans so Young-Turkish as the Turkish Jews, no American so spread-eagle as the American Jews, no section of Britain so Jingo as Anglo-Jewry, which even converts the Chanukah celebration of Maccabaeian valor into a British military festival. Of the two British spies now confined in German fortresses one is a Jew. The French Jewry and the German reproduce in miniature the Franco-German rivalries, and the latter even apes the aggressive *Welt-Politic*. All this ultra-patriotism is probably due to Jews feeling consciously what the other citizens take subconsciously as a matter of course; doubtless, too, a certain measure of Marranoism or protective mimicry enters into the ostentation. At any rate each section of Jewry, wherever it is permitted entrance into the general life, invariably evolves a somewhat over-colored version of the life in which it finds itself embedded, and fortunate must be accounted the peoples which have at hand so gifted and serviceable a race, proud to wear their livery.

What wonder that Jews are the chief ornaments of the stage, that this

chameleon quality finds its profit in artistic mimicry as well as in biological. Rachel, the child of a foreign pedlar in a Paris slum, teaches purity of diction to the Faubourg St. Germain; Sarah Bernhardt, the daughter of Dutch Jews, carries the triumph of French acting across the Atlantic. A Hungarian Jew, Ludwig Barnay, played a leading rôle in the theatrical history of Germany, and another, von Sonnenthal, in that of Austria. For if, like all other peoples, the Jews can only show a few individuals of creative genius—a Heine, a Spinoza, a Josef Israels, a Mendelssohn, etc.—they flourish in all the interpretative arts out of all proportion to their numbers. They flood the concert-platforms—whether as conductors, singers or performers. As composers they are more melodious than epoch-making. Till recently unpracticed in painting and sculpture they are now copiously represented in every gallery and movement, though only rarely as initiators. Indeed, the Jew is a born intermediary and every form of artistic and commercial agency falls naturally into his hands. He is the connoisseur *par excellence*, the universal art-dealer. His gift of tongues, his relationship with all the lands of the Exile, mark him out for success in commerce and finance, in journalism and criticism, in scholarship and travel. It was by their linguistic talents that the adventurous journeys of Arminius Vambery and Emin Pasha were made possible. If a Russian Jew, Berenson, is the chief authority on Italian art, and George Brandes, the Dane, is Europe's greatest critic, if Reuter initiated telegraphic news and Blowitz was the prince of foreign correspondents, if the Jewish Bank of Amsterdam founded modern finance and Charles Frohman is the world's greatest entrepreneur, all these phenomena find their explanation in the cosmopolitanism of the wandering Jew. Lifted to the plane of idealism, this cosmopolitan habit of mind creates Socialism through Karl Marx and Lassalle, an international language through Dr. Zamenhof, the inventor of Esperanto, a prophecy of the end of war through Jean de Bloch, an International Institute of Agriculture through David Lubin, and a Race Congress through Dr. Felix Adler. For when the Jew grows out of his own Ghetto without narrowing into his neighbor's, he must necessarily possess a superior sense of perspective.

As a physician the Jew's fame dates from the Middle Ages, when he was the bearer of Arabian science, and the tradition that kings shall always have Jewish physicians is still unbroken. Dr. Ehrlich's recent discovery of '606,' the cure for syphilis, and Dr. Haffkine's inoculation against the Plague in India, are but links in a long chain of Jewish contributions to medicine. Nor would it be possible to mention any other science, whether natural or philological, to which Jewish professors have not contributed revolutionizing ideas. The names of Lombroso for criminology, Benfey for Sanscrit, Jules Oppert for Assyriology, Sylvester for Mathematics, and Mendeleiff for Chemistry ('The Periodic Law') must suffice as examples.

In law, mathematics and philosophy, the Jew is peculiarly at home, especially as an expounder. In chess he literally sweeps the board. There is never a contest for the championship of the world in which both rivals are not

Jews. Even the first man to fly (and die) was the Jew, Lilienthal.

But to gauge the contribution of the Jew to the world's activity is impossible here. To mention only living Jews, one thinks at random of Rothschilds with their ubiquitous financial and philanthropic activity, Sir Ernest Cassel financing the irrigation of Egypt, Mr. Jacob Schiff financing the Japanese war against Russia and building up the American Jewry, Herr Ballin creating the Hamburg-American Line, Maximilian Harden's bold political journalism, the Dutch jurist Asser at The Hague conference, or the American statesman and peace-lover Oscar Straus, the French plays of Bernstein, or the German plays of Ludwig Fulda, or the Dutch plays of Hyermanns, or the Austrian plays of Schnitzler, the trenchant writings of Max Nordau, the paintings of Solomon and Rothenstein, of Jules Adler and Max Liebermann, the archeologic excavations of Waldstein, Hammerstein building the English Opera House, Imre Kiralfy organizing our Exhibitions, Sidney Lee editing the Dictionary of English Biography, Sir Matthew Nathan managing the Post Office, Meldola investigating coal-tar dyes, the operas of Goldmark, the music-plays of Herr Oscar Straus and Humperdinck (Herr Max Bernstein), the learned synopses of Salomon Reinach, the sculpture of Antokolsky, Mischa Elman and his violin, Sir Rufus Isaacs pleading on behalf of the Crown, Signor Nathan polemizing with the Pope, Dr. Frederick Cowen conducting one of his own symphonies, Michelson measuring the velocity of light, Lippmann developing color photography, Henri Bergson giving pause to Materialism with his new philosophy of Creative Evolution, Bréal expounding the science of Semantics, or Herrmann Cohen his neo-Kantism, and one wonders what the tale would be both for yesterday and to-day if every Jew wore a yellow badge and every Crypto-Jew came out into the open, and every half-Jew were as discoverable as Montaigne or the composer of 'The Mikado.' The Church could not even write its own history; that was left for the Jew, Neander. To the Gentile the true Jewish problem should rather be how to keep the Jew in his midst—this rare one per cent. of mankind. The elimination of all this genius and geniality would surely not enhance the gaiety of nations. Without Disraeli would not England lose her only Saint's Day?

But the miracle remains that the Gentile world has never yet seen a Jew, for behind all these cosmopolitan types which obsess its vision, stand inexhaustible reserves of Jewish Jews—and the Talmudic mystic, the Hebrew-speaking sage, remains as unknown to the Western world as though he were hidden in the fastnesses of Tibet. A series of great scholars—Geiger, Zunz, Steinschneider, Schechter—has studied the immense Hebrew literature produced from age to age in these obscure Jewries. But there is a modern Hebrew literature, too, a new galaxy of poets and novelists, philosophers and humanists, who express in the ancient tongue the subtlest shades of the thought of to-day. And there is a still more copious literature in Yiddish, no less rich in men of talent and even genius, whose names have rarely reached the outside world.

And if the Jew, with that strange polarity which his historian Graetz remarked in him, displays simultaneously with the most tenacious preservation of his past the swiftest surrender of it that the planet has ever witnessed, if we find him entering with such passionate patriotism into almost every life on earth but his own, may not even the Jewish patriot draw the compensating conclusion that the Jew therein demonstrates the comparative superficiality of all these human differences? Like the Colonel's lady and Judy O'Grady all these peoples are the same under their skins—as even Bismarck was once constrained to remark when he saw Prussians and Frenchmen lying side by side in the community of death. Could Jews so readily assimilate to all these types, were these types fundamentally different? The primitive notion of the abysmal separateness of races can scarcely survive under Darwinism. Every race is really akin to every other. Imagine a Canine Congress debating if all these glaring differences of form, size and color could possibly consist with an underlying and essential dogginess. It is curious that Houston Chamberlain, the most eloquent champion of the race-theory and the Teutonic spirit, is himself an Englishman married to the daughter of Wagner (*alias* Geier) and that with quasi-Semitic assimilativeness he has written his book in German after a career as a writer in French.

Not only is every race akin to every other but every people is a hotch-potch of races. The Jews, though mainly a white people, are not even devoid of a colored fringe, black, brown or yellow. There are the Beni-Israel of India, the Falashas of Abyssinia, the disappearing Chinese Colony of Kai-Fung-Foo, the Judeos of Loango, the black Jews of Cochin, the negro Jews of Fernando Po, Jamaica, Surinam, etc., the Daggatuns and other warlike nomads of the North African deserts who remind us what the conquerors of the Philistines were like. If the Jews are in no metaphorical sense brothers of all these peoples, then all these peoples are brothers of one another. If the Jew has been able to enter into all incarnations of humanity and to be at home in every environment, it is because he is a common measure of humanity. He is the pioneer by which the true race-theory has been experimentally demonstrated. Given a white child, it is the geographical and spiritual heritage—the national autocosm, as I have called it—into which the child is born that makes out of the common human element the specific Frenchman, Australian or Dutchman. And even the color is not an unbridgeable and elemental distinction.

Nor is it only with living races that the Jew has manifested his and their mutual affinity, he brings home to us his brotherhood and ours with the peoples that are dead, the Medes, the Babylonians, the Assyrians. If the Jew Paul proved that the Hebrew Word was universal, the Jews who rejected his teaching have proved the universality of the Hebrew race. One touch of Jewry makes the whole world kin.

The labors of Hercules sink into child's play beside the task the late Dr. Herzl set himself in offering to this flotsam and jetsam of history the project

of political reorganization on a single soil. But even had this dauntless idealist secured co-operation instead of bitter hostility from the denaturalized leaders of all these Jewries, the attempt to acquire Palestine would have had the opposition of Turkey and of the 600,000 Arabs in possession. It is little wonder that since the great leader's lamentable death, Zionism—again with that idealization of impotence—has sunk back into a cultural movement which instead of ending the Exile is to unify it through the Hebrew tongue and nationalist sentiment. But for such unification, a religious revival would have been infinitely more efficacious: race alone cannot survive the pressure of so many hostile milieux—or still more parlous—so many friendly. The Territorial movement, representing the original nucleus of the Herzlian idea, is still searching for a real and not a metaphorical soil, its latest negotiation being with the West Australian Government.

But if the prospect of a territorial solution of the Jewish Question, whether in Palestine or in the New World appears remote, it must be admitted that the Jewish race, in abandoning before the legions of Rome the struggle for independent political existence, in favor of spiritual isolation and economic symbiosis, discovered the secret of immortality, if also of perpetual motion. In the diaspora anti-Semitism will always be the shadow of Semitism. The law of dislike for the unlike will always prevail. And whereas the unlike is normally situated at a safe distance, the Jews bring the unlike into the heart of every milieu and must thus defend a frontier-line as large as the world. The fortunes of war vary in every country, but there is a perpetual tension and friction even at the most peaceful points, which tend to throw back the race on itself. The drastic method of love—the only human dissolvent—has never been tried upon the Jew as a whole, and Russia carefully conserves—even by a ring fence—the breed she designs to destroy. But whether persecution extirpates or brotherhood melts, hate or love can never be simultaneous throughout the diaspora, and so there will probably always be a nucleus from which to restock this eternal type. But what a melancholy immortality! 'To be *and* not to be'—that is a question beside which Hamlet's alternative is crude.

It only remains to consider what part the world should be called upon to play in the solution of this tragic problem. To preserve the Jews, whether as a race or as a religious community, is no part of the world's duty, nor would artificial preservation preserve anything of value. Their salvation must come from themselves, though they may well expect at least such sympathy and help as Italy or Greece found in their struggles for regeneration. The world's duty is only to preserve the ethical ideals it has so slowly and laboriously evolved, largely under Jewish inspiration. Civilization is not called upon to save the Jews, but it *is* called upon to save itself. And by its treatment of the Jews it is destroying itself. If there is no justice in Venice for Shylock, then alas for Venice.

'If you deny me, fie upon your law!

There is no force in the decrees of Venice.'

Even from the economic standpoint Russia with her vast population of half-starved peasants is wasting one of her most valuable assets by crippling Jewish activity, both industrially and geographically. In insisting that Russia abolish the Jewish Pale I am pleading for the regeneration of Russia, not of the Russian Jew. A first-class ballet is not sufficient to constitute a first-class people. Very truly said Roditchev, one of the Cadet leaders, 'Russia cannot enter the temple of freedom as long as there exists a Pale of Settlement for the Jews.' But abolition of the Pale and the introduction of Jewish equality will be the deadliest blow ever aimed at Jewish nationality. Very soon a fervid Russian patriotism will reign in every Ghetto and the melting-up of the race will begin. But this absorption of the five million Jews into the other hundred and fifty millions of Russia constitutes the Jewish half of the problem. It is the affair of the Jews.

That the preservation of the Jewish race or religion is no concern of the world's is a conclusion which saves the honest Jew from the indignity of appealing to it. For with what face can the Jew appeal *ad misericordiam* before he has made the effort to solve his own problem? There is no reason why a race any more than a man should be safeguarded against its own unwisdom, and its own selfishness. No race can persist as an entity that is not ready to pay the price of persistence. Other peoples are led by their best and strongest. But the best and strongest in Israel are absorbed by the superior careers and pleasures of environment—even in Russia there is a career for the renegade, even in Roumania for the rich—and the few who remain to lead lead for the most part to destroy. If, however, we are tempted to say, 'then let this, people agonize as it deserves,' we must remember that the first to suffer are not the powerful but the poor. It is the masses who bear almost the entire brunt of Alien Bills and massacres and economic oppression. While to the philosopher the absorption of the Jews may be as desirable as their regeneration, in practice the solution by dissolution presses most heavily upon the weakest. The dissolution invariably begins from above, leaving the lower classes denuded of a people's natural defences, the upper classes. Moreover, while as already pointed out the Jewish upper classes are, if anything, inferior to the classes into which they are absorbed, the marked superiority of the Jewish masses to their environment, especially in Russia, would render *their* absorption a tragic degeneration.

But if dissolution would bring degeneracy and emancipation dissolution, the only issue from this delimita is the creation of a Jewish State or at least a Jewish land of refuge upon a basis of local autonomy to which in the course of the centuries all that was truly Jewish would drift. And if the world has no ethical duty to take the lead in this creation, it may yet find its profit in getting rid of the Jewish problem. Many regions of the New World, whether in America or Australia, would moreover be enriched and consolidated by the accession of a great Jewish colony, while to the Old World its political blessing might be many-sided. A host of political rivalries, perilous to the world's peace, center around Palestine, while in the still more dangerous

quarter of Mesopotamia, a co-operation of England and Germany in making a home under the Turkish flag for the Jew in his original birthplace would reduce Anglo-German friction, foster world-peace and establish in the heart of the Old World a bridge of civilization between the East and the West and a symbol of hope for the future of mankind.”¹⁰¹³

Israel Zangwill’s racist tract corroborates much that appears in the *Protocols*. The Zionists exercised a grossly undue influence over the course of world events throughout the Twentieth Century, selfishly interfering in world events for the sake of a few million nationalists, but doing little to rescue millions of Europe’s Jews during the Holocaust and the Stalinist purges. Unlike many other political Zionists, Einstein did make some effort to successfully rescue individuals from the Nazis, and by war’s end had abandoned much of the political Zionist mythology he had initially espoused and disseminated, though Einstein also callously rejected some pleas for help, which prompts the question if Einstein, like so many racist political Zionists, placed more value on racist Zionist life than on assimilated Jewish life.

Israel Zangwill was a member of a long tradition of Jewish racism in Great Britain, which held that anti-Semitism benefitted the allegedly superior Jewish race. Zionist Joseph Chaim Brenner believed that the hostility towards Gentiles and the feeling of Jewish superiority commonly expressed in Jewish literature resulted from Jewish envy of Gentiles.¹⁰¹⁴

Jewish racists also believed that racial integration would be the downfall of Gentiles of all races. The question arises as to what rôle Jewish racism played in the evolution of the modern liberal spirit of “racial integration” which is often promoted by Jewish liberals today, many of whom have the best of intentions and are philanthropic and loving persons.

Were there some darker souls who held the misguided view that they could degrade their enemies with a false Liberalism of racial integration? The question prompts itself as to whether or not the “Friendship of the Nations” of the Soviet Union with its long standing propaganda campaign for “race mixing” was intended to weaken the Russians’ blood as revenge for their persecutions of the Jews and to render them easier to dominate. Stalin promoted “racial integration” in the sentimental film *Circus*, a motion picture released in 1936 directed by Grigori Alexandrov and starring Lyubov Orlova Benjamin, which like most Communist propaganda employed sentimentality as bait for a trap to lead people into intended harm. In the minds of racist Zionists, “race mixing” weakened the general population and the loss of a “race-based” national spirit left a people without a biological reason for existence. In addition, Houston Stewart Chamberlain wrote that miscegenation resulted in “chaos”, weak strains of human beings who were in general incapable of competing with “pure races”. His book was popular among Zionists and the English translation of it received a long and favorable review in the *Times Literary Supplement* of 15 December 1910, pp. 500-501. Before Chamberlain, racist Zionist Benjamin Disraeli wrote that human “races” could be weakened through “race mixing”. Many have alleged that prominent Jews have long promoted liberal immigration policies and miscegenation in the American media, in order to open the

gates to the immigration of Eastern European Jews, and to make it impossible, in their view, for European anti-Semitism to take over America, and to weaken American culture and render it incapable of competing with corrupt tribal and segregated Jewish American society. As is often the case, the ultimate source is found in the Old Testament, which teaches the Jews that Esau is angry with them and that they can profit by diluting the blood of Esau and lessen his capacity to fight.

Joseph Stalin was clearly not a philanthropist, and so we can safely conclude that his drive for miscegenation was not motivated by humanitarianism. He deliberately murdered intellectuals and degraded the genes of the Soviet peoples through the mass murder and the exile of their best citizens. Napoleon's wars and Hitler's wars also degraded the bloodlines of Europeans by killing off their best males of breeding age—and these effects were not unknown to Jewish racists, since they were known generally.¹⁰¹⁵ In addition, the Talmud at *Sanhedrin 37a* teaches the Jews the importance of the fact that taking the life of an individual can also signify the genocide of countless unborn descendants of that individual. The racist Jews who instigated countless wars and revolutions sought to exterminate the better part of the non-Jewish Peoples and leave them inferior and easily managed "races" forever, or at least until they were completely wiped out. The following article appeared in *The World's Work*, Volume 24, Number 6, (October, 1912), pp. 612-613,

"EUGENICS AND WAR

ONE subject warmly discussed at the Congress of Eugenists recently held in London was the effect of war on national physique. Prof. Vernon Kellogg, of Leland Stanford, Jr. University, urged the necessity of peace for the development and maintenance of the best manhood. He declared that nothing could be more disastrous to the physical strength of a people than the direct selection of the most robust for work which carried them away from home, prevented their giving their vigor to children, and returned them, if at all, maimed, diseased, and exhausted. The prevalence of war, draining the country of its able-bodied men, brings with it an era of greatly lowered birth-rate and of the birth of weak and undersized children. This happened during the Napoleonic campaigns. When they were over, even though the survivors were decimated and wounded France entered on a period in which an inch was added to the wartime stature of its inhabitants.

Professor Kellogg's argument provoked replies from German and English military officers, who defended military service on the ground that it strengthened and developed the recruits. The German, a general, alluded to the physical strength and high spirits of the young soldiers he had seen marching through the streets of London. There can be no doubt that military exercise and discipline are beneficial to those brought under them—so long as they do not go to war. But the same exercise and discipline directed in other channels—in preparation for duties not destructive but efficient for prosperity—these would give the same result, as a by-product, while their chief purpose would not be wasted. Every advantage claimed for military

service could be gained by training for war, not against other nations, but against the common foes of all. On the sole ground of the maintenance of a people's physical vigor, war is greatly to be deplored. It inevitably kills many, injures more, and at the best withdraws a large proportion of the most vigorous from fatherhood during their best years, while it leaves the weakest to transmit their deficiencies to the following generation."

Jews had long had access to European leaders, and given their networks of contacts throughout the world, could impress these leaders by forecasting events known to them by intercommunication with their colleagues, giving the illusion of an almost supernatural gift of prophecy to the leaders of Europe, whom they could then pit against one another for profit. If a "court Jew" knew of an opportunity, or could manipulate the markets to profit a leader, or could predict a war and its outcome, not based on insight, but based on inside information; it would make quite an impression on a naïve and gullible European leader, especially if the "court Jew" was able accomplish this seemingly miraculous feat time after time, while flattering the ego, and promoting the ambitions of the foolish leader. This would instill confidence in the leader, which could then be exploited at a critical time to take advantage of the leader's faith and trust to lead a nation into self-destruction through unwise investment, treaty or war. A "court Jew" often managed national loans. The powers which control capital and debt know what investments persons and nations will make in the future, which gives them inside information and the ability to stimulate or destroy a national economy. Whoever controls the press knows of events before the public. Anyone with a story to tell must first report it to the press. Therefore, the press knows of a great deal of inside information and knows of many scandals. The press can expose, suppress or utilize this information in a corrupt fashion.

Jews have long dominated both international finance and the mass media. Through tribal collusion, they can also regulate those interests which they place in Gentile hands, so as to remain in control behind the scenes. Zionist Jews and Jewish bankers used their control of the American Press to incite Americans into accepting Woodrow Wilson's efforts to make war with Germany without just grounds. Congressmen Moore and Callaway tried to warn the United States Congress that Wilson, who was under the control of Zionist Jews, together with the Jewish controlled Press of America were attempting to bring America into the First World War on false grounds. Their statements are captured in the *Congressional Record* for 9 February 1917,

"Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the remarks Of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] move me to say that, along with him and my other colleagues, I hope to see the President sustained in all proper efforts to maintain the honor and dignity of this country. We are considering now one of the great war bills, and the most of us will vote for it even to the limit of those things asked for to sustain the President. While doing that and considering other war bills, it seems to me that we might say

to ourselves—whether it is carried over the telegraphic lines to the people of the country or not—that there are many disturbing and conflicting rumors concerning war conditions which are asserted to-day and denied to-morrow. Yesterday we were informed that an American had been killed on the wrecked steamer *Turino*. His name was George Washington, and, of course, it would occasion a patriotic thrill the whole length and breadth of the country if it was true that George Washington had gone down at the hands of an enemy in foreign waters. But the newspapers had their say yesterday, and they had it again this morning, that this sure-enough American was killed, and therefore we ought to go to war with Germany.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Did this man have any number?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not know. He was an individual of color, but his taking off was supposed to be reason to cause war. Efforts have been made, desperate efforts have been made, since the President was here on Saturday last, to prove that we must go to war. The coasts of the world seem to have been raked to find some overt act to force the President to come in here and ask us to declare war. We have had very little but rumors, but we have had headlines galore, all with a view of stampeding the House and stampeding the country into an act of war. [Applause.] I rose to make this very brief statement because I do not want the people of this country to be deceived. I am satisfied that most of the people of the country want peace; peace with honor, of course. [Applause.] But they do not want to go into a dishonorable war, and they ought not to be forced into a war by the munition makers or the munition users of this or any other land. [Applause.]

Most of the dispatch headlines declaring that American ships have gone down, that American lives have been lost, that international laws have been violated have come from London, and London has been crazy with delight since it heard the glad tidings on Saturday last that the President had severed diplomatic relations with Germany. Coming from the Liberty Bell and Independence Hall district of the United States, I can not forget that we had trouble with London in 1776, and that we had trouble with London in 1812. I am not quite ready to accept all of these rumors that come out of London now without a grain of salt. London is a little more in need of American help just now than we are in need of the advice of London. I am not quite ready, therefore, to believe every damnable, pernicious, and lying report that comes out of London, or to accept it as an inducement to declare my country in a state of war. [Applause.]

On the night of the day that the President appeared here and informed the Congress of the fact that he had severed diplomatic relations with Germany, we had newspaper ‘extras’ announcing in startling headlines that the *Housatonic* had gone down in violation of international law; there were great scare heads, and boys on the streets shouting it aloud. It was declared that American rights had been violated by a country with which we were on

friendly terms up to that time. Yet the next day's newspapers announced in smaller type that the *Housatonic* was loaded with contraband, and even our State Department declared that there was no occasion for any warlike declaration in consequence of her sinking.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Is it the contention of the gentleman that because a ship is loaded with contraband, Germany has the right to destroy the lives of passengers and crew?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I made the statement that after all these headlines the State Department declared that there was no breach of international law. The people were being inflamed—

Mr. GORDON. But they did not say it was because the ship was loaded with contraband.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I stated what the gentleman's own Secretary of State announced to the public—he was not as anxious as some newspaper editors are to rush into war.

Mr. GORDON. I agree with much of what the gentleman has said; but—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not arguing the point of contraband at all. The gentleman is merely taking my time. I am trying to make a plain statement to the House as to the truth and the facts. The gentleman may be stampeded because certain things appear in the newspapers, but—

Mr. GORDON. Oh, don't you worry about my being stampeded. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am making the statement that we see alarming headlines to-day indicating that we are on the verge of war because some 'overt act' has been committed, and the next day the whole thing is denied.

Mr. GORDON. I agree with the gentleman about that.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell me what he thinks the duty of this Government ought to be if the German Government has taken charge of

and forcibly restrained by order our ambassador in that country?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is carried away with the headlines.

Mr. RAGSDALE. No; he is not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will listen, I will demonstrate what fools some men are—not like the gentleman from South Carolina, of course—who believe everything they read. I was coming to that very point. For three days we have heard that our American ambassador, who was on excellent terms with everyone in high life in Germany, has ‘been in captivity’ and held for exchange. The gentleman believes that statement.

Mr. RAGSDALE. No; the gentleman does not.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is absurd upon its face. Though we have had it for three days, this morning’s newspapers announce that Berlin is in conference with the American ambassador, that conferences have been going on in Berlin, and that the ambassador will be safeguarded out of Germany just as we are going to safeguard the German ambassador out of the United States. Oh, how easy it is for you to rush into war upon the say so of somebody who is interested in having war.

Mr. DYER. His passports have been issued to him.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The ambassador is going to get out safely. Somebody wanted to inflame the American people by declaring that the American ambassador had been held in captivity. Absurd! We have given safe conduct to the German ambassador and are sending him home, and the Germans have been decent with the American ambassador. But at least 2 college professors and about 150 editors, more or less, yesterday declared—not that they were willing to enlist, for the barracks down here are waiting for men like them to come forward and enlist—but they declared in effect that they were willing to involve their country in war because ‘the American ambassador was held in bondage in Berlin.’ This morning the newspapers show that those editors and those college professors did not know what they were talking about, and that is what I am trying to say to the gentleman from South Carolina. The plain people should not be fooled. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. One minute.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In that one minute let me say, and I hope not to be interrupted again, that the *Housatonic* alarm has gone glimmering. The State Department seems to concede that the Germans were within their rights and that the *Housatonic* presents no casus belli. The next day we had the *California* sensation. Because this ship bore a good old American name everybody was made to suspect that it was an American ship, and that the Germans had perpetrated such an outrage as would force us to go to war. After the sensation had thrilled the country we were quietly informed that the *California* was a British ship, sailing under the British flag, and that she had been given the warning required by international law. But a great deal is made of the fact that one American was aboard that ship. He may have been

planted there to protect the cargo and to involve this country in an international warfare; I do not know, but the next day after the newspapers had worked the story of the American passenger to the limit, it developed that he was taken off the ship to a place of safety. It matters not that he was a colored man.

Mr. BRITTEN. And the ship was armed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then, again, Mr. Chairman, the report went broadcast over the United States on the day after the President addressed Congress, that this Government had seized all the interned German ships. These reports were tempered here and there with the suggestion that the German sailors were endeavoring to destroy the property of their own country, but nevertheless it was broadly announced that our naval officers had seized this German property. I will not stop to discuss the moral aspect of this seizure except to say that there had been no declaration of war and that it was not clear why we should deliberately take this German property and appropriate it to the United States. Within a day or two the answer came from both the State Department and the White House that these German ships had not been seized, and that while this Government was taking certain precautions with respect to possible impediments to navigation, every courtesy was being shown the officers and men in charge of these German vessels. It was evident that some tall lying was done in this instance for the purpose of irritating Germany under very aggravating circumstances. Somebody evidently wanted Germany to commit an 'overt act' that would bring on a war. We ought to be on our guard against this dangerous 'rumor' business, whether it originates in London or the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts: For fuel; the removal and transportation of ashes and garbage from ships of war; books, blanks, and stationery, including stationery for commanding and navigating officers of ships, chaplains on shore and afloat, and for the use of courts-martial on board ships; purchase, repair, and exchange of typewriters for ships; packing boxes and materials; interior fittings for general storehouses, pay offices, and accounting offices in navy yards; expenses of disbursing officers; coffee mills and repairs thereto; expenses of naval clothing factory and machinery for the same; laboratory equipment; purchase of articles of equipage at home and abroad under the cognizance of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, and for the payment of labor in equipping vessels therewith, and the manufacture of such articles in the several navy yards; musical instruments and music; mess outfits; soap on board naval vessels; athletic outfits; tolls, ferriages, yeomen's stores, safes, and other incidental expenses; labor in general storehouses, paymasters' offices, and accounting offices in navy yards and naval stations, including naval stations maintained in island possessions under the control of the United States, and expenses in handling stores purchased and manufactured under 'General account of advances'; and reimbursement to appropriations of the Department of Agriculture of cost of inspection of meats and meat food products for the Navy Department: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for chemists and for clerical, inspection, storeman, store laborer, and messenger service in the supply and accounting departments of the navy yards and naval stations and disbursing offices for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, shall not exceed \$1,400,000; in all, \$2,750,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAGSDALE, and Mr. CALLAWAY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement that I have of how the newspapers of this country have been handled by the munition manufacturers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting a certain statement. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask whether it is the gentleman's purpose to insert a long list of extracts from newspapers?

Mr. CALLAWAY. No; It will be a little, short statement, not over $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches in length in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD at this point a statement showing the newspaper combination, which explains their activity in this war matter, just discussed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore]:

'In March, 1915, the J.P. Morgan interests, the steel, shipbuilding, and powder interests, and their subsidiary organizations, got together 12 men high up in the newspaper world and employed them to select the most influential newspapers in the United States and a sufficient number of them to control generally the policy of the daily press of the United States.

'These 12 men worked the problem out by selecting 179 newspapers, and then began, by an elimination process, to retain only those necessary for the purpose of controlling the general policy of the daily press throughout the country. They found it was only necessary to purchase the control of 25 of the greatest papers. The 25 papers were agreed upon; emissaries were sent to purchase the policy, national and international, of these papers; an agreement was reached; the policy of the papers was bought, to be paid for by the month; an editor was furnished for each paper to properly supervise and edit information regarding the questions of preparedness, militarism, financial policies, and other things of national and international nature considered vital to the interests of the purchasers.

'This contract is in existence at the present time, and it accounts for the news columns of the daily press of the country being filled with all sorts of preparedness arguments and misrepresentations as to the present condition of the United States Army and Navy, and the possibility and probability of the United States being attacked by foreign foes.

'This policy also included the suppression of everything in opposition to the wishes of the interests served. The effectiveness of this scheme has been

conclusively demonstrated by the character of stuff carried in the daily press throughout the country since March 1915. They have resorted to anything necessary to commercialize public sentiment and sandbag the National Congress into making extravagant and wasteful appropriations for the Army and Navy under the false pretense that it was necessary. Their stock argument is that it is 'patriotism.' They are playing on every prejudice and passion of the American people."¹⁰¹⁶

J. P. Morgan was a Rothschild agent,¹⁰¹⁷ and Louis Brandeis and Samuel Untermyer used Morgan and the debilitating panic of 1907 the Jewish bankers deliberately caused to make the American public clamor for banking reform.¹⁰¹⁸ It was a trap and the "reform" ultimately put in place the Federal Reserve System which created a private central bank that regulated the money supply and operated a fractional reserve banking system. The Jewish bankers finally had the system in place in America they had always sought. Senator and financier Nelson W. Aldrich, who was one of the infamous conspirators who helped draft the Federal Reserve Act on Jekyll Island confirmed that it was means to consolidate their power and reduce their competition, which had been growing in recent years,

"Before the passage of this Act, the New York bankers could only dominate the reserves of New York. Now, we are able to dominate the bank reserves of the entire country."¹⁰¹⁹

Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh Sr. was very aware of the fact that the bankers had deliberately caused the panic in 1907 in order to make the public clamor for banking reforms, banking reforms the bankers would draft which would give them complete control over the money supply and wipe out the lower level, but numerous, competing banks,

"When the Aldrich-Vreeland Emergency Currency Bill was sprung on the House in its finished draft and ready for action to be taken, the debate was limited to three hours and Banker Vreeland placed in charge. It took so long for copies of the bill to be gotten that many members were unable to secure a copy until within a few minutes of the time to vote. No member who wished to present the people's side of the case was given sufficient time to enable him to properly analyze the bill. I asked for time and was told that if I would vote for the bill it would be given me, but not otherwise. Others were treated in the same way.

Accordingly, on June 30, 1908, the Money Trust won the first fight and the Aldrich-Vreeland Emergency Law was placed on the statute books. Thus the first precedent was established for the people's guarantee of the rich man's watered securities, by making them a basis on which to issue currency. It was the entering wedge. We had already guaranteed the rich men's money, and now, by this act, the way was opened, and it was intended that we should guarantee their watered stocks and bonds. Of course, they were too keen to

attempt to complete, in a single act, such an enormous steal as it would have been if they had included all they hoped ultimately to secure. They knew that they would be caught at it if they did, and so it was planned that the whole thing should be done by a succession of acts. The first three have taken place.

Act No. 1 was the manufacture, between 1896 and 1907, through stock gambling, speculation and other devious methods and devices, of tens of billions of watered stocks, bonds, and securities.

Act No. 2 was the panic of 1907, by which those not favorable to the Money Trust could be squeezed out of business and the people frightened into demanding changes in the banking and currency laws which the Money Trust would frame.

The Act No. 3 was the passage of the Aldrich-Vreeland Emergency Currency Bill, by which the Money Trust interests should have the privilege of securing from the Government currency on their watered bonds and securities. But while the act contained no authority to change the form of the bank notes, the U. S. Treasurer (in some way that I have been unable to find a reason for) implied authority and changed the form of bank notes which were issued for the banks on government bonds. These notes had hitherto had printed on them, 'This note is secured by bonds of the United States.' He changed it to read as follows: 'This note is secured by bonds of the United States or other securities.' 'Or other securities' is the addition that was secured by special interests. The infinite care the Money Trust exercises in regard to important detail work is easily seen in this piece of management. By that change it was enabled to have the form of the money issued in its favor on watered bonds and securities, the same as bank notes secured on government bonds, and, as a result, the people do not know whether they get one or the other. None of the \$500,000,000 printed and lying in the U. S. Treasury ready to float on watered bonds and securities has yet (April, 1913) been used. But it is there, maintained at a public charge, as a guarantee to the Money Trust that it may use it in case it crowds speculation beyond the point of its control. The banks may take it to prevent their own failures, but there is not even so much as a suggestion that it may be used to help keep the industries of the people in a state of prosperity.

The main thing, however, that the Money Trust accomplished as a result of the passing of this act was the appointment of the National Monetary Commission, the membership of which was chiefly made up of bankers, their agents and attorneys, who have generally been educated in favor of, and to have a community interest with, the Money Trust. The National Monetary Commission was placed in charge of the same Senator Nelson W. Aldrich and Congressman Edward B. Vreeland, who respectively had charge in the Senate and House during the passage of the act creating it.

The act authorized this commission to spend money without stint or account. It spent over \$300,000 in order to learn how to form a plan by which to create a greater money trust, and it afterwards recommended Congress to give this proposed trust a fifty-year charter by means of which it could rob

and plunder all humanity. A bill for that purpose was introduced by members of the Monetary Commission, and its passage planned to be the fourth and final act of the campaign to completely enslave the people.

The fourth act, however, is in process of incubation only, and it is hoped that by this time we realize the danger that all of us are in, for it is the final proposed legislation which, if it succeeds, will place us in the complete control of the moneyed interests. History records nothing so dramatic in design, nor so skillfully manipulated, as this attempt to create the National Reserve Association,—otherwise called the Aldrich plan,—and no fact nor occurrence contemplated for the gaining of selfish ends is recorded in the world's records which equals the beguiling methods of this colossal undertaking. Men, women, and children have been equally unconscious of how stealthily this greatest of all giant octopuses,—a greater Money Trust,—is reaching out its tentacles in its efforts to bind all humanity in perpetual servitude to the greedy will of this monster.

I was in Congress when the Panic of 1907 occurred, but I had previously familiarized myself with many of the ways of high financiers. As a result of what I discovered in that study, I set about to expose the Money Trust, the world's greatest financial giant. I knew that I could not succeed unless I could bring public sentiment to my aid. I had to secure that or fail. The Money Trust had laid its plans long before and was already executing them. It was then, and still is, training the people themselves to demand the enactment of the Aldrich Bill or a bill similar in effect. Hundreds of thousands of dollars had already been spent and millions were reserved to be used in the attempt to bring about a condition of public mind that would cause demand of the passage of the bill. If no other methods succeeded, it was planned to bring on a violent panic and to rush the bill through during the distress which would result from the panic. It was figured that the people would demand new banking and currency laws; that it would be impossible for them to get a definitely practical plan before Congress when they were in an excited state and that, as a result, the Aldrich plan would slip safely through. It was designed to pass that bill in the fall of 1911 or 1912.”¹⁰²⁰

This was not the first time the bankers had deliberately caused a financial calamity in order to cause the People of America to clamor for banking reforms, “reforms” which the bankers would draft and which would make the citizens of the United States the slaves of the Jewish bankers. When President Andrew Jackson sought to maintain a debt-free government and truly Federal control over the money, Nicholas Biddle and the Rothschilds conspired to create the panic of 1837. Biddle had previously deliberately caused the panic of 1819. Biddle bragged about his actions.

In 1802, Thomas Jefferson anticipated the Great Depression of the Twentieth Century when he stated in a letter to Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury,

“I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than

standing armies. . . . If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency, first by inflation, then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around [the banks]. . . will deprive the people of all property until their children wake-up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered. . . . The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the people, to whom it properly belongs.”

In 1913, the creation of the Federal Reserve together with the creation of the Federal Income Tax made war an immensely profitable venture. The Jewish bankers had at last a means to tax the American People and heat up the economy and then collapse it in the Great Depression by contracting the money supply, which created a wonderful buying opportunity for them in that it forced others to sell and yet maintained the value of the bankers’ money enabling them to buy up whatever they wanted to buy.

It appears that another trap is today being set for the American Public. Americans will be asked to chose between the gold standard as one panacea, or an international currency issuing from a central world bank as another panacea. Either option could ruin the nation. Poseurs serving the interests of the Jewish bankers, bankers who are driven by greed and religious fervor to place all of the wealth of the world in Jewish hands, will step forward and ridicule the bankers and the Federal Reserve and might even scapegoat all Jews including assimilated Jews. These propagandists will be the agents of the bankers themselves and they will offer up the poisoned fruit of the gold standard. Jewish bankers control most of the gold in the world and if America were to adopt the gold standard it would transfer America’s wealth into the hands of Jewish bankers. America would lose its sovereignty to the prophesied Jewish world government and ultimately the gold will be melted down and shipped to Jerusalem severely contracting the money supply and destroying all Gentile economies (*Genesis 47*).

America’s gold should be recovered by legal and military means and reparations and damages, as well as the principal and accrued interest stolen from the American economy by Jewish bankers should be recovered. However, the method of securing the lasting value of American money most likely to succeed is for the American Government to issue its own notes and so pay down the debt without accruing more debt. This cannot be done by adopting a gold standard.

J. P. Morgan served the interests of the Zionists by funding England in the war, which tied America to it in the minds of the public, and by financing the American war machine. He made immense profits doing it, most of which ended up in the hands of the Jewish bankers, who ultimately served Rothschild, King of the Jews. The newspapers were edited and staffed by a disproportionate number of Jews. At the end of Morgan’s life, it was discovered that most of the monies thought to be controlled by him found their way back to the Rothschilds.

Another means of corrupting the press, one other than ownership, editorship and reporters, is the power of advertising. Jewish enterprises have often withdrawn their advertising from news sources which do not favor their perceived self-interests. This is ruinous to a newspaper. In addition, Jews boycott businesses which advertise in

news sources they want shut down. The Jews have been expelled from many societies at many different times for many different reasons. Jewish tribal strategy is so corrupt, unethical and immoral that most Gentile societies, which cannot compete with Jewish corruption and still maintain their human dignity, and which refuse to degrade themselves by lowering themselves to the abnormal and inhuman standards of Jewish tribal behavior, find themselves with no option but to expel the Jews; which is exactly what Zionists have often wanted and is one reason why they so openly flaunt their corruption.

New York City Mayor John Francis Hylan believed that the bankers, directly or indirectly, owned the major newspapers. In 1918, a letter from Hylan to the President of the National Association of City Editors was published in *The New York Times* on 25 August 1918 on page 16,

**“HYLAN ATTACKS
ALL NEWSPAPERS
Mayor Declares Confidence of
the Public in Them Has
Been Shaken.
VANDERLIP DISPUTES THIS
Banker Tells City Editors He Would
Emigrate to Russia If Condition
Were True.**

Mayor John F. Hylan, in a letter which was read last night at the dinner held at the Hotel Majestic of the National Association of City Editors, bitterly attacked the newspapers, saying that the confidence of their readers had been shaken ‘by misrepresentation, biased and untruthful news and editorials which had been and are at intervals appearing in the press.’

Frank A. Vanderlip, President of the National City Bank, who was one of the speakers at the dinner, promptly seized upon the Mayor’s letter and asserted if he thought the conditions described by the Mayor were true he would consider emigrating to Russia. Mr. Vanderlip disputed the Mayor’s assertions.

Mayor Hylan’s letter was as follows:

City of New York.
Office of the Mayor.

Aug. 23. 1918.

Clyde P. Steen, Esq., President National Association of City Editors. Hotel Majestic. New York City:

Dear Mr. Steen: Your Invitation to be present and welcome the members of the National Association of City Editors at their annual banquet is received.

I have delayed answering, hoping that I might be able to arrange to be present and to personally extend a welcome on behalf of the city. I regret this is impossible. I am taking this opportunity to say a word to you.

The people of New York are highly honored to have such distinguished men in their midst who will attend your annual convention. As Chief Executive of the city, I wish to extend to you a warm and sincere greeting. I hope the result of your deliberations at your annual convention will meet the expectations of your association and result in benefits to the people throughout the country.

I would like to offer a word or suggestion, which I hope will be received in the spirit in which it is intended by the great men who control the destinies of the papers throughout the country. The people for many years past have looked to your association to guide and advise them in all matters of public importance and benefit. The daily readers have assumed that the papers they read are independent, unbiased, truthful, and fair in their articles and editorials. However, their confidence has been shaken by misrepresentation, biased and untruthful news and editorials which have born and are at intervals appearing in the press. They believe that the policy of the paper is controlled and influenced by certain interests that are more interested in the special privilege seeker than in the people. In many instances this is true, brought about, no doubt, by the financial condition of a particular paper, whose owners are unable to secure sufficient revenue from their paper to make a profit, and who are compelled to rely upon the subsidy furnished, in one form or another, by certain interests who are profiteering upon the people. This makes the paper a pliant tool of the interests and is used to mislead the people.

The management of the paper, with this policy in mind, sends out the news gatherer on a mission, with instructions. The facts gathered are distorted and the articles colored in accordance with instructions and in accordance with the prejudices of the individual news gatherer, thereby getting away from the purpose of disseminating fair and unbiased news. The editorial writer likewise colors his editorial to suit the Interests of the paper and his employer. The people in a small community quickly discover the gossip monger and the talebearer, and such person is discredited and has no standing in the community.

The people have discovered, particularly in New York, that practically all of the large newspapers are controlled by the special privilege seeking interests, and have as little regard and little respect for the truthfulness and fairness of such papers as they have for the gossip monger and trouble maker in a small community. This shaken confidence and the belief that the press is controlled to a great extent by those who are profiteering in the necessities of life, is causing great and most serious unrest among the people.

The policy of every paper in the country should be to present the facts as they find them, and not to attempt to bias and prejudice the minds of the people with untruthful and unfair editorials and news articles.

In order for the press to regain the confidence in the people they must first of all adopt a policy which will make their paper honest, fearless, and independent in the presentation of news. I sincerely hope that the great men who are connected with the papers of the United States will appreciate the necessity of regaining the confidence of the people, and use their influence against the profiteering interests that are controlling the necessities of life and exploiting the people.

Permit me to make this suggestion at this time: Would it not be wise for a return to the days when our writers and molders of public thought on matters affecting public questions appearing in the daily papers signed the same with their names? Very truly yours.

JOHN F. HYLAN, Mayor.

‘When I hear of the low state of the public press as described by the Mayor, of the low state of justice as regards newspapers, I would look to Russia as a place to emigrate to, for it would be an improvement to live there,’ Mr. Vanderlip said after the Mayor’s letter had been read.

The occasion was the first dinner of the New York City Editors’ Association, an organization formed under the auspices of the National Association of City Editors. The latter organization came into being, according to Clyde P. Steen, the President, at the suggestion of George Creel, Chairman of the Committee on Public Information, so that the committee might have an organization to reach the bulk of the smaller editors of the country. The dinner was attended by a group of editors from up State.”

Frank A. Vanderlip was one of the notorious conspirators on Jekyll Island who created the plan for the Federal Reserve Act which “Colonel” Edward Mandell House forced President Wilson to enact, despite Wilson’s campaign promise to oppose such legislation. Paul Warburg drafted the plan and Senator and financier Nelson W. Aldrich attached his name to it in the first attempt to pass it. Vanderlip confessed to his crimes against the American People in an article entitled “The ‘First-Name Club’” in the *Saturday Evening Post* in the edition of 9 February 1935, on page 25. George Creel was a muckraking journalist who became the chief propagandist for the Wilson Administration. He lied to the American Public and viciously defamed the German People in order to promote the Jewish bankers in their Zionist efforts to bring America into the First World War on the side of the British in exchange for the Balfour Declaration—a declaration written out to Lord Rothschild which the Zionists took as a blank check.

On 2 March 1922 on page 3 in an article entitled “Hylan Denounces Rule from Albany”, *The New York Times* quoted Mayor Hylan,

“Assails Big Newspapers.

‘The present system permits big lawbreakers to escape punishment, provides constant opportunity for increasing the fields for public plundering and flouts the will of the majority, while legislation for the benefit of entrenched monopoly is smeared all over the statute books. And these

interests are careful to see to it that they and their official trools receive clean bills of health when seeking popular favor. It is here that the subsidized press—the ever-ready and powerful ally of privilege, comes to the rescue. This help is never denied, for the sinister forces of greed and corruption influence, own or control practically all the newspapers throughout the country. Hence you may be sure that the journalistic pap dished out to the people is at all times of a character to make the people feel kindly disposed toward the hand-picked candidates who are secretly committed to the cause of the interests.

‘While it is imperative to do everything possible to mitigate the consequences of political evils, the real solution of the difficulty lies in the removal of the causes, and so I say it would be a great day for the people of this State if we could but clean out the whole kit and caboodle of grasping interests, mercenary politicians and lick-spittol newspapers. These are the three heads of the hydra which must be lopped off together.’

The New York Times wrote on 27 March 1922 on page 3,

“HYLAN TAKES STAND ON NATIONAL ISSUES

Suggestion of a Presidential
Boom Is Seen in a Speech
Delivered in Chicago.

CONDEMNS PACIFIC TREATY

Says International Bankers and
Standard Oil Constitute an
‘Invisible Government.’

Special to the New York Times.

CHICAGO, March 26.—John F. Hylan, Mayor of New York City, in an address to the Knights of Columbus at the Hotel La Salle here tonight, declared that ‘a little coterie of international bankers’ virtually ran the United States Government for their own selfish interests, assailed ‘invisible government’ and the Rockefeller-Standard-Oil interests and predicted a ‘whirlwind of public condemnation’ for those Senators who voted for the ratification of the Four-Power Treaty, which he described as an ‘awful act’ and a departure from the policy of George Washington.

It was Mayor Hylan’s maiden speech in Chicago on the occasion of his first visit to this city. His address was at the dinner of the Knights of Columbus following the initiation of 600 candidates to the fourth degree of the order.

Mayor Hylan spoke largely on national issues and his speech was considered by many present to mark the launching of his own Presidential

boom, the suggestion for which was first put forward tentatively last month at Palm Beach by Commissioner Grover A. Whalen of his Cabinet, while others thought it was rather an amplification and endorsement of the utterances and theories of William Randolph Hearst, as presented almost daily in the Hearst papers.

While Mayor Hylan's speech was punctuated with occasional applause, it was not greeted with any unroarious display of approval. His audience was attentive, courteous and polite, but that was all.

His Choice for President.

Mayor Hylan naturally did not mention himself for the Presidency, but he expressed the hope that both parties would nominate in 1924, 'men who are genuinely independent, men who have a little of the milk of human kindness in their souls, men of the type of Hiram Johnson, William Randolph Hearst and Rodman Wanamaker.'

With possible reference to his own political fortunes, Mayor Hylan urged complete religious tolerance in political action should never be founded on racial or religious impulse or alignment.

'We are all God's children, no matter in which religion we may chance to have been born,' he said. 'There is no room for bigotry in the free breezes of America and those who seek to instil it are unworthy the name of American.'

Quoting the late Theodore Roosevelt, he attacked 'invisible government,' which, he said, 'like a giant octopus sprawls its slimy length over city, State and nation,' and 'squirms in the jaws of darkness and is thus the better able to clutch the reins of government.'

Other points in Mayor Hylan's speech included a recital of events in the last two New York City Mayoralty elections, a demand that Europe pay its war debts to this country, a boost for the soldier bonus, advocacy of the referendum and recall 'used with discretion,' an ambiguous reference construed to favor beer and light wines and a protest against the prevailing heavy taxes.

Assails Treaty Ratification.

Mayor Hylan pictured 'the flag that snapped proudly over Valley Forge and Bunker Hill' as drooping on its staff. 'For it has been decreed by a handful of Senators at Washington,' he continued, 'that the Stars and Stripes must flutter beside the standards of Great Britain and Japan if at any time the insular possessions of these empires in the region of the Pacific are in anywise threatened.'

'The Senators who by their action have made the free and independent United States of America the prop of crumbling European or warlike Asiatic dynasties may live to regret the day and the deed that was done on it. As surely as the sun shines and the seasons come and go in this Republic founded by Washington and saved by Lincoln, those Senators will reap the harvest of the whirlwind of public condemnation which they have sown by this awful act of ratification.'

Mayor Hylan also attacked the New York newspapers which opposed him for re-election last Fall, and declared the 'kept' press did not support any candidate who did not have the approval of Wall Street and the traction interests.

'The hooting, gibing and sneering at my candidacy and the tacking upon me of a nickname, which was an echo of the days when I used the pick and shovel and drove a locomotive, were most flagrant and disgraceful,' he added.

Beginning his speech with complimentary reference to the wartime and reconstruction work of the Knights of Columbus, Mayor Hylan launched almost immediately into an attack upon 'invisible government.'

'Some years ago,' he said, 'a sterling American, Theodore Roosevelt, condemned what he called 'invisible government.' He denounced as malefactors of great wealth and as enemies of the Republic those men of excessive fortune who were forever trying to grasp greater gain.

Names 'Head of the Octopus.'

'The warning of Theodore Roosevelt has much timeliness today, for the real menace of our republic is this invisible government which like a giant octopus sprawls its slimy length over city, State and nation.

'Like the octopus of real life it operates under cover of a self-created screen. It seizes in its long and powerful tentacles our executive officers, our legislative bodies, our schools, our courts, our newspapers and every agency created for the public protection.

'It squirms in the jaws of darkness and thus is the better able to clutch the reins of government, secure enactment of the legislation favorable to corrupt business, violate the law with impunity, smother the press and reach into the courts.

'To depart from mere generalizations, let me say that at the head of this octopus are the Rockefeller-Standard Oil interests and a small group of powerful banking houses generally referred to as the international bankers.

'The little coterie of powerful international bankers virtually run the United States Government for their own selfish purposes. They practically control both parties, write political platforms, make catspaws of party leaders, use the leading men of private organizations and resort to every device to place in nomination for high public office only such candidates as will be amenable to the dictates of corrupt big business. They connive at centralization of government on the theory that a small group of hand-picked, privately controlled individuals in power can be more easily handled than a larger group among whom there will most likely be men sincerely interested in public welfare.

'These international bankers and Rockefeller-Standard Oil interests control the majority of newspapers and magazines in this country. They use the columns of these papers to club into submission or drive out of office public officials who refuse to do the bidding of the powerful corrupt cliques which compose the invisible government.'

Mayor Hylan quoted the paper attributed to Dr. Frederick T. Gates of the General Education Board, which advocated educating rural children to remain in that station of life rather than training them for the professions.

‘This is the kind of education the coolies receive in China,’ Mr. Hylan said, ‘but we are not going to stand for it in these United States. One of my first acts as Mayor was to pitch our, bag and baggage, from the educational system of our city the Rockefeller agents and the Gary plan of education to fit the children for the mill and factory.’

Criticizes Our Entering War.

Entrance of the United States into the World War was viewed by Mayor Hylan as a departure of doubtful wisdom from its traditional policy.

‘In the second Wilson presidential campaign the slogan was ‘He kept us out of war.’ Shortly after the Administration entered upon its second term the cry ‘to arms’ was roared, and the free and independent United States of America was plunged into the seething cauldron of the European war.

‘The slogan of the Harding campaign was ‘No League of Nations.’ Scarcely a year after this new national administration entered into office, a peace parley was called to effect an association of nations—which is the same as a League of Nations—to bind the Republic of the United States of America, pulsating with life, to the moribund monarchies of Europe.

‘We have in this country a few Tories who are more interested in the welfare of foreign countries than they are in the United States Government. Some way ought to be found for dealing effectively with them.

‘Our departure from the patriotic and wise admonitions of our far-sighted early patriots which led to our participation in the World War has taught thinking America a lesson, sad, bitter and costly.’

Mayor Hylan declared the United States should collect the ten billion dollars owed by her allies during the war, even though they showed no sign of willingness to pay. ‘I for one,’ he said, ‘insist that the Government demand the return of principal and interest as soon as possible, so that at least part of these sums may be distributed to the soldiers of the United States and their families who are in need. Seventy-five thousand ex-service men are tramping the streets of the City of New York hungry and jobless, and on behalf of them and every other unemployed veteran, I sincerely hope that Congress will take this matter up and insist on an early settlement of at least part of the debts owing to the United States by these European countries.’”

On 9 December 1922, *The New York Times* quoted Hylan, “As the cities of the State of New York were organized to oppose Governor Miller last November, so Mayor Hylan plans a nation-wide cities bloc to fight against ‘corporation and international bankers’ in the Presidential election two years hence. [***] We have got to get the cities together for the fight in 1924. There is going to be a battle then and a hard one to prevent the corporate interests and the great international bankers from dictating to the two old parties when the time comes for nominating a President.”¹⁰²¹

As Presidential candidate for the Progressive Party, Theodore Roosevelt gave a speech in August of 1912, in Oyster Bay, New York, “The Progressive Covenant With The People” (note that Roosevelt’s allusion to an “invisible government” is similar to Walter Rathenau’s declaration on 24 December 1912 in the *Wiener Freie Presse*, that “Three hundred men, each of whom knows all the others, govern the fate of the European continent, and they elect their successors from their entourage.”¹⁰²²),

“Political parties exist to secure responsible government and to execute the will of the people. From these great tasks both of the old parties have turned aside. Instead of instruments to promote the general welfare they have become the tools of corrupt interests, which use them impartially to serve their selfish purposes. Behind the ostensible government sits enthroned an invisible government owing no allegiance and acknowledging no responsibility to the people. To destroy this invisible government, to dissolve the unholy alliance between corrupt business and corrupt politics, is the first task of the statesmanship of the day. Unhampered by tradition, uncorrupted by power, undismayed by the magnitude of the task, the new party offers itself as the instrument of the people, to sweep away old abuses, to build a new and nobler government. This declaration is our covenant with the people and we hereby bind the party and its candidates, in state and nation, to the pledges made herein. With all my heart and soul, with every particle of high purpose that is in me, I pledge you my word to do everything I can to put every particle of courage, of common sense, and of strength that I have at your disposal, and to endeavor so far as strength has given me to live up to the obligations you have put upon me, and to endeavor to carry out in the interest of our whole people the policies to which you have today solemnly dedicated yourselves in the name of the millions of men and women for whom you speak. Surely there never was a fight better worth making than the one in which we are engaged. It little matters what befalls any one of us, who for the time being stand in the forefront of the battle. I hope we shall win, and I believe that if we can wake the people to what the fight really means, we shall win. But win or lose, we shall not falter. Whatever fate may at the moment overtake any of us, the movement itself will not stop. Our cause is based on the eternal principles of righteousness. Even though we who now lead may for the time fail, in the end the cause itself shall triumph. Six weeks ago, here in Chicago, I spoke to the honest representatives of a convention which was not dominated by honest men. A convention wherein sat, alas, a majority of men who, with sneering indifference to every principle of right, so acted as to bring to a shameful end a party which had been founded over half a century ago by men in whose souls burned the fire of lofty endeavor. Now to you men, who, in your turn have come together to spend and be spent in the endless crusade against wrong, to you who face the future resolute and confident, to you who strive in a spirit of brotherhood for the betterment of our nation, to you who gird yourselves for this great new fight in the never ending warfare for the good of humankind, I say in closing what in that

speech I said in closing: We stand at Armageddon, and we battle for the Lord.”

Two key elements of Roosevelt’s Progressive Party were iterated in the “Platform of the Progressive Party” on 7 August 1912,

“The Old Parties

Political parties exist to secure responsible government and to execute the will of the people.

From these great tasks both of the old parties have turned aside. Instead of instruments to promote the general welfare, they have become the tools of corrupt interests which use them impartially to serve their selfish purposes. Behind the ostensible government sits enthroned an invisible government, owing no allegiance and acknowledging no responsibility to the people.

To destroy this invisible government, to dissolve the unholy alliance between corrupt business and corrupt politics is the first task of the statesmanship of the day.

The deliberate betrayal of its trust by the Republican Party, and the fatal incapacity of the Democratic Party to deal with the new issues of the new time, have compelled the people to forge a new instrument of government through which to give effect to their will in laws and institutions.

Unhampered by tradition, uncorrupted by power, undismayed by the magnitude of the task, the new party offers itself as the instrument of the people to sweep away old abuses, to build a new and nobler commonwealth.”

and,

“Currency

We believe there exists imperative need for prompt legislation for the improvement of our National currency system. We believe the present method of issuing notes through private agencies is harmful and unscientific.

The issue of currency is fundamentally government function and the system should have as basic principles soundness and elasticity. The control should be lodged with the Government and should be protected from domination manipulation by Wall Street or any special interests.

We are opposed to the so-called Aldrich currency bill, because its provisions would place our currency and credit system in private hands, not subject to effective public control.”

Silas Bent published a review of the books *The Life of Woodrow Wilson*¹⁰²³ by Josephus Daniels and *The True Story of Woodrow Wilson*¹⁰²⁴ by David Lawrence under the caption “Career of the Creator of ‘International Conscience’” in *The New York Times Book Review* 22 June 1924 on page 3, in which Bent wrote, among other things,

“Mr. Lawrence quotes [President Woodrow Wilson] as calling the Colonel ‘a monumental faker.’ That was in private conversation. Mr. Wilson did not reply to his predecessor’s attacks on him as a candidate.

To Colonel E. M. House Mr. Lawrence gives credit for influence in naming the greater part of the first Wilson Cabinet. Mr. Daniels mentions Colonel House only in reference to the appointment of Albert. S. Burleson as Postmaster General. It was Colonel House, so Mr. Lawrence says, who first interested Mr. Wilson in banking reform. It was Colonel House who made a trip to Wall Street before the inauguration and reassured the most powerful bankers in this country about Mr. Wilson’s views, telling them his intentions toward business and finance, so as to avert a threatened panic.

The second Mrs. Wilson, according to Mr. Lawrence, was chiefly responsible for the break between her husband and Colonel House. She exercised an extraordinary influence and thought the Colonel was too much in evidence at Versailles. It was she, according to the same writer, who caused the break with Secretary Tumulty; but some of those who read Mr. Tulmuty’s about himself and the President regarded that as abundant provocation.”

Woodrow Wilson, himself, stated in a campaign speech before he was elected for his first term as President,

“Since I entered politics, I have chiefly had men’s views confided to me privately. Some of the biggest men in the United States, in the field of commerce and manufacture, are afraid of somebody, are afraid of something. They know that there is a power somewhere so organized, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they had better not speak above their breath when they speak in condemnation of it.”¹⁰²⁵

Jacob Schiff, whose family had a long and intimate relationship with the Rothschild family, destroyed Russia through the collusive actions of international finance, which was disproportionately in the hands of Jewish financiers. The Bolsheviks he put into power forestalled Russian progress for a century. Zionist Meir Kahane launched a secret war against the Soviet Union, attempting to provoke conflict between the Soviets and the Americans, in order to force the Soviet Union into sending Jews to Israel.¹⁰²⁶ Israel needed to increase its Jewish population so as to change the demographics of the country and overwhelm the large native Palestinian population.

Kahane’s actions could have brought the United States, N.A.T.O., the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union to war—had the potential to provoke World War III, but racist Jews are so selfish and so fanatical that they welcome the notion of a third world war which they see as necessary to fulfill Old Testament prophecy. There is today a rise in anti-Semitism in Russia and the Ukraine; and, given this history of Zionist agitation, the question arises, are Zionists agitating to provoke this anti-Semitism and yet again causing the Jews and Gentiles of Russia needless misery in

order to promote their perceived Zionist self-interests? Zionists want to force Russian Jews to move to Israel, because the demographic situation still favors the Palestinians in Israel, which is by no means a democracy; and if Israel were to become a democracy, the Palestinians would effectively rule by swing vote and eventually by majority vote. When the Soviet Union broke apart, a Jewish mafia took over many of the profitable businesses of Russia and funneled the fortunes into the hands of Jewish financiers.¹⁰²⁷ International finance grossly restricted the influx of investment capital into the former Soviet Nations preventing their successful transition into Capitalism, and the Jewish mafia discouraged the influx of foreign capital by manifesting rampant corruption that frightened off foreign investors. Both before and after the reign of the Jewish “Red Terror”, Russia, a nation with the greatest potential of any nation on Earth, was destroyed again and again by Jewish finance. *Malachi* 1:1-5 states,

“1 The burden of the word of the LORD to Israel by Malachi. 2 I have loved you, saith the LORD. Yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us? *Was* not Esau Jacob’s brother? saith the LORD: yet I loved Jacob, 3 And I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness. 4 Whereas Edom saith, We are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate places; thus saith the LORD of hosts, They shall build, but I will throw down; and they shall call them, The border of wickedness, and, The people against whom the LORD hath indignation for ever. 5 And *your* eyes shall see, and ye shall say, The LORD will be magnified from the border of Israel.”

Congressman Louis T. McFadden gave the following famous speech before the United States House of Representatives on 10 June 1932, which tells the story of how the Jewish bankers ruined Russia and delivered America into slavery, war and depression through their agent “Colonel” Edward Mandell House:

“Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, at the present session of Congress we have been dealing with emergency situations. We have been dealing with the effect of things rather than with the cause of things. In this particular discussion I shall deal with some of the causes that lead up to these proposals. There are underlying principles which are responsible for conditions such as we have at the present time and I shall deal with one of these in particular which is tremendously important in the consideration that you are now giving to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have in this country one of the most corrupt institutions the world has ever known. I refer to the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve Banks. The Federal Reserve Board, a Government board, has cheated the Government of the United States and the people of the United States out of enough money to pay the national debt. The depredations and iniquities of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks acting together have cost this country enough money to pay the

national debt several times over. This evil institution has impoverished and ruined the people of the United States; has bankrupted itself, and has practically bankrupted our Government. It has done this through the defects of the law under which it operates, through the maladministration of that law by the Federal Reserve Board, and through the corrupt practices of the moneyed vultures who control it.

Some people think the Federal Reserve banks are United States Government institutions. They are not Government institutions. They are private credit monopolies which prey upon the people of the United States for the benefit of themselves and their foreign customers; foreign and domestic speculators and swindlers; and rich and predatory money lenders. In that dark crew of financial pirates there are those who would cut a man's throat to get a dollar out of his pocket; there are those who send money into States to buy votes to control our legislation; and there are those who maintain international propaganda for the purpose of deceiving us and of wheedling us into the granting of new concessions which will permit them to cover up their past misdeeds and set again in motion their gigantic train of crime.

These 12 private credit monopolies were deceitfully and disloyally foisted upon this country by the bankers who came here from Europe and repaid us for our hospitality by undermining our American institutions. Those bankers took money out of this country to finance Japan in a war against Russia. They created a reign of terror in Russia with our money in order to help that war along. They instigated the separate peace between Germany and Russia and thus drove a wedge between the Allies in the World War. They financed Trotsky's mass meetings of discontent and rebellion in New York. They paid Trotsky's passage from New York to Russia so that he might assist in the destruction of the Russian Empire. They fomented and instigated the Russian revolution and they placed a large fund of American dollars at Trotsky's disposal in one of their branch banks in Sweden so that through him Russian homes might be thoroughly broken up and Russian children flung far and wide from their natural protectors. They have since begun the breaking up of American homes and the dispersal of American children.

It has been said that President Wilson was deceived by the attentions of these bankers and by the philanthropic poses they assumed. It has been said that when he discovered the manner in which he had been misled by Colonel House, he turned against that busybody, that 'holy monk' of the financial empire, and showed him the door. He had the grace to do that, and in my opinion he deserves great credit for it.

President Wilson died a victim of deception. When he came to the Presidency, he had certain qualities of mind and heart which entitled him to a high place in the councils of this Nation; but there was one thing he was not and which he never aspired to be; he was not a banker. He said that he knew very little about banking. It was, therefore, on the advice of others that the

iniquitous Federal reserve act, the death warrant of American liberty, became law in his administration.

Mr. Chairman, there should be no partisanship in matters concerning the banking and currency affairs of this country, and I do not speak with any.

In 1912 the National Monetary Association, under the chairmanship of the late Senator Nelson W. Aldrich, made a report and presented a vicious bill called the National Reserve Association bill. This bill is usually spoken of as the Aldrich bill. Senator Aldrich did not write the Aldrich bill. He was the tool, but not the accomplice, of the European-born bankers who for nearly twenty years had been scheming to set up a central bank in this country and who in 1912 had spent and were continuing to spend vast sums of money to accomplish their purpose.

The Aldrich bill was condemned in the platform upon which Theodore Roosevelt was nominated in the year 1912, and in that same year, when Woodrow Wilson was nominated, the Democratic platform, as adopted at the Baltimore convention, expressly stated: 'We are opposed to the Aldrich plan for a central bank.' This was plain language. The men who ruled the Democratic Party then promised the people that if they were returned to power there would be no central bank established here while they held the reigns of government. Thirteen months later that promise was broken, and the Wilson administration, under the tutelage of those sinister Wall Street figures who stood behind Colonel House, established here in our free country the worm-eaten monarchical institution of the 'king's bank' to control us from the top downward, and to shackle us from the cradle to the grave. The Federal Reserve act destroyed our old and characteristic way of doing business; it discriminated against our 1-name commercial paper, the finest in the world; it set up the antiquated 2-name paper, which is the present curse of this country, and which wrecked every country which has ever given it scope; it fastened down upon this country the very tyranny from which the framers of the Constitution sought to save us.

One of the greatest battles for the preservation of this Republic was fought out here in Jackson's day, when the Second Bank of the United States, which was founded upon the same false principles as those which are here exemplified in the Federal Reserve act, was hurled out of existence. After the downfall of the Second Bank of the United States in 1837, the country was warned against the dangers that might ensue if the predatory interests, after being cast out, should come back in disguise and unite themselves to the Executive, and through him acquire control of the Government. That is what the predatory interests did when they came back in the livery of hypocrisy and under false pretenses obtained the passage of the Federal reserve act.

The danger that the country was warned against came upon us and is shown in the long train of horrors attendant upon the affairs of the traitorous and dishonest Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks. Look around you when you leave this chamber and you will see evidences on all sides. This is an era of economic misery and for the conditions that caused

that misery, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks are fully liable. This is an era of financed crime and in the financing of crime, the Federal Reserve Board does not play the part of a disinterested spectator.

It has been said that the draughtsman who was employed to write the text of the Federal reserve bill used a text of the Aldrich bill for his purpose. It has been said that the language of the Aldrich bill was used because the Aldrich bill had been drawn up by expert lawyers and seemed to be appropriate. It was indeed drawn up by lawyers. The Aldrich bill was created by acceptance bankers of European origin in New York City. It was a copy and in general a translation of the statutes of the Reichsbank and other European central banks.

Half a million dollars was spent one part of the propaganda organized by those same European bankers for the purpose of misleading public opinion in regard to it, and for the purpose of giving Congress the impression that there was an overwhelming popular demand for that kind of banking legislation and the kind of currency that goes with it, namely, an asset currency based on human debts and obligations instead of an honest currency based on gold and silver values. Dr. H. Parker Willis had been employed by the Wall Street bankers and propagandists and when the Aldrich measure came to naught and he obtained employment from CARTER GLASS to assist in drawing a banking bill for the Wilson administration, he appropriated the text of the Aldrich bill for his purpose. There is no secret about it. The text of the Federal reserve act was tainted from the beginning.

Not all of the Democratic Members of the Sixty-third Congress voted for this great deception. Some of them remembered the teachings of Jefferson; and, through the years, there had been no criticisms of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks so honest, so out-spoken, and so unsparingly as those which have been voiced here by Democrats. Again, although a number of Republicans voted for the Federal reserve act, the wisest and most conservative members of the Republican Party would have nothing to do with it and voted against it. A few days before the bill came to a vote, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts, wrote to Senator John W. Weeks as follows:

NEW YORK CITY, *December 17, 1913.*

MY DEAR SENATOR WEEKS: * * * Throughout my public life I have supported all measures designed to take the Government out of the banking business * * *. This bill puts the Government into the banking business as never before in our history and makes, as I understand it, all notes Government notes when they should be bank notes.

The powers vested in the Federal Reserve Board seem to me highly dangerous, especially where there is political control of the Board. I should be sorry to hold stock in a bank subject to such domination. The bill as it stands seems to me to open the way to a vast inflation of the currency. There is no necessity of dwelling upon this point after the remarkable and most powerful argument of the senior Senator from New York. I can be content here to follow the example of the English

candidate for Parliament who thought it enough 'to say ditto to Mr. Burke.' I will merely add that I do not like to think that any law can be passed which will make it possible to submerge the gold standard in a flood of irredeemable paper currency.

I had hoped to support this bill, but I can not vote for it as it stands, because it seems to me to contain features and to rest upon principles in the highest degree menacing to our prosperity, to stability in business, and to the general welfare of the people of the United States.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY CABOT LODGE.

In 18 years which have passed since Senator Lodge wrote that letter of warning all of his predictions have come true. The Government is in the banking business as never before. Against its will it has been made the backer of horsethieves and card sharps, bootleggers, smugglers, speculators, and swindlers in all parts of the world. Through the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks the riffraff of every country is operating on the public credit of this United States Government. Meanwhile, and on account of it, we ourselves are in the midst of the greatest depression we have ever known. Thus the menace to our prosperity, so feared by Senator Lodge, has indeed struck home. From the Atlantic to the Pacific our country has been ravaged and laid waste by the evil practices of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks and the interests which control them. At no time in our history has the general welfare of the people of the United States been at a lower level or the mind of the people so filled with despair.

Recently in one of our States 60,000 dwelling houses and farms were brought under the hammer in a single day. According to the Rev. Father Charles E. Coughlin, who has lately testified before a committee of this House, 71,000 houses and farms in Oakland County, Mich., have been sold and their erstwhile owners dispossessed. Similar occurrences have probably taken place in every county in the United States. The people who have thus been driven out are the wastage of the Federal reserve act. They are the victims of the dishonest and unscrupulous Federal Reserve Board and Federal reserve banks. Their children are the new slaves of the auction blocks in the revival here of the institution of human slavery.

In 1913, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. Alexander Lassen made the following statement:

But the whole scheme of the Federal reserve bank with its commercial-paper basis is an impractical, cumbersome machinery, is simply a cover, to find a way to secure the privilege of issuing money and to evade payment of as much tax upon circulation as possible, and then control the issue and maintain, instead of reduce, interest rates. It is a system that, if inaugurated, will prove to the advantage of the few and the detriment of the people of the United States. It will mean continued shortage of actual money and further extension of credits; for when there is a lack of real money people have to borrow credit to their cost.

A few days before the Federal Reserve act was passed Senator Elihu Root denounced the Federal Reserve bill as an outrage on our liberties and made the following prediction:

Long before we wake up from our dreams of prosperity through an inflated currency, our gold, which alone could have kept us from catastrophe, will have vanished and no rate of interest will tempt it to return.

If ever a prophecy came true, that one did. It was impossible, however, for those luminous and instructed thinkers to control the course of events. On December 23, 1913, the Federal reserve bill became law, and that night Colonel House wrote to his hidden master in Wall Street as follows:

I want to say a word of appreciation to you for the silent but no doubt effective work you have done in the interest of currency legislation and to congratulate you that the measure has finally been enacted into law. We all know that an entirely perfect bill, satisfactory to everybody, would have been an impossibility, and I feel quite certain fair men will admit that unless the President had stood as firm as he did we should likely have had no legislation at all. The bill is a good one in many respects; anyhow good enough to start with and to let experience teach us in what direction it needs perfection, which in due time we shall then get. In any event you have personally good reason to feel gratified with what has been accomplished.

The words ‘unless the President had stood as firm as he did we should likely have had no legislation at all,’ were a gentle reminder that it was Colonel House himself, the ‘holy monk,’ who had kept the President firm.

The foregoing letter affords striking evidence of the manner in which the predatory interests then sought to control the Government of the United States by surrounding the Executive with the personality and the influence of a financial Judas. Left to itself and to the conduct of its own legislative functions without pressure from the Executive, the Congress would not have passed the Federal reserve act. According to Colonel House, and since this was his report to his master, we may believe it to be true, the Federal reserve act was passed because Wilson stood firm; in other words because Wilson was under the guidance and control of the most ferocious usurers in New York through their hireling, House. The Federal reserve act became law the day before Christmas Eve in the year 1913, and shortly afterwards the German international bankers, Kuhn, Loeb and Co., sent one of their partners here to run it.

In 1913, when the Federal reserve bill was submitted to the Democratic caucus, there was a discussion in regard to the form the proposed paper currency should take.

The proponents of the Federal reserve act, in their determination to create a new kind of paper money, had not needed to go outside of the Aldrich bill for a model. By the terms of the Aldrich bill, bank notes were to be issued by the National Reserve Association and were to be secured partly by gold or

lawful money and partly by circulating evidences of debt. The first draft of the Federal reserve bill presented the same general plan, that is, for bank notes as opposed to Government notes, but with certain differences of regulation.

When the provision for the issuance of Federal reserve notes was placed before President Wilson he approved of it, but other Democrats were more mindful of Democratic principles and a great protest greeted the plan. Foremost amongst those who denounced it was William Jennings Bryan, the Secretary of State. Bryan wished to have the Federal reserve notes issued as Government obligations. President Wilson had an interview with him and found him adamant. At the conclusion of the interview Bryan left with the understanding that he would resign if the notes were made bank notes. The President then sent for his Secretary and explained the matter to him. Mr. Tumulty went to see Bryan and Bryan took from his library shelves a book containing all the Democratic platforms and read extracts from them bearing on the matter of the public currency. Returning to the President, Mr. Tumulty told him what had happened and ventured the opinion that Mr. Bryan was right and that Mr. Wilson was wrong. The President then asked Mr. Tumulty to show him where the Democratic Party in its national platforms had ever taken the view indicated by Bryan. Mr. Tumulty gave him the book, which he had brought from Bryan's house, and the President read very carefully plank after plank on the currency. He then said, 'I am convinced there is a great deal in what Mr. Bryan says,' and thereupon it was arranged that Mr. Tumulty should see the proponents of the Federal reserve bill in an effort to bring about an adjustment of the matter.

The remainder of this story may be told in the words of Senator GLASS. Concerning Bryan's opposition to the plan of allowing the proposed Federal reserve notes to take the form of bank notes and the manner in which President Wilson and the proponents of the Federal reserve bill yielded to Bryan in return for his support of the measure, Senator GLASS makes the following statement:

The only other feature of the currency bill around which a conflict raged at this time was the note-issue provision. Long before I knew it, the President was desperately worried over it. His economic good sense told him the notes should be issued by the banks and not by the Government; but some of his advisers told him Mr. Bryan could not be induced to give his support to any bill that did not provide for a 'Government note.' There was in the Senate and House a large Bryan following which, united with a naturally adversary party vote, could prevent legislation. Certain overconfident gentlemen proffered their services in the task of 'managing Bryan.' They did not budge him. * * * When a decision could no longer be postponed the President summoned me to the White House to say he wanted Federal reserve notes to 'be obligations of the United States.' I was for an instant speechless. With all the earnestness of my being I remonstrated, pointing out the unscientific nature of such a thing, as well as the evident inconsistency of it.

'There is not, in truth, any Government obligation here, Mr. President,' I

exclaimed. 'It would be a pretense on its face. Was there ever a Government note based primarily on the property of banking institutions? Was there ever a Government issue not one dollar of which could be put out except by demand of a bank? The suggested Government obligation is so remote it could never be discerned,' I concluded, out of breath.

'Exactly so, GLASS,' earnestly said the President. 'Every word you say is true; the Government liability is a mere thought. And so, if we can hold to the substance of the thing and give the other fellow the shadow, why not do it, if thereby we may save our bill?'

Shadow and substance! One can see from this how little President Wilson knew about banking. Unknowingly, he gave the substance to the international banker and the shadow to the common man. Thus was Bryan circumvented in his efforts to uphold the Democratic doctrine of the rights of the people. Thus the 'unscientific blur' upon the bill was perpetrated. The 'unscientific blur,' however, was not the fact that the United States Government, by the terms of Bryan's edict, was obliged to assume as an obligation whatever currency was issued. Mr. Bryan was right when he insisted that the United States should preserve its sovereignty over the public currency. The 'unscientific blur' was the nature of the currency itself, a nature which makes it unfit to be assumed as an obligation of the United States Government. It is the worst currency and the most dangerous this country has ever known. When the proponents of the act saw that the Democratic doctrine would not permit them to let the proposed banks issue the new currency as bank notes, they should have stopped at that. They should not have foisted that kind of currency, namely, an asset currency, on the United States Government. They should not have made the Government liable on the private debts of individuals and corporations and, least of all, on the private debts of foreigners.

The Federal reserve note is essentially unsound.
As Kemmerer says:

The Federal Reserve notes, therefore, in form have some of the qualities of Government paper money, but, in substance, are almost a pure asset currency possessing a Government guaranty against which contingency the Government has made no provision whatever.

Hon. E. J. Hill, a former Member of the House, said, and truly:

* * * They are obligations of the Government for which the United States has received nothing and for the payment of which at any time it assumes the responsibility looking to the Federal reserve to recoup itself.

If the United States Government is to redeem the Federal reserve notes when the general public finds out what it costs to deliver this flood of paper money to the 12 Federal reserve banks, and if the Government has made no

provision for redeeming them, the first element of unsoundness is not far to seek.

Before the Banking and Currency Committee, when the Federal reserve bill was under discussion, Mr. Crozier, of Cincinnati, said:

In other words, the imperial power of elasticity of the public currency is wielded exclusively by these central corporations owned by the banks. This is a life and death power over all local banks and all business. It can be used to create or destroy prosperity, to ward off or cause stringencies and panics. By making money artificially scarce, interest rates throughout the country can be arbitrarily raised and the bank tax on all business and cost of living increased for the profit of the banks owning these regional central banks, and without the slightest benefit to the people. These 12 corporations together cover the whole country and monopolize and use for private gain every dollar of the public currency and all public revenue of the United States. Not a dollar can be put into circulation among the people by their Government without the consent of and on terms fixed by these 12 private money trusts.

In defiance of this and all other warnings, the proponents of the Federal reserve act created the 12 private credit corporations and gave them an absolute monopoly of the currency of the United States, not of the Federal reserve notes alone, but of all the currency, the Federal reserve act providing ways by means of which the gold and general currency in the hands of the American people could be obtained by the Federal reserve banks in exchange for Federal reserve notes, which are not money, but merely promises to pay money. Since the evil day when this was done the initial monopoly has been extended by vicious amendments to the Federal reserve act and by the unlawful and treasonable practices of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks.

Mr. Chairman, when a Chinese merchant sells human hair to a Paris wigmaker and bills him in dollars, the Federal reserve banks can buy his bill against the wigmaker and then use that bill as collateral for the Federal reserve notes. The United States Government thus pays the Chinese merchant the debt of the wigmaker and gets nothing in return except a shady title to the Chinese hair.

Mr. Chairman, if a Scottish distiller wishes to send a cargo of Scotch whiskey to the United States, he can draw his bill against the purchasing bootlegger in dollars; and after the bootlegger has accepted it by writing his name across the face of it, the Scotch distiller can send that bill to the nefarious open discount market in New York City, where the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks will buy it and use it as collateral for a new issue of Federal reserve notes. Thus the Government of the United States pays the Scotch distiller for the whiskey before it is shipped; and if it is lost on the way, or if the Coast Guard seizes it and destroys it, the Federal reserve banks simply write off the loss and the Government never recovers the money that was paid to the Scotch distiller.

While we are attempting to enforce prohibition here, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks are financing the distillery business in Europe and paying bootleggers' bills with the public credit of the United States Government.

Mr. Chairman, if a German brewer ships beer to this country or anywhere else in the world and draws his bill for it in dollars, the Federal reserve banks will buy that bill and use it as collateral for Federal reserve notes. Thus, they compel our Government to pay the German brewer for his beer. Why should the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks be permitted to finance the brewing industry in Germany, either in this way or as they do by compelling small and fearful United States banks to take stock in the Isenbeck brewery and in the German bank for brewing industries?

Mr. Chairman, if Dynamit Nobel of Germany wishes to sell dynamite to Japan to use in Manchuria or elsewhere, it can draw its bill against the Japanese customers in dollars and send that bill to the nefarious open discount market in New York City, where the Federal Reserve Board and Federal reserve banks will buy it and use it as collateral for a new issue of Federal reserve notes, while at the same time the Federal Reserve Board will be helping Dynamit Nobel by stuffing its stock into the United States banking system. Why should we send our representatives to the disarmament conference at Geneva while the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks are making our Government pay Japanese debts to German munition makers?

Mr. Chairman, if a bean grower of Chile wishes to raise a crop of beans and sell them to a Japanese customer, he can draw a bill against his prospective Japanese customer in dollars and have it purchased by the Federal Reserve Board and Federal reserve banks and get the money out of this country at the expense of the American public before he has even planted the beans in the ground.

Mr. Chairman, if a German in Germany wishes to export goods to South America or anywhere else, he can draw his bill against his customer and send it to the United States and get the money out of this country before he ships or even manufactures the goods.

Mr. Chairman, why should the currency of the United States be issued on the strength of Chinese human hair? Why should it be issued on the trade whims of a wigmaker? Why should it be issued on the strength of German beer? Why should it be issued on the crop of unplanted beans to be grown in Chile for Japanese consumption? Why should the Government of the United States be compelled to issue many billions of dollars every year to pay the debts of one foreigner to another foreigner? Was it for this that our national-bank depositors had their money taken out of our banks and shipped abroad? Was it for this that they had to lose it? Why should the public credit of the United States Government and likewise money belonging to our national-bank depositors be used to support foreign brewers, narcotic drug vendors,

whiskey distillers, wigmakers, human-hair merchants, Chilean bean growers, and the like? Why should our national-bank depositors and our Government be forced to finance the munition factories of Germany and Soviet Russia?

Mr. Chairman, if a German in Germany, wishes to sell wheelbarrows to another German, he can draw a bill in dollars and get the money out of the Federal reserve banks before an American farmer could explain his request for a loan to move his crop to market. In Germany, when credit instruments are being given, the creditors say, 'See you, it must be of a kind that I can cash at the reserve.' Other foreigners feel the same way. The reserve to which these gentry refer is our reserve, which, as you know, is entirely made up of money belonging to American bank depositors. I think foreigners should cash their own trade paper and not send it over here to bankers who use it to fish cash out of the pockets of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing like the Federal reserve pool of confiscated bank deposits in the world. It is a public trough of American wealth in which foreigners claim rights equal to or greater than those of Americans. The Federal reserve banks are agents of the foreign central banks. They use our bank depositors' money for the benefit of their foreign principals. They barter the public credit of the United States Government and hire it out to foreigners at a profit to themselves.

All this is done at the expense of the United States Government, and at a sickening loss to the American people. Only our great wealth enabled us to stand the drain of it as long as we did.

I believe that the nations of the world would have settled down after the World War more peacefully if we had not had this standing temptation here—this pool of our bank depositors' money given to private interests and used by them in connection with illimitable drafts upon the public credit of the United States Government. The Federal Reserve Board invited the world to come in and to carry away cash, credit, goods, and everything else of value that was movable. Values amounting to many billions of dollars have been taken out of this country by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks for the benefit of their foreign principals. The United States has been ransacked and pillaged. Our structures have been gutted and only the walls are left standing. While this crime was being perpetrated everything the world could rake up to sell us was brought in here at our own expense by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks until our markets were swamped with unneeded and unwanted imported goods priced far above their value and made to equal the dollar volume of our honest exports and to kill or reduce our favorable balance of trade. As agents of the foreign central banks, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks try by every means within their power to reduce our favorable balance of trade. They act for their foreign principals and they accept fees from foreigners for acting against the best interests of the United States. Naturally there has been great competition among foreigners for the favors of the Federal Reserve Board.

What we need to do is to send the reserves of our national banks home to the people who earned and produced them and who still own them and to the banks which were compelled to surrender them to predatory interests. We need to destroy the Federal reserve pool, wherein our national-bank reserves are impounded for the benefit of the foreigners. We need to make it very difficult for outlanders to draw money away from us. We need to save America for Americans.

Mr. Chairman, when you hold a \$10 Federal Reserve note in your hand you are holding a piece of paper which sooner or later is going to cost the United States Government \$10 in gold, unless the Government is obliged to give up the gold standard. It is protected by a reserve of 40 per cent, or \$4 in gold. It is based on Limburger cheese, reputed to be in foreign warehouses; or on cans purported to contain peas but which may contain no peas but salt water instead; or on horse meat; illicit drugs; bootleggers' fancies; rags and bones from Soviet Russia of which the United States imported over a million dollars' worth last year; on wine, whiskey, natural gas, on goat or dog fur, garlic on the string, or Bombay ducks. If you like to have paper money which is secured by such commodities, you have it in the Federal reserve note. If you desire to obtain the thing of value upon which this paper currency is based—that is, the Limburger cheese, the whiskey, the illicit drugs, or any of the other staples—you will have a very hard time finding them. Many of these worshipful commodities are in foreign countries. Are you going to Germany to inspect her warehouses to see if the specified things of value are there? I think not. And what is more, I do not think you would find them there if you did go.

Immense sums belonging to our national-bank depositors have been given to Germany on no collateral security whatever. The Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks have issued United States currency on mere finance drafts drawn by Germans. Billions upon billions of our money has been pumped into Germany and money is still being pumped into Germany by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks. Her worthless paper is still being negotiated here and renewed here on the public credit of the United States Government and at the expense of the American people. On April 27, 1932, the Federal reserve outfit sent \$750,000, belonging to American bank depositors, in gold to Germany. A week later, another \$300,000 in gold was shipped to Germany in the same way. About the middle of May \$12,000,000 in gold was shipped to Germany by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks. Almost every week there is a shipment of gold to Germany. These shipments are not made for profit on the exchange since the German marks are below parity against the dollar.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the national-bank depositors of the United States are entitled to know what the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks are doing with their money. There are millions of national-bank depositors in this country who do not know that a percentage of every

dollar they deposit in a member bank of the Federal reserve system goes automatically to American agents of the foreign banks and that all their deposits can be paid away to foreigners without their knowledge or consent by the crooked machinery of the Federal reserve act and the questionable practices of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks. Mr. Chairman, the American people should be told the truth by their servants in office.

In 1930 we had over half a billion dollars outstanding daily to finance foreign goods stored in or shipped between countries. In its yearly total, this item amounts to several billion dollars. What goods are those on which the Federal reserve banks yearly pledge several billions of dollars of the public credit of the United States? What goods are those which are hidden in European and Asiatic storehouses and which have never been seen by any officer of this Government, but which are being financed on the public credit of the United States Government? What goods are those upon which the United States Government is being obligated by the Federal reserve banks to issue Federal reserve notes to the extent of several billions of dollars a year?

The Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks have been international bankers from the beginning, with the United States Government as their enforced banker and supplier of currency. But it is none the less extraordinary to see those 12 private credit monopolies buying the debts of foreigners against foreigners in all parts of the world and asking the Government of the United States for new issues of Federal reserve notes in exchange for them.

I see no reason why the American taxpayers should be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the European and Asiatic customers of the Federal reserve banks. I see no reason why a worthless acceptance drawn by a foreign swindler as a means of getting gold out of this country should receive the lowest and choicest rate from the Federal Reserve Board and be treated as better security than the note of an American farmer living on American land.

The magnitude of the acceptance racket, as it has been developed by the Federal reserve banks, their foreign correspondents, and the predatory European-born bankers who set up the Federal Reserve institution here and taught our own brand of pirates how to loot the people—I say the magnitude of this racket is estimated to be in the neighborhood of \$9,000,000,000 a year. In the past ten years it is said to have amounted to \$90,000,000,000. In my opinion, it has amounted to several times as much. Coupled with this you have, to the extent of billions of dollars, the gambling in the United States securities, which takes place in the same open discount market—a gambling upon which the Federal Reserve Board is now spending \$100,000,000 per week.

Federal reserve notes are taken from the United States Government in unlimited quantities. Is it strange that the burden of supplying these immense sums of money to the gambling fraternity has at last proved too heavy for the

American people to endure? Would it not be a national calamity if the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks should again bind this burden down on the backs of the American people and, by means of the long rawhide whips of the credit masters, compel them to enter another 17 years of slavery? They are trying to do that now. They are taking \$100,000,000 of the public credit of the United States Government every week in addition to all their other seizures, and they are spending that money in the nefarious open market in New York City in a desperate gamble to reestablish their graft as a going concern.

They are putting the United States Government in debt to the extent of \$100,000,000 a week, and with the money they are buying up our Government securities for themselves and their foreign principals. Our people are disgusted with the experiments of the Federal Reserve Board. The Federal Reserve Board is not producing a loaf of bread, a yard of cloth, a bushel of corn, or a pile of cordwood by its check-kiting operations in the money market.

A fortnight or so ago great aid and comfort was given to Japan by the firm of A. Gerli & Sons, of New York, an importing firm, which bought \$16,000,000 worth of raw silk from the Japanese Government. Federal reserve notes will be issued to pay that amount to the Japanese Government, and these notes will be secured by money belonging to our national-bank depositors.

Why should United States currency be issued on this debt? Why should United States currency be issued to pay the debt of Gerli & Sons to the Japanese Government? The Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks think more of the silkworms of Japan than they do of American citizens. We do not need \$16,000,000 worth of silk in this country at the present time, not even to furnish work to dyers and finishers. We need to wear home-grown and American-made clothes and to use our own money for our own goods and staples. We could spend \$16,000,000 in the United States of America on American children and that would be a better investment for us than Japanese silk purchased on the public credit of the United States Government.

Mr. Speaker, on the 13th of January of this year I addressed the House on the subject of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In the course of my remarks I made the following statement:

In 1928 the member banks of the Federal reserve system borrowed \$60,598,690,000 from the Federal reserve banks on their 15-day promissory notes. Think of it! Sixty billion dollars payable upon demand in gold in the course of one single year. The actual payment of such obligations calls for six times as much monetary gold as there is in the entire world. Such transactions represent a grant in the course of one single year of about \$7,000,000 to every member bank of the Federal reserve system. Is it any wonder that there is a depression in this country? Is it any wonder that American labor, which ultimately pays the cost of all banking operations of this country, has at last proved unequal to the task of supplying this

huge total of cash and credit for the benefit of the stock-market manipulators and foreign swindlers?

Mr. Chairman, some of my colleagues have asked for more specific information concerning this stupendous graft, this frightful burden which has been placed on the wage earners and taxpayers of the United States for the benefit of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks. They were surprised to learn that member banks of the Federal reserve system had received the enormous sum of \$60,598,690,000 from the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks on their promissory notes in the course of one single year, namely, 1928. Another Member of this House, Mr. BEEDY, the honorable gentleman from Maine, has questioned the accuracy of my statement and has informed me that the Federal Reserve Board denies absolutely that these figures are correct. This Member has said to me that the thing is unthinkable, that it can not be, that it is beyond all reason to think that the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks should have so subsidized and endowed their favorite banks of the Federal reserve system. This Member is horrified at the thought of a graft so great, a bounty so detrimental to the public welfare as sixty and a half billion dollars a year and more shoveled out to favored banks of the Federal reserve system.

I sympathize with Mr. BEEDY. I would spare him pain if I could, but the facts remain as I have stated them. In 1928, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks presented the staggering amount of \$60,598,690,000 to their member banks at the expense of the wage earners and taxpayers of the United States. In 1929, the year of the stock-market crash, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks advanced fifty-eight billions to member banks.

In 1930, while the speculating banks were getting out of the stock market at the expense of the general public, the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks advanced them \$13,022,782,000. This shows that when the banks were gambling on the public credit of the United States Government as represented by the Federal reserve currency, they were subsidized to any amount they required by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks. When the swindle began to fall, the bankers knew it in advance and withdrew from the market. They got out with whole skins and left the people of the United States to pay the piper.

On November 2, 1931, I addressed a letter to the Federal Reserve Board asking for the aggregate total of member bank borrowing in the years 1928, 1929, 1930. In due course, I received a reply from the Federal Reserve Board, dated November 9, 1931, the pertinent part of which reads as follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In reply to your letter of November 2, you are advised that the aggregate amount of 15-day promissory notes of member banks during each of the past three calendar years has been as follows:

1928	_____	\$60,598,690,000
1929	_____	58,046,697,000

1930 _____ 13,022,782,000
* * * * *

Very truly yours,

CHESTER MORRILL, *Secretary.*

This will show the gentleman from Maine the accuracy of my statement. As for the denial of these facts made to him by the Federal Reserve Board, I can only say that it must have been prompted by fright, since hanging is too good for a Government board which permitted such a misuse of Government funds and credit.

My friend from Kansas, Mr. MCGUGIN, has stated that he thought the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks lent money by rediscounting. So they do, but they lend comparatively little that way. The real rediscounting that they do has been called a mere penny in the slot business. It is too slow for genuine high flyers. They discourage it. They prefer to subsidize their favorite banks by making these \$60,000,000,000 advances, and they prefer to acquire acceptances in the notorious open discount market in New York, where they can use them to control the prices of stocks and bonds on the exchanges. For every dollar they advanced on rediscounts in 1928 they lent \$33 to their favorite banks for gambling purposes. In other words, their rediscounts in 1928 amounted to \$1,814,271,000, while their loans to member banks amounted to \$60,598,690,000. As for their open-market operations, these are on a stupendous scale, and no tax is paid on the acceptances they handle; and their foreign principals, for whom they do a business of several billion dollars every year, pay no income tax on their profits to the United States Government.

This is the John Law swindle all over again. The theft of Teapot Dome was trifling compared to it. What king ever robbed his subjects to such an extent as the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks have robbed us? Is it any wonder that there have lately been 90 cases of starvation in one of the New York hospitals? Is there any wonder that the children of this country are being dispersed and abandoned?

The Government and the people of the United States have been swindled by swindlers de luxe to whom the acquisition of American gold or a parcel of Federal reserve notes presented no more difficulty than the drawing up of a worthless acceptance in a country not subject to the laws of the United States, by sharpers not subject to the jurisdiction of the United States courts, sharpers with a strong banking 'fence' on this side of the water—a 'fence' acting as a receiver of the worthless paper coming from abroad, indorsing it and getting the currency out of the Federal reserve banks for it as quickly as possible, exchanging that currency for gold, and in turn transmitting the gold to its foreign confederates.

Such were the exploits of Ivar Kreuger, Mr. Hoover's friend, and his hidden Wall Street backers. Every dollar of the billions Kreuger and his gang

drew out of this country on acceptances was drawn from the Government and the people of the United States through the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks. The credit of the United States Government was peddled to him by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks for their own private gain. That is what the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks have been doing for many years. They have been peddling the credit of this Government and the signature of this Government to the swindlers and speculators of all nations. That is what happens when a country forsakes its Constitution and gives its sovereignty over the public currency to private interests. Give them the flag and they will sell it.

The nature of Kreuger's organized swindle and the bankrupt condition of Kreuger's combine was known here last June when Hoover sought to exempt Kreuger's loan to Germany of one hundred twenty-five millions from the operation of the Hoover moratorium. The bankrupt condition of Kreuger's swindle was known here last summer when \$30,000,000 was taken from the American taxpayers by certain bankers in New York for the ostensible purpose of permitting Kreuger to make a loan to Colombia. Colombia never saw that money. The nature of Kreuger's swindle and the bankrupt condition of Kreuger was known here in January when he visited his friend, Mr. Hoover, at the White House. It was known here in March before he went to Paris and committed suicide there.

Mr. Chairman, I think the people of the United States are entitled to know how many billions of dollars were placed at the disposal of Kreuger and his gigantic combine by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks and to know how much of our Government currency was issued and lost in the financing of that great swindle in the years during which the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks took care of Kreuger's requirements.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there should be a congressional investigation of the operations of Kreuger and Toll in the United States and that Swedish Match, International Match, the Swedish-American Investment Corporation, and all related enterprises, including the subsidiary companies of Kreuger and Toll, should be investigated and that the issuance of United States currency in connection with those enterprises and the use of our national-bank depositors' money for Kreuger's benefit should be made known to the general public. I am referring, not only to the securities which were floated and sold in this country, but also to the commercial loans to Kreuger's enterprises and the mass financing of Kreuger's companies by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks and the predatory institutions which the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks shield and harbor.

A few days ago, the President of the United States, with a white face and shaking hands, went before the Senate on behalf of the moneyed interests and asked the Senate to levy a tax on the people so that foreigners might know that the United States would pay its debt to them. Most Americans thought

it was the other way around. What does the United States owe to foreigners? When and by whom was the debt incurred? It was incurred by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks when they peddled the signature of this Government to foreigners for a price. It is what the United States Government has to pay to redeem the obligations of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks. Are you going to let those thieves get off scot free? Is there one law for the looter who drives up to the door of the United States Treasury in his limousine and another for the United States veterans who are sleeping on the floor of a dilapidated house on the outskirts of Washington?

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad is here asking for a large loan from the people and the wage earners and the taxpayers of the United States. It is begging for a hand-out from the Government. It is standing, cap in hand, at the door of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, where all the other jackals have gathered to the feast. It is asking for money that was raised from the people by taxation, and wants this money of the poor for the benefit of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., the German international bankers. Is there one law for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and another for the needy veterans it threw off its freight cars the other day? Is there one law for sleek and prosperous swindlers who call themselves bankers and another law for the soldiers who defended the United States flag?

Mr. Chairman, some people are horrified because the collateral behind Kreuger and Toll debentures was removed and worthless collateral substituted for it. What is this but what is being done daily by the Federal reserve banks? When the Federal reserve act was passed, the Federal reserve banks were allowed to substitute 'other like collateral' for collateral behind Federal reserve notes but by an amendment obtained at the request of the corrupt and dishonest Federal Reserve Board, the act was changed so that the word 'like' was stricken out. All that immense trouble was taken here in Congress so that the law would permit the Federal reserve banks to switch collateral. At the present time behind the scenes in the Federal reserve banks there is a night-and-day movement of collateral. A visiting Englishman, leaving the United States a few weeks ago, said that things would look better here after 'they cleaned up the mess at Washington.' Cleaning up the mess consists in fooling the people and making them pay a second time for the bad foreign investments of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks. It consists in moving that heavy load of dubious and worthless foreign paper—the bills of wigmakers, brewers, distillers, narcotic-drug vendors, munition makers, illegal finance drafts, and worthless foreign securities, out of the banks and putting it on the back of American labor. That is what the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is doing now. They talk about loans to banks and railroads but they say very little about that other business of theirs which consists in relieving the swindlers who promoted investment trusts in this country and dumped worthless foreign securities into them and then resold that mess of pottage to American investors under cover of their own

corporate titles. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is taking over those worthless securities from those investment trusts with United States Treasury money at the expense of the American taxpayer and the wage earner.

It will take us 20 years to redeem our Government, 20 years of penal servitude to pay off the gambling debts of the traitorous Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks and to earn again that vast flood of American wages and savings, bank deposits, and United States Government credit which the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks exported out of this country to their foreign principals.

The Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks lately conducted an anti-hoarding campaign here. Then they took that extra money which they had persuaded the American people to put into the banks and they sent it to Europe along with the rest. In the last several months, they have sent \$1,300,000,000 in gold to their foreign employers, their foreign masters, and every dollar of that gold belonged to the people of the United States and was unlawfully taken from them.

Is not it high time that we had an audit of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks and an examination of all our Government bonds and securities and public moneys instead of allowing the corrupt and dishonest Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks to speculate with those securities and this cash in the notorious open discount market of New York City?

Mr. Chairman, within the limits of the time allowed me, I can not enter into a particularized discussion of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks. I have singled out the Federal reserve currency for a few remarks because there has lately been some talk here of 'fiat money.' What kind of money is being pumped into the open discount market and through it into foreign channels and stock exchanges? Mr. Mills of the Treasury has spoken here of his horror of the printing presses and his horror of dishonest money. He has no horror of dishonest money. If he had, he would be no party to the present gambling of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks in the nefarious open discount market of New York, a market in which the sellers are represented by 10 great discount dealer corporations owned and organized by the very banks which own and control the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks. Fiat money, indeed!

After the several raids on the Treasury Mr. Mills borrows the speech of those who protested against those raids and speaks now with pretended horror of a raid on the Treasury. Where was Mr. Mills last October when the United States Treasury needed \$598,000,000 of the taxpayers' money which was supposed to be in the safe-keeping of Andrew W. Mellon in the designated depositories of Treasury funds, and which was not in those depositories when the Treasury needed it? Mr. Mills was the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury then, and he was at Washington throughout October, with the exception of a very significant week he spent at White Sulphur Springs closeted with international bankers, while the Italian

minister, Signor Grandi, was being entertained—and bargained with—at Washington.

What Mr. Mills is fighting for is the preservation whole and entire of the banker's monopoly of all the currency of the United States Government. What Mr. PATMAN proposes is that the Government shall exercise its sovereignty to the extent of issuing some currency for itself. This conflict of opinion between Mr. Mills as the spokesman of the bankers and Mr. PATMAN as the spokesman of the people brings the currency situation here into the open. Mr. PATMAN and the veterans are confronted by a stone wall—the wall that fences in the bankers with their special privileges. Thus the issue is joined between the host of democracy, of which the veterans are a part, and the men of the king's bank, the would-be aristocrats, who deflated American agriculture and robbed this country for the benefit of their foreign principals.

Mr. Chairman, last December I introduced a resolution here asking for an examination and an audit of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks and all related matters. If the House sees fit to make such an investigation, the people of the United States will obtain information of great value. This is a Government of the people, by the people, for the people, consequently, nothing should be concealed from the people. The man who deceives the people is a traitor to the United States. The man who knows or suspects that a crime has been committed and who conceals or covers up that crime is an accessory to it. Mr. Speaker, it is a monstrous thing for this great Nation of people to have its destinies presided over by a traitorous Government board acting in secret concert with international usurers. Every effort has been made by the Federal Reserve Board to conceal its power but the truth is the Federal Reserve Board has usurped the Government of the United States. It controls everything here and it controls all our foreign relations. It makes and breaks governments at will. No man and no body of men is more entrenched in power than the arrogant credit monopoly which operates the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks. These evil-doers have robbed this country of more than enough money to pay the national debt. What the National Government has permitted the Federal Reserve Board to steal from the people should now be restored to the people. The people have a valid claim against the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks. If that claim is enforced, Americans will not need to stand in the breadlines or to suffer and die of starvation in the streets. Homes will be saved, families will be kept together, and American children will not be dispersed and abandoned. The Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks owe the United States Government an immense sum of money. We ought to find out the exact amount of the people's claim. We should know the amount of the indebtedness of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks to the people and we should collect that amount immediately. We certainly should investigate this treacherous and disloyal conduct of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks.

Here is a Federal reserve note. Immense numbers of these notes are now

held abroad. I am told that they amount to upwards of a billion dollars. They constitute a claim against our Government and likewise a claim against the money our people have deposited in the member banks of the Federal reserve system. Our people's money to the extent of \$1,300,000,000 has within the last few months been shipped abroad to redeem Federal reserve notes and to pay other gambling debts of the traitorous Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks. The greater part of our monetary stock has been shipped to foreigners. Why should we promise to pay the debts of foreigners to foreigners? Why should our Government be put into the position of supplying money to foreigners? Why should American farmers and wage earners add millions of foreigners to the number of their dependents? Why should the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks be permitted to finance our competitors in all parts of the world? Do you know why the tariff was raised? It was raised to shut out the flood of Federal reserve goods pouring in here from every quarter of the globe—cheap goods, produced by cheaply paid foreign labor on unlimited supplies of money and credit sent out of this country by the dishonest and unscrupulous Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks. Go out in Washington to buy an electric light bulb and you will probably be offered one that was made in Japan on American money. Go out to buy a pair of fabric gloves and inconspicuously written on the inside of the gloves that will be offered to you will be found the words 'made in Germany' and that means 'made on the public credit of the United States Government paid to German firms in American gold taken from the confiscated bank deposits of the American people.'

The Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks are spending \$100,000,000 a week buying Government securities in the open market and are thus making a great bid for foreign business. They are trying to make rates so attractive that the human-hair merchants and distillers and other business entities in foreign lands will come here and hire more of the public credit of the United States Government and pay the Federal reserve outfit for getting it for them.

Mr. Chairman, when the Federal Reserve act was passed, the people of the United States did not perceive that a world system was being set up here which would make the savings of an American school-teacher available to a narcotic-drug vendor in Macao. They did not perceive that the United States were to be lowered to the position of a coolie country which has nothing but raw materials and heavy goods for export; that Russia was destined to supply the man power and that this country was to supply financial power to an international superstate—a superstate controlled by international bankers and international industrialists acting together to enslave the world for their own pleasure.

The people of the United States are being greatly wronged. If they are not, then I do not know what 'wronging the people' means. They have been driven from their employments. They have been dispossessed of their homes. They have been evicted from their rented quarters. They have lost their

children. They have been left to suffer and to die for lack of shelter, food, clothing, and medicine.

The wealth of the United States and the working capital of the United States has been taken away from them and has either been locked in the vaults of certain banks and the great corporations or exported to foreign countries for the benefit of the foreign customers of those banks and corporations. So far as the people of the United States are concerned, the cupboard is bare. It is true that the warehouses and coal yards and grain elevators are full, but the warehouses and coal yards and grain elevators are padlocked and the great banks and corporations hold the keys. The sack of the United States by the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks is the greatest crime in history.

Mr. Chairman, a serious situation confronts the House of Representatives to-day. We are trustees of the people and the rights of the people are being taken away from them. Through the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal reserve banks, the people are losing the rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution. Their property has been taken from them without due process of law. Mr. Chairman, common decency requires us to examine the public accounts of the Government and see what crimes against the public welfare have been or are being committed.

What is needed here is a return to the Constitution of the United States. We need to have a complete divorce of Bank and State. The old struggle that was fought out here in Jackson's day must be fought over again. The independent United States Treasury should be reestablished and the Government should keep its own money under lock and key in the building the people provided for that purpose. Asset currency, the device of the swindler, should be done away with. The Government should buy gold and issue United States currency on it. The business of the independent bankers should be restored to them. The State banking systems should be freed from coercion. The Federal reserve districts should be abolished and State boundaries should be respected. Bank reserves should be kept within the borders of the States whose people own them, and this reserve money of the people should be protected so that the international bankers and acceptance bankers and discount dealers can not draw it away from them. The exchanges should be closed while we are putting our financial affairs in order. The Federal reserve act should be repealed and the Federal reserve banks, having violated their charters, should be liquidated immediately. Faithless Government officers who have violated their oaths of office should be impeached and brought to trial. Unless this is done by us, I predict that the American people, outraged, robbed, pillaged, insulted, and betrayed as they are in their own land, will rise in their wrath and send a President here who will sweep the money changers out of the temple. [Applause.]¹⁰²⁸

**[5.10 The Holocaust as a Zionist Eugenics Program for the Jewish "Remnant":
Zionist Nazis Use Natural and Artificial Selection to Strengthen the Genetic](#)**

Stock of Jews Destined for Forced Deportation to Palestine

Theodor Herzl wrote in his book *The Jewish State*,

“Oppression and persecution cannot exterminate us. No nation on earth has survived such struggles and sufferings as we have gone through. Jew-baiting has merely stripped off our weaklings; the strong among us were invariably true to their race when persecution broke out against them. This attitude was most clearly apparent in the period immediately following the emancipation of the Jews. Later on, those who rose to a higher degree of intelligence and to a better worldly position lost their communal feeling to a very great extent. Wherever our political well-being has lasted for any length of time, we have assimilated with our surroundings. I think this is not discreditable. Hence, the statesman who would wish to see a Jewish strain in his nation would have to provide for the duration of our political well-being; and even Bismarck could not do that. [***] The Governments of all countries scourged by Anti-Semitism will serve their own interests in assisting us to obtain the sovereignty we want. [***] Great exertions will not be necessary to spur on the movement. Anti-Semites provide the requisite impetus. They need only do what they did before, and then they will create a love of emigration where it did not previously exist, and strengthen it where it existed before. [***] I imagine that Governments will, either voluntarily or under pressure from the Anti-Semites, pay certain attention to this scheme; and they may perhaps actually receive it here and there with a sympathy which they will also show to the Society of Jews.”¹⁰²⁹

An article in the *Christian Reader*, Volume 3, Number 67, (19 November 1824), page 366, evinces that the Rothschilds were aware that the Jews of Europe did not have the skills, abilities or character needed to successfully farm the fields of Palestine or build the palaces which wealthy Western Jews wanted. Indeed, Lord Sydenham pointed out in 1922 that the Jews emigrating to Palestine under the British Palestine Mandate had no business being in the region and only served to worsen the situation in the Middle East. *The London Times* published a Letter to the Editor from Lord Sydenham of Combe, “British Policy in Palestine. Divergence from Balfour Declaration.” on 4 April 1923, on page 6, which stated, *inter alia*,

“Into Palestine we are dumping successive shiploads of impecunious aliens, we are imposing a loan equal to the whole annual revenue, and we have ordained a third official language perfectly useless to the people. All this, together with minor inflictions, we are doing in opposition to the strongly expressed wishes of a huge majority of Palestinians. It would be interesting if the ‘Zionist Organization’ would explain what ‘civil rights’ are left to a little people so circumstanced, and how the declaration, ‘revised in the Zionist offices in America as well as in England,’ can be reconciled with this use of British military forces.”

On 7 April 1922, on page 8, *The London Times* published a Letter to the Editor from Lord Sydenham, “Jewish ‘National Home.’ Lord Sydenham Urges Inquiry.”:

“Are these colonies or any of them being worked on an economic basis to-day? Palestine does not lend itself to cheap irrigation; but that aspect of the question needs investigation. My own strong opinion is that the national home must eventually break down on economic grounds, because you cannot indefinitely maintain colonies unable to pay their way. This is also the view of some leading American Jews besides Mr. Morgenthau. If, then, as Dr. Weizmann proposes, ‘between 50,000 and 60,000 Jews per annum’ are deposited in the Holy Land, we shall soon be confronted with appalling difficulties—partly economic and partly arising from the hostility of the rightful owners of the land, who would find themselves displaced by the growing horde of immigrants. My conclusion is that, in the interests of the Jews as well as the Arabs, immigration must be stopped until a full inquiry has taken place, if serious troubles are to be averted. For moral as well as economic reasons, the ‘powerful irritant’ must be removed.”

On 8 September 1922 on page 9, *The London Times* published correspondence which had taken place between Lord Sydenham and Winston Churchill, “Our Palestine Policy”, in which Lord Sydenham wrote,

“3. A ‘Jewish National Home’ can be interpreted in several ways, and Mr. Balfour’s undertaking—that the ‘civil rights’ of the Palestinians would not be prejudiced naturally reassured me. I never dreamed that a Jewish Government would be set up, and I imagined only a slow immigration of desirable Jews under a purely British Government. In 1917, it was not yet clear that there would be a rush of Russian and Central European Jews to other countries, and that a portion of them would be dumped down in Palestine. I was further reassured in 1918 by General Allenby’s Proclamation, which appeared to render impossible what is now happening, while the text of the Treaty with the Hedjaz, which is disputed, was unknown to me at the time. Since 1917 I have given much thought and study to the Jewish problems, and I have been forced to change my opinions. I was, as you suggest, ‘mistaken in thinking that the Jews were entitled to regard Palestine as the ‘National Home.’ I consider that they have no more claim to Palestine than the modern Italians to Britain, or the Moors to Southern Spain. I also think that ‘a horde of aliens’ correctly describes the immigrants.”

Jewish Messianic prophecy called for the expulsion of all non-Jews from Palestine. This necessitated the development of a Jewish workforce suited to fulfill the needs of wealthy Jews. The Jews of Eastern Europe would have to be toughened and trained in construction and agriculture before they would be prepared to build the Palestine the Zionists wanted. The Nazis set about the task of building the Jewish workforce the Zionist Jews had demanded as least as early as 19 November 1824.

Exodus 1:8-14 and 3:2 taught the Jews that oppression strengthened their “race” and ultimately increased their numbers, and note the ancient declaration made by the Jews themselves (the story is a fabrication) that the Jews were a dangerously disloyal nation within a nation, note also the image of enduring a holocaust,

“8 Now there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph. 9 And he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel *are* more and mightier than we: 10 Come on, let us deal wisely with them; lest they multiply, and it come to pass, that, when there falleth out any war, they join also unto our enemies, and fight against us, and *so* get them up out of the land. 11 Therefore they did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses. 12 But the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew. And they were grieved because of the children of Israel. 13 And the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigour: 14 And they made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar, and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field: all their service, wherein they made them serve, *was* with rigour. [***] 3:2 And the angel of the LORD appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed.”

Zionists often stated that Moses saved the Jews by persecuting them. Racist Zionist Jakob Klatzkin stated in 1925,

“When Moses came to redeem the children of Israel, their leaders said to him, ‘You have made our odor evil in the eyes of Pharaoh and in the eyes of his servants, giving them a sword with which to kill us.’ Nevertheless, Moses persisted in worsening the situation of the people, and he saved them.”¹⁰³⁰

Adolf Hitler was the Zionists’ modern Moses.

The *Christian Reader*, Volume 3, Number 67, (19 November 1824), page 366:

“CHRISTIAN REGISTER.

BOSTON, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1824.

THE JEWS. It is stated with much assurance in the Gazette of Spire, that the Sublime Porte has recently made proposals to the House of Rothschild for the loan of a considerable sum of money, and has offered as a security for payment, the entire country of Palestine. It is stated also that in consequence of this proposal a confidential agent had been dispatched by that House to Constantinople, ‘to examine into the validity of the pledge offered by the Turkish Cabinet.’

The editor of the *National Advocate* observes in relation to this report, that he at first supposed it was intended as a satire on the prevailing custom of raising loans for different nations; but on a nearer view of the subject, the

proposition might be supposed probable. The Advocate proceeds with some interesting remarks on the subject, tending to show, that if such a proposition had been made it could not be accepted with any prospect, on the part of the Rothschilds, (who are Jews,) of the immediate restoration of their countrymen to Palestine, as it was probably not in the power even of the Turkish government, to guarantee to the Jews the quiet possession of the country against the prejudices and interests of the Egyptians, the Wechabites, the Wandering Arabs, and the Tartar Hordes.

It is also argued that the discrepancy of education, habits, views, and manners, existing between the Jews of different countries, unfit them to amalgamate and become united under one government. They must be prepared for this by the same discipline which their fathers, who went out of Egypt were subjected to under Moses, for forty years in the wilderness, to prepare them for the promised land. ‘Our country,’ continues the Advocate, ‘must be an asylum to the ancient people of God. Here they must reside; here, in calm retirement, study laws, governments, sciences; become familiarly known to their brethren of other religious denominations; cultivate the useful arts; acquire a knowledge of legislation, and become liberal and free. So, that appreciating the blessings of just and salutary laws, they may be prepared to possess permanently their ancient land, and govern righteously.’”

Racist Zionists have long complained that Jewish genes and Jewish mores have been corrupted in the Diaspora by the persecutions of the Middle Ages. Racist Zionists, like Adolf Hitler, believed that Americans constituted superior racial strains with the strongest and most adventurous of the races having migrated to the New World.¹⁰³¹ Racist Zionists, including Adolf Hitler, believed that the Holocaust would cause a process of natural selection that would improve the Jewish blood and undo the damage of the Diaspora, leaving only the strongest and smartest Jews left alive. Racist Zionists believed that American Jews and the improved Jewish remnant of the Holocaust would stock Israel. Jewish prophets predicted that Jews in the end times would be superior to those who had come before them.

There are numerous accounts from Holocaust survivors of SS doctors reviewing new arrivals at the concentration camps and selecting out some Jews for a chance at survival—should they be strong enough to survive the poor rations and rampant diseases and be clever enough to outlive their fellows. These same doctors allegedly selected out some Jews, or part-Jews, for immediate death. The rationale given for this selection process was that the Nazis only spared the lives of Jews who were fit to work. However, the Nazis had conquered numerous territories and could more easily have used those populations as a slave labor force, with no chance that a select remnant of Jews would survive.

If the accounts of the artificial selection of the fittest Jews are true, and not scripted, this was likely part of a broader eugenics program to improve the genetic stock and “racial purity” of the Jews who survived the war and who were slated by the Zionists to dwell in Palestine. Even if these stories are not true, there is no doubt

that the Jews were starved and overworked and faced deadly diseases, which had the effect of natural selection and the survival of the fittest. We know that the Zionists handpicked the best Jews to smuggle out of the Reich. We know further that the Nazis aided the Zionists in training fit recruits for the Zionist cause.

The Zionists wanted young, strong and clever Jews to populate their land. They did not want old, very young or feeble Jews to get in the way of the founding of their “Jewish State”. The racist Zionists overlooked such sentimentalities as the innate value of human life. They justified mass murder as the prophesied birth pangs of the Messianic Age, the “hevlei Mashiah”. They doubted that Palestine could absorb more than a fraction of the Jews under Hitler’s control, so the loss of some assimilatory Jews to a eugenics program that profited the Zionists was an overall gain, in their minds.

We know that the Nazis and Zionists collaborated and practiced human selection of the best Jews slated to survive in Israel. Hannah Arendt wrote in her book *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*,

“Of greater importance for Eichmann were the emissaries from Palestine, who would approach the Gestapo and the S.S. on their own initiative, without taking orders from either the German Zionists or the Jewish Agency for Palestine. They came in order to enlist help for the illegal immigration of Jews into British-ruled Palestine, and both the Gestapo and the S.S. were helpful. They negotiated with Eichmann in Vienna, and they reported that he was ‘polite,’ ‘not the shouting type,’ and that he even provided them with farms and facilities for setting up vocational training camps for prospective immigrants. (‘On one occasion, he expelled a group of nuns from a convent to provide a training farm for young Jews,’ and on another ‘a special train [was made available] and Nazi officials accompanied’ a group of emigrants, ostensibly headed for Zionist training farms in Yugoslavia, to see them safely across the border.) According to the story told by Jon and David Kimche, with ‘the full and generous cooperation of all the chief actors’ (*The Secret Roads: The ‘Illegal’ Migration of a People, 1938-1948*, London, 1954), these Jews from Palestine spoke a language not totally different from that of Eichmann. They had been sent to Europe by the communal settlements in Palestine, and they were not interested in rescue operations: ‘That was not their job.’ They wanted to select ‘suitable material,’ and their chief enemy, prior to the extermination program, was not those who made life impossible for Jews in the old countries, Germany or Austria, but those who barred access to the new homeland; that enemy was definitely Britain, not Germany. Indeed, they were in a position to deal with the Nazi authorities on a footing amounting to equality, which native Jews were not, since they enjoyed the protection of the mandatory power; they were probably among the first Jews to talk openly about mutual interests and were certainly the first to be given permission ‘to pick young Jewish pioneers’ from among the Jews in the concentration camps. Of course, they were unaware of the sinister implications of this deal, which still lay in the future; but they too somehow

believed that if it was a question of selecting Jews for survival, the Jews should do the selecting themselves. It was this fundamental error in judgment that eventually led to a situation in which the non-selected majority of Jews inevitably found themselves confronted with two enemies—the Nazi authorities and the Jewish authorities. As far as the Viennese episode is concerned, Eichmann’s preposterous claim to have saved hundreds of thousands of Jewish lives, which was laughed out of court, finds strange support in the considered judgment of the Jewish historians, the Kimches: ‘Thus what must have been one of the most paradoxical episodes of the entire period of the Nazi regime began: the man who was to go down in history as one of the arch-murderers of the Jewish people entered the lists as an active worker in the rescue of Jews from Europe.’”¹⁰³²

Nazi Zionist Adolf Eichmann stated,

“[H]ad I been a Jew, I would have been a fanatical Zionist. I could not imagine being anything else. In fact, I would have been the most ardent Zionist imaginable.”¹⁰³³

Eichmann was a Jew and a Zionist—indeed, as he stated, the most ardent Zionist imaginable, one who fulfilled Jewish prophecy and mass murdered assimilatory Jews in his staged rôle as a crypto-Jewish Nazi leader. Eichmann was an ardent Zionist who selected out genetically superior Jews for survival, one who fulfilled the desire of Orthodox Jews to live a segregated life in a Ghetto. Adolf Eichmann was an ardent Zionist who helped found the “Jewish State”. Eichmann likened himself to Paul, a Jew who persecuted Jews and who had converted to Christianity in an effort to preserve the Jewish nation. Adolf Eichmann stated,

“I issued the cloth [yellow cloth for the badges Jews were forced to wear] to my Jewish functionaries and they trotted off with them. [***] There was a Jewish lawyer in Vienna who said to me, ‘Sir, I wear this star with pride.’ This man impressed me. He was an idealist. So I let him emigrate soon afterward. [***] We even had some Jewish SS men who had taken part in the early struggles of the Nazis—about 50 of them in Germany and Austria. I remember giving my attention to a Jewish SS sergeant, a good man, who wanted to leave for Switzerland. I had instructed the border control to let him pass [***] He was a 100% Jew, a man of the most honorable outlook. [***] I am no anti-Semite. I was just politically opposed to Jews because they were stealing the breath of life from us. [***] Certainly I too had been aiming at a solution of the Jewish problem, but not like this. [***] I would not say I originated the ghetto system. That would be to claim too great a distinction. The father of the ghetto system was the orthodox Jew, who wanted to remain by himself. In 1939, when we marched into Poland, we had found a system of ghettos already in existence, begun and maintained by the Jews. We merely regulated those, sealed them off with walls and barbed wire and

included even more Jews than were already dwelling in them. The assimilated Jew was of course very unhappy about being moved to a ghetto. But the Orthodox were pleased with the arrangement, as were the Zionists. The latter found ghettos a wonderful device for accustoming Jews to community living. Dr. Epstein from Berlin once said to me that Jewry was grateful for the chance I gave it to learn community life at the ghetto I founded at Theresienstadt, 40 miles from Prague. He said it made an excellent school for the future in Israel. The assimilated Jews found ghetto life degrading, and non-Jews may have seen an unpleasant element of force in it. But basically most Jews feel well and happy in their ghetto life, which cultivates their peculiar sense of unity. [***] [W]e did not want to punish individual Jews. We wanted to work toward a political solution. [***] Himmler would not stand for that kind of thing. That is sadism. [***] ‘I will gladly jump into my grave in the knowledge that five million enemies of the Reich have already died like animals.’ (‘Enemies of the Reich,’ I said, not ‘Jews.’) [***] Long before the end, any of the Jews I dealt with would have set up foreign exchange for me in any country I had named, if I had promised any special privileges for them. [***] It would be too easy to pretend that I had turned suddenly from a Saul to a Paul. No, I must say truthfully that if we had killed all the 10 million Jews that Himmler’s statisticians originally listed in 1933, I would say, ‘Good, we have destroyed an enemy.’ But here I do not mean wiping them out entirely. That would not be proper—and we carried on a proper war. Now, however, when through the malice of fate a large part of these Jews whom we fought against are alive, I must concede that fate must have wanted it so. I always claimed that we were fighting against a foe who through thousands of years of learning and development had become superior to us. I no longer remember exactly when, but it was even before Rome itself had been founded that the Jews could already write. It is very depressing for me to think of that people writing laws over 6,000 years of written history. But it tells me that they must be a people of the first magnitude, for law-givers have always been great.”¹⁰³⁴

Bryan Mark Rigg estimates the total number of Jewish soldiers and sailors in the Nazi military perhaps ranges upwards to 150,000.¹⁰³⁵

At his trial, Session Number 90, 26 Tammuz 5721, 10 July 1961,¹⁰³⁶ Eichmann confirmed that he twice requested permission to learn Hebrew from a Rabbi. He also stated that the annihilation (*Vernichtung*) of the Jews to him meant deportation and Zionism, however, he further stated that Hitler later changed course in the middle of the war and sought the physical annihilation of the Jews. Yet again Eichmann stated that he was a convinced Zionist, who wanted to put segregated soil under the feet of the Jewish populace, and that it was Adolf Böhm’s book *Die Zionistische Bewegung*, which convinced him that the root of all evil was the fact that the Jews did not have a homeland.

Julius Streicher was another crypto-Jewish poseur, who pretended to be the most anti-Semitic man alive and archenemy of the Jews, so that he could forward the

Jewish Zionists' "final solution of the Jewish question", which solution was Zionism, not extermination—see: Ernst Heimer's *Der Giftpilz: Ein Stürmerbuch für Jung u. Alt*, Der Stürmer, Nürnberg, (1938)—a children's book designed to lure kids into believing that the Nazis would protect them from the Jewish bankers, who in fact used the Nazis to destroy the Germans. Just as the crypto-Jewish *Dönme* Turks appeared to be the most zealous Moslems in their communities, while keeping to the Jewish faith in private and subverting the Turkish Empire; and just as the Marrano Jews of Spain and South America pretended to be the most pious Catholics in all of the Spanish Empire, while forwarding the interests of Jews around the world; crypto-Jews including Julius Streicher, Adolf Hitler, Adolf Eichmann, Reinhard Heydrich and Joseph Goebbels pretended to be the most ardent anti-Semites in the world, the most feared foes of the Jewish bankers, and they thereby gained the trust of the German People by pretending to fight the Jewish bankers who were bent on destroying Germany. They did this in order to subvert German interests and fulfill Judaic Messianic prophecy and the evil designs of the Jewish bankers to ruin Germany. In so doing, the Jewish bankers put the foxes in charge of the hen house and the Jewish bankers used their crypto-Jewish Zionist Nazis to ruin Europe and chase the Jews to Palestine.

Streicher was fond of the old Zionist maxim,

“Without a solution of the Jewish question
there will be no salvation of humanity!”

“Ohne Lösung der Judenfrage
keine Erlösung der Menschheit!”¹⁰³⁷

The following article appeared in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 22 September 1922 on page 31, which states that there would be no salvation of humanity without a solution of the Jewish question,

“5682.

THE YEAR'S RETROSPECT.

THE year just closing will be for ever memorable in Jewish annals as the year which saw the confirmation of the Mandate, with its formal and solemn establishment of the Jewish claim to Palestine as the National Home of the race. That one great central, irrevocable fact, however it be construed or whittled down by individual statesmen, stamps 5682 as *annus mirabilis* in Jewish history. It calls a halt to two thousand years of aimless drifting, and sets a definite direction in which the Jew may march with confidence. It comes at a moment of immense opportuneness to lift, if ever so little, an almost intolerable burden of suffering, confusion, and despair. It represents a movement which, whatever deductions may legitimately be made from its value upon this or that ground, is, at all events in essence, constructive. It embodies the recognition by the nation that it has a second problem of

‘reparations’ to solve—reparation to the Jew for two thousand years of martyrdom; and that the solution of the Jewish question is indispensable to world peace. Whether the Jewish Palestine, as the politicians are at the moment fashioning it, be a great bright light, illuminating the darkness of the Diaspora, or a will-o’-the-wisp full with fatality for the hopes of our people, the world-approved Mandate we cannot away with. Hold destiny what it may, the future of the Jewish People after the Mandate’s confirmation can never be like the past. It is that which makes the year now ending a year of years in our people’s chequered career, and its story a tale to linger over in the depressing procession of tragedies called Jewish history.”

It is interesting to note that the prosecutor at Eichmann’s trial stated that Eichmann’s accusation that Chaim Weizmann had declared a Jewish war against Germany was a “lie”, when in fact it was true and was reported in *The London Times*, on 6 September 1939 on page 8 under the title, “Jews Fight for Democracies”.¹⁰³⁸ This was but one of the countless Jewish declarations of war against Germany, including repeated provocations from Weizmann, as proven in Hartmut Stern’s book, *Jüdische Kriegserklärungen an Deutschland: Wortlaut, Vorgeschichte, Folgen*, FZ-Verlag, München, Second Edition, (2000), ISBN: 3924309507; *see also*: Stern’s response to Goldhagen,¹⁰³⁹ *KZ-Lügen: Antwort auf Goldhagen*, FZ-Verlag, München, Second Edition, (1998), ISBN: 3924309361; *see also*: Rabbi Moshe Shonfeld, *The Holocaust Victims Accuse: Documents and Testimony on Jewish War Criminals*, Neturei Karta of U.S.A., Brooklyn, (1977). Many believe that these Jewish declarations of war against Germany were deliberate provocations meant to worsen the situation of Jews in Germany so as to force them towards embracing Zionism and into emigrating to Palestine, against their own wishes.

The Editors of *The World’s Work*, presumably French Strother and Burton J. Hendrick, revealed that the Zionists had established a governing body at least as early as 1921, and that Chaim Weizmann was at the head of this government, which means that he had the power to declare war against Germany as the leading official of the Zionist organization, and bear in mind that leading Zionists openly declared that Jews were a foreign and hostile nation within Germany,

*“The situation which provoked the controversy at Cleveland arose from the arrival in this country of Dr. Chaim Weizmann from London to share in its deliberations. Dr. Weizmann is the head of the world organization of Zionists. This world organization has a highly centralized form of government. This consists of an international committee, including representatives from all countries that have a local organization. But the real control is vested in what is known as the ‘Inner Actions Council.’ This is a compact body of only seven men; and it is dominated by the Jews of Europe.”*¹⁰⁴⁰

In 1921, Jewish anti-Zionist Henry Morgenthau saw the writing on the wall and

sought to distinguish between Jews in general and the nationalistic Zionists, who would provoke a war that would alienate Jews,

“I for one, will not forego this vision of the destiny of the Jews. I do not presume to say to my co-religionists of Europe that they shall accept my programme. But neither do I intend to allow them to impose their programme upon me. They may continue, if they will, a practice of our common faith which invites martyrdom, and which makes the continuance of oppression a certainty. I have found a better way (and when I say *I*, it is to speak collectively as one of a great body of American Jews of like mind). I resent the activities of Dr. Weizmann and his followers in this country. In the foregoing pages I have given my reasons for opposing Zionism. They make plain why I asserted in its first paragraphs that Zionism is not a solution; that it is a surrender. It looks backward, and not forward. It would practically place in the hands of seven men, steeped in a foreign tradition, the power to turn back the hands of time upon all which I and my predecessors of the same convictions have won for ourselves here in America. We have fought our way through to liberty, equality, and fraternity. We have found rest for our souls. No one shall rob us of these gains. We enjoy in America exactly the spiritual liberty, the financial success, and the social position which we have earned. Any Jew in America who wishes to be a saint of Zion has only to practice the cultivation of his spiritual gifts—there is none to hinder him. Any Jew in America who seeks material reward has only to cultivate the powers of his mind and character—there are no barriers between him and achievement. Any Jew in America who yearns for social position has only to cultivate his manners—there are no insurmountable discriminations here against true gentlemen. The Jews of France have found France to be their Zion. The Jews of England have found England to be their Zion. We Jews of America have found America to be our Zion. Therefore, I refuse to allow myself to be called a Zionist. I am an American.”¹⁰⁴¹

Adolf Eichmann stated that he had sought a deal with the Western Allies to exchange one million Jews for 10,000 trucks to be used on the Eastern front. Jewish Communist turned Zionist, Joel Brand had established a relationship with the Nazis and tried to arrange the deal with the Western Allies.¹⁰⁴² The offer was declined. This story was first publicly exposed in 1956.¹⁰⁴³ Eichmann told another story of his dealings with the Zionist Dr. Rudolf Kastner, which ultimately resulted in the deaths of countless assimilated Hungarian Jews, and the survival of the fittest Zionists for Israel, who were Kastner’s friends. Eichmann stated, *inter alia*,

“As a matter of fact, there was a very strong similarity between our attitudes in the SS and the viewpoint of these immensely idealistic Zionist leaders who were fighting what might be their last battle. As I told Kastner: ‘We, too, are idealists and we, too, had to sacrifice our own blood before we came to power.’ I believe that Kastner would have sacrificed a thousand or a hundred

thousand of his blood to achieve his political goal. He was not interested in old Jews or those who had become assimilated into Hungarian society. But he was incredibly persistent in trying to save biologically valuable Jewish blood—that is, human material that was capable of reproduction and hard work. ‘You can have the others,’ he would say, ‘but let me have this group here.’ And because Kastner rendered us a great service by helping keep the deportation camps peaceful, I would let his groups escape. After all, I was not concerned with small groups of a thousand or so Jews.’¹⁰⁴⁴

In an article by Chris Johnston and Nassim Khadem, “War Crime Suspect Admits to His Leading Fascist Role”, *The Age*, (15 February 2006); Lajos Polgar, a leader of the “Arrow Cross Party” in Hungary, was quoted as stating, among other things (for a similar view of Jews, and in particular Hungarian Jews, see: Douglas Reed, “How Odd of God”, *Disgrace Abounding*, Chapter 23, Jonathan Cape, London, (1939), pp. 228-262. See also: Rebecca Dana and Peter Carlson’s article on the diary of Harry “S” Truman in *The Washington Post*, on 11 July 2003 on page A1),

“‘The Jews were not wanted in Hungary. They were taking over. When they come into power and money they are terrible; they don’t know anything. The thing is, you can’t help but want to get rid of them.

‘The party wanted to be free from the Jews, and there was only one way that was possible and that was by getting rid of them, by sending them out, but the biggest problem actually was that the Jews have no real home to send them to.’

Mr Polgar said Arrow Cross was not anti-Semitic but Zionist, or pro-Jewish. ‘The idea was to put them into ghettos. . . where they would be protected. Then after the war they would be sent back to settle peacefully in Palestine. So in a noble sense, I am a Zionist. Zionism wants a home for the Jews.’¹⁰⁴⁵

Jewish Zionists again sought to terrorize Hungarian Jews in 1956, in an attempt to scare them into fleeing to Israel.¹⁰⁴⁶

The Zionist “Rescue Committee” published a memorandum “for Zionist eyes only” written by Apolinari Hartglass entitled *Comments on Aid and Rescue*, in 1943, in which it predicted that 7 million European Jews would be murdered. The Zionists’ concern was not to save Jews, especially not the German assimilationist Jews they so hated, but to let them die off and to ensure that the remnant of the Jews had no option but to live in Palestine, even if against their wishes. The Zionists wanted to cut off all other nations to Jewish emigration even though they asserted that it meant certain death for many millions of Jews. They then planned to exploit the tragedy to promote Zionism and to hand pick those Jews who would survive in Europe and to condemn those Jews whom they resented to death. This memorandum is contained in the Central Zionist Archives in Jerusalem, S/26 1232, and parts of it are quoted in Tom Segev’s book, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and

Wang, New York, (1993), pp. 99-101. I quote from the *Comments*, as translated to English on page 100 of *The Seventh Million*:

“Whom to save: . . . Should we help everyone in need, without regard to the quality of the people? Should we not give this activity a Zionist-national character and try foremost to save those who can be of use to the Land of Israel and to Jewry? I understand that it seems cruel to put the question in this form, but unfortunately we must state that if we are able to save only 10,000 people from among 50,000 who can contribute to building the country and to the national revival of the people, as against saving a million Jews who will be a burden, or at best an apathetic element, we must restrain ourselves and save the 10,000 that can be saved from among the 50,000—despite the accusations and pleas of the million. I take comfort from the fact that it will be impossible to apply this harsh principle 100 percent and that the million will get something also. But let us see that it does not get too much.”

The “something” that the million assimilating Jews the Zionists hated “got” was humiliation and death. There is a troubling contradiction in the statements of the Rescue Committee; in that they claimed to have little influence, and yet spoke as if they had absolute control over the fate of European Jews. Did the Zionists control Nazi policy? Were they at the head of it?

The Zionists, steeped in the same racist and eugenic ideology which permeated Nazism, only wanted the very best genetic stock of the European Jews to emigrate to Palestine, and only a very limited number of those. The Zionists calculated that Palestine simply could not house a large number of Jews.¹⁰⁴⁷ Among very early references to “soap which they make of human fats”—which is today known to have been a myth, and “gas chambers and blood-poisoning stations”, Sholem Asch wrote in his article, “In the Valley of Death”, *The New York Times*, (7 February 1943), pages 16 and 36, at 16,

“The population of the Warsaw ghetto, into which 500,000 Jews were driven, was reduced last September to 120,000, and in October to only 40,000, as proved by the number of food cards issued. Those remaining are the strongest; they have not been killed yet because they are being used as slave labor.”

Judaism is replete with stories and prophecies that filter the Jewish people primarily based on three criteria: “racial” purity, craftiness and deceitfulness, and obedience to God. The stories of Cain and Abel, Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau, etc. teach the Jews that God has elected some to be his people and some to be weeded off. Numerous prophecies tell that only the “remnant”, the “elect” of God among the Jews, will survive. The rest of the Jews will be killed off (*Isaiah* 1:9; 6:9-13; 10:20-22; 11:11-12; 17:6; 37:31-33; 41:9; 42; 43; 44; 65; 66. *Ezekiel* 20:38; 25:14. *Daniel* 12:1, 10. *Amos* 9:8-10. *Obadiah* 1:18. *Micah* 5:8. *Romans* 9:27-28;

11:1-5. *See also: Enoch*)

Since Palestine could not house all of the Jews of Europe; and since the Jews of Europe would not go to Palestine until terrified in Europe; and, further, since the Jews of Europe had suffered from inbreeding as a result of Jewish self-segregation; and, still further, since the Jews had an ancient history of martyrdom and the ritual sacrifice of their own children; the Zionists instituted the Holocaust as a means to artificially select Jews for emigration to Palestine, and those slated for immediate death, and they believed that natural selection would improve the “tribe” through death by disease, starvation, exposure and overwork. The Zionists felt they had the Lord on their side. As but one example among many, *Isaiah* 6:9-13 states:

“9 And he said, Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. 10 Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand *with* their heart, and convert, and be healed. 11 Then said I, Lord, how long? And he answered, Until the cities be wasted without inhabitant, and the houses without man, and the land be utterly desolate, 12 And the LORD have removed men far away, and *there be* a great forsaking in the midst of the land. 13 But yet in it *shall be* a tenth, and *it* shall return, and shall be eaten: as a teil tree, and as an oak, whose substance *is* in them, when they cast *their leaves*: so the holy seed *shall be* the substance thereof.”

Benjamin Disraeli, who was to become Prime Minister of England, wrote of the allegedly destructive effects of racial integration in his *Coningsby; or, The New Generation*, H. Colburn, London, (1844), pp. 249-254 (other Jews, like Nicolai and Boas, strongly contested these unproven racial theories),

“The party broke up. Coningsby, who had heard Lord Eskdale announce Sidonia’s departure, lingered to express his regret, and say farewell.

‘I cannot sleep,’ said Sidonia, ‘and I never smoke in Europe. If you are not stiff with your wounds, come to my rooms.’

This invitation was willingly accepted.

‘I am going to Cambridge in a week,’ said Coningsby. ‘I was almost in hopes you might have remained as long.’

‘I also; but my letters of this morning demand me. If it had not been for our chase, I should have quitted immediately. The minister cannot pay the interest on the national debt; not an unprecedented circumstance, and has applied to us. I never permit any business of State to be transacted without my personal interposition; and so I must go up to town immediately.’

‘Suppose you don’t pay it,’ said Coningsby, smiling.

‘If I followed my own impulse, I would remain here,’ said Sidonia. ‘Can anything be more absurd than that a nation should apply to an individual to maintain its credit, and, with its credit, its existence as an empire, and its comfort as a people; and that individual one to whom its laws deny the

proudest rights of citizenship, the privilege of sitting in its senate and of holding land? for though I have been rash enough to buy several estates, my own opinion is, that, by the existing law of England, an Englishman of Hebrew faith cannot possess the soil.'

'But surely it would be easy to repeal a law so illiberal—'

'Oh! as for illiberality, I have no objection to it if it be an element of power. Eschew political sentimentalism. What I contend is, that if you permit men to accumulate property, and they use that permission to a great extent, power is inseparable from that property, and it is in the last degree impolitic to make it the interest of any powerful class to oppose the institutions under which they live. The Jews, for example, independently of the capital qualities for citizenship which they possess in their industry, temperance, and energy and vivacity of mind, are a race essentially monarchical, deeply religious, and shrinking themselves from converts as from a calamity, are ever anxious to see the religious systems of the countries in which they live flourish; yet, since your society has become agitated in England, and powerful combinations menace your institutions, you find the once loyal Hebrew invariably arrayed in the same ranks as the leveller and the latitudinarian, and prepared to support the policy which may even endanger his life and property, rather than tamely continue under a system which seeks to degrade him. The Tories lose an important election at a critical moment; 'tis the Jews come forward to vote against them. The Church is alarmed at the scheme of a latitudinarian university, and learns with relief that funds are not forthcoming for its establishment; a Jew immediately advances and endows it. Yet the Jews, Coningsby, are essentially Tories. Toryism, indeed, is but copied from the mighty prototype which has fashioned Europe. And every generation they must become more powerful and more dangerous to the society which is hostile to them. Do you think that the quiet humdrum persecution of a decorous representative of an English university can crush those who have successively baffled the Pharaohs, Nebuchadnezzar, Rome, and the Feudal ages? The fact is, you cannot destroy a pure race of the Caucasian organization. It is a physiological fact; a simple law of nature, which has baffled Egyptian and Assyrian Kings, Roman Emperors, and Christian Inquisitors. No penal laws, no physical tortures, can effect that a superior race should be absorbed in an inferior, or be destroyed by it. The mixed persecuting races disappear; the pure persecuted race remains. And at this moment, in spite of centuries, or tens of centuries, of degradation, the Jewish mind exercises a vast influence on the affairs of Europe. I speak not of their laws, which you still obey; of their literature, with which your minds are saturated; but of the living Hebrew intellect.

'You never observe a great intellectual movement in Europe in which the Jews do not greatly participate. The first Jesuits were Jews; that mysterious Russian Diplomacy which so alarms Western Europe is organized and principally carried on by Jews; that mighty revolution which is at this moment preparing in Germany, and which will be, in fact, a second and

greater Reformation, and of which so little is as yet known in England, is entirely developing under the auspices of Jews, who almost monopolize the professorial chairs of Germany. Neander the founder of Spiritual Christianity, and who is Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Berlin, is a Jew. Benary, equally famous, and in the same University, is a Jew. Wehl, the Arabic Professor of Heidelberg, is a Jew. Years ago, when I was in Palestine, I met a German student who was accumulating materials for the History of Christianity, and studying the genius of the place; a modest and learned man. It was Wehl; then unknown, since become the first Arabic scholar of the day, and the author of the life of Mahomet. But for the German professors of this race, their name is Legion. I think there are more than ten at Berlin alone.

‘I told you just now that I was going up to town tomorrow, because I always made it a rule to interpose when affairs of State were on the carpet. Otherwise, I never interfere. I hear of peace and war in the newspapers, but I am never alarmed, except when I am informed that the Sovereigns want treasure; then I know that monarchs are serious.

‘A few years back we were applied to by Russia. Now, there has been no friendship between the Court of St. Petersburg and my family. It has Dutch connections, which have generally supplied it; and our representations in favour of the Polish Hebrews, a numerous race, but the most suffering and degraded of all the tribes, have not been very agreeable to the Czar. However, circumstances drew to an approximation between the Romanoffs and the Sidonias. I resolved to go myself to St. Petersburg. I had, on my arrival, an interview with the Russian Minister of Finance, Count Cancrin; I beheld the son of a Lithuanian Jew. The loan was connected with the affairs of Spain; I resolved on repairing to Spain from Russia. I travelled without intermission. I had an audience immediately on my arrival with the Spanish Minister Senor Mendizabel; I beheld one like myself, the son of Nuevo Christiano, a Jew of Arragon. In consequence of what transpired at Madrid, I went straight to Paris to consult the President of the French Council; I beheld the son of a French Jew, a hero, an imperial marshal, and very properly so, for who should be military heroes if not those who worship the Lord of Hosts?’

‘And is Soult a Hebrew?’

‘Yes, and others of the French marshals, and the most famous; Massena, for example; his real name was Manasseh: but to my anecdote. The consequence of our consultations was, that some Northern power should be applied to in a friendly and mediative capacity. We fixed on Prussia; and the President of the Council made an application to the Prussian Minister, who attended a few days after our conference. Count Arnim entered the cabinet, and I beheld a Prussian Jew. So you see, my dear Coningsby, that the world is governed by very different personages from what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes.’

‘You startle, and deeply interest me.’

‘You must study physiology, my dear child. Pure races of Caucasus may be persecuted, but they cannot be despised, except by the brutal ignorance of some mongrel breed, that brandishes fagots and howls extermination, but is itself exterminated without persecution, by that irresistible law of Nature which is fatal to curs.’

‘But I come also from Caucasus,’ said Coningsby.

‘Verily; and thank your Creator for such a destiny: and your race is sufficiently pure. You come from the shores of the Northern Sea, land of the blue eye, and the golden hair, and the frank brow: ’tis a famous breed, with whom we Arabs have contended long; from whom we have suffered much: but these Goths, and Saxons, and Normans were doubtless great men.’

‘But so favoured by Nature, why has not your race produced great poets, great orators, great writers?’

‘Favoured by Nature and by Nature’s God, we produced the lyre of David; we gave you Isaiah and Ezekiel; they are our Olynthians, our Philippians. Favoured by Nature we still remain: but in exact proportion as we have been favoured by Nature we have been persecuted by Man. After a thousand struggles; after acts of heroic courage that Rome has never equalled; deeds of divine patriotism that Athens, and Sparta, and Carthage have never excelled; we have endured fifteen hundred years of supernatural slavery, during which, every device that can degrade or destroy man has been the destiny that we have sustained and baffled. The Hebrew child has entered adolescence only to learn that he was the Pariah of that ungrateful Europe that owes to him the best part of its laws, a fine portion of its literature, all its religion. Great poets require a public; we have been content with the immortal melodies that we sung more than two thousand years ago by the waters of Babylon and wept. They record our triumphs; they solace our affliction. Great orators are the creatures of popular assemblies; we were permitted only by stealth to meet even in our temples. And as for great writers, the catalogue is not blank. What are all the schoolmen, Aquinas himself, to Maimonides? And as for modern philosophy, all springs from Spinoza.

‘But the passionate and creative genius, that is the nearest link to Divinity, and which no human tyranny can destroy, though it can divert it; that should have stirred the hearts of nations by its inspired sympathy, or governed senates by its burning eloquence; has found a medium for its expression, to which, in spite of your prejudices and your evil passions, you have been obliged to bow. The ear, the voice, the fancy teeming with combinations, the imagination fervent with picture and emotion, that came from Caucasus, and which we have preserved unpolluted, have endowed us with almost the exclusive privilege of MUSIC; that science of harmonious sounds, which the ancients recognised as most divine, and deified in the person of their most beautiful creation. I speak not of the past; though, were I to enter into the history of the lords of melody, you would find it the annals of Hebrew genius. But at this moment even, musical Europe is ours. There

is not a company of singers, not an orchestra in a single capital, that is not crowded with our children under the feigned names which they adopt to conciliate the dark aversion which your posterity will some day disclaim with shame and disgust. Almost every great composer, skilled musician, almost every voice that ravishes you with its transporting strains, springs from our tribes. The catalogue is too vast to enumerate; too illustrious to dwell for a moment on secondary names, however eminent. Enough for us that the three great creative minds to whose exquisite inventions all nations at this moment yield, Rossini, Meyerbeer, Mendelssohn, are of Hebrew race; and little do your men of fashion, your muscadins of Paris, and your dandies of London, as they thrill into raptures at the notes of a Pasta or a Grisi, little do they suspect that they are offering their homage to ‘the sweet singers of Israel!’”¹⁰⁴⁸

Disraeli wrote in 1852 in his *Lord George Bentinck: A Political Biography*, Chapter 24, Third Revised Edition, Colburn, (1852), pp. 482-507, at 491-497,

“But having made this full admission of the partial degradation of the Jewish race, we are not prepared to agree that this limited degeneracy is any justification of the prejudices and persecution which originated in barbarous or mediæval superstitions. On the contrary, viewing the influence of the Jewish race upon the modern communities, without any reference to the past history or the future promises of Israel, dismissing from our minds and memories, if indeed that be possible, all that the Hebrews have done in the olden time for man, and all which it may be their destiny yet to fulfil, we hold that instead of being an object of aversion, they should receive all that honour and favour from the northern and western races which, in civilised and refined nations, should be the lot of those who charm the public taste and elevate the public feeling. We hesitate not to say that there is no race at this present, and following in this only the example of a long period, that so much delights, and fascinates, and elevates, and ennobles Europe, as the Jewish.

We dwell not on the fact, that the most admirable artists of the drama have been and still are of the Hebrew race: or, that the most entrancing singers, graceful dancers, and exquisite musicians, are sons and daughters of Israel: though this were much. But these brilliant accessories are forgotten in the sublimer claim.

It seems that the only means by which in these modern times we are permitted to develop the beautiful is music. It would appear definitively settled that excellence in the plastic arts is the privilege of the earlier ages of the world. All that is now produced in this respect is mimetic, and, at the best, the skilful adaptation of traditional methods. The creative faculty of modern man seems by an irresistible law at work on the virgin soil of science, daily increasing by its inventions our command over nature, and multiplying the material happiness of man. But the happiness of man is not merely material. Were it not for music, we might in these days say, the

beautiful is dead. Music seems to be the only means of creating the beautiful in which we not only equal but in all probability greatly excel the ancients. The music of modern Europe ranks with the transcendent creations of human genius; the poetry, the statues, the temples of Greece. It produces and represents as they did whatever is most beautiful in the spirit of man, and often expresses what is most profound. And who are the great composers, who hereafter will rank with Homer, with Sophocles, with Praxiteles, or with Phidias? They are the descendants of those Arabian tribes who conquered Canaan, and who by the favour of the Most High have done more with less means even than the Athenians.

Forty years ago—not a longer period than the children of Israel were wandering in the desert—the two most dishonoured races in Europe were the Attic and the Hebrew, and they were the two races that had done most for mankind. Their fortunes had some similarity: their countries were the two smallest in the world, equally barren and equally famous; they both divided themselves into tribes; they both built a famous temple on an acropolis; and both produced a literature which all European nations have accepted with reverence and admiration. Athens has been sacked oftener than Jerusalem, and oftener rased to the ground; but the Athenians have escaped expatriation, which is purely an oriental custom. The sufferings of the Jews however have been infinitely more prolonged and varied than those of the Athenians. The Greek nevertheless appears exhausted. The creative genius of Israel on the contrary never shone so bright; and when the Russian, the Frenchman, and the Anglo-Saxon, amid applauding theatres or the choral voices of solemn temples yield themselves to the full spell of a Mozart or a Mendelssohn, it seems difficult to comprehend how these races can reconcile it to their hearts to persecute a Jew.

We have shown that the theological prejudice against the Jews has no foundation, historical or doctrinal; we have shown that the social prejudice, originating in the theological but sustained by superficial observations irrespective of religious prejudice, is still more unjust, and that no existing race is so much entitled to the esteem and gratitude of society as the Hebrew. It remains for us to notice the injurious consequences to European society of the course pursued by the communities of this race, and this view of the subject leads us to considerations which it would become existing statesmen to ponder.

The world has by this time discovered that it is impossible to destroy the Jews. The attempt to extirpate them has been made under the most favourable auspices and on the largest scale; the most considerable means that man could command have been pertinaciously applied to this object for the longest period of recorded time. Egyptian pharaohs, Assyrian kings, Roman emperors, Scandinavian crusaders, Gothic princes, and holy inquisitors, have alike devoted their energies to the fulfilment of this common purpose. Expatriation, exile, captivity, confiscation, torture on the most ingenious and massacre on the most extensive scale, a curious system

of degrading customs and debasing laws which would have broken the heart of any other people, have been tried, and in vain. The Jews, after all this havoc, are probably more numerous at this date than they were during the reign of Solomon the wise, are found in all lands, and unfortunately prospering in most. All which proves, that it is in vain for man to attempt to baffle the inexorable law of nature which has decreed that a superior race shall never be destroyed or absorbed by an inferior.

But the influence of a great race will be felt; its greatness does not depend upon its numbers, otherwise the English would not have vanquished the Chinese, nor would the Aztecs have been overthrown by Cortez and a handful of Goths. That greatness results from its organisation, the consequences of which are shown in its energy and enterprise, in the strength of its will and the fertility of its brain. Let us observe what should be the influence of the Jews, and then ascertain how it is exercised. The Jewish race connects the modern populations with the early ages of the world, when the relations of the Creator with the created were more intimate than in these days, when angels visited the earth, and God himself even spoke with man. The Jews represent the Semitic principle; all that is spiritual in our nature. They are the trustees of tradition, and the conservators of the religious element. They are a living and the most striking evidence of the falsity of that pernicious doctrine of modern times, the natural equality of man. The particular equality of a particular race is a matter of municipal arrangement, and depends entirely on political considerations and circumstances; but the natural equality of man now in vogue, and taking the form of cosmopolitan fraternity, is a principle which, were it possible to act on it, would deteriorate the great races and destroy all the genius of the world. What would be the consequences on the great Anglo-Saxon republic, for example, were its citizens to secede from their sound principle of reserve, and mingle with their negro and coloured populations? In the course of time they would become so deteriorated that their states would probably be reconquered and regained by the aborigines whom they have expelled, and who would then be their superiors. But though nature will never ultimately permit this theory of natural equality to be practised, the preaching of this dogma has already caused much mischief, and may occasion much more. The native tendency of the Jewish race, who are justly proud of their blood, is against the doctrine of the equality of man. They have also another characteristic, the faculty of acquisition. Although the European laws have endeavoured to prevent their obtaining property, they have nevertheless become remarkable for their accumulated wealth. Thus it will be seen that all the tendencies of the Jewish race are conservative. Their bias is to religion, property, and natural aristocracy; and it should be the interest of statesmen that this bias of a great race should be encouraged, and their energies and creative powers enlisted in the cause of existing society.”

5.11 Zionist Lies

The First World War emancipated the Jews of Russia. Turkey and Germany were greatly weakened and were further crippled by unjust debts placed on them through treacherous treaties. Jews in Eastern Europe were segregated and seemed ready for emigration to Palestine—though most did not wish to go. In 1916, France and Britain divided up the Mid-East amongst themselves in the Sykes-Picot Agreement. At the San Remo conference in 1920, the British granted themselves the right to rule of Palestine and the French granted themselves the right to rule Syria. The Jews pushed for the ratification of the Palestine Mandate in the League of Nations so that they could enforce their bogus interpretation of the Balfour Declaration of 1917.

The political Zionists remained a fanatical minority group among Jews, and though many Eastern European Jews would have been happy to have moved to Palestine, if it had meant a good job and a stable life, very few Western Jews desired to leave their comfortable homes and head for the desert. Most Jews knew that the political Zionists were totalitarian zealots, and dangerous terrorists. An article appeared in 1921, which, while naïve and inaccurate on some points, made several important arguments against the utterly selfish, undemocratic, totalitarian political Zionist movement, which are valid to this day. It was published in: *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 127, Number 2, (February, 1921), pp. 268-279 (note that the racist political Zionists dominated and censored the mass media at the time when they made the racist political Zionist Albert Einstein an international celebrity and censored his critics):

“POLITICAL ZIONISM

BY ALBERT T. CLAY

I

A TRAVELER returning from the Near East is at once struck by the utter ignorance of Europeans and Americans concerning the true situation in Palestine—an ignorance due largely to the fact that in London there is, practically, only one of the important daily papers that will print anything detrimental to the schemes of the Political Zionists. Besides the English press, the other sources of information upon which America has been dependent for its news of Palestine have been the Jewish Telegraphic Agency and the Zionist propaganda. The latter, with its harrowing stories of pogroms in Europe, and its misrepresentations of the situation in the Near East, has been able to awaken not a little sympathy for the Zionist programme. But there certainly are reasons why Americans should endeavor to realize fully what is happening in Syria, and this quite promptly.

In discussing the existing conditions in Palestine, and the serious problem that the League of Nations will very probably have to face, it is necessary to differentiate briefly between what have been called the three aspects of Zionism, namely, the religious, economic, and political aspects.

Religious Zionism is an expression used to represent the belief of orthodox Judaism that the Jews are the chosen people of the one and only God; that a Messiah will be sent to redeem Israel; and that Jehovah will gather his people, restore the Temple and its service, and reestablish the

priesthood and the Jewish kingdom. For the restoration of their kingdom and the fulfillment of prophecy, they look to God in his own time and way, and not to Jewish financiers and politicians, or to peace conferences. Only a small group of orthodox Jews, 'the Eastern,' take an active part in the political movement to establish a Jewish state. Tolerance for the religious ideals of different faiths precludes any criticism or lack of respect for Religious Zionism. The Christian faith, it might be added, is, in certain respects at least, inseparably identified with some of its ideals.

Economic Zionism, so-called, has as its object the amelioration of the deplorable conditions in which Jews have lived in certain lands, where they have been outrageously persecuted, and many instances foully murdered. Since the governments concerned could no be induced to alleviate their sufferings, the Jews, in recent years, have been urged to emancipate themselves by seeking a new home, where they might live in security, and carry on their activities as free citizens. About fifty years ago organizations sprang up which encouraged colonization in Palestine. However, most Jews preferred to go to South and North America, with the result that some thousands went to Palestine and two millions moved westward. About forty colonies, some large and others containing only a few houses have been established in Palestine, numbering about 13,000 souls. The entire Jewish population, including those who are indigenous, numbers 65,300. For comparison, it may be stated that there are also about 62,500 Christians and over a half million Moslems in the land. Economic Zionism is not a theory, nor is it an experiment. The Balfour declaration sanctions the movement; it reads: 'His Majesty's government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine.' The San Remo Conference has interpreted the Peace Treaty as implying this, and there is no alternative; moreover, the movement is already a substantial reality.

A visit to some of the better established Jewish colonies will not fail to awaken sympathy for Economic Zionism. No unbiased observer of past events could think of throwing obstacles in the way of those Jews who, being persecuted in certain lands, prefer to live in a community solely Jewish; or who, through historical sentiment, long reside in a purely Jewish cultural community in the land of their ancestors. Only an extremist would deny the gratification of their desires to as many of these people as can be accommodated; yet it must be borne in mind that, as estimated by experts, the tiny country can support only about a million and a half additional inhabitants; which number, if all were Jews, would represent only one tenth of the fifteen millions in the world.

II

Political Zionism was launched by Herzl, in 1896, in a monograph on

‘The Jewish State’; and since that time this has become the dominant note in the whole movement. He and others have claimed that the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth would become an active force, by bringing diplomatic pressure to bear upon the nations, to secure protection for Jews in all lands. A clannish sense of pride in the Jewish race, however, seems to be uppermost in their minds. They apparently think that their status in society will be enhanced everywhere if a Jewish nation exists in Palestine. This phase of Zionism is the crux of the whole Palestine problem.

Political Zionism is strongly opposed by many orthodox Jews in Palestine; especially because they recognize that, through the fanaticism of the Zionist leaders, it has become most difficult for them to maintain their former amicable relations with the other natives. It is opposed also by many of the leading Jews throughout the world, especially, as the Political Zionists themselves admit, by the upper circles of Jewish society. The Central Conference of American Rabbis, which has a membership of about three hundred, representing many of the largest and most important synagogues in America, has year after year discussed the problem; and while favoring the idea of the country’s being open to Jews who, because of religious persecution, desire to reside there, it denies that the Jews are ‘a people without a country’; and even refuses to ‘subscribe to the phrase in the [Balfour] declaration which says, ‘Palestine is to be the national home-land for the Jewish people.’

When we consider the feelings of the Jews who desire to spend their lives in study and meditation in Palestine and be buried there, we must not lose sight of the fact that the same impulse also draws, and has drawn, the Christian and the Moslem. It is the Holy Land for the three great religions. It is not the birthplace of Islam; yet Mohammed, who claimed to be the successor of a line of prophets from Abraham to Christ, would have made Jerusalem the centre of his religion if the Jews and the Christians had recognized him as a prophet. As it is, Jerusalem is one of three most revered cities in Islam; moreover, the sites identified with Abraham, Jacob, Rachel, Joseph, Moses, Samuel, David, Solomon, and other Old Testament characters, are regarded with as much veneration by the Moslem as by the Jew.

One need only recall the immense and magnificent hospices built by the Eastern and the Western branches of the Christian Church, as well as the many monasteries, hospitals, homes, and schools, throughout the land, to reach some conception of what the country is to the Christian. The inhabitants of Bethlehem and Nazareth, as well as of some other cities, are largely Christian. Moreover, practically every country in Christian Europe is represented among the inhabitants of Palestine by colonies, settlements, or communities.

The Political Zionists, through their propaganda, systematically endeavor to give the world a false conception of the Palestinians. They would have us believe, to quote the words of Zangwill, that ‘Palestine is not so much

occupied by the Arabs as over-run by them. They are nomads. . . . And therefore we must gently persuade them to 'trek.'" Examine the literature of the leaders of Zionism, and it will be found that this false position is reiterated again and again. True, nomads are found in Palestine, as everywhere throughout the Orient; but to foist upon the intelligent public the idea that the population of this land is made up of Bedouins, or even of Arabs, is a deliberate attempt to deceive it.

The inhabitants of the land should be called Syrians—or Palestinians, if Palestine is to be separated from Syria. True, there are many Arabs living there, more, for example, than Greeks, Germans, or Latins, because of the proximity of Arabia; but these are not the real Palestinians, nor do they represent the bulk of the substantial part of the nation. The people whom the Jews conquered when they entered Palestine were called by the general name of Amorites or Canaanites. While many were massacred by the Jews in certain cities, still only a portion of the country was conquered. Even after David took Jerusalem, Amorites continued to live in that city; besides, many foreign peoples, as the Hittites and Philistines, also lived in the land. There can be no question that the blood of the present Palestinian, or Syrian, includes that of the Jew as well as of the Amorite, Hittite, Phœnician, Philistine, Persian, Greek, Latin, and Arab. Such a fusion is not unlike that found in the veins of many Americans whose ancestors have lived here for several generations. When the whole population of Palestine became Mohammedan, there is little doubt that a large percentage of the Jews were also forced to accept this faith; their descendants are now classed by the Political Zionists as 'Arabs.' The Yemenites, who we know migrated from Arabia, and who in every respect resemble the Arab in physique, appearance, and bearing, they, none the less, call Jews, because of their faith. Then, also, in such Christian cities as Bethlehem and Ramallah a type is seen that is distinctively European, and doubtless largely represents remnants or descendants of the Crusaders, or of Christians who migrated to the Holy Land in the past centuries. Moreover, the Palestinian or Syrian is a composite race, largely Semitic, which has developed from the association of the different racial elements inhabiting the land for at least five thousand years past. And while the Arabs have in all periods filtered in from Arabia, and the language, as in Egypt and Mesopotamia, is Arabic, it is a deliberate misrepresentation to classify the inhabitants as 'Arabs.'

These are the people whose status the Political Zionist proposes to reduce by securing the control of the country; and who—what is still worse—must be persuaded to 'trek.' As Zangwill says, 'After all, they have all Arabia with its million square miles, and Israel has not a square inch. There is no particular reason for the Arabs to cling to these few kilometres. To fold their tents and silently steal away is their proverbial habit; let them exemplify it now.' *Palestine*, the organ of the British Palestine Committee, for July 10, 1920, says: 'For the Arab nation there are vast areas outside of Palestine in which to develop its national life, and Arabs of Palestine will be free to

develop there, also'

III

Much has been written upon the historic claims of the Jews to this territory, which they held for less than five hundred years, prior to two thousand five hundred years ago. But how about the claims of the Palestinian, who possessed the land before the Jew, and who is still in possession, having lived there for over five thousand years? The Aramæans, who came from Aram, whom we call Hebrews, under Joshua conquered, and even ruthlessly exterminated, the people of a portion of Palestine; and later on, under David and Solomon, extended their rule over the whole country. But, if we are to decide the question of actual ownership of the territory, the Palestinian who has continuously lived there surely has a clearer title than the Jew. Moreover, this decision is based upon the records handed down by the Jew himself. Even the Hebrew language, which the Jews are attempting to revive as their spoken tongue, originally belonged to the people they are trying to oust. The language in Aram—Abraham's ancestral home—was Aramæan; when the Aramieans came to Palestine, they adopted the Canaanite language, now called Hebrew.

The Palestine News, the official journal of the Egyptian Expeditionary Force under Allenby, published, on November 14, 1918, a declaration, which had been agreed to by the British and French Governments, and communicated to the President of the United States, informing the people that their aim in waging the war in the East was 'to ensure the complete and final emancipation of all those people so long oppressed by the Turks, to establish national governments and administrations which shall derive their authority from the initiative and free will of the peoples themselves,' and 'to assure, by their support and practical aid, the normal workings of such governments and administrations as the people themselves have adopted.'

In the twelfth of the fourteen points enumerated by President Wilson to Congress, January 8, 1918, he demanded that the nationalities then under Turkish rule should be assured of 'an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development.' His second principle, stated in his address at Mount Vernon, July 4, 1918, reads: 'The settlement of every question, whether of territory, of sovereignty, of economic arrangement, or of political relationship shall be upon the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people immediately concerned, and not upon the basis of the material interest or advantage of any other nation or people which may desire a different settlement for the sake of its exterior influence or mastery.'

The edict of England and France, which was published in every town and village in the land about the time the Armistice was signed, has been violated in every essential particular; nor have the principles and demands of Mr. Wilson been observed. 'An unmolested opportunity of autonomous development' has been denied the inhabitants. The questions 'of territory, of economic arrangement, or political relationship' have been settled contrary to the will of 'the people immediately concerned'; and it has been done 'upon

the basis of the material interest or advantage' of another people 'for the sake of its exterior interest or mastery.'

Not only have these principles and demands been ignored, but the twenty-second article of the League of Nations Covenant, in which they were incorporated, has been grossly violated. The middle section of this article reads: 'Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized, subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a Mandatory Power until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the Mandatory Power.' It is needless to point out that their existence as independent nations has not been provisionally recognized, nor have the wishes of the people been a principal consideration in the selection of the Mandatory Power.

The circulation of the self-determination edict by England and France in November, 1918, which the people accepted placidly, calmed the popular feeling for a time; but after a few months the people saw clearly that the Political Zionists were favored by the British authorities, to their disadvantage; and they began to appreciate that they were being dealt with falsely. National anti-foreign sentiment grew apace, and in the spring of 1919 conditions had reached such a point that General Money had difficulty in quieting the people. He continually represented the necessity for his government to make a clear declaration of its policy—either one of repression of the people in favor of the Jews, or one of equality of treatment, which would have been acceptable to all, including the Palestinian Jews, but not, of course, to the Political Zionists. The Peace Conference, as a result of the dissatisfaction, appointed an inter-Allied commission to ascertain the wishes of the people. France, who claimed the whole of Syria, which included Palestine, declined send out her representatives; and her example was followed by England. The work of the Commission, therefore, devolved upon the two American representatives, Ambassador Crane and President King. This Commission held a most impartial and exhaustive inquiry, hearing delegates from almost every town and village. In order to be ready to give useful information before the Commission, branches of the Moslem and Christian League were formed at Jaffa, Gaza, Hebron, Djenin, Nablus, Acre, Haifa, Safed, and other places. All branches worked under a constitution approved by the Military Governor of Jerusalem. It was decided to up three resolutions to be presented the Commission:—

1. The independence of Syria, from the Taurus Mountains to Rafeh, the frontier of Egypt.
2. Palestine not to be separated from Syria, but to form one whole country.
3. Jewish immigration to be restricted.

The entire Christian and Moslem population agreed to these resolutions.

It should be said here that there is no justification, from an ethnological or geographical point of view, for dividing Syria into the northern part under the French and the southern part, namely Palestine, under the British. This has already been pointed out by the greatest authority on the history and geography of Palestine, Sir George Adam Smith. One race, the Syrian, or Palestinian, is dominant throughout the territory, from Aleppo to Beersheba; and there is no natural frontier that can divide the two halves of this land. France for decades had regarded herself as the protector of the country. Although, being occupied with the enemy, she had done practically nothing toward driving out the Turks, the situation was such that, when the British army entered Jerusalem, in deference to the French a company of French soldiers was invited to be present. The question arises, then, why should the land and people be separated, and two separate administrations be established, with all the expense that this implies? For the entire territory, from Aleppo to Beersheba, is only about 400 miles and 100 miles wide—about the length of Pennsylvania, and one third its width? Why divide this small land and its people? Let us ask another question at the same time: why was the Balfour pronouncement made in 1917?

The Turkish government, when approached during the war on the problem of a Jewish state, said that it would continue to maintain, as it always had done, a favorable attitude toward the Jews in their efforts to promote flourishing settlements, within the limits of the capacity of the country, and toward the free development of their civilization and their economic enterprises; but it looked with disfavor upon Zionists who have political ambitions for Palestine, and it regards them as enemies to the government. But what the Turks refused to grant the Jews, Britain promised them, even before she had captured the country. The Political Zionists inform us that the text of the Balfour declaration was revised in the Zionist offices in America as well as in England, and that it was put into the form in which they desired it. Moreover, they intimate that this stroke of British policy had the desired effect upon the Zionists in Germany during the war. The financial assistance rendered by the Jewish plutocrats during the war, it is said, was a matter of no small consideration. But besides this, and the bid for Jewish favor everywhere, there can be little doubt that uppermost in the minds of the Cabinet, because of France's interest in the land, was the idea of creating a buffer state between the portion they would let the French retain and the Suez Canal. The Canal, according to English opinion, is the chief asset of the Empire. The strategic value of this territory to England has been referred to recently by Lord Curzon in the House of Lords. Hence, the reason that the Balfour declaration was made, and that Syria has been divided. It might be added, that this division is yet to be ratified by the League of Nations.

When the first body of representatives appeared before the Commission sent out by the Peace Conference, Aref Pasha el Dajani, the President of the Moslem and Christian League, was asked what mandatory government the League preferred. He replied that at one time they would unanimously have

asked for Great Britain, but the Balfour declaration had so shocked them that they now requested that America should have the mandate for Palestine and Syria. The Commission interviewed all the communities separately, getting in each instance the reply that their requests had been made through the Moslem and Christian League, except in the case of the Zionists, who asked for a British mandate and a separate rule for Palestine. The Commission then traveled throughout the country, making an impartial and exhaustive inquiry, hearing deputations from almost every town. Everywhere they found the same unanimity for the three resolutions.

The report of the Commissioners has never been published. The Conference, apparently under the influence of the Political Zionists, took no notice of it except in so far as to announce that no political privilege would be granted to the Jews, who were in the minority in the land; but that they would be given economic privileges in connection with its development. As a result, not a few natives who had returned from America and elsewhere with their gains, for this very purpose, were naturally disappointed. Some British firms were ready to invest capital in the development of the country, particularly for the improvement of the ports of Haifa and Jaffa; but they were turned down under instructions from the Foreign Office, so that the Zionist could have the first option in such undertakings.

Relying upon the decision they had given the Americans on the Commission, as well as upon the fact that they had made their views perfectly clear to the British authorities, the Moslems and Christians did not send a deputation to the Conference held at San Remo, which, as is well known, gave the mandate over Palestine to Great Britain. Through the efforts of the Zionist Commission, which had powerful representatives present, a clause was interpolated in the mandate, establishing a 'Jewish homeland' in accordance with the Balfour declaration.

The Grand Mufti, who is the ecclesiastical head of the Moslems in Jerusalem, on hearing the news concerning the mandate, still refused to believe that the British, who had pledged themselves to protect small powers, and who had promised that their rights should not be violated, would allow the Christians and Moslems of Palestine to be ruled by Political Zionists. The Moslems, he said, looked upon Great Britain as their best friend; they had welcomed the arrival of the British armies and in spite of all appearance to the contrary, he still believed that Great Britain would treat them fairly. The Grand Mufti was anxious that it should be understood that he and his followers were not anti-Jews, but that they objected to their country's being exploited by Jewish foreigners, and to their efforts to make both Christians and Moslems their vassals. While the Zionists during the past years had collected through propaganda immense sums from all parts of the world, he said, the Moslem and Christian natives of Palestine, by reason of the Turkish oppression and the war, were without funds. All that they asked for was a number of years in which to get on their feet economically. The Moslems, the Grand Mufti told the writer, had objections to the same quiet

development of Jewish colonies going on as in the past. What they did strenuously object to was the plan of the British government to turn over their land to the Political Zionists, for the purpose of establishing a Jewish state.

The highly respected Aref Pasha, President of the Moslem and Christian League, which had been formed to stem the tide of Jewish immigration, said that the Moslems, understanding Great Britain's love for justice, decided to fight their coreligionists and to throw in their lot with her. Not less than 130,000 Moslems, many of them deserters from the Turkish army, fought with the British. The Moslems of India figured prominently in the same cause. Now, however, they find that the British victory means for them vassalage under the Jews; the people, he said, preferred the tyranny of the Turk to being ruled by the Jew.

The Christian inhabitants of the land hold the same view. Last spring no less than 20,000 people held a demonstration in Jerusalem, in order to show the administration and the foreign consuls their bitter opposition to this Jewish movement. Following this demonstration, many of the Christians proceeded to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and took a solemn oath that they would resist with their lives the Jews' efforts to rule them. So far as is known to me, not a single representative of any of the religious communities in Palestine favors the project. The views of the Christians are summed up in the following message, which a highly honored citizen of the country dictated to the writer as he was leaving the port of Jaffa, requesting that it should be made public. 'The Moslems and Christians welcomed the British occupation because they did not know that their country had been sold to the Jews. The honor of England is in jeopardy. The Christians of the whole world do not know of this treachery, nor did the three hundred millions of Moslems know of it. But some day it will be known, because it will surely mean another war. Had the people known what was to happen, they would have worn crape when the British entered.'

To show the consideration with which the Political Zionists are treated by the British government, the following is offered. The conflict between the British troops and the Turco-Germans left many cities and villages of Palestine in a condition not unlike that of those in Northern France and Belgium. Few people in Europe and America appreciate what the Syrian inhabitants of the land have suffered because of the conflict. The herds and farm-stock of the people had been carried away by the Turks, and they were naturally sorely pressed in their efforts to secure plough animals and grain for the cultivation of their fields. The Anglo-Palestine Bank, a Zionist concern, lent money to these people at a very exorbitant rate. The Chief Administrator, appreciating the embarrassment of the natives, and in order to ensure that the economic restoration of the country should speedily be effected, revived the Turkish system of making loans to the farmers, and made arrangements with a British bank, the Anglo-Egyptian, to lend them the money at six and a half per cent, payable over a period which could be

extended to five years. In the event of failure of payment, the land would become the property of the government, not of the Zionist bank.

The Zionist Commissioner, realizing that this defeated their plans to secure titles to lands, set their forces at work in London, with the result that orders were actually sent from the Foreign Office to suspend this arrangement, which had been such a boon to the war-ridden inhabitants. It was not long afterward that General Money resigned, and Colonel Vivian Gabriel, his chief financial adviser, was relieved of his post, because it was stated that he had adopted 'an attitude inconsistent with the Zionist policy of the Government.' The injustice of the interference, however, on the part of the Zionists, became so clear to everyone that, after several months, even Dr. Weizmann, the President of the Zionists, thought it necessary to withdraw the embargo; and the British government again permitted the loans to be made.

The departure of General Money, a thoroughly sound and upright governor of the best British type, was a great loss to the people, and it was the signal for a recrudescence of the Zionist claims. The Zionist Commission claimed the right to a previous scrutiny and veto of all the acts of the administration; they asked the British government for the lands and farms of the interned German colonists; they asked for the possession of the magnificent German Hospice on the Mount of Olives (then occupied by the Administration), for their projected Jewish University. They offended the Moslems by trying to acquire lands adjoining the Mosque of Omar, for which they offered £150,000. There seemed to be no limit to their arrogance; moreover, the aggressiveness of individuals, on the street and everywhere, was most marked.

The old resident Jews of Palestine certainly have other than religious grounds for their indifference toward the efforts of the Political Zionists. Last winter the Council of Jerusalem Jews appointed a commission of representative men holding leading positions, to visit parents who were sending their children to proscribed schools, in order to secure their withdrawal. Among these schools, which included those conducted by the convents and churches, some of which have existed in Jerusalem for a long time, are the British High School for Girls, the English College for Boys, and the Jewish School for Girls. In the latter, conducted by Miss Landau, an educated English Jewess, all the teachers are Jewish; most of the teaching is in the English language. This school, which is financed by enlightened Jews of England, was denounced more severely than the others, because, not being in sympathy with the programme of the Political Zionists, Miss Landau refused to teach the Zionist curriculum. She was even informed that her school would be closed.

In a series of articles that appeared in *Doar Hayom*, the Hebrew daily paper, last December, it was stated that the parents who refused to comply with the requests of the Commission were to be boycotted, cast out from all intercourse with Jews, denied share in Zionist funds, and deprived of all custom for their shops and hotels. 'Anyone who refused, let him know that

it is forbidden for him to be called by the name of Jew; and there is to be for him no portion or inheritance with his brethren.' They were given notice that they would 'be fought by all lawful means.' Their names were to be put 'upon a monument of shame, as a reproach forever, and their deeds writte unto the last generation.' 'If they are supported, their support will cease; if they are merchants, the finger of scorn will be pointed at them; if they are rabbis, they will be moved far from their office; they shall be put under the ban and persecuted, and all the people of the world shall know that there is no mercy in justice.'

A month later the results of this 'warfare' were reviewed. We were informed that some Jews had been influenced, 'but others—and the greater number, and those of the Orthodox,—those who fear God—having read the letters [signed by the head of its delegates and the Zionist Commission] became angry at the 'audacity' of the Council of Jerusalem Jews 'which mix themselves up in private affairs,' have torn the letter up, and that finished it.'

Then followed a long diatribe against these parents, boys, and girls, in which it was demanded that the blacklist of traitors to the people be sent to 'those who perform circumcision, who control the cemeteries and hospitals'; that an order go forth so that 'doctors will not visit their sick, that assistance when in need, if they are on the list of the American Relief Fund, will not be given to them.' 'Men will cry to them, 'Out of the way, unclean, unclean.' . . . They are in no sense Israelites.'

It is to be regretted that only these few paraphrases and quotations from the series of articles published can be presented here.

The work of the Councils Committee met with not a little success; pupils left schools, and teachers gave up their positions. Two instructors in the English College, whose fathers were rabbis, and a third, whose brother was a teacher in a Zionist school, resigned. Another refused to do so, and declared himself ready, in the interests of the Orthodox Jews, who were suffering under this tyranny, which they deplored, to give the fullest testimony to the authorities concerning this persecution. The administration, under Governor Bols, finally intervened, and at least no further public efforts to carry out their programme were made.

If, in this early stage of the development of Political Zionism, even the Palestinian Religious Jews already find themselves under such a tyranny, what will happen if these men are allowed to have full control of the government? And what kind of treatment can the Christian and th Moslem expect in their efforts to educate their children, if the Political Zionists are allowed to develop their Jewish state to such a point that they can dispense with their mandatory and tell the British to clear out? When such things happen under British administration, what will take place if the Jewish State is ever realized, and such men are in full control?

V

The appointment of a Jew and Political Zionist, Sir Herbert Samuel, as the High Commissioner of Palestine, although he is considered to be an

impartial and fair-minded man, was regarded as a serious mistake by practically every non-Jew in Palestine, because of the powerful, and even fanatical, forces that would be brought to bear upon him. The question arises, what was done on his advent in July with regard to the civil rights of the people, which were guaranteed by England's edict, by the Balfour declaration, the League of Nations, and the San Remo Conference? In his inaugural address, Samuel informed the people of Palestine that he would nominate an advisory council,—which would be composed mostly of British officials, with ten unofficial members, whom he would choose from the various sections of the people,—to meet under his presidency at frequent intervals; to this council matters of importance would be submitted for advice; and the unofficial members would be free also to raise questions to which they desired the attention of the government to be directed.

Palestine and Syria have, perhaps, more intelligent men in proportion to the inhabitants than any other country in the Near East, for which fact, of course, there are abundant reasons. Despite all that has been said with regard to the self-determination of small nations, and all that has been promised these people, by official statements and edicts, concerning their civil rights and their wishes, we learn that they are to be represented by ten unofficial members, appointed by the leader of the Political Zionists, who, when called by him, shall have the privilege of meeting, to hear reports, to give advice, and to ask questions. Certainly, this is a remarkable realization of the much heralded doctrine of self-determination of the small nation, and a remarkable fulfillment of all the promises that have been made to these unhappy people.

It is also deemed most unfortunate that the British government has placed the judicial department of the country in the hands of a Jew and Political Zionist, who even has the appointment of the judges of Palestine, about twenty of whom are Moslems. The demoralizing effect of this is fully appreciated by non-Jews. Protests against his occupying this position have been made, but without avail. The case, however, is different when the Jews endeavor to oust a Christian judge who is not favorable to their programme. Even a man of the highest type and standing, credited with a long career of faithful judicial service, has been disposed of through their influence.

Those who are familiar with life in Palestine, where the feeling between Moslem and Christian and Jew is perhaps more intense than in any other land, are fully cognizant that this scheme for a Jewish state not only accentuates and increases the animosities that have always existed, but invites another tragic chapter in the history of the Hebrews. The Political Zionists are simply intensifying this feeling, as well as the bigotry and fanaticism of the masses, by their efforts to force themselves into a sovereign position. And there can be no question that anti-Semitism, not only in Palestine but throughout the world, will increase more and more as the world, Christian and Moslem, becomes familiar with the situation.

The British politicians in London seem to have little comprehension of the difficulties they are helping to create for their Empire. The Political

Zionists will never be satisfied with the country west of the Jordan, and only as far north as the Litany. All kinds of intrigues on the part of their politicians, to secure the territory that will be held by the French and Arabs, can be looked for. They have already claimed that the boundaries of the Solomonic kingdom, which extended to the Euphrates, should be those of their state. Already an outlet on the Gulf of Akaba has been demanded. Since there are 50,000 Jews in Bagdad, what is to prevent their plutocrats, when Great Britain is again hard pressed, from exacting another declaration from the government, which will embrace this territory?

In *Palestine*, for September 25 the statement is made that the boundary-line set by France would make it impossible to get water for electric power. This would rob them, they claim, of all hope of economic prosperity. There can be no other result but that Britain's difficulties with France and Arabia will be increased, and that the estrangement between these countries will be accentuated.

It is the opinion of nearly every non-Jewish British official in Palestine, not only that Britain's reputation for justice and fair dealing is at stake, and that a great wrong is being done the inhabitants of the land, but that there are serious dangers ahead for the Empire. They believe that, if immigration from Russia, Roumania, and Poland is to be allowed to any great extent, so that the Jews will be in the majority,—will have, as they say, at least fifty-one per cent,—not only racial riots and massacres will result, but there will be a continual menace to the Empire, especially because of the interest of the Moslems of other lands in Jerusalem and in their coreligionists. Moreover, these officials feel keenly the change in the attitude toward the British that has come over the inhabitants since they entered, for they know that they are now hated and despised.

The propagandists endeavor to have the world believe that, since Sir. H. Samuel's appointment, the opposition of the inhabitants is disappearing; and we are told that many have signed petitions asking for Jewish rule. To one familiar with the actual situation, this, to say the least, is ludicrous. Thousands of signatures could easily be obtained at the cost of three or four for a shilling. Order has been maintained the last few months in this little land with the assistance of 24,000 soldiers. But we are informed that anti-Zionist sentiment has increased since the arrival of Sir H. Samuel, to whom quite recently national associations at Jaffa, Hebron, and Gaza sent the following resolution:—

'With all due respect to His Britannic Majesty and to your person, we beg to protest against the decision taken at San Remo [that is, the granting of the mandate to Great Britain], and against your appointment.'

The Palestine problem can be easily and effectively disposed of by the British government with dignity and honor, to the satisfaction of the Christians and Moslems in Palestine and throughout the world, as well as of the many Jews who are opposed to this political movement. This can be accomplished by simply carrying out the provisions of the League of Nations

and all the pronouncements that Great Britain has made. The loosely worded and ambiguous Balfour declaration does not prevent this; for if the non-Jewish inhabitants are granted their civic rights, which can mean only that they will have a voice in the government in proportion to their population, then justice will be rendered them, and the problem will be solved. Unless this is done, governing by a mandate, as many British maintain, is simply another phrase for a power's taking possession of a country, and ruling it as it desires. And unless this is done now, before the status of the Christian and the Moslem is compromised, and before the country becomes full of Russian, Roumanian, and Polish Jews, so that they will be in a majority, a grave injustice will be committed, which will be resented more and more by the Christians and Moslems of the world as they become familiar with the situation in their Holy Land."

Lord Islington, Lord Sydenham, and others, repeatedly reminded the House of Lords that the British had promised Palestine to the Palestinians, and prohibited the formation of a Jewish Government in that territory, in the Balfour Declaration of 1917 itself; as well as in the correspondence between Sir Henry McMahon, His Majesty's High Commissioner at Cairo and the Sherif Husayn (Hussein) of Mecca of July 14th, August 30th, September 9th, October 24th, November 5th, and December 14th of 1915—most especially the letter from McMahon to Husayn of 24 October 1915; and in General Allenby's Proclamation of 14 November 1918. The Allies had sought the help of the Arabs in defeating the Turkish Empire and promised them sovereignty in their own lands. They then stabbed the Arabs in the back with the Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916, and yet worse after the war. *The New York Times* reported on 20 July 1922 on page 19,

"JERUSALEM, June 22 (Correspondence of the Associated Press).—The inhabitants of Palestine, both Moslem and Christian, are immeasurably pleased that the British House of Lords yesterday passed the Islington motion disapproving the Balfour declaration of 1917. The native press is jubilant; pan-Arab demonstrations are being held and the local cable office is swamped with congratulatory messages from Arabs to the House of Lords.

The Balfour declaration pledged the erection of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. The resolution passed yesterday by a vote of 60 to 29 set forth that 'the mandate for Palestine in its present form is unacceptable to this House, because it directly violates the pledges made by his Majesty's Government to the people of Palestine in the declaration of October, 1915, and again in the declaration of November, 1918 (pledges given to the Arabs), and is as at present framed opposed to the sentiments and wishes of the great majority of the people of Palestine. That, therefore, its acceptance by the Council of the League of Nations should be postponed until such modifications have therein been effected as will comply with pledges given by his Majesty's Government.'

The Arabs regard this incident as a great victory. 'It is the bounden duty,'

says an Arab call to a demonstration of celebration, ‘of all of us to set forth our gratitude to the House of Lords for having proved to the world that God and justice still live in Great Britain.’

Miraat el Shark, a Jerusalem newspaper, says: ‘We will win our fight for freedom; we have God and right on our side.’ Beit el Makdes, another local paper, says: ‘Our victory in the House of Lords is the beginning of the end of political Zionism.’

The Zionists are correspondingly disappointed at the news. They have not failed to cable strong protests to London. The Chairman of the Zionist organization here said to the Associated Press:

‘All our hopes have been shattered on the rocks of political expediency. If the House of Commons follows the lead of the House of Lords, then Jews of the world will have been dealt a more staggering blow than that administered by the Emperor Hadrian 1,800 years ago, when his persecutions brought about the last dispersion of the Jewish race.’”

Jewish prophecy had long held that Gentiles should soldier and slave for Israel. In other words, Israel is a leech on the Gentile nations, which has no right to exist, and which forever throws the world into turmoil. *The London Times* published a Letter to the Editor from Lord Sydenham of Combe, “British Policy in Palestine. Divergence from Balfour Declaration.” on 4 April 1923, on page 6, which stated, *inter alia*,

“I do not think any useful purpose can be served by further discussion of the terms of the correspondence between Sir H. McMahon and the Sherif of Mecca. There can be no doubt that Palestine was included in the area in which ‘Great Britain is prepared to recognize and support the independence of the Arabs.’ [***] Into Palestine we are dumping successive shiploads of impecunious aliens, we are imposing a loan equal to the whole annual revenue, and we have ordained a third official language perfectly useless to the people. All this, together with minor inflictions, we are doing in opposition to the strongly expressed wishes of a huge majority of Palestinians. It would be interesting if the ‘Zionist Organization’ would explain what ‘civil rights’ are left to a little people so circumstanced, and how the declaration, ‘revised in the Zionist offices in America as well as in England,’ can be reconciled with this use of British military forces.”

Lord George Sydenham Clarke Sydenham of Combe, author of *The Jewish World Problem*,¹⁰⁴⁹ told the House of Lords of the,

“mad policy of protecting the Jews against the Arabs in Palestine with the help of English bayonets, which cost the British taxpayer five hundred thousand pounds a month.”¹⁰⁵⁰

On 7 April 1922, on page 8, *The London Times* published a Letter to the Editor

from Lord Sydenham,

“JEWISH ‘NATIONAL HOME.’

LORD SYDENHAM URGES INQUIRY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—I have read the important articles of your Correspondent in the Near East on Palestine with great interest. We have established what you justly call ‘a powerful irritant’ in the Near East, and the entire responsibility for the consequences must fall upon us.

Next year the taxpayers will have to provide another £4,000,000, which might be largely increased by events, and, as you point out, ‘the extent of our financial commitments is very imperfectly understood.’ I hold strongly that some solution of our difficulty must be found before it becomes obviously dangerous.

It has already been proved that the two parts of the Declaration are incompatible. You cannot make Palestine into a ‘national home’ in the sense which the Zionists proclaim, and at the same time insist that ‘nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights’ of the owners of the soil. The civil rights of the Palestinians are being violated in many ways, and before their eyes, every day, and the natural result is growing exasperation.

If this contention is correct, why should we not say plainly that the ‘national home’ must be conditioned by inexorable facts? It is now clear that the Declaration was made without any inquiry into the economic possibilities of the country. I cordially agree with Lord Northcliffe’s proposal that ‘an impartial Commission should be appointed to inquire into the results of the experiment’; but I suggest that the inquiry should be extended to ascertain what additional population beyond the natural increase can be economically supported, by what means, and in what time. We have officers trained in India who are well able to conduct such an inquiry, and the long-established Jewish colonies would provide valuable data. Are these colonies or any of them being worked on an economic basis to-day? Palestine does not lend itself to cheap irrigation; but that aspect of the question needs investigation.

My own strong opinion is that the national home must eventually break down on economic grounds, because you cannot indefinitely maintain colonies unable to pay their way. This is also the view of some leading American Jews besides Mr. Morgenthau. If, then, as Dr. Weizmann proposes, ‘between 50,000 and 60,000 Jews per annum’ are deposited in the Holy Land, we shall soon be confronted with appalling difficulties—partly economic and partly arising from the hostility of the rightful owners of the land, who would find themselves displaced by the growing horde of immigrants.

My conclusion is that, in the interests of the Jews as well as the Arabs, immigration must be stopped until a full inquiry has taken place, if serious

troubles are to be averted. For moral as well as economic reasons, the 'powerful irritant' must be removed.

I am, Sir, yours obediently,
April 3. SYDENHAM."

In a Letter to the Editor published in *The London Times* on 24 August 1922 on page 11, Lord Sydenham accused the crypto-Jewish Zionist spokesman Winston Churchill of being a Zionist dictator, and one might add a typical Zionist liar and sophist seeking to stifle debate (*see also: The Jewish Chronicle* issues from about 15 June 1922 to 17 June 1922, which republish portions of the debates in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords),

“THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF CRITICISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—In his remarkable letter to Lord Islington, Mr. Churchill propounds a doctrine which is new and disturbing. Stated baldly, that doctrine appears to be that the critics of any policy which any Government may adopt are responsible for any disasters which that policy entails because they stated their opinions 'without having the power of altering the policy.'

Does Mr. Churchill really wish us to believe that the opponents of Mr. Montagu's policy, whose only thought was the welfare of the masses of India, are responsible for the heavy loss of life—unparalleled since the Mutiny—which that policy inevitably entailed? Everything which we foretold has happened or is happening, and if the Prime Minister's recent speech has any meaning it is that he intends to reverse the main principles of that disastrous policy.

Again, are those who consistently opposed the total change of policy in Ireland, which the Government suddenly adopted last summer, really responsible for the appalling destruction of life and property which they foresaw?

In Palestine the policy of forcing by British bayonets a horde of aliens, some of them eminently undesirable, upon the rightful owners of the country, in violation of Lord Balfour's promise that the 'civil rights' of the Arabs should not be prejudiced, led to risings before the delegation came to London. Are we, who opposed the policy because we knew that its injustice must lead to loss of life, responsible for anything that may now happen?

I humbly venture to suggest that Mr. Churchill's new doctrine can apply only under a dictatorship, that it is wholly unsuited to this country, and that even the Coalition Government may benefit from honest criticism. 'No people,' it has been well said, 'can deserve freedom except there is a healthy criticism of public men and of national policy.'

I am, Sir, yours obediently,
SYDENHAM.

The Priory, Lamberhurst, Kent, Aug. 19.”

On 8 September 1922 on page 9, *The London Times* published correspondence which had taken place between Lord Sydenham and Winston Churchill (this correspondence also appeared under the heading “British Policy in Palestine. Mr. Churchill and Lord Sydenham. Amusing Correspondence.” in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 15 September 1922 on page 17),

**“OUR PALESTINE POLICY.
LORD SYDENHAM’S CHARGES.
CORRESPONDENCE
WITH MR. CHURCHILL.**

The following correspondence has passed between Mr. Churchill and Lord Sydenham:—

FROM MR. CHURCHILL TO LORD SYDENHAM.

26th August, 1922.

Dear Lord Sydenham,—I observe in your letter to *The Times* of August 19, in reference to my correspondence with Lord Islington, you write as follows:—

‘In Palestine the policy of forcing by British bayonets a horde of aliens, some of them eminently undesirable, upon the rightful owners of the country, in violation of Lord Balfour’s promise that the ‘civil rights’ of the Arabs should not be prejudiced, led to risings before the delegation came to London. Are we, who opposed the policy because we knew that its injustice must lead to loss of life, responsible for anything that may now happen?’

I observe also that at the time of Mr. Balfour’s declaration in 1917 you are reported to have expressed yourself as follows:

‘I earnestly hope that one result of the war will be to free Palestine from the withering blight of Turkish rule, and to render it available as the national home of the Jewish people, who can restore its ancient prosperity.’

It seems to me that before you take further part in this particular controversy you owe at to the public, and, I may add, to yourself to offer some explanation of the apparent discrepancy between these positions. In particular it would be interesting to know what has occurred in the interval to convert ‘the Jewish people’ for whom you hoped to make Palestine ‘the national home’ into ‘a horde of aliens.’ Your opinions as to the expediency of the policy of Zionism may no doubt quite naturally have turned a complete somersault in the last five years, but the relation of the Jewish race to Palestine has not altered in that period. Either, therefore, you were mistaken then in thinking that the Jews were entitled to regard Palestine as ‘the national home’ or you are mistaken now in describing them as ‘a horde of aliens.’

It is to this point that it would be specially interesting to see you address yourself.

From Lord Sydenham to Mr. Churchill.

Aug. 29, 1922.

Dear Mr. Churchill,—It is my strong impression that I have already sent an explanation of my change of view to the Jewish paper which asked me for a message by telegram in 1917. This explanation, however, seems not to have been supplied to you with the text of the message which you read in the House of Commons. I was in the country away from books and papers, and I, too, hurriedly sent the reply which you again quote.

I was grievously mistaken, and for three reasons:—

1. I had no knowledge of the economic conditions of Palestine, which can never support a large population, and can only receive carefully selected immigrants gradually without grave injury to the inhabitants.

2. I was quite unaware that the Balfour Declaration was obtained by the prolonged underhand methods, which are, in part, described in the Zionist Political Report. This remarkable document came to me as a revelation.

3. A 'Jewish National Home' can be interpreted in several ways, and Mr. Balfour's undertaking—that the 'civil rights' of the Palestinians would not be prejudiced naturally reassured me. I never dreamed that a Jewish Government would be set up, and I imagined only a slow immigration of desirable Jews under a purely British Government. In 1917, it was not yet clear that there would be a rush of Russian and Central European Jews to other countries, and that a portion of them would be dumped down in Palestine. I was further reassured in 1918 by General Allenby's Proclamation, which appeared to render impossible what is now happening, while the text of the Treaty with the Hedjaz, which is disputed, was unknown to me at the time.

Since 1917 I have given much thought and study to the Jewish problems, and I have been forced to change my opinions. I was, as you suggest, 'mistaken in thinking that the Jews were entitled to regard Palestine as the 'National Home.' I consider that they have no more claim to Palestine than the modern Italians to Britain, or the Moors to Southern Spain. I also think that 'a horde of aliens' correctly describes the immigrants.

I am sure you will agree that, when a man finds himself obliged to change his opinions, he is not only justified in pressing what he has come to believe just and right, but he is actually bound to do so. When the Government changed their minds in regard to the 'murder gang' in Ireland, they were not only right, but bound to make a complete change in their policy.

I have tried to answer your questions quite frankly, and I have only to add that I greatly regret my mistake, due mainly to my absence from London, and to the fact that I was then absorbed in studying the course of the war, which engrossed my thoughts at the time.

FROM MR. CHURCHILL TO LORD SYDENHAM.

August 31, 1922.

Dear Lord Sydenham,—I am obliged to you for your letter of the 29th

instant, in which you admit that you were grievously mistaken when you promised to support the Zionist policy, and have entirely changed your view on the question of establishing a Jewish national home. In the face of so complete an admission, expressed, as it is, in language of the utmost courtesy, I do not wish to press my point unduly. If, however, the only reasons which have changed you from an ardent advocate into an active opponent are those set out in your letter, I cannot but feel that they are inadequate, even where they are not based on misconceptions.

(1) The policy of his Majesty's Government has always been to bring in only 'carefully selected immigrants gradually, without grave injury to the inhabitants,' or, I may add, any kind of injury to the inhabitants.

(2) Lord Balfour's declaration did not arise from underhand methods of any kind, but from wide and deep arguments which have been clearly explained.

(3) No Jewish Government has been set up in Palestine, but only a British Government, in which Jews as well as Arabs participate. A reference to the White Paper recently published should reassure you in this respect.

There is, however, one reason for a change of view, which I am glad to see you do not give—namely, that it was an easy and popular thing to advocate a Zionist policy in the days of the Balfour Declaration, and that it is a laborious and much-criticized task to try to give honourable effect at the present time to the pledges which were given then. Still, it seems to me that if a public man, like yourself, has mistakenly supported the giving of the pledge, he should, even if he has changed his mind, show a little forbearance, and even consideration, to those who are endeavouring to make it good. Might you not well have left to others the task of inflicting censure and creating difficulties, and reserved your distinguished controversial gifts for some topic upon which you have an unimpeachable record? To change your mind is one thing; to turn on those who have followed your previous advice another.

P.S.—I am sending this correspondence to the Press.

FROM LORD SYDENHAM TO MR. CHURCHILL.

4th September, 1922.

Dear Mr. Churchill,—I beg to thank you for your letter of the 31st ultimo, which I received this morning.

We are all of us liable to 'misconceptions'; but I regret that I cannot admit as such the three points you refer to, for the following reasons:—

(1) I was glad to learn that latterly some care has been observed on the selection of immigrants; but I have abundant evidence that for some time most unsuitable persons were freely admitted, and this is proved by the official inquiry into the Jaffa riots. I am still not satisfied that persons who do not fulfil the economic requirements of Palestine and whose importation may adversely affect the interests of the Palestinians are excluded.

(2) I cannot, of course, tell why the Government, at a time when the Empire was fighting for its life and the conquest of Palestine had not been

accomplished, adopted the policy of Lord Balfour's declaration. The Zionists, however, who do not represent all Jews, have explained some of the elaborate steps they took to bring pressure on the Government, and I have a good deal of information on this subject. They have further hinted not obscurely that the first High Commissioner was their selection. I must assume that the Government, in yielding to this pressure, envisaged some great advantage to the Empire, though I can see only danger.

(3) As Government in Palestine is an autocracy under an Administrator whom you have described as an 'ardent Zionist,' and as important posts are increasingly being conferred upon Jews, I must adhere to my contention that it is, in actual fact, a 'Jewish Government.'

I am sorry that I cannot accept your proposition that a man who has once expressed a mistaken opinion is thereafter debarred from opposing a policy which he has been forced to believe unjust and dangerous. If your principle had held the field in the past, much of our political history would have read differently.

The moral I draw is that it is unwise to be beguiled into any expression of opinion failing time to make a careful study of the question raised. To this unwisdom I have pleaded guilty with extenuating circumstances."

Henry Morgenthau pointed out that leading Jews misrepresented the precise language of the Balfour Declaration, which did not offer to give Palestine to the Jews, but merely expressed support for the idea that Jews might wish to live there under the rule of the indigenous population,

"It is worth while at this point to digress for a moment from my main argument, to point out that the Balfour Declaration is itself not even a compromise. It is a shrewd and cunning delusion. I have been astonished to find that such an intelligent body of American Jews as the Central Conference of American Rabbis should have fallen into a grievous misunderstanding of the purport of the Balfour Declaration. In a resolution adopted by them, they assert that the declaration says: 'Palestine is to be a national home-land for the Jewish people.' Not at all! The actual words of the declaration (I quote from the official text) are: 'His Majesty's Government views with favor the establishment *in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people.*' These two phrases sound alike, but they are really very different. I can make this obvious by an analogy. When I first read the Balfour Declaration I was temporarily making my home in the Plaza Hotel. Therefore I could say with truth: 'My home is in the Plaza Hotel.' I could not say with truth: 'The Plaza Hotel is my home.' If it were 'my home,' I would have the freedom of the whole premises, and could occupy any room in the house with impunity. Quite obviously, however, I would not venture to trespass in the rooms of my friend, Mr. John B. Stanchfield, who happened at the same time also to have found 'a home-land in the Plaza,' nor in the private quarters of any other resident of that hostelry, whose right to his share

in it was as good as mine, and in many cases of much longer standing.”¹⁰⁵¹

5.12 Zionists Declare that Anti-Semitism is the Salvation of the “Jewish Race”

Why would any Jew sponsor Adolf Hitler, or found an anti-Jewish society? After Jewish emancipation, the vast majority of European Jews wanted to assimilate into Western society. Racist Zionist Jews, a small minority in the Jewish community, feared that the “Jewish race” would disappear through the “final solution to the Jewish question” of “assimilation”, or so they stated in their writings and speeches of the Nineteenth Century. The Nazis did not coin the phrase “final solution to the Jewish question”, nor did the Nazis intend it to mean the extermination of the Jews. The Zionists used the expression to refer to the integration of Jews, which process the Zionists loathed. The political Zionists were and are racist segregationists. Both the political Zionists and the Nazis, who were in fact political Zionists, offered an alternative “final solution to the Jewish question” to that of assimilation, one of Jewish segregation in a “World Ghetto”—which is another Zionist phrase.¹⁰⁵² Before the Nazis even came into existence, the political Zionists called for the segregation of Jews into a ghetto.

The “final solution” of extermination was not proposed by a German Nazi, but rather by an American Jew; and it was not the extermination of Jews which he proposed, but the genocide of German Gentiles. Theodor Newman Kaufman advocated the genocidal sterilization of all Germans as a “final solution” in 1941 in his book *Germany Must Perish!*, Argyle Press, Newark, New Jersey, (1941), before the Wannsee-Konferenz occurred.

Kaufman’s book was merely a more modern manifestation of the ancient racist Jewish divine commandment that Jews must exterminate the seed of Esau/Edom/Amalek/Haman (*Deuteronomy* 25:19), lest God exterminate the Jews, themselves; which “race” of Esau came to signify Gentiles in general. I do not touch upon the question of whether and which Nazis did in fact attempt to exterminate European Jews under their control. There certainly was an ancient Jewish tradition that assimilatory Jews must be exterminated. Numerous Jewish prophets called for the genocide of Jews and Gentiles in their pursuit of Jewish world domination and a Messianic Age, when all religions other than Judaism would be suppressed, when all the nations would be destroyed, and when Gentile cattle would serve the Jews as slaves or face certain death.

The political Zionists, Albert Einstein chief racist among them, embraced the myth that anti-Semitism is the salvation of the “Jewish race”, in that it forces Jews to segregate against their will and better natures. Einstein hated non-racist Jews, though he himself had married a non-Jew. At least since Spinoza, prominent Jewish racists have openly stated that anti-Semitism is the only means to preserve the divine race.

Jewish terror organizations have long tried to alienate and terrify Jews, and to promote anti-Semitism as a means to force Jews to flee to Palestine. Jews have often posed as anti-Semites and committed terrorist acts against other Jews in order to frighten them into segregation and emigration. In its article “Zionism”, the *Great*

Soviet Encyclopedia: A Translation of the Third Edition, Volume 23, Macmillan, New York, (1979), pp. 745-746, at 745, wrote,

“After the state of Israel was formed in 1948 on part of Palestine’s territory by a resolution of the United Nations, Zionism became Israel’s official ideology. Its main goals are to secure the unconditional support of Israel by the world’s Jews, to gather the world’s Jews in Israel, and to inculcate a Zionist spirit among Jews in various countries. Zionism seeks to expand Israel to the boundaries of the ‘Greater Land of Israel.’ To this end, Zionists evoke the thesis of ‘eternal anti-Semitism,’ a situation which they often deliberately instigate.”

See also: N. S. Alent’eva, Editor, *Tseli i metody voinstvuiushchego sionizma*, Izd-vo polit. lit-ry, Moskva, (1971). Н. С. Алентьева, Редактор, Цели и методы воинствующего сионизма, Издательство Политической Литературы, Москва, (1971).

Jewish terrorist organizations do not care about the negative repercussions of their vile actions for other Jews should they be found out, because they feel that anti-Semitism benefits their cause of forcing Jews to Israel against their will. They recklessly promote Jewish disloyalty and deceit around the world in the belief that if their deceit is unearthed innocent as well as guilty Jews might be forced to flee to Israel. Victor Ostrovsky wrote in his book *By Way of Deception*,

“The one problem with the system [of sayanim] is that the Mossad does not seem to care how devastating it could be to the status of the Jewish people in the diaspora if it was known. The answer you get if you ask is: ‘So what’s the worst that could happen to those Jews? They’d all come to Israel? Great.’”¹⁰⁵³

Jewish racists helped to put Hitler into power in order to herd up the Jews of Europe and force them into segregation. Jewish racists collaborated with the Nazis to kill off the weakest Jews and preserve the best genetic stock for deportation to Palestine, which could not possibly house the numerous Jews of Europe. Western Jews in general hated Eastern Jews. Political Zionists encouraged the Nazis to force assimilatory Jews, especially Eastern Jews, into segregation. They also encouraged the Soviets towards anti-Semitism in order to leave “red assimilationist” Jews no option but to create a Jewish state in formerly Russian territory, in China, or in Palestine, or face annihilation.

The worst enemy of persons of Jewish descent has always been the Zionist, especially the Zionist in anti-Semite’s clothing. Too many Zionists have carried on, and carried out, the bloodthirsty and treacherous tradition of ancient Jewish racism, which they see as the product of “superior Jewish racial instincts”, and which admonishes Jews to exterminate other Jews who would otherwise assimilate.

Einstein claimed that anti-Semites were correct to believe that Jews exercised undue influence in Germany. Einstein wrote in the *Jüdische Rundschau*, on 21 June

1921, on pages 351-352,

“This phenomenon [*i. e.* Anti-Semitism] in Germany is due to several causes. Partly it originates in the fact that the Jews there exercise an influence over the intellectual life of the German people altogether out of proportion to their number. While, in my opinion, the economic position of the German Jews is very much overrated, the influence of Jews on the Press, in literature, and in science in Germany is very marked, as must be apparent to even the most superficial observer. This accounts for the fact that there are many anti-Semites there who are not really anti-Semitic in the sense of being Jew-haters, and who are honest in their arguments. They regard Jews as of a nationality different from the German, and therefore are alarmed at the increasing Jewish influence on their national entity. [***] But in Germany the judgement of my theory depended on the party politics of the Press[.]¹⁰⁵⁴

Einstein also stated,

“The way I see it, the fact of the Jews’ racial peculiarity will necessarily influence their social relations with non-Jews. The conclusions which—in my opinion—the Jews should draw is to become more aware of their peculiarity in their social way of life and to recognize their own cultural contributions. First of all, they would have to show a certain noble reservedness and not be so eager to mix socially—of which others want little or nothing. On the other hand, anti-Semitism in Germany also has consequences that, from a Jewish point of view, should be welcomed. I believe German Jewry owes its continued existence to anti-Semitism.”¹⁰⁵⁵

Nazi Zionist Joseph Goebbels, sounding very much like political Zionist Albert Einstein, was quoted in *The New York Times*, on 29 September 1933, on page 10,

“It must be remembered the Jews of Germany were exercising at that time a decisive influence on the whole intellectual life; that they were absolute and unlimited masters of the press, literature, the theatre and the motion pictures, and in large cities such as Berlin, 75 percent of the members of the medical and legal professions were Jews; that they made public opinion, exercised a decisive influence on the Stock Exchange and were the rulers of Parliament and its parties.”

Einstein had a reputation as a rabid anti-assimilationist, which is to say that Einstein was a rabid racist segregationist. On 15 March 1921, Kurt Blumenfeld wrote to Chaim Weizmann,

“Einstein [***] is interested in our cause most strongly because of his revulsion from assimilatory Jewry.”¹⁰⁵⁶

Einstein expressed his virulently segregationist viewpoint in 1921,

“To deny the Jew’s nationality in the Diaspora is, indeed, deplorable. If one adopts the point of view of confining Jewish ethnical nationalism to Palestine, then one, to all intents and purposes, denies the existence of a Jewish people. In that case one should have the courage to carry through, in the quickest and most complete manner, entire assimilation. We live in a time of intense and perhaps exaggerated nationalism. But my Zionism does not exclude in me cosmopolitan views. I believe in the actuality of Jewish nationality, and I believe that every Jew has duties towards his coreligionists. [***] [T]he principal point is that Zionism must tend to strengthen the dignity and self-respect of the Jews in the Diaspora. I have always been annoyed by the undignified assimilationist cravings and strivings which I have observed in so many of my friends.”¹⁰⁵⁷

In 1921, Einstein declared, referring to Eastern European Jews,

“These men and women retain a healthy national feeling; it has not yet been destroyed by the process of atomisation and dispersion.”¹⁰⁵⁸

On 1 July 1921, Einstein was quoted in the *Jüdische Rundschau* on page 371,

“Let us take brief look at the *development of German Jews* over the last hundred years. With few exceptions, one hundred years ago our forefathers still lived in the Ghetto. They were poor and separated from the Gentiles by a wall of religious tradition, secular lifestyles and statutory confinement and were confined in their spiritual development to their own literature, only relatively weakly influenced by the forceful progress which intellectual life in Europe had undergone in the Renaissance. However, these little noticed, modestly living people had one thing over us: *Every one of them belonged with all his heart to a community*, into which he was incorporated, in which he felt a worthwhile member, in which nothing was asked of him which conflicted with his normal processes of thought. Our forefathers of that era were pretty pathetic both bodily and spiritually, but—in social relations—in an enviable state of mental equilibrium. Then came emancipation. It offered undreamt of opportunities for advancement. The isolated individual quickly found their way into the upper financial and social circles of society. They eagerly absorbed the great achievements of art and science which the Occidentals¹⁰⁵⁹ had created. They contributed to the development with passionate affection, and themselves made contributions of lasting value. They thereby took on the lifestyle of the Gentile world, turning away from their religious and social traditions in growing masses—took on Gentile customs, manners and mentality. It appeared as if they were being completely dissolved into the numerically superior, politically and culturally better organized host peoples, such that no trace of them would be left after

a few generations. The complete eradication of the Jewish nationality in Middle and Western Europe appeared to be inevitable. However, it didn't turn out that way. It appears that racially distinct nations have instincts which work against interbreeding. The adaptation of the Jews to the European peoples among whom they have lived in language, customs and indeed even partially in religious practices *was unable to eliminate all feelings of foreignness* which exist between Jews and their European host peoples. In short, this spontaneous feeling of foreignness is ultimately due to a loss of energy.¹⁰⁶⁰ For this reason, *not even well-meant arguments can eradicate it*. Nationalities do not want to be mixed together, rather they want to go their own separate ways. A state of peace can only be achieved by mutual tolerance and respect.”

Einstein stated that Jews should not participate in the German Government,

“I regretted the fact that [Rathenau] became a Minister. In view of the attitude which large numbers of the educated classes in Germany assume towards the Jews, I have always thought that their natural conduct in public should be one of proud reserve.”¹⁰⁶¹

Einstein merely parroted the Zionist Party line. Werner E. Mosse wrote,

“While the leaders of the CV saw it as their special duty to represent the interests of the German Jews in the active political struggle, Zionism stood for. . . systematic Jewish non-participation in German public life. It rejected as a matter of principle any participation in the struggle led by the CV.”¹⁰⁶²

The Jewish Central-Verein fought against Nazi racism, while many Zionists embraced it. In 1925, Einstein wrote in the official Zionist Party organ *Jüdische Rundschau*,

“By study of their past, by a better understanding of the spirit [Geist] that accords with their race, they must learn to know anew the mission that they are capable of fulfilling. [***] What one must be thankful to Zionism for is the fact that it is the only movement that has given many Jews a justified pride, that it has once again given a despairing race the necessary faith, if I may so express myself, given new flesh to an exhausted people.”¹⁰⁶³

On 12 October 1929, Albert Einstein wrote to the *Manchester Guardian*,

“In the re-establishment of the Jewish nation in the ancient home of the race, where Jewish spiritual values could again be developed in a Jewish atmosphere, the most enlightened representatives of Jewish individuality see the essential preliminary to the regeneration of the race and the setting free of its spiritual creativeness.”¹⁰⁶⁴

Einstein's public racism eventually waned, but he continued to publicly express his segregationist philosophy in the same terms as anti-Semites, as well as his belief that Jews "thived on" and owed their "continued existence" to anti-Semitism.

Einstein stated in December of 1930 to an American audience,

"There is something indefinable which holds the Jews together. Race does not make much for solidarity. Here in America you have many races, and yet you have the solidarity. Race is not the cause of the Jews' solidarity, nor is their religion. It is something else—which is indefinable."¹⁰⁶⁵

Einstein's confusing public statement perhaps resulted from his desire to promote multi-culturalism in America, which had the benefit of freeing up Jewish immigration to the United States.¹⁰⁶⁶ Einstein was also likely parroting, or trying to parrot, a fellow anti-assimilationist political Zionist whose pamphlet was well known in America, Solomon Schechter and his *Zionism: A Statement*, Federation of American Zionists, New York, (1906), in which Schechter states, among other things, "Zionism is an ideal, and as such is indefinable."¹⁰⁶⁷

Einstein stated in 1938,

"JUST WHAT IS A JEW?"

The formation of groups has an invigorating effect in all spheres of human striving, perhaps mostly due to the struggle between the convictions and aims represented by the different groups. The Jews, too, form such a group with a definite character of its own, and anti-Semitism is nothing but the antagonistic attitude produced in the non-Jews by the Jewish group. This is a normal social reaction. But for the political abuse resulting from it, it might never have been designated by a special name.

What are the characteristics of the Jewish group? What, in the first place, is a Jew? There are no quick answers to this question. The most obvious answer would be the following: A Jew is a person professing the Jewish faith. The superficial character of this answer is easily recognized by means of a simple parallel. Let us ask the question: What is a snail? An answer similar in kind to the one given above might be: A snail is an animal inhabiting a snail shell. This answer is not altogether incorrect; nor, to be sure, is it exhaustive; for the snail shell happens to be but one of the material products of the snail. Similarly, the Jewish faith is but one of the characteristic products of the Jewish community. It is, furthermore, known that a snail can shed its shell without thereby ceasing to be a snail. The Jew who abandons his faith (in the formal sense of the word) is in a similar position. He remains a Jew.

[***]

WHERE OPPRESSION IS A STIMULUS

[***]

Perhaps even more than on its own tradition, the Jewish group has thrived on oppression and on the antagonism it has forever met in the world. Here

undoubtedly lies one of the main reasons for its continued existence through so many thousands of years.”¹⁰⁶⁸

Albert Einstein was parroting racist political Zionist leader Theodor Herzl, who wrote in his book *The Jewish State*,

“Oppression and persecution cannot exterminate us. No nation on earth has survived such struggles and sufferings as we have gone through. Jew-baiting has merely stripped off our weaklings; the strong among us were invariably true to their race when persecution broke out against them. This attitude was most clearly apparent in the period immediately following the emancipation of the Jews. Later on, those who rose to a higher degree of intelligence and to a better worldly position lost their communal feeling to a very great extent. Wherever our political well-being has lasted for any length of time, we have assimilated with our surroundings. I think this is not discreditable. Hence, the statesman who would wish to see a Jewish strain in his nation would have to provide for the duration of our political well-being; and even Bismarck could not do that. [***] The Governments of all countries scourged by Anti-Semitism will serve their own interests in assisting us to obtain the sovereignty we want. [***] Great exertions will not be necessary to spur on the movement. Anti-Semites provide the requisite impetus. They need only do what they did before, and then they will create a love of emigration where it did not previously exist, and strengthen it where it existed before. [***] I imagine that Governments will, either voluntarily or under pressure from the Anti-Semites, pay certain attention to this scheme; and they may perhaps actually receive it here and there with a sympathy which they will also show to the Society of Jews.”¹⁰⁶⁹

Einstein went along with the crowd of prominent political Zionists who openly stated that anti-Semitism is welcomed, encouraged and useful to the Zionists. They based their belief on Spinoza’s declaration that emancipation leads to assimilation and that the Jews only exist in modern times because of anti-Semitism. Prominent Zionist and author of the *Encyclopaedia Judaica; das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Jakob Klatzkin stated in 1925,

“The national viewpoint taught us to understand the true nature of antisemitism, and this understanding widens the horizons of our national outlook. [***] In the age of enlightenment antisemitism was included among the phenomena that are likely to disappear along with other forms of prejudice and iniquity. The antisemites, so the rule stated, were the laggard elements in the march of progress. Hence, our fate is dependent on the advance of human culture, and its victory is our victory. [***] In the period of Zionism, we learned that antisemitism was a psychic-social phenomenon that derives from our existence as a nation within a nation. Hence, it cannot change, until we attain our national end. But if Zionism had fully understood

its own implications, it would have arrived, not merely as a psycho-sociological explanation of this phenomenon, but also as a justification of it. It is right to protest against its crude expressions, but we are unjust to it and distort its nature so long as we do not recognize that essentially it is a defense of the integrity of a nation, in whose throat we are stuck, neither to be swallowed nor to be expelled. [***] And when we are unjust to this phenomenon, we are unfair to our own people. If we do not admit the rightfulness of antisemitism, we deny the rightfulness of our own nationalism. If our people is deserving and willing to live its own national life, then it is an alien body thrust into the nations among whom it lives, an alien body that insists on its own distinctive identity, reducing the domain of their life. It is right, therefore, that they should fight against us for their national integrity. [***] Know this, that it is a good sign for us that the nations of the world combat us. It is proof that our national image is not yet utterly blurred, our alienism is still felt. If the war against us should cease or be weakened, it would indicate that our image has become indistinct and our alienism softened. We shall not obtain equality of rights anywhere save at the price of an explicit or implied declaration that we are no longer a national body, but part of the body of the host-nation; or that we are willing to assimilate and become part of it. [***] Instead of establishing societies for defense against the antisemites, who want to reduce our rights, we should establish societies for defense against our friends who desire to defend our rights. [***] When Moses came to redeem the children of Israel, their leaders said to him, ‘You have made our odor evil in the eyes of Pharaoh and in the eyes of his servants, giving them a sword with which to kill us.’ Nevertheless, Moses persisted in worsening the situation of the people, and he saved them.”¹⁰⁷⁰

Karl Kautsky predicted that the Jews would disappear due to their assimilation following World War I. The First World War, which the Zionists planned would fulfill their dream of a Jewish state, instead rendered it obsolete, and they were the only group that had a vested interest in promoting discord in Europe, anti-Semitism and the segregation and expulsion of Jews. Others had learned that the emigration of large numbers of Jews from their country resulted in economic hardship. The Zionists unwisely promised profits for all from racism directed against Jews.

Albert Einstein’s anti-assimilationist beliefs hailed from an ancient tradition. Simon Dubnow wrote in 1905,

“Assimilation is common treason against the banner and ideals of the Jewish people. [***] But one can never ‘become’ a member of a natural group, such as a family, a tribe, or a nation. One may attain the rights or privileges of citizenship with a foreign nation, but one cannot appropriate for himself its nationality too. To be sure, the emancipated Jew in France calls himself a Frenchman of Jewish faith. Would that mean, however, that he became a part of the French nation, confessing to the Jewish faith? Not at all. Because, in

order to be a member of the French nation one must be a Frenchman by birth, one must be able to trace his genealogy back to the Gauls, or to another race in close kinship with them, and finally one must also possess those characteristics which are the result of the historic evolution of the French nation. A Jew, on the other hand, even if he happened to be born in France and still lives there, in spite of all this, he remains a member of the Jewish nation, and whether he likes it or not, whether he is aware or unaware of it, he bears the seal of the historic evolution of the Jewish nation.”¹⁰⁷¹

Long before the First World War, Voltaire stated in the end of Chapter 104 of his *Essai sur les Moeurs et l’Esprit des Nations, et sur les Principaux faits de l’Histoire Depuis Charlemagne Jusqu’à Louis XIII*, (1769); that should Gentiles—in Voltaire’s view—become wise to the ways of Jews and prevent Jews from exploiting them, then rich Jews would abandon their religious superstitions and assimilate and the poor Jews would become thieves like Gypsies. According to Voltaire, whose work was well known, Jews would disappear through assimilation.¹⁰⁷²

The emancipation of Jews in Bolshevik lands, and the assimilation of affluent Jews in capitalistic societies, greatly concerned the Zionists, who feared it would be the end of all Jews. Before Voltaire, Spinoza noted that assimilation was causing the Jewish ethnicity to disappear. After Voltaire, Wellhausen, relying on Spinoza’s observations, noted that emancipation was leading the Jews to assimilate and therefore to disappear—a fact that terrified the Zionists, many of whom were hypocrites who had themselves married Gentiles. Julius Wellhausen wrote in 1881,

“The Jews, through their having on the one hand separated themselves, and on the other hand been excluded on religious grounds from the Gentiles, gained an internal solidarity and solidity which has hitherto enabled them to survive all the attacks of time. The hostility of the Middle Ages involved them in no danger; the greatest peril has been brought upon them by modern times, along with permission and increasing inducements to abandon their separate position. It is worth while to recall on this point the opinion of Spinoza, [Footnote: *Tract. Theol. Polit.* 0. 4, *ad fin.*] who was well able to form a competent judgment :—‘That the Jews have maintained themselves so long in spite of their dispersed and disorganised condition is not at all to be wondered at, when it is considered how they separated themselves from all other nationalities in such a way as to bring upon themselves the hatred of all, and that not only by external rites contrary to those of other nations, but also by the sign of circumcision, which they maintain most religiously. Experience shows that their conservation is due in a great degree to the very hatred which they have incurred. When the king of Spain compelled the Jews either to accept the national religion or to go into banishment, very many of them accepted the Roman Catholic faith, and in virtue of this received all the privileges of Spanish subjects, and were declared eligible for every honour; the consequence was that a process of absorption began immediately, and in a short time neither trace nor memory of them survived. Quite different was

the history of those whom the king of Portugal compelled to accept the creed of his nation; although converted, they continued to live apart from the rest of their fellow-subjects, having been declared unfit for any dignity. So great importance do I attach to the sign of circumcision also in this connection, that I am persuaded that it is sufficient by itself to maintain the separate existence of the nation for ever.' The persistency of the race may, of course, prove a harder thing to overcome than Spinoza has supposed; but nevertheless he will be found to have spoken truly in declaring that the so-called emancipation of the Jews must inevitably lead to the extinction of Judaism wherever the process is extended beyond the political to the social sphere. For the accomplishment of this centuries may be required."¹⁰⁷³

Spinoza's observations are antedated by Biblical writings, which tell that God will punish assimilated Jews and pious Jews to remind all of Israel that God is a Jew. God punishes them with the sword and with fire and renders them ash. The punishment of assimilatory Jews through murderous anti-Semitism in order to drive them back to God is perhaps most strongly advocated in the books of *Deuteronomy* and *Ezekiel*, and in *Malachi* 4:1-6 it states,

"1 For, behold, the day cometh, that *shall* burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the LORD of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. 2 But unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall. 3 And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I *shall* do *this*, saith the LORD of hosts. 4 Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, *with* the statutes and judgments. 5 Behold, I *will* send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the LORD: 6 And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth *with* a curse."

Long before the Holocaust, some authors¹⁰⁷⁴ cited *Exodus* 1:11-12 and *Exodus* 3:2 as instances where persecution benefitted the Jews and increased their numbers,

"1:11 Therefore they did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses. 1:12 But the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew. And they were grieved because of the children of Israel. [***] 3:2 And the angel of the LORD appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed."

Jewish Zionists Theodor Herzl and Albert Einstein concluded that anti-Semitism

was a good and useful thing, in that it forced Jews towards Zionism and segregation. Spiritual Zionist Ahad Ha-Am noted that Western Zionists thrived on anti-Semitism, because their racist political Zionism is “a product of anti-Semitism, and is dependent on anti-Semitism for its existence[.]”¹⁰⁷⁵

Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann wrote to Ha-Am in mid-December, 1914,

“I pointed out to [Balfour] that we too are in agreement with the cultural antisemites, in so far as we believe that Germans of the Mosaic faith are an undesirable, demoralizing phenomenon, but that we totally disagree with [Cosima] Wagner and [Houston Stewart] Chamberlain as to the diagnosis and the prognosis; and I also said that, after all, all these Jews have taken part in building Germany, contributing much to her greatness, as other Jews have to the greatness of France and England, at the expense of the whole Jewish people, whose sufferings increase in proportion to ‘the withdrawal’ from that people of the creative elements which are absorbed into the surrounding communities—those same communities later reproaching us for this *absorption*, and reacting with antisemitism.”¹⁰⁷⁶

Even after obtaining the Balfour Declaration in exchange for bringing America into the war on the side of Great Britain, the Zionists faced a seemingly insurmountable challenge after the First World War. The vast majority of Jews did not want to segregate, much less steal the Palestinian’s land and move to the desert. The question prompts itself, to what extent did the Zionists promote the anti-Semitism of the Holocaust, which ultimately led to formation of the State of Israel?

Israel Zangwill, in consort with many other Zionists—including Einstein, stated in 1914,

“But if from the Gentile point of view the Jewish problem is an artificial creation, there is a very real Jewish problem from the Jewish point of view—a problem which grows in exact proportion to the diminution of the artificial problem. Orthodox Judaism in the diaspora cannot exist except in a Ghetto, whether imposed from without or evolved from within. Rigidly professing Jews cannot enter the general social life and the professions. Jews *qua* Jews were better off in the Dark Ages, living as chattels of the king under his personal protection and to his private profit, or in the ages when they were confined in Ghettos. Even in the Russian Pale a certain measure of autonomy still exists. It is emancipation that brings the ‘Jewish Problem.’ It is precisely in Italy with its Jewish Prime Minister and its Jewish Syndic of Rome that this problem is most acute. The Saturday Sabbath imposes economic limitations even when the State has abolished them. As Shylock pointed out, his race cannot eat or drink with the Gentile. Indeed, social intercourse would lead to intermarriage. Unless Judaism is reformed it is, in the language of Heine, a misfortune, and if it is reformed, it cannot logically confine its teachings to the Hebrew race, which, lacking the normal protection of a territory, must be swallowed up by its proselytes. [***] Nor

is there anywhere in the Jewish world of to-day any centripetal force to counteract these universal tendencies to dissipation. The religion is shattered into as many fragments as the race. After the fall of Jerusalem the Academy of Jabneh carried on the authoritative tradition of the *Sanhedrin*. In the Middle Ages there was the *Asefah* or Synod to unify Jews under Judaism. From the middle of the sixteenth to the middle of the eighteenth century, the *Waad* or Council of Four Lands legislated almost autonomously in those Central European regions where the mass of the Jews of the world was then congregated. To-day there is no center of authority, whether religious or political. Reform itself is infinitely individual, and nothing remains outside a few centers of congestion but a chaos of dissolving views and dissolving communities, saved from utter disappearance by persecution and racial sympathy. The notion that Jewish interests are Jesuitically federated or that Jewish financiers use their power for Jewish ends is one of the most ironic of myths. No Jewish people or nation now exists, no Jews even as sectarians of a specific faith with a specific center of authority such as Catholics or Wesleyans possess; nothing but a multitude of individuals, a mob hopelessly amorphous, divided alike in religion and political destiny. There is no common platform from which the Jews can be addressed, no common council to which any appeal can be made. Their only unity is negative—that unity imposed by the hostile hereditary vision of the ubiquitous Haman. [***] The labors of Hercules sink into child's play beside the task the late Dr. Herzl set himself in offering to this flotsam and jetsam of history the project of political reorganization on a single soil. But even had this dauntless idealist secured co-operation instead of bitter hostility from the denaturalized leaders of all these Jewries, the attempt to acquire Palestine would have had the opposition of Turkey and of the 600,000 Arabs in possession. It is little wonder that since the great leader's lamentable death, Zionism—again with that idealization of impotence—has sunk back into a cultural movement which instead of ending the Exile is to unify it through the Hebrew tongue and nationalist sentiment. But for such unification, a religious revival would have been infinitely more efficacious: race alone cannot survive the pressure of so many hostile milieux—or still more parlous—so many friendly. [***] In the diaspora anti-Semitism will always be the shadow of Semitism. The law of dislike for the unlike will always prevail. And whereas the unlike is normally situated at a safe distance, the Jews bring the unlike into the heart of every milieu and must thus defend a frontier-line as large as the world. The fortunes of war vary in every country, but there is a perpetual tension and friction even at the most peaceful points, which tend to throw back the race on itself. The drastic method of love—the only human dissolvent—has never been tried upon the Jew as a whole, and Russia carefully conserves—even by a ring fence—the breed she designs to destroy. But whether persecution extirpates or brotherhood melts, hate or love can never be simultaneous throughout the diaspora, and so there will probably always be a nucleus from which to restock this eternal type. But what a melancholy

immortality! ‘To be *and* not to be’—that is a question beside which Hamlet’s alternative is crude. [***] But abolition of the Pale and the introduction of Jewish equality will be the deadliest blow ever aimed at Jewish nationality. Very soon a fervid Russian patriotism will reign in every Ghetto and the melting-up of the race will begin. But this absorption of the five million Jews into the other hundred and fifty millions of Russia constitutes the Jewish half of the problem. It is the affair of the Jews. [***] Moreover, while as already pointed out the Jewish upper classes are, if anything, inferior to the classes into which they are absorbed, the marked superiority of the Jewish masses to their environment, especially in Russia, would render *their* absorption a tragic degeneration.”¹⁰⁷⁷

As early as 1903, Zangwill wrote,

“At present, though orthodox rabbis are working amicably with ultra-modern thinkers, the movement is political, and more indebted to the pressure of the external forces of persecution than to internal energy and enkindlement. [***] Apart from its political working, Zionism forces upon the Jew a question the Jew hates to face. Without a rallying centre, geographical or spiritual; without a Synhedrion; without any principle of unity or of political action; without any common standpoint about the old Book; without the old cement of dictory laws and traditional ceremonies; without even ghetto walls built by his friend the enemy, it is impossible for Israel to persist further, except by a miracle—of stupidity. It is a wretched thing for a people to be saved only by its persecutors or its fools. As a religion, Judaism has still magnificent possibilities, but the time has come when it must be denationalized or renationalized.”¹⁰⁷⁸

In 1914, Zionist Joseph Chaim Brenner stated that Jews owed their survival to anti-Semitism, a thought echoed by Albert Einstein,

“Then they come and tell us: All praise to our history of martyrdom! All praise to the martyr-people who suffered everything and yet survived despite all persecution, all oppression by authorities, and all hatred of the people. But here, too, who can tell us what might have happened if not for the oppression and the hatred? Who can tell us whether, had there been no universal and understandable hatred of such a strange being, the Jew, that strange being would have survived at all? But the hatred was inevitable, and hence survival was equally inevitable! A form of survival such as befits that kind of being, survival with no struggle for worldly things (apart from those familiar livelihoods by which we live a dog’s or a loan-shark’s life) but, of course, full of martyrdom for the sake of the world-to-come, yes, certainly, in the name of the Kingdom of Heaven. [***] The expulsions and the ghettos—these assured our survival. [***] History! History! But what has history to tell? It can tell that wherever the majority population, by some

fluke, did not hate the Jews among them, the Jews immediately started aping them in everything, gave in on everything, and mustered the last of their meager strength to be like everyone else. Even when the yoke of ghetto weighed most heavily upon them—how many broke through the walls? How many lost all self-respect in the face of the culture and beautiful way of life of the others! How many envied the others! How many yearned to approach them!”¹⁰⁷⁹

Before the Holocaust, political Zionists warned assimilatory Jewry that the Holocaust was coming, then political Zionists encouraged it. While the Holocaust was occurring, political Zionists rejoiced in the fact that the prophecies were being fulfilled and gloated over their warnings, which were made good by their own actions. It is some magician who holds up a cup of blood, predicts that it will spill, and then deliberately pours it onto the ground. After the Holocaust, Jewish and Christian Zionists poured blame on assimilatory Jewry for the demise of the Jews in Europe the Zionists had deliberately caused.¹⁰⁸⁰ The Zionists had a road map to Jerusalem in the book of *Ezekiel*, and the road was paved by Hitler. *Ezekiel* 20:30-49:

“30 Wherefore say unto the house of Israel, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Are ye polluted after the manner of your fathers? and commit ye whoredom after their abominations? 31 For when ye offer your gifts, when ye make your sons to pass through the fire, ye pollute yourselves with all your idols, even unto this day: and shall I be enquired of by you, O house of Israel? As I live, saith the Lord GOD, I will not be enquired of by you. 32 And that which cometh into your mind shall not be at all, that ye say, We will be as the heathen, as the families of the countries, to serve wood and stone. 33 As I live, saith the Lord GOD, surely with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out, will I rule over you: 34 And I will bring you out from the people, and will gather you out of the countries wherein ye are scattered, with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out. 35 And I will bring you into the wilderness of the people, and there will I plead with you face to face. 36 Like as I pleaded with your fathers in the wilderness of the land of Egypt, so will I plead with you, saith the Lord GOD. 37 And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the covenant: 38 And I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against me: I will bring them forth out of the country where they sojourn, and they shall not enter into the land of Israel: and ye shall know that I *am* the LORD. 39 As for you, O house of Israel, thus saith the Lord GOD; Go ye, serve ye every one his idols, and hereafter *also*, if ye will not hearken unto me: but pollute ye my holy name no more with your gifts, and with your idols. 40 For in mine holy mountain, in the mountain of the height of Israel, saith the Lord GOD, there shall all the house of Israel, all of them in the land, serve me: there will I accept them, and there will I require your offerings, and the firstfruits of your oblations, with all your holy things. 41 I will accept you with your sweet savour, when I bring

you out from the people, and gather you out of the countries wherein ye have been scattered; and I will be sanctified in you before the heathen. 42 And ye shall know that I *am* the LORD, when I shall bring you into the land of Israel, into the country *for* the which I lifted up mine hand to give it to your fathers. 43 And there shall ye remember your ways, and all your doings, wherein ye have been defiled; and ye shall lothe yourselves in your own sight for all your evils that ye have committed. 44 And ye shall know that I *am* the LORD when I have wrought with you for my name's sake, not according to your wicked ways, nor according to your corrupt doings, O ye house of Israel, saith the Lord GOD. 45 Moreover the word of the LORD came unto me, saying, 46 Son of man, set thy face toward the south, and *drop thy* word toward the south, and prophesy against the forest of the south field; 47 And say to the forest of the south, Hear the word of the LORD; Thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I will kindle a fire in thee, and it shall devour every green tree in thee, and every dry tree: the flaming flame shall not be quenched, and all faces from the south to the north shall be burned therein. 48 And all flesh shall see that I the LORD have kindled it: it shall not be quenched. 49 Then said I, Ah Lord GOD! they say of me, Doth he not speak parables?"

Ezekiel 21:31-32,

"31 And I will pour out mine indignation upon thee, I will blow against thee in the fire of my wrath, and deliver thee into the hand of brutish men, *and* skilful to destroy. 32 Thou shalt be for fuel to the fire; thy blood shall be in the midst of the land; thou shalt be no *more* remembered: for I the LORD have spoken it."

Ezekiel 28:18, 25,

"18 Thou hast defiled thy sanctuaries by the multitude of thine iniquities, by the iniquity of thy traffick; therefore will I bring forth a fire from the midst of thee, it shall devour thee, and I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all them that behold thee. [***] 25 Thus saith the Lord GOD; When I shall have gathered the house of Israel from the people among whom they are scattered, and shall be sanctified in them in the sight of the heathen, then shall they dwell in their land that I have given to my servant Jacob."

The political Zionists relied upon the hope that anti-Semitism would tend to force Jews into unity and segregation, and away from assimilation. Even after the nation of Israel was founded, the Israelis have been fighting a demographic battle for existence, which they believe compels them to propagandize for immigration.¹⁰⁸¹ Even today, the demographics of the Moslem versus Jewish populations in the region of Israel cause some to provoke international anti-Semitism, or to exaggerate the appearance of anti-Semitism, or to stage anti-Semitic incidents in order to persuade

more Jews to emigrate to Israel. It was only after the horrors of the Holocaust—shortly after—that the Jewish-State became a reality—after two-thousand years of failed attempts.

Again, the question prompts itself, to what extent did the Zionists promote the anti-Semitism of Fascism and Communism, which ultimately led to formation of the State of Israel? It was already clear to Jewish leaders in 1901, that the Zionists were threatening fellow Jews with a holocaust and were working with anti-Semites to make it happen,

“Now behold Satan has come and confused the world. There are threats from the leaders of the Zionists that a powerful danger is lurking behind our walls and that the power of the enemies of Israel is prevailing—Heaven forbid. It is therefore all the more incumbent upon us to protect ourselves from confusing the masses of the people. Everyone who has a brain in his skull will realize that the Zionists, through their nonsensical writings, will only increase hostility; if they continue in their brazenness to spread the libel that we are in revolt against the peoples and that we are a danger to the lands in which we reside, then their evil prophecy will be fulfilled—Heaven forbid. [***] A thick cloak rests over the eyes of the leaders of the Zionists. Only owing to their lack of faith and absence of belief in God do they fail to realize the extent of the danger involved in their promises to the masses of the peoples among whom we live, of all the delights of the world provided they give aid to the Zionists. They even urge them to expel Jews from their midst and every sensible person will realize the help which they are giving to the enemies of Israel.”¹⁰⁸²

In 1896, Theodor Herzl wrote his book *The Jewish State*,

“Great exertions will not be necessary to spur on the movement. Anti-Semites provide the requisite impetus. They need only do what they did before, and then they will create a love of emigration where it did not previously exist, and strengthen it where it existed before. [***] I imagine that Governments will, either voluntarily or under pressure from the Anti-Semites, pay certain attention to this scheme; and they may perhaps actually receive it here and there with a sympathy which they will also show to the Society of Jews.”¹⁰⁸³

Most Jews had no desire to colonize Palestine until after the Holocaust, and even then only very few of the Jews who had themselves suffered the Holocaust elected to move to Palestine after the Second World War and most of that few were forced, in one way or another, to do so.

“Christian” Zionists who were hoping for the Apocalypse also saw anti-Semitism as a good and useful thing, in that it forced Jews towards Zionism and segregation. Christian Zionist William Blackstone, who was praying for the end times when the anti-Christ would come and when Jews would be destroyed, wrote in a very popular

book *Jesus Is Coming* in 1908,

“The anti-semitic agitations in Germany, Austria and France, and the fierce persecutions in Russia and Roumania, have stirred up the Jews of the world as the eagle doth her nest. Deut. 32:11.

[***]

The Universelle Israelite Alliance was organized in Paris in 1860, and later the Anglo-Jewish Association in England. Through these powerful organizations the Jews can make themselves felt throughout the world. And now, within a few years, there have been organized Chovevi (lovers of) Zion and Shova (colonizers of) Zion societies, mostly among the orthodox Jews of Russia, Roumania, Germany, and even in England and the United States. This is really the first practical effort they have made to regain their home in Palestine.

In a few words, followers of the status quo are striving to reconcile the genius of Judaism with the requirements of modern times, and in Western Europe are in a great majority.

The Reformed Jews or Neologists have rapidly thrown away their faith in the inspiration of the Scriptures. They have flung to the wind all national and Messianic hopes. Their Rabbis preach rapturously about the mission of Judaism, while joining with the most radical higher critics in the destruction of its very basis, the inspiration of the Word of God. Some have gone clear over into agnosticism.

Strange to say, from these agnostics now comes the other wing of the Zionist party. And not only have they joined this party, but they furnished the leaders, viz.: Dr. Max Nordau of Paris, and Dr. Theodore Herzl of Vienna.

The orthodox Jews who have enlisted under the Zionist banner, are animated by the most devout religious motives. But the agnostics aver that this is not a religious movement at all. It is purely economic and nationalistic. Dr. Herzl, its founder and principal leader, espoused it as a *dernier resort*, to escape the persecutions of anti-semitism, which has taken such a firm hold of the masses of the Austrian people. He conceived the idea that if the Jews could regain Palestine and establish a government, even under the suzerainty of the Sultan, it would give them a national standing which would expunge anti-semitism from the other nations of the world, and make it possible for all Jews to live comfortably in any nation they may desire.

Not all the orthodox Jews have joined this movement. Indeed, the leaders of the Chovevi Zion Societies hold aloof.

The call, issued by Dr. Herzl, for the Zionist Congress, held in Basle, Switzerland in 1897 met with severe opposition from the German Rabbis and also a large portion of the Jewish press, as well as the mass of rich reformed Jews. Nevertheless, over 200 delegates, from all over Europe and the Orient and some from the United States, met and carried through the program of the congress with tremendous enthusiasm.

Memorials, approving the object of the congress, came in from all

sections, signed by tens of thousands of Jews.

The congress elected a central committee and authorized the raising of \$50,000,000 capital.

It has certainly marked a wonderful innovation in the attitude of the Jews and a closer gathering of the dry bones of Ezekiel.

And now, after ten years of wonderful growth and progress it remains to be seen what the providential openings in the Ottoman Empire may be that shall give opportunity to realize its object.

Zionism is now the subject of the most acrimonious debate among the Jews. Many of the orthodox criticise it as an attempt to seize the prerogatives of their God.

While others say that God will not work miracles to accomplish that which they can do themselves.

Most of the reformed Jews, now that they can no longer ridicule the movement, decry it, as an egregious blunder that will increase instead of diminishing anti-semitism.

They have no desire to return to Palestine. They are like the man in Kansas, who, in a revival meeting said he did not want to go to heaven, nor did he wish to go to hell but he said he wanted to stay right there in Kansas.

Just so these reformed Jews are content to renounce all the prophesied glory of a Messianic kingdom in the land of their ancestors, preferring the palatial homes and gathered riches which they have acquired in Western Europe and the United States. They coolly advise their persecuted brethren, in Russia, Roumania, Persia and North Africa, to patiently endure their grievous persecutions until anti-semitism shall die out.

But these brethren retort that their prudent advisers would think very differently if they lived in Morocco or Russia, and that even in Western Europe anti-semitism instead of dying out, is rather on the increase.

In the midst of these disputes, the Zionists have seized the reins and eschewing the help of Abraham's God they have accepted agnostics as leaders and are plunging madly into this scheme for the erection of a Godless state.

But the Bible student will surely say, this godless national gathering of Israel is not the fulfilment of the glorious divine restoration, so glowingly described by the prophets.

No, indeed! Let it be carefully noted that while God has repeatedly promised to gather Israel, with such a magnificent display of *His* miraculous power, that it shall no more be said, 'The Lord liveth that brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but the Lord liveth, that brought up the children of Israel from the land of the north and from all the lands whither he had driven them,' Jer. 16:14; yet has He also said, 'Gather yourselves together, yea, gather together, O nation that hath no longing, before the decree bring forth, before the day pass as the chaff, before the fierce anger of the Lord come upon you.' Zeph. 2:1, 2. Could this prophecy be more literally fulfilled than by this present Zionist movement?

One of the speakers at the first congress said of the Sultan, 'If His majesty will now receive us, we will accept Him as our Messiah.'

God says, 'Ye have sold yourselves for nought and ye shall be redeemed without money.' Isa. 52:3.

But Dr. Herzl is reported to have said, 'We must buy our way back to Palestine, salvation is to be by money.'

What a sign is this that the end of this dispensation is near.

If it stood alone we might well give heed to it. But when we find it supported by all these other signs, set forth in the Word, how can we refuse to believe it?

Shall we Christians condemn the Jews for not accepting the cumulative evidence that Jesus is the Messiah; and ourselves refuse this other cumulative evidence that His second coming is near?

It is significant that this first Zionist congress assembled just 1,260 years after the capture of Jerusalem by the Mohammedans in A. D. 637. Dan. 12:7.

It is probable that 'the times of the Gentiles' are nearing their end, and that the nations are soon to plunge into the mighty whirl of events connected with Israel's godless gathering, 'Jacob's trouble' (Jer. 30:6, 7), that awful time of tribulation, like which there has been none in the past, nor shall be in the future. Mat. 24:21.

But we, brethren, are not of the night. We are to watch and pray always that we may escape all these things that shall come to pass and stand before the Son of Man. Lu. 21:36.

Oh! glorious Hope. No wonder the Spirit and the Bride say come. No wonder the Bridegroom saith, 'Surely I come quickly,' and shall not we all join with the enraptured apostle,

'Even so come, Lord Jesus?'"¹⁰⁸⁴

The belief among some Jews that anti-Semitism has had beneficial consequences is not dead. In a work which is yet to be released, but which has been reviewed, *The Paradox of Anti-Semitism*, Continuum International Publishing Group, (2006), Rabbi Dan Cohn-Sherbock apparently asserts that anti-Semitism has had positive, as well as negative, consequences for the Jewish People. Jay Lefkowitz, director of Cabinet affairs in President George Herbert Walker Bush's administration, reiterated an old refrain,

"Deep down, I believe that a little anti-Semitism is a good thing for the Jews—it reminds us who we are."¹⁰⁸⁵

5.13 Communist Jews in America

It was very persuasive to argue to anyone ignorant of the facts that the *Protocols* were fictions on their face and that there were no Zionist or financial groups operating behind the scenes to influence governments and the outcome of wars, as Louis Marshall did argue—just as it was persuasive to argue to anyone ignorant of

the facts that the charges of an Italian organized crime syndicate operating at the same time were fictions. Joe Valachi has since bolstered the allegations that these secret, or not so secret, societies exist and that their corrupt actions and intentions pose a real threat to humanity. In fact, the Italian mafia was overseen by the Jewish mafia.

Benjamin Harrison Freedman, a man with firsthand knowledge of Zionist and Communist inner circles, came forward with allegations that Zionists and Communists had corrupted the Government of the United States of America and were responsible for America's involvement in World War I, and deliberately contributed to the tensions of post-World War I Germany.¹⁰⁸⁶ It was also alleged that the Communists Ethel Greenglass Rosenberg and her husband Julius Rosenberg had treasonously provided Communists with American nuclear secrets for building atomic bombs. Ethel and Julius were convicted and executed.

Communist leaders like Jacob Abraham Stachel, a. k. a. "Jack" Stachel (deceased), were prosecuted by the United States Government. *The New York Times* stated in Stachel's obituary on 2 January 1966, *inter alia*,

"Less well known than such party leaders as Eugene Dennis and Gus Hall, Jacob A. Stachel was one of the first 11 Communists convicted under the Smith Act in 1949 for conspiring to overthrow the United States Government and served five years in prison."¹⁰⁸⁷

Jacob Abraham Stachel (deceased), foreign born of Galician-Jewish origin, was a follower of the "self-hating Jew" Karl Marx.¹⁰⁸⁸ Galician Jews had an especially bad reputation and were criticized by Gentiles and Jews alike, from Herzl to Hitler. A typical characterization is found in: E. A. Ross, *The Old World in the New: The Significance of Past and Present Immigration to the American People*, The Century Company, (1914), p. 146,

"Besides the Russian Jews we are receiving large numbers from Galicia, Hungary, and Roumania. The last are said to be of a high type, whereas the Galician Jews are the lowest. It is these whom Joseph Pennell, the illustrator, found to be 'people who, despite their poverty, never work with their hands; whose town. . . is but a hideous nightmare of dirt, disease and poverty' and its misery and ugliness 'the outcome of their own habits and way of life and not, as is usually supposed, forced upon them by Christian persecutors.'"

There was a high concentration of Frankist Hasidic Jews in Galicia and one wonders how many of those Jewish Communist subversives who emigrated to America from Galicia were Frankists. Frankists often promoted anti-Semitism as means to promote themselves and as a means to take over Gentile governments. Communist Jews used this tactic in America.

Nathaniel Weyl wrote in his book *The Jew in American Politics*,

"Although Communist leaders were normally taciturn about the extent to

which Party membership was Jewish, Jack Stachel complained in *The Communist* for April 1929 that in Los Angeles ‘practically 90 per cent of the membership is Jewish.’ In 1945, John Williamson, another national leader of the American Communist Party, observed that, while a seventh of the Party membership was concentrated in Brooklyn, it was not the working-class districts, but in Brownsville, Williamsburg, Coney Island and Bensonhurst, which he characterized as ‘primarily Jewish American communities.’ [***] The extent to which American Communism remained an organization of the foreign-born was revealed by a boast in *The Communist* for July 1936 that 45% of Party section organizers were now native-born as against none native-born in 1934. [***] In 1929, massacres of Jews by Palestine Arabs were described by the *Freiheit*, New York’s Communist Party Yiddish organ, as a ‘pogrom’. The Party promptly reprimanded the *Freiheit* for having failed to realize that these murders were a ‘class war. . . against British imperialism and their Zionist agents.’ The *Freiheit* proceeded to report the Palestine struggle in a Nazi fashion. ‘Indeed,’ comments Glazer, ‘the cartoons it ran of hook-nosed and bloated Jews sadistically attacking Arabs could have appeared in any German anti-Semitic newspaper.’”¹⁰⁸⁹

Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court Felix Frankfurter was suspected of being the power behind the throne of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt administration and was suspected of having been a Communist. It was alleged in 1950, that Frankfurter together with Henry Morgenthau, Jr. and Herbert H. Lehman corrupted the Government of the United States in the interests of Communism and Zionism. These three Jews were called, “A GOVERNMENT IN THEMSELVES”.¹⁰⁹⁰ Albert Einstein had an ongoing affair with a Soviet spy, Margarita Konenkova, and had other connections to Communism.¹⁰⁹¹ Max Born wrote, “Einstein was well known to be politically left-wing, if not ‘red’.”¹⁰⁹² In 1919, Einstein denied being a Bolshevik, but acknowledged that he was universally considered to be one. Albert Einstein wrote to Heinrich Zangger in mid-December, 1919, “Another comical thing is that I myself count everywhere as a Bolshevik[.]”¹⁰⁹³ However, on 27 January 1920, Einstein informed Born that he was reading communist material and found the Bolsheviks appealing and believed that they would succeed in Germany.¹⁰⁹⁴ Einstein defended Pacifist Georg Nicolai against an alleged conspiracy of the “pan-German press”. Both Einstein and Nicolai were signatories to the “Manifesto to the Europeans” and a protest against the murder of the Communist leaders Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg.

Benjamin Harrison Freedman was active in the prosecutions of alleged Communist traitors. Freedman also made it his mission to expose the undue influence of Zionists on the American Government and over American public opinion. *The New York Times* reported (among other things) on 5 May 1948 on page 35,

“Benjamin H. Freedman, who says he has spent more than \$100,000 of his

own money fighting Zionism, charged yesterday that outstanding Americans of the Jewish faith were the ‘dictators’ of our policy on Palestine.”

Freedman made an address at the Biltmore Hotel and *The New York Times* reported on 20 August 1965 on page 8, in an article entitled “Goldberg Urged to Reverse Pro-Israeli Policies of U. S.”:

“Mr. Freedman declared that the presence of Israel in the Middle East was due to a world Zionist plot involving the British. The existence of a Jewish state in the Middle East, he said, could provoke a world nuclear war.”

Today, there are plans in the ready to attack Iran with nuclear weapons in order to secure Israel’s hegemony in the Middle East.

No one doubts the existence of the Mossad, nor their corrupt use of disloyal citizens of various nations throughout the world to infiltrate the mass media, financial markets and the governments of many nations. The Mossad is sponsored by a nation born out of Theodor Herzl’s racist vision. The fact that the Mossad is a state sponsored institution renders it no less secretive and no less deadly than the Cosa Nostra. Of course, as with the Italian mafia, no generalization to all persons of Jewish descent can fairly be made based on the activities of those who are aggressively disloyal. To do so would be a gross injustice to millions of very fine people. Numerous Israeli agents, many, if not most of whom were American Jews, have been investigated and prosecuted by the Government of the United States of America for espionage. Israel has proven itself again and again to be an aggressive enemy of the United States.

In assessing the rôle some Jews played in the politics of the late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries, it must be recognized that there was a definite and urgent need for social change in the Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries and many of the Jews who participated in entirely reasonable efforts to bring about that much needed change are to be commended, admired and emulated. Their efforts to bring about social justice were in conflict with the perceived interests of monarchies and oligarchies around the world, making them the targets of smear campaigns by very powerful forces, who stood to lose much from equitable wealth distribution. Furthermore, lower level Jewish political Zionists and Communists have often been bitter enemies of each other. But the lower level games of these pawns ought not to distract attention from the genocidal Jewish financiers who oversaw and regulated both the Zionists and the Communists, and the Zionist Communists. The real goal, and it was one many Jews even on the lowest levels sensed, was to fulfill the Judaic Messianic prophecies.

The *Times* articles meant to refute the *Protocols* were in turn refuted by Paquita de Shishmareff who argued that Maurice Joly’s book was itself derived from other sources, *i. e.* Karl Marx’s good friend Jacob Venedey’s *Macchiavel, Montesquieu, Rousseau*, Berlin, (1850); Niccolo Machiavelli’s *The Prince*; and Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu’s, *De l’esprit des lois, ou Du rapport que les loix doivent avoir avec la constitution de chaque gouvernement, les moeurs, le climat, la*

religion, le commerce, &c., à quoi d'auteu a ajouté des recherches nouvelles, sur les loix romaines touchant les successions, sur les loix françoises, & sur les loix féodales, Barrillot & Fils, Geneve, 1748; and Joly would likely have been introduced to these works by Adolphe Isaac Crémieux. Shishmareff argues that a prayer book which quotes the Bible is not rendered a forgery merely because it makes use of an earlier source.¹⁰⁹⁵ In addition, there is a distinction between a forgery and a fabrication, and to call the book a forgery is to assert that the content of it is authentic.

Racist Zionist blackmailer Louis Dembitz Brandeis asserted in 1918 (therefore three years before the *Times* article appeared) that the *Protocols* were a forgery and asked that no response be published to refute them.¹⁰⁹⁶ Brandeis intimated that he had evidence that they were a forgery. The first such evidence to come to the fore was a copy of Joly's book. Perhaps Brandeis had an original copy of the authentic *Protocols* and therefore had reason to believe that the Russian copy was a forgery.

The London Times published a letter from Zionist Israel Zangwill,¹⁰⁹⁷ who alleged that Count A. M. du Chayla had seen the original handwritten *Protocols* in French, though others claim no such original ever existed. Chayla later testified at a trial meant to ban the publication of the *Protocols*. This trial took place in Bern in 1934, after having been instigated in 1933. A verdict was rendered in 1935. The outcome of the corrupt trial, which found that the *Protocols* must be suppressed, and the defendants must pay 28,000 francs, was overturned on appeal in 1937. The results of the original trial and of the appeal were miscast by some elements of the press to give the false impression that the *Protocols* had been proven a forgery, when in fact the defendants, and the right to free speech, had been vindicated.¹⁰⁹⁸ Chayla smeared Nilus in a Russian language newspaper published in Paris, *Posledniya Novosty*, in 1921.¹⁰⁹⁹ Nilus was persecuted by the Bolshevists in Russia, who made it a capital offense to possess copies of the *Protocols*. Chayla claimed that the *Protocols*, in their original French, were written by more than one person, and were in poor French. Tatiana Fermor claimed that Chayla was an *agent provocateur*, who was arrested for espionage, defiled Catholic churches, called for pogroms, etc., and cannot be considered a credible source.¹¹⁰⁰

5.14 The Attempted Assassination of Henry Ford

Though the American Jewish leader Louis Marshall, president of the American Jewish Committee from 1912-1929, spoke out against the *Protocols* and pressured Putnam to not publishing them,¹¹⁰¹ racist American Zionist leader and blackmailer, U. S. Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis refused to sign Marshall's protest¹¹⁰² and defended Henry Ford, whose newspaper published articles which endorsed the *Protocols* and aggressively and personally attacked Louis Marshall.¹¹⁰³ Zionists placed enormous pressure on Marshall, Jacob Schiff and the American Jewish Committee to submit to their will, and Marshall feared them. *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* attacked Marshall on 26 November 1921 (*see also*: "Hylan in Attack upon Untermyer", *The New York Times*, (2 November 1921), p. 3):

“America’s’ Jewish Enigma—Louis Marshall

SOMETHING of an enigma is Louis Marshall, whose name heads the list of organized Jewry in America, and who is known as the arch-protester against most things non-Jewish. He is head of nearly every Jewish movement that amounts to anything, and he is chief opponent of practically every non-Jewish movement that promises to amount to something. Yet he is known mostly as a name—and not a very Jewish name at that.

It would be interesting to know how the name of ‘Marshall’ found its way to this Jewish gentleman. It is not a common name, even among Jews who change their names. Louis Marshall is the only ‘Marshall’ listed in the Jewish Encyclopedia, and the only Jewish ‘Marshall’ in the index of the publications of the American Jewish Historical Society. In the list of the annual contributors to the American Jewish Committee are to be found such names as Marshutz, Mayer, Massal, Maremort, Mannheimer, Marx, Morse, Mackler, Marcus, Morris, Moskowitz, Marks, Margolis, Mareck—but only one ‘Marshall,’ and that is Louis. Of any other prominent Jew it may be asked, ‘Which Straus?’ ‘Which Untermeyer?’ ‘Which Kahn?’ ‘Which Schiff?’—but never, ‘Which Marshall?’ for there is only one.

This in itself would indicate that Marshall is not a Jewish name. It is an American, or an Anglo-Saxon name transplanted into a Jewish family. But how and why are questions to which the public as yet have no answer.

Louis Marshall is head of the American Jewish Committee, and the American Jewish Committee is head of all official Jewish activity in the United States.

As head of the committee, he is also head of the executive committee of the New York Kehillah, an organization which is the active front of organized Jewry in New York, and the center of Jewish propaganda for the United States. The nominal head of the Kehillah is Rabbi Judah L. Magnes, a brother-in-law of Louis Marshall. Not only are the American Jewish Committee and the Kehillah linked officially (see chapter 33, Volume II, reprint of this series), but they are linked domestically as well.

Louis Marshall was president of all the Jewish Committees of the world at the Versailles Peace Conference, and it is charged now, as it has been charged before, that the Jewish Program is the only program that went through the Versailles conference as it was drawn, and the so-called League of Nations is busily carrying out its terms today. A determined effort is being made by Jews to have the Washington Conference take up the same matter. Colonel House was Louis Marshall’s chief aid at Paris in forcing the Jewish Program on an unwilling world.

Louis Marshall has appeared in all the great Jewish cases. The impeachment of Governor Sulzer was a piece of Jewish revenge, but Louis Marshall was Sulzer’s attorney. Sulzer was removed from the office of governor. The case of Leo Frank, a Jew, charged with the peculiarly vicious murder of a Georgia factory girl, was defended by Mr. Marshall. It was one

of those cases where the whole world is whipped into excitement because a Jew is in trouble. It is almost an indication of the racial character of a culprit these days to note how much money is spent for him and how much fuss is raised concerning him. It seems to be a part of Jewish loyalty to prevent if possible the Gentile law being enforced against Jews. The Dreyfus case and the Frank case are examples of the endless publicity the Jews secure in behalf of their own people. Frank was reprieved from the death sentence, and sent to prison, after which he was killed. That horrible act can be traced directly to the state of public opinion which was caused by raucous Jewish publicity which stopped at nothing to attain its ends. To this day the state of Georgia is, in the average mind, part of an association of ideas directly traceable to this Jewish propaganda. Jewish publicity did to Georgia what it did to Russia—grossly misrepresented it, and so ceaselessly as to create a false impression generally. It is not without reason that the Ku Klux Klan was revived in Georgia and that Jews were excluded from membership.

Louis Marshall is chairman of the board and of the executive committee of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, whose principal theologian, Mordecai M. Kaplan, is the leading exponent of an educational plan by which Judaism can be made to supercede Christianity in the United States. Under cover of synagogal activities, which he knows that the well known tolerance of the American people will never suspect, Rabbi Kaplan has thought out and systemized and launched a program to that end, certainly not without the approval of Mr. Marshall.

Louis Marshall is not the world leader of Jewry, but he is well advanced in Jewry's world counsel, as is seen by the fact that international Jewry reports to him, and also by the fact that he headed the Jews at the 'kosher conference'—as the Versailles assemblage was known among those on the inside. Strange things happened in Paris. Mr. Marshall and 'Colonel' House had affairs very well in hand between them. President Wilson sent a delegation to Syria to find out just what the contention of the Syrians was against the Jews, but that report has never seen the light of day. But it was the easiest thing imaginable to keep the President informed as to what the Jews of New York thought (that is, the few who had not taken up their residence in Paris). For example, this prominent dispatch in the *New York Times* of May 27, 1919:

'Wilson gets Full Report of Jewish Protest
Here.

'Copyright, 1919, by the New York Times Co.

'By Wireless to *The New York Times*.

'Paris, May 26.—Louis Marshall, who has succeeded Judge Mack as head of the Jewish Committee in Paris, was received by President Wilson this afternoon, and gave him a long cabled account of the Jewish mass meeting recently held in Madison Square Garden, including the full text of the resolutions adopted at the meeting and editorial comment in *The Times* and other papers'

When Russia fell, Louis Marshall hailed it with delight. The *New York Times* begins its story on March 19, 1917:

‘Hailing the Russian upheaval as the greatest world event since the French Revolution, Louis Marshall in an interview for the *New York Times* last night said’—a number of things, among which was the statement that the events in Russia were no surprise. Of course they were not, the events being of Jewish origin, and Mr. Marshall being the recipient of the most intimate international news.

Even the new Russian revolutionary government made reports to Louis Marshall, as is shown by the dispatch printed in the *New York Times* of April 3, 1917, in which Baron Gunzburg reports what had been done to assure to the Jews the full advantage of the Russian upheaval.

This glorification of the Jewish overthrow of Russia, it must be remembered, occurred before the world knew what Bolshevism was, and before it realized that the revolution meant the withdrawal of the whole eastern front from the war. Russia was simply taken out of the war and the Central Powers left free to devote their whole attention to the western front. One of the resulting necessities was the immediate entrance of America into the conflict, and the prolongation of the hostilities for nearly two more years.

As the truth became known, Louis Marshall first defended, then explained, then denied—his latest position being that the Jews are against Bolshevism. He was brought to this position by the necessity of meeting the testimony of eye-witnesses as given to congressional investigation committees. This testimony came from responsible men whom even Mr. Marshall could not dispose of with a wave of his hand, and as time has gone on the testimony has increased to mountainous proportions that *Bolshevism is Jewish in its origin, its method, its personnel and its purpose*. Herman Bernstein, a member of Mr. Marshall’s American Jewish Committee, has lately been preparing American public opinion for a great anti-Semitic movement in Russia. Certainly, it will be an anti-Semitic movement, because it will be anti-Bolshevist, and the Russian people, having lived with the hybrid for five years, are not mistaken as to its identity.

During the war, Mr. Marshall was the arch-protestor. While Mr. Baruch was running the war from the business end (‘I probably had more power than perhaps any other man did in the war; doubtless that is true’), Mr. Marshall was running another side. We find him protesting because an army officer gave him instructions as to his duties as a registration official. It was Mr. Marshall who complained to the Secretary of War that a certain camp contractor, after trying out carpenters, had advertised for Christian carpenters only. It was to the discrimination in print that Mr. Marshall chiefly objected, it may be surmised, since it is the policy of his committee to make it impossible, or at least unhealthy, to use print to call attention to the Jew.

It was Mr. Marshall who compelled a change in the instructions sent out by the Provost Marshal General of the United States Army to the effect that ‘the foreign-born, especially Jews, are more apt to malingering than the native-

born.’ It is said that a Jewish medical officer afterward confirmed this part of the instruction, saying that experience proved it. Nevertheless, President Wilson ordered that the paragraph be cut out.

It was Mr. Marshall who compelled the revision of the Plattsburg Officers’ Training Manual. That valuable book rightly said that ‘the ideal officer is a Christian gentleman.’ Mr. Marshall wrote, wired, demanded, and the edition was changed. It now reads that ‘the ideal officer is a courteous gentleman,’ a big drop in idealism.

There was nothing too unimportant to draw forth Mr. Marshall’s protest. To take care of protests alone, he must have a large organization.

And yet with all this high-tension pro-Jewish activity, Mr. Marshall is not a self-advertising man, as is his law partner, Samuel Untermyer, who has been referred to as the arch-inquisitor against the Gentiles. Marshall is a name, a power, not so much a public figure.

As an informed Jew said about the two men:

‘No, Marshall doesn’t advertise himself like Sam, and he has never tried to feature himself in the newspapers for personal reasons. Outside his professional life he devotes himself exclusively to religious affairs.’ That is the way the American Jew like to describe the activities referred to above—‘religious affairs.’ We shall soon see that they are political affairs.

Mr. Marshall is short, stocky, and aggressive. Like his brother-in-law, Rabbi Magnes, he works on the principle that ‘the Jew can do no wrong.’ For many years Mr. Marshall has lived in a four-story brownstone house, of the old-fashioned type, with a grilled door, in East Seventy-second street. This is an old-time ‘swell’ neighborhood, once almost wholly occupied by wealthy Jews. It was as close as they could crowd to the choice Fifth Avenue corners, which had been pre-empted by the Vanderbilts, the Astors, and other rich families.

That Mr. Marshall regards the whole Jewish program in which he is engaged, not in its religious aspect alone, but in its world-wide political aspect, may be judged from his attitude on Zionism. Mr. Marshall wrote in 1918 as follows:

‘I have never been identified and am not now in any way connected with the Zionist organization. I have never favored the creation of a sovereign Jewish state.’

BUT—

Mr. Marshall says, ‘Let the Zionists go on. Don’t interfere with them.’ Why? He writes:

‘Zionism is but an incident of a far-reaching plan. It is merely a convenient peg on which to hang a powerful weapon. All the protests that non-Zionists may make would be futile to affect that policy.’

He says that opposition to Zionism at that time would be dangerous. ‘I could give concrete examples of a most impressive nature in support of what I have said. I am not an alarmist, and even my enemies will give me credit for not being a coward, but my love for our people is such that even if I were

disposed to combat Zionism, I would shrink from the responsibilities that might be entailed were I to do so.'

And in concluding this strange pronouncement, he says:

'Give me the credit of believing that I am speaking advisedly.'

Of course, there is more to Zionism than appears on the surface, but this is as close as anyone can come to finding a Jewish admission on the subject.

If in this country there is apprehension over the Jewish Problem, the activities of Louis Marshall have been the most powerful agents to evoke it. His propagandas have occasioned great resentment in many sections of the United States. His opposition to salutary immigration laws, his dictation to book and periodical publishers, as in the recent case of G. P. Putnam's Sons, who modified their publishing program on his order; his campaign against the use of 'Christological expressions' by Federal, State and municipal officers; all have resulted in alarming the native population and harming the very cause he so indiscreetly advocates.

That this defender of 'Jewish rights,' and restless advocate of the Jewish religious propaganda, should make himself the leader in attacking the religion of the dominant race in this country, in ridiculing Sunday laws and heading an anti-Christianity campaign, seems, to say the least, inconsistent.

Mr. Marshall, who is regarded by the Jews as their greatest 'constitutional' lawyer, since the decline of Edward Lauterbach (and that is a tale!) originated, in a series of legal arguments, the contention that 'this is not a Christian country nor a Christian government.' This argument he has expounded in many writings. He has built up a large host of followers among contentious Jews, who have elaborated on this theme in a variety of ways. It is one of the main arguments of those who are endeavoring to build up a 'United Israel' in the United States.

Mr. Marshall maintains that the opening of deliberative assemblies and conventions with prayer is a 'hollow mockery'; he ridicules 'the absurd phrase 'In the name of God, Amen,' as used in the beginning of wills. He opposes Sunday observance legislation as being 'the cloak of hypocrisy.' He advocates 'crushing out every agitation which tends to introduce into the body politic the virus of religious controversy.'

But Mr. Marshall himself has spent the last twenty years of his life in the 'virus of religious controversy.' A few of his more impertinent interferences have been noted above. These are, in the Jewish phrase, 'religious activities' with a decidedly political tinge.

The following extracts are quoted from the contentions of Mr. Marshall, published in the *Menorah Journal*, the official organ of the Jewish Chautauqua, that the United States is not a Christian country:

IS OURS A CHRISTIAN GOVERNMENT?

BY LOUIS MARSHALL

When, in 1892, Mr. Justice Brewer, in rendering the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the Church of the Holy Trinity against the United States (144 U.S. 457), which

involved an interpretation of the Alien Labor Law, indulged in the *obiter* remark that 'this is a Christian nation,' a subject was presented for the consideration of thoughtful minds which is of no ordinary importance.

The dictum of Mr. Justice Story in *Vidal against Girard's Executors* (2 How. U.S., 198), to the effect that Christianity was a part of the common law of Pennsylvania, is also relied upon, but is not an authoritative judicial determination of that proposition. The remark was not necessary to the decision.

The remarks of Mr. Justice Brewer, to which reference has already been made, were also unnecessary to the decision rendered by the court.

The fact that oaths are administered to witnesses, that the hollow mockery is pursued of opening deliberative assemblies and conventions with prayer, that wills begin with the absurd phrase 'In the name of God, Amen,' that gigantic missionary associations are in operation to establish Christian missions in every quarter of the globe, were all instanced. But none of these illustrations affords any valid proof in support of the assertion that 'this is a Christian nation.'

Our legislation relative to the observance of Sunday is such a mass of absurdities and inconsistencies that almost anything can be predicated thereon except the idea that our legislators are impressed with the notion that there is anything sacred in the day. According to the views of any section of the Christian church, the acts which I have enumerated as permitted would be regarded as sinful. Their legality in the eye of the law is a demonstration that the prohibitory enactments relating to Sunday are simply police regulations, and it should be the effort of every good American citizen to liberalize our Sunday legislation still more, so that it shall cease to be the cloak of hypocrisy.

As a final resort, we are told by our opponents that this is a Christian government because the majority of our citizens are adherents of the Christian faith; that this is a government of majorities, because government means force and majorities represent the preponderance of strength. This is a most dangerous doctrine . .

. .

If the Christianity of the United States is to be questioned, the last person to initiate the inquiry should be a member of that race which had no hand in creating the Constitution or in the upbuilding of the country. If Christian prayers in public are a hollow mockery, and Sunday laws unreasonable, the last person in the world to oppose them should be a Jew.

Mr. Marshall has the advantage of being an American by birth. He was born in Syracuse, New York, in 1856, the son of Jacob and Zilli Marshall. After practicing law in Syracuse, he established himself in New York, became a Wall Street corporation lawyer, and his native country has afforded

him generous means to win a large fortune.

The question arises whether it is patriotic for Mr. Marshall to implant into the minds of his foreign-born co-religionists the idea that this is not a Christian country, that Sunday laws should be opposed, and that the manners and customs of the native-born should be scorned and ridiculed. The effect has been that thousands of immigrant Jews from Eastern Europe are persistently violating Sunday laws in the large industrial centers of the country, that they are haled to court, lectured by judges, and fined. American Jews who are carrying into practice the teachings of Mr. Marshall and his followers are reaping the whirlwind of a natural resentment.

Mr. Marshall was the leader of the movement which led to the abrogation of the treaty between the United States and Russia. Whenever government boards or committees are appointed to investigate the actions, conduct or conditions of foreign-born Jews, great influences are immediately exerted to have Mr. Marshall made a member of such bodies to 'protect' the Jewish interests.

As head of millions of organized Jews in the United States, Mr. Marshall has invariably wielded this influence by means of a campaign of 'protests,' to silence criticisms of Jewish wrongdoing. He thus protested when testimony was made before the Senate Sub-Committee in Washington, in 1919, that the Jewish East Side of New York was the hotbed of Bolshevism. Again he protested to Norman Hapgood against the editorial in *Harper's Weekly*, criticising the activities of Jewish lobbyists in Washington.

Mr. Marshall describes himself in 'Who's Who' as a leader in the fight for the abrogation of the treaty with Russia. That was a distinct interference in America's political affairs and was not a 'religious activity' connected with the preservation of 'Jewish rights' in the United States. The limiting expression 'in the United States' is, of course, our own assumption. It is doubtful if Mr. Marshall limits anything to the United States. He is a Jew and therefore an internationalist. He is ambassador of the 'international nation of Jewry' to the Gentile world.

The pro-Jewish fights in which Mr. Marshall has been engaged in this country make a considerable list:

He fought the proposal of the Census Bureau to enumerate Jews as a race. As a result, there are no official figures, except those prepared by the American Jewish Committee, as to the Jewish population of the United States. The Census has them listed under a score of different nationalities, which is not only a non-descriptive method, but a deceptive one as well. At a pinch the Jewish authorities will admit of 3,500,000 Jews in the United States. The increase in the amount of Passover Bread required would indicate that there are 6,000,000 in the United States now! But the Government of the United States is entirely at sea, officially, as to the Jewish population of this country, except as the Jewish government in this country, as an act of courtesy, passes over certain figures to the government. The Jews have a 'foreign office' through which they deal with the Government of the United

States.

Mr. Marshall also fought the proposed naturalization laws that would deprive 'Asiatics' of the privilege of becoming naturalized citizens. This was something of a confession!

Wherever there were extradition cases to be fought, preventing Jewish offenders from being extradited, Mr. Marshall was frequently one who assisted. This also was part of his 'religious activities,' perhaps.

He fought the right of the United States Government to restrict immigration. He has appeared oftener in Washington than any other Jew on this question.

In connection with this, it may be suggested to Mr. Marshall that if he is really interested in upholding the law of the land and restraining his own people from lawless acts, he could busy himself with profitable results if he would look into the smuggling of Jews across the Mexican and Canadian borders. And when that service is finished, he might look into the national Jewish system of bootlegging which, as a Jew of 'religious activities,' he should be concerned to break up.

Louis Marshall is leader of that movement which will force the Jew by law into places where he is not wanted. The law, compelling hotel keepers to permit Jews to make their hotels a place of resort if they want to, has been steadily pushed. Such a law is practically a Bolshevik order to destroy property, for it is commonly known what Jewish patronage does for public places. Where a few respectable Jews are permitted, the others flock. And when one day they discover that the place they 'patronize' is becoming known as 'a Jew hotel' or a 'Jew club,' then all the Jews abandon it—but they cannot take the stigma with them. The place is known as 'a Jew place,' but lacks both Jew and Gentile patronage as a result.

When Louis Marshall succeeded in compelling by Jewish pressure and Jewish threats the Congress of the United States to break the treaty with Russia, he was laying a train of causes which resulted in a prolongation of the war and the utter subjugation of Russia. Russia serves the world today as a living illustration of the ruthlessness, the stupidity and the reality of Jewish power—endless power, fanatically mobilized for a vengeful end, but most stupidly administered. Does Mr. Marshall ever reflect on the grotesque stupidity of Jewish leadership?

It is regretted that space does not permit the publication here of the correspondence between Mr. Marshall and Major G. H. Putnam, the publisher, as set forth in the annual report of the American Jewish Committee. It illustrates quite vividly the methods by which Mr. Marshall secures the suppression of books and other publications which he does not like. Mr. Marshall, assisted by factors which are not mentioned in his letter, procured the suppression of the Protocols, after the house of Putnam had them ready to publish, and procured later the withdrawal of a book on the Jewish Question which had attracted wide attention both here and in England.

Mr. Marshall apparently has no confidence in ‘absurdities’ appearing absurd to the reader, nor of ‘lies’ appearing false; but he would constitute himself a censor and a guide of public reading, as well as of international legislation. If one might hazard a guess—Mr. Marshall’s kind of leadership is on the wane.”

The correspondence between Marshall and Putnam appeared in the *American Jewish Year Book* 5682 (1921-22), pp. 327ff. It is also reproduced, together with editorial comment, in L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), pp. 79-90; and, with a very different editorial comment, in: *Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty; Selected Papers and Addresses*, Volume 1, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1957), pp. xxxix, 320-389. Marshall attempted to explain his comments when writing to Max Senior (that letter which *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* called, what “Mr. Marshall wrote in 1918”) in a letter from Louis Marshall to John Spargo of 11 December 1920, and the context of the remainder of the letter is indeed important—as is the broader context of the Zionists’ known intimidation of the American Jewish Committee.¹¹⁰⁴ It is interesting, though, that Marshall himself feared the consequences of a Congressional investigation of the charges made in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* and implicit in the *Protocols*. Was he worried about what might turn up?¹¹⁰⁵ Any investigation may turn up evidence of wrongdoing or embarrassing facts, which does not necessarily mean that the wrongdoing sought exits. Witch hunts may scare up goblins, instead. They might also turn up witches.

Aaron Sapiro sued Henry Ford for libel for attacking him and Jews in general, in 1927. The suit did not go well for Sapiro; but, mysteriously, Ford settled the suit and retracted the articles published in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT*—after a mistrial had already been declared making it likely Ford would eventually win the case. Eventually, after many strange events and allegations, and the attempted assassination of Henry Ford, Louis Marshall and Aaron Sapiro forced Ford to retract his anti-Semitic campaign in 1927 in a written apology allegedly signed by Ford, which was widely published and which was written by Marshall and others.¹¹⁰⁶

Brandeis often wrote of his admiration for Ford. Marshall was confused by Ford and wrote to him,

“What seemed most mysterious was the fact that you whom we had never wronged and whom we had looked upon as a kindly man, should have lent yourself to such a campaign of vilification apparently carried on with your sanction.”¹¹⁰⁷

Henry Ford’s apology was not written by Ford nor by his lawyers,¹¹⁰⁸ but was instead written by Arthur Brisbane, Samuel Untermyer and Louis Marshall; and was signed by Ford’s employee Harry Herbert Bennett with Ford’s name. Marshall then wrote a letter to Ford graciously accepting the apology Marshall himself had written. Marshall had a well deserved reputation as a liar and a crooked lawyer. Like many

Jewish leaders of his era, Marshall was immensely wealthy. Jewish corruption was one of the leading causes of economic inequality and wealth condensation in America. It was especially pernicious, because it tended to result from vice, theft and political corruption, rather than production.

Marshall wanted Ford to halt all publication of *The International Jew* around the world. On 7 December 1927, Adolf Hitler published an article in the *Völkischer Beobachter* which published Henry Ford's letter (written by Samuel Untermyer and Louis Marshall and published in *The New York Times*) to Theodor Fritsch, who published Ford's *The International Jew* in Germany, demanding that Fritsch cease publication of the German translation.¹¹⁰⁹ Fritsch wrote back to Ford and claimed that Ford's retraction and apology were insincere, and that Jewish bankers forced Ford to sign it, which was true. Since Hitler's article published only excerpts of Fritsch's letter to Ford, Marshall wrote to Ford requesting the entire letter so that he could tell Ford what to say in response to it. Therefore, we know that Ford was controlled by Marshall on these issues and was willing to put his signature on statements he had not written—probably nothing new for Ford. Marshall wrote to Ford,

“This will enable me to indicate what I believe would be a desirable answer to [Fritsch's] unwarrantable remarks.”¹¹¹⁰

The articles which were highly critical of Jews that were published in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* and republished in *The International Jew* were likely written by William J. Cameron, who replaced E.G. Pipp as editor of *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* in April of 1920, just before the paper kicked off its anti-Jewish campaign on 22 May 1920. In turn, Cameron received his information from Boris Brasol¹¹¹¹ and Paquita de Shishmareff, who wrote *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ* under the *nom de plume* Leslie Fry, which book attempts to prove the authenticity of the *Protocols*.¹¹¹² Paquita de Shishmareff was later named, then cleared, in President Roosevelt's Sedition Trials. Cameron believed in the myth that the British were a lost tribe of Israel—the so-called “British-Israel” movement.¹¹¹³ This movement had a long association with Zionism and many of its founders and members were crypto-Jews and Zionists.

Henry Ford gave an interesting interview, which was published in *The New York Times* on 29 October 1922 on page 5. Ford had knowledge of Moloch, or Baal worship. Ford equated war to human sacrifice. Ford also stated that the beauty of the automobile was that it would promote “mixing”. He asserted that wars would soon end. He asserted that he was not religious. It is strange that Ford had a difficult time identifying Benedict Arnold, but knew of such obscure beliefs as Moloch worship. Alex Jones has videotaped events at the “Bohemian Grove” where views not unlike Ford's were expressed. Ford's philosophy mirrors Cabalistic Judaism. Ford may well have instigated his campaign at the behest of, or in collusion with, very powerful forces, who wanted to fulfill Judaic prophecies. Ford's campaign against the Jews came at a time when powerful American Jews wanted to accomplish two goals: One, to stop, or at least slow, the influx of Eastern Jews into the United States who had been “freed” from the Pale of Settlement; and, two, to populate Palestine with

Jews—American Jews, even American Zionists, clearly had no interest in trekking to the desert and they wanted to redirect Russian Jews to head towards Palestine.

It might also have been that Ford had heard of Nachum Sokolow's pronouncement that the First World War was an act of human sacrifice to Moloch. Sokolow's statement was published under the heading "Begrüssung für Sokolow. Zionistische Massendemonstration in Berlin", *Jüdische Rundschau*, Number 82/83, (14 October 1921), pp. 595-596 (front page and second page of the issue), at 595.

The question prompts itself, was Henry Ford a "useful idiot" for the Zionists and Bolsheviks. The interview in *The New York Times* on 29 October 1922 on page 5:

**“FORD, DENYING HATE,
LAYS WAR TO JEWS
Asserts They Are the Greatest
Victims of a Money System
That Is All Wrong.**

HE ADMIRES THEIR POWER

Sees Education as Great Need and
Thinks Automobile Is Con-
tributing a Large Part.

Special to The New York Times.

BOSTON, Mass., Oct. 28.—‘I curry favor with no man,’ snapped Henry Ford, the automobile king, in answer to my question as he let his chair, which had been tilted back against the wall in his apartment at the Copley Plaza, fall forward with an abrupt jerk.

‘But when I do say that I have no hatred in my heart for the Jew I mean it. In fact, I do not blame the Jew money-lender for bunking humanity just as long as humanity lets him get away with it. As a matter of fact, I admire the Jew because when things get stuck he is the only one who seems to have the power to start it up again and pull it over.’ Tilting back the chair again, he resumed more quietly. ‘However, that does not wipe out the fact that the Jew, who is a victim of a false money system, is the very foundation of the world’s greatest curse today—war.

‘He is the cause of all the abnormality in our daily life because he is the money maniac. One cannot blame him as long as he is able to play his game. Our money system is all wrong, and the Jew, who is the money specialist, is its greatest victim. There is the fact.

‘No, I have no hatred for the Jew, and those Jews who play hardest at the money game are very much in the minority.’

As he paused and stroked his iron gray hair, I said:

‘The money system—how would you change that?’

He came back quickly.

Would abolish Interest.

‘I believe the whole world would benefit tremendously if all interest on money were abolished.’ It was a startling statement, and I attempted to follow it up, whereupon the Detroit manufacturer dismissed the subject as quickly as he had broached it by answering:

‘I cannot go into that further at this time because I am now writing something on that subject out in Detroit.

‘To get back to the Jew again,’ he continued voluntarily, ‘the only reason that the Jew money lender doesn’t take the pocketbook of the everyman is because the everyman won’t let him. Through education the everyman will one day refuse to let the Jew bunk him with this institution called war, because it is these same money lenders who create war today. War is purely a financial institution. I learned that through my peace ship expedition. That expedition was a college of experience.’

‘Where does patriotism fit here?’ I asked.

‘Patriotism,’ he retorted, is as Johnson said, ‘a last refuge for the scoundrel.’ It is worked up by these money lenders who are playing their money game. Poverty, misery and the slaughtering of the flower of young manhood mean nothing to them as long as their money game goes on successfully.’ The chair had come forward again and his thin hand was jerking back and forth.

‘And the mob, true to its emotion,’ he went on, ‘swallows the stuff, hook, line and sinker, whereupon bands play and even mothers in the hysteria of it all place their own offspring upon the altar of murder, just as the ignorant mothers of years ago fed their babies into the flaming bowls of the god Moloch.’

‘And how near are we to the end of it all?’ he was asked.

‘We will have more wars,’ he answered, ‘but we are nearer the end than most people think.’

Motor as an Educator.

‘You spoke of education as the remedy. Just what kind?’

‘Do you know,’ he replied, ‘the automobile is contributing a great part. It has opened new roads. It allows people to mix as never before. It is the mixing of people that will on some far day turn the trick. This idea that money is all there is to business is all wrong. The present system of business is simply an inheritance handed down through the ages. Doing something for humanity through business should be the dominating feature. This idea is the warp and woof of my Detroit industry.

‘We are on the threshold of remarkable advances in industry. The main reason why I am here in the East at present is to inspect one of my new plants at Green Island, Troy, N. Y.—the only plant of its kind in the world where the heat, light and manufacturing power are all to be furnished by electricity.

‘*Coué*? Oh, yes, I have read his philosophy. He has the right idea. People do not dream hard enough. I absolutely believe that if a person dreams his dreams intensely enough those dreams cannot help but come true. There is a reason for everything in this world, no matter how terrible it may seem. We

are always going on for the better. Oh, no, I am not orthodox in my religion. Doing for your fellow-men is religion enough for me.'

'God? Why, God is in everything, always working for perfection. My motto is, one world at a time. Make this as fine a world as possible and don't worry about the next. That will take care of itself. Three worlds from now the Ford will be a better car than ever before, because of the experience gained. Life is experience. The whole process of reaching the ultimate perfection is naught but experience. Facts are facts, and we should not be afraid of them.'

'You are more or less of a fatalist, Mr. Ford?'

'Perhaps so, in the proper sense. Surely there is an inevitable law of action and reaction. Selfishness has little or nothing to do with it. If humanity suddenly discovers that by doing something for somebody else it itself will accrue greater benefit, the brotherhood of man idea will quickly prevail, purely from selfish motives. So, you see, selfishness has not so much to do with it as people think.'

Manner Suggests the Motor.

Henry Ford, tall and lithe, with his steel-gray eyes and quick motions and speech, suggest the motor. For the most part his quick answers have an air of finality to them, while at other times he turns questions that he does not care to answer aside with a kind of impatience.

'I know nothing about this President talk,' he almost snapped at one time. He could not be inveigled into discussing party politics in any way which was significant in itself.

However, his 'go through' spirit is an inspiring thing to see.

I first met him in the lobby of the hotel yesterday morning. He had not time to talk just then, but said if I cared to see him at 8 o'clock tonight he would be glad to do so.

'Where will I meet you?' I asked.

'Right here where we are now,' he answered, and I left him.

At 8 o'clock tonight, ten hours later, I stood in the lobby making a bet with myself that Henry Ford, who was being covered by the hotel authorities, who was not even listed on the register, would forget the appointment.

The theatre throngs had left the lobby, only a few people remained. The hands of the clock read 8:02. Suddenly an elevator door off to my left opened and Henry Ford stepped out. 'Ah, there you are,' he said.

'No wonder you turn out so many Fords a day with great precision,' I remarked. 'Why do you say that?' he questioned, his eyes wide.

'Why, ten hours have intervened since my seeing you for a brief moment this morning and you did not forget your appointment.'

'I never forget appointments. It is one of the first principles of business,' he answered in a matter-of-fact way."

Harry Herbert Bennett claimed,

"In the early 1920's Mr. Ford was getting an average of five threatening

letters a week. When he rode down the street, his driver had a gun under each arm. Mr. Ford had two loaded Magnum revolvers in holsters that were built into the car, and if I rode with him, I carried a gun, too. [Many of Bennett's statements must be taken with a grain of salt. For example, the first "Magnum revolver", the .357 Magnum Smith & Wesson Model 27, did not appear until 1935.]"¹¹⁴

At 8:30 PM, on 27 March 1927, two men tried to murder Henry Ford. The attempted assassination occurred shortly before Ford was scheduled to testify in the Sapiro libel suit against him. Harry Herbert Bennett, an employee of Ford's and Ford's spokesman to the press when the attempt was made on Ford's life during the Sapiro trial, stated in his book *We Never Called Him Henry*,¹¹⁵ and in *True* ("Man's Magazine"), October, 1951, page 125, that Arthur Brisbane, Samuel Untermyer and Louis Marshall had drawn up the apology which they wrongfully attributed to Ford; and that he, Harry Herbert Bennett, signed Ford's name on it—all of which was done with Ford's knowledge and consent. Ford did not read the "apology" and wanted it to be as "bad" as possible.¹¹⁶ Why did Henry Ford allow himself to be controlled by Louis Marshall? *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* had railed against Marshall on 26 November 1921 in an article entitled "America's Jewish Enigma—Louis Marshall".

After Aaron Sapiro filed his libel suit against Ford, Ford had investigators try to determine if there was any corruption involved in the prosecution of the case against him. Ford's investigation turned up evidence of jury tampering by Sapiro in the form of bribes. Due to the exposure of this scandal in the press, a mistrial was declared, even though Sapiro was cleared of the charges. Ford had essentially won the case.

However, shortly before Ford was scheduled to testify in the trial, two men in a large Studebaker sedan attempted to murder Henry Ford by forcing his Ford coupé off of a road and down a steep embankment immediately after Ford had crossed the bridge spanning the Rouge River on his way home. On 31 March 1927, *The New York Times* reported that there was suspicion that there had been a plot to murder Ford. The front page headline read, "Henry Ford Hurt in Crash as Other Car Upsets His; Plot to Kill Him Suspected".

On 2 April 1927, Harry Bennett, temporarily Ford's spokesman, told the press that the crash was an accident and that those who had run Ford off of the road were known and would not be prosecuted. However, many years later, after Henry Ford had died, Bennett published a polemic against Ford in 1951, which changed the alleged facts, as documented in the press of the 1920's. Bennett, in his later story, gave no indication that those who had chased Ford off of the road were known, but instead implied that Ford had staged the event, though Bennett offered up no proof and had made no such statements in 1927. Bennett claimed in 1951 that Ford's car had been run off of the bridge into the river and that he had investigated this accident scene. However, press accounts from the 1920's state that Ford's car was chased down an embankment after crossing the river and had missed the water. Bennett's conflicting accounts cannot be accurate, and in any event he had not witnessed what had occurred, though others had and they confirmed Ford's initial story.

It appears that Ford was frightened by the experience and, in spite of the fact that

his lawyers had essentially won the case for him, Ford settled with Sapiro and Marshall. The American crime syndicate was run by Jews and Marshall had easy access to their services. After the attempted murder, Louis Marshall told Henry Ford, one of the most powerful men of industry in the world, what to do and what not to do. Douglas Reed states that murder and violent intimidation were common practice for political Zionists before and after Ford was attacked and that Zionists often murdered with impunity, especially in Palestine, due to their corrupt influence over the courts.¹¹¹⁷ After the attack, Louis Marshall again and again stated that Ford would sign anything Marshall prepared for him. Louis Marshall wrote to Robert Marshall on 11 January 1928:

“[Henry Ford] expressed his readiness to do anything that I might at any time suggest to enable him to minimize the evil that had been done. In fact, for several months past, I have prepared letters for him in order to bring about the withdrawal and destruction of the re-published articles from the Dearborn Independent under the title ‘The International Jew,’ which have been circulated in various European countries in half a dozen languages. Ford is ready to sign anything that I prepare for him and has made a ‘a holy show’ of Fritsch—the most bitter of German anti-Semites who has now shown himself to be a low blackmailer.”¹¹¹⁸

In a letter to Herman Bernstein of 21 February 1928, Louis Marshall wrote:

“I was very much amused at what Henry Ford told me when he called on me some weeks ago. He said that Cameron is out of a job and had indicated his willingness to write on the Jewish side of the subject. I replied that we did not need his help.”¹¹¹⁹

5.15 How the Zionists Blackmailed President Wilson

The Zionists asserted their influence in the uppermost positions in the United States Government through corrupt means. It is widely known that while serving as president at Princeton University, Woodrow Wilson, who was to become President of the United States of America, had an affair with a married woman known as “Mrs. Peck” (Mary Allen Peck a. k. a. Mary Allen Hulbert). Mrs. Peck divorced her husband and remarried, which second marriage also failed. Mrs. Peck retained Louis Marshall’s law partner Samuel Untermyer (Zionist patron,¹¹²⁰ together with Brandeis a Rothschild partisan in the banking investigations,¹¹²¹ corrupt war profiteer, coauthor of “Ford’s” apology and later one of the chief organizers of the international boycott against German goods in 1933¹¹²²) to bring suit against President Wilson for breach of promise. She alleged that Wilson had promised to marry her when his wife died.

Mrs. Peck offered up Wilson’s love letters as proof of her allegation; but Wilson did not marry Mrs. Peck when his first wife died and instead married Mrs. Edith Bolling Galt. Mrs. Peck demanded \$75,000.00USD from the President for breach of

promise. Wilson did not have the money. If made public, these letters could have destroyed Wilson.

Samuel Untermyer and Louis Brandeis blackmailed President Wilson with Wilson's love letters from the affair with Mrs. Peck, forcing Wilson to nominate the outspoken and unpopular racist Zionist Louis Dembitz Brandeis for the United States Supreme Court. Brandeis was the least respected lawyer in the United States. In return, Untermyer paid Mrs. Peck¹¹²³ \$65,000.00USD through the Zionist banker and multi-millionaire Bernard Baruch, who became Chairman of the War Industries Board under Wilson, and was a notorious war profiteer—Baruch proclaimed that he had more power during the war than any other person.¹¹²⁴ The Jewish leadership in America profited immensely from the First World War and cared not about the American lives lost to generate their profits. *The New York Times* reported on 25 August 1917 on the front page,

**“AMERICAN BOARD
TO BUY FOR ALLIES**

**Baruch, Lovett, and Brookings
Named to Make All
Purchases Here.**

**BIG ECONOMIES EXPECTED
European Allies Have Been
Boosting Prices by Competitive
Dealings—More Loans.**

Special to The New York Times.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 24.—Official announcement was made tonight that an agreement had been reached between the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, France, and Russia, by which all purchases in this country for these allied Governments would be made by an American commission composed of Bernard M. Beruch, Robert S. Lovett, and Robert S. Brookings.

The announcement followed conferences today between the Secretary of the Treasury, Lord Northcliffe, special representative of Great Britain; Ambassador Jusserand of France, and Ambassador Bakhmeteff of Russia. The agreement provides that hereafter all purchases of supplies of every description shall be made for account of this Government and the allied Governments concerned.

It is understood that Italy will assent to the agreement.

The official announcement, issued by Secretary McAdoo, was as follows:

‘Formal agreements were signed today by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, on behalf of the United States, and by the representatives of Great Britain, France, and Russia for the creation of a commission with headquarters at Washington, through which all purchases

made by those Governments in the United States shall proceed. It is expected that similar agreements will be signed with representatives of other allied Governments within the next few days.

‘The agreements name Bernard M. Baruch, Robert S. Lovett and Robert S. Brookings as the commission. These gentlemen are also members of the recently created War Industries Board of the Council of National Defense, and will thereby be able thoroughly to coordinate the purchases of the United States Government with the purchases of the allied powers.

‘It is believed that these arrangements will result in a more effective use of the combined resources of the United States and foreign Governments in the prosecution of the war.’

As rapidly as practicable other countries engaged in the war against the Central Powers will be brought into the arrangement. The purchasing commission will have headquarters in Washington and will avail itself of all the organized facilities already in operation for the prosecution of the war. The War Industries Board has had charge of enormous buying projects in the short time it has been in existence. Its members are intimately acquainted with every phase of the many business conditions involved in the supply of munitions and war supplies. They have acted with the constant co-operation and direction of President Wilson.

The action taken in forming the purchasing commission to take charge of the buying for all the Allies has been rendered necessary because of the continual disadvantages in the markets for various supplies resulting from the competitive buying of the many representatives of the different belligerent countries in the United States.

One of the most distinct difficulties occurring in this line became known within the past ten days, when it was found that France was buying copper in very large amounts in this country at a price far in excess of the likely to be paid by the United States under existing agreements with the copper syndicate. Similar instances were also found in the matter of buying wheat and meat supplies. In some cases it was found that agents of the allied countries had combed the Western markets for grain months in advance of any efforts of American buyers and had large quantities of materials stored awaiting favorable conditions of shipment, while prices went upward in consequence of the steadily increasing scarcity of certain staples.

The commission will begin its work at once. All programs for the purchase of war supplies will be laid before it and will receive its consideration and be carried out under its direction.

In the conferences today it was developed that the monthly program of advances of money by this Government to the Allies would be subject to a material increase in totals. The Italian campaign will require a larger credit, and other allowances will be larger hereafter. The total of \$500,000,000 a month heretofore loaned will be increased to \$600,000,000. This money will be for the greater part expended in this country in the purchase of war supplies for the Allies and under the direction of the new Purchasing

Commission.”

Brandeis became the first Jewish Supreme Court Justice appointed to the United States Supreme Court, though not the first nominated. Untermeyer was very active in Brandeis’ nomination and subsequent appointment. It should be noted that Brandeis and Untermeyer were men of ill repute and Brandeis’ nomination was scandalous and was strongly opposed by many newspapers, the bar association, senators, President Taft, etc.¹¹²⁵ Brandeis and Untermeyer worked together to secure the banking interests of the United States for the Rothschild family. Both Brandeis and Untermeyer (and Untermeyer’s law partner Louis Marshall) were notorious “shysters”.¹¹²⁶ Many former government officials and numerous active officials in the government sought to prevent Brandeis’ appointment to the Supreme Court and a massive campaign was waged against him in fear that he might be appointed, which story was well covered in *The New York Times* over the period of several months.

If Untermeyer and Brandeis did not blackmail Wilson, Brandeis, who was so widely hated and of such poor reputation, never would have been nominated or appointed to the Supreme Court. Nicholas Murray Butler wrote in 1936,

“When on January 28, 1916, President Wilson nominated Louis D. Brandeis of Boston to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, there was furious criticism and opposition to the confirmation of this appointment from many members of the bench and bar.”¹¹²⁷

Brandeis had been recruited into racist Zionism by Theodor Herzl’s honorary secretary in London, Jacob Judah Aaron de Haas,¹¹²⁸ and Brandeis was privy to Zionist secrets and, being a United States Supreme Court Justice, was a powerful and very well-connected mouthpiece for, and instrument of, Zionist policy in America. De Haas maintained a strong influence over Brandeis, and Brandeis controlled Wilson. The Zionists had an American dictator in their pocket. The Zionists used their influence over Woodrow Wilson to bring America into the First World War on the side of British, in exchange for the Balfour Declaration.

5.15.1 Before the War, the Zionists Plan a Peace Conference After the War—to be Led by a Zionist Like Woodrow Wilson

The Zionists orchestrated the First World War to disrupt the world, knowing that there would eventually be a need for a peace conference where the fate of small nations would be discussed, which would provide the Zionists with an opportunity to petition for a nation-state. Political Zionists gave speeches before and during the war, which likened the situation of the Zionists in terms of the war to the efforts of Mazzini, Garibaldi and Cavour.

President Wilson gave the Warburgs and other Jewish financiers great powers in the United States Government. During the war, Wilson appointed Bernard Baruch as Chairman of the War Industries Board. Before America had entered the war, President Wilson’s advisor “Colonel” Edward Mandell House, who had close

connections with the New York financiers, had begun work on President Wilson's "Fourteen Points". Before the war had even begun, House essentially defined the League of Nations in his book *Philip Dru: Administrator* published in 1912, which League of Nations—as defined in the Covenants House drafted in 1918—paved the way for the Zionists' Mandate for Palestine of 1922. America declared war against Germany in April of 1917, and in the same month, "Colonel" House met with Balfour to discuss the terms of peace. Later in 1917, Balfour issued the famous Balfour Declaration to the most famous financier of them all, "Lord" Rothschild. House also organized "The Inquiry" in 1917, which was a board that planned peace negotiations. President Wilson issued the "Fourteen Points" in 1918, which misled Germany into surrendering; and in 1919, "Colonel" House betrayed President Wilson, America and Germany to British, French and Zionist interests at the Paris Peace Conference. At that point, Wilson had finally had enough—though his health suddenly began to fail him.

Zionist Louis Brandeis stated in 1915,

"The war is developing opportunities which make possible the solution of the Jewish problem. [***] While every other people is striving for development by asserting its nationality, and a great war is making clear the value of small nations, shall we voluntarily yield to anti-Semitism, and instead of solving our 'problem' end it by noble suicide? Surely this is no time for Jews to despair. Let us make clear to the world that we too are a nationality striving for equal rights to life and to self-expression. That this should be our course has been recently expressed by high non-Jewish authority. Thus Seton-Watson; speaking of the probable results of the war, said:

'There are good grounds for hoping that it [the war] will also give a new and healthy impetus to Jewish national policy, grant freer play to their splendid qualities, and enable them to shake off the false shame which has led men who ought to be proud of their Jewish race to assume so many alien disguises and to accuse of anti-Semitism those who refuse to be deceived by mere appearances. It is high time that the Jews should realize that few things do more to foster anti-Semitic feeling than this very tendency to sail under false colors and conceal their true identity. The Zionists and the orthodox Jewish Nationalists have long ago won the respect and admiration of the world. No race has ever defied assimilation so stubbornly and so successfully; and the modern tendency of individual Jews to repudiate what is one of their chief glories suggests an almost comic resolve to fight against the course of nature.' [***] The Zionist movement is idealistic, but it is also essentially practical. It seeks to realize that hope; to make the dream of a Jewish life in a Jewish land come true as other great dreams of the world have been realized, by men working with devotion, intelligence, and self-sacrifice. It was thus that the dream of Italian independence and unity, after centuries of vain hope, came true through the efforts of Mazzini, Garibaldi and Cavour; that the dream of Greek, of Bulgarian and of Serbian independence became facts."

Zionists had been planning for an international peace conference following a devastating world war at least since the Congress of Vienna of 1814-1815 failed to achieve the results the Rothschilds sought. They thought to use the arguments of small nations for independence, based on the historic unity of the peoples of those territories, as a basis to argue for a Jewish state. In 1923, racist Zionist Israel Zangwill lamented that the League of Nations and the First World War had failed to achieve the Zionist's goals. In an article entitled, "Mr. Zangwill on Zionism", *The London Times* wrote, on 16 October 1923, on page 11,

"The only hope for the Jewish Diaspora lay in the clause of the Treaty of Versailles providing for the protection of minorities. But the League of Nations had only moral power, and was as yet only spurious institution."

Racist Zionist Theodor Herzl spoke at the first Zionist Congress of 1897 and disclosed the machinations of the Zionists and their centuries' old desire to destroy the Turkish Empire and bankrupt the Sultan. Herzl had a covert plan to have Turks mass murder Armenians, which would cause an outrage around the world, so as to leave the Turkish Empire at the mercy of the Jewish controlled media, which Herzl pledged would cover up the atrocities if the Sultan would agree to give the Zionists Palestine.¹¹²⁹ *The New York Times* reported on 31 August 1897 on page 7,

"ZIONIST CONGRESS IN BASEL.

The Delegates Adopt Dr. Herzl's Programme for Re-establishing the Jews in Palestine.

BASEL, Switzerland, Aug., 30.—At to-day's session of the Zionist Congress the delegates present unanimously adopted, with great enthusiasm, the programme for re-establishing the Hebrews in Palestine, with publicly recognized rights.

A dispatch was sent to the Sultan of Turkey, thanking his Majesty for the privileges enjoyed by the Hebrews in his empire.

The Zionist Congress opened at Basel yesterday with 200 delegates in attendance from various parts of Europe. Dr. Theodor Herzl, the so-called 'New Moses' and originator of the scheme to purchase Palestine and resettle the Hebrews there, was elected President and Dr. Max Nordau was elected Vice President of the Congress.

Dr. Herzl has only recently come into prominence. He seeks to float a limited-liability company in London for the purpose of acquiring Palestine from the Sultan of Turkey and thoroughly organizing it for resettlement by the Hebrews. He has, it is said, already won converts to the Zionistic movement in all parts of the world.

When asked to outline his plans, Dr. Herzl said:

'We shall first send out an exploring expedition, equipped with all the modern resources of science, which will thoroughly overhaul the land from one end to the other before it is colonized, and establish telephonic and

telegraphic communication with the base as it advances. The old methods of colonization will not do here.

‘See here,’ continued Dr. Herzl, showing a good-sized book, ‘this is one of the four books which contain the records of the movement—the logbooks of the Mayflower,’ he added, with a smile. That one watchword, the ‘Jewish State,’ has been sufficient to rouse the Jews to a state of enthusiasm in the remotest corners of the earth, though there are those forming the so-called philanthropic party who predict that the watchword will provoke reprisals from Turkey. Inquiries in Constantinople and Palestine show that nothing is further from the truth.

‘My plan is simple enough. We must obtain the sovereignty over Palestine—our never-to-be-forgotten, historical home. At the head of the movement will be two great and powerful agents—the Society of Jews and the Jewish Company. The first named will be a political organization, and spread the Jewish propaganda. The latter will be a limited-liability company, under English laws, having its headquarters in London and a capital of, say, a milliard of marks. Its task will be to discharge all the financial obligations of the retiring Jews and regulate the economic conditions in the new country. At first we shall send only unskilled labor—that is, the very poorest, who will make the land arable. They will lay out streets, build bridges and railroads, regulate rivers, and lay down telegraphs according to plans prepared at headquarters. Their work will bring trade, their trade the market, and the markets will cause new settlers to flock to the country. Every one will go there voluntarily, at his or her own risk, but ever under the watchful eye and protection of the organization.

‘I think we shall find Palestine at our disposal sooner than we expected. Last year I went to Constantinople and had two long conferences with the Grand Vizier, to whom I pointed out that the key to the preservation of Turkey lay in the solution of the Jewish question.

‘The Jews, in exchange for Palestine, would regulate the Sultan’s finances and prevent disintegration, while for Europe we should form a new outpost against Asiatic barbarism and a guard of honor to hold intact the sacred shrines of the Christians.

‘We can afford to play a waiting game, and either take over Palestine from the European Congress called together to divide the spoils of disintegrated Turkey, or look out for another land, such as Argentina, and say: ‘Your Zion Is there.’

‘It is to confer over this point that the congress was arranged for at Basel.

‘I am sure that the Jews are even better colonists than Englishmen. There are already colonies of Jews in Palestine, and I have on my table excellent Bordeaux, Sauterne, and cognac grown in that country. It is well known that in Galicia and the Balkans the Jews perform the roughest kind of manual labor. There the wealth they bring is not their money, but themselves.’”

When Herzl’s designs failed to achieve their ends, the First World War and the

Jewish-led revolution of the “Young Turks”¹³⁰ achieved the same objectives. The crypto-Jewish Young Turks committed genocide against the Armenian Christians. In exchange for the Zionists having brought America into the war against America’s own best interests and without the consent of American People, the Allies destroyed the Turkish Empire and took Palestine by force in the First World War, which had been the Zionists’ goal for centuries. The Zionists created the war in order to achieve these ends, and had been planning and fomenting the war for many generations.

When the First World War had only just begun, Chaim Weizmann wrote to Shmarya Levin, in New York, on 23 September 1914, that the war provided a means to establish a Jewish state in Palestine,

“But will it be possible to raise a Jewish voice also when there is talk of peace, when the interests of small nations are to be safeguarded? This, my dear friends, is what will fall, in part at least, to your lot, for America will play an enormous role in the clarification of all these questions. We in Europe can, and should, prepare for that time, and I’d very much like to know your views about it.”¹³¹

The *Encyclopedia International* wrote in its article on Weizmann,

“As director of the Admiralty laboratories (1916-19), [Chaim Weizmann] contrived a process for extracting acetone, a solvent used in making cordite [an explosive propellant used as a smokeless replacement for black powder], from cereal and horse chestnuts. This significant discovery gave Weizmann diplomatic leverage in negotiating with the British wartime government on the future of Zionism, a cause he had adopted in 1898. A product of these negotiations was the Balfour Declaration, a promissory statement of support for ‘the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people,’ issued on Nov. 2, 1917, by the Foreign Secretary.”¹³²

British Prime Minister Lloyd George state in his *War Memoirs*,

“When our difficulties were solved through Dr. Weizmann’s genius, I said to him: ‘You have rendered great service to the State, and I should like to ask the Prime Minister to recommend you to His Majesty for some honour.’ He said: ‘There is nothing I want for myself.’ ‘But is there nothing we can do as a recognition of your valuable assistance to the country?’ I asked. He replied: ‘ Yes, I would like you to do something for my people.’ He then explained his aspirations as to the repatriation of the Jews to the sacred land on Palestine they had made famous. That was the fount and origin of the famous declaration about the National Home for Jews in Palestine.

As soon as I became Prime Minister I talked the whole matter over with Mr. Balfour, who was then Foreign Secretary. As a scientist he was immensely interested when I told him of Dr. Weizmann’s achievement. We

were anxious at that time to enlist Jewish support in neutral countries, notably in America. Dr. Weizmann was brought into direct contact with the Foreign Secretary. This was the beginning of an association, the outcome of which after long examination, was the famous Balfour Declaration which became the charter of the Zionist movement. So that Dr. Weizmann with his discovery not only helped us to win the War, but made a permanent mark upon the map of the world.”¹¹³³

Harry Elmer Barnes wrote several books which detailed the propaganda the Allies and Americans used to draw America into the First World War.¹¹³⁴ He records that President Wilson desired to enter the war in the Spring of 1917, in order to give America a voice in the planned Peace Conference—one of the chief aims of the Zionists,

“Having been converted to intervention by these various influences, Mr. Wilson rationalized his change of mind in terms of noble moral purpose. As he told Jane Addams in the spring of 1917, he felt that, if there was to be any hope of a just and constructive peace, the United States must be represented at the peace conference following the war. Mr. Wilson could only be at the peace conference if the United States had previously entered the conflict.”¹¹³⁵

Barnes again stated in 1940,

“When, as an outcome of these various influences, Wilson had been converted to intervention, he rationalized his change of attitude on the basis of a noble moral purpose. As he told Jane Addams in the spring of 1917, he felt that the United States must be represented at the peace conference which would end the World War if there was to be any hope of a just and constructive peace. But Wilson could be at the peace conference only if the United States had previously entered the World War.”¹¹³⁶

Louis Marshall, President of the American Jewish Committee, wrote to John Spargo on 11 December 1920,

“I was strongly pro-Ally from the day that Germany declared war, and I labored constantly to see to it that the Jews of the United States, so far as my influence could accomplish that result, would say nothing and do nothing that would in any way militate against the Entente. I can say, with all becoming modesty, that I was most successful in that endeavor. When the Balfour Declaration was made, I looked upon it as only incidentally of interest to the Jews. I interpreted it as an important political move, undoubtedly inspired by altruism, but at the same time intended to strengthen the Entente, and especially England, in the Near East, to protect the Suez Canal and the road to India.”¹¹³⁷

Some asserted after the war that England had been duped into Palestine and the Balfour Declaration by the Zionists, who led the British to believe that it would be in their best interests for the Jews to control the land around the Suez and secure the British route to India and to oil. Some claim that this arrangement instead cost the British dearly.¹¹³⁸ In May of 1916, France and England divided Palestine in half in the Sykes-Picot Pact.¹¹³⁹ After the war, pursuant to the San Remo Conference, France sought to control all of Syria, including much of Palestine. Henry Morgenthau pointed out that to give the Jews Palestine on the premise that it would secure the Suez for the British was a false notion. Instead, it would have inflamed the Moslem world against England and would have caused unrest among the millions of Moslems in India. This might have cost the British India and thereby made the Suez of next to no value to the British—except perhaps as an escape route on their way out of India. Moslem support of the British was crucial to their interests. Arousing Moslem wrath by placing Jews in charge of Palestine and its Holy places was against British interests, despite the Zionists propaganda. Morgenthau, himself a Jew, wrote in 1921,

“POLITICAL IMPOSSIBILITY OF A JEWISH STATE

I HAVE just said that it may be politic for the British Government to coddle the aspirations of the Jews. There are, however, profound reasons why this coddling will not take the form of granting to them even the name and surface appearance of a sovereign government ruling Palestine. In the first place, Britain’s hold upon India is by no means so secure that the Imperial Government at London can afford to trifle with the fanatical sensibilities of the millions of Mohammedans in its Indian possessions. Remember that Palestine is as much the Holy Land of the Mohammedan as it is the Holy Land of the Jew, or the Holy Land of the Christian. His shrines cluster there as thickly. They are to him as sacredly endeared. In 1914 I visited the famous caves of Macpelah, twenty miles from Jerusalem; and I shall never forget the mutterings of discontent that murmured in my ears, nor the threatening looks that confronted my eyes, from the lips and faces of the devout Mohammedans whom I there encountered. For these authentic tombs of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are as sacred to them, because they are saints of Islam, as they are to the most orthodox of my fellow Jews, whose direct ancestors they are, not only in the spiritual, but in the actual physical sense. To these Mohammedans, my presence at the tombs of my ancestors was as much a profanation of a Mohammedan Holy Place as if I had laid sacrilegious hands upon the sacred relics in the mosque at Mecca. To imagine that the British Government will sanction a scheme for a political control of Palestine which would place in the hands of the Jews the physical guardianship of these shrines of Islam, is to imagine something very foreign to the practical political sense of the most politically practical race on earth. They know too well how deeply they would offend their myriad Mohammedan subjects to the East.

Exactly the same political issue of religious fanaticism applies to the question of Christian sensibilities. Any one who has seen, as in 1914 I saw

at Easter-tide, the tens of thousands of devout Roman Catholics from Poland, Italy, and Spain, and the other tens of thousands of devout Greek Catholics from Russia and the East, who yearly frequent the shrines of Christianity in Palestine, and who thus consummate a lifetime of devotion by a pilgrimage undertaken at, to them, staggering expense and physical privation; and who has observed, as I have observed, the suppressed hatred of them all for both the Jew and the Mussulman; and who has noted, further, the bitter jealousies between even Protestant and Catholic, between Greek Catholic and Roman—such an observer, I say, can entertain no illusions that the placing of these sacred shrines of Christian tradition in the hands of the Jews would be tolerated. The most enlightened Christians might endure it, but the great mass of Christian worshippers of Europe would rebel. They regard the Jew not merely as a member of a rival faith, but as the man whose ancestors rejected their fellow Jew, the Christ, and crucified Him. Their fanaticism is a political fact of gigantic proportions. A Jewish State in Palestine would inevitably arouse their passion. Instead of such a State adding new dignity and consideration to the position of the Jew the world over (as the Zionists claim it would do), I am convinced that it would concentrate, multiply, and give new venom to the hatred which he already endures in Poland and Russia, the very lands in which most of the Jews now dwell, and where their oppressions are the worst.

The political pretensions of Zionism are fantastic. I think the foregoing paragraphs have demonstrated this.”¹¹⁴⁰

In 1922 and 1923, Lord George Sydenham Clarke Sydenham of Combe published several Letters to the Editor in *The London Times*, in which he demonstrated that Jewish colonies in Palestine were a terrible financial drain on Great Britain. Lord Sydenham proved what an irritant it was to the Moslem world to have a large influx of Jews into Palestine. He pointed out the injustice and provocation which arose from the appointment of ardent Jewish Zionists to rule over Palestine in a *de facto* Jewish Government and how these irritations served to undermine British interests in India and throughout the Middle East.

It would take another world war, the Holocaust, the independence of India from Great Britain and the creation of Pakistan, as well as pervasive corruption both clerical and profane to overcome these political and religious obstacles. The Jews used the French under Napoleon, and then the British in the First World War, to chase the Turks out of Palestine and Greater Syria. The Jews lured the French and the British into the region by leading them to believe that a route to their colonies was vitally important to their national interests.

The Jews created the illusion that only Jews could be their friends in the Middle East to secure this route, while Moslems could not. The opposite was true as both the French and the British soon learned after the First World War. When the Turks were finally forced out of Palestine and Greater Syria, the French and British went to war over who would control this region, into which they had been led by the Jews. The Jews then felt a need to destroy the French and the British Imperial interests in Asia.

The Jews accomplished this goal in the Second World War with their Zionist National Socialists, with the Nazis; and with their old friends, the Imperial Japanese—Jewish monies and political influence deliberately caused the deaths of hundred of thousands of Americans in the Second World War alone. Zionist Jews murdered one hundred million people in two world wars in order to create a racist “Jewish State” in Palestine which would house one to five million Jews in a place where they did not want to live. Boris Brasol told of the Zionists’ plan in 1920 to create a Socialist German army that would crush British Imperialism and secure Palestine for the Jews, and note that the army was the Nazi army, an army Walther Rathenau began to build in cooperation with the Bolsheviks in 1922 with the Rapallo Treaty (Poale-Zion were Russian Communist Jewish Zionists),

“Mr. Eberlin, a Jew himself, and one of the foremost leaders of the Poale-Zionist movement, in a book recently published in Berlin, entitled ‘On the Eve of Regeneration,’ stated:

‘The foreign policy of England in Asia Minor is determined by its interests in India. There was a saying about Prussia that she represents the army with an admixture of the people. About England it could be said that she represents a colonial empire with a supplement of the metropolis. . . . It is obvious that England desires to use Palestine as a shield against India. This is the reason why she is feverishly engaged in the construction of strategic railroad lines, uniting Egypt to Palestine, Cairo to Haifa, where work is started for the construction of a huge port. In the near future Palestine will be in a position to compete with the Isthmus of Suez, which is the main artery of the great sea route from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean.’[Footnote: Translation from Russian, ‘On the Eve of Regeneration,’ by I. Eberlin, pp. 129, 130, Berlin, 1920.]

But this Poale-Zionist goes a step farther when he asserts that:

‘It is only Socialism attained in Europe which will prove capable of giving honestly and without hypocrisy Palestine to the Jews, thus assuring them unhampered development. . . . The Jewish people will have Palestine only when British Imperialism is broken.’”¹⁴¹

The Second World War unhitched England from the East and largely destroyed British Imperialism. The Zionists deliberately caused those events and created those circumstances. The lost lives and misery were a deliberate human sacrifice the Zionists made to their Jewish God.

Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations gave the winning powers of World War I the arbitrary authority to divide the spoils of war amongst themselves under the guise of acting as the benefactor of small nations. This product of the war was anticipated by the Zionists before the war began, when they correctly guessed that at the closure of the war, which had not yet happened, negotiations over the fate of small nations would occur where they could make a bid for a Jewish State. The mandate power the League of Nations fit the purpose of creating a Jewish State so

well as to leave little doubt that it was custom tailored to suit the purpose of the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine, which territory had previously been held by Turkey:

“Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, 28 June 1919

Article 22. To those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization and that securities for the formance of this trust should be embodied in this Covenant.

The best method of giving practical effect to this principle is that the tutelage of such peoples should be entrusted to advanced nations who by reason of their resources, their experience or their geographical position can best undertake this responsibility, and who are willing to accept it, and that this tutelage should be exercised by them as Mandatories on behalf of the League.

The character of the mandate must differ according to the stage of the development of the people, the geographical situation of the territory, its economic conditions and other similar circumstances.

Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a Mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the Mandatory.

Other peoples, especially those of Central Africa, are at such a stage that the Mandatory must be responsible for the administration of the territory under conditions which will guarantee freedom of conscience and religion, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, the prohibition of abuses such as the slave trade, the arms traffic and the liquor traffic, and the prevention of the establishment of fortifications or military and naval bases and of military training of the natives for other than police purposes and the defence of territory, and will also secure equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of other Members of the League.

There are territories, such as South-West Africa and certain of the South Pacific Islands, which, owing to the sparseness of their population, or their small size, or their remoteness from the centres of civilization, or their geographical contiguity to the territory of the Mandatory, and other circumstances, can be best administered under the laws of the Mandatory as integral portions of its territory, subject to the safeguards above-mentioned in the interests of the indigenous population.

In every case of Mandate, the Mandatory shall render to the Council an annual report in reference to the territory committed to its charge.

The degree of authority, control or administration to be exercised by the Mandatory shall, if not previously agreed upon by the Members of the League, be explicitly defined in each case by the Council.

A permanent Commission shall be constituted to receive and examine the annual reports of the Mandatories and to advise the Council on all matters relating to the observance of the mandates.”

Lord Northcliffe, principal owner of *The Times* of London, opposed Zionism and called for an inquiry into the results of the Zionist experiment. He planned to personally report on his findings. He was prevented from doing so in his own newspaper. Douglas Reed, who worked for *The London Times*, alleged in his book *The Controversy of Zion*¹¹⁴² that Lord Northcliffe, principal owner of the *Times* and an anti-Zionist, believed that he was being poisoned after he openly opposed Zionism, which was at the critical time the Palestine Mandate came under consideration in the League of Nations. Northcliffe suffered from some of the same symptoms as President Wilson.

An editor at *The Times*, Wickham Steed, wished to suppress Northcliffe’s anti-Zionist views. Northcliffe sought to fire Steed. Steed hired Northcliffe’s own lawyer to defend him—Steed. Northcliffe wanted to take over as editor of *The Times*, and would have spoken out against the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine. An unnamed doctor, at Steed’s instigation, declared Northcliffe insane and committed him to an asylum. Northcliffe died soon thereafter on 14 August 1922. Reed presents the history of events that led to Northcliffe’s demise, but comes to no conclusions as to the ultimate cause of his death.

Douglas Reed wrote, *inter alia*,

“Lord Northcliffe was removed from control of his newspapers and put under constraint on June 18, 1922; on July 24, 1922 the Council of the League of Nations met in London, secure from any possibility of loud public protest by Lord Northcliffe, to bestow on Britain a ‘mandate’ to remain in Palestine and by arms to install the Zionists there (I describe what events have shown to be the fact; the matter was not so depicted to the public, of course).

This act of ‘ratifying’ the ‘mandate’ was in such circumstances a formality. The real work, of drawing up the document and of ensuring that it received approval, had been done in advance, in the first matter by drafters inspired by Dr. Weizmann and in the second by Dr. Weizmann himself in the ante-chambers of many capitals. The members of Mr House’s ‘Inquiry’ had drafted the Covenant of the League of Nations; Dr. Weizmann, Mr. Brandeis, Rabbi Stephen Wise and their associates had drafted the Balfour Declaration; now the third essential document had to be drafted, one of a kind that history never knew before. Dr. Weizmann pays Lord Curzon (then British Foreign Secretary) the formal compliment of saying that he was ‘in charge of the actual drafting of the mandate’ but adds, ‘on our side we had the valuable assistance of Mr. Ben V. Cohen. . . one of the ablest draughtsmen *in*

America'. Thus a Zionist in America (Mr. Cohen was to play an important part in a much later stage of this process) in fact drafted a document under which 'the new world order' was to dictate British policy, the use of British troops and the future of Palestine."¹¹⁴³

The League of Nations followed from the "New World Order" proposed by the "progressive" U. S. President Woodrow Wilson, who had been blackmailed by the Zionists and was under the control of an enigmatic man, who was sort of a mixture of Svengali, Karl Marx, Huey Long and Karl Rove—one "Colonel" Edward Mandell House (House never actually was a colonel). The League, created by Wilson and "Colonel" House, organized the distribution of Third World colonies among the major powers after World War I.

The League was a first step towards world government of the type envisioned in Jewish Messianic prophecy, though it was very weak compared to the absolute tyranny proposed by the ancient Jews. A more absolute world government was envisioned by H. G. Wells in 1913 in his book on world war and atomic bombs, *The World Set Free: A Story of Mankind*, Macmillan, London, (1914); also published in Leipzig, Germany, by B. Tauchnitz; and carried still further in Well's *The Open Conspiracy; Blue Prints for a World Revolution*, V. Gollancz Ltd., London, (1928); which was itself derivative of Ivan Stanislavovich Bloch's *The Future of War in Its Technical, Economic, and Political Relations; Is War Now Impossible?*, Doubleday & McClure Co., New York, (1899); preceded by William Winwood Reade's *The Martyrdom of Man*, Trübner & Co., London, (1872); and Baron Edward Bulwer-Lytton's *The Coming Race: Or the New Utopia*, (1848).¹¹⁴⁴

The Zionists learned early on that Liberal and Socialist revolution led to assimilation. In 1898, Nachman Syrkin,¹¹⁴⁵ who despised assimilation, combined Zionism with Marxist internationalism in a way that would prevent the assimilation of Jews and would conform to Jewish Messianic supremacism. In the hands of the Zionists, Communism was an intermediary means to achieve Jewish nationalism, as well as a means to subjugate Gentile peoples and place them under absolute autocratic government led overtly, or in some instances covertly, by Jews. As is clear in Syrkin's writings, the Zionists tended to label every other group of human beings as their enemy, which allowed them justify their inhumanity by blaming their victims.

Syrkin deduced Jewish Nationalism from Communist Internationalism by presuming that Internationalism is merely partisan international cooperation; and that individual liberty, equality and fraternity depend upon national status and ethnic segregation. In order for there to be an international understanding, there must first be dignified segregated and ethnically based nations, which mutually respected one another, and which compete on a level playing field. In Syrkin's eyes, a Jew had no right to choose his or her own individuality in an international community of humanity. He or she must first be a nationalistic Jew and place Jewish interests ahead of all others, before acquiring the free will to become a dignified representative in the international community as a Jewish member of the community of nations. This *Blut und Boden* belief system, this volatile blend of Zionist Nationalism and

Communist Internationalism later became known as Nazism and mirrors the Nazi Party's original platform as iterated in "The 25 Points" of Nazism in 1920.¹¹⁴⁶ Bernard Lazare made similar Zionist arguments at about the same time as Syrkin.¹¹⁴⁷ Einstein later parroted their thoughts.¹¹⁴⁸

The Zionists wanted to establish the precedent of separating out small, ethnically segregated nations from international unions and empires in order to justify the creation of the small Jewish nation they sought to create—and in order to put an end to the assimilation of Jews occurring in the Turkish, pan-Slavic and pan-Germanic Empires, which were very cosmopolitan and tolerant communities into which Jews easily and happily dissolved. At the same time, the Zionists required strong international organizations which would have the authority and the power needed to establish this territorial Jewish State, while protecting the right of Jews to live wherever they chose and to have full rights and privileges in all nations.

The Zionists hoped that a ruined Europe could be led by an American controlled movement calling itself "international", that would use its collective force to destroy international unions and establish tiny impotent nations in the place of the empires which had existed before World War I, while concurrently weakening the sovereignty of European states in favor of the dominance of America, which was itself dominated by Jews. They would do this through the League of Nations. This American-led "international" institution could then insist upon the creation of the State of Israel. The Balfour Declaration, Wilson's Fourteen Points, the League of Nations British-Palestine Mandate, etc. tended toward the destruction of cosmopolitan assimilated international societies for the sake of ethnically segregated small nations. Even with this international support for ethnically segregated Nationalism (not to be confused with a truly internationalist and cosmopolitan spirit), the Zionists failed to persuade the majority of Jews to follow them, and so lacked the large numbers of decent citizens needed to make a nation-state viable. Communism, which was meant to ruin the Gentiles and liberate the Jews, failed them. Pseudo-Internationalism for the sake of Jewish Nationalism, *viz.* the League of Nations, failed them. Most significantly, the Jewish People refused to oblige the Zionists, but the Zionists never gave up their struggle to force the Jews to move the Palestine.

The Zionists determined that they needed a rapid rise in anti-Semitism to force Jews to move. They knew that bad economic conditions were the best conditions for anti-Semitism to grow and for a dictator to come to power.

Albert Einstein wrote to Adriaan Fokker on 30 July 1919 that the German political mentality led Germans to follow an unscrupulous minority in blind obedience, and that the German people were fools to be outraged at the dictated peace and the Treaty of Versailles. The Germans had laid down their arms based on the false promises of a just peace iterated in Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points. Instead of demanding that those promises be kept, Jewish traitors of Einstein's ilk forced Germany into accepting the Treaty of Versailles, which destroyed the Turkish Empire, the pan-German Empire, the German nation and the German economy. The Germans never would have laid down their arms if they had known the treachery that awaited them. There was a large delegation of Jews at the peace talks, who decided Germany's sorry fate.

Some Germans planned to continue the war. Einstein held out hope for the future of the League of Nations, because,

“It is especially encouraging that America, which has not retained the fatal traditions of Europe, is in charge.”

“Insbesondere ist erfreulich, dass Amerika, welches nicht mit den fatalen Traditionen Europas belastet ist, die Führung hat.”¹¹⁴⁹

European “traditions” and resultant Nationalism were common topics of the era,¹¹⁵⁰ and the derogatory commonplaces that emerged often vilified Germans. The Zionists had planned that America would lead the League, because they led America.

Einstein wrote to Hedwig Born on 31 August 1919,

“The greatest danger for future developments is, in my opinion, the potential withdrawal of the Americans; it is to hoped that Wilson can prevent it. I don’t believe that humanity as such can change in essence, but I do believe that it is possible and even *necessary* to put an end to anarchy in international relations, even though the sacrifice of autonomy will be significant for individual states.”¹¹⁵¹

Wilson was not so spiteful towards the German People as Einstein was. Though Wilson tried to prevent the Zionists from corrupting his intentions to the point where even he could no longer tolerate their unfairness, Wilson could not prevent the injustices done to Germany after the First World War, which injustices Einstein and his hateful ilk sought. Wilson’s Zionist partner as President, “Colonel” Edward Mandell House, betrayed him and the United States to the British, French and Zionists in the League of Nations. They instituted the punitive measures against Germany Einstein had long espoused, which measures ultimately led to Hitler’s rise to power and to the Second World War, which ultimately led large numbers of Jews to Zionism making it possible to create the State of Israel in Palestine.

All along Zionists encouraged anti-Semitism in order to leave assimilated and assimilating Jews no option but to join them. When even medieval-style anti-Semitism failed to inspire large numbers of Jews to become Zionists in the 1930’s, the worst of the horrors began at the behest of the Zionists. Syrkin knew in 1898 that the Jewish masses could be united by anti-Semitic criminals, even by crypto-Jews posing as anti-Semitic criminals. He probably did not realize that even Zionist sponsored criminals could not persuade patriotic assimilated Jews to leave their homes in their various nations.

Einstein was quoted in *The Literary Digest* during his visit to America in 1921, and made clear his inconsistent support of nationalistic Zionism (nationalism and segregation for Jews) and concomitant Internationalism and anti-Nationalism (no freedom of sovereignty and “racial” integration for Gentiles). Einstein lacked the wit of Syrkin, though not his willingness to employ sophistry. Einstein failed to speak out against the injustices done to Germany, which, if corrected, would promote the

“Internationalism” he allegedly espoused. Einstein asserts the positivist dogma that science ought to play a fundamental rôle in politics, which inevitably leads to politics playing a fundamental rôle in science through censorship, destructive partisanship, etc.:

“EINSTEIN FINDS THE WORLD NARROW

PROFESSOR ALBERT EINSTEIN, whose theories on space, light, and infinity have made his name familiar throughout the world, thinks that this small particular planet on which we live is suffering from narrowness in its point of view. Too much nationalism—that is Professor Einstein’s definition for the ‘disease from which mankind is suffering to-day.’ Even before the war sectional prejudices were bad enough, but the ‘prewar internationalism’ was infinitely preferable to the present state of mind of most of humanity, he says, and he urges that the people of this sphere return to charity and mutual understanding. The great German scientist arrived in this country early in April, to lecture upon Zionism as well as upon his revolutionary theory of relativity. A *New York Times* reporter, who was among the many newspaper men assembled to greet him at the pier, gives this picture of the thinker whom the nations have decided to honor:

A man in a faded gray raincoat and a flopping black felt hat that nearly concealed the gray hair that straggled over his ears stood on the boat deck of the steamship *Rotterdam* yesterday, timidly facing a battery of camera men. In one hand he clutched a shiny briar pipe and the other clung to a precious violin. He looked like an artist—a musician. He was.

But underneath his shaggy locks was a scientific mind whose deductions have staggered the ablest intellects of Europe—a mind whose speculative imagination was so vast that its great scientific theories puzzled and appalled the reasoning faculty.

The man was Dr. Albert Einstein, propounder of the much-debated theory of relativity that has given the world a new conception of space, and time, and the size of the universe.

Dr. Einstein comes to this country as one of a group of prominent Jews who are advocating the Zionist movement and hope to get financial aid and encouragement for the rebuilding of Palestine and the founding of a Jewish university. He is of medium height, with strongly built shoulders, but an air of fragility and self-effacement. Under a high, broad forehead are large and luminous eyes, almost childlike in their simplicity and unworldliness.

Professor Einstein does not like to be interviewed, and the questions of the reporters bothered him a great deal. One of the few real interviews he has ever given was forwarded from Berlin to the *New York Evening Post*, shortly before Einstein’s departure for this country. ‘I had come to Professor Einstein to hear what he had to say about the plight of German science,’ writes Mr.

Tobinkin. The subject was just then occupying much space in the newspapers of Berlin. Professor Einstein, however, spoke not of science, but of humanity:

‘Of course,’ he said, ‘science is suffering from the terrible effects of the war, but it is humanity that should be given first consideration. Humanity is suffering in Germany, everywhere in eastern Europe, as it has not suffered in centuries.

‘Humanity,’ he continued, ‘is suffering from too much and too narrow a conception of nationalism. The present wave of nationalism, which at the slightest provocation or without provocation passes over into chauvinism, is a sickness.

‘The internationalism that existed before the war, before 1914, the internationalism of culture, the cosmopolitanism of commerce and industry, the broad tolerance of ideas—this internationalism was essentially right. There will be no peace on earth, the wounds inflicted by the war will not heal, until this internationalism is restored.’

‘Does this imply you oppose the formation of small nations?’ the interviewer asked.

‘Not in the least,’ he replied. ‘Internationalism as I conceive it implies a rational relationship between countries, a sane union and understanding between nations, mutual cooperation, mutual advancement without interference with a country’s customs or inner life.’

‘And how would you proceed to bring back this internationalism that existed prior to 1914?’

‘Here,’ he said, ‘is where science, scientists, and especially the scientists of America, can be of great service to humanity. Scientists, and the scientists of America in the first place, must be pioneers in this work of restoring internationalism.’

‘America is already in advance of all other nations in the matter of internationalism. It has what might be called an international ‘psyche.’ The extent of America’s leaning to internationalism was shown by the initial success of Wilson’s ideas of internationalism, the popular acclaim with which they met from the American people.

‘That Wilson failed to carry out his ideas is beside the point. The enthusiasm with which the preaching of these ideas by Wilson was received shows the state of mind of the American public. It shows it to be internationally inclined. American scientists should be among the first to attempt to develop these ideas of internationalism and to help carry them forward. For the world, and that means America, also, needs a return to international friendship. The work of peace can not go forward in your own country, in any country, so long as your Government or any Government is uneasy about its international relations. Suspicion and bitterness are not a good soil for progress. They should vanish. The intellectuals should be among the first to cast them off.’

There are two men in Germany to-day who are traditionally inaccessible to newspaper men, Mr. Tobinkin notes. One is the financier, Hugo Stinnes. The other is Einstein. We are told:

Einstein has been greatly abused by a section of the German press, and he

therefore shuns publicity. He lives in a quiet section of Berlin on the top floor of a fairly up-to-date apartment-house. His study consists of a reception-room, or rather a conference-room, and of his private workroom. The walls of the conference-room are lined with books of a general character. The large number of English books is especially noticeable. There is an *édition de luxe* of Dickens in English and a costly Shakespeare edition in German. Alongside of Shakespeare stands Goethe in a similarly luxurious edition. Einstein is an admirer of both Goethe and Schiller, and has the busts of the two poets prominently displayed.

Adjoining the conference-room is a large music-room. When he is not in his study, Mrs. Einstein told me, her husband is in the music-room. Music and cigars are the scientist's only relaxations. The number of cigars he smokes is controlled by Mrs. Einstein for his health's sake, but there is no control over the amount of time he chooses to spend at the piano or with his violin, for he plays both instruments well.

His workroom is exceedingly simple. There is a telescope in it. The windows give an exceptionally good view of the sky. There are also a number of globes and various metal representations of the solar system. There are two engravings of Newton on the walls. They are the only pictures in the room. The table he works at is simple and rather small. There is a small typewriter, which is used by his secretary. Einstein has a large correspondence, receiving on an average sixty letters a day.

He was pacing up and down the room as I entered his study. He was dressed in a pair of worn-out trousers and a sweater-coat. If he had a collar on, the collar was very unobtrusive, for I can not recall having seen it. He was at work. His hair was disheveled and his eye had a roving look. His wife told me that when the professor is seized by a problem the fact becomes known to her by this peculiar wandering look which comes into his eyes and by his feverish pacing up and down the room. At such times, she said, the professor is never disturbed. His food is brought to him in his workroom. Sometimes this mode of living lasts for three or four days at a time. It is when the professor rejoins his family at the table that they know that his period of intense concentration, and abstraction, is over.

After such a period of concentration, Einstein often rests himself by reading fiction. He is fond of reading Dostoyefsky. He walks a lot through the parks, and in the summer often goes out with his family in the fields. But he is never asked by his wife or children to go for a walk. It is he who has to do the asking, and when he asks them for a walk they know that his mind is relieved of work. His hours of work are indefinite. He sometimes struggles through a whole night with a problem and goes to bed only late in the morning.

Dr. Einstein asked whether he could not see a copy of my interview with him before it was printed. I told him that I would not write the interview until after my return to America.

'In that event,' he said, 'when you write it, be sure not to omit to state that I am a convinced pacifist, that I believe that the world has had enough of war. Some sort of an international agreement must be reached among nations preventing the recurrence of another war, as another war will ruin our civilization completely. Continental civilization, European civilization, has been badly damaged and set back by this war, but the loss is not irreparable. Another war may prove fatal to Europe.'

The New York *World* extends a welcome, and a hearty congratulations,

in the following editorial:

It is not invidious to say that of the many distinguished visitors from abroad recently arriving in New York the one inspiring the most spontaneous popular demonstration at the pier is not a great general or statesman but a plain man of science—Dr. Albert Einstein, who comes with prominent Jews in aid of the Zionist movement.

Plain, that is, as respects his unaffected personality, but a scientific investigator who has progressed into a higher sphere of speculative thought unfathomable to the ordinary intelligence. What he has to exhibit is not a new play or a new theory of life but a new hypothesis of the celestial mechanism, involving a radically altered conception of time and space and the size of the universe.

It is something when New York turns out to honor a stranger bringing gifts of this recondite character. Perhaps by the time he is ready to return the public will be glibly discussing the Einstein theory of relativity, whether or not it proves capable of understanding it. But behind the outward demonstration there is discernible a sincere tribute of admiration to the physicist who, amid the turmoil of war and the distractions of material interests, has kept his mind fixt on the star of pure science and has mounted to the heights with Newton and the other great leaders of scientific thought.”¹¹⁵²

In promoting the League of Nations, Einstein was not so concerned about the fate of Europe, as he was the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine. Einstein and friends wanted to achieve the Messianic Jewish goals of the destruction of all Gentile governments and the creation of a Jewish State. Therein lies the resolution of the apparent contradiction between Einstein’s Zionism and his anti-nationalistic Internationalism. The Old Testament tells the Jews that they will ruin all other nations and forever keep their own. The contradictory, simplistic, absolute and arbitrary nature of Einstein’s pronouncements are the result of his mediocre intellect and his reliance upon others to craft his speeches and beliefs. Einstein’s request to read the interview before it was published and his insistence that it contain his scripted political messages is further evidence that much of the man’s public persona was a fraud.

After the First World War, the Zionists had their Peace Conference and their League of Nations and their Palestine Mandate, but they lacked the broad support of the Jewish People. They decided to bring on a Second World War, which would result in another Peace Conference; and, the second time around, they would torture the Jewish People into embracing Zionism.

Lenni Brenner wrote in his exposé *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, “The Wartime Failure to Rescue”, Chapter 24, Lawrence Hill Books, Chicago, (1983), pp. 235-238 [Brenner cites in his notes: “22. Michael Dov-Ber Weissmandel, *Min HaMaitzer* (unpublished English translation). 23. Ibid. 24. Ibid. (Hebrew edn), p. 92. 25. Ibid., p. 93.”],

“For only with Blood Shall We Get the land’

The Nazis began taking the Jews of Slovakia captive in March 1942. Rabbi Michael Dov-Ber Weissmandel, an Agudist, thought to employ the traditional weapon against anti-Semitism: bribes. He contacted Dieter Wisliceny, Eichmann's representative, and told him that he was in touch with the leaders of world Jewry. Would Wisliceny take their money for the lives of Slovakian Jewry? Wisliceny agreed for 50,000 in dollars so long as it came from outside the country. The money was paid, but it was actually raised locally, and the surviving 30,000 Jews were spared until 1944 when they were captured in the aftermath of the furious but unsuccessful Slovak partisan revolt.

Weissmandel, who was a philosophy student at Oxford University, had volunteered on 1 September 1939 to return to Slovakia as the agent of the world Aguda. He became one of the outstanding Jewish figures during the Holocaust, for it was he who was the first to demand that the Allies bomb Auschwitz. Eventually he was captured, but he managed to saw his way out of a moving train with an emery wire; he jumped, broke his leg, survived and continued his work of rescuing Jews. Weissmandel's powerful post-war book, *Min HaMaitzer* (From the Depths), written in Talmudic Hebrew, has unfortunately not been translated into English as yet. It is one of the most powerful indictments of Zionism and the Jewish establishment. It helps put Gruenbaum's unwillingness to send money into occupied Europe into its proper perspective. Weissmandel realised: 'the money is needed here – by us and not by them. For with money here, new ideas can be formulated.'²² Weissmandel was thinking beyond just bribery. He realised immediately that with money it was possible to mobilise the Slovak partisans. However, the key question for him was whether any of the senior ranks in the SS or the Nazi regime could be bribed. Only if they were willing to deal with either Western Jewry or the Allies, could bribery have any serious impact. He saw the balance of the war shifting, with some Nazis still thinking they could win and hoping to use the Jews to put pressure on the Allies, but others beginning to fear future Allied retribution. His concern was simply that the Nazis should start to appreciate that live Jews were more useful than dead ones. His thinking is not to be confused with that of the Judenrat collaborators. He was not trying to save some Jews. He thought strictly in terms of negotiations on a Europe-wide basis for all the Jews. He warned Hungarian Jewry in its turn: do not let them ghettoise you! Rebel, hide, make them drag the survivors there in chains! You go peacefully into a ghetto and you will go to Auschwitz! Weissmandel was careful never to allow himself to be manoeuvred by the Germans into demanding concessions from the Allies. Money from world Jewry was the only bait he dangled before them.

In November 1942, Wisliceny was approached again. How much money would be needed for all the European Jews to be saved? He went to Berlin, and in early 1943 word came down to Bratislava. For \$2 million they could have all the Jews in Western Europe and the Balkans. Weissmandel sent a courier to Switzerland to try to get the money from the Jewish charities. Saly

Mayer, a Zionist industrialist and the Joint Distribution Committee representative in Zurich, refused to give the Bratislavan ‘working group’ any money, even as an initial payment to test the proposition, because the ‘Joint’ would not break the American laws which prohibited sending money into enemy countries. Instead Mayer sent Weissmandel a calculated insult: ‘the letters that you have gathered from the Slovakian refugees in Poland are exaggerated tales for this is the way of the ‘*Ost-Juden*’ who are always demanding money’.²³

The courier who brought Mayer’s reply had another letter with him from Nathan Schwalb, the HeChalutz representative in Switzerland Weissmandel described the document:

There was another letter in the envelope, written in a strange foreign language and at first I could not decipher at all which language it was until I realised that this was Hebrew written in Roman letters, and written to Schwalb’s friends in Pressburg [Bratislava] . . . It is still before my eyes, as if I had reviewed it a hundred and one times. This was the content of the letter:

‘Since we have the opportunity of this courier, we are writing to the group that they must constantly have before them that in the end the Allies will win. After their victory they will divide the world again between the nations, as they did at the end of the first world war. Then they unveiled the plan for the first step and now, at the war’s end, we must do everything so that Eretz Yisroel will become the state of Israel, and important steps have already been taken in this direction. About the cries coming from your country, we should know that all the Allied nations are spilling much of their blood, and if we do not sacrifice any blood, by what right shall we merit coming before the bargaining table when they divide nations and lands at the war’s end? Therefore it is silly, even impudent, on our part to ask these nations who are spilling their blood to permit their money into enemy countries in order to protect our blood—for only with blood shall we get the land. But in respect to you, my friends, *atem taylu*, and for this purpose I am sending you money illegally with this messenger.’²⁴

Rabbi Weissmandel pondered over the startling letter:

After I had accustomed myself to this strange writing, I trembled, understanding the meaning of the first words which were ‘only with blood shall we attain land’. But days and weeks went by, and I did not know the meaning of the last two words. Until I saw from something that happened that the words ‘*atem taylu*’ were from ‘*tiyul*’ [to walk] which was their special term for ‘rescue’. In other words: you, my fellow members, my 19 or 20 close friends, get out

of Slovakia and save your lives and with the blood of the remainder—the blood of all the men, women, old and young and the sucklings—the land will belong to us. Therefore, in order to save their lives it is a crime to allow money into enemy territory—but to save you beloved friends, here is money obtained illegally.

It is understood that I do not have these letters, for they remained there and were destroyed with everything else that was lost.²⁵

Weissmandel assures us that Gisi Fleischman and the other dedicated Zionist rescue workers inside the working group were appalled by Schwalb's letter, but it expressed the morbid thoughts of the worst elements of the WZO leadership. Zionism had come full turn: instead of Zionism being the hope of the Jews, their blood was to be the political salvation of Zionism."

5.15.2 "Colonel" Edward Mandell House

Einstein was not alone in this regard, "Colonel" Edward Mandell House was President Wilson's intimate friend—then betrayer—during his presidency. House initially prompted Wilson to run for the presidency, and then dominated Wilson's presidency as the true "power behind the throne". In 1911, "Colonel" Edward Mandell House, who was perhaps a crypto-Jew and who was certainly a Zionist, anonymously authored the fictional novel *Philip Dru: Administrator*, B. W. Huebsch, New York, (1912); which pitted a corrupt conservative Senator against a progressive Socialist hero in a second civil war in America. The novel was propaganda for a Socialist revolution.

After publishing his novel, House, with the assistance of a few of the large banking houses in New York, recruited Woodrow Wilson to run for the Presidency and guided and funded Wilson's campaign. In his novel, House vilifies a financier named "Thor". This campaign against specific bankers matched the real campaign of the Zionists Louis Brandeis and Samuel Untermyer.¹¹⁵³ Brandeis and Untermyer pretended to fight banker corruption, but really only attacked the Rothschilds' competition and secured control over American finances for the Rothschild family.

House's book was written in 1911. In 1912-1913, the Congressional House of Representatives investigated bankers in the "Money Trust Investigation" which explored some of the corruption which was rampant at the time.¹¹⁵⁴ The scandal made it obvious that many reforms were needed. The bankers initiated the investigation so that it would point out the need for reforms, and then they instituted "reforms" which would give them absolute control and shield them from further investigations. President Wilson and "Colonel" House took this manufactured opportunity to place financiers at the reins of government. They enacted several laws which gave the banks control over the money supply through the creation of the Federal Reserve System.¹¹⁵⁵ This corruption eventually led to the Great Depression, as pools of rich financiers artificially ran up stock prices and then sold off their interests, to then profit a second time by short selling the stocks that they had at first collusively inflated.¹¹⁵⁶

“Colonel” House came from Texas. He expresses a sympathy for the South in his novel and an antagonism towards the blacks President Wilson later betrayed while in office. Wilson also came from the South and the Civil War greatly affected him.

House advocated the use of propaganda in his propaganda novel. He also advocated Illuminati and Freemasonry methods of subtle manipulation. Many of the things he promoted were very important social reforms. He was a strong advocate of women’s suffrage, equal pay for women and the rights of women to dignity and independence. He held out a helpful hand so that he could let go at just the right moment and let the nation fall. House wrote in Chapter 43 of his novel *Philip Dru: Administrator*,

‘In many ways,’ said Dru. ‘Have clubs for them, where they may sing, dance, read, exercise and have their friends visit them. Have good women in charge so that the influence will be of the best. Have occasional plays and entertainments for them, to which they may each invite a friend, and make such places pleasanter than others where they might go. And all the time protect them, and preferably in a way they are not conscious of. By careful attention to the reading matter, interesting stories should be selected each of which would bear its own moral. Quiet and informal talks by the matron and others at opportune times, would give them an insight into the pitfalls around them, and make it more difficult for the human vultures to accomplish their undoing. There is no greater stain upon our vaunted civilization,’ continued Dru, ‘than our failure to protect the weak, the unhappy and the abjectly poor of womankind.’

‘Philosophers still treat of it in the abstract, moralists speak of it now and then in an academic way, but it is a subject generally shunned and thought hopelessly impossible.’

‘It is only here and there that a big noble-hearted woman can be found to approach it, and then a Hull House is started, and under its sheltering roof unreckoned numbers of innocent hearted girls are saved to bless, at a later day, its patron saint.’

‘Start Hull Houses, Senator Selwyn, along with your other plan, for it is all of a kind, and works to the betterment of woman. The vicious, the evil minded and the mature sensualist, we will always have with us, but stretch out your mighty arm, buttressed as it is by fabulous wealth, and save from the lair of the libertines, the innocent, whose only crime is poverty and a hopeless despair.’

‘In your propaganda for good,’ continued Dru, ‘do not overlook the education of mothers to the importance of sex hygiene, so that they may impart to their daughters the truth, and not let them gather their knowledge from the streets.’”

The use of reading material for propaganda purposes was a tactic Schiff had used to propagandize bored Russian prisoners of war in Japan in 1905 with revolutionary propaganda. Before Schiff, the Illuminati and Freemasons used reading rooms as a

platform from which to propagandize a populace. *Philip Dru: Administrator* was typical of the sentimental Bolshevik propaganda that evolved from the literature of Victor Hugo's *Les Misérables* and Charles Dickens' *A Christmas Carol*, among many other like works.

In Bolshevik propaganda, the emotional presentation of the suffering of the poor is used to justify violent revolution, mass murder and absolute dictatorship in a totalitarian state; as an allegedly necessary step towards a democracy—which never comes. For example, House's propaganda exploited the suffering of the poor to justify dictatorship, revolutionary war resulting in countless unnecessary deaths, and the militaristic Imperialism of the United States over Mexico and Latin America, again resulting in countless unnecessary deaths. It seems the Zionists hold fast to these objectives even today.

As the Russian Jewish immigrants to America began to impose their influence, the American news media began to fill with communist propagandists, and many Hollywood script writers, film makers, producers, directors and actors owed their allegiance to Joseph Stalin and the Soviet Union. When the United States Government investigated their activities, they relentlessly lied to the American public in order to protect one another. They produced motion pictures which exploited the good natures of most Americans and which appealed to the liberal sentiments of most Americans.

However, though some were innocent dupes, many of these Communists had no loyalty to America or to the principles of Liberalism. They sought to subjugate America under Soviet-Stalinist-style despotism. Had they been successful, it would have meant the utter destruction of the American People. Hardcore Communists had little or no respect for human life—the movement took the form of a pernicious cult bent on destroying society. Members were sheepishly loyal to each other, to their leaders and to their cause. They blindly obeyed orders, had no regard at all for the rights of others to self-determination or even to life. They were quick to betray American interests to the Soviets. Hardcore Communists were perfectly willing to commit any and all acts, no matter how heinous or deceitful, to further the advancement of Communism and destroy the lives of their fellow human beings—all in the name of their false Liberalism.

Preaching false Liberalism and appealing to the good nature of human beings in order to exploit a gullible population is an old Biblical tradition, not only in Christianity, but also in the Old Testament. Christianity, itself, is based on the human sacrifice of Jesus¹¹⁵⁷ and countless Jews and converts followed his example in the first centuries of the movement, offering their lives to God. According to the Old Testament, before the Jews fled Egypt, their God committed atrocities against the Egyptians and miraculously made the Egyptians gullible. The Jews then borrowed their Egyptian neighbors' jewels of gold and silver. The Jews stole this treasure as they left, betraying the trust and generosity of the Egyptian People—or so goes the story. However, there is no archeological evidence to support the Exodus myth.

The story is evidently an allegory, where the firstborn of Egypt are sacrificed to Baal in the pursuit of Zionism, of Greater Israel. The possibility exists that the Jews absorbed an Egyptian sub-population and that Moses was a secessionist Egyptian

leader, perhaps the Egyptian Pharaoh Akhenaton IV, who brought monotheism, circumcision, and other ancient Egyptian beliefs and practices that ended up with the Jews. It could be that the Jews demanded that the Egyptian monotheist exiles give up their gold and their firstborn children as ritual sacrifices to Baal.

It was the Canaanites, the Judeans, not the Egyptians, who worshiped Baal. Baalism demanded as a sacrifice the child that opens the womb—the firstborn. This child would be burned as a “holocaust”, a burnt offering to Baal. The Jews never fully surrendered this practice in the Old Testament, nor in the history of the ancient world. Although it allegedly inspired God’s wrath—angered the Egyptian monotheists, many if not most Jews continued the practice of sacrificing their children in a holocaust. *Exodus* 10-11:

“10:1 And the LORD said unto Moses, Go in unto Pharaoh: for I have hardened his heart, and the heart of his servants, that I might shew these my signs before him: 2 And that thou mayest tell in the ears of thy son, and of thy son’s son, what things I have wrought in Egypt, and my signs which I have done among them; that ye may know how that I *am* the LORD. 3 And Moses and Aaron came in unto Pharaoh, and said unto him, Thus saith the LORD God of the Hebrews, How long wilt thou refuse to humble thyself before me? let my people go, that they may serve me. 4 Else, if thou refuse to let my people go, behold, to morrow will I bring the locusts into thy coast: 5 And they shall cover the face of the earth, that one cannot be able to see the earth: and they shall eat the residue of that which is escaped, which remaineth unto you from the hail, and shall eat every tree which groweth for you out of the field: 6 And they shall fill thy houses, and the houses of all thy servants, and the houses of all the Egyptians; which neither thy fathers, nor thy fathers’ fathers have seen, since the day that they were upon the earth unto this day. And he turned himself, and went out from Pharaoh. 7 And Pharaoh’s servants said unto him, How long shall this man be a snare unto us? let the men go, that they may serve the LORD their God: knowest thou not yet that Egypt is destroyed? 8 And Moses and Aaron were brought again unto Pharaoh: and he said unto them, Go, serve the LORD your God: *but* who *are* they that shall go? 9 And Moses said, We will go with our young and with our old, with our sons and with our daughters, with our flocks and with our herds will we go; for we *must hold* a feast unto the LORD. 10 And he said unto them, Let the LORD be so with you, as I will let you go, and your little ones: look *to it*; for evil *is* before you. 11 Not so: go now ye *that are* men, and serve the LORD; for that ye did desire. And they were driven out from Pharaoh’s presence. 12 And the LORD said unto Moses, Stretch out thine hand over the land of Egypt for the locusts, that they may come up upon the land of Egypt, and eat every herb of the land, *even* all that the hail hath left. 13 And Moses stretched forth his rod over the land of Egypt, and the LORD brought an east wind upon the land all that day, and all *that* night; *and* when it was morning, the east wind brought the locusts. 14 And the locusts went up over all the land of Egypt, and rested in all the coasts of

Egypt: very grievous *were they*; before them there were no such locusts as they, neither after them shall be such. 15 For they covered the face of the whole earth, so that the land was darkened; and they did eat every herb of the land, and all the fruit of the trees which the hail had left: and there remained not any green thing in the trees, or in the herbs of the field, through all the land of Egypt. 16 Then Pharaoh called for Moses and Aaron in haste; and he said, I have sinned against the LORD your God, and against you. 17 Now therefore forgive, I pray thee, my sin only this once, and intreat the LORD your God, that he may take away from me this death only. 18 And he went out from Pharaoh, and intreated the LORD. 19 And the LORD turned a mighty strong west wind, which took away the locusts, and cast them into the Red sea; there remained not one locust in all the coasts of Egypt. 20 But the LORD hardened Pharaoh's heart, so that he would not let the children of Israel go. 21 And the LORD said unto Moses, Stretch out thine hand toward heaven, that there may be darkness over the land of Egypt, even darkness *which* may be felt. 22 And Moses stretched forth his hand toward heaven; and there was a thick darkness in all the land of Egypt three days: 23 They saw not one another, neither rose any from his place for three days: but all the children of Israel had light in their dwellings. 24 And Pharaoh called unto Moses, and said, Go ye, serve the LORD; only let your flocks and your herds be stayed: let your little ones also go with you. 25 And Moses said, Thou must give us also sacrifices and burnt offerings, that we may sacrifice unto the LORD our God. 26 Our cattle also shall go with us; there shall not an hoof be left behind; for thereof must we take to serve the LORD our God; and we know not with what we must serve the LORD, until we come thither. 27 But the LORD hardened Pharaoh's heart, and he would not let them go. 28 And Pharaoh said unto him, Get thee from me, take heed to thyself, see my face no more; for in *that* day thou seest my face thou shalt die. 29 And Moses said, Thou hast spoken well, I will see thy face again no more. 11:1 And the LORD said unto Moses, Yet will I bring one plague *more* upon Pharaoh, and upon Egypt; afterwards he will let you go hence: when he shall let *you* go, he shall surely thrust you out hence altogether. 2 Speak now in the ears of the people, and let every man borrow of his neighbour, and every woman of her neighbour, jewels of silver, and jewels of gold. 3 And the LORD gave the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians. Moreover the man Moses *was* very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh's servants, and in the sight of the people. 4 And Moses said, Thus saith the LORD, About midnight will I go out into the midst of Egypt: 5 And all the firstborn in the land of Egypt shall die, from the firstborn of Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne, even unto the firstborn of the maidservant that *is* behind the mill; and all the firstborn of beasts. 6 And there shall be a great cry throughout all the land of Egypt, such as there was none like it, nor shall be like it any more. 7 But against any of the children of Israel shall not a dog move his tongue, against man or beast: that ye may know how that the LORD doth put a difference between the Egyptians and Israel. 8 And all these thy

servants shall come down unto me, and bow down themselves unto me, saying, Get thee out, and all the people that follow thee: and after that I will go out. And he went out from Pharaoh in a great anger. 9 And the LORD said unto Moses, Pharaoh shall not hearken unto you; that my wonders may be multiplied in the land of Egypt. 10 And Moses and Aaron did all these wonders before Pharaoh: and the LORD hardened Pharaoh's heart, so that he would not let the children of Israel go out of his land."

In 1887, Communist Frederick Engels knew that the First World War was coming and that it would destroy the Empires of Europe and leave them ripe for revolution. He also knew that it would murder millions of people, and he welcomed the holocaust as a necessary sacrifice to Communism,

"No other war is now possible for Prussia-Germany than a world war, and indeed a world war of hitherto unimagined sweep and violence. Eight to ten million soldiers will mutually kill each other off, and in the process devour Europe barer than any swarm of locusts ever did. The desolation of the Thirty Years' War compressed into three or four years and spread over the entire continent: famine, plague, general savagery, taking possession both of the armies and of the masses of the people, as a result of universal want; hopeless demoralization of our complex institutions of trade, industry and credit, ending in universal bankruptcy; collapse of the old states and their traditional statecraft, so that crowns will roll over the pavements by the dozens and no one be found to pick them up; absolute impossibility of foreseeing where this will end, or who will emerge victor from the general struggle. Only *one* result is absolutely sure: general exhaustion and the creation of the conditions for the final victory of the working class."¹¹⁵⁸

Like other religious cults, Communists recruited initiates by telling them tales of Utopia, filling their days and thoughts with comradeship and eventually demanding that they become obedient servants to the cause. They were masters of propaganda and had the means to disseminate it. They had no scruples whatsoever and eventually succeeded in manipulating public opinion to the point where those who accused them of what they were doing were themselves treated like criminals by society.¹¹⁵⁹ The only way they could offer competition to better reasoned and far more effective systems of government was to weaken those systems through corruption, and concurrently blame the destruction they deliberately caused on those who had tried to prevent it. Communists have perpetrated tens of millions, if not hundreds of millions, of murders—which they view as human sacrifices to the cause, the dogmas and dictatorship of Communism—ultimately human sacrifices to Judaism.

The truth behind "Colonel" House's feigned Liberalism was that Mexico had oil fields, gold mines, silver mines and rubber plantations, which House's financier friends wanted to exploit. Jewish financiers had been working toward a "race war" between Latin Catholics and Anglo-Saxon Protestants centered in Mexico and

spreading to the United States, France, Austria and North Germany, at least since the time of the Civil War. The Rothschilds desired to divide America up between France and Great Britain.¹¹⁶⁰ The North would join with Canada and return to the British Empire. The South would go to Mexico, which would in turn serve as a colony of France. The Rothschilds would then have a profitable division between Latin and French Catholics in the South, and Anglo-Saxon Protestants in the North. The Rothschilds could then use the model they had so successfully employed in Europe to create perpetual wars¹¹⁶¹ between the North and South which would earn the Rothschilds immense profits, place both Empires further in the Rothschilds' debt, and destroy the competitive threat that American finance posed. Bismarck, who had close contacts with Jewish finance, stated,

“The division of the United States into federations of equal force was decided long before the Civil War by the high financial powers of Europe. These bankers were afraid that the United States, if they remained in one block and was one nation, would attain economic and financial independence, which would upset their financial domination over Europe and the world. Of course, in the ‘inner circle’ of Finance, the voice of the Rothschilds prevailed. They saw an opportunity for prodigious booty if they could substitute two feeble democracies burdened with debt to the financiers, . . . in place of a vigorous Republic sufficient unto herself. Therefore, they sent their emissaries into the field to exploit the question of slavery and to drive a wedge between the two parts of the Union. . . . The rupture between the North and the South became inevitable; the masters of European finance employed all their forces to bring it about and to turn it to their advantage.”¹¹⁶²

On 10 June 1862, on page 3, *The Chicago Tribune* reported,

**“FRANCE AND MEXICO.
THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE
EXPEDITION.
THE ACTUAL ATTITUDE OF THE
FRENCH GOVERNMENT.
New Mutterings of Intervention.**

[New York Times Correspondent.]

PARIS, May 23, 1862.

The Mexican affair has assumed all at once at Paris a most serious aspect. Never before has the Emperor been attacked by the liberal press with such violence, or rather, with such an outspoken energy, as within the last few days, on this unfortunate Mexican expedition. It is the all-absorbing topic of the moment, and I cannot do better than to give you an *aperçu* of the situation, as we understand it here.

It so happens that, so far as regards the Press, the three papers which have thus far defended the cause of the rebellion in the United States, are exactly those which sustain the Almonte-Maximilian programme for Mexico; while the rest of the journals, with the exception of the Catholics, defend the cause of the Union in the United States, and combat the monarchical programme in Mexico. This striking concurrence in the division of views on the two subjects, indicates, beyond any question, that for the French there is an important connection between the two. It is this connection which gives the question its gravity.

For a long time the Emperor has dreamed of two things:

First—The acquisition of Sonora, with its gold and silver mines.

Second—The reconstruction of the Latin race, and the pitting of this race and Catholicism against the Anglo Saxon race and Protestantism.

The two governments of France and England, and no doubt of Spain also, did not believe till lately that there was any possibility of the suppression of the rebellion in the United States and the reconstruction of the Union. When, therefore, the treaty of London, of last year, in regard to the expedition to Mexico, was drawn up, it was drawn up with an almost complete indifference as to what the United States might think or do about it, and there is now every reason to believe that each of the contracting parties had ulterior views, which were not only concealed from the world, but from each other. The treaty was therefore drawn up in a loose and vague manner, so as to admit of deviations at will, so that each might seize upon whatever advantages offered themselves. And here I ought to recall, for its historical value, an observation made by Mr. Dayton nine months ago, and put upon record at the time in this correspondence, to the effect that, although the French government was full of kind and frank expressions towards the United States in connection with this Mexican expedition, yet that there seemed to be a vagueness and a confusion in their own understanding of the objects and the details of the expedition which foreboded no good to the future relations between France and the United States.

At the time of the arrival of the Soledad Convention at Paris there had been nothing done toward changing the belief of the French Government that a final dissolution of the Union was inevitable, and Napoleon is known at that time to have given Gen. Lorencez hasty and imperative orders to hurry on to the City of Mexico, without regard to consequences. Why? Because, the Government papers here now say, it was recognized as impossible to gain the objects of the expedition without displacing Jaurez from power and establishing in his stead a stable government, capable of offering, besides indemnity for the present, security for the future. And here is where the English and Spaniards deserted Napoleon, and where the great majority of Napoleon's own subjects also deserted him. They divided on the question of an interference in the internal affairs of Mexico, after having obtained satisfaction for the first objects of the expedition. It came out all at once that Napoleon had been serious in his secret transactions with Almonte at Paris,

and that the plan of erecting a throne for an Austrian Prince was not an illusion. Knowing the mind of the Mexican people, the Allies and the Liberals of Paris naturally and legitimately jumped to the conclusion that the Emperor was bent on a conquest of the country, for that was the only condition on which he could maintain a foreign Prince in power, and that sooner or later it would terminate with an acquisition of territory and a war with the United States.

The news of the breaking up of the alliance at Orizaba arrived in Europe with that of the capture of New Orleans, and it is hard to tell which event caused most consternation at the Palace. For the first time the fact that the Southern Confederacy might possibly prove a failure, penetrated the short vision of the French Government; and now we believe that under the influence of these two events, the French Government has modified its intentions, and that it has sent to Mexico orders not to push matters to the extreme point at first designed.

The opposition press here has said to the Emperor: Your Mexican expedition, under the present aspect of the case, (that is to say, as an agent of the monarchial party,) is either an aberration or a scheme for the ransom of Venetia. If it be the first, comment is unnecessary—there is but one course to follow: withdraw as quickly as possible after securing what Mexico owes us; if it be the ransom of Venetia that is intended, permit us to suggest that a war with Austria in the quadrilateral will cost us infinitely less in time; men, money, and especially in honor, than a war with the United States.

The opposition press also points out with telling effect on the public mind the analogy which exists between the entrance of the allies into France in 1815, bringing with them the exiles who were selling their country in order to gain power for a minority. For whatever may be the faults of Juarez, he is fighting for his native country against the foreigner, which constitutes his patriotism—quite another thing to that of Almonte, Miramon and company.

As we understand the question then, to-day, Napoleon, at the moment he heard of the treaty of Soledad, gave to Gen. Lorencez instructions which conveyed with them the perspective of a monarchy, a more or less permanent occupation, an acquisition of territory, and a strengthening of the Latin race in America. But the late Union victories have changed the programme, and by this time we have every reason to believe Gen. Lorencez has received a modification to his previous orders. But how far this modification extends no one knows or pretends even to conjecture. That the Emperor will renounce the monarchical programme is, however, generally believed, but whether, when his troops arrive at the capital, they will treat with Juarez or insist on putting Almonte into the Presidential chair before treating, is all in doubt. If Almonte is put into the chair provisionally, every one can see that then the reign of anarchy will only have commenced, and that the French will be obliged to remain to carry out their unfortunate programme by force. And yet, up to the present moment, the Ministerial papers here declare that it will be degrading to the dignity of France to treat with such a man as Juarez, and

that such a thing cannot be thought of for a moment. But who can see the end if they go beyond Juarez? One step beyond him and everything is darkness and confusion. Every one in France seems to understand that, if the power of the Federal Government is again consolidated by the suppression of the rebellion, Mexico will at once occupy the attention of the United States, and that France cannot afford, for the benefit of an Austrian Duke and a score of Mexican exiles, to bring upon herself a war with the United States.

The Republicans in France, in view of this war with the United States, declare that it will bring with it the downfall of the Bonaparte dynasty, and they are quite elated at the prospect.

Among the persons who have been indicated as having used their influence with the Emperor since the commencement of the rebellion, in urging on the Sonora programme, are Messrs. Michel-Chevalier, Fould, Rouher, and De Rothschild. These gentlemen do not see why France should not make an acquisition of valuable gold mines—which, by the way, she much needs—as well as the United States.

As regards the more utopian scheme of reconstructing and strengthening the Latin and Catholic elements in America, some of the most influential imperialist writers of France have long been urging it. To these must be added a demented party not far removed from the Emperor's person, who dream of nothing less than setting up in America what has been repudiated in Europe—a nobility system, based upon the divine right, and which shall give an asylum and an occupation to the castoff kings and princes of Europe. They would have the Grand Duke Maxamilian or Ferdinand II., of Naples, placed on the throne of Mexico, surrounded by the European rejected princes, and this try to gain a new foothold for a system which is here growing weaker every day.

But the Emperor has generally shown great judgment in seizing the right side of questions as they pass before him, and great wisdom in retreating from mistaken positions, into which, like the ablest of men, he has sometimes fallen; and we have great confidence that he will yet, with the new light which has broken in upon him from the United States, retire from Mexico before he has become so far entangled in the meshes that await him.

A new secession pamphlet is also just out, to which M. Marc de Haut, advocate at the Imperial Court, has put his name. It is entitled: *The American Crisis: its causes, probable results, and connection with France and Europe*. The pamphlet is but a repetition of several of those which have preceded it, and appears to prove that the secessionists think it necessary to keep certain arguments continually, in one form or another, before the public. The following are the stereotyped heads of arguments found in this book: Republics, when they grow too large, must divide. The Americans of the North are ancient English Puritans, sombre, intolerant, taciturn and commercial. The Southerners are descendants of the Cavaliers, grand, historical *seigneurs*, who love a large and free existence, who don't build workshops or counters, but furnish orators, statesmen and presidents. The

sole cause of the dissolution of the Union is the tariff—slavery was only the pretext. The Yankees abandoned slavery in the Northern States, not from principle, but because free labor was more profitable in their climate. The proof of this is found in their well known antipathy to the person of the negro. The present struggle is one of free trade against protection. A reunion can never take place. And then the writer terminates with that funny appeal for the sympathy of the French—that the South is French. ‘Does not,’ he exclaims, ‘the General-in-Chief of the Southern forces bear a French name—Beauregard? And what souvenirs do the following names of *Southern* towns recall to the French hear—Louisburg, Montmorency, St. Louis, Vincennes, Duquesne, New Orleans?’

Thus you will see that the French secessionists demand sympathy for the South because it is French, while, the other day, the London *Times* demanded the sympathy of the English for the South because it is English! We hope they will settle the question between them.

MALAKOFF.”

Oil magnates wanted to steal Mexican oil and the American Government readied to invade Mexico in order to seize their oil fields during World War I, but President Wilson did not approve the plan. Bernard Baruch tells this story and according to him, the financiers asked the President to invade Mexico without a declaration of war by the Congress.¹¹⁶³ House, while exorcizing his real power over the United States Government, used banker corruption to justify “reforms” which resulted in greater banker corruption and eventually in the Great Depression.

At the instigation of the Jewish bankers, House and Wilson led America into bloody world war allegedly for the sake of peace and to “make the world safe for democracy”—democracies like Bolshevik Russia. They were unjust to Germany in the name of justice, and oppressed and exploited the Third World in the name of freedom and equality for small nations. The First World War yielded them immense profits, which the Jewish bankers then used to corrupt the stock markets, which then led to the Depression, which then enabled them to buy whatever they wanted to buy at deflated prices, which then led to the Second World War, which yielded them immense profits. Smedley D. Butler’s book *War Is a Racket*, Round Table Press, New York, (1935), tells of the ungodly profits the warmongers made under the Wilson Administration at the expense of the American People they were duty bound to protect. Wilson was the perfect puppet dictator House had envisioned in his book.

The Zionists knew a great deal about dictators and revolutions. George Orwell warned in 1945 that revolutions most often result in a mere shift of power, and ultimately return to the same, or even worse, unfair conditions,¹¹⁶⁴ Zionist Max Simon Nordau explored this common wisdom in 1909 in a book translated into English in 1910,

“Revolutions do not, as a rule, transform anything, with the exception of the hierarchy of rank. Generally they leave everything essentially as it is: the weak continue to be exploited, and the strong exploit. New modes of

adaptation to what is disagreeable prolong the endurance of what is enduring. Only, other individuals and classes take the place of those individuals and classes hitherto privileged to exploit. Revolution gives to some what it takes from others. It is a practical test of the symbols and prestige of power, which are tried and found wanting. It gives the strong the position inherited by the weak man, who maintained it simply because his strength was a tradition which had never been tested. It destroys an appearance which corresponded to no reality. But its effect does not last. 'Red men are white men on the way; white men are red men arrived,' as Alphonse Karr has said. A new order soon becomes petrified to a new routine; the new real strength soon dissipates itself in new symbols; new weakly heirs begin to live on the prestige of new strong ancestors. A long period of time presents the aspect of a succession of waves of more or less equal size. The noisiest revolutions are very limited in their effect, and do not go very deep. Tocqueville [*Footnote*: Quoted by Robert Flint, 'The Philosophy of History in France and Germany,' Edinburgh and London, 1874, p. 313.] declares that 'even the great French Revolution has had far less influence upon the course of development of French history than is believed.' Lotze [*Footnote*: Hermann Lotze, 'Microcosm: Idea of a History and Natural History of Mankind—an Attempted Anthropology,' vol. iii, Leipzig, 1864, p. 49.] lets fall a stimulating remark: 'The unrest and variety manifest in constant revolutions and reconstructions, for which a connected meaning is sought, simply represents the history of the male sex: women make their way through the storm and stress, hardly affected by its changing aspects, renewing with perpetual uniformity the grand, simple forms of the life of the human soul.' This needs one limitation, however. History is not that of the male sex, but of a small section of it; what Lotze says of women is true of the great majority of men.

We have been speaking of revolutions. It might be objected that historical advance is not always, perhaps not even mainly, due to revolution, but to at least an equal extent to slow, tentative, and peaceful innovations, limited in extent, directed by authority. The objection would be invalid. From a psychological point of view there is no difference between the revolution and the cautious, official reform. Every innovation breaks in upon habit, and compels new adaptations. Even the picture on a postage-stamp cannot be altered without disturbing someone and overcoming some opposition. The difference between revolution and reform or evolution is not a difference of essential, but of mass, extent, energy, rhythm. Revolution requires greater strength on the part of those who rouse it than reform does, because it has against it the weight of habit, the whole routine of life, the interests of the powerful, the symbols connected in the minds of the multitude with the ideas of power, legality, order, and respectability: on its side, only the superior will-power of its leaders, the sense of discontent of their followers, and the adaptability of the young, whose habits are not yet stereotyped, and whose discontent is less patient than that of the older generation. The advantage of

reform is that it can be undertaken with smaller powers. It is set going with the aid of the whole machinery of society and the State, which embodies the habits of the multitude. It therefore departs less from routine, offends fewer people, and demands less new adaptation than revolution does. But the same cause operates in both—the discontent that is felt and understood as the need for change.”¹¹⁶⁵

The horrors of the Civil War and the destruction of the South still haunted Americans, who were not eager for revolution nor war. Americans had to be shocked and propagandized into the war. House had to create his revolution and dictatorship by operating behind the scenes through a puppet President. He had to find someone with charisma—someone he could control.

House maintained an almost surreal relationship with President Wilson. Wilson thought of House as his soul mate or “alter ego”, until House betrayed him for the sake of Great Britain and Zionism at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, where Wilson’s (originally House’s) Fourteen Point plan for a just peace with Germany (and the colonial exploitation of the Third World) was abandoned for punitive measures that crushed Germany.

Much has been written by and about Edward Mandell House.¹¹⁶⁶ Sigmund Freud coauthored a book with William Bullitt, *Thomas Woodrow Wilson, Twenty-Eighth President of the United States: A Psychological Study*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, (1966/1967); which famously employed the use of psychology as a political weapon to smear Wilson, and which expresses the authors’ opinions about the formation and nature of Wilson’s personality and its relationship to, and impact on, world events. Many of the disastrous actions Woodrow Wilson took as President of the United States were forced on him by the ardent Zionists Louis Dembitz Brandeis and “Colonel” Edward Mandell House.

House’s intentions were revealed in his book *Philip Dru: Administrator* of 1911. He planned to corrupt the Senate and install a puppet President of the United States, who would do his bidding and that of the financiers House favored, and who favored him. With a puppet President in power, House planned to stack the Supreme Court with appointees of his choosing and House planned to name all of the President’s other appointees. “Colonel” Edward Mandell House succeeded in his plans. In his book he makes a Socialist dictator the hero. House was the corrupt “Selwyn”. House wrote, *inter alia*:

“Chapter XI

Selwyn Plots with Thor

For five years Gloria and Philip worked in their separate fields, but, nevertheless, coming in frequent touch with one another. Gloria proselyting the rich by showing them their selfishness, and turning them to a larger purpose in life, and Philip leading the forces of those who had consecrated themselves to the uplifting of the unfortunate. It did not take Philip long to discern that in the last analysis it would be necessary for himself and co-workers to reach the results aimed at through politics. Masterful and arrogant

wealth, created largely by Government protection of its profits, not content with its domination and influence within a single party, had sought to corrupt them both, and to that end had insinuated itself into the primaries, in order that no candidates might be nominated whose views were not in accord with theirs.

By the use of all the money that could be spent, by a complete and compact organization and by the most infamous sort of deception regarding his real opinions and intentions, plutocracy had succeeded in electing its creature to the Presidency. There had been formed a league, the membership of which was composed of one thousand multi-millionaires, each one contributing ten thousand dollars. This gave a fund of ten million dollars with which to mislead those that could be misled, and to debauch the weak and uncertain.

This nefarious plan was conceived by a senator whose swollen fortune had been augmented year after year through the tributes paid him by the interests he represented. He had a marvelous aptitude for political manipulation and organization, and he forged a subtle chain with which to hold in subjection the natural impulses of the people. His plan was simple, but behind it was the cunning of a mind that had never known defeat. There was no man in either of the great political parties that was big enough to cope with him or to unmask his methods.

Up to the advent of Senator Selwyn, the interests had not successfully concealed their hands. Sometimes the public had been mistaken as to the true character of their officials, but sooner or later the truth had developed, for in most instances, wealth was openly for or against certain men and measures. But the adroit Selwyn moved differently.

His first move was to confer with John Thor, the high priest of finance, and unfold his plan to him, explaining how essential was secrecy. It was agreed between them that it should be known to the two of them only.

Thor's influence throughout commercial America was absolute. His wealth, his ability and even more the sum of the capital he could control through the banks, trust companies and industrial organizations, which he dominated, made his word as potent as that of a monarch.

He and Selwyn together went over the roll and selected the thousand that were to give each ten thousand dollars. Some they omitted for one reason or another, but when they had finished they had named those who could make or break within a day any man or corporation within their sphere of influence. Thor was to send for each of the thousand and compliment him by telling him that there was a matter, appertaining to the general welfare of the business fraternity, which needed twenty thousand dollars, that he, Thor, would put up ten, and wanted him to put up as much, that sometime in the future, or never, as the circumstances might require, would he make a report as to the expenditure and purpose therefor.

There were but few men of business between the Atlantic and Pacific, or between Canada and Mexico, who did not consider themselves fortunate in

being called to New York by Thor, and in being asked to join him in a blind pool looking to the safe-guarding of wealth. Consequently, the amassing of this great corruption fund in secret was simple. If necessity had demanded it twice the sum could have been raised. The money when collected was placed in Thor's name in different banks controlled by him, and Thor, from time to time, as requested by Selwyn, placed in banks designated by him whatever sums were needed. Selwyn then transferred these amounts to the private bank of his son-in-law, who became final paymaster. The result was that the public had no chance of obtaining any knowledge of the fund or how it was spent.

The plan was simple, the result effective. Selwyn had no one to interfere with him. The members of the pool had contributed blindly to Thor, and Thor preferred not to know what Selwyn was doing nor how he did it. It was a one man power which in the hands of one possessing ability of the first class, is always potent for good or evil.

Not only did Selwyn plan to win the Presidency, but he also planned to bring under his control both the Senate and the Supreme Court. He selected one man in each of thirty of the States, some of them belonging to his party and some to the opposition, whom he intended to have run for the Senate.

If he succeeded in getting twenty of them elected, he counted upon having a good majority of the Senate, because there were already thirty-eight Senators upon whom he could rely in any serious attack upon corporate wealth.

As to the Supreme Court, of the nine justices there were three that were what he termed 'safe and sane,' and another that could be counted upon in a serious crisis.

Three of them, upon whom he could not rely, were of advanced age, and it was practically certain that the next President would have that many vacancies to fill. Then there would be an easy working majority.

His plan contemplated nothing further than this. His intention was to block all legislation adverse to the interests. He would have no new laws to fear, and of the old, the Supreme Court would properly interpret them.

He did not intend that his Senators should all vote alike, speak alike, or act from apparently similar motives. Where they came from States dominated by corporate wealth, he would have them frankly vote in the open, and according to their conviction.

When they came from agricultural States, where the sentiment was known as 'progressive,' they could cover their intentions in many ways. One method was by urging an amendment so radical that no honest progressive would consent to it, and then refusing to support the more moderate measure because it did not go far enough. Another was to inject some clause that was clearly unconstitutional, and insist upon its adoption, and refusing to vote for the bill without its insertion.

Selwyn had no intention of letting any one Senator know that he controlled any other senator. There were to be no caucuses, no conferences of his making, or anything that looked like an organization. He was the

center, and from him radiated everything appertaining to measures affecting 'the interests.'

Chapter XII

Selwyn Seeks a Candidate

Selwyn then began carefully scrutinizing such public men in the States known as Presidential cradles, as seemed to him eligible. By a process of elimination he centered upon two that appeared desirable.

One was James R. Rockland, recently elected Governor of a State of the Middle West. The man had many of the earmarks of a demagogue, which Selwyn readily recognized, and he therefore concluded to try him first.

Accordingly he went to the capital of the State ostensibly upon private business, and dropped in upon the Governor in the most casual way. Rockland was distinctly flattered by the attention, for Selwyn was, perhaps, the best known figure in American politics, while he, himself, had only begun to attract attention. They had met at conventions and elsewhere, but they were practically unacquainted, for Rockland had never been permitted to enter the charmed circle which gathered around Selwyn.

'Good morning, Governor,' said Selwyn, when he had been admitted to Rockland's private room. 'I was passing through the capital and I thought I would look in on you and see how your official cares were using you.'

'I am glad to see you, Senator,' said Rockland effusively, 'very glad, for there are some party questions coming up at the next session of the Legislature about which I particularly desire your advice.'

'I have but a moment now, Rockland,' answered the Senator, 'but if you will dine with me in my rooms at the Mandell House to-night it will be a pleasure to talk over such matters with you.'

'Thank you, Senator, at what hour?'

'You had better come at seven for if I finish my business here to-day, I shall leave on the 10 o'clock for Washington,' said Selwyn.

Thus in the most casual way the meeting was arranged. As a matter of fact, Rockland had no party matters to discuss, and Selwyn knew it. He also knew that Rockland was ambitious to become a leader, and to get within the little group that controlled the party and the Nation.

Rockland was a man of much ability, but he fell far short of measuring up with Selwyn, who was in a class by himself. The Governor was a good orator, at times even brilliant, and while not a forceful man, yet he had magnetism which served him still better in furthering his political fortunes. He was not one that could be grossly corrupted, yet he was willing to play to the galleries in order to serve his ambition, and he was willing to forecast his political acts in order to obtain potential support.

When he reached the Mandell House, he was at once shown to the Senator's rooms. Selwyn received him cordially enough to be polite, and asked him if he would not look over the afternoon paper for a moment while he finished a note he was writing. He wrote leisurely, then rang for a boy and ordered dinner to be served.

Selwyn merely tasted the wine (he seldom did more) but Rockland drank freely though not to excess. After they had talked over the local matters which were supposed to be the purpose of the conference, much to Rockland's delight, the Senator began to discuss national politics.

'Rockland,' began Selwyn, 'can you hold this state in line at next year's election?'

'I feel sure that I can, Senator, why do you ask?'

'Since we have been talking here,' he replied, 'it has occurred to me that if you could be nominated and elected again, the party might do worse than to consider you for the presidential nomination the year following.'

'No, my dear fellow, don't interrupt me,' continued Selwyn mellifluously.

'It is strange how fate or chance enters into the life of man and even of nations. A business matter calls me here, I pass your office and think to pay my respects to the Governor of the State. Some political questions are perplexing you, and my presence suggests that I may aid in their solution. This dinner follows, your personality appeals to me, and the thought flits through my mind, why should not Rockland, rather than some other man, lead the party two years from now?'

'And the result, my dear Rockland, may be, probably will be, your becoming chief magistrate of the greatest republic the sun has ever shone on.'

Rockland by this time was fairly hypnotized by Selwyn's words, and by their tremendous import. For a moment he dared not trust himself to speak.

'Senator Selwyn,' he said at last, 'it would be idle for me to deny that you have excited within me an ambition that a moment ago would have seemed worse than folly. Your influence within the party and your ability to conduct a campaign, gives to your suggestion almost the tender of the presidency. To tell you that I am deeply moved does scant justice to my feelings. If, after further consideration, you think me worthy of the honor, I shall feel under lasting obligations to you which I shall endeavor to repay in every way consistent with honor and with a sacred regard for my oath of office.'

'I want to tell you frankly, Rockland,' answered Selwyn, 'that up to now I have had someone else in mind, but I am in no sense committed, and we might as well discuss the matter to as near a conclusion as is possible at this time.'

Selwyn's voice hardened a little as he went on. 'You would not want a nomination that could not carry with a reasonable certainty of election, therefore I would like to go over with you your record, both public and private, in the most open yet confidential way. It is better that you and I, in the privacy of these rooms, should lay bare your past than that it should be done in a bitter campaign and by your enemies. What we say to one another here is to be as if never spoken, and the grave itself must not be more silent. Your private life not only needs to be clean, but there must be no public act at which any one can point an accusing finger.'

‘Of course, of course,’ said Rockland, with a gesture meant to convey the complete openness of his record.

‘Then comes the question of party regularity,’ continued Selwyn, without noticing. ‘Be candid with me, for, if you are not, the recoil will be upon your own head.’

‘I am sure that I can satisfy you on every point, Senator. I have never scratched a party ticket nor have I ever voted against any measure endorsed by a party caucus,’ said Governor Rockland.

‘That is well,’ smiled the Senator. ‘I assume that in making your important appointments you will consult those of us who have stood sponsor for you, not only to the party but to the country. It would be very humiliating to me if I should insist upon your nomination and election and then should for four years have to apologize for what I had done.’

Musingly, as if contemplating the divine presence in the works of man, Selwyn went on, while he closely watched Rockland from behind his half-closed eyelids.

‘Our scheme of Government contemplates, I think, a diffuse responsibility, my dear Rockland. While a president has a constitutional right to act alone, he has no moral right to act contrary to the tenets and traditions of his party, or to the advice of the party leaders, for the country accepts the candidate, the party and the party advisers as a whole and not severally.

‘It is a natural check, which by custom the country has endorsed as wise, and which must be followed in order to obtain a proper organization. Do you follow me, Governor, and do you endorse this unwritten law?’

If Rockland had heard this at second hand, if he had read it, or if it had related to someone other than himself, he would have detected the sophistry of it. But, exhilarated by wine and intoxicated by ambition, he saw nothing but a pledge to deal squarely by the organization.

‘Senator,’ he replied fulsomely, ‘gratitude is one of the tenets of my religion, and therefore inversely ingratitude is unknown to me. You and the organization can count on my loyalty from the beginning to the end, for I shall never fail you.

‘I know you will not ask me to do anything at which my conscience will rebel, nor to make an appointment that is not entirely fit.’

‘That, Rockland, goes without saying,’ answered the Senator with dignity. ‘I have all the wealth and all the position that I desire. I want nothing now except to do my share towards making my native land grow in prosperity, and to make the individual citizen more contented. To do this we must cease this eternal agitation, this constant proposal of half-baked measures, which the demagogues are offering as a panacea to all the ills that flesh is heir to.

‘We need peace, legislative and political peace, so that our people may turn to their industries and work them to success, in the wholesome knowledge that the laws governing commerce and trade conditions will not be disturbed over night.’

‘I agree with you there, Senator,’ said Rockland eagerly.

‘We have more new laws now than we can digest in a decade,’ continued Selwyn, ‘so let us have rest until we do digest them. In Europe the business world works under stable conditions. There we find no proposal to change the money system between moons, there we find no uncertainty from month to month regarding the laws under which manufacturers are to make their products, but with us, it is a wise man who knows when he can afford to enlarge his output.

‘A high tariff threatens to-day, a low one to-morrow, and a large part of the time the business world lies in helpless perplexity.

‘I take it, Rockland, that you are in favor of stability, that you will join me in my endeavors to give the country a chance to develop itself and its marvelous natural resources.’

As a matter of fact, Rockland’s career had given no evidence of such views. He had practically committed his political fortunes on the side of the progressives, but the world had turned around since then, and he viewed things differently.

‘Senator,’ he said, his voice tense in his anxiety to prove his reliability, ‘I find that in the past I have taken only a cursory view of conditions. I see clearly that what you have outlined is a high order of statesmanship. You are constructive: I have been on the side of those who would tear down. I will gladly join hands with you and build up, so that the wealth and power of this country shall come to equal that of any two nations in existence.’

Selwyn settled back in his chair, nodding his approval and telling himself that he would not need to seek further for his candidate.

At Rockland’s earnest solicitation he remained over another day. The Governor gave him copies of his speeches and messages, so that he could assure himself that there was no serious flaw in his public record.

Selwyn cautioned him about changing his attitude too suddenly. ‘Go on, Rockland, as you have done in the past. It will not do to see the light too quickly. You have the progressives with you now, keep them, and I will let the conservatives know that you think straight and may be trusted.

‘We must consult frequently together,’ he continued, ‘but cautiously. There is no need for any one to know that we are working together harmoniously. I may even get some of the conservative papers to attack you judiciously. It will not harm you. But, above all, do nothing of importance without consulting me.

‘I am committing the party and the Nation to you, and my responsibility is a heavy one, and I owe it to them that no mistakes are made.’

‘You may trust me, Senator,’ said Rockland. ‘I understand perfectly.’

[***]

Chapter XIV

The Making of a President

Selwyn now devoted himself to the making of enough conservative senators to control comfortably that body. The task was not difficult to a man of his

sagacity with all the money he could spend.

Newspapers were subsidized in ways they scarcely recognized themselves. Honest officials who were in the way were removed by offering them places vastly more remunerative, and in this manner he built up a strong, intelligent and well constructed machine. It was done so sanely and so quietly that no one suspected the master mind behind it all. Selwyn was responsible to no one, took no one into his confidence, and was therefore in no danger of betrayal.

It was a fascinating game to Selwyn. It appealed to his intellectual side far more than it did to his avarice. He wanted to govern the Nation with an absolute hand, and yet not be known as the directing power. He arranged to have his name appear less frequently in the press and he never submitted to interviews, laughingly ridding himself of reporters by asserting that he knew nothing of importance. He had a supreme contempt for the blatant self-advertised politician, and he removed himself as far as possible from that type.

In the meantime his senators were being elected, the Rockland sentiment was steadily growing and his nomination was finally brought about by the progressives fighting vigorously for him and the conservatives yielding a reluctant consent. It was done so adroitly that Rockland would have been fooled himself, had not Selwyn informed him in advance of each move as it was made.

After the nomination, Selwyn had trusted men put in charge of the campaign, which he organized himself, though largely under cover. The opposition party had every reason to believe that they would be successful, and it was a great intellectual treat to Selwyn to overcome their natural advantages by the sheer force of ability, plus what money he needed to carry out his plans. He put out the cry of lack of funds, and indeed it seemed to be true, for he was too wise to make a display of his resources. To ward heelers, to the daily press, and to professional stump speakers, he gave scant comfort. It was not to such sources that he looked for success.

He began by eliminating all states he knew the opposition party would certainly carry, but he told the party leaders there to claim that a revolution was brewing, and that a landslide would follow at the election. This would keep his antagonists busy and make them less effective elsewhere.

He also ignored the states where his side was sure to win. In this way he was free to give his entire thoughts to the twelve states that were debatable, and upon whose votes the election would turn. He divided each of these states into units containing five thousand voters, and, at the national headquarters, he placed one man in charge of each unit. Of the five thousand, he roughly calculated there would be two thousand voters that no kind of persuasion could turn from his party and two thousand that could not be changed from the opposition. This would leave one thousand doubtful ones to win over. So he had a careful poll made in each unit, and eliminated the strictly unpersuadable party men, and got down to a complete analysis of the

debatable one thousand. Information was obtained as to their race, religion, occupation and former political predilection. It was easy then to know how to reach each individual by literature, by persuasion or perhaps by some more subtle argument. No mistake was made by sending the wrong letter or the wrong man to any of the desired one thousand.

In the states so divided, there was, at the local headquarters, one man for each unit just as at the national headquarters. So these two had only each other to consider, and their duty was to bring to Rockland a majority of the one thousand votes within their charge. The local men gave the conditions, the national men gave the proper literature and advice, and the local man then applied it. The money that it cost to maintain such an organization was more than saved from the waste that would have occurred under the old method.

The opposition management was sending out tons of printed matter, but they sent it to state headquarters that, in turn, distributed it to the county organizations, where it was dumped into a corner and given to visitors when asked for. Selwyn's committee used one-fourth as much printed matter, but it went in a sealed envelope, along with a cordial letter, direct to a voter that had as yet not decided how he would vote.

The opposition was sending speakers at great expense from one end of the country to the other, and the sound of their voices rarely fell on any but friendly and sympathetic ears. Selwyn sent men into his units to personally persuade each of the one thousand hesitating voters to support the Rockland ticket.

The opposition was spending large sums upon the daily press. Selwyn used the weekly press so that he could reach the fireside of every farmer and the dweller in the small country towns. These were the ones that would read every line in their local papers and ponder over it.

The opposition had its candidates going by special train to every part of the Union, making many speeches every day, and mostly to voters that could not be driven from him either by force or persuasion. The leaders in cities, both large and small, would secure a date and, having in mind for themselves a postmastership or collectorship, would tell their followers to turn out in great force and give the candidate a big ovation. They wanted the candidate to remember the enthusiasm of these places, and to leave greatly pleased and under the belief that he was making untold converts. As a matter of fact his voice would seldom reach any but a staunch partisan.

Selwyn kept Rockland at home, and arranged to have him meet by special appointment the important citizens of the twelve uncertain states. He would have the most prominent party leader, in a particular state, go to a rich brewer or large manufacturer, whose views had not yet been crystallized, and say, 'Governor Rockland has expressed a desire to know you, and I would like to arrange a meeting.' The man approached would be flattered to think he was of such importance that a candidate for the presidency had expressed a desire to meet him. He would know it was his influence that was wanted but, even so, there was a subtle flattery in that. An appointment would be

arranged. Just before he came into Rockland's presence, his name and a short epitome of his career would be handed to Rockland to read. When he reached Rockland's home he would at first be denied admittance. His sponsor would say,—‘this is Mr. Munting of Muntingville.’ ‘Oh, pardon me, Mr. Munting, Governor Rockland expects you.’

And in this way he is ushered into the presence of the great. His fame, up to a moment ago, was unknown to Rockland, but he now grasps his hand cordially and says,—‘I am delighted to know you, Mr. Munting. I recall the address you made a few years ago when you gave a library to Muntingville. It is men of your type that have made America what it is to-day, and, whether you support me or not, if I am elected President it is such as you that I hope will help sustain my hands in my effort to give to our people a clean, sane and conservative government.’

When Munting leaves he is stepping on air. He sees visions of visits to Washington to consult the President upon matters of state, and perhaps he sees an ambassadorship in the misty future. He becomes Rockland's ardent supporter, and his purse is open and his influence is used to the fullest extent.

And this was Selwyn's way. It was all so simple. The opposition was groaning under the thought of having one hundred millions of people to reach, and of having to persuade a majority of twenty millions of voters to take their view.

Selwyn had only one thousand doubtful voters in each of a few units on his mind, and he knew the very day when a majority of them had decided to vote for Rockland, and that his fight was won. The pay-roll of the opposition was filled with incompetent political hacks, that had been fastened upon the management by men of influence. Selwyn's force, from end to end, was composed of able men who did a full day's work under the eye of their watchful taskmaster.

And Selwyn won and Rockland became the keystone of the arch he had set out to build.

There followed in orderly succession the inauguration, the selection of cabinet officers and the new administration was launched.

Drunk with power and the adulation of sycophants, once or twice Rockland asserted himself, and acted upon important matters without having first conferred with Selwyn. But, after he had been bitterly assailed by Selwyn's papers and by his senators, he made no further attempts at independence. He felt that he was utterly helpless in that strong man's hands, and so, indeed, he was.

One of the Supreme Court justices died, two retired because of age, and all were replaced by men suggested by Selwyn.

He now had the Senate, the Executive and a majority of the Court of last resort. The government was in his hands. He had reached the summit of his ambition, and the joy of it made all his work seem worth while.

But Selwyn, great man that he was, did not know, could not know, that when his power was greatest it was most insecure. He did not know, could

not know, what force was working to his ruin and to the ruin of his system.

Take heart, therefore, you who had lost faith in the ultimate destiny of the Republic, for a greater than Selwyn is here to espouse your cause. He comes panoplied in justice and with the light of reason in his eyes. He comes as the advocate of equal opportunity and he comes with the power to enforce his will.

[***]

Chapter XVII

Selwyn and Thor Defend Themselves

In the meantime Selwyn and Thor had issued an address, defending their course as warranted by both the facts and the law.

They said that the Government had been honeycombed by irresponsible demagogues, that were fattening upon the credulity of the people to the great injury of our commerce and prosperity, that no laws unfriendly to the best interests had been planned, and no act had been contemplated inconsistent with the dignity and honor of the Nation. They contended that in protecting capital against vicious assaults, they were serving the cause of labor and advancing the welfare of all.

Thor's whereabouts was a mystery, but Selwyn, brave and defiant, pursued his usual way.

President Rockland also made a statement defending his appointments of Justices of the Supreme Court, and challenged anyone to prove them unfit. He said that, from the foundation of the Government, it had become customary for a President to make such appointments from amongst those whose views were in harmony with his own, that in this case he had selected men of well known integrity, and of profound legal ability, and, because they were such, they were brave enough to stand for the right without regard to the clamor of ill-advised and ignorant people. He stated that he would continue to do his duty, and that he would uphold the constitutional rights of all the people without distinction to race, color or previous condition.

Acting under Selwyn's advice, Rockland began to concentrate quietly troops in the large centers of population. He also ordered the fleets into home waters. A careful inquiry was made regarding the views of the several Governors within easy reach of Washington, and, finding most of them favorable to the Government, he told them that in case of disorder he would honor their requisition for federal troops. He advised a thorough overlooking of the militia, and the weeding out of those likely to sympathize with the 'mob.' If trouble came, he promised to act promptly and forcefully, and not to let mawkish sentiment encourage further violence.

He recalled to them that the French Revolution was caused, and continued, by the weakness and inertia of Louis Fifteenth and his ministers and that the moment the Directorate placed Bonaparte in command of a handful of troops, and gave him power to act, by the use of grape and ball he brought order in a day. It only needed a quick and decisive use of force, he thought, and untold suffering and bloodshed would be averted.

President Rockland believed what he said. He seemed not to know that Bonaparte dealt with a ragged, ignorant mob, and had back of him a nation that had been in a drunken and bloody orgy for a period of years and wanted to sober up. He seemed not to know that in this contest, the clear-brained, sturdy American patriot was enlisted against him and what he represented, and had determined to come once more into his own.

[***]

Chapter XXXVI

Selwyn's Story, Continued

Flushed though I was with victory, and with the flattery of friends, time servers and sycophants in my ears, I felt a deep sympathy for the boss. He was as a sinking ship and as such deserted. Yesterday a thing for envy, to-day an object of pity.

I wondered how long it would be before I, too, would be stranded.

The interests, were, of course, among the first to congratulate me and to assure me of their support. During that session of the legislature, I did not change the character of the legislation, or do anything very different from the usual. I wanted to feel my seat more firmly under me before attempting the many things I had in mind.

I took over into my camp all those that I could reasonably trust, and strengthened my forces everywhere as expeditiously as possible. I weeded out the incompetents, of whom there were many, and replaced them by big-hearted, loyal and energetic men, who had easy consciences when it came to dealing with the public affairs of either municipalities, counties or the State.

Of necessity, I had to use some who were vicious and dishonest, and who would betray me in a moment if their interests led that way. But of these there were few in my personal organization, though from experience, I knew their kind permeated the municipal machines to a large degree.

The lessons learned from Hardy were of value to me now. I was liberal to my following at the expense of myself, and I played the game fair as they knew it.

I declined re-election to the next legislature, because the office was not commensurate with the dignity of the position I held as party leader, and again, because the holding of state office was now a perilous undertaking.

In taking over the machine from the late boss, and in molding it into an almost personal following I found it not only loosely put together, but inefficient for my more ambitious purposes.

After giving it four or five years of close attention, I was satisfied with it, and I had no fear of dislodgment.

I had found that the interests were not paying anything like a commensurate amount for the special privileges they were getting, and I more than doubled the revenue obtained by the deposed boss.

This, of course, delighted my henchmen, and bound them more closely to me.

I also demanded and received information in advance of any extensions

of railroads, standard or interurban, of contemplated improvements of whatsoever character, and I doled out this information to those of my followers in whose jurisdiction lay such territory.

My own fortune I augmented by advance information regarding the appreciation of stocks. If an amalgamation of two important institutions was to occur, or if they were to be put upon a dividend basis, or if the dividend rate was to be increased, I was told, not only in advance of the public, but in advance of the stockholders themselves.

All such information I held in confidence even from my own followers, for it was given me with such understanding.

My next move was to get into national politics. I became something of a factor at the national convention, by swinging Pennsylvania's vote at a critical time; the result being the nomination of the now President, consequently my relations with him were most cordial.

The term of the senior Senator from our State was about to expire, and, although he was well advanced in years, he desired re-election.

I decided to take his seat for myself, so I asked the President to offer him an ambassadorship. He did not wish to make the change, but when he understood that it was that or nothing, he gracefully acquiesced in order that he might be saved the humiliation of defeat.

When he resigned, the Governor offered me the appointment for the unexpired term. It had only three months to run before the legislature met to elect his successor.

I told him that I could not accept until I had conferred with my friends. I had no intention of refusing, but I wanted to seem to defer to the judgment of my lieutenants.

I called them to the capital singly, and explained that I could be of vastly more service to the organization were I at Washington, and I arranged with them to convert the rank and file to this view.

Each felt that the weight of my decision rested upon himself, and their vanity was greatly pleased. I was begged not to renounce the leadership, and after persuasion, this I promised not to do.

As a matter of fact, it was never my intention to release my hold upon the State, thus placing myself in another's power.

So I accepted the tender of the Senatorship, and soon after, when the legislature met, I was elected for the full term.

I was in as close touch with my State at Washington as I was before, for I spent a large part of my time there.

I was not in Washington long before I found that the Government was run by a few men; that outside of this little circle no one was of much importance.

It was my intention to break into it if possible, and my ambition now leaped so far as to want, not only to be of it, but later, to be *it*.

I began my crusade by getting upon confidential terms with the President. One night, when we were alone in his private study, I told him of the

manner and completeness of my organization in Pennsylvania. I could see he was deeply impressed. He had been elected by an uncomfortably small vote, and he was, I knew, looking for someone to manage the next campaign, provided he again received the nomination.

The man who had done this work in the last election was broken in health, and had gone to Europe for an indefinite stay.

The President questioned me closely, and ended by asking me to undertake the direction of his campaign for re-nomination, and later to manage the campaign for his election in the event he was again the party's candidate.

I was flattered by the proffer, and told him so, but I was guarded in its acceptance. I wanted him to see more of me, hear more of my methods and to become, as it were, the suppliant.

This condition was soon brought about, and I entered into my new relations with him under the most favorable circumstances.

If I had readily acquiesced he would have assumed the air of favoring me, as it was, the rule was reversed.

He was overwhelmingly nominated and re-elected, and for the result he generously gave me full credit.

I was now well within the charmed circle, and within easy reach of my further desire to have no rivals. This came about naturally and without friction.

The interests, of course, were soon groveling at my feet, and, heavy as my demands were, I sometimes wondered like Clive at my own moderation.

The rest of my story is known to you. I had tightened a nearly invisible coil around the people, which held them fast, while the interests despoiled them. We overdid it, and you came with the conscience of the great majority of the American people back of you, and swung the Nation again into the moorings intended by the Fathers of the Republic.

When Selwyn had finished, the fire had burned low, and it was only now and then that his face was lighted by the flickering flames revealing a sadness that few had ever seen there before.

Perhaps he saw in the dying embers something typical of his life as it now was. Perhaps he longed to recall his youth and with it the strength, the nervous force and the tireless thought that he had used to make himself what he was.

When life is so nearly spilled as his, things are measured differently, and what looms large in the beginning becomes but the merest shadow when the race has been run.

As he contemplated the silent figure, Philip Dru felt something of regret himself, for he now knew the groundwork of the man, and he was sure that under other conditions, a career could have been wrought more splendid than that of any of his fellows.

In modeling the laws, Dru called to the attention of those boards that were doing that work, the so-called 'loan sharks,' and told them to deal with them with a heavy hand. By no sort of subterfuge were they to be permitted to be usurious. By their nefarious methods of charging the maximum legal rate of interest and then exacting a commission for monthly renewals of loans, the poor and the dependent were oftentimes made to pay several hundred per cent, interest per annum. The criminal code was to be invoked and protracted terms in prison, in addition to fines, were to be used against them.

He also called attention to a lesser, though serious, evil, of the practice of farmers, mine-owners, lumbermen and other employers of ignorant labor, of making advances of food, clothing and similar necessities to their tenants or workmen, and charging them extortionate prices therefor, thus securing the use of their labor at a cost entirely incommensurate with its value.

Stock, cotton and produce exchanges as then conducted came under the ban of the Administrator's displeasure, and he indicated his intention of reforming them to the extent of prohibiting, under penalty of fine and imprisonment, the selling either short or long, stocks, bonds, commodities of whatsoever character, or anything of value. Banks, corporations or individuals lending money to any corporation or individual whose purpose it was known to be to violate this law, should be deemed as guilty as the actual offender and should be as heavily punished.

An immediate enforcement of this law was made because, just before the Revolution, there was carried to a successful conclusion a gigantic but iniquitous cotton corner. Some twenty or more adventurous millionaires, led by one of the boldest speculators of those times, named Hawkins, planned and succeeded in cornering cotton.

It seemed that the world needed a crop of 16,000,000 bales, and while the yield for the year was uncertain it appeared that the crop would run to that figure and perhaps over. Therefore, prices were low and spot-cotton was selling around eight cents, and futures for the distant months were not much higher.

By using all the markets and exchanges and by exercising much skill and secrecy, Hawkins succeeded in buying two million bales of actual cotton, and ten million bales of futures at an approximate average of nine and a half cents. He had the actual cotton stored in relatively small quantities throughout the South, much of it being on the farms and at the gins where it was bought. Then, in order to hide his identity, he had incorporated a company called 'The Farmers' Protective Association.'

Through one of his agents he succeeded in officering it with well-known Southerners, who knew only that part of the plan which contemplated an increase in prices, and were in sympathy with it. He transferred his spot-cotton to this company, the stock of which he himself held through his dummies, *and then had his agents burn the entire two million bales.* The burning was done quickly and with spectacular effect, and the entire commercial world, both in America and abroad, were astounded by the act.

Once before in isolated instances the cotton planter had done this, and once the farmers of the West, discouraged by low prices, had used corn for fuel. That, however, was done on a small scale. But to deliberately burn one hundred million dollars worth of property was almost beyond the scope of the imagination.

The result was a cotton panic, and Hawkins succeeded in closing out his futures at an average price of fifteen cents, thereby netting twenty-five dollars a bale, and making for himself and fellow buccaneers one hundred and fifty million dollars.

After amazement came indignation at such frightful abuse of concentrated wealth. Those of Wall Street that were not caught, were open in their expressions of admiration for Hawkins, for of such material are their heroes made.

[***]

Chapter XLIII

The Rule of the Bosses

General Dru was ever fond of talking to Senator Selwyn. He found his virile mind a never-failing source of information. Busy as they both were they often met and exchanged opinions. In answer to a question from Dru, Selwyn said that while Pennsylvania and a few other States had been more completely under the domination of bosses than others, still the system permeated everywhere.

In some States a railroad held the power, but exercised it through an individual or individuals.

In another State, a single corporation held it, and yet again, it was often held by a corporate group acting together. In many States one individual dominated public affairs and more often for good than for evil.

The people simply would not take enough interest in their Government to exercise the right of control.

Those who took an active interest were used as a part of the boss' tools, be he a benevolent one or otherwise.

'The delegates go to the conventions,' said Selwyn, 'and think they have something to do with the naming of the nominees, and the making of the platforms. But the astute boss has planned all that far in advance, the candidates are selected and the platform written and both are 'forced' upon the unsuspecting delegate, much as the card shark forced his cards upon his victim. It is all seemingly in the open and above the boards, but as a matter of fact quite the reverse is true.

'At conventions it is usual to select some man who has always been honored and respected, and elect him chairman of the platform committee. He is pleased with the honor and is ready to do the bidding of the man to whom he owes it.

'The platform has been read to him and he has been committed to it before his appointment as chairman. Then a careful selection is made of delegates from the different senatorial districts and a good working majority

of trusted followers is obtained for places on the committee. Someone nominates for chairman the 'honored and respected' and he is promptly elected.

'Another member suggests that the committee, as it stands, is too unwieldy to draft a platform, and makes a motion that the chairman be empowered to appoint a sub-committee of five to outline one and submit it to the committee as a whole.

'The motion is carried and the chairman appoints five of the 'tried and true.' There is then an adjournment until the sub-committee is ready to report.

'The five betake themselves to a room in some hotel and smoke, drink and swap stories until enough time has elapsed for a proper platform to be written.

'They then report to the committee as a whole and, after some wrangling by the uninitiated, the platform is passed as the boss has written it without the addition of a single word.

'Sometimes it is necessary to place upon the sub-committee a recalcitrant or two. Then the method is somewhat different. The boss' platform is cut into separate planks and first one and then another of the faithful offers a plank, and after some discussion a majority of the committee adopt it. So when the sub-committee reports back there stands the boss' handiwork just as he has constructed it.

'Oftentimes there is no subterfuge, but the convention, as a whole, recognizes the pre-eminent ability of one man amongst them, and by common consent he is assigned the task.'

Selwyn also told Dru that it was often the practice among corporations not to bother themselves about state politics further than to control the Senate.

This smaller body was seldom more than one-fourth as large as the House, and usually contained not more than twenty-five or thirty members.

Their method was to control a majority of the Senate and let the House pass such measures as it pleased, and the Governor recommend such laws as he thought proper. Then the Senate would promptly kill all legislation that in any way touched corporate interests.

Still another method which was used to advantage by the interests where they had not been vigilant in the protection of their 'rights,' and when they had no sure majority either in the House or Senate and no influence with the Governor, was to throw what strength they had to the stronger side in the factional fights that were always going on in every State and in every legislature.

Actual money, Selwyn said, was now seldom given in the relentless warfare which the selfish interests were ever waging against the people, but it was intrigue, the promise of place and power, and the ever effectual appeal to human vanity.

That part of the press which was under corporate control was often able

to make or destroy a man's legislative and political career, and the weak and the vain and the men with shifty consciences, that the people in their fatuous indifference elect to make their laws, seldom fail to succumb to this subtle influence."

House's 1911 novel appeared as if a stage play scripted to give life to the *Übermensch* discussed in Max Simon Nordau's *The Interpretation of History* of 1909, which was translated into English in 1910, and (in chapters not here reprinted) to make the ambitious "superior man"—House's "dictator"—appear benevolent and necessary to reform. Nordau, who was not in this particular instance writing sentimental propaganda, had a more pessimistic view of the man who aspired to lead,

"The superior man reckons with the organized habits of the average crowd. His egoism employs different means for its satisfaction in an old, compact, and firmly established State from those applicable to the simple conditions of primitive barbarism. He no longer waves his axe above the head of the individual whom he wishes to subdue; he does not even permit armed servants to spread terror before them; instead he masters the machinery of State, and thus acquires at a single blow the power that in an unorganized crowd could only have been won by a series of acts of violence directed against individuals. He disturbs the habits of the multitude as little as possible; he makes them useful.

The parasitic egoism of the strong man assumes the most different forms, and passes, according to the degree of energy it possesses, through every stage, from the lowest desire for pleasure, through greed, vanity, and ambition, to the hunger for power and that inability to endure the thought of resistance, any limitation of personal omnipotence, which is allied to the hypertrophy of self that develops into megalomania. One is content with small satisfactions: he seeks to win his way to political power by his pliancy and observation of the idiosyncrasies of the men who are its guardians. He is the typical opportunist. At school he acquires the good graces of his teacher by flattery and obsequiousness; at the examination he studies the little preferences of the examiners; when an official, he pays court to those above him; by means of invitations, intrigues, and the influence of women, he becomes an academician, obtains titles and orders, and ends by dying as a pillar of society and the State, respectable and influential, surrounded by toadies, and envied by people in general. Another looks higher: he would not receive but distribute honours. In an absolute monarchy he attaches himself to the person of the ruler, studies him, and tries to make himself indispensable to him—in other words, he tries to master him and use him for the accomplishment of his own will. Under a modern democracy he comes forward at popular meetings; is at pains to acquire an influence over the crowd and to win their votes by appealing to their emotions and prejudices, by making promises and juggling with illusions; at the same time he tries to force himself into the inner circles of the leading people. Once in office, he

continues his activity until he has become a minister, party leader, or, in a republic, President. Others, though these are more rare, will not stop short of supreme power. They do not employ, or not to any great extent, the method of subservience, but rather that of force, much after the fashion of primitive man—that of mutiny, rising, military revolt, dictatorship, *coup d'état*. They are represented on a small scale by such men as Nicola di Rienzi, Jack Cade, Masaniello; on a big scale, and on the biggest, by Oliver Cromwell, Washington, Napoleon I. and III., and Louis Kossuth.

The instinct of exploitation that the man of will and deeds retains enables him to display his organic superiority in another sphere, in other fields of action, when it is directed to the amassing of wealth by speculations on the Stock Exchange, company promoting, the formation of trusts, cartels, and monopoly undertakings. Mighty financiers manage average men in the same way as do politicians, courtiers, and military despots. They begin by conjuring up illusions and intoxicating weak heads with their delights; then, as their power grows, they intimidate some and rouse the cupidity of the others by rewards and promises, purchase useful allies by a cleverly graduated system of shares, and so build up a human pyramid, on to the top of which they climb over backs, shoulders, and heads. The amassers of gold belong to the same family as the demagogue, the party leader, and the king-maker; this is not the place to enter into the psychic differences between them. Member of the same family, but a poor relation, an unsuccessful cousin, is the professional criminal, who has to content himself with the poorest and least remunerative form of exploitation, because he only possesses the parasitic instinct, without the intellectual equipment in himself, or the social forces behind him, to enable him to satisfy it on a large scale or in the grand style.

All these activities and careers conform to a single type. A man who is richly endowed by nature in any direction employs or misuses his superiority in order to subjugate others to his will, obtain possession of the fruits of their labour, or use them simply and solely for his own profit or pleasure. According to the degree and quality of his superiority, he makes them serviceable to himself by compulsion, fascination, illusion, or gross deception. To take a few examples. The politician uses the parliamentary system as a ladder up which he may climb from being a secretary to a member, parliamentary reporter, or honorary secretary to some political club, to member of a parliamentary committee, member of Parliament itself, party leader, and finally minister. The scholar can use the organization of the University or academy as a means to obtaining a position and reputation independent of the worth of his scientific attainments. The financier employs the mechanism of the Stock Exchange and the limited liability company to draw the small competences of the many into his net and combine them into a vast fortune. Even the criminal has arrangements at his disposal which render his evil-doing less arduous, such as the Mafia, the Camorra, the Mano Negra, and the unions of thieves and burglars, with a far-reaching system of

division of labour, that exist in large towns and are also international in their scope.

From the psychological point of view all institutions represent organized habits. They have been materialized by the human brain, and have no existence apart from man. The superior man must therefore approach men through habit, and try to turn it to his advantage. He may either adapt himself to it or try to alter it. The lower order of aspirant adapts himself. Rabagas acquired reputation and influence as a revolutionary, but became reactionary when he attained the ministry. The powerful personality alters it: Robespierre found a loyal people, and taught it to convey its king and queen to execution on a tumbril. Yet there are some habits so deeply rooted and so strongly organized that no individual can stand against them. Cromwell failed to destroy the habit of loyalty in the English people; which made the Restoration possible immediately after his death. Napoleon could not overcome the habit of religion in the French people, or avoid a concordat with Rome. Were a negro of the highest genius to arise in the United States, a Napoleon in generalship, a Cavour in diplomacy, a Gladstone in eloquence, and a Bismarck in strength of will, he could never attain the highest position there, because the habit of race hatred would ever be more powerful than his genius. In Russia today it would be impossible for a Jew, whether he had been baptized or no, to rouse a mass movement like that led by Lasalle in Germany in the fifties and sixties; or to rise to the premiership, as Disraeli did in England. Each time that a personality endeavours to subdue others to its will there is a clash between this will and the habits opposed to it: the more deeply rooted, general, and essential are their habits, the more powerful must be the will that is to overcome them, until it reaches a limit beyond which the power of a single will cannot go. Napoleon was one of the most powerful personalities the species has hitherto produced. Yet he was overcome by weak contemporaries like Alexander I., Francis II., Frederick William III., and George III., because they were supported by the habits of the whole of Europe, with the exception of France, and could demand and obtain from their peoples exertions which even Napoleon's mighty intellect could not call forth.

It is necessary to guard against the possibility of misunderstanding. All the preceding examples show the exploiter rising above his fellows in order to satisfy his desires at their expense. Nothing has been said of the nobler type of ambition, which strives for power and influence for the sake of serving mankind, and is impelled only by the desire of making the world better, more beautiful, and happier. The reason for this apparent omission is that the expression 'superior man' is used in a purely biological, not in an ethical, sense. It merely represents the individual who is equipped with organic energy above the average, especially in the sphere of judgment and will. The superior man in this sense uses his superiority selfishly for his own advantage, not selflessly for the good of others. That this is so is painful to anyone who seeks to see history as governed by a moral ideal; but it is an

observed fact which admits of no exception. The selfless friends of man are not opportunists. They have no ambition. They are incapable of making incessant efforts to subdue the many to their will. Their influence is confined to their words and example. They spend their lives as settlers penitents, or teachers, like Buddha Cakya-Muni; they are crucified like Jesus, or, to take smaller instances, burned like Savonarola, or hanged like John Brown, the enemy of negro slavery. The influence of men who wish to save their fellows is felt, as I have already shown, through others—disciples, perhaps, of developed will-power, who work for some reward, real or imagined, earthly or hereafter; or rulers and politicians, who find something in the doctrine of salvation which they can use for their own selfish ends. Elaborate psychological analysis would be necessary before the rare instances of the use of power by those in authority for the good of their subjects could be ascribed to pure altruism. Titus, ‘the delight of the human race,’ did not seem so benevolent to all the people under his sway as he did to the Romans. Alfred the Great was certainly a benefactor to his realm, but, in giving peace, order, well-being, and education to his disordered State, he was in the first instance working for himself. Joseph II. is probably the best and most indubitable example of a philanthropist on the throne. But it is very doubtful whether his qualities were such as to have raised him, by his own strength, above his fellow-men. He was Emperor because born in the purple. He was the inheritor, not the founder, of a dynasty. It is on a materially lower plane that the altruists who combine strength of will with love for their fellows are to be found—St. Francis of Assisi, St. Vincent de Paul, Peabody, Dr. Barnardo, Dunant, perhaps General Booth. But the men who scale the heights of power and make their mark on history have been spurred on by selfishness, and delayed by no backward glances at their fellow-men.

At the lowest stage of civilization there is probably little difference between the individuals composing any race or horde. No one rises high above the others: exploitation is confined to the family, the wife, and growing children. The arrangements of life are determined by custom—that is, by habit; such institutions as there are exist, not to afford privilege to anyone, but to economize effort by sparing the need for fresh decisions; there are no leaders or rulers, or they possess small dignity or power. Another case where mutual exploitation within the race or people is impossible is that of a body composed of individuals of remarkable judgment and will-power, who are, to use the phrase a match for one another. Such a community is superficially denominated a democracy; as a matter of fact it is a loose confederation of aristocrats who, impatient of any overlordship, live side by side in proud and jealous independence, remaining poor because each is dependent on his own labour, and this in a primitive State, under natural conditions, can provide the bare necessities of life, but allow no one to become rich. Such, according to Vico, was the condition of the Quirites in the early days of Rome. History teaches that this condition of things did not last long. The gifted people overflowed its boundaries, first to plunder, then

to conquer; it made itself master of foreign peoples of less force, among whom it formed a ruling nobility, and then carried out the exploitation made possible by its organic superiority, first in the countries it had subdued, then in colonies; finally, with the help of the power and riches thus acquired, in its own land upon compatriots who had been slower and less adaptable, and had remained at home in poverty.

The limited extent to which the multitude are able to free themselves from their habits, and direct their thought and will along lines outside their organized associations, not only makes it easier for the superior man to master and exploit them with the aid of existing institutions which they occupy and utilize; it also renders it possible for power to be retained by individuals who are not themselves in any sense superior men, and never could have risen above the crowd by their own strength.”¹¹⁶⁷

The German Government was very much aware of “Colonel” House’s influence over President Wilson. The German Ambassador to America, Count von Bernstorff, wrote to Count von Montgelas of the German Foreign Office on 5 May 1914,

“Colonel and Mrs. House will soon be arriving in Berlin and, as far as I know, will be staying with the American Ambassador. Gerard will certainly receive him, for Colonel House is President Wilson’s most intimate friend. He is one of the few people with whom the hermit-like President lives at all on terms of friendship. He sees other people only on business. Here Colonel House is thought to be ‘the power behind the throne’. If this may be one of those common American exaggerations, yet it is so far true that Colonel House possesses great influence. He has interests in Texas and was able therefore often to advise the President regarding the Mexican question, mostly in the direction of energetic action, in opposition to Bryan.

If an opportunity occurs of treating Colonel House in a friendly fashion it would be to our interests. If you get to know him, you will find him an agreeable member of society. He knows a great deal about Wall Street. I met him at the houses of Speyer and Warburg.”¹¹⁶⁸

“Demnächst werden Colonel und Mrs. House nach Berlin kommen und, soviel ich weiß, bei dem amerikanischen Botschafter wohnen. Jedenfalls wird sich Gerard ihrer annehmen, da Colonel House der intimste Freund des Präsidenten Wilson ist. Er gehört zu den wenigen Leuten, mit welchen der einsiedlerische Präsident überhaupt freundschaftlich verkehrt. Sonst sieht Herr Wilson die Menschen nur zu geschäftlichen Besprechungen. Colonel House gilt daher hier als „the power behind the throne“. Wenn hierin auch eine der üblichen amerikalischen Übertreibungen liegen mag, so ist jedenfalls so viel wahr, daß Colonel House großen Einfluß besitzt. Er hat Interessen in Texas und konnte daher auch oft den Präsidenten in der mexikanischen Frage beraten, meistens in der energischen Richtung im Gegensatz zu Bryan.

Wenn sich Gelegenheit bieten sollte, Colonel House freundlich zu behandeln, so würde dies in unserem Interesse liegen. Sie werden, falls Sie ihn kennen lernen, in Colonel House einen angenehmen Gesellschafter finden. Er weiß auch in Wall Street gut Bescheid. Ich traf ihn bei Speyers und Warburgs.”¹¹⁶⁹

The German Ambassador to America, Count von Bernstorff, wrote to the German Foreign Office on 6 May 1914,

“A letter from myself to Count Montgelas is on the way begging that House be treated as well as possible; he may be described as the only personal friend Wilson has. Being a Texan, he exercised special influence in the question of Mexico. He lives now in New York, where he knows the great bankers well. I have often met him with Speyer and Warburg. I recommend his being received by His Majesty, if that is possible.”¹¹⁷⁰

“Ich schrieb bereits Privatbrief, der unterwegs an Graf Montgelas mit der Bitte um möglichst freundliche Behandlung von House, den man vielleicht als den einzigen persönlichen Freund Wilsons bezeichnen kann. Als Texaner hat er besonders in Mexikofrage Einfluß ausgeübt. Er lebt jetzt in New York, wo er mit den großen Bankiers gut bekannt. Ich traf ihn öfters bei Speyer und Warburg. Ich befürworte Empfang durch Seine Majestät, falls angängig.”¹¹⁷¹

Boris L. Brasol wrote in 1921,

“Because of America’s tremendous natural resources and her unlimited financial wealth, because of her great man-power and immense technical assets, also on account of Russia’s withdrawal from the Entente combination, America’s entry into the war gave her instantaneously the advantage of becoming the leading power among the belligerents. But there were two angles to America’s leadership in the trend of world events — the purely practical influence which she was able to exert upon the financial resources of the military conflict; and second, the political phase pertaining to the terms of the peace settlement. The first element was negative and destructive, for its aim was to accelerate the defeat of Germany and the victory of the Allies. The second element was positive and constructive; it sought to build up a new political and social order along the lines of the Wilsonian doctrine. However, the political credit given by Europe to America was by no means an unconditional surrender of Europe to the New World. Europe was prepared to follow America so long as she retained the hope that her prescriptions would bring an immediate solution of the European troubles. The failure to fulfill this hope was bound to produce a radical change in the attitude of European Nations toward the Wilsonian ideology, and eventually toward America herself.

It was obviously impossible to solve European problems by merely proclaiming a series of moral commandments or scholastic principles, however commendable they may have been. Above all, in order to present tangible schemes for the reconstruction of European States, it was absolutely necessary to acquire a deep knowledge of the political and social history of Europe. But a comprehensive knowledge of political phenomena does not spring up like a *deus ex machina*; it is rather attained by constant participation in the everyday political life of the different national bodies, evolving a firm historical tradition in foreign policy. America, however, has never had such a tradition and, therefore, she could not have had the experience which was indispensable for the maintenance of her political leadership in European affairs.

As to the controversy between the Senate and the President, it will be recalled that Article II, Section 2, of the Constitution of the United States, vests the President with the power to make treaties '*by and with the advice of the Senate . . . providing two-thirds of the Senators present concur.*' Although the making of treaties forms part of the executive prerogative, and in spite of the fact that the President is the Chief Executive, nevertheless, his right to enter into treaties is limited by the above provision. European statesmen were cognizant of this limitation, but Europe at large was unconcerned about such 'technicalities' of the American Constitution. Mr. Wilson appeared on the European Continent not only as the Chief Executive of, but also as the sole spokesman for, America. The peoples of Europe were inclined to believe that whatever he said, proclaimed, admitted or agreed upon was absolutely binding upon the United States. It was a matter of great disappointment to the outside world when gradually the controversy between the President and the Senate divulged the fact that President Wilson, no more than the Senate, had the authority to enter into alliances with European Nations, and that both the President and the Senate, with regard to the framing of treaties, had equal rights, neither of them having authority to act independently of the other. The executive power of the United States was represented at Paris by the person of Mr. Wilson himself, while 'His Majesty's opposition' was kept arrested in Washington, D. C. It so happened, however, that while Mr. Wilson's administration was Democratic, the majority of the Senate was Republican. This was precisely why Mr. Wilson should have secured a strong Republican representation at the Peace Conference, thus avoiding any possible surprises in the future. But Mr. Wilson was never considered an able psychologist. In all his political doings the human touch was distinctly lacking. Senator Lodge may have been wrong in some points of his criticism of the Peace Treaty, but that did not alter the nature of the case itself. In a matter of such vital importance as the framing of the Covenant, a Republican Senate certainly was entitled to have its voice heard in Europe before the treaty was actually completed.

The struggle which arose between the Senate and the President of the United States did not add to the prestige of the latter. On the contrary, it

tended to make Mr. Wilson's position in Europe all the more difficult. The statesmen assembled at Versailles were put face to face with an undeniable fact, that America had two foreign policies — one advocated by the President, and the other maintained by the Senate. For European diplomacy such a condition would have been impossible. Messrs. Orlando, Lloyd George and Clemenceau had free hands with regard to their own countries, while Mr. Wilson was handicapped in each of his enterprises regardless of their particular merits. For a short period Mr. Wilson was regarded in Europe as almighty; very soon, however, he proved his impotency on the soil of his own country.

The American delegation to the Peace Conference, headed by President Wilson himself, was composed of men of varied abilities, but above all scarcely familiar with the basic facts of European history and the underlying psychological factors of European relationship. Although cunning politicians, most of these men were pronounced amateurs in State affairs, sometimes without even elementary administrative experience, as was the case with Colonel House. It is true that during the two years preceding the armistice there was in Washington a commission at work engaged in gathering data for the future Peace Conference. This body succeeded in accumulating tons of memoranda pertaining to the different national problems, but much of the information thus obtained was distinctly erroneous and hopelessly misleading. Persons who themselves were quite ignorant of international affairs were requested to present their views and render their 'expert' opinions on problems of the utmost complexity. The work of the commission was purely mechanical and, therefore, absolutely discoordinated. Besides, with regard to the Eastern problem, which proved to be the heel of Achilles in the European situation, the information collected by the commission came mostly from Semitic sources.

No sooner had Mr. Wilson proclaimed his motto of self-determination than Washington became a meeting place for innumerable promoters of different mushroom States, all of whom claimed their allegiance to the Wilsonian dogma. None of these ten-days-old republics was absent from the American capital: Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Czechs, Slovaks, Letts, Finns, Georgians, Esthonians, Armenians, White Russians, Zionists and what not; all of them offered evidence in support of their claims for independence. Their respective representatives enjoyed free entry to the State Department. They were attentively listened to, while their contradictory statements were scrupulously added to the files of Colonel House's commission. Indeed, it was an orgy of self-determination.

Referring to the personnel of the American delegation, it is noteworthy that their very names, with the exception of Mr. Lansing and Colonel House, have remained almost unknown to the general public. [*Footnote:* Hon. Henry White and General Tasker H. Bliss were the other two delegates.] The delegates were simply absorbed by the personality of Mr. Wilson. From time to time the papers alluded to a new name in the American delegation, but it

meant nothing either to the hearts or to the minds of the American people.

Colonel House was next to President Wilson to attract public attention. No one knew who he was, from whence he came, nor what he stood for, and his prestige was largely due to his mysteriousness. It was understood at Paris that he exerted a tremendous, almost boundless, influence upon the President. In fact, one of Colonel House's intimate friends, Mr. Arthur D. Howden Smith, in his volume 'The Real Colonel House,' frankly admitted:

'He holds a power never wielded before in this country by any man out of office, a power greater than that of any political boss or Cabinet member. He occupies a place in connection with the Administration which is anomalous, because no such place ever existed before Woodrow Wilson became President of the United States.' [Footnote: 'The Real Colonel House, An Intimate Biography,' by Arthur D. Howden Smith, p. 14, George H. Doran Company, New York, 1918.]

It was rumored that Colonel House was very radical in his political views, that he shared Mr. Wilson's admiration for the 'chosen people' and was bitterly anti-Russian. In addition it was positively known that he was sent to Germany by President Wilson prior to America's entry into the war, but until now the object of his mission was never discovered.

Mr. Keynes, in his able characterization of the personnel of the Peace Conference, referring to the American Peace Delegation and Mr. Wilson personally, stated that:

'His fellow-plenipotentiaries were dummies; and even the trusted Colonel House, with vastly more knowledge of men and of Europe than the President, from whose sensitiveness the President's dullness had gained so much, fell into the background as time went on. . . . Thus day after day and week after week, he (Mr. Wilson) allowed himself to be closeted, unsupported, unadvised, and alone, with men much sharper than himself, in situations of supreme difficulty, where he needed for success every description of resource, fertility, and knowledge.' [Footnote: John Maynard Keynes, C.B., 'The Economic Consequences of the Peace,' p. 45, Harcourt, Brace, and Howe, New York, 1920.]

That the members of the American delegation were dummies is a generally recognized fact. One has only to recall the manner in which the Shantung settlement was brought about. In his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate Mr. Lansing frankly admitted that:

'President Wilson alone approved the Shantung decision, that the other members of the American Delegation made no protest against it, and that President Wilson alone understood whether Japan has guaranteed to return Shantung to China.'

The same applies to the delicate question of Fiume. Mr. Wilson disagreed on all points with Signor Orlando. It was a personal altercation between the President and the Italian plenipotentiary, no other members of the American

delegation having participated in the controversy. Mr. Wilson's sudden decision to appeal to the Italian people 'over the heads of the Italian Government,' unwise as it may have been, was taken quite independently, while the other members of the delegation, when they read this proclamation in *Le Temps*, were probably as much surprised as Signor Orlando himself.

On every question of international importance the President acted autocratically, without advice from his colleagues. Had he consulted them beforehand, he probably would have avoided many false steps as well as his erroneous move concerning the Fiume settlement. The whole affair was caused by groundless rumors accusing the Italian Government of the intention to incorporate Fiume in the territory of the Italian Kingdom in spite of Mr. Wilson's determination to cede the city to Jugoslavia. Had Mr. Lansing been consulted he would certainly have drawn the President's attention to the fact that the decision of converting the Fiume problem into an international scandal was all the more detrimental to the general cause of peace, since it came on the eve of the arrival of the German Peace Mission.

When Mr. Baruch arrived in Paris he became very active with regard to the framing of the financial policy of the Allies, and especially that of America; and because he was not only a member of the American delegation, but also a prominent figure in the Jewish delegation, it was not impossible that he had much to do with the President's peculiar stand with regard to the notorious 'Jewish Minority Rights.'

Mr. Dillon, whose knowledge of the inside story of the intrigue at the Peace Conference is so profound, did not hesitate to state that the Allied policy toward the Zionist claims was:

'Looked upon as anything but disinterested.' Elucidating this point, Mr. Dillon added:

'Unhappily this conviction was subsequently strengthened by certain of the measures decreed by the Supreme Council between April and the close of the Conference. The misgivings of other delegates turned upon a matter which at first sight may appear so far removed from any of the pressing issues of the twentieth century as to seem wholly imaginary. They feared that a religious — some would call it racial — bias lay at the root of Mr. Wilson's policy. It may seem amazing to some readers, but it is none the less a fact that a considerable number of delegates believed that the real influences behind the Anglo-Saxon peoples were Semitic.' [Footnote: E. J. Dillon, 'The Inside Story of the Peace Conference,' p. 496, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1920.]

This observation is quite correct, but scarcely can it be confined to the Anglo-Saxon peoples only. It is true that Mr. Wilson's policy at all times was distinctly pro-Jewish and that Mr. Lloyd George's affiliations with Sir Philip Sassoon aroused much comment among the general public. Nor can the fact be denied that the British policy, ever since Mr. Balfour's declaration on the Zionist claims of November 2, 1917, has been developing under the coordinated pressure of Messrs. Rufus Isaacs, Louis Namier, Mond and

Montagu, all of whom are Jews, manifesting a spirit of deep loyalty to the cause of Israel. But almost every plenipotentiary at the Peace Conference had his own Jew to guide him in matters of international importance. Mr. Clemenceau himself, whose reputation of a French 'tiger' was so exaggerated, had Mr. Mendel as private secretary, acting as intermediary between the Quai d'Orsay and the Stock Exchange. In the same way the Italian policy was largely controlled by Baron Sonnino, Minister of Foreign Affairs. The German Peace Delegation, in turn, was so obviously dominated by Jewish banking interests that it became known as 'The Warburg Delegation,' while the Spa Conference was labeled as the 'Hugo Stinnes Conference.' Thus, Mr. Dillon's remark being correct in itself, is to be interpreted in a larger sense, namely, that the Jews as a united nation brought upon the Peace Conference a twofold pressure: First, that of the international finance whose fundamental aim it was to save Germany from economic ruin; and, second, the influence of international Bolshevism, which, as *The Jewish Chronicle* justly remarked, is:

'At many points consonant with the finest ideals of Judaism.' [Footnote: See *The Jewish Chronicle*, No. 2609, April 4, 1919, p. 7, article entitled 'Peace, War, and Bolshevism.']

The effect of this double pressure was most disastrous. On one hand it left the German problem unsolved, while on the other hand it gave tremendous impetus to the revolutionary movement throughout the world.

Many excellent articles and books have been written on the proceedings of the Peace Conference, giving a detailed account of the happenings at Paris. Therefore, it would scarcely be advisable here to repeat all that has been said about the diplomatic achievements and of the Peace Treaty itself. The object of this volume is to depict the world crisis so far as it reflects upon the international situation.

It was a correct assertion on the part of Mr. Sarolea when he stated that:

'To us the present social convulsion is but an untoward incident and an aftermath of the war. To posterity the war itself will only appear as the preliminary to the revolutionary catastrophe which has just begun, and which is spreading with such inexorable directness in the two hemispheres. We are still totally in the dark as to its meaning and as to its future possibilities. In the meantime we can only see that until it has spent its force it is futile to talk about concluding peace. For a peace settlement means an agreement between the Allied Governments and the Governments of Germany, Austria, and Russia. And there are no sovereign German, Austrian, or Russian Governments left with whom we can conclude peace. There will be no such settled governments for years to come. No agreements made to-day can bind the future, or can have either reality or finality.' [Footnote: Charles Sarolea, 'Europe and the League of Nations,' pp. 8 and 9.]

The Peace Treaty itself is neither real nor final. The series of conferences

which were held by the Allied and German statesmen, after the signing of the Treaty, have considerably amended the provisions of the Covenant, especially with regard to its economic clauses. Therefore, a final analysis of the treaty, whether it be considered from a narrow legal viewpoint or treated in the light of a broad political event, would have to be considered as premature. In a preceding chapter it was pointed out that the World War and subsequent events were but links in an endless chain of causes and consequences, extending as far back as the middle of the Nineteenth Century.

However, out of the turmoil of political babbling which accompanied the work of the Peace Conference, two factors of international significance have arisen, both of which will bear a lasting influence upon the future destinies of humanity. They are: *The League of Nations* and *International Bolshevism*. Both factors express the modern tendency of internationalism as opposed to the principle of national existence of the state. But while the idea of an association of nations is the moderate ramification of the principle of internationalism, Bolshevism is its revolutionary manifestation. Nevertheless, both phenomena work in the same direction, tending to undermine the fundamental basis of national development.

The Peace Conference was not the originator of either of these two factors but it promoted both, and the future historian will always associate their perpetuation with the policies of the Peace Conference.”¹¹⁷²

Like many of the Jewish critics of the day, notably Alfred Rosenberg, Brasol sought to prove that “Jews” as a general group promoted internationalism and Bolshevism, controlled world affairs, and that the only solution was to promote the common interest of the anti-Semites with the Zionists in the formation of an absolutely independent Jewish State in Palestine. Brasol sought to establish that British imperialism had subverted the Balfour Declaration. Brasol was a Zionist, and like Zionist Winston Churchill, and the Zionist Chaim Weizmann, Brasol offered up the carrot and the stick of Zionism versus Bolshevism:

“If Lord Milner was instrumental in forcing upon the English people a disastrous policy in Egypt, his Majesty’s Government as a body is to be blamed for the shortsighted, and also extremely harmful, attitude towards Palestine. At present it cannot be doubted that Mr. Balfour’s declaration of November 2, 1917, with regard to British support of the Zionist claim, was a clever move to keep France out of the Promised Land. The ambition of the Jews to establish a homeland of their own in Palestine was used by British as a pretext to include that part of Asia in the orbit of British influence. Mr. Herbert Adams Gibbons was right when as far back as in January, 1919, he asserted that the Britishers ‘have planned, through using Zionism, to prevent codominium with France and other nations in Palestine, to establish an all-rail British route from Haifa to Bassorah.’ [Footnote: See Mr. Gibbons’s article ‘Zionism and the World Peace,’ published in the *Century Magazine*, January, 1919, pp. 368-3 78.]

So far, so good, or at least, so long as political Zionism, advocated by British diplomats, had a definite political object to serve, criticism was confined to the question of whether England or France, or both, ought to control Palestine and Mesopotamia. It is not impossible that Messrs. Weizmann and Sokolow intended to doublecross British diplomacy, while the British intended to double-cross their Zionist friends, and it was difficult to forecast who, in the long run, would prove to be the user and who the used. Still there was logic in the declaration of November 2, 1917, because there was a chance for Britain to expand her influence in Asia Minor through the wise realization of the Palestine scheme. Moreover, in a way, Palestine could have been used as a new stronghold for British rule in the East, thus strengthening England's position with regard to India. Instead, England appointed Sir Herbert Samuel High Commissioner of Palestine, which renders the whole Palestine scheme hopeless.

It is important to remember that according to Jewish sources the population of Palestine is divided thus: Mohammedans, six hundred and fifty thousand; Christians, one hundred and fifty thousand; Jews, ninety thousand. The bulk of the population is composed of Arabs, part of whom profess the Koran, while others have been converted to Christianity. The latter group, which is but a minor section of the total Arabian populace, is ravaged by internal strife, belonging to different denominations of the Christian Church: Roman Catholic, Protestant, Russian Greek Orthodox, etc. Nevertheless, the Arabs, whether Christians or Mohammedans, are united in their hatred of the Jew. As everywhere, the Jew in Palestine is an urban element, while the Arabs are mostly farmers. The Jew in Palestine, as all over the world, is a middleman and not a producer. He is engaged in small trade. Only few Jews have settled as farmers.

The antagonism between the Arabs and the Jews is so accentuated that often the country has been on the brink of an open anti-Semitic revolt. The Ottoman Empire had great trouble in suppressing the anti-Semitic feeling among both its Christian and Mohammedan subjects.

The appointment of Sir Herbert Samuel, which was so much applauded by the Zionist group in England, is a direct challenge to the Arabs. To appoint a Jew to a post which requires holding the balance between the Jews and the Arabs, is a measure which is apt to ruin the very idea of British prestige. What England gained through the gallant efforts of General Allenby is now nullified by Samuel's appointment. It is immaterial whether Sir Herbert Samuel is good or bad, whether he is able or inefficient, the point is that he is a Jew, and as such, he cannot maintain an equilibrium between the two parts of the Palestine population, so bitterly hostile to each other. Nor does it add to British prestige when orders are given, as they were given by Sir Herbert Samuel, to British governmental employees to stand up when the Zionist anthem, *Atikva*, is played.

When the Zionist claim was first established, and Theodore Hertzl, in 1897, came out with his specific program of a Jewish State, the world at large

gave a sigh of relief as it was trusted that henceforth the Jews would have a country of their own where they would be able to develop freely and unhampered their racial peculiarities, their cultural traditions and their religious thought. Christian countries have been so accustomed to innumerable complaints made by the Jews of their oppression, of anti-Semitism breeding throughout the world, of pogroms ravaging the Jewish masses, that there was every reason to hope that the Jews would dash to Palestine, leaving those cruel Christians to their own destinies. What better scheme for a fair solution of the Jewish problem could be hoped for by both Gentiles and Jews? The enormous wealth of Jewish bankers could be easily used for the reconstruction of Palestine, which could thus be made a model state. There is a place for everybody under the sun, and there is no reason whatsoever why the Jews should not have their place in Asia Minor, with Jerusalem once more becoming their metropolis, with the Rothschilds and Warburgs conferring the blessings of their benevolent rule on the hitherto downtrodden people.

With this understanding, the greatest statesmen of Europe, long before Mr. Balfour's declaration, promised Theodore Hertzl their utmost support to the Zionist scheme. Kaiser Wilhelm II was the first to migrate to Palestine, thus setting the example for the Jews to follow. The Turkish Sultan assured Mr. Hertzl that he would favorably look upon the Zionist efforts in the Ottoman Empire. The Russian Minister of the Interior, Mr. V. K. Plehve, promised his help to facilitate Jewish emigration from Russia. Another reason why so many Gentiles were willing to give their enthusiastic support to the Zionist movement was because it was justly argued that should the Jews build up a state of their own, they would be relieved of the necessity of bearing the burden of double-citizenship and double-allegiance on one hand to their own nation, and on the other hand to the countries of their adoption. This would also enable them to abandon their traditional policy of intermeddling in foreign matters, giving them a chance to enjoy genuine independence and civic freedom. From a legal point of view, then, the Jews would be considered, outside of Palestine, as aliens, just as Americans are considered in Japan, or the Japanese in America. While, of course, as Jewish citizens, they would not enjoy the rights of citizenship in any other country outside of their own Jewish State, they would also be relieved of all duties to Gentile countries. Consequently, they would be relieved of the hardship of serving simultaneously God and Mammon.

But when the time came, and the restoration of Palestine was announced by the Great Powers, many people, including some of the Jews themselves, became bitterly disappointed. Palestine has been restored not as a *Jewish State*, but merely as a *Homeland* for those restless spirits who, while residing in New York, London or Paris, would use Palestine as their summer resort, or perhaps as an additional base for their Third Internationale.

The British protectorate over Palestine converted that country into a British colony, with the British administration ruling over the population.

The most representative Zionists, themselves, came out with bitter criticism against such a solution. Thus, Israel Zangwill, in the London *Jewish Chronicle*, violently denounced the Judo-British pact proposing to make Palestine a purely Jewish State, with the expulsion of all Arabs to Arabia.

The *Jewish Guardian*, referring to this situation, remarked:

‘Zionists were aiming for a Jewish Palestine but the Jews received a British Palestine.’

Mr. Eberlin, a Jew himself, and one of the foremost leaders of the Poale-Zionist movement, in a book recently published in Berlin, entitled ‘On the Eve of Regeneration,’ stated:

‘The foreign policy of England in Asia Minor is determined by its interests in India. There was a saying about Prussia that she represents the army with an admixture of the people. About England it could be said that she represents a colonial empire with a supplement of the metropolis. . . . It is obvious that England desires to use Palestine as a shield against India. This is the reason why she is feverishly engaged in the construction of strategic railroad lines, uniting Egypt to Palestine, Cairo to Haifa, where work is started for the construction of a huge port. In the near future Palestine will be in a position to compete with the Isthmus of Suez, which is the main artery of the great sea route from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean.’ [*Footnote*: Translation from Russian, ‘On the Eve of Regeneration,’ by I. Eberlin, pp. 129, 130, Berlin, 1920.]

But this Poale-Zionist goes a step farther when he asserts that:

‘It is only Socialism attained in Europe which will prove capable of giving honestly and without hypocrisy Palestine to the Jews, thus assuring them unhampered development. . . . The Jewish people will have Palestine only when British Imperialism is broken.’

That the present policy towards Palestine is hopelessly erroneous can scarcely be denied. The Jews blame England for making it a British colony, while the Arabs are outraged by the appointment of Sir Herbert Samuel, because he is a Jew. The British public itself is at the cross roads — whether to consider Palestine as the Promised Land for the Jews, or for the English — and so, everybody on the Thames is waiting for Mr. Lloyd George and his parliamentary secretary, Mr. Sassoon, to solve the mystery of the Sphinx with regard to their Asia Minor policy.

However, there is nothing humorous in the whole situation because Lenin, the Argus of international dissension, is closely watching the developments in Syria, Mesopotamia and Palestine, and his agents are hard at work inciting the Jews against the British and the Arabs against the Jews. Moscow Soviet propagandists are always headed for political mischief; wherever there is natural cause for unrest, they stimulate it, converting it into

an international scandal. All the more serious is the situation because Palestine is literally the shield for British rule in India.”¹¹⁷³

Another surreal part of the very odd “Colonel” House story occurred posthumously in October of 1939. England and France had just declared war on Germany on 3 September 1939. Many Americans worried that history would repeat itself and that America would be dragged into another bloody world war. The German Government had an incentive to undermine the relationship between the United States and Great Britain. It was not unusual for faked documents to be used as war propaganda.

Congressman Jacob Thorkelson of Montana submitted a letter into the Congressional Record, which was allegedly written by “Colonel” House and was addressed to David Lloyd George, Prime Minister of England. The letter was dated 10 June 1919 and was allegedly written on stationery from the British Embassy in New York, though Thorkelson did not have the supposed original. Therefore, there was no original signature, which could be checked for authenticity. The letter made it appear that Great Britain sought to recapture America as a colony, through the League of Nations. If the letter were authentic, one would have to believe that House and J. P. Morgan & Company were corrupting agents of the British Government and were undermining American sovereignty—and there is evidence that they were, especially if one considers the fact that Rothschilds essentially ruled England, Morgan and House.¹¹⁷⁴ While this may sound preposterous, there were published calls for the melding of Great Britain and the United States, such as those of Clarence K. Streit, who was an aide with the American mission at the Versailles Peace Conference in the First World War, and later a *New York Times* reporter who covered the League of Nations. In 1938, Streit openly called for the two nations to unite, and more broadly for a world government.¹¹⁷⁵

House’s secretary, Francis B. Denton, immediately stated that the alleged House letter was spurious. *The New York Times* published several articles denouncing the letter as a fake.¹¹⁷⁶ Fabulously wealthy banker and oil man, George Washington Armstrong,¹¹⁷⁷ tried to explain the discrepancies between the “House Report” and contrary facts, in 1950-1951,¹¹⁷⁸ by claiming that Great Britain was controlled by the Zionists and the N. M. Rothschild & Son Bank, which controlled the Bank of England, the railroads and the press. Armstrong attributed the letter to Lord Northcliffe.

It is interesting to note that a “secret society” had been formed by Cecil John Rhodes in the Nineteenth Century with the expressed purpose of reunifying the British Empire.¹¹⁷⁹ Rhodes attempted to unite English-speaking financiers to pool their wealth and rule the world, and one of his main goals was to bring America back under British control. Rhodes was long-term associate of Nathaniel M. Rothschild and Alfred Beit, and was a *de facto* Rothschild agent.¹¹⁸⁰ Rhodes’ not so secret society was founded on racist principles and promoted the Jewish Messianic ambitions of one world government, one world language, etc.

President Wilson’s “progressive” movement in America, like the “progressive” movements of Bolshevism and Zionism, was in practice a repressive movement

which included segregationist laws and punitive government censorship. Wilson betrayed the American blacks who had voted him into office, by promoting segregation; and Wilson made it a Federal offense in the United States to speak out against the war, or on behalf of Germany, and imprisoned those who had dared to do either, or both. The Congress passed the “Espionage Act” on 15 June 1917 and amended it on 16 May 1918 to make it even more oppressive. Many anti-war protestors were beaten, arrested and imprisoned as a result.

These “progressive” movements for “international peace”, instead proved to be fronts for centralized racist international tyranny, exploitive colonization, and the promotion of Entente European and of American interests, at the expense of the rest of the world—including Germany. Einstein had a long relationship with the League of Nations, which was advocated by Wilson. Zionist spokesman Samuel Landman wrote in 1936,

“Moreover, the fact that the very existence of the future of Jewish Palestine depends, from the point of view of international law, on a Mandate of the League of Nations has powerfully contributed towards making the Jews everywhere into strong supporters of the League of Nations. In France, for instance, it is well known that the Jews are among the leaders of the pro-League policy. In other lands it is equally true, though less well known. For instance, the views of such a man as Dr. Einstein—a convinced Zionist believer in the League—count heavily in the land where he now dwells—the U.S.A. [***] In the opinion of Lord Cecil and General Smuts, the League of Nations and a Jewish Palestine are the two greatest positive results of the Great War. The two things are interdependent to a large extent. A Government that has let the world understand clearly that Great Britain stands unshakably by the League cannot logically do otherwise with regard to Zionism and Palestine.”¹⁸¹

The formation of the League of Nations after the apocalypse of the First World War, and the attempted formation of the State of Israel, were the fulfillment of Jewish prophecy.

5.15.3 The Balfour Declaration—*QUID PRO QUO*

Zionist Jews betrayed Germany in the middle of the First World War by bringing America into the war on the side of the British. The Zionists controlled President Wilson through blackmail. They struck a deal with the British and agreed to use their influence over Woodrow Wilson and the American Press to bring America into the war on England’s side. For their part, the British agreed to issue the Balfour Declaration and conquer Palestine. The entire world suffered as a consequence.

Albert Einstein’s anti-German rhetoric in the post-war period especially irked many Germans, because they knew that Zionist traitors like Einstein had betrayed Germany to England and Russia in exchange for a deal with the British to take Palestine from Turkey and make it available to the Jews for a homeland. This stab

in the back came after Germany had done so much for Jews and it betrayed the generally very positive relationship between Jews and Germany. Albert Einstein stated in 1938,

“When the Germans had lost the World War hatched by their ruling class, immediate attempts were made to blame the Jews, first for instigating the war and then for losing it. In the course of time, success attended these efforts. The hatred engendered against the Jews not only protected the privileged classes, but enabled a small, unscrupulous, and insolent group to place the German people in a state of complete bondage.”¹¹⁸²

Albert Einstein told Peter A. Bucky,

“For instance, after the First World War, many Germans accused the Jews first of starting the war and then of losing it. This is nothing new, of course. Throughout history, Jews have been accused of all sorts of treachery, such as poisoning water wells or murdering children as religious sacrifices. Much of this can be attributed to jealousy, because, despite the fact that Jewish people have always been thinly populated in various countries, they have always had a disproportionate number of outstanding public figures.”¹¹⁸³

Einstein’s opinion that many Germans blamed Jews for the First World War, and for Germany’s defeat in that war, is correct. Hitler wrote in his unpublished sequel to *Mein Kampf*,

“The war against Germany was fought by an overpowering world coalition in which only a part of the states could have a direct interest in Germany’s destruction. In not a few countries the shift to war was brought by influences which in no way sprang from the real domestic interests of these nations or even which could also be to their benefit. A monstrous war propaganda began to befog public opinion of these peoples and to stir it into enthusiasm for a war which for these very peoples in part could not bring any gain at all and indeed sometimes ran downright counter to their real interests.

International world Jewry was the power which instigated this enormous war propaganda. For as senseless as the participation in the war by many of these nations may have been, seen from the viewpoint of their own interests, it was just as meaningful and logically correct seen from the viewpoint of the interests of world Jewry.”¹¹⁸⁴

Einstein does not tell us how or why the Germans came to this conclusion, how this message was spread, or why it was widely believed. A factual analysis based on primary source material answers these questions.

Marxist and Secretary of State in the German Foreign Office,¹¹⁸⁵ Karl Kautsky wrote in 1921,

“Neither of the two belligerent groups [in the First World War] had the upper hand from the outset. Each was obliged to utilise every resource at its disposal. On both sides of the trenches, each government sought to obtain the full support of its proletarians, and also of its Jews. The cheapest concession that could be made to the latter was in the form of promises to support Zionism. For these promises were all to be realised at the expense of Turkey. The Central Powers, as well as the Entente, permitted the Jews to believe that their victory would result in a Jewish homeland in Palestine.”¹¹⁸⁶

Influential Jews in America, and those Jews in the press throughout the Western World, were often of German-Jewish descent, and were perceived as being quite pro-German prior to the middle of the First World War. Jews had strongly defended German Protestants in the *Kulturkampf*. There were also millions of Russian Jews in America at the time, and they hated the Czar and were pro-German because Germany was the enemy of Russia. German-Americans, many of whom were of Jewish descent, were an influential group in the 1916 Presidential campaigns.¹¹⁸⁷ President Wilson, in part, won his campaign on the slogan, “He kept us out of the war!”

Republican Theodore Roosevelt was forced out of the race for the Republican nomination because he had alienated the German-American vote—the “hyphenates”, which included many Jews. American Jews who had emigrated from Germany and Austria were very concerned by the rhetoric of the advocates for “preparedness”, *i. e.* war against Germany. The statements of the advocates of “preparedness” attacked pacifists as if disloyal to America and claimed that immigrants from Entente countries were loyal Americans, but immigrants from Germany and Austria were traitors. This so affected the Jewish community, that some of the advocates for “preparedness” made exceptions to their ethnic attacks for German Jews.¹¹⁸⁸

Strangely, some political Zionists claimed that all Jewish newspapers around the world, outside of Germany itself, became anti-German in 1914. Germany tried very hard to help Jews fulfill their dreams of emancipation in Russia, and to achieve a homeland in Palestine. In search of an explanation for the fact that some of the leadership of the pro-German Jews of the world suddenly became anti-German, many Germans concluded that they were rewarded for helping their Jewish neighbors by an international Jewish betrayal. Though many Jews took bold actions to distance themselves from the anti-German activities of a prominent few, leading Jews in the German press, in the German Government, and in the German-Jewish financial community, subverted German interests during and after the war. These were often the same Jews who had beat the drums of war most loudly when the war began.

Lisa Endlich tells a revealing story of the conflicts among German-Jewish financiers, who split along Zionist lines, in her book *Goldman Sachs: The Culture of Success*,

“World War I divided Europe and Goldman Sachs. Henry Goldman, highly conscious and fiercely proud of his German-Jewish heritage, was a

staunch and vocal supporter of Germany and its war efforts. An intense, high-strung, and didactic man, his outspoken support and deep admiration for everything German did untold damage to the firm's reputation. When Sam Sachs returned from Europe shortly after the outbreak of the war, after assuring the Kleinwort partners of the firm's pro-British stance, he was horrified by his brother-in-law's open support for the enemy. The Sachs's German origins were just as recent and just as strong, but their allegiance was to England and France.

In 1915, Goldman, despite pressure from his partners and sisters, rejected Goldman Sachs's participation in the \$500 million J. P. Morgan sponsored Anglo-French loan to fund the war effort, to which virtually all the leading Wall Street firms of the day were subscribing. The firm had a longstanding policy requiring unanimous agreement of the partnership for participation in any piece of business. Out of their own strong beliefs and to save face for their firm, Sam and Harry Sachs marched down to the offices of J. P. Morgan and personally subscribed \$125,000 toward the loan.

As the war continued, the ill will between Goldman and the Sachses grew. One can only imagine the uncomfortable atmosphere that must have prevailed in the firm's small offices. Even after the United States entered the war Goldman continued to speak out publicly in support of Germany, despite the fact that two of his partners and one of his partner's sons were on duty in Europe. The episode was a painful one for the Goldman and Sachs families both personally and professionally. Finally, Kleinwort cabled Goldman Sachs that it was in danger of being blacklisted in London. The British merchant bank had been embarrassed when called before the Ministry of Blockade and shown a large number of cables between Goldman Sachs, its partner of two decades, and German banks. It was clear to the Kleinwort partners that the firm was doing an active exchange business with the Germans. They wrote to Goldman Sachs in 1916: 'We were frankly astonished at the evident importance of these operations, and we are therefore not surprised to find the authorities skeptical as to the possibility of entirely avoiding any indirect connection between such business and your sterling account with us.' The Bank of England eventually prevented Kleinwort from doing exchange business with Goldman Sachs, cutting off much of Goldman Sachs's London business until after the war.

The firm's business had come to an almost complete standstill, despite its growing stature in the financial community. [***] Shortly after this, Henry Goldman announced his departure on Goldman Sachs letterhead with the words 'Save & Serve. Buy Liberty Bonds!' emblazoned in red at the top of the page. He wrote, 'I am not in sympathy with many trends which are now stirring the world and which are now shaping public opinion. I retire with the best of feeling towards the firm (and all of its members) with which I have been associated for thirty-five years and to which I have given all there is in me.'"¹⁸⁹

The Zionists, who had President Wilson under their control through blackmail, struck a deal with the British. The Zionists brought America into the war on England's side and Britain issued the Balfour Declaration promising Palestine to the Zionists as a potential homeland for Jews—both before and after securing Palestine for the Palestinians. This greatly changed the face of international Jewish propaganda.

Jewish interests in the media in France, England and America had long agitated against Russia in the hopes that these nations would pressure Russia to free Jews from the Pale of Settlement. Russia and the Czar were regularly ridiculed in the press in the West and story after story appeared in the newspapers telling of atrocities allegedly committed against Jews by Russians. Many prominent and influential Jews actively agitated against Russia with governmental leaders in Italy, France and England—Russia's allies—the Allies.¹¹⁹⁰ However, when the Zionists decided to turn against Germany, the press suddenly began to laud Russia in the middle of World War I and urged Russian Jews to fight for the Allies for the sake of taking Palestine from the Turks; while Jewish financiers conspired with the German Government to destroy the Russian State and its people.

Formerly openly anti-Russian Jews suddenly became pro-Russian¹¹⁹¹ and urged all Russian Jews to fight to capture Palestine—a move that cost the Turks and Germans, who were the enemies of Russia in the First World War. The Russian Revolution freed Russian Jews and the entrance of America into the war on the side of the Allies secured Germany's eventual defeat. This was part of a Zionist strategy to elicit the Balfour Declaration. As a result, many Germans came to stereotype all Jews as if duplicitous and believed that Jews had caused them to lose the war and had caused the terrible hardships the Germans faced in the post-war period. Many prominent Jews published works claiming that Germans are inherently evil and that Germany must be divided and made agrarian and primitive.

After the Zionists made their deal with the British, a wave of anti-German propaganda appeared in American and British journals, newspapers and books linking Germans with the persecution of Americans in Germany and of Jews in Russia. Zionist headquarters moved from Berlin to London. As opposed to the double dealings of the Zionists, some German Jews revealed that many of the Zionists in Palestine were savages and that Germany represented the best hope of "World Jewry".

The Germans were about to win the war in 1916. The Zionists in England interceded with the British government, who were largely resigned to defeat, and promised them that they could bring America into the war on the side of the British, with their influence over the press, their financial power, and their power in the American government.¹¹⁹² It was well-known that the Zionists had President Wilson in their pocket. The Zionists Louis Brandeis and Samuel Untermyer blackmailed him President Wilson with love letters he had written to Mrs. Peck.

Jews in Germany were enjoying unprecedented power and equal rights in Germany and many fought valiantly to defend the "Fatherland" in the First World War. They, and the Germans in general, felt that the Zionists had stabbed them in the back in the pursuit of racist Zionism. German Jews tried to obstruct the immigration

of Eastern European Jews, whom they considered to be primitive and decadent.¹¹⁹³ In America, German Jews and their decedents had tended toward assimilation. Some exploited immigrant Eastern European Jews—the impoverished *Ostjuden* who emigrated to America and soon greatly outnumbered the German Jews—in garment factories owned by German Jews; which resulted in the formation of some of the earliest labor unions in America.

German Jews encouraged Eastern European Jews to assimilate, and feared that the massive influx of orthodox Eastern European Jews to America would result in increased anti-Semitism. Sephardic and German Jews were quite successful in American, and looked down upon the less sophisticated *Ostjuden*, the Jews of Eastern Europe. Burton J. Hendrick wrote in 1923 in a pro-Jewish article meant to refute the accusations of *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT*,

“In all that has been said of the economic progress of the Jews in America one fact should not escape observation. The Jewish names in this list are especially significant; Lewisohn, Kahn, Wolf, Guggenheim, Warburg, Schiff; they are all names of German Jews. The same statement is true of the great Jewish department store proprietors: Straus, Stern, Gimbel, Altman. An examination of the occasional Jewish name that appears as a director of banks would bring out the same fact. The important Jewish banking houses—Kuhn, Loeb & Co., Speyer & Co., Goldman, Sachs & Co., Hallgarten—are almost exclusively Germanic. In the financial advertisements of this magazine a few Jewish names figure; they are invariably the names of German Jews. The big Jewish lawyers of New York—Untermeyer, Marshall—and of Chicago—Levy Meyer, Samuel Alshuler—also belong to the German branch of the race. Most of the Jews who have reached important public position—Henry Morgenthau, Oscar Straus, Eugene Meyer, Louis Brandeis, Abraham Elkus—are likewise German Jews; a few others, Bernard Baruch, Benjamin Cardozo, belong to that Spanish-Portuguese element which has been established in this country for nearly three hundred years. Yet these German and Spanish branches represent only a small minority of the Jewish population of America. Of the three million Jews in this country, probably not far from 2,500,000 are Russian Jews. Of New York City’s 1,500,000 Jews not far from 1,300,000 have come from the East of Europe. What progress have these Jews made? How do they earn their living? What fields of business do they ‘dominate’? This phase of the subject will be treated in the next article.”¹¹⁹⁴

Burton J. Hendrick iterated a typical pro-Sephardic Jew and pro-German Jew attitude common among the Jewish elite in the West, those Jews who prevented the exodus of Jews seeking refuge from the pogroms and from Nazism. Hendrick wrote in 1923 in an anti-Communist—anti-Polish-Jew—article entitled “Radicalism among the Polish Jews”—in contrast to a series of otherwise philo-Semitic articles he wrote on “The Jews in America” in *The World’s Work*,¹¹⁹⁵

“There is only one way in which the United States can be protected from the anti-Semitism which so grievously afflicts the eastern sections of Europe. That is by putting up bars against these immigrants until the day comes when those already here are absorbed.”¹¹⁹⁶

Racist Marxist Zionist Ber Borochov stated,

“Anti-Semitism menaces both the poor helpless Jews and the all-powerful Rothschilds. The latter, however, understand very well where the source of trouble lies; the poverty-ridden Jewish masses are at fault. The Jewish plutocracy abhors these masses, but anti-Semitism reminds it of its kinship to them. Two souls reside within the breast of the Jewish upper bourgeoisie—the soul of a proud European and the soul of an unwilling guardian of his eastern coreligionists. Were there no anti-Semitism, the misery and poverty of the Jewish emigrants would be of little concern to the Jewish upper bourgeoisie. It is impossible, however, to leave them in some west European city (on their way to a place of refuge) in the care of the local governments, for that would arouse anti-Semitic ire. Therefore, in spite of themselves and despite their efforts to ignore the Jewish problem, the Jewish aristocrats must turn philanthropists. They must provide shelter for the Jewish emigrants and must make collections for pogrom-ridden Jewry. Everywhere the Jewish upper bourgeoisie is engaged in the search for a Jewish solution to the Jewish problem and a means of being delivered of the Jewish masses. This is the sole form in which the Jewish problem presents itself to the Jewish upper bourgeoisie.”¹¹⁹⁷

Many American Jews sought to prevent public awareness of the discord between German Jews and Eastern European Jews. They tried to prevent the press from covering the strikes by Eastern European Jews against factories owned by German Jews.¹¹⁹⁸ Some believe that American Jewish financiers funded Hitler in order to block the flow of *Ostjuden* to the West, to provide a buffer against the spread of Bolshevism, to profit from the wars Hitler was liable to provoke, and to promote Zionism.¹¹⁹⁹ Some of these reasons might also have been behind the failure of Great Britain to act against the Nazi regime until they were forced into war—and Hitler was allegedly somewhat surprised that England actually declared war against Germany when Germany invaded Poland.

Speaking in general terms, Eastern European Jews resented the assimilationist attitudes of the German Jews. Even before Herzl, in the 1880's when the Pogroms heated up in Russia, Russian Jews like Peretz Smolenskin railed against rich assimilated Jews in the West, Jews who had allegedly disowned their “Volk”.¹²⁰⁰ By choosing England over Germany, the Zionists were able to create discord between German Jews, who were the most ardent anti-Zionist—pro-assimilationists among Jews, and German Gentiles; thereby forcing German Jews towards Zionism and weakening Germany in preparation for Marxist revolution—revolution which came at war's end. By siding with the British, the Zionists were also siding against the

Turkish Empire, which ruled Palestine and Greater Syria.

Anti-Semites, many of whom worked for the Zionists, exploited this opportunity to stereotype all Jews based on the actions of a few. They wanted to create an animus against all Jews for the mere fact of being Jews, so as to obstruct assimilation. Hitler's friend, Dietrich Eckart, wrote in his *Bolshevism from Moses to Lenin: A Dialogue Between Adolf Hitler and Me*,

“‘Completely aside from that, it’s clear that they have had America by the throat for quite a while,’ I continued. ‘No country, writes Sombart, displays more of a Jewish character than the United States. [Notation: Werner Sombart, *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben* (Leipzig, 1911), p. 39.] We have already seen a consequence of this in the World War. In 1915, at a time when the true Americans hadn’t the slightest thought of a war against us and, in fact, were so disposed toward us that any indication of a possible conflict of interest could have been smoothly and amicably settled, a secret advisory committee met with President Wilson for the sole purpose of preparing the country for war against Germany. [Notation by English translator deleted—its evidentiary content demonstrated below.] And who was the chief wire-puller in these nefarious activities, which were set into motion a full two years before the engagement of the United States in the war? The previously unknown Jew, Bernard Baruch. ‘I believed that the war would come, long before it came,’ he later calmly explained to the special committee of Congress which confirmed all this. And no one got up and beat the crafty scoundrel to a pulp.’”¹²⁰¹

The Germans knew of the deal struck between the Zionists, President Wilson and the British, as it happened. *The New York Times* reported on 12 November 1917 on page 13,

“ZIONISTS HERE SEE TEUTON PLAN HALTED

British Victories in the Holy Land
Thwart Germany’s Ambition
to Control Palestine.

HER PRESS CAMPAIGN BARED

Its Aim Was to Save Enough Eastern
Territory to Menace
the Suez Canal.

American Zionists who have been watching with interest the various military operations near the Holy Land have been tremendously relieved by the events of the last few days. The British victories at Beersheba and Gaza, forecasting the eventual occupation of Jerusalem, and the promise given last week by Mr. Balfour, in the name of the British Government, that they would 'use their best endeavors to facilitate the establishment of Palestine as a national home for the Jewish people,' have apparently spiked a German scheme for setting up in Palestine a Jewish State, nominally autonomous, but really under German control.

A statement issued yesterday by the Provisional Executive Committee for General Zionist Affairs gave a detailed account of a press campaign supporting this scheme which has been going on in Germany and Austria for some time. This is held to indicate that the German military leaders foresaw the collapse of the Berlin-to-Bagdad plan and were preparing another arrangement by which it was hoped that Germany might save from the wreck of its plans in the Near East enough to form a constant menace to the Suez Canal, Egypt, and India.

'To accomplish this purpose,' says the committee, 'Germany was evidently preparing to ride roughshod, if need be, over its present ally, should Turkey refuse to recognize that it was to her 'best interests' to fall in with the new project. To give 'punch' to its publicity campaign, Germany unearthed a conspiracy between America and the Zionist Organization, including United States Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, Judge Julian W. Mack, head of the American Military Insurance Department; Felix Frankfurter of the War Department, as well as Lord Walter Rothschild, leader of the English Zionists, and former Ambassador Henry W. Morgenthau to seize Palestine for exploitation by the Jews, Christian missionaries, and capitalists.

'In the end, if General Allenby hadn't gotten the jump on her by striking hard and quickly, Germany would one day soon have blandly announced the establishment of a Jewish republic under its auspices and suzerainty, and in response to Turkey's protests would have pointed to the overwhelming demand of the German people, and quoted for the benefit of its ravished ally, 'Vox populi, vox Dei.'

'If it had carried out its new plan, the establishment of an autonomous Jewish State in Palestine under its overlordship, whether with the consent of the Ottoman Government or in utter disregard of Turkey's wishes, Germany would have had, in addition to the strategical advantage that this would mean for the next war,' also the satisfaction of 'beating the Allies to it.' England,

France, Italy, and Russia have already made it clear that the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine is one of their aims in this war, and in Jewish circles in America it is held that Washington's view as to the desirability of this coincides with that of the Allies.

'Some echoes of these whisperings must have reached Germany, and several of its leading publications speak harshly of these 'infamous American Zionist proposals.' Thus *Die Kölnische Zeitung*, published in Cologne, publishes a long screed impugning the honesty of President Wilson, and ending with these complimentary allusions to Americans in general:

The Americans belong to that class of ?????? that have been for the last sixty years undermining the proud edifice of the Turkish Empire, and haven't stopped it yet. The Palestine action fully reveals Wilson's intentions. America has dropped its mask and shown itself in its true colors—a power that has the greatest interest from the capitalistic and religious point of view to bring Turkey under the influence of missionaries and capitalists. This is the true American humanity, which is based on the alliance of the religious men with the king of trusts. Turkey has watched this campaign with the utmost patience, and now it has received the cruelest reward. It can see now that America is not far behind the other Entente Powers in their enmity to Turkey and their plans for its destruction.

Kaiser Visits Palestine.

'For Germany to give its consent to the establishment of the Jewish nationality on its historic soil, requires a reversal of its previous attitude toward Palestine. Attempts have been made to establish German colonies in the Holy Land, and Kaiser Wilhelm has paid several visits to Palestine in order to win favor with the peoples of that country, and to encourage his subjects in their vain attempts to gain a strong footing there.

'The way was being prepared by a rather obvious campaign which began with the publication of apparently innocent scientific articles, by experts, on the near East, which discussed at great length, and with much detail, the accomplishments of the Jewish colonists and the vast possibilities of Palestine from an economic standpoint. A remarkable array of such articles, studying Palestine from every conceivable angle, has been published in over a hundred periodicals in Germany and Austria. These were followed by 'letters to the editor' and now the propaganda has attained the editorial stage.'

Among the first of these articles was one by Major Carl Frank Enders to make clear to the German people that it had better give up all hope of colonization in the Holy Land, and at the same time warn Turkey not to put any obstacles in the way of the Jewish operations there. Major Enders wrote:

The realization of the Zionists idea means infinitely more to our economic life than those fantasies and dreams of the German people that the Near East will create for us the lost world markets. * * * It will not be politically wise for Turkey to hinder the Jewish immigration into Palestine * * * German colonization in Palestine is nothing but a dream, beyond the realm of realization, which I would advise the German people to forego.

‘The Munich Neueste Nachrichten makes the frank statement that ‘Zionism has become a question of the first magnitude, and Germany and Turkey have no choice but to give it serious consideration.’ Gustave von Dobeller said: ‘For many years the object which our Kaiser tried to accomplish by arduous political effort has been the making of a strong Turkey. A method not to be despised would be the establishment of a strong Jewish State, under Turkish suzerainty. As the Jewish people favor republics, let them, therefore, establish a republic, which must, however, be under the protection of the Ottoman Empire. It is always a question of importance whether you or your opponent has the key of the door. The idea of establishing a Jewish State is good for that power which effects it.’

Sees No Gain to Jews.

‘The Vice President of the Austrian Parliament, Professor Paul Rohrbach, whose job was that of persuading the Jews of Germany and Austria-Hungary that the political schemes of the Allies are not to be trusted, wrote: ‘The national aspirations of the Jews will be listened to with more sympathy by the allies of Middle Europe than by the Entente, even though certain papers and politicians on that side have lately been promising great things to the Jews. I do not believe that, even if the Entente were victorious and Turkey dismembered so that Palestine came under the suzerainty of either England or France, the Jews would benefit by this. Jews will have nothing to gain by the imperialistic schemes of England.’

‘The Frankfurter Zeitung said:

‘Pan Turkish ideas have no meaning in Palestine, where practically no Turks dwell.’

‘Die Reichsbote, the mouthpiece of the Junkers, is calling upon the German Government to act promptly for the establishment of a Jewish State to ‘offset the American Zionist proposals.’ This must be done, it insists, to counteract the Wilson intrigue and ‘to prevent England from making use of these American Zionist proposals as a backdoor which will enable her to pass freely from Egypt to India. For this purpose,’ it says, ‘the German-Austrian Zionist plans for a Jewish settlement must be strengthened. This is the opportune moment for the Zionist movement to attain its ideal.’

‘These ‘American Zionist proposals’ are creating a real panic in the minds of Germany. The indications are that the German Press is alluding to the Palestine Commission appointed by President Wilson last Summer, consisting of Former Ambassador Morgenthau and Felix Frankfurter of War Secretary Baker’s Advisory Council. At any rate, the Deutsche Worte speaks of them as a ‘graver calamity than a declaration of war by a small or even medium-sized nation would be,’ and charges the enemies of Germany with ‘trying to enlist in their service the Zionist movement.’ But it sees through the game of the Allies. ‘We know very well what Mr. Morgenthau and Lord Rothschild are doing in this behalf for America and England,’ it declares, the while it admits that if ‘this plan of our enemies succeeds, it will go very badly with us.’

‘These editorials will suffice to indicate how Germany was making ready to ‘beat the Allies to it’ in Palestine. General Allenby had not beaten Germany by taking Beersheba and capturing the highway to Jerusalem. The unfurling of the Union Jack over the hills of the Holy City will signalize the end of the ‘Berlin to Bagdad’ dream.’”

Bernard Shaw wrote in 1930,

“The controversy proved superfluous after all; for the foreign trade department at the Admiralty, in the sensible hands of Sir Richard Webb, consented to pay for the confiscated cargoes; the support of the American Jews was purchased by Lord Balfour at the price of Jerusalem (Zion); and the sinking of the Lusitania by a German submarine not only removed the danger of America coming into the war on the German side, but practically forced her in on our side.”¹²⁰²

Political Zionist leader Samuel Landman repeatedly confirmed the Germans’ and Austrians’ belief that Zionists had used President Woodrow Wilson to bring America into the war on the side of the Allies in exchange for the Balfour Declaration. If Germany should win the war, the Zionists would obtain Palestine and should England win the war, the Zionists still would obtain Palestine. The Zionists had no loyalty to either England or Germany. Landman wrote in 1936,

“During the critical days of 1916 and of the impending defection of Russia, Jewry, as a whole, was against the Czarist regime and had hopes that Germany, if victorious, would in certain circumstances give them Palestine. Several attempts to bring America into the War on the side of the Allies by influencing influential Jewish opinion were made and had failed. Mr. James A. Malcolm, who was already aware of German pre-war efforts to secure a foothold in Palestine through the Zionist Jews and of the abortive Anglo-French *démarches* at Washington and New York; and knew that Mr. Woodrow Wilson, for good and sufficient reasons, always attached the greatest possible importance to the advice of a very prominent Zionist (Mr. Justice Brandeis, of the US Supreme Court); and was in close touch with Mr. Greenberg, Editor of the *Jewish Chronicle* (London); and knew that several important Zionist Jewish leaders had already gravitated to London from the Continent on the *qui vive* awaiting events; and appreciated and realised the depth and strength of Jewish national aspirations; spontaneously took the initiative, to convince first of all Sir Mark Sykes, Under-Secretary to the War Cabinet, and afterwards Monsieur Georges Picot, of the French Embassy in London, and Monsieur Goût of the Quai d’Orsay (Eastern Section), that the best and perhaps the only way (which proved so to be) to induce the American President to come into the War was to secure the co-operation of Zionist Jews by promising them Palestine, and thus enlist and mobilise the hitherto unsuspectedly powerful forces of Zionist Jews in America and

elsewhere in favour of the Allies on a *quid pro quo* contract basis. Thus, as will be seen, the Zionists, having carried out their part, and greatly helped to bring America in, the Balfour Declaration of 1917 was but the public confirmation of the necessarily secret ‘gentleman’s’ agreement of 1916 made with the previous knowledge, acquiescence and/or approval of the Arabs and of the British, American, French and other Allied Governments, and not merely a voluntary altruistic and romantic gesture on the part of Great Britain as certain people either through pardonable ignorance assume or unpardonable ill-will would represent or misrepresent.

Sir Mark Sykes was Under-Secretary to the War Cabinet specially concerned with Near Eastern affairs, and, although at the time scarcely acquainted with the Zionist movement, and unaware of the existence of its leaders, he had the flair to respond to the arguments advanced by Mr. Malcolm as to the strength and importance of this movement in Jewry, in spite of the fact that many wealthy and prominent international or semi-assimilated Jews in Europe and America were openly or tacitly opposed to it (Zionist movement), or timidly indifferent. MM. Picot and Gou t were likewise receptive.

An interesting account of the negotiations carried on in London and Paris, and subsequent developments, has already appeared in the Jewish press and need not be repeated here in detail, except to recall that immediately after the ‘gentleman’s’ agreement between Sir Mark Sykes, authorized by the War Cabinet, and the Zionist leaders, cable facilities through the War Office, the Foreign Office and British Embassies, Legations, etc., were given to the latter to communicate the glad tidings to their friends and organizations in America and elsewhere, and the change in official and public opinion as reflected in the American press in favour of joining the Allies in the War, was as gratifying as it was surprisingly rapid. [***] In Germany, the value of the bargain to the Allies, apparently, was duly and carefully noted. In his ‘Through Thirty Years’ Mr. Wickham Steed, in a chapter appreciative of the value of Zionist support in America and elsewhere to the Allied cause, says General Ludendorff is alleged to have said after the War, that: ‘The Balfour Declaration was the cleverest thing done by the Allies in the way of propaganda, and that he wished Germany had thought of it first.’ [*Footnote*: Volume 2, page 392.] As a matter of fact, this was said by Ludendorff to Sir Alfred Mond (afterwards Lord Melchett), soon after the War. The fact that it was Jewish help that brought U.S.A. into the War on the side of the Allies has rankled ever since in German—especially Nazi—minds, and has contributed in no small measure to the prominence which anti-Semitism occupies in the Nazi programme.”¹²⁰³

Samuel Landman repeated his story in: S. Landman, “Origins of the Balfour Declaration: Dr. Hertz’s Contribution”, in I. Epstein, J. H. Hertz, E. Levine, and C. Roth, Editors, *Essays in Honour of the Very Rev. Dr. J. H. Hertz, Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire, on the Occasion of His*

Seventieth Birthday, September 25, 1942 (5703), E. Goldston, London, (1942); and in: S. Landman, "Balfour Declaration: Secret Facts Revealed", *World Jewry: Independent Weekly Journal*, Volume 2, Number 43, J. H. Castel, London, (22 February 1935).

Concerned that Chaim Weizmann had not recognized James A. Malcolm's¹²⁰⁴ leading role in drawing America into the war through the influence of American Jews like Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis through British support of the Zionist cause, Malcolm Thomson¹²⁰⁵ wrote in a Letter to the Editor published as "Origin of the Balfour Declaration" in *The [London] Times Literary Supplement* of 22 July 1949 on page 473, in response to their review of Chaim Weizmann's *Trial and Error*,¹²⁰⁶ quoting from Adolf Böhm's *Die Zionistische Bewegung*,

"Mr. Malcolm, President of the Armenian National Committee in London, advised Sir Mark Sykes to influence Wilson through Brandeis, and to guarantee Palestine forthwith to the Jews, in order to gain their support. After discussion with Lord Milner, Sykes begged Mr. Malcolm to put him into touch with the Zionist leaders, because Sir Edward Grey and Mr. Balfour were convinced of the justice of the Zionist demand for Palestine. Through Greenburg, Malcolm made contact with Weizmann.' [***] [T]he Foreign Office had sent word to Brandeis and through him had worked on Wilson, in Washington."

"Mr. *Malcolm*, Präsident des Armenischen National-Komitees in London, riet Sir *Mark Sykes*, *Wilson* durch *Brandeis* zu beeinflussen und den Juden, um sie günstig zu stimmen, gleichzeitig Palästina zu sichern. Nach Rücksprache mit Lord *Milner* bat *Sykes* Mr. *Malcolm*, ihn mit den zionistischen Führern in Verbindung zu setzen, da Sir *Edward Grey* und Mr. *Balfour* von der Gerechtigkeit der zionistischen Forderung auf Palästina überzeugt seien. Durch *Greenberg* trat *Malcolm* auch mit *Weizmann* in Verbindung. [Footnote: Über die hier dargestellten Vorgänge siehe den Bericht über die „Balfour-Declaration“ von *S. Landmann*, der von 1917-1922 Sekretär der zionistischen Exekutive war, in „World Jewry“, London, 1935, Nr. 42 und 43.]”¹²⁰⁷

Malcolm Thomson wrote in a Letter to the Editor "The Balfour Declaration" in *The London Times* on 2 November 1949 on page 5,

"A change of attitude was, however, brought about through the initiative of Mr. James A. Malcolm, who pressed on Sir Mark Sykes, then Under-Secretary to the War Cabinet, the thesis that an allied offer to restore Palestine to the Jews would swing over from the German to the allied side the very powerful influence of American Jews, including Judge Brandeis, the friend and adviser of President Wilson.”¹²⁰⁸

See also: The Secret History of the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate, Pamphlets

on Arab Affairs, Number 6, Arab Office, London, (1947).

Frank Owen wrote in his book *Tempestuous Journey: Lloyd George: His Life and Times*,

“Enough for a day? No. There was trouble in the House of Lords about Honours. And there was always Ireland. But something—or rather, somebody—else was about to cause still more division in the War Cabinet.

There was another persistent people knocking at the door—and one with a still older history of oppression and exile. The Jews.

For nearly 2,000 years, the Jews had been wanting and waiting to return to the Land of their Fathers. (‘Next Year in Jerusalem’ they toasted at their Passover.) But it was not until about the dawn of the present century that the powerful Zionist Movement had been born, a world-wide organization pledged to restore Palestine as the national homeland of the Jewish people. They were not likely to overlook the possibilities of action opened up by a world war, and when the contemporary tyrant occupier of their ancient country (the Turk) took the side of the Central Powers, the Zionists naturally sought succour from the Allies. One of their leading members was a Russian Jew named Dr. Weizmann.

The reader has met him already, with Lloyd George one day in 1915 at the Ministry of Munitions, when the brilliant scientist set to work to produce the then vitally-needed acetone. In declining any honour or award to himself for his services, he had told Lloyd George of the national aspirations of his own people. Dr. Weizmann already knew Balfour, and had worked under him at the Admiralty. To him, too, the ardent Zionist confided his dreams, and Balfour had been perhaps more impressed.

Asquith, who was still Prime Minister in those days, had not been so encouraging. He had his good reasons. One was that secret Sykes-Picot Pact of May, 1916, whereby the Allies had agreed to carve up the Turkish Empire in the Middle East into Russian, French and British zones; the proposed Anglo-French dividing line cut right through Palestine. By the autumn of that year, however, a still stronger reason had arisen for revising this arrangement. This was the urgent necessity of winning over the goodwill of American Jewry to the Allied cause. For the Germans had not been idle in courting Zionism, either, notably addressing themselves to the Russian Jews.

So, under a new War Cabinet which included Lloyd George, Balfour and Smuts (another strong sympathizer with the ideas of Zionism), there had gone forth secret assurances to the Zionist leaders that Britain would support their claims, if she could carry her Allies with her. One thus addressed was Justice Brandeis, an outstanding figure of the Movement in the United States, and a close personal friend of President Wilson. A Zionist delegation, which included Dr. Weizmann, Sir Herbert Samuel and Mr. James de Rothschild, M.P., had journeyed to Paris, and there secured the agreement of the French Government.

Throughout the summer of 1917, Balfour kept up his talks with the

Zionists, and on 3 September, he laid before the War Cabinet the draft of a public statement to be made by the British Government endorsing and proclaiming all that had been promised in private.

But not everybody was pro-Zionist, and perhaps the least unanimous (in fact, they were about equally divided) were the people most concerned. Within the War Cabinet itself two more meetings were required before a bridge could be built to span the differences, and in public life, outside, the rifts long remained. Fiercest opposition of all came from wealthy Jews, who feared that if a Jewish National State were established they might lose their own status as citizens of the countries where they and their forbears had long dwelt and prospered. Lloyd George's own old friend, Sir Charles Henry, M.P., was foremost among these Anti-Zionists, and he did not delay any longer to found an anti-Zionist newspaper, *The Jewish Guardian*, to express his views.

In the War Cabinet, the new Secretary of State for India, Edwin Montagu, led the Anti-Zionist party. In a stormy meeting on 4 October, 1917, Balfour warned of a new German drive to capture the Zionist forces for the enemy side, and he claimed that though some rich Jews in Britain might oppose the idea of Zionism, it was enthusiastically backed by those in America and Russia. On whose side were those influential people to be ranged? There was no inconsistency whatever in having a Jewish National Home and Jews being members of other States. The French Government were sympathetic to the idea, and so, as he personally knew, was President Wilson.

Edwin Montagu rose. He most strongly objected to a 'National Home' for Jews, insisting that the Jews were really only a religious community and that he was himself a 'Jewish Englishman'. He turned to Lloyd George. 'All my life,' he said, 'I have been trying to get out of the Ghetto. You want to force me back there!'

Curzon was opposed to the proposal on other grounds. Ah! well did he recollect a journey he had made through the Promised Land, many years ago now. Alas! It was a barren land, with little cultivation even on the terraced slopes, and watered by all too few streams. How could this place of stone and sand become a home for millions more Jews? Moreover, what about the Moslems already living there?

Milner interposed to declare himself in favour of the National Home for Jews—provided nothing was done to prejudice the civil and religious rights of the non-Jews in Palestine, or the political status of Jews elsewhere.

The Prime Minister ruled that the War Cabinet had heard enough for one day. There was still a war on. Resolved: to hear the further views of Zionists, Anti-Zionists, Non-Zionists, and President Wilson.

The days passed. A week. Three weeks.

The Jews (at any rate, the pro-Zionist Jews) were getting restive. In particular, Lord Rothschild, the Head of his House. He had been in correspondence with Balfour since mid-July, and was beginning to wonder if anything was going to happen in the War Cabinet or not? Because,

decidedly, something was happening in Palestine.

The British Army was marching in.

After three years' hold-up, 80 per cent of it by Turkish bluff (the considerable contribution of British Army Intelligence in accepting it must not be entirely overlooked), our far more powerful forces in Egypt had begun to take the offensive against a war-weary enemy, who now counted as many deserters as troops remaining on his battle strength.

'Jerusalem by Christmas!' Lloyd George had demanded of General Allenby, in appointing him to the Egypt Command in the summer of 1917. Now Allenby had crossed the desert from Egypt, turned the weak Turkish line at Gaza by a brilliant manœuvre and was moving on the Holy City. This he would take, entering humbly on foot a fortnight before Christmas Day.

At a third War Cabinet, 31 October, 1917, Balfour once more brought up the question of the National Home. How could its establishment possibly prejudice Jews elsewhere? Surely, on the analogy of a European immigrant in the United States, it would help that they had a recognized land of origin? As for the present poverty of Palestine, the scientific development of her resources might yet make it a land flowing with milk and honey.

Curzon followed. He delivered another reminiscent address on his travels in the Middle East, which the Prime Minister this time interrupted to ask if he agreed with some expression of sympathy? Resolved:

'His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish People, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.'

Next day, Lloyd George presented this draft to the leaders of British Jewry. Of eight of them, four accepted it, including the Chief Rabbi, Dr. Hertz, one was neutral and three were hostile. Thus, the famous Balfour Declaration was delivered to the world. Next year, France, Italy and the United States all declared their accord with this policy.

But what *was* the policy? Lloyd George himself, in later years, insisted that what he had meant was that Jews should be free to go to Palestine and settle there in such strength as the land could support—or be made to support. Then, in due course, they should set up their own autonomous Jewish Administration. By no means all Jews would go there, any more than all the Irish-born return to Ireland.

It did not work out that way. The Jewish Question, like the Irish Question, had been too long part of History to be dismissed from it overnight. But the troubles this generation has known were far ahead in October, 1917. [***] There was also a new row raging between the Zionist and the anti-Zionist Jews. His Foreign Secretary, Balfour, was no Jew, but he was the foremost and certainly the most famous Christian Zionist."¹²⁰⁹

William D. Rubinstein argues that one of the drafts of the Balfour Declaration was written by a crypto-Jew named Leopold Charles Moritz Stennett Amery.¹²¹⁰ Amery's family feigned conversion to Protestantism. His mother was perhaps the child of Frankist Jews who fled Hungary after the revolution of 1848, who eventually settled in England by way of Constantinople—many Jews and crypto-Jews emerged from Turkish *Dönmeh* training grounds to become prominent Zionist spokesmen and leaders, as well as revolutionaries who sought to subvert the societies into which they moved.¹²¹¹ Perhaps beginning with Poland, Salonika and Paris, these crypto-Jewish *Dönmeh* have established subversive groups around the world. Amery was a leading force in unseating Chamberlain's government and installing longtime Zionist Winston Churchill as Prime Minister. Leopold Amery's son John, outwardly an anti-Semite and a Fascist—like so many Jewish Zionists of the period, betrayed England and helped the Zionist Nazis. He was hanged for treason after the war. A typical Zionist leader of his time, Leopold Amery, together with Chaim Weizmann, also helped betray a million, by his own account, Hungarian Jews to death.

Benjamin Harrison Freedman wrote (Bear in mind the ill will between Armenians and the Turks who controlled Palestine. The Zionists—Jewish bankers and the Young Turks under Jewish leadership,¹²¹² *Dönmeh* Turks who had long feigned Moslem conversion while undermining Turkish society and eventually succeeded in overthrowing the Sultan and destroying much of Turkish culture—the Zionists secretly and artificially created this ill-will to bring about the ruin of the Turkish Empire during the First World War. Jewish bankers and other Jewish Zionists, forever destroyed the Turkish Empire and mass murdered the Armenians.),

“Mr. James A. Malcolm was an Oxford-educated Armenian who had been appointed to take charge of Armenian interests during and after the War. In his official capacity as advisor to the British Government on Eastern affairs. . . he had frequent contact with the Cabinet Office, the Foreign Office, the War Office and the French and other Allied embassies in London and made visits to Paris for consultation with his colleagues and leading French officials.

He was passionately devoted to an Allied victory. While his home in London was being bombed by the Germans in 1944, he prepared the following account which speaks for itself. Mr. Malcolm feared he would not survive, and prepared the following which he deposited in the British Museum for the benefit of posterity. It has become one of the most important documents explaining how the United States was railroaded into World War I, and follows here:

During one of my visits to the War Cabinet Office in Whitehall Gardens in the late summer of 1916 I found Sir Mark Sykes less buoyant than usual. . . I enquired what was troubling him. . . [H]e spoke of military deadlock in France, the growing menace of submarine warfare, the unsatisfactory situation which was developing in Russia and the general bleak outlook. . . [T]he Cabinet was looking anxiously for United States intervention. . .

[H]e had thought of enlisting the substantial Jewish influence in the United States but had been unable to do so. . .

[R]eports from America revealed a very pro-German tendency among the wealthy American-Jewish bankers and bond houses, nearly all of German origin, and among Jewish journalists who took their cue from them. . . I inquired what special argument or consideration had the Allies put forward to win over American Jewry. . . Sir Mark replied that he made use of the same argument as used elsewhere, viz., that we shall eventually win and it was better to be on the winning side. . .

I informed him that there was a way to make American Jewry thoroughly pro-Ally, and make them conscious that only an Allied victory could be of permanent benefit to Jewry all over the world. . . I said to him, 'You are going the wrong way about it. . . do you know of the Zionist Movement?'. . . Sir Mark admitted ignorance of this movement and I told him something about it and concluded by saying, 'You can win the sympathy of the Jews everywhere in one way only, and that way is by offering to try and secure Palestine for them'. . . Sir Mark was taken aback. He confessed that what I had told him was something quite new and most impressive. . .

He told me that Lord Milner was greatly interested to learn of the Jewish Nationalist movement but could not see any possibility of promising Palestine to the Jews. . . I replied that it seemed to me the only way to achieve the desired result, and mentioned that one of President Wilson's most intimate friends, for whose humanitarian views he has the greatest respect, was Justice Brandeis of the Supreme Court, who was a convinced Zionist. . .

[I]f he could obtain from the War Cabinet an assurance that help would be given towards securing Palestine for the Jews, it was certain that Jews in all neutral countries would become pro-British and pro-Ally. . . I said I thought it would be sufficient if I were personally convinced of the sincerity of the Cabinet's intentions so that I could go to the Zionists and say, 'If you help the Allies, you will have the support of the British in securing Palestine for the Jews'. . .

[A] day or two later, he informed me that the Cabinet had agreed to my suggestion and authorized me to open negotiations with the Zionists. . . the messages which were sent to the Zionist leaders in Russia were intended to hearten them and obtain their support for the Allied cause. . . other messages were sent to Jewish leaders in neutral countries and the result was to strengthen the pro-Allied sympathies of Jews everywhere. . .

[A] wealthy and influential anti-Zionist Jewish banker there was shown the telegram announcing the provisional promise of Palestine to the Jews... he was very much moved and said, 'How can a Jew refuse such a gift?'

[A]ll these steps were taken with the full knowledge and approval of Justice Brandeis, between whom and [Zionist leader] Dr. Weizmann there was an active interchange of cables. . . [A]fter many anxious weeks and months, my seed had borne fruit and the Government had become an ally of Zionism. . . the Declaration is dated 2nd November, 1917, and is known to history as the Balfour Declaration. . . its obligation to promise British help for the Jews to obtain Palestine."¹²¹³

The *Jewish Daily Bulletin* allegedly wrote on 30 October 1934, on page 3,

“The New Germany persists toward the complete extermination of the Jew because it was Jews who instigated the United States to enter the World War, accomplishing the defeat of Germany, and who later caused the inflation in Germany, Herr Richard Kunze, a leading Nazi Parliament figure, declared at a mass meeting in Magdeburg yesterday.”¹²¹⁴

Winston Churchill told William Griffin in August of 1936 in an interview published in the *New York Enquirer*,

“America should have minded her own business and stayed out of the World War. If you hadn’t entered the war, the Allies would have made peace with Germany in the spring of 1917. Had we made peace then there would have been no collapse in Russia followed by Communism, no breakdown in Italy followed by Fascism, and Germany would not have signed the Versailles Treaty, which has enthroned Nazism in Germany. If America had stayed out of the war, all these ‘isms’ wouldn’t today be sweeping the continent of Europe and breaking down parliamentary government, and if England had made peace early in 1917, it would have saved over one million British, French, American and other lives.”¹²¹⁵

Zionist¹²¹⁶ British Prime Minister David Lloyd George wrote in 1939,

“The Germans were equally alive to the fact that the Jews of Russia wielded considerable influence in Bolshevik circles. The Zionist Movement was exceptionally strong in Russia and America. The Germans were, therefore, engaged actively in courting favour with that Movement all over the world. A friendly Russia would mean not only more food and raw material for Germany and Austria, but fewer German and Austrian troops on the Eastern front and, therefore, more available for the West. These considerations were brought to our notice by the Foreign Office, and reported to the War Cabinet.

The support of the Zionists for the cause of the Entente would mean a great deal as a war measure. Quite naturally Jewish sympathies were to a great extent anti-Russian, and therefore in favour of the Central Powers. No ally of Russia, in fact, could escape sharing that immediate and inevitable penalty for the long and savage Russian persecution of the Jewish race. In addition to this, the German General Staff, with their wide outlook on possibilities, urged, early in 1916, the advantages of promising Jewish restoration to Palestine under an arrangement to be made between Zionists and Turkey, backed by a German guarantee. The practical difficulties were considerable; the subject was perhaps dangerous to German relations with Turkey; and the German Government acted cautiously. But the scheme was by no means rejected or even shelved, and at any moment the Allies might have been forestalled in offering this supreme bid. In fact in September,

1917, the German Government were making very serious efforts to capture the Zionist Movement.

Another most cogent reason for the adoption by the Allies of the policy of the declaration lay in the state of Russia herself. Russian Jews had been secretly active on behalf of the Central Powers from the first; they had become the chief agents of German pacifist propaganda in Russia; by 1917 they had done much in preparing for that general disintegration of Russian society, later recognised as the Revolution. It was believed that if Great Britain declared for the fulfilment of Zionist aspirations in Palestine under her own pledge, one effect would be to bring Russian Jewry to the cause of the Entente.

It was believed, also, that such a declaration would have a potent influence upon world Jewry outside Russia, and secure for the Entente the aid of Jewish financial interests. In America, their aid in this respect would have a special value when the Allies had almost exhausted the gold and marketable securities available for American purchases. Such were the chief considerations which, in 1917, impelled the British Government towards making a contract with Jewry.”¹²¹⁷

Sigmund Freud and William C. Bullitt wrote in 1932,

“Balfour had replaced Grey as British Foreign Secretary. He came to America in April 1917 to inform Wilson that the condition of the Allies was desperate, that Russia was more than likely to withdraw from the war, that the morale of France was collapsing, that the financial condition of England threatened calamity and that the United States would have to carry a war burden enormously greater than either Wilson or anyone else in America had anticipated. He was prepared to reveal to Wilson some at least of the secret treaties of the Allies and to discuss war aims, assuming naturally that Wilson would insist on defining the precise aims for which he must ask the people of the United States to pour out a flood of blood and wealth.

Wilson wished to settle the question of war aims with Balfour definitely and at once. At that moment he might have written his own peace terms and might possibly have turned the war into the crusade for peace which he had proclaimed. The Allies were completely at his mercy. But House persuaded him not to demand a definition of war aims from Balfour by the argument that the discussion which would ensue would interfere with the prosecution of the war. Both Wilson and House overlooked the fact that all the warring powers had discussed their peace terms in detail while prosecuting the war with notable efficiency. House also inserted in Wilson’s mind the picture of a Peace Conference at which England would loyally cooperate with the United States in establishing a just and lasting peace. And Wilson, always anxious to ‘dodge trouble,’ let slip this opportunity to avoid the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and secure the just peace of which he dreamed. Both the President and House seem to have misunderstood totally the sort of respect

that the governments of Europe had for Wilson. For the President as wielder of the physical strength of America, they had the greatest respect; for Woodrow Wilson as a moral leader, they had no respect. So long as the physical assistance of the United States was vital to the Allies they had to defer to the President of the United States; but Woodrow Wilson was never able to make any European statesman ‘drunk with this spirit of self-sacrifice.’

Balfour mentioned the existence of some of the secret treaties to Wilson and promised to send them to Wilson; but he never sent them and, having arranged for the utmost physical assistance from the United States, went home happy.”¹²¹⁸

Many revisionists have argued that the great debts the Allies had accrued caused Wilson to enter the war in order to ensure that America could recover its loans.¹²¹⁹ This argument does not seem plausible for the simple reason that America incurred more expenses by going to war and making additional loans to the Allies, than the total monies it stood to lose if England and France were to default on their initial loans. America could not recover these internal expenses and America itself was financed by its own citizens, who invested large sums in bonds.

Prior to the close of World War I, Germany had provided Jews with more opportunities than any other nation on Earth. In return, Germany benefitted from Jewish contributions in Mathematics, the Arts and Sciences, the professions, high finance, and from Jewish educators. Many of the most prosperous of the Americans of Jewish descent had emigrated to America from Germany and promoted German businesses and culture in America—until the political Zionists began to smear the Germans, who had done so much to help Jews throughout the world. Then, Germany became a pariah nation in the American press. Germans and those of German descent, including German-Jewish immigrants, were resented and persecuted in America, and America entered the war on England’s side. Many Germans knew that the British then issued the Balfour declaration (actually drafted by Zionists) to Rothschild in fulfilment of a contract with Zionists to win the war for England in exchange for Palestine by bringing in America on the Allies’ side:

“Foreign Office.
November 2nd, 1917.

Dear Lord Rothschild,

I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty’s Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations which has been submitted to, and approved by, the Cabinet

‘His Majesty’s Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.’

I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.”

The British had no lawful authority to make this declaration. The British did not control Palestine, and even if they had, they would have had no right to offer it up to the Jews for settlements. Henry Morgenthau pointed out that leading Jews misrepresented the precise language of the Balfour Declaration, which did not offer to give Palestine to the Jews, but merely expressed support for the idea that Jews might wish to live there under the rule of the indigenous population,

“It is worth while at this point to digress for a moment from my main argument, to point out that the Balfour Declaration is itself not even a compromise. It is a shrewd and cunning delusion. I have been astonished to find that such an intelligent body of American Jews as the Central Conference of American Rabbis should have fallen into a grievous misunderstanding of the purport of the Balfour Declaration. In a resolution adopted by them, they assert that the declaration says: ‘Palestine is to be a national home-land for the Jewish people.’ Not at all! The actual words of the declaration (I quote from the official text) are: ‘His Majesty’s Government views with favor the establishment *in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people.*’ These two phrases sound alike, but they are really very different. I can make this obvious by an analogy. When I first read the Balfour Declaration I was temporarily making my home in the Plaza Hotel. Therefore I could say with truth: ‘My home is in the Plaza Hotel.’ I could not say with truth: ‘The Plaza Hotel is my home.’ If it were ‘my home,’ I would have the freedom of the whole premises, and could occupy any room in the house with impunity. Quite obviously, however, I would not venture to trespass in the rooms of my friend, Mr. John B. Stanchfield, who happened at the same time also to have found ‘a home-land in the Plaza,’ nor in the private quarters of any other resident of that hostelry, whose right to his share in it was as good as mine, and in many cases of much longer standing.”¹²²⁰

[5.16 A Newspaper History of Zionist Intrigues During the First World War, which Proves that Jewish Bankers Betrayed Germany](#)

The London Times reported on 17 August 1914, on page 7,

**“AMERICAN SYMPATHY
INCREASING.**

CHANCELLOR’S ‘FUTILE PLEA.’

FEARS OF JAPAN'S INTENTIONS.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

WASHINGTON, AUG. 16.

'A futile plea' is the *New York World's* comment on the German Chancellor's latest effort to justify Germany in American eyes. Like the *New York Times*, the *Tribune*, and various other organs reflecting respectable opinion, the *New York World* resents German efforts to cloak the scandal of the violation of Belgian neutrality under vague references to a life and death struggle between Teuton and Slav. The *New York Times* is particularly indignant at the attempt to make out that England entered upon the war in order to further her commercial ambitions at the expense of Germany.

There are also signs of indignation at the clumsy propaganda of Pro-Germans in the United States. The responsible American Press is doing its best to be fair. Its Readers are constantly reminded that the news which comes is mainly from Anglo-French sources. Some newspapers are publishing daily extracts from German-American organs side by side with extracts from Franco-American contemporaries. Accusations of ignorance and prejudice are therefore annoying.

Unmistakable evidence is reaching Washington that South American sympathies are equally with us. The only discordant note is an agitation in the Japanophobe Press over the reported determinations of Japan to make war.¹²²¹ In spite of a reassuring statement by Count Okuma, the opinion is widely expressed that Japan espies an opportunity of expansion into China. There is reason to believe that the State Department is not immune from such fears, though there is no basis for reports that it has already taken a hand in current Far Eastern diplomacy. Should Japan take up arms, the State Department's policy will be one of cautious championship of the integrity of China outside foreign zones."

The London Times reported on 18 August 1914, on page 5,

“THROUGH GERMAN EYES.

THE BRITISH FLEET'S MOVEMENTS.

BID FOR AMERICAN FAVOUR.

GREAT NUMBERS OF PRISONERS.

A party of Americans who left Berlin on August 13 were each presented at the station of departure with a packet of 12 *Lokalanzeiger*. On the outside of the packet, one of which, by the kindness of one of the tourists, has come into our possession, is fixed a handbill addressed to ‘The returning Citizens of the-to-us-friendly United States.’

The enclosed newspapers, it is stated, must ‘serve to destroy the web of lies which the hostile Press has spread over us, and give truth its place of honour.’ Then, in still larger type: ‘Redistribution for publication in American papers is solicited.’

The newspapers in question seem chiefly anxious to convey two impressions—that Germany is everywhere victorious, and that American public opinion is favourable to Germany’s cause. The ultimatum of Japan to Germany followed hard upon the gift which the Japanese Colony in Berlin are said to have given to their ‘dear, brave friends.’

The Russians have, according to these papers, been beaten back all along the line. The French have been thoroughly beaten in Alsace, and the event is published in the following *communiqué*:—

At Mulhausen German troops have taken prisoner 10 French officers and 513 men. In addition four guns and a great number of rifles were taken. German soil is cleansed of the enemy.

At Lagarde ‘more than 1,000 unwounded prisoners of war have fallen into our hands, more than a sixth of the two French regiments which were in the fight.’

According to a telegram from Hannover, 500 Belgian prisoners have been brought into the province, and 700 French prisoners of war are announced from Worms to be on their way to internment in Germany.

In the paper of August 13 is a notice to the effect that German submarines ‘in the course of the last few days’ have run along the East Coast of England and Scotland as far as the Shetlands. As to the results of this expedition—so runs the notice—nothing can, for obvious reasons, be published.

A telegram from Copenhagen purports to give the movements of the English Fleet. A great number of English men-of-war are said to have been sighted off Grimsby, going in a south-easterly direction, but the main British fleet is assembled to the east of Pentland Firth.

The news of victories generally seemed to be given out by the Kaiser himself. Liége is said to have fallen, with all its forts, into German hands (August 9). In spite of the demand of the *Lokalanzeiger* that the German losses should be published, no such list is given, on the ground that the number has not yet been ascertained.”

The London Times reported on 19 August 1914, on page 5,

“PRESIDENT WILSON CRITICIZED.

(FROM OUR CORRESPONDENT.)

NEW YORK, AUG. 17.

The recent announcement of the State Department as to the attitude of this Government stating that ‘loans by Americans bankers to any foreign nation which is at war are inconsistent with the true spirit of neutrality’ is the subject of much comment here. Assuming that this is intended to apply to such arrangements as the Morgan French loan proposal, which was not a war loan in the ordinary sense, but merely a proposition to buy foodstuffs for France on a credit to be established here, the leading newspapers sharply criticize and condemn the Government’s policy.

The *New York Sun* inquires whether, ‘if Dr. Wilson and Mr. Bryan hold that it is a violation of the true spirit of neutrality to lend a belligerent funds to buy foodstuffs, it is not equally a violation of that spirit to sell a belligerent foodstuffs’; the *Sun* thinks the position of the Administration inconsistent with the modern theory of international law.

The *New York Times* feels that Dr. Wilson and Mr. Bryan ‘are betrayed by their natural benevolent idealism into taking a somewhat extreme attitude against loaning American credit in time of war.’ Food, it remarks, is needed for non-combatants as well as for the armies.

The *World* says:—

A national loan would be inadmissible, but to discourage loans by individuals while exerting the Government’s utmost power to encourage the sale of our surplus products in belligerent markets is neither sound business, correct sentiment, nor true neutrality. It is statesmanship at cross purposes.

It is feared that the attitude of the Government may delay the resumption of shipments of grain and cotton commodities. Such shipments, it is argued in many quarters, will soon exhaust European balances here, and it will be almost impossible for Europe to purchase grain, &c., here unless credit in some way is arranged. We need the proceeds from our surplus grain and cotton quite as much as Europe will need those products.

KAISER’S PROTEST TO AMERICA.

WASHINGTON, AUG. 18.

The Kaiser has made a protest to President Wilson stating that Germany has been maligned and her motives misunderstood, misconstrued, and misrepresented in a campaign organized to foster anti-German sentiment.

The United States Government is protesting against these allegations through Mr. Gerard, the American Ambassador at Berlin, and Mr. Bryan.—*Exchange Telegraph Company.*”

The London Times published the following letter on 19 August 1914, on page 7,

“GERMAN SOCIALISTS AND THE
WAR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—If the German Social Democratic Party was as wholeheartedly against this war as Mr. H. M. Hyndman would have us believe, would he kindly explain how it is that the official organ of that party, the *Vorwärts*, which had hitherto seldom shown any tenderness for the Kaiser, broke out, just as the most acute stage of this crisis, into a sudden outburst of praise for Germany’s War Lord as a great prince of peace?

About 20 years ago, I was watching, with Herr Bebel, a Prussian regiment of Foot Guards marching out of the Brandenburg Gate at Berlin. The Socialist leader told me, with some pride, that more than half of them probably were Social Democrats. I asked him whether, in the event of war, that would make the slightest difference, and he replied to me quite frankly, ‘No, I am afraid, not the slightest. Nothing will happen until Germany has been sobered by a great military catastrophe. *Das Volk ist noch immer siegestrunken*’ (The people are still drunk with victory).

It is folly to attempt to disguise from ourselves that this war is at present a popular war, and probably more popular against England than against any other of the allied Powers. Do not let us forget that no movement has received more enthusiastic support throughout Germany than the German big Navy movement. In this island country of ours no Navy League has ever secured, in all these years, a tithe of the popular support which the German Navy League has received in Continental Germany. Founded under exalted patronage, it could boast within a few years a membership of over one million, recruited all over the country, and largely through University professors and school teachers, who were the most active instruments of this essentially anti-British propaganda.

Yours obediently,

VALENTINE CHIROL.

August 18.”

In English and American newspapers, the Zionist cause was said to be championed by the Czar, by the Germans, by the Turks, by the British, by the Armenians, etc., depending on the complexion of the world at the time and which nation/side appeared to be winning once war broke out. There are too many relevant articles to reproduce all of them here, but I will reprint a few.

The New York Times reported on 1 July 1914,

“Prof. Levin of Berlin told the convention that European countries, including Turkey, were friendly to the Zionists, and that there was a great need of a university at Jerusalem.”¹²²²

Early in the war in 1915, more than two years before the Balfour Declaration of

the British pledged Palestine to the Zionists for a homeland, the Russians stated that one of the reasons for their war against the Turks was to capture Palestine for the Zionists. *The New York Times* wrote on 15 July 1915, page 3,

“SENT JEWS TO CAUCASUS.

Grand Duke Told Them to Retake Palestine, German Paper Says.

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

ZURICH, July 14, (Dispatch to The London Daily Graphic.)—The Munich journal *Neueste Nachrichten* publishes a dispatch from Lemberg stating that before the fall of that town Grand Duke Nicholas issued an order of the day to the Jewish soldiers in his army, stating that he had decided to give them a special opportunity of showing courage and patriotism. One of the aims of the struggle with Turkey was said to be in order to reconquer Palestine for the Jews so they could live there united and independent. The order of the day concluded as follows:

‘We will therefore pave the way for you to join the Army of the Caucasus. It now depends on you what treatment your race and co-religionists will receive during the war and after. Reconquer Palestine for yourselves and a new day of glory will dawn for Jewry.’

Jewish soldiers in the Galacian army were then transferred to the Army of the Caucasus.”

Later, the Russian Revolution was said to favor the Zionists. Bolsheviki were said to have freed the Zionists, then banned them. Two themes emerged at war’s end, and they were not lost upon the Germans—the Zionists were loyal only to themselves, and the combatant nations’ loyalty to Zionism came not from love, but desperation—and the need for money and to bring America into the war as an ally. Such illusions were created by the enormous wealth and influence of Jewish high finance.

Maurice Paléologue recorded the cruelly conducted concentration of Jews by the Russians and the rôle of the alleged influence of American Jews on America’s war policy, as well as the use of the Jewish question to promote Jews and alternatively to condemn Jews as allies of the Germans or of the Russians, throughout Paléologue’s *An Ambassador’s Memoirs*. For example, we find his entry of 28 October 1914,

“*Wednesday, October 28, 1914.*

For the Jews of Poland and Lithuania the war is one of the greatest disasters they have ever known. Hundreds of thousands of them have had to leave their homes in Lodz, Kielce, Petrokov, Ivangorod, Skiernewice,

Suvalki, Grodno, Bieloostock, etc. Almost everywhere the prelude to their lamentable exodus has been the looting of their shops, synagogues, and houses. Thousands of families have taken refuge in Warsaw and Vilna; the majority are wandering aimlessly like a flock of sheep. It's a miracle that there have been no *pogroms* — organized massacres. But not a day passes in the zone of the armies without a number of Jews being hanged on a trumped-up charge of spying.

Incidentally, Sazonov and I have been talking of the Jewish question and all the religious, political, social and economic problems it raises. He informed me that the Government was considering what modifications could be made in the far too arbitrary and vexatious regulations to which the Russian Jews are subjected. A new law is about to be issued in favour of the Jews of Galicia who will become subjects of the Tsar. I have encouraged him to be as tolerant and liberal as possible:

'I'm speaking to you as an ally. In the United States there is a very large, influential and wealthy Jewish community who are very indignant at your treatment of their co-religionists. Germany is very skillfully exploiting this quarrel with you—which means a quarrel with us. It's a matter of importance for us to win the sympathy of Americans.'¹²²³

Political Zionist leader Israel Zangwill published a letter in *The London Times* on 19 August 1914 on page 7, which precipitated his Zionist campaign to draw America into World War I on the side of the Allies and against Germany, and to convince German Jews around the world to side with Zionists against Germany,

“EQUALITY FOR JEWS IN RUSSIA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—The rumour in your issue of to-day that the Tsar is about to give civil and political rights to his Jews will, if confirmed, do much to relieve the feelings of those who, like myself, believe that the Entente with Russia was too high a price to pay even for safety against the German peril. Not that the Russians are not a fine people; it is only with the Russian Government that civilization has a quarrel, and the quarrel is as much on behalf of her Russian as her Jewish subjects. The offer of autonomy to Poland—even if it is only a good stroke of business—shows that that Government is entering upon an era of greater intelligence, and learning at last from her British ally that minorities and dependencies are attached more closely by love than by fear. The emancipation of the Russian Jews would be felt as an immense relief in many countries, not only among Jews, who have felt bitterly that the old land of freedom was helping involuntarily to perpetuate the Pale, but among Christians also, for all civilization suffers under this medieval survival with its sequelæ in massacre and emigration. In Russia there is a colossal field—half of Europe and half of Asia—for the energies of the six million Jews now cooped up in a province of which they are forbidden even the villages.

Their enfranchisement would, indeed, be a logical consequence of the redemption of Poland, for how could Russia permit the Jews in her Polish dominion to be freer than in Russia proper? But there is no logic in Russia, and it is, alas! far from improbable that the Poles, now engaged in a barbarous boycott of their Jews, would be stupid enough to imitate Russia and deny them equality. In that case the Jews now in Austrian and German Poland would lose their hard-won rights just as the Jews of Khiva and Bokhara lost theirs when these regions were assigned to Russia. And Russian Jews would only assuredly count as human beings if Russia, instead of conquering German and Austrian Poland, herself loses to Germany her German Balkan-speaking provinces. In these—and they include the bulk of the Jewish Pale—the Jews would be seised at a stroke of the rights they have so long vainly demanded from Russia. Is it not tragic that in this instance civilization should have more to gain from German militarism than from our Eastern ally? I hope that in the final issue of this cosmic cataclysm England will not be found the catspaw of Powers opposed to her noblest traditions, but that by her insistence on justice and freedom all round she will retrospectively justify her Entente, show a glorious profit on her outlay in armaments, resume her moral hegemony of the world, and her old place in the affections of mankind.”

To which J. E. C. Bodley replied in *The London Times* on 21 August 1914, on page 4,

“MR. ZANGWILL’S ANTI-BRITISH THEORIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—Mr. Israel Zangwill informs us in *The Times* of yesterday that, because of Jewish disabilities in Russia, ‘the Entente with Russia was too high a price to pay, even for safety against the German peril.’ Mr. Zangwill is welcome to consider that the interests of his Russian compatriots are more important than those of the land of his adoption and of the British Empire. But before trying to convert us to his inopportune theory he should have a word to say to the proceedings of his fellow Hebrews in the United States, as recorded in the instructive dispatches from *The Times* Washington Correspondent on August 15, &c. [*Refer to the Endnote.*¹²²⁴] showing that the powerful Jewish Press of America is German in sympathy and bitterly anti-English in its unscrupulous propaganda.

Most of us are willing to believe that the majority of British Jews are (unlike Mr. Zangwill) first Englishmen and then Hebrews. But utterances such as his make it necessary to recall the unpleasant fact that, in the Press of Europe and America, Jewish influence means German influence. French anti-Semitism in its origin was entirely an anti-German movement, roused by the undue influence of German Jews in the Press and politics of France;

and at that time the long-settled Jewish communities of Bordeaux and Bayonne excited no animosity.

What right has Mr. Zangwill to lecture us and to talk lightly of ‘the German peril’—which is no peril to him or to his people—when England alone in the world has given, at the expense of her working classes and of her ratepayers, a reckless hospitality to the Russian Jews, whose interests he puts above those of the British race?

I deplore anti-Semitism, especially at a crisis which has united British subjects of all races. But to propagate that *doctrine de haine* in England seems to be the object of Mr. Israel Zangwill.”

Bodley referred to the fact that most Jews of German Jewish descent sided with Germany and expressed their pro-German stance in their newspapers. His charge that French anti-Semitism arose from the belief that Jewish liberalism was a stalking horse for German militarism found examples in the Dreyfus Affair and in anti-Semitic propaganda of the period (*see, for example, the period cartoon reproduced in: R. M. Seltzer, Jewish People, Jewish Thought: The Jewish Experience In History, Macmillan, New York, (1980), p. 631*).

The machinations of Jewish financiers in the anti-Catholic French Revolution as well as Rothschild’s theft of the wealth of France in Napoleon’s anti-Catholic campaigns, left many French suspicious of Jewish bankers. Jews had been accused of robbing nations of their gold from the times of the Roman Empire, when Flaccus charged the Jews with stealing the gold of Rome and sending it to Jerusalem.¹²²⁵ Before Flaccus, the Jews accused themselves of stealing the Egyptians’ gold by asking to borrow it from their trusting Egyptian neighbors, then emigrating without giving it back (*Exodus* 11:2; 12:35-36). Many have interpreted the Old Testament to predict that when the Messiah arrives, the Jews will horde all the gold, silver and jewels of the world and keep this treasure in Jerusalem (*Isaiah* 23:17-18). Michael Higger wrote in his book published in 1932, *The Jewish Utopia*, divulging the intentions of Jews who wish to fulfill Judaic Messianic prophecy,

“All the treasures and natural resources of the world will eventually come in possession of the righteous. This would be in keeping with the prophecy of Isaiah: ‘And her gain and her hire shall be holiness to the Lord; it shall not be treasured nor laid up; for her gain shall be for them that dwell before the Lord, to eat their fill and for stately clothing.[*Isaiah* 23:18]’²⁰ Similarly, the treasures of gold, silver, precious stones, pearls, and valuable vessels that have been lost in the seas and oceans in the course of centuries will be raised up and turned over to the righteous.²¹ Joseph hid three treasuries in Egypt: One was discovered by Korah, one by Antoninus, and one is reserved for the righteous in the ideal world.²² [***] Gold will be of secondary importance in the new social and economic order. Eventually, all the friction, jealousy, quarrels, and misunderstandings that exist under the present system, will not be known in the ideal Messianic era.³¹⁹ The city of Jerusalem will possess most of the gold and precious stones of the world. That ideal city will be

practically full of those metals and stones, so that the people of the world will realize the vanity and absurdity of wasting their lives in accumulating those imaginary valuables.^{320,1226}

The Messianic prophecy found in *Haggai 2:7-8* states,

“7 And I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the LORD of hosts. 8 The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the LORD of hosts.”

The Chicago Tribune, reported on 17 August 1870 on page 4,

“FRANCE.

Special Despatch to The Chicago Tribune.

NEW YORK, Aug. 16,—A Paris letter to the *World* remarks that Messrs. de Rothschild are said to lose several thousand dollars a day on the money they keep idle in their safe, or, rather, vault. One of their most lucrative branches of business is dealing in bullion, and melting and refining gold. The government has ordered them to discontinue this business. The Messrs. de Rothschild are not looked upon with a favorable eye by the government. It is notorious that their sympathies are all German. They have not contributed a son to any of the war funds. You know nine-tenths of the banking business of Paris is in the hands of German bankers. The police watch them very closely. It is even rumored that one of the wealthiest of them was arrested yesterday for sending large amounts of money out of France. The Bank of France refuses to touch the paper of men suspected of extorting bullion. At the last discount day one of the firms under this suspicion sent in 600,000 francs worth of paper to be discounted. Every cent of it was returned, refused.

In Switzerland matters are still worse. The banks have suspended specie payments, and have refused to discount any notes except those of manufacturers in the neighborhood, and these only in sums sufficient to keep the manufactories running. The interdiction to export gold from France presses with a heavy weight upon Switzerland. It and the banks' refusal to discount have forced all commercial firms in Switzerland to suspend payments. Men whose books show them to be worth millions are compelled to suspend payments, because none of their assets are available. It is impossible to get a bill on Paris cashed anywhere, and all but impossible to get a bill on London cashed. Travellers are advised by bankers here to take with them gold enough to pay their expenses.

The outflow of gold from France continues to be enormous, despite all the measures taken. This necessarily so. Last week the French Government was obliged to send \$15,000 in gold to Spain to pay for the wheat, wine, oil, brandy, etc., bought there by the government agents.”

In 1890, the Marquis de Mores and other Frenchman alleged that Jews had taken over France. Their allegations were met with the threat that the Jews controlled the money markets of Europe, and had enormous influence in America, and that those who stood against the Jews, especially noblemen, would face the Guillotine—as they had in the French Revolution. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported on 4 February 1890 on page 5,

“DE MORES ON THE JEWS.

AIMS OF THE LEADERS OF THE ANTI-SEMITIC MOVEMENT IN FRANCE.

It Is Claimed That the Country Is Really Governed by the Jews, Who Find No Difficulty in Getting the Department Officials and the Legislators in Their Power—The London ‘Times’ Pays Parnell \$25,000 and His Libel Suit Is Withdrawn—General Foreign News.

SPECIAL CABLE DISPATCH TO THE TRIBUNE.

(Copyright, 1890, by Jaqmes Gordon Bennett.)

PARIS, Feb. 3.—The Marquis de Mores, who fought a duel with Camille Dreyfus yesterday, is one of the recognized leaders of the anti-Semitic party in France, which is actively working against the Jews. The Marquis, when interviewed by a *Herald* correspondent, said: ‘Foolish rumors are being circulated to the effect that we are attempting to drive the Jews from France. This is the most utter nonsense. We have no objection to Jews because they are Jews—in fact, we regard them as useful and necessary members of society so long as they remain in their proper place—but we object most decidedly to their monopolizing the entire country. We object to a state of things which permits a sect only a few thousand strong to govern a nation which numbers millions. We are not stirring up an agitation with a view to depriving the Jews of any of their rights, but of securing French people in rights which the Jews have succeeded in swindling them out of. When I say that this nation is governed by Jews I speak advisedly. It is true that we are living under a régime which we call republican, but unfortunately we are a republic in name only. In all its machinery the administration of today has retained the policy of centralization and redtapeism just as it existed when we were ruled by Emperors and Kings. The only difference is that the country has lost all the advantages of stability and responsibility which she used to enjoy, and has in exchange gained none of the benefits of a real, enlightened democracy. Local self-government, as understood in America, is unknown to us. We write the word ‘liberty’ in large letters on our public buildings, and then in our private lives continue to submit to oppression just as if the great revolution had never occurred. The Anglo-Saxon, it has often been said, will never fight except for something tangible, but we Frenchmen will tear down the heavens for an idea only. The trouble is that, having once established the external truth of our ideas, we never dream of putting them into practice; we are content to lay down to the world great principles of action which must

lead to prosperity. The world acts upon them quickly, while we, vain theorists, accept the empty shadow for the reality. That is the way it has been with our Republic, and that is how the Jews who are not at all theorists, but shrewd, farseeing schemers, have by getting hold of all centralized power been able to wield an influence in the management of national affairs none the less absolute for being exercised in secret.

A GOVERNMENT BY CLERKS.

‘Theoretically the French people govern themselves; practically they are governed by a certain number of clerks and under secretaries in the bureaus of the Paris Ministers. These men are paid only a few hundred francs per month, and can consequently be tempted by a few hundred francs over and above their meager salaries. The Ministers and nominal heads of the departments may or may not be honest men, they may or may not be ignorant of what is going on among their subordinates, but even if they are so disposed they can do little to remedy the evil. With the present kaleidoscope system Ministers succeed Ministers so rapidly that they have neither time nor inducement to learn to discharge the duties of the office. The result is that clerks and secretaries who have held their positions long enough to understand the work are left to transact the business of the country, and these young gentlemen or old gentlemen, as the case may be, hardly able to live on their official salaries, manage to live comfortably on the supplemental salaries paid them by the Jews.

‘It is needless to add that the Jews do not pay these salaries for nothing. Not only is bribery carried on throughout the various executive departments of the State, but far from uncommonly in the Chamber itself. Last year the salaries of not less than 180 deputies were attached for debt. I mention this to show how welcome a few 1,000-franc notes would be to a debtor thus embarrassed. In such cases 1,000-franc notes are not always forthcoming from the Jews, but always for a consideration. The result is that all serious legislation for the real interests of the people is impossible. No great reform can pass the Chamber, although the people are clamoring for reform. No great abuse can be done away with, although the people are groaning under numberless abuses, for it must be borne in mind that whenever there is a popular abuse there is money to be wrung from the people; hence the Jews believe in popular abuses and fight against reform. And such is the insidious influence of the Rothschilds and their followers and such the perfection of their organization throughout France that the real voice of the people is not heard even at the general elections.

JEWS KEPT BOULANGER OUT.

‘The pressure of immense sums of money, used as the Jews know how to use it, is simply incalculable. There is not the slightest doubt that but for this hostile influence last September the dissatisfied elements led by Boulanger would have swept the country at these elections. It would be hard to say how many millions of francs have been furnished M. Constans, Minister of the Interior, from the Jewish coffers. Thus for the time they have

stifled the voice of universal discontent, but it will not be stifled forever. A storm is brewing and will burst ere long. Boulangism, even without Boulanger, is today stronger than ever, for Boulangism never meant anything but discontent, and every week and every day gives France new causes for being discontented.

‘And not only have the Jews been able to prevent all legislation tending toward reform and toward bettering the people’s lot, but they have paralyzed the industrial activity of the country by a long series of financial swindles, which in the end always result in taking the people’s savings in exchange for more or less valueless bonds and shares. They have succeeded in obtaining the absolute control of the Bank of France and all our great institutions of credit, and they can at will refuse or grant a needed loan. If a man wants to raise 2,000,000 francs for any enterprise he is absolutely at the mercy of the Jews, and if the enterprise is not big enough to suit them they refuse to bother about it.

‘Now, what we demand is that this financial tyranny shall cease; that the workingman shall be able to get in his purchases something like the value of his money; that the consumer shall be allowed to deal directly with the producer, thus saving the middleman’s or Jew’s enormous profits; that the Government shall grant credit to workingmen’s societies, organized on a socialistic and coöperative basis; in short, that the Jew be forced to attend to his own business and allow other people to attend to theirs.

‘THE PAST, PRESENT AND THE FUTURE.’

‘It is curious to study the causes that will bring a crisis to a head. The Jews, after taking the past in the shape of savings and the future in the shape of loans, in their insatiable greed have laid their hands on the present. They have now touched the daily life of the people, and this will bring the crisis. Speaking of the meat question in Paris, German dressed mutton, under cover of existing treaties and tariffs, is flooding Paris, and all the men who used to live from work in the slaughter-houses, tanneries, etc., are idle and hungry, and, under existing circumstances, nothing can be done for them. From that savage quarter, when hungry, will start the bolt, as these people have a right to live and will not allow men rolling in easily-gotten millions to regulate their appetites. Our object is to execute social reforms, and we begin our social experiments in Paris. Our ideas are that when individual enterprise has created a national monopoly the duty of society is to step in, indemnify creative genius, and give the benefit of the instrument to all and not to one. If in Paris we arrive at a majority and execute some reforms the country, now sick of talk, will follow us farther and we will be able to force other reforms. But remember we are not fanatics; we only want to pull off the masks and give every man his due.’

AN EDITORIAL OPINION.

The Paris *Herald* prints the following editorial on the above interview:

We are agreeably surprised with our interview with the Marquis de Mores on the anti-Jewish question. It has made a deep impression in political

circles and is an important contribution to a grand question which is of current interest. The Marquis was moderate, conservative, with sound ideas on the evils of bureaucracy in France—evils which we fear are almost inseparable from a shifting and evanescent republican government everywhere. It has had a rank growth in the United States for generations.

As to the crusade against the Jews, the Marquis should remember that he who sows the wind shall reap the whirlwind. Among the facts of modern civilization which must be accepted is that the Jews control the money markets of Europe and have a vast influence in America. If they were not possessed of great ability it would be otherwise. In the struggle for wealth more, perhaps, than in any other the fittest survives. Is it wise for the Marquis and noblemen like him, under pretense of an anti-Semitic crusade, to excite the mob against the rich, to teach poverty and crime to war upon property? A crusade against 100,000,000 francs means very soon a crusade against 1,000 francs. It is Belleville against the rentes, crime against thrift.

The Marquis should not forget the sinister lessons of the revolution. It was noblemen of his class—Mirabeau, Talleyrand, Lafayette, Egalite d’Orleans—who sharpened the pike which the mob drove home to the heart of France. Even Princes of the blood dallied with the fashionable movement until it was too late, as, in the Arabian tale, the spirit they summoned from the bottle became a demon that swept the earth.

Noblemen like the Marquis were to blame for the revolution of 1789, as many of the highest nobles in France are to blame for the Boulanger revolution of 1889, which, but for the steadier nerve of the French people, might have come to issues as grave as those of the ‘Terror.’

The cry against the Jews is a cry against the rich, the outcast against Dives. The Marquis and his noble friends are playing with fire as their ancestors did before them. Fight bureaucracy to the end—that is all right and it will be a good campaign—but let the Jews alone. Avoid all mad, eccentric politics, like Knownothingism and anti-Masonry. Especially let France remember that the nineteenth century came in under the shadows of the guillotine, and not invoke that appalling specter for its closing years.”

The Roman Catholic Church was suspicious that Jewish liberals; who trumpeted the ideals of the French Revolution of liberty, equality and fraternity; tended toward the atheism, or the paganism, that attended the French Revolution. Reformed Judaism and reformed Catholicism in the form of Protestantism were merging. There was obvious collusion between Jewish liberalism in the press and the *Kulturkampf* against Catholicism.¹²²⁷ A similar set of circumstances occurred in Vienna, where Karl Lueger eventually became Mayor of the city—Vienna had suffered a stock market crash in 1873 on “Black Friday”, which had been caused by corrupt Jews, and Jewish firms such as the House of Rothschild openly profited from the calamity.¹²²⁸ *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume 9, Robert Appleton, New York, (1910), wrote,

“**Lueger, KARL**, burgomaster of Vienna, Austrian political leader and municipal reformer, b. at Vienna, 24 October, 1844; d. there, 10 March, 1910. His father, a custodian in the Institute of Technology in Vienna, was of a peasant family of Neustadtl in Lower Austria, his mother, the daughter of a Viennese cabinet maker. After completing the elementary schools, in 1854 he entered the Theresianum, Vienna, from which he passed in 1862 to the University of Vienna, enrolling in the faculty of law, taking his degree four years later. After serving his legal apprenticeship from 1866 to 1874, he opened an office of his own and soon attained high rank in his profession by his sure and quick judgment, his exceptionally thorough legal knowledge, and his cleverness and eloquence in handling cases before the court. His generosity in giving his services gratuitously to poor clients, who flocked to him in great numbers, was remarkable, and may account largely for the fact that, although he practised law until 1896, he never became a wealthy man.

In 1872, having decided upon a political career, he joined an independent Liberal political organization, the Citizens' Club of the Landstrasse, one of the districts, or wards, of Vienna. Liberalism, which had guided Austria from aristocracy to democracy in government, was at this period the one political creed the profession of which offered any prospect of success in practical politics. But Liberalism had come to mean economic advancement for the capitalist at the cost of the small tradesman, the capitalist being usually a Jew. The result was an appalling material moral degradation and a regime of political corruption focussed at Vienna, which city in the seventies of the last century was the most backward capital in Europe, enormously overtaxed, and with a population sunk in a lazy indifference, political, economic, and religious. The Jewish Liberalism ruled supreme in city and country; public opinion was moulded by a press almost entirely Jewish and anti-clerical; Catholic dogmas and practices were ridiculed; priests and religious insulted in the streets. In 1875 Lueger was elected to the Vienna city council for one year. Re-elected in 1876 for a full term of three years, he resigned his seat in consequence of the exposure of corruption in the city administration. Having now become the leader of the anti-corruptionist movement, he was again elected councillor in 1878 as an independent candidate, and threw himself heart and soul into the battle for purity in the municipal government.

In 1882 Lueger's party, called the Democratic was joined by the Reform and by the German National organizations, the three uniting under the name Anti-Semitic party. In 1885 Lueger associated himself with Baron Vogelsang, the eminent social-political worker, whose influence and principles had great weight in the formation of the future Christian Socialists. The year 1885 witnessed, too, Lueger's election to the Reichsrat, where, although the only member of his party in the house, he quickly assumed a leading position. He made a memorable attack on the dual settlement between Austria and Hungary, and against what he bitterly called 'Judeo-Magyarism' on the occasion of the Ausgleich between Austria and Hungary in 1886. A renewal of this attack in 1891 almost caused him to be hounded

from the house. At his death there were few members of the Austrian Reichsrat who did not share his views. In 1890 Lueger had been elected to the Lower Austrian Landtag; here again he became the guiding spirit in the struggle against Liberalism and corruption. In municipal, state, and national politics he was now the leader of the Anti-Semitic and Anti-Liberal party, the back-bone of which was the union of Christians called variously the Christian Socialist Union and, in Vienna especially, the United Christians, This union developed later into the present (1910) dominant party in Austria, the Christian Socialists. In 1895 the United Christians were strong enough to elect Lueger burgomaster of Vienna, but his majority in the council was too small to be effective and he would not accept. His party returning after the September elections with an increased majority, Lueger was once more elected burgomaster, but Liberal influence prevented his confirmation by the emperor. The council stubbornly reelected him and was dissolved. In 1896 he was again chosen. Not, however, until the brilliant victory of his party, now definitely called the Christian Socialist party, in the Reichsrat elections in 1897, when he was for the fifth time chosen burgomaster, did the emperor confirm the choice.

Lueger's subsequent activity was devoted to moulding and guiding the policy of the Christian Socialist party and to the re-creation of Vienna, of which he remained burgomaster until his death, his re-election occurring in 1903 and 1909. The political ideal of the Christian Socialists is a German-Slav-Magyar state under the Habsburg dynasty, federal in plan, Catholic in religion but justly tolerant of other beliefs, with the industrial and economic advancement of all the people as an enduring political basis. The triumph of the party has conditioned an ever-increasing revival of Catholic religious life and organization of every kind. Under Lueger's administration Vienna was transformed. Nearly trebled in size, it became, in perfection of municipal organization and in success of municipal ownership, a model to the world, in beauty it is now unsurpassed by any European capital. A born leader of the people, Lueger joined to a captivating exterior a fiery eloquence tempered by a real Viennese wit, great organizing power, unsullied loyalty to the Habsburg dynasty, and unimpeachable integrity. Among all classes his influence and popularity were unbounded. A beautiful characteristic was his tender love of his mother; he was himself in turn idolized by children, He was anti-Semitic only because Semitism in Austria was politically synonymous with political corruption and oppressive capitalism. Lueger never married. A fearless outspoken Catholic, the defence of Catholic rights was ever in the forefront of his programme. His cheerfulness, resignation, and piety throughout his last illness edified the nation. His funeral was the most imposing ever accorded in Vienna to anyone not a royal personage."

Hermann Bielohlawek vented his rage about the alleged defamations of the "Viennese Jewish press beasts" against Lueger, and the alleged "muzzling and terrorism" of the Social Democrats who prevented fair and open debate, before the

Vienna City Council in 1902.¹²²⁹

Germans who were opposed to Jewish tribalism sometimes called on the Jews to assimilate. Martin Luther resented Jews for not accepting Christ as their Messiah and initially strove to convert them. In more modern times, Heinrich von Treitschke demanded that Jews assimilate. Assimilation was often coerced by laws which allowed only converted Jews to become university professors, etc.

The London Times reported on 15 August 1914 on page 5,

**“AMERICA AND THE
WAR.**

GERMAN BAIT REFUSED.

**ENTIRE SYMPATHY WITH
THE ALLIES.**

BRITISH UNITY ADMIRERED.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

WASHINGTON, AUG. 14.

The outcome of the impending battle is awaited here with intense anxiety. As days pass the realization grows that the conflict is unlike the Balkan war, which was regarded primarily as a spectacle. This concerns the United States almost as closely as it does the belligerents, and people are learning that there is no place in the twentieth century world for the isolated United States of Washington or Monroe. That undoubtedly is one reason for what a German apologist calls the ‘amazing volume of anti-Teutonic prejudice’ displayed by the American Press. A perusal of the majority of the leading newspapers of the United States fails to reveal anything except sympathy in varying degrees with us and our Allies.

Disapprobation was registered at the initial Austrian attack upon Servia, and still more at the way in which Germany took up arms. The treatment of Belgium especially seems to have awakened Americans to the real significance of German policy.

Regarding England’s course there is only one view, and that was weightily expressed in Admiral Mahan’s recent statement. Honour and expediency alike are deemed to have demanded our participation.

Thus in a few days the obvious effects of the Kaiser’s sedulous missionary work from Prince Henry’s visit downwards have been obliterated.

His manifestations of friendship are forgotten, and only the sabre-rattling and epigrams of the 'War Lord' are remembered. Hence there is a marked tendency to saddle on the Kaiser the responsibility for the cataclysm.

BRITAIN UNITED.

Germany, too, has suffered—unjustly to a great extent, or so level-headed people here are inclined to believe—by stories that have been published of her treatment of defenceless belligerents and stranded Americans suspected of espionage, and even of outrages upon officials of other countries. An impression of hysterical ruthlessness has been spread.

And if Germany has suffered, we have scored. The evident effectiveness of our military preparations, the wholehearted cooperation of the Government and Opposition, Mr. Redmond's great speech, the reconciliation of Lord Charles Beresford and Mr. Churchill, the suffragist truce, and the general coolness of the public have all been reported with a wealth of approving detail. There is no longer talk of the decay of British statesmanship and nerve. The crisis, it is proclaimed, has been met in a way whereof every Anglo-Saxon should be proud. The war has brought the American people closer to us than any amount of exhibitions or 'hands-across-the-sea' celebrations could have done.

The question prompts itself: Will there be reaction? Barring accident, it seems impossible that there should be. Yet there are factors which cannot be overlooked. German-Americans, especially Jewish-German-Americans, are active, and their influence is not to be despised. Of this I am convinced by recent investigations. There are signs of pro-German activity in high financial circles. The newspapers of New York, Boston, and even Chicago, are by no means immune from that kind of suasion which business sometimes tries to apply to journalism. While it is doubtful whether any independent newspaper will yield more to such influences than to emphasize obvious facts—such as that the bulk of such war news as we get comes from Anglo-French sources, and is, therefore, not uncoloured—the existence of propaganda should not be overlooked.

GERMAN JEWISH PRESS.

The German-American-Jewish Press is also active. The *Wahrheit* and the *Tageblatt*, the two chief German-Jewish organs, inveigh against our helping Russia and Slavs. The *Wahrheit* even says that Germany, Austria, and Italy are the only European countries not openly antagonistic to Jews. The German-American Press and German-American societies, led by the excellent New York *Staats-Zeitung*, similarly hammer away in defence of the Fatherland, helped by a widely-scattered band of German or Germanophil professors, of whom Professor Hugo Munsterberg,¹²³⁰ of Harvard, is the most important, and by a new English weekly just started in New York in the interests of a true understanding of Germany's position. It is doubtful, however, whether even German-Americans are solid. The *Staats-Zeitung* today proclaims that they are, but the statement is contradicted by my experience of the big Eastern cities. A good many thoughtful and influential

German-Americans seem to make no secret of their disapproval of what one of them called the 'militaristic madness of the Kaiser.' I even heard talk of the probability of a German Republic should Germany be beaten.

Among Irish-Americans there is the same division of opinion. While Mr. Redmond has many followers, there are some extremists, represented in New York, for instance, by the Irish National Volunteer Organization, who deem him a traitor. But a discussion of this subject is premature until this week's Irish-American newspapers are available."

Zionist leader Israel Zangwill responded to J. E. C. Bodley in *The London Times* of 28 August 1914 on page 5,

**“JEWS AND THE WAR.
TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.**

Sir,—Mr. Bodley labels as 'anti-British theories' views which I hold in common with many distinguished Englishmen, and by a further jugglery suggests that 'anti-British' and 'Jewish' are synonymous. These dialectical methods only need pointing out.

But I welcome his letter, for it enables me to correct a slip of the pen in my own. 'German Balkan-speaking provinces' should, of course, have been 'Baltic German-speaking provinces.' Because I drew attention to the fate of the Jews in those provinces, Mr. Bodley accuses me of putting Russo-Jewish interests before those of my own native land. But since the Russian Jews are England's allies in this war—some 200,000 of them fighting on our side—why should a mention of their interests expose me to Mr. Bodley's labels? Rather does his indifference to the interests of an oppressed race seem to me 'anti-British.' If England has lost the Palmerston tradition, it has been because of 'the German peril.' Once relieved from that nightmare, England would indeed cease to be 'the England of our dreams' if she continued callous to those great civilized ideals which she has so often served and not infrequently initiated.

As to the argument about newspapers into which the Chief Rabbi has been betrayed, a newspaper is not Jewish because it is owned by a frequently anti-Semitic Jew, and there is no real Jewish newspaper in the world (except naturally the German) which is not wholeheartedly on the side of England and against Germany. There is, indeed, no country so beloved by the Jews as England (has not even Zionism placed its legalized centre in London?). And for Mr. Bodley to say I talk lightly of 'the German peril' comes as 'the most unkindest cut of all' to the author of *The War God*, which, through the mouth of Sir Herbert Tree at His Majesty's Theatre, gave German *Militarismus* the warning which I hope will yet prove prophetic:—

Why squat here spinning crafty labyrinths,
Getting your filthy network o'er the globe?
You think to bind the future? Poor grey
spinner!

Fate, the blind housewife, with her busy broom
Shall shrivel at one sweep your giant web
And leave a little naked scuttling spider!”

The venom Zangwill directed at Germany, and the Zionists’ move from Berlin, where they were well treated and were more prosperous than any other Jews on earth, to London, prompted many Germans to suspect that the Zionists had cut, or sought to cut, a deal with the British and the Russians to bring America into the war on the Allies’ side and against the Germans and Turks, in exchange for a planned Zionist takeover of Palestine, which would be free from German, or Turkish, oversight. The Jewish population represented a scant percentage of the total population of Palestine, and the Turks would have been more sympathetic to the rights of Moslems than would the British. Many Germans believed that the sudden shift among German-Jewish newspapers to an anti-German stance from their decidedly pro-German posture demonstrated the collusion of the Zionists and the Allies against the Germans. In *The London Times* of 28 September 1914 on page 9, Zangwill wrote,

**“THE KAISER’S AMERICAN
AGENTS.**

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—Your American Correspondent’s article on the failure of the German Press campaign will give pleasure to English Jews, not only as patriots, but because the suggestion that this campaign was largely one of Jewish journals seems to have vanished. Indeed, the *Wahrheit*, the German-Jewish paper with the largest circulation, which has hitherto been represented as playing a peculiarly malign part, astonished me by sending me a lengthy editorial entitled ‘Zangwill and the War,’ declaring:—

Although we know the majority of our readers are German or pro-German, we are convinced, exactly as Zangwill is convinced, that there could be no greater misfortune for humanity than a victory for the German arms. [It goes on] And even were we convinced that the momentary interest of the Jews is with Germany and not with the Allies we would—and should—be ready, exactly as Zangwill teaches, to sacrifice the momentary interest of the Jewish people in the name of the general culture and civilization of all humanity.

I should add that, since receiving Sir Edward Grey’s assurance that England’s sympathies lay with the emancipation of the Russian Jews, I have had a number of applications from Jews—Rumanian and English, as well as Russian Jews outside Russia—anxious to enlist in the Jewish Territorial Organization under the idea it is a branch of the British Army! It would certainly be easy to form a foreign legion of Jews grateful for Britain’s sympathy—apart from the thousands in our Regular Forces, whose names are being published in the *Jewish Chronicle*. The only pity is that the Tsar does not at once remove Jewish disabilities as a concession to his British Ally, not to mention the strengthening of his own position. But in justice to his

Imperial Majesty it must be said that he has as yet made no promise whatever, and that therefore the doubts thrown upon his honour by the entire Jewish Press of America are without foundation.”

Before the war began, a Jewish leader in Berlin, Dr. Paul Nathan, had warned the world of the inhumanity of political Zionists in Palestine—who employed terrorist tactics some Germans later came to associate with Zionists and Bolsheviks in general and which later led some Germans to believe that the Zionists had instigated the First World War through terrorist and propagandist tactics, and had made it impossible for Germany to win that war. *The New York Times* reported on 18 January 1914 in Section 3 on page 3:

“SAYS THE ZIONISTS DISTURB PALESTINE

Dr. Paul Nathan of Berlin
Asserts Jewish Cause Is
Imperilled.

TERRORISM, RUSSIAN STYLE

Statements Exaggerated, New York
Jews Say—Dispute Over
Question of Language.

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

BERLIN, Jan. 17.—Grave charges against what he terms the ‘arrogant Zionist activity’ in Palestine, with which prominent men in New York are identified, are preferred by Dr. Paul Nathan, a well-known Jewish leader in Berlin. Dr. Nathan has just returned from the Holy Land, where he went on a trip of investigation on behalf of the German Jewish National Relief Association, through which the Jewish philanthropists in America and Europe operate.

In a pamphlet issued to-day Dr. Nathan accuses the Zionist elements in Palestine of stirring up discord, even among the Mohammedan and Christian populations, to such an extent that the entire cause is imperiled. Allegations based on documentary evidence are made that alleged Zionists are carrying on a campaign of terrorism modeled almost on Russian pogrom lines. Their

hostility is directed mainly under the auspices of the German Association and is said to spring from failure to realize their desire to establish a great technical college at Haifa, where wealthy American Jews already have endowed various institutions.

Dr. Nathan declares that attempts have been made to blow up some of the German schools, and that the Zionists have not shrunk even from organizing riots. Matters recently reached such a pass that the Mohammedan Governor of Jerusalem was compelled to issue a public warning against further disturbances of the peace. Only strong resistance on the part of the religious elements in the country resulted in effecting a partial restoration of order.

Dr. Nathan says he desires to raise his voice against the ‘overwrought Jewish nationalist chauvinism.’ As a friend of Zionist works he appeals to their supporters throughout the world to suppress the ‘officious intriguing elements at work in Palestine,’ which threaten Judaism’s interests with incalculable and irreparable harm. [. . .]”

The article continues and Louis Marshall and others denied Nathan’s charges by shouting them down and tried to change the subject to the issue of which language should be spoken in Palestinian schools, which issues were discussed in later articles—the inhumanity of the Zionists having conveniently disappeared from the debate.¹²³¹ Marshall said, “No responsible Zionists there have been guilty of the acts charged in the cablegram[.] It’s all nonsense.” But Marshall did not say that the acts were not committed nor did he deny the fact that they were committed by political Zionists, who were, by definition, irresponsible for having committed them.

Political Zionist Israel Zangwill tried to turn all Jews against Germany. *The New York Times* reported on 10 September 1914 on the front page,

**“ZANGWILL URGES JEWS
TO SUPPORT ALLIES**

***Has Sir Edward Grey’s Assurance
That He Will Seek Emancipation
of Russian Jews.***

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

LONDON, Sept. 9.—Israel Zangwill has sent to The Standard an appeal to the Jews of neutral countries to support the Allies against Germany. Mr. Zangwill appeals especially to the Jews of America. He says:

‘Although the most monstrous war in human history was ‘made in Germany,’ and although Germany’s behavior in the war is as barbarous as her temper in peace, I note with regret that a certain section of Jewry in

America and other neutral countries seems to withhold sympathy from Great Britain and her Allies.

‘In so far as these Jews are German born their feeling for Germany is as intelligible as is mine for England, but in so far as they are swayed by consideration for the interests of the Russian Jews, to whom Germany and Austria are offering equal rights, let me tell them that it is better for the Jewish minority to continue to suffer, and that I would far sooner lose my own rights as an English citizen than that the great interests of civilization should be submerged by the triumph of Prussian militarism.

‘And in saying this I speak not as a British patriot, but as a world patriot, dismayed and disgusted by the inhuman ideal of the Gothic superman. I am well aware that Germany’s press agent paints Germany as the guardian of civilization and as an angel fighting desperately against hordes of savages imported from Africa and Asia, but if we are using black forces it is for white purposes, while she is using white forces for black purposes.

‘But it is not even certain that the Jews of Russia will continue to suffer once England is relieved from this Teutonic nightmare. Assurances I have been privileged to obtain from Sir Edward Grey that he would neglect no opportunity of encouraging the emancipation of the Russian Jews mark a turning point in their history, replacing, as it does, windy Russia rumors by a solid political basis of hope. Nor is this a mere utterance of a politician in a crisis.

‘I am in a position to state that it represents the attitude of all that is best in English thought. It is with confidence therefore that I appeal to American and other ‘neutral’ Jews not to let the shadow of Russia alienate their sympathies from this indomitable island, which now, as not seldom before, is fighting for mankind and which may yet civilize Russia and Germany.’”

The American Hebrew countered Zangwill’s British intrusion into American internal politics in the name of the Jews. *The New York Times* reported on 15 September 1914,

“OPPOSE ZANGWILL’S APPEAL

It Lacks a Jewish Point of View, American Hebrew Says.

The appeal of Israel Zangwill for Jewish support of the cause is criticised adversely in *The American Hebrew*, which says, editorially,

‘We regret the intrusion of Israel Zangwill’s appeal to American Jews at this time as an advocate of the cause of England. As an Englishman, Mr. Zangwill is within his rights—and it would be his patriotic duty—to support the cause of his Government. But his advice to American Jews lacks a Jewish point of view, notwithstanding his assurance that the English Prime Minister

has experienced a change of heart regarding the Jewish question in Russia.

‘We remember too well Sir Edward Grey’s attitude when approached by English Jews on the Russian passport question. He was reluctant then to interfere in Russia’s internal affairs. With Russia victorious on the field, will his British prudence allow him to overcome this reluctance? Mr. Zangwill as a Jewish leader is in the wrong galley as a press agent of the British Empire.’”

The New York Times wrote on 20 February 1916, on page 10,

“HOPE FOR JEWS IN RUSSIA.

Prof. Basch Quotes Letter from
Alfred Dreyfus to Show Trend.

All the Jews of the world, and, indeed, all men who are interested in the cause of humanity, says Victor Basch, Professor at the University of Paris, who is now at Columbia University, should make every effort to secure emancipation and the rights of citizenship for the Russian and Polish Jews. There are six millions of Russian Jews, asserts Professor Basch, who have entered the war with the greatest enthusiasm, and who are rewarded with nothing but renewed persecution. It is for this reason, he points out, that there is a Jewish aspect to the present war.

In France today there is, he says, no trace of antisemitism left. Whatever conditions may have been in the past, Professor Basch points out that today in France there is nothing but admiration for the Jews who have been fighting so bravely and dying for their country. A personal letter from Colonel Alfred Dreyfus, the famous prisoner of the Isle du Diable, to Professor Basch voices these sentiments:

* * * France is the country which first proclaimed equality for all men and put the Jews on the same plane with other citizens. It is the country which accepts and sustains all the persecuted peoples, all the martyrs. But it is also the country where justice triumphs always in spite of iniquity and the sophistry of the ‘raison d’Etat.’

Need I quote my own case to you who so generously felt the same indignation as did all noble and generous minds? Accused, then condemned for an infamous crime of which I was innocent, I received finally a brilliant reparation which was the triumph of truth and right. The victory of France in the present war means the victory of right and humanity and the liberation of all the oppressed peoples. We are the champions of liberty and of civilization. The defeat of France would be the defeat of civilization. The martyrdom of Belgium, the crushing of the Serbs, and the extermination of the Armenians are but a foretaste of what a Germanized world would be. France, on the contrary, would realize a Europe where would reign greater justice, greater kindness, and greater humanity.

Jan. 29, 1916.

ALFRED DREYFUS.

Professor Basch showed in the course of his remarks that the Russian Jews should find in the present war a favorable opportunity to achieve emancipation. The entire liberal party in Russia, he said, was widely

proclaiming that the first step toward the regeneration of their country must be the emancipation of the Jews, that only the bureaucracy which is of German origin was their oppressor and that the Russian peasant had few racial or religious prejudices.

Antisemitism, he declared, was born in Germany, and came from Germany to Russia. Consequently he thinks a bill of complete Jewish emancipation, social as well as legal, is possible in Russia, more possible than in Germany, and more possible today than ever before.”

This article published the claim that anti-Semitism had completely disappeared in France, which claim was not only false, it was absurd. The wartime propagandists brought forth Alfred Dreyfus to play upon the emotions of the Jewish community in their efforts to vilify the Germans, but it was the French, not the Germans, who had persecuted Dreyfus believing him to be an agent of the Germans, because the Jews had so often betrayed France to Germany and Catholicism to Protestantism; and it was the Jews, not the Turks, who were behind the genocide of the Armenians. Basch strangely claimed that the Russian *muzhiks* “had few racial or religious prejudices[,]” and sought to place the blame for all the hardships of the Jews in Russian controlled lands on the Germans—who were fighting against the Russians and who had made great advances in emancipating the Jews. Conventional wisdom molded by Jewish propagandists held that Germans in and around the Russian Royal family had brought anti-Semitism to Russia. The fact is that Jews had deliberately segregated themselves for centuries and had encouraged the Czars to mild persecutions so as to keep the Jews segregated and promote Jewish emigration to Palestine, Germany, England and America. By far the largest concentration of Jews in the world was to be found in “Russia”, though Sephardic Jews considered these people to be converted Khazars and not real Jews, not the “chosen people”.

Anti-Semitism was not created in Germany and Germany had done far more for the interests of the Jews than had Russia or France, which is to say Germany provided Jews with an environment in which they could thrive and do more for themselves and for humanity. If the true goal of the Zionists were the emancipation of Russian Jews, a most noble and necessary pursuit that promised to spare millions their misery, the logical choice would have been to have sided with Germany against Russia in the First World War, though that might not have achieved the political Zionists’ goals of ensuring that Zionism would succeed in the creation of an autonomous state free from German or Turkish oversight whichever side won the war. The words “civilized” and “civilization” were, understandably, code words for states in which Jews enjoyed equal rights with the rest of humanity, and the French Revolution had emancipated Jews in France. The false messages Basch and Dreyfus expressed above were that German victory meant Jewish oppression and French victory meant complete Jewish emancipation.

Germany was working hard to secure the liberty of Russian Jews and was at war with the Russian Czarist regime that allegedly oppressed Jews. The article itself points out that the Jews fighting for Russia were rewarded only with renewed persecution—perhaps at the instigation of the Zionists who feared that the

emancipation of the Jews without a national homeland would lead to assimilation and the death of the race. The ardent political Zionist Israel Zangwill voiced this concern even before the First World War had begun,

“But the abolition of the Pale [of Settlement] and the introduction of Jewish equality will be the deadliest blow ever aimed at Jewish nationality.”¹²³²

The political Zionist Theodor Herzl conspired with the Turks to cover up the persecution of the Armenians caused by the Jews. France was not just, nor kind, nor humane, nor did it free all oppressed people, at war's end. In fact, tragically, France's injustice and inhumanity to Germany created an environment where Nazism could flourish. France was also the nation which most strongly opposed the British takeover of all of Palestine at war's end and thus placed an obstacle in the way of the Zionists.

Yet more alarming series than the involvement of Zionists in bringing America into the war emerged after the German loss. Adolf Hitler claimed in 1923 that the Bolsheviks, with their alleged control of the press, instigated World War I so that the German and Russian autocracies would weaken each other in their fight against one another, which would provide an opportunity for revolutionary Jews (there was a Jewish Bolshevik revolution in Bavaria, Germany, in 1918, and a series of Jewish revolutionary attempts took place in Russia, finally succeeding in the Jewish Bolshevik Revolution in 1917) to overthrow the monarchies and then fully emancipate the Jews of Russia and Germany, as the Jews had been emancipated by the French Revolution.¹²³³ Some philo-Semites had come to similar conclusions. Karl Kautsky wrote in 1921,

“It is not in Palestine, but in Eastern Europe, that the destinies of the suffering and oppressed portion of Jewry are being fought out. Not for a few thousand Jews, or at most a few hundred thousand, but for a population of between eight and ten million. Emigration abroad cannot help them, no matter whither it may be turned. Their destiny is intimately connected with that of the *revolution, in their own country.*

The methods of the Bolsheviks are not those of the Western European Social-Democracy. The Bolsheviks will not be able to found a modern socialist state. What they are really establishing is a bourgeois revolution, which will assume forms corresponding to the social condition of present-day Russia, resembling in many ways the forms of the great French Revolution toward the end of the Eighteenth Century. Among its other effects, the French Revolution liberated the Jews in France, giving them full rights of citizenship. The same accomplishment will be included among the permanent achievements of the Russian Revolution for all of Eastern Europe, unless the Revolution succumbs to the most savage counter-revolution. But the struggle in Eastern Europe now is not only a struggle for political freedom and for the rights of the Jews to change their domicile. The conditions are also being prepared for an enhancement of their economic situation. In addition to the

emancipation of the Jews, the emancipation of the peasants also will be one of the achievements of the revolution in Eastern Europe. A more prosperous peasantry will take the place of the present impoverished peasantry, thus creating a greater internal market for urban industry. Once peace has been reestablished in Eastern Europe, industry, and with it transportation, will necessarily develop with giant strides; the urban population will find abundant employment and food, and the great mass of the Jewish population will find it possible to rise from conditions of life in which they have hardly emerged from the *lumpenproletariat*, to the conditions of the proletariat in large-scale industry, as a portion of which class they may then take part in the upward struggle of the entire class.

Herein only is there a possibility for the Jewish masses to achieve a truly human status. Zionism cannot strengthen them in this effort. Zionism will weaken them at the historically decisive moment by promulgating an ambition which amounts practically to a desertion of the colours.

[***]

The only force capable of a thorough overturning of the present order and of a complete destruction of all oppression, of all legal and social inequality, now remains the proletariat, which must achieve this end in order to achieve its own liberation. Only a victorious proletariat can bring complete emancipation for the Jews; all of Jewry, except in so far as it is already fettered to capitalism, is interested in a proletarian victory.

[***]

‘The ‘Yiddish’ daily press, after having been in existence for ten years, exceeds the Polish press in circulation and in Russia is second in this respect only to the Russian press proper.’ [Footnote: Hersch, *Le Juif*, p. 9]”¹²³⁴

Many countered such claims by pointing out that the war resulted in great suffering for Jews and that the Bolsheviks eventually persecuted Jews and specifically targeted Zionists. The Bolsheviks were in fact very good to the Jews, and Bolshevik “anti-Semitism” was simply a Jewish means to preserve the “Jewish race”.

The New York Times reported on 22 February 1916 on page 7,

“SEES CHANCE FOR ZIONISTS.

War Will Open Palestine to Them,

Dr. Mossinsohn Says.

The University Zionist Society held a meeting last night at 347 Amsterdam Avenue. Eugene Meyer, Jr., President of the club, presided, and the speakers were Dr. B. Z. Mossinsohn, director of the Hebrew Gymnasium at Jaffa; Dr. Leo Motzkin, head of the Larger Action Committee on Zionism and organizer of the International Bureau at Copenhagen, and Z. W. Gluskin, who was one of the pioneers in the educational and industrial development

of Palestine.

Dr. Mossinsohn discussed the war as it affected affairs in Palestine, and told of the possible political combinations at the end of the conflict. In the readjustment that is coming in the Near East, he sees great opportunity for the permanent establishment of the Jews in Palestine. It is going to be desirable to develop that country, and he believes that a share in this task will fall to the Jews.”

The New York Times reported on 13 November 1916 on page 13,

“TO GET RIGHTS FOR JEWS.

**International Committee Suggested
to Solve Problem After War.**

An International Committee of Correspondence to facilitate a world-wide demand for the settlement of the Jewish problem was proposed by Oscar S. Straus, Chairman of the Public Service Commission, at the tenth annual convention of the American Jewish Committee, held at the Hotel Astor yesterday. It was voted to submit Mr. Straus’s proposal to the American Jewish Congress, which will be held some time before the end of the war.

In offering his suggestion Mr. Straus said that such a committee would be able when peace was discussed at the war’s close to present a strong case for the Jews in countries where they are oppressed. He called attention to the good work done in this country before the Revolutionary War by the Colonial Committee of Correspondence, which was formed in Boston in 1722 and soon had branches which kept each informed of sentiment and action in the different colonies.

‘There is need,’ Mr. Straus said, ‘of some instrumentality through which the Jews in all countries may address themselves to our common object, which, shorn of all details, is this—the securing of equal rights for Jews in countries where they are oppressed. I believe we should name such a committee here and now.’

Jacob H. Schiff opposed immediate action, and Henry M. Goldfogle moved that the proposal of Mr. Straus be referred to the Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee for consideration of its submission to the Congress Committee, and after Mr. Straus said this would be satisfactory to him, the motion was carried. [. . .]”

While the political Zionists were promoting rabid nationalism and continued war, most Jews opposed the political Zionists. *The New York Times* reported on 16 January 1917 on page 3,

“Har Sinai Temple was crowded tonight at the opening religious service, the feature of which was the sermon by the Rev. Dr. David Philipson of Cincinnati. He protested against the Zionistic movement, holding that

internationalism alone would enable the Jews to retain their place among the nations. This important question will be discussed in the convention and action will be taken.

‘We protagonists of universalism,’ said Dr. Philipson, ‘are being laughed to scorn. Our claim that Israel is an international religious community is being held up to ridicule. We are told that Israel can only survive by stressing its separatistic nationalism; that only by drawing ourselves off from our fellow inhabitants in the lands in which we live as a separate nationalistic group can we perpetuate Jewish life.

‘But that we will not do. We internationalists, basing our claim on what has been Israel’s task in the world, taking our stand on the religious idealistic interpretation of history whereof we believe Israel presents the most striking symbol, as over against the materialistic interpretation whereof the present war, the apotheosis of nationalism, is the climax—we internationalists, despite all the frightfully distressing days through which we are passing, must hold our rudder true, feeling that the mists will disappear before a rearing sun.’”

The Russian Revolution was funded by German-Jewish financiers, who intended to free the Jews from the oppressive Pale of Settlement and pogroms and to further the cause of Jews in Palestine. They also wanted to take over the Russian Government and steal the wealth of Russia. They further sought murderous revenge and committed genocide against the Russians.

Revolution in Russia was also promoted by the German Government, in particular by Ludendorff, especially after the Balkan Wars lead to the First World War. An unstable government in Russia, or a friendly government in Russia, would profit the Germans immensely as America entered the war on the side of the Allies. Ludendorff admitted after the war that he had been duped by the Jews. After the war, Walter Rathenau secured the Rappollo Treaty, in anticipation of the Second World War. *The New York Times* reported on 28 March 1917 on page 13,

“SEES NEW LIFE FOR ZIONISM.

Leo Motzkin Says the Russian Revolution
Will Aid the Movement.

Leo Motzkin of Kieff, Russia, one of the leading Zionist publicists and the head of the international press bureau which had much to do with the acquittal of Mendel Beilis of the charge of ritual murder, is now in New York, and no one has followed recent events in Russia with greater interest than he, especially in their relation to possibilities for the Jews. Mr. Motzkin said yesterday that he was confident that the Russian revolution would mean the ultimate liberation of the Jews and unprecedented progress for the Zionist movement. But he saw many things to be done and admitted that there were still difficulties and uncertainties to be encountered.

‘The Russian revolution,’ said Mr. Motzkin, ‘will ultimately lead to the

full emancipation of the Jews in Russia, both social and national. But we cannot base too much on what we are hearing now about Jewish rights, because these rights can be established only by law, and laws cannot be made until the Constituent Assembly meets. There is no doubt, however, that the condition of the Jews in Russia was materially ameliorated in an administrative way when the temporary authorities came into power, and there is no doubt that the Constituent Assembly will grant equality to the Jews.

‘There are naturally various parties among the Jews in Russia, but all agree that the present régime will give all of them equal rights. The Zionists, especially, expect the establishment of the new Government to advance their cause, for two main reasons:

‘First—because the persecution of the Zionists will cease. Under the old régime the Zionist party, with other progressive parties, was persecuted and hindered. Zionism was illegal, as was evidenced by the fact that when the war began 100 Zionist cases were awaiting trial in courts. Of course, Zionism will now become legal, as will other progressive movements, and the hindrances will be removed.

‘Second—With the growth of democracy and the removal of restrictions from speech and the press Zionists will be permitted to extend their propaganda and educated persons will be able to learn something of Zionism and to understand its ideal. They will learn to respect its purpose, which is simply the creation of a national cultural home for Jewish people in their ancient country. This view is based upon the fact that the present Foreign Minister of Russia has recently expressed his sympathy with the Zionist aim, and the same sentiments have been heard from other progressive statesmen in all democratic countries.’

Mr. Motzkin added that big commercial organizations in Petrograd had attempted to establish relations with similar organizations in England and America, but had been handicapped by the old régime. The fact that many members of these organizations were among the revolutionists, he said, made it certain that international business would be developed with other democratic countries.”

The New York Times reported on 23 July 1917 on page 9,

**“*JEWISH SOCIALISTS
FOR FREE PALESTINE*”**

*Appeal to Brethren Here and in
Russia to Oppose Anything That
Hinders Allies, Who Aid It.*

A notable appeal from a Jewish Socialistic labor association exiled from Palestine to Socialist brethren in the United States and Russia to oppose any movement 'having the effect of putting in question the liberation of Palestine by the allied armies,' has reached this country through official sources. The appeal seems to align the Jewish Socialists of Asia Minor firmly on the side of the Allies and against the Turks and Germans evidently with the idea that through allied victory alone can the dream of Zionism for an independent Palestine come true.

The appeal comes from the Poale Zion, a Socialist labor organization consisting of sixty to eighty members, most of them prominent in the more advanced thought of the sections from which Turkish oppression has exiled them. They are now refugees in Egypt. They belong to the artisan class, for the most part, and are now connected with Mospruds Jewish Relief Committee in Cairo.

The text of their resolution, in which they adopt for the first time a nationalistic point of view, is as follows:

'We, the Poale Zion, who are refugee Palestinians in Egypt, beg you to communicate with our Socialistic companions in America and Russia, putting the following appeal before them:

'Considering that we find ourselves at an epoch of history in which it is our duty to put events to the best possible purpose, and considering that the allied powers have openly claimed that they are fighting for the liberation of small nationalities, and considering that the advance of the British armies toward Palestine signifies for us and for our country the inauguration of an era of independence and liberty and justice, we address you, comrades, with the appeal to redouble your vigilance in proclaiming among all of those who take part in the International Socialistic Conference that for safeguarding the interests of the Jewish masses of Palestine, oppressed in the home of its ancestors by the Turkish regime, they should with all their forces oppose any resolution having the effect of putting in question the liberation of Palestine by the allied armies.'"

The New York Times reported on 9 November 1917 on page 3,

"BRITAIN FAVORS ZIONISM.

Balfour Gives Cabinet View In a
Letter to Rothschild.

LONDON, Nov. 8.—Arthur J. Balfour, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, has written the following letter to Lord Rothschild expressing the Government's sympathy with the Zionist movement:

'The Government view with favor the establishment of Palestine as a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to

facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing will be done that may prejudice the civil or religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine.’

Mr. Balfour adds that this declaration of sympathy with the Jewish Zionist aspirations has been submitted to and approved by the Cabinet.

The Jewish Chronicle, commenting on Mr. Balfour’s letter, says:

‘With one step the Jewish cause has made a great bound forward. It is the perceptible lifting of the cloud of centuries; a palpable sign that the Jew—condemned for two thousand years by unparalleled wrong—is at last coming to his right. He is to be given the opportunity and means by which in place of being a hyphenation he can become a nation, in place of being a wanderer in every clime there is to be a home for him in his ancient land. The day of his exile is to be ended.’”

The New York Times reported on 12 November 1917 on page 13,

“ZIONISTS HERE SEE TEUTON PLAN HALTED

British Victories in the Holy Land
Thwart Germany’s Ambition
to Control Palestine.

HER PRESS CAMPAIGN BARED

Its Aim Was to Save Enough Eastern
Territory to Menace
the Suez Canal.

American Zionists who have been watching with interest the various military operations near the Holy Land have been tremendously relieved by the events of the last few days. The British victories at Beersheba and Gaza, forecasting the eventual occupation of Jerusalem, and the promise given last week by Mr. Balfour, in the name of the British Government, that they would ‘use their best endeavors to facilitate the establishment of Palestine as a national home for the Jewish people,’ have apparently spiked a German scheme for setting up in Palestine a Jewish State, nominally autonomous, but

really under German control.

A statement issued yesterday by the Provisional Executive Committee for General Zionist Affairs gave a detailed account of a press campaign supporting this scheme which has been going on in Germany and Austria for some time. This is held to indicate that the German military leaders foresaw the collapse of the Berlin-to-Bagdad plan and were preparing another arrangement by which it was hoped that Germany might save from the wreck of its plans in the Near East enough to form a constant menace to the Suez Canal, Egypt, and India.

‘To accomplish this purpose,’ says the committee, ‘Germany was evidently preparing to ride roughshod, if need be, over its present ally, should Turkey refuse to recognize that it was to her ‘best interests’ to fall in with the new project. To give ‘punch’ to its publicity campaign, Germany unearthed a conspiracy between America and the Zionist Organization, including United States Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, Judge Julian W. Mack, head of the American Military Insurance Department; Felix Frankfurter of the War Department, as well as Lord Walter Rothschild, leader of the English Zionists, and former Ambassador Henry W. Morgenthau to seize Palestine for exploitation by the Jews, Christian missionaries, and capitalists.

‘In the end, if General Allenby hadn’t gotten the jump on her by striking hard and quickly, Germany would one day soon have blandly announced the establishment of a Jewish republic under its auspices and suzerainty, and in response to Turkey’s protests would have pointed to the overwhelming demand of the German people, and quoted for the benefit of its ravished ally, ‘Vox populi, vox Dei.’

‘If it had carried out its new plan, the establishment of an autonomous Jewish State in Palestine under its overlordship, whether with the consent of the Ottoman Government or in utter disregard of Turkey’s wishes, Germany would have had, in addition to the strategical advantage that this would mean for the next war,’ also the satisfaction of ‘beating the Allies to it.’ England, France, Italy, and Russia have already made it clear that the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine is one of their aims in this war, and in Jewish circles in America it is held that Washington’s view as to the desirability of this coincides with that of the Allies.

‘Some echoes of these whisperings must have reached Germany, and several of its leading publications speak harshly of these ‘infamous American Zionist proposals.’ Thus Die Kölnische Zeitung, published in Cologne, publishes a long screed impugning the honesty of President Wilson, and ending with these complimentary allusions to Americans in general:

The Americans belong to that class of ?????? that have been for the last sixty years undermining the proud edifice of the Turkish Empire, and haven’t stopped it yet. The Palestine action fully reveals Wilson’s intentions. America has dropped its mask and shown itself in its true colors—a power that has the greatest interest from the capitalistic and

religious point of view to bring Turkey under the influence of missionaries and capitalists. This is the true American humanity, which is based on the alliance of the religious men with the king of trusts. Turkey has watched this campaign with the utmost patience, and now it has received the cruelest reward. It can see now that America is not far behind the other Entente Powers in their enmity to Turkey and their plans for its destruction.

Kaiser Visits Palestine.

‘For Germany to give its consent to the establishment of the Jewish nationality on its historic soil, requires a reversal of its previous attitude toward Palestine. Attempts have been made to establish German colonies in the Holy Land, and Kaiser Wilhelm has paid several visits to Palestine in order to win favor with the peoples of that country, and to encourage his subjects in their vain attempts to gain a strong footing there.

‘The way was being prepared by a rather obvious campaign which began with the publication of apparently innocent scientific articles, by experts, on the near East, which discussed at great length, and with much detail, the accomplishments of the Jewish colonists and the vast possibilities of Palestine from an economic standpoint. A remarkable array of such articles, studying Palestine from every conceivable angle, has been published in over a hundred periodicals in Germany and Austria. These were followed by ‘letters to the editor’ and now the propaganda has attained the editorial stage.’

Among the first of these articles was one by Major Carl Frank Enders to make clear to the German people that it had better give up all hope of colonization in the Holy Land, and at the same time warn Turkey not to put any obstacles in the way of the Jewish operations there. Major Enders wrote:

The realization of the Zionists idea means infinitely more to our economic life than those fantasies and dreams of the German people that the Near East will create for us the lost world markets. * * * It will not be politically wise for Turkey to hinder the Jewish immigration into Palestine * * * German colonization in Palestine is nothing but a dream, beyond the realm of realization, which I would advise the German people to forego.

‘The Munich Neueste Nachrichten makes the frank statement that ‘Zionism has become a question of the first magnitude, and Germany and Turkey have no choice but to give it serious consideration.’ Gustave von Dobeller said: ‘For many years the object which our Kaiser tried to accomplish by arduous political effort has been the making of a strong Turkey. A method not to be despised would be the establishment of a strong Jewish State, under Turkish suzerainty. As the Jewish people favor republics, let them, therefore, establish a republic, which must, however, be under the protection of the Ottoman Empire. It is always a question of importance whether you or your opponent has the key of the door. The idea of establishing a Jewish State is good for that power which effects it.’

Sees No Gain to Jews.

‘The Vice President of the Austrian Parliament, Professor Paul Rohrbach, whose job was that of persuading the Jews of Germany and Austria-Hungary

that the political schemes of the Allies are not to be trusted, wrote: ‘The national aspirations of the Jews will be listened to with more sympathy by the allies of Middle Europe than by the Entente, even though certain papers and politicians on that side have lately been promising great things to the Jews. I do not believe that, even if the Entente were victorious and Turkey dismembered so that Palestine came under the suzerainty of either England or France, the Jews would benefit by this. Jews will have nothing to gain by the imperialistic schemes of England.’

‘The Frankfurter Zeitung said:

‘Pan Turkish ideas have no meaning in Palestine, where practically no Turks dwell.’

‘Die Reichsbote, the mouthpiece of the Junkers, is calling upon the German Government to act promptly for the establishment of a Jewish State to ‘offset the American Zionist proposals.’ This must be done, it insists, to counteract the Wilson intrigue and ‘to prevent England from making use of these American Zionist proposals as a backdoor which will enable her to pass freely from Egypt to India. For this purpose,’ it says, ‘the German-Austrian Zionist plans for a Jewish settlement must be strengthened. This is the opportune moment for the Zionist movement to attain its ideal.’

‘These ‘American Zionist proposals’ are creating a real panic in the minds of Germany. The indications are that the German Press is alluding to the Palestine Commission appointed by President Wilson last Summer, consisting of Former Ambassador Morgenthau and Felix Frankfurter of War Secretary Baker’s Advisory Council. At any rate, the Deutsche Worte speaks of them as a ‘graver calamity than a declaration of war by a small or even medium-sized nation would be,’ and charges the enemies of Germany with ‘trying to enlist in their service the Zionist movement.’ But it sees through the game of the Allies. ‘We know very well what Mr. Morgenthau and Lord Rothschild are doing in this behalf for America and England,’ it declares, the while it admits that if ‘this plan of our enemies succeeds, it will go very badly with us.’

‘These editorials will suffice to indicate how Germany was making ready to ‘beat the Allies to it’ in Palestine. General Allenby had not beaten Germany by taking Beersheba and capturing the highway to Jerusalem. The unfurling of the Union Jack over the hills of the Holy City will signalize the end of the ‘Berlin to Bagdad’ dream.’”

Morgenthau later published a Zionist appeal which is consistent with the accusation: “The Future of Palestine”, *The New York Times*, (12 December 1917), p. 14; and he published a racist polemic against the Germans and the Kaiser, *Ambassador Morgenthau’s Story*, Doubleday, Page, Garden City, New York, (1918). He later came to oppose the Zionists. His son, Henry Junior, became an arch political Zionist. However, Morgenthau Senior published an anti-Zionist article “Zionism a Surrender, Not a Solution”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 42, Number 3, (July, 1921), pp. i-viii; when Chaim Weizmann and the Eastern European Jews took over the Zionist

movement in America at the infamous Cleveland Convention of American Zionists in the summer of 1921.

The New York Times reported on 14 November 1917 on page 3,

**“ZIONISTS GET TEXT
OF BRITAIN’S PLEDGE**

***Balfour’s Declaration Promises
Defense of Jews’ Rights in
Palestine and Elsewhere.***

The declaration by Great Britain of its purpose to facilitate the effort of the Zionists to establish a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine, which was formally announced by Arthur J. Balfour, Secretary of State of Foreign Affairs, in a letter to Baron Rothschild, Vice President of the British Zionist Federation, on Nov. 3, carries with it a proviso that the establishment of a Jewish State in the Holy Land shall not in any way conflict with the rights of non-Jewish communities now existing in Palestine. It also carries pledges of Great Britain to oppose any project offered at the peace conference which might in any way impair the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

The Provisional Zionist Committee in this city has received from Dr. Chaim Weitzman, President of the British Zionist Committee, and Dr. Nachum Sokolow of the Inner Actions Committee a cable giving the complete text of the British proposal, which differs somewhat from the first reports published in this country. The full text of the British declaration is:

‘His Majesty’s Government views with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use its best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rites of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.’”

The Armenian Christians had for a long time been persecuted by the Jews through the Turks. The Young Turks, led by crypto-Jews¹²³⁵ who carried out a revolution against the Sultan which had been planned for centuries by the *Dönme* Jews, and who pretended to be Moslem, slaughtered the Armenians. The Jews committed the Armenian genocide. The Armenian people were largely blind to the fact that it was the Zionists who had caused the persecutions. Their well paid leaders, who worked for the Zionists, betrayed them. *The New York Times* reported on 19

November 1917 on page 5, giving evidence of the cooperation of the Armenian leadership with the Zionists (Freedman stated that, “James A. Malcolm was an Oxford-educated Armenian”), in spite of the fact that Zionist Theodor Herzl had secretly conspired with the Sultan of Turkey to cover up the persecution of Armenians, and the Young Turks under crypto-Jewish leadership mass murdered them,

“JOIN ZIONIST MOVEMENT.

Enlistment of Two Rothschilds Reported in London Dispatch.

The Jewish Morning Journal published the following yesterday as a special dispatch from London:

‘At a reception held in Princess Hall, Piccadilly, London, given by Lord Rothschild, the head of the Rothschild family in England, in celebration of the official declaration by the British Government in favor of a Jewish home land in Palestine, Lord Rothschild announced that his younger brother, Charles, and Baron Edmund De Rothschild of Paris, head of the French branch of the Rothschild family, had joined the Zionist movement.

‘The reception was attended by all the Zionist leaders in England as well as by prominent Jews and gentiles. One of the latter, a priest, presented Lord Rothschild with a handsome volume of suitable texts relating to the return of the Jews to Palestine.

‘The prevailing opinion in well-informed Zionist circles in London is that Russia will urge the interallied conference, to be held soon in Paris, to give its approval to Zionism. The Armenian Consul in London congratulated the Zionist leaders on their excellent prospect of getting Palestine, and expressed a hope that the Jews would prove good neighbors.

‘Lord Swaythling, Lucien Wolf, the publicist, who is the foreign editor of the London Daily Graphic, and Sir Philip Magnus, a Member of Parliament, formed a league of British Jews to combat the view that the Jews form a nation, as manifest by the Palestine declaration of the British Government. This league, however, expresses the readiness to facilitate the settlement of the Jews in Palestine.

‘The German newspaper, Germania, organ of the German Catholic Party, urges the German Government to take steps against the alliance of Great Britain and the Zionists.’”

The Armenians were Christians. The “Young Turks”, led by Jewish positivists, slaughtered the Armenians, and accomplished, in part, the ancient Judaic goals of ruining Christendom and secularizing the Turks. Dönme Jews pretended to convert Islam, changed their names to escape detection and undermined Turkish society, much like the Frankists, who came from this movement in Turkey, pretended to convert to Catholicism, became Polish aristocracy and destroyed Poland, which never recovered after having been one of the most advanced societies on Earth. The

Jews hoped the ruined Poles would venture into the world spreading modern culture and monotheism to prepare the way for Jews to migrate to the ends of the Earth and dominate all cultures—just as the Jews had spread culture and monotheism when they were chased out of Palestine and traveled to the ends of the Earth in the Diaspora (*Genesis* 12:3; 28:14. *Deuteronomy* 28:64-66. *Isaiah* 27:6; 49:6. *Jeremiah* 24:9)—note that the Jews were promised all lands upon which they had slapped the soles of their feet, and thus believed the ends of the Earth and all points in between were theirs (*Deuteronomy* 6:10-11; 11:24-25. *Joshua* 1:2-5. *Isaiah* 2:1-4; 40:15-17, 22-24; 54:1-4; 60:5, 8-12; 61:5-6). The Jews used Roman Christians to condition the world to accept eventual Jewish domination and the destruction of the Gentiles themselves.

The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* writes in its article “Messianic Movements”:

“Even Josephus—who tried to conceal the messianic motives of the great revolt—once had to reveal that ‘what more than all else incited them to the war was an ambiguous oracle, likewise found in the sacred Scriptures, to the effect that at that time one from their country would become ruler of the world’ [***] One trend of Jewish messianism which left the national fold was destined ‘to conquer the conquerers’—by the gradual Christianization of the masses throughout the Roman Empire. Through Christianity, Jewish messianism became an institution and an article of faith of many nations. Within the Jewish fold, the memory of glorious resistance, of the fight for freedom, of martyred messiahs, prophets, and miracle workers remained to nourish future messianic movements.”¹²³⁶

Many Spanish Cabalist Jews had emigrated to Turkey when Ferdinand, a Jew,¹²³⁷ and Isabella, expelled many of the Jews from Spain in 1492. Turkey became a center for Jewish mysticism and the production of Cabalist revolutionaries, crypto-Jewish leaders, and Jewish heads of state. The Spanish aristocracy had perhaps expelled the Jews in order to “save” the Sephardic Jewish “race” from extinction through assimilation—the Sephardics were considered to be the true Judeans by most Jews of the age, though some later argued that they were merely religious Jews descended from Phoenician sailors who had settled in Spain. Another myth, which Spanish Jews initiated during the Inquisition, was that they had migrated to Spain long before the crucifixion of Christ, and therefore could not be held to account for killing Christ. German and other Jews fabricated similar fictions. The Jews of Worms told that their ancestors’ Sanhedrin had written to the King of Judea and asked that Christ not be put to death.¹²³⁸ The question naturally arises, was the entire British-Israel movement, which was so vital to Zionist interests, initiated by Jews who sought to distance themselves from the crucifixion of Christ?

Note that 1492 was the year that Columbus sailed to the Americas. Some argue that he was a crypto-Jew in search of a homeland for the Jews, where they would not assimilate. He was financed by Jews and Jews accompanied him on his voyage.¹²³⁹ The Jews of this age welcomed and perhaps intentionally caused their own suffering as an artificial means to hasten the arrival of the Messiah—which is to say the

unimaginably rich Jews intentionally caused the less wealthy Jews to suffer, in collusion with Ferdinand, himself a Jew, and Isabella. The genocidal Zionists believed in the Messianic myth of “hevlei Mashiah”, or “the birth pangs of the Messiah”.¹²⁴⁰ The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* wrote in its article on “Messianic Movements”,

“Even on the eve of the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, both Jews and *anusim* actively harbored these hopes. About 1481 a Converso told a Jew, when at his request the latter read the messianic prophecies to him: ‘Have no fear! Until the appearance of the Messiah, whom all of us wait for, you must disperse in the mountains. And I—I swear it by my life—when I hear that you are banished to separate quarters or endure some other hardship, I rejoice; for as soon as the measure of your torments and oppression is full, the Messiah, whom we all await, will speedily appear. Happy the man who will see him!’ One Marrano was certain that the Messiah would possess the philosopher’s stone and be able to turn iron into silver. He also hoped that ‘in 1489 there will be only one religion’ in the world. Even after the expulsion many Marranos expressed these hopes and were punished for them by the Inquisition (*ibid.*, 350ff.)”¹²⁴¹

In order to restrain the Christians from reacting to a Jewish Messiah as the anti-Christ, the Spanish Jews may have sought to destroy the Catholic Church with the “Spanish Popes”, who were likely of Jewish descent, and who would perhaps have permitted the ascendancy of the Jewish anointed King, and who perhaps sought to turn God’s eye from the Christians to the Jews, by making the Christians decadent. *The New York Times* reported on 30 November 1917,

“Those of the Zionist movement here believe that after the war even Germany will not place obstacles in the way of the realization of Jewish hopes.”¹²⁴²

The New York Times reported on 3 December 1917 on page 4,

“ZIONISTS PLAN BIG LOAN.

\$101,000,000 to Create and Maintain
Proposed Palestinian Government

Special to The New York Times.

BALTIMORE, Dec. 2.—At two great meetings held tonight in the Hippodrome and Palace Theatres under the auspices of the Baltimore Conference for Jewish National Restoration in Palestine the declaration of the British Government, promulgated by Mr. Balfour, favoring the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, was unanimously and enthusiastically approved.

Prior to the submission of the resolution, Jacob De Haas, at one time the

secretary to Dr. Herzl, the founder of the Zionist movement, said in the course of an address that in the near future subscriptions would be asked to a \$1,000,000 fund to be used in the creation of the Government in Palestine, and subsequently a \$100,000,000 liberty loan would be issued to provide for its maintenance.

While all the principal speakers dwelt upon the benefit to be derived from nationalization, Mr. De Haas devoted himself more particularly to the political significance of the movement. He made the assertion that not only were the European Allies back of the declaration, but that this Government would in the very near future announce its endorsement and concur in the establishment of a national Jewish home.”

The New York Times reported on 7 December 1917 on page 4, after recalling the tyranny of the Bolsheviks,

“Jews Turn to Palestine.

Then there are the Jews. Besides their manifold efforts in general Russian politics, they are swelling the tide of national movements. The Zionists now are the strongest party among Russian Jews, and they are overjoyed at the British promise of Palestine. At Odessa last Friday there was a huge Zionist demonstration, with a procession twenty blocks long. Grusenberg, the newly elected member for Odessa, made a speech of triumph and gratitude, to which the British Council, Picton Bage, replied. Toward the close of the demonstration members of the Bund, or Jewish Socialist Party, began agitating against the Zionists and England. There was a scuffle, and a shot was fired, but no harm was done.”

The New York Times reported on 7 December 1917 on page 4,

“VOTING FAVORS BOLSHEVIKI.

**But Constitutional Democrats Make
Strong Showing Also.**

PETROGRAD, Dec. 6.—According to the preliminary returns from the provinces the Bolsheviks in the elections obtained 2,704,000 votes; the Constitutional Democrats, 2,230,500, and the Social Revolutionaries, who form the majority of the Left, 221,260.

The Central Executive Committee has given its consent to a decree granting to the Councils of Electoral Districts the right to proceed with re-elections for all elective bodies, including the Constituent Assembly, in accordance with the demands of the electors. Thus it will be possible for the electors to revoke their choice in the case of those representatives whose politics no longer correspond with their own.

The project provoked great opposition on the part of the moderate element of the committee, who termed it an attempt to curtail the rights of

members of the Constituent Assembly. In defending the measure Leon Trotzky, the Bolshevik Foreign Minister, said:

‘Should there be a majority of the Constitutional Democrats, members of the Right and Social Revolutionists, the people would forcibly dissolve the Constituent Assembly. This measure is meant to avoid the possibility of dissolution.’

Since the system of representation is proportional, an objection to one member of the Constituent Assembly would necessitate the recall of all the members of a given election district.”

The New York Times reported on 10 December 1917, on page 4,

“ARMENIANS FAVOR ZION.

London Association Sends Resolutions to Justice Brandeis.

The Provisional Zionist Committee yesterday announced that Justice Louis D. Brandeis of the United States Supreme Court has received a letter of congratulation from the Armenian United Association of London on the British declaration in favor of the establishment of a national Jewish home in Palestine, to which the Cabinet promises that ‘his Majesty’s Government will exert its best endeavors.’

The resolution accompanying the letter follows:

The council of the Armenian United Association of London, having read in the press that the British Government had now formally expressed its sympathy with the project for the reconstruction of Palestine as the national home of the Jewish people, at their meeting held on Nov. 10, 1917, at the offices of the association,

Resolved, To record their unalloyed gratification and to convey their cordial congratulations and sincere and neighborly greetings to the President, Dr. C. F. Weitzman, committee and members of the Zionist Federation of Great Britain, and through them to all other Zionist leaders and Zionist organizations, and especially those in the United States, Russia, France, Italy, Poland, and Rumania, upon the recognition of Jewish nationality and their righteous, inalienable claim to the historic soil and country of their ancestry.

Resolved, further, to request the Honorary Secretary to send copies of this resolution to Chief Rabbi, Dr. Weitzman, to Lord Rothschild, to Baron Edmond de Rothschild, to Mr. Nahoum Sokolow, to Dr. Tschlenow of Moscow, to Judge Louis D. Brandeis of the United States Supreme Court, and to the press.”

The New York Times reported on 14 December 1917,

“The Jews of Russia, he predicts, will have an important influence. The capture of Jerusalem by the British, he says, will be a weighty factor in the situation.”¹²⁴³

The New York Times reported on 21 December 1917 on page 6 that German

Zionists had betrayed Germany,

“ENGLAND’S RECOGNITION.

Appreciative Comment of a German
Jewish Paper on Britain’s Attitude.

Judische Rundschau, the official organ of the German Zionists, commenting on the British Government’s declaration of its attitude toward Zionism, says that this is the first occasion on which a great power has officially declared itself in relation to Zionism. For the first time the claim of the Jewish Nation to a renewal of its national existence in Palestine has been lifted by a European Government into the circle of the weighty political problems of the present time, and it must be admitted that the recognition of this claim by the British Government is an event of world-wide historic importance.”

The New York Times reported on 24 December 1917 on page 9,

“SEES ZIONISTS’ HOPE IN ALLIED VICTORY

Britain’s Pledge to Restore Jerusalem
Urged Upon Jews as
Reason for War Effort.

GREAT MEMORIAL MEETING

Aged Men Declare Themselves
Young Again and Anxious to
Start Anew in the Holy Land.

In celebration of the British promise to restore Jerusalem and the Holy Land to the Jewish people, thousands of New York Zionists packed Carnegie Hall last night in a commemoration meeting. Thousands more crowded the streets around the building, unable to get in, until long after the beginning of the meeting. Inside American, British and Zionist flags were intertwined, and with songs in the Hebrew language interspersed between the speeches, a group of leaders of Zionism in New York and the Old World told of the

significance of the British promise.

The last and most enthusiastically welcomed speaker was Dr. Schmarya Levin, who spoke in Yiddish, declaring that the act of Great Britain was not an act of politics or diplomacy, but something far deeper, a stage in the development of history which in effect added another chapter to the Bible a modern chapter by which the Jews of today could link something of their own time to the story of the old Jewish kingdom.

Dr. Levin spoke as a representative of the international Zionist organization, but the speaker who stirred most enthusiasm, next to him, was a Christian, the Rev. Otis A. Glazebrook, late American Consul at Jerusalem, who had charge of the distribution of Jewish relief funds in the Holy City.

Hope Centred in the Allies.

And one of the most enthusiastic outbursts of the evening occurred when Dr. Glazebrook declared: 'It is the duty of every Jew who loves Palestine, who fosters the hope of the restoration of Israel, to use his influence, his material wealth, and his life to see that England and the Allies win this war.

'We have seen a vision of the restoration of the Jewish people,' he said, 'and we pray that this vision may not be spoiled by war, but may be crowned by a war, ending gloriously in victory for the Entente Powers. If Palestine is to be restored to Israel, remember that Palestine and Syria must remain in the hands of the Allies. And the one most important lesson just now, more important than the immediate working out of the details of the Zionistic state, is that you see and do your whole and complete duty in this war for the success of Great Britain, France, Italy, and America.'

Dr. Stephen S. Wise, Chairman of the meeting, said that what Zionists were rejoicing over was only a scrap of paper, 'but that scrap of paper is written in English. It is signed by the British Government, and therefore is sacred and inviolable. It represents not an unconsidered policy of a temporary Government, but all the great political parties of England have united in giving their adherence to this declaration. It is true to the finest traditions of the British people, and is a symbol of the will of the Allies to right wrongs, however ancient, to undo injustice, however hoary, to supplant the Prussian ideal of rule by might with the changelessly true principles of justice and right.

'Liberation, Justice, Peace.'

'This meeting is a challenge to every American Jew to unite with us. We offer our hands in welcome to those who up to this time have not worked with us. Let them come to us.

'More than all else, this meeting has been called in order to reaffirm the faith of every living American Jew not only in the certainty of the triumph of our arms, but in the righteousness of our aims. The American Jew by this assembly tonight reaffirms his faith that there shall be no faltering until victory shall crown our arms, and such a triumph be granted to our aims and the aims of our allies as shall bring the boon of liberation, justice and peace to all the nations.'

Nathan Straus, who was repeatedly interrupted by applause, spoke as a man who was seeing the realization of the dream of a lifetime. 'There are only a few things that can enthuse a man of my years,' he said. 'I have come to the place where I am skeptical and hard to be impressed, for I have seen so many things go wrong, but now they are going right. The moment of realization has come.

'I stand before you in appearance and somewhat in fact an old man. Many of these gray hairs have come through years of striving for the national cause of our people. My eyes have grown weak watching, my heart heavy with praying; but all this time, as the soldiers say, I carried on. And this moment is my reward.

'All we who have worked for Zionism are rejuvenated now. But the support which is most necessary is that of the masses of Jews, and the masses of Jews are Zionists. If they are not I'm sorry for them. In Zionism the Jew and the non-Jew have found a bond of brotherhood.

'This promise of England has made me young again. All Jews are young now. I feel that this appearance of mine is camouflage: I want to buy a horse and plow, a cow—for I can't be separated from the milk business—and begin a new life in the old land. All Jews are young now and we shall make our old country flow with milk and honey.

Abram I. Elkus, former Ambassador to Turkey, praised the work of the various American consular officials in that empire, 'who spent their time and energy without stint to alleviate the suffering of those of all races and creeds.'

Other speakers were Dr. Aaron Aaronson, director of the Zionist agricultural experiment station in Palestine; Morris Rothenberg, Chairman of the Zionist Council of Greater New York, and Jacob de Haas, Secretary of the Provisional Zionist Executive Committee.

'The Star Spangled Banner' and 'The Hatikvah,' the Jewish national anthem, were sung at the beginning and end of the meeting. Palestinian songs were sung by the Hadassah Choral Union, directed by A. W. Binder.

Declare for a Jewish State.

PHILADELPHIA, Dec. 23.—Resolutions in favor of making Palestine a Jewish State, to be populated by Jews from all parts of the earth, were adopted here today at a conference of Jewish labor organizations held under the auspices of the workmen's wing of the Zionist movement. Speakers explained that this State should be a Jewish nation in fact and a centre of Judaic literature, art and law."

The New York Times reported on 30 December 1917 on page 5, that German Zionist financiers had betrayed Germany,

“JEWS IN GERMANY FIRM.

**Won't Support War Loan Until
Palestine Independence Is
Sanctioned.**

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

THE HAGUE, Dec. 29.—It is reported here that the leading Jewish financiers of Germany refused to support the German war loan unless the German Government undertook to refrain from all opposition to the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine, independent of any Turkish suzerainty or control.

By Associated Press.

THE HAGUE, Dec. 29.—The Jewish Correspondence Bureau here has received a telegram from Berlin stating that at a Zionist conference in Germany a resolution was adopted in which satisfaction was expressed that Great Britain had recognized the right of the Jewish people to a national existence in Palestine.”

Eduard Bernstein wrote after the war,

“To many Social Democrats the war really seemed to be one for national existence; and to many passionate natures the opposition of so many Jews to the war credits might have seemed to betray un-German or anti-German thinking. How little such feeling had to do with anti-Semitism can be seen from the fact that those Jews who voted for the war loans were more highly esteemed and sought after than ever.”¹²⁴⁴

The New York Times reported on 2 April 1918 on page 10,

“ZIONISTS CELEBRATE NEW JEWISH FUTURE

2,500 in Carnegie Hall Pledge
Loyalty to America and
the Allies.

CHEER PALESTINE SOLDIERS

Dr. Wise Says Jewish Freedom Is

Secure Because It Is Written in
the English Language.

In a tremendous demonstration in Carnegie Hall last night the Zionists of New York attested their patriotism to America, their loyalty to the cause of the Allies, and their joy over the prospect of a land for the Jews in Palestine. The meeting was arranged by the Zionist Council of this city and it was preceded by a parade in which 2,500 Zionists marched.

As the marchers filed into Carnegie Hall the banners they carried were ranged along the wall and their flags hung out from platform and galleries. The meeting was full of enthusiasm from the start, and there were three periods when it reached the greatest pitch. One of these was when the blue and white flag of the House of David, the flag of the new Jewish home land, was raised, and again when Louis Lipsky, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Federation of American Zionists, mentioned the name of President Wilson. Then again when the Rev. Dr. Stephen S. Wise declared that the charter of Jewish freedom was secure and sacred because it was written in the English language by the English people.

Over the stage there was a great American banner and stacked to one side of the stage were the flags of the Allies. Hung from one side of the stage was the Jewish flag. This is a white field upon which are two broad blue stripes. In the centre is the six-pointed star of the House of David. When this flag was put up the entire audience from boxes to topmost gallery, arose and cheered. Among those on the platform were young men in the khaki of the Jewish Legion. There were about 250 of them and they were honored by the speakers.

Morris Rothenberg, Chairman of the meeting and President of the Zionist Council of New York, said in opening the meeting that the arrival of the Zionist Commission in Palestine to lay the foundation of the new Jewish national freedom was worthy of celebration. Nathan Straus spoke briefly, but he called upon Dr. Wise to deliver to the Zionists the message of patriotism and devotion to the cause of America and her allies.

The storm of applause and the cheering broke out again when Dr. Wise declared that Germany would never win the war. It came again when, lifting his hands above his head, he said: 'England, France, and America have said to Germany, 'Thus far shall thou go, and no further.' '

'If Germany could win the war,' he said, 'as she cannot, she would give Palestine back again to those hands to which our Holy Land under God shall never be restored—to the Turks. And, gentlemen, there was a time when some of you would have felt differently, but I speak for myself tonight, not for you. I speak not as Chairman of the Provisional Zionist Committee. I speak as a Jew: I speak as an American. I say to you, the charter of Jewish freedom is secure, is sacred, because it is written in the English language by the English people, and if men say to you: 'How do you know but if

Germany could win the war Germany might give Palestine to the Jews?' I answer, 'We want never to be the receivers of stolen property, we want never, never; never will we accept any gift from foul and murderous hands. We are going into Palestine with heart directly facing the world, as self-revering free men. We will go to Palestine as one of the victorious Allies, or else shall stay out until another and better day dawns.'

Mr. Straus was applauded when he said: 'We are going to Palestine this year and we will stay there.' In referring to the arrival of the Jewish Administrative Commission in Palestine, Mr. Lipsky said:

'While jubilant over the change in our national status, the Zionist organization desires to express its feelings with regard to the Governments and peoples that have made this change possible. The magnanimity of the British Government in making its historic declaration on Nov. 2, 1917, will never be forgotten by the Jewish people. Relations have been established that will forever link our destiny with the interests of the great empire. In the days to come Nov. 2 will be a day of Jewish rejoicing, and our traditions will be enriched by the memory of the act of reparation achieved by a great Government in the midst of a gigantic struggle, in which its own future had to be defended by its heroic sons. As a token of that relationship the sons of Israel, under their own banner, will soon stand shoulder to shoulder on the Palestinian frontier with the gallant and heroic Englishmen. The blood there shed will be an everlasting covenant between the two peoples, which nothing shall ever erase.'

The New York Times reported on 24 December 1915 on page 3,

“SEMITIC ISSUE IN GERMANY.

Some Berlin Newspapers Accused of Reviving Anti-Jewish Feeling.

BERLIN, Dec. 23.—Anti-Semitism, an issue which has been almost dead since the beginning of the war, has been revived this week by the *Tageszeitung* and other newspapers. In consequence a controversy which may be described as almost bitter has broken out between papers of the *Tageszeitung* stamp on the one hand and those like the *Tageblatt*, which adopt a liberal attitude in regard to the Jewish question, on the other.

The more liberal papers resent intensely every anti-Jewish movement, particularly as it is asserted that German Jews have borne their share of the war's burdens liberally and are doing their utmost for the Fatherland in both a military and an economic sense.

The present revival of the anti-Semitic movement began with a savage attack in the *Tageszeitung* against Eugen Dietrich of Jena, who had accused

‘a Berlin morning newspaper’—inferentially, the *Tageszeitung*—of being anti-Jewish. The *Tageszeitung* denied it was the newspaper attacked and further roused Jewish feeling by putting the blame on still another Berlin journal.

The *Tagesblatt* entered the controversy, calling the *Tageszeitung* utterances ‘base defamation of German Jews, many of whom died for the Fatherland after voluntarily joining the army—in which they were notably different from certain anti-Semitic Nationalist typewriter heroes, who have not lived up to the war propaganda they preached for years.’

Theodor Wolff of the *Tageblatt*, who is perhaps the most prominent editor of Germany, declares that notwithstanding the recent revival of anti-Semitism the feeling against Jews in Germany is gradually on the wane, existing nowhere to a great extent except possibly among the minor nobility.

‘I am glad to be able to say there is absolutely no anti-Jewish movement in Government circles or in the high nobility,’ Mr. Wolff said. ‘The Jew now has equal rights in the army and may become an officer along with a Christian. In virtually all strata the Jew is found intermingled with all others.’

‘It is only among the minor nobility that the Jew is still unwelcome, on account of the fact that he is able to outstrip his competitors, who are jealous of him. But do not forget there are notable exceptions in this class—fine examples of Germans who are too broad to be anti-Jewish or anti-anything. A few German newspapers which represent this class of the minor nobility, such as the *Tageszeitung* and the *Taegliche Rundschau*, are naturally anti-Jewish, but their agitation is becoming less effective each month. I look for eventual liberty for Jews in Germany, such as exists in America today.’”

Early in the war, it was alleged that Jews avoided military service in Germany by working for Jewish war profiteers under the direction of Walter Rathenau. Jews have often been accused of cowardice in war, allegedly preferring to shuffle goods in the Quartermasters Corps to the front lines.¹²⁴⁵ Jews were also accused of supplying substandard arms at inflated prices. After the war, it was frequently alleged that Jews had reaped their alleged war profits in hopes of using the money to achieve their Zionist aims—the implication being that Zionists started the war in order to found and to fund their new state.¹²⁴⁶

The German Ministry of War ordered a census taken in October of 1916 to determine the percentage of Jews serving in the military. The results showed that Jews represented a lower percentage in the military than in the general population. Some claimed that Jews were, in part, deliberately excluded from the census. The results of the census were not published by the German Government, which feared they might cause conflict between Gentile and Jewish soldiers. However, the results were leaked and published in pamphlet form.

Walther Rathenau was widely accused of profiteering from the war, as was Bernard Baruch, an American who was Chairman of the American War Industries Board. Rathenau was also accused of making statements which indicated that he had hoped that Germany would lose the war.¹²⁴⁷ Rathenau was further accused of

profiteering from the reparations he encouraged Germany to pay after the war, and from the profits to be made through the Rapallo Treaty.

Jews had long been accused of war profiteering. Schopenhauer and Wagner were among the many pacifists who have made the same accusation against the Jews. Schopenhauer wrote; in terms Einstein would later, in part, copy;

“War is a word as heavy as lead. It is the scourge of humanity and of nations, the antithesis of all reason, although not seldom a harvest for the great, for ministers, generals, contractors, and Jews. War is mankind’s obscene picture, and war first begot despotism. War begot the feudal system. War made of free men the first slaves.”¹²⁴⁸

In December of 1915, Theodor Wolff, Chief Editor of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, stated that there was no anti-Semitic movement in the German government or higher nobility. Anti-Semitism, as basic bigotry, and as a complex political, racist and religious belief system, doubtlessly continued on many levels, conscious and unconscious, as did Wolff’s somewhat juvenile and provocative approach to confronting it. Einstein criticized the *Berliner Tageblatt*,¹²⁴⁹ in spite of the fact that he used it as an organ to unfairly denigrate his critics. The *Berliner Tageblatt*’s approach to redressing anti-Semitism was counterproductive. Willi Buch (Wilhelm Buchow) wrote in 1937,

“Besides, other Jewish newspapers like the *Berliner Tageblatt* and the *Freisinnige Zeitung* worked in the same direction as the philo-Semitic defense publications. The defense against anti-Semitism was so reckless, the attacks against its representatives so full of hate and obvious lies that their effect upon the sober and realistic German was mostly contrary to the intended one.”¹²⁵⁰

It was only after America entered the war on the Allies’ side when Germany was about to win it and bring peace to the world; and after the Zionists moved their headquarters from Berlin to London and then attempted to blackmail Germany in 1917 and made very public their allegiance, including the allegiance of Zionist financiers, to the Allies; that anti-Semitism began to rise as a political movement in Germany in 1918—especially after the short-lived Bolshevik revolution in Bavaria. The political Zionists believed that the strife between Gentile and Jew benefitted their cause. Failed Communist takeovers of Germany in January and March of 1919 and March, 1920, further resulted in concerns that Jewish Bolsheviks had Germany forever in their sights. Indeed, the Communist finally took Eastern Germany after the Second World War, and the Nazi Party was a Communist organization.

The unfortunate Jews in Poland, Lithuania, Ukraine and Russia suffered terribly as pawns and scapegoats caught between all rival forces as the First World War progressed—though not nearly so badly as they later would in the Holocaust to come in the Second World War. They had the Zionists to blame for their suffering.

The Bolsheviks also played no small part in the misery the Jews of Eastern

Europe endured. The policy was often to segregate Jews into concentrated masses meant for expulsion; which was done at the behest of the political Zionists. The Jews did not wish to leave Europe. The Zionists took it upon themselves to insist that the Jews of Eastern Europe migrate to Palestine in order to provide the Zionists with soldiers and slaves. When the First World War could not accomplish this end, the Zionists took it upon themselves to promote anti-Semitism in order force the expulsion of the Jews from Europe to Palestine. Just as the Zionists ignored the desires of the majority of Jews, the American people were never asked if they wanted to fight war after war to found a racist “Jewish State” in Palestine and maintain it. Zionists have absolutely no respect for the principle of self-determination, be it on a national or a personal level.

5.17 The Germans’ Side of the First World War

Prior to the *quid pro quo* arrangement between the British and the Zionist Jews to bring America into the war on the side of Great Britain in exchange for the Balfour Declaration, a great many books and pamphlets were published in America defending Germany,¹²⁵¹ and the financiers backed both sides in the war until the time of the Balfour Declaration. After the Jewish deal to bring America into the war was struck, a great many books were published in America attacking Germany—many of which adopted the vilification of all Germans propagandized by Émile Durkheim in 1915.¹²⁵² The Jewish anti-German propaganda campaign, and their efforts to bring the German People into world wars, have been very successful. A “Suppressed Speech by Company Sergeant-Major” made during the First World War stated,

“What is the use of a wounded German anyway? He goes into hospital and the next thing that happens is that you meet him again in some other part of the line. That’s no good to us, is it? So when you see a German laid out, just finish him off. . . . Kill them, every mother’s son of them. Remember that your job is to kill them. . . . exterminate the vile creatures. Murder that vile animal called a German.”¹²⁵³

At least as early as the 1860's, Zionist racist and National Socialist Moses Hess argued that the “German race” had a genetically programmed antagonism towards the “Jewish race”—the implication being that one must destroy the other in order to survive. Two World Wars did nearly accomplish the destruction of Germany, and ended their prominence in world affairs. Hess wrote in 1862,

“It seems that German education is not compatible with our Jewish national aspirations. Had I not once lived in France, it would never have entered my mind to interest myself with the revival of Jewish nationality. Our views and strivings are determined by the social environment which surrounds us. Every Living, acting people, like every active individual, has its special field. . . . Indeed, every man, every member of the historical nations, is a political, or as we say at present, a social animal; yet within this sphere

of the common social world, there are special places reserved by Nature for individuals according to their particular calling. The specialty of the German of the higher class, of course, is his interest in abstract thought; and because he is too much of a universal philosopher, it is difficult for him to be inspired by national tendencies. 'Its whole tendency,' my former publisher, Otto Wigand, once wrote to me, when I showed him an outline of a work on Jewish national aspirations, 'is contrary to my pure human nature.'

The 'pure human nature' of the Germans is, in reality, the character of the pure German race, which rises to the conception of humanity in theory only, but in practice it has not succeeded in overcoming the natural sympathies and antipathies of the race. German antagonism to Jewish national aspiration has a double origin, though the motives are really contrary to each other. The duplicity and contrariety of the human personality, such as we can see in the union of the spiritual and the natural, the theoretical and the practical sides, are in no other nation so sharply marked in their points of opposition as in the German. Jewish national aspirations are antagonistic to the theoretical cosmopolitan tendencies of the German. But in addition to this, the German opposes Jewish national aspirations because of his racial antipathy, from which even the noblest Germans have not as yet emancipated themselves. The publisher, whose 'pure human' conscience revolted against publishing a book advocating the revival of Jewish nationality, published books preaching hatred to Jews and Judaism without the slightest remorse, in spite of the fact that the motive of such works is essentially opposed to the 'pure human conscience.' This contradictory action was due to inborn racial antagonism to the Jews. But the German, it seems, has no clear conception of his racial prejudices; he sees in his egoistic as well as in his spiritual endeavors, not German or Teutonic, but 'humanitarian tendencies'; and he does not know that he follows the latter only in theory, while in practice he clings to his egoistic ideas.

[***]

In 1858, there appeared, at Leipzig, a work written by Otto Wigand under the title *Two discourses concerning the desertion from Judaism*, being an analysis of the views on this question expressed in the recently published correspondence of Dr. Abraham Geiger. The author endeavors to prove that the conclusions of Dr. Geiger are untenable both from a philosophic and from a social standpoint. Here are his social arguments:

'My friend,' says the author, 'there are certain conclusions which you cannot escape. The stamp of slavery, if we may use this expression, which centuries of oppression have deeply impressed upon the Jewish features, might have been obliterated by the blessed hand of regained civil liberty. The gait of the Jews, buoyed up by the happy reminiscences of the victory won in the struggle for the noble possession of liberty, might have been straighter and prouder. The Jewish face may certainly beam with pride, as it views the tremendous progress made by the Jews in a brief time, their mighty flight to the spiritual height upon which they now stand, which is especially notable

considering the fact that their poets and writers at whose greatness the nation is astonished, and of whose talents the entire people takes account, have sprung from those who, a generation ago, could hardly converse correctly in the language of the land. Such a state of affairs should undoubtedly call forth admiration in the hearts of the present German generation, and yet, in spite of these achievements, the wall separating Jew and Christian still stands unshattered, for the watchman that guards them is one who will not be caught napping. It is the race difference between the Jewish and Christian populations. If this assertion of mine surprises or astonishes you, I ask you to consider whether it is not almost a rule with the Germans that race differences generate prejudices which cannot be overcome by any manifestation of good-will on the part of the other race. The relations existing between the German and the Slavic populations in Bohemia, in Hungary and Transylvania, between the Germans and the Danes in Schleswig, or between the Irish and the Anglo-Saxon settlers in Ireland, illustrates well the power of race antagonism in the German world. In all these countries the different elements of the population have lived side by side for centuries, sharing equally all political rights, and yet, so strong are the national or racial differences, that a social amalgamation of the various elements of the population is even at the present day quite unthinkable. And what comparison is there between the race differences of a German and Slav, a Celt and Anglo-Saxon, or a German and Dane, and the race antagonism between the children of the Sons of Jacob, who are of Asiatic descent, and the descendants of Teut and Herman, the ancestors of whom have inhabited Europe from time immemorial; between the proud and the tall blond German and the small of figure, black-haired and black-eyed Jew? Races which differ in such a degree oppose each other instinctively and against such opposition reason and good sense are powerless.'

These expressions are certainly frank and sincere in their meaning, though they by no means prove the conclusions to which the author wishes to arrive, namely, the desirability of conversion; for conversion will not turn a Jew into a German. But they at least contain the confession, that an instinctive race antagonism triumphs in Germany above all humanitarian sentiments. The 'pure human nature' resolves itself, according to the Germans, in the nature of pure Germanism. The 'high-born blond race' looks with contempt upon the regeneration of the 'black-haired, quick-moving mannikins,' without regard to whether they are descendants of the Biblical patriarchs, or of the ancient Romans and Gauls.

While other civilized western nations mention the shameful oppression to which the Jews were formerly subjected, only as an act of theirs of which they are ashamed, the German remembers only the 'stamp of slavery' which he impressed upon 'the Jewish physiognomy.'

In a *feuilleton* which appeared recently in the *Bonnerzeitung*, entitled 'Bonn Eighty Years Ago,' the author speaks of the Jews in mocking terms and describes them as people who lived in separate quarters and supported

themselves by petty trades. I believe that we should wonder less at the fact that the Jews, who were forbidden to participate in the important branches of industry and commerce, lived on petty trade, than at the fact that they were able to live at all in those centuries of oppression. As a matter of fact, almost every means of existence, including the right of domicile, was denied them. It was only by means of bribes that every Jewish generation could procure anew the 'privilege' not to be driven out of their homes in Bonn, and they felt happy indeed if, in spite of the contract, they were not robbed of their property and exiled, or attacked by a fanatical mob in the bargain. I, also, can tell a story of 'eighty years ago.' A Jew won the high favor of the Kurfuerst of Bonn, that he and his descendants were granted the 'privilege' to settle in Ebendich.

[***]

Gabriel Riesser, the editor of the magazine, *The Jew*, as far as I can recollect, never fell into the error, common to all modern German Jews, that the emancipation of the Jews is irreconcilable with the development of Jewish Nationalism. He demanded emancipation for the Jews on the one condition only, that of their receiving all civil and political rights in return for their assuming all civil and political burdens."¹²⁵⁴

Racist Zionist Moses Hess stated that emancipation ended Jewish nationalism in Germany, making Jewish liberty and Germany the enemies of Zionism. Racist Zionist Adolf Hitler put an end to both Jewish freedom and Germany. Hess, in the express terms Hitler would later adopt, relied upon racist mythologies and National Socialism to solve the "dilemma" of Jewish nationalism.

The racist hatred against Germans by some Jews reached its climax in the proposed genocide of Germans by Theodor Newman Kaufman, who claimed to have connections to Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, in 1941 in Kaufman's genocidal book *Germany Must Perish!*¹²⁵⁵ After the Balfour Declaration, German Zionist financiers attempted to blackmail Germany into unconditionally securing Palestine as a Jewish State without any Turkish or German oversight. Since Turkey was Germany's ally, this was an unreasonable request, though Germany did attempt to gain Palestine as a land of settlement for Jews with almost complete independence.

President Wilson won his declaration of war against Germany in the United States Congress based on false reports of the sinking of the S. S. Sussex and through the arranged attack on the Lusitania. Wilson was elected with Jewish financier's money, twice, and surrounded himself with appointees, who were themselves Jewish financiers, or who were selected by Jewish financiers.

Francis Neilson wrote in his book *The Makers of War*,

"In America, Woodrow Wilson, desperate to find a pretext to enter the war, found it at last in the 'sinking' of the *Sussex*, in mid-channel. Someone invented the yarn that American lives had been lost. With this excuse he went to Congress for a declaration of war. Afterwards, the Navy found that the

Sussex had not been sunk, and no American lives were lost.”¹²⁵⁶

Though much was initially published exonerating Germany,¹²⁵⁷ the German side of the story as to how England and America entered into the First World War is not often told today, but is essential to an understanding of the political climate in Germany in the post-World War I period. Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg, Chancellor of Germany, spoke to the Reichstag on 4 August 1914, and stated,

“THE CHANCELLOR’ S SPEECH IN THE REICHSTAG,
AUGUST 4, 1914

A TERRIBLE fate is breaking over Europe. Since we won in war the respect of the world for our German Empire we have lived in peace forty-four years, and have guarded the peace of Europe. In peaceful labor we have grown strong and mighty; and people have envied us. In nery patience we have suffered hostilities to be fanned in the east and the west, and fetters to be forged against us. The wind was sown there, and now we have the whirlwind. We wanted to go on living and working in peace, and like a silent vow, from the Emperor down to the youngest recruit, this was the will: Our sword shall not be drawn except in a just cause. Now the day has come when we must draw it. Russia has put the torch to our house. We have been forced into a war with Russia and France.

Gentlemen, a number of papers penned in the stress of hurrying events have been distributed to you. [*Footnote:* These papers the New York Times printed as ‘The German White Paper,’ perhaps a misnomer. While the Times deserves thanks for having published this information, the comparison of this hurried compilation with the well arranged British White Paper has been unfavorable to the cause of Germany.] Let me single out the facts which characterize our action.

From the first moment of the Austrian conflict we strove and labored that this conflict might be confined to Austria-Hungary and Servia. All the cabinets, notably the English cabinet, took the same ground, only Russia insisted that she would have to say a word. This was the beginning of the danger threatening Europe. As soon as the first definite news of military preparations in Russia reached us, we declared in St. Petersburg, kindly but firmly, that military preparations against us would force us to take similar steps, and that mobilization and war are not far apart. Russia assured us in the most friendly way that she was taking no measures against us. England in the meanwhile was trying to mediate between Austria and Servia, and was receiving our hearty support. On July 28 the Emperor telegraphed to the Czar asking him to consider that Austria had the right and the duty to protect herself against the Greater-Servian plots which threatened to undermine her existence. The Emperor called the Czar’s attention to their common monarchical interest against the crime of Serajevo, and asked the Czar to help him personally to smooth away the difficulties between Vienna and St.

Petersburg. At about the same time, and before he had received this telegram, the Czar asked the Emperor to help him and to counsel moderation in Vienna. The Emperor accepted the part of mediator, but he has hardly begun to act, when Russia mobilizes all her troops against Austria-Hungary. Austria-Hungary on the other hand had mobilized only her army corps on the Servian frontier, and two other corps in the north, but far removed from Russia. The Emperor at once points out to the Czar that the Russian mobilization makes his mediation, undertaken at the Czar's request, very difficult if not impossible. We nevertheless continue our mediation even to the extreme limit permitted by our alliance. During this time Russia of her own accord repeats her assurance that she is taking no military preparations against us.

Then there arrives the 31st of July. In Vienna a decision is due. We have already succeeded so far that Vienna has renewed a personal exchange of opinion with St. Petersburg, which had stopped for some time, but even before a decision is made in Vienna, we receive the news that Russia is mobilizing her entire army — that is, she is mobilizing also against us. The Russian Government, which from our repeated representations knows what a mobilization on our frontier means, does not notify us, and gives us no explanatory reply. Not until July 31st in the afternoon a telegram is received from the Czar in which he says that his army is taking no provocative attitude towards us. But — the Russian mobilization on our frontier was vigorously begun as early as during the night of July 30th. While we are still trying to mediate in Vienna at Russia's request, the whole Russian military force rises on our long, almost open frontier; and France, while she is not yet mobilizing, confesses that she is making military preparations. And we? We had intentionally refrained, up to that moment, from calling a single reservist to the colors — for the sake of the peace of Europe. Should we now be waiting any longer, until the powers between whom we are wedged in would choose their own moment of attack? To expose Germany to this danger would have been a crime! For this reason we demanded at once, on July 31st, that Russia demobilize, which action alone could still have preserved the peace of Europe. The Imperial Ambassador in St. Petersburg was simultaneously instructed to declare that we should have to consider ourselves at war with Russia, if she declined. The Imperial Ambassador has followed his instructions.

Even today we do not yet know Russia's reply to our demand that she demobilize. No telegraphic news has reached us, although the telegraph went on for a while communicating many less important matters. So it came that when the time limit was long past the Emperor was obliged to mobilize our military forces at five o'clock in the afternoon of August 1st. At the same time we had to ask for assurances as to the attitude of France. She replied to our definite inquiry whether she would be neutral in a Russian-German war by saying that she would do what her interests demanded. This was an evasion of our question if not a negative reply. The Emperor nevertheless

ordered that the French frontier be respected in its entirety. This order has been rigorously obeyed with one single exception. France, who mobilized at the same hour that we did, declared that she would respect a zone of ten kilometers on our frontier. And what did really happen? Bomb throwing, flyers, cavalry scouts, and companies invading Alsace-Lorraine. Thus France attacked us before war had been declared.

As regards the one exception I mentioned, I have received this report from the General Staff: 'As regards the French complaints concerning our transgressing her frontier, only one case is to be acknowledged. Contrary to definite orders a patrol of the 14th Army Corps, led it would seem by an officer, crossed the frontier on August 2d. It appears that all were shot except one man, who returned. But long before this one act of crossing the frontier took place, French flyers dropped bombs as far from France as South Germany, and near the Schluchtpass French troops made an attack on our frontier guards. Thus far our troops have confined themselves to the protection of our frontier.' This is the report of the General Staff.

We have been forced into a state of self-defence, and the necessity of self-defence knows no other law. Our troops have occupied Luxemburg, and have perhaps already been obliged to enter Belgian territory. That is against the rules of international law. It is true that the French Government announced in Brussels that it would respect Belgian neutrality as long as its opponents would do so. But we knew that France was ready for an invasion of Belgium. France could afford to wait. We could not wait. An attack on our flank on the lower Rhine might have been fatal. We were therefore obliged to disregard the protest of the Luxemburg and Belgian governments. For the wrong we have done thereby we shall try to atone, as soon as our military end is obtained. People who like ourselves are fighting for their lives and homes must think of naught but how they may survive.

Gentlemen, we are standing shoulder to shoulder with Austria-Hungary. As regards the attitude of England, Sir Edward Grey's remarks yesterday in the lower house of Parliament have shown what her stand will be. We have assured the English Government that we shall not attack the north coast of France as long as England remains neutral, and that we shall not infringe the territorial integrity and independence of Belgium. This assurance I here repeat before the whole world; and I may add, as long as England remains neutral, we shall not even take any hostile measures against the French merchant marine, provided France will treat our merchantmen in the same way.

Gentlemen, this was the course of events. Germany enters this war with a clear conscience. We are fighting to protect the fruits of our peaceful labor, and our heritage of the great past. We are fighting for our future. The fifty years are not yet past during which Moltke used to say we should have to remain armed if we were to protect our heritage and our achievements of 1870.

Now the supreme hour has come which will test our people. But it finds

us ready and full of confidence. Our army is in the field, our fleet is well prepared, and back of them stands the whole German people — *The Whole German People*.”¹²⁵⁸

The telegraphic correspondence referred to in the above speech is reproduced in *Truth about Germany: Facts about the War*, Throw Press, New York, (1914). Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg, Chancellor of Germany, again spoke to the Reichstag in 1914 and stated, *inter alia*,

“Where the responsibility in this greatest of all wars lies is quite evident to us. Outwardly responsible are the men in Russia who planned and carried into effect the general mobilization of the Russian army. But in reality and truth the British Government is responsible. The London Cabinet could have made war impossible if they had unequivocally told Petersburg that England was not willing to let a continental war of the Great Powers result from the Austro-Hungarian conflict with Serbia. Such words would have compelled France to use all her energy to keep Russia away from every warlike measure. Then our good offices and mediation between Vienna and Petersburg would have been successful, and there would have been no war! But England has chosen to act otherwise. She knew that the clique of powerful and partly irresponsible men surrounding the Czar were spoiling for war and intriguing to bring it about. England saw that the wheel was set a-rolling, but she did not think of stopping it. While openly professing sentiments of peace, London secretly gave St. Petersburg to understand that England stood by France and therefore by Russia too. This has been clearly and irrefutably shown by the official publications which in the meantime have come out, more particularly by the Blue Book edited by the British Government. Then St. Petersburg could no longer be restrained. In proof of this we possess the testimony of the Belgian Chargé d’Affaires at St. Petersburg, a witness who is surely beyond every suspicion. He reported (you know his words, but I will repeat them now), he reported to his Government on July 30th that ‘England commenced by making it understood that she would not let herself be drawn into a conflict. Sir George Buchanan said this openly. To-day, however, everybody in St. Petersburg is quite convinced,—one has actually received the assurance—that England will stand by France. This support is of enormous weight and has contributed largely toward giving the war-party the upper hand. Up to this summer English statesmen have assured their Parliament that no treaty or agreement existed influencing England’s independence of action, should a war break out, England was free to decide whether she would participate in a European war or not. Hence, there was no treaty obligation, no compulsion, no menace of the homeland which induced the English statesmen to originate the war and then at once to take part in it. The only conclusion left is that the London Cabinet allowed this European war, this monstrous world war, because they thought it was an opportune moment with the aid of England’s political

confederates, to destroy the vital nerve of her greatest European competitors in the markets of the world. Therefore, England, together with Russia (I have spoken about Russia on the 4th of August), is answerable before God and man for this catastrophe which has come over Europe and over mankind.”¹²⁵⁹

At least as early as 1908, even before the Balkan Wars, German writers were anticipating the events which would result in the “World War” with England, France and Russia; and revealed the existence of a British alliance with France to attack Germany, whether or not Germany had invaded Belgium in an act of self-defense—the pretext for the British and French declarations of war against Germany. The English-French Entente had created Belgium. The defensive German invasion of Belgium was the excuse the British and French gave for their entrance into the war—a completely unnecessary war made most horrible by the entrance of the Entente, and then made to last by the entrance of the Americans. Rudolf Emil Martin, Regierungsrat im Reichsamt des Innern in Berlin, wrote in his book *Stehen wir vor einem Weltkrieg?* F. Engelmann, Leipzig, pp. 142-145, on 30 June 1908, as quoted in his *Der Weltkrieg und sein Ende*, Rudolf Martin, Berlin, (1915), pp. 62-64:

“Eine Voraussage des Weltkrieges aus dem Jahre 1908.

In meinem am 30. Juni 1908 erschienenen Buche „Stehen wir vor einem Weltkrieg?“ finden sich auf Seite 142 bis 145 folgende Ausführungen:

„Seit der Zusammenkunft der englischen Königsfamilie mit der russischen Zarenfamilie am 9. und 10. Juni auf der Rhede von Reval ist die politische Lage um vieles ernster geworden. Die eifrigen Versicherungen der russischen, englischen und französischen Blätter, daß die Zusammenkunft von Reval sich gegen Deutschland richte, bilden den besten Beweis für die hochgradige Gespanntheit der internationalen Lage. Nachdem in Paris, London und Petersburg alle Vorbereitungen zum Kampfe gegen Deutschland getroffen worden sind, pocht den verantwortlichen Leitern der Politik das Herz vor Aufregung, denn niemand weiß, wie dieser Weltkrieg enden wird. Man diskutiert in den politischen Zirkeln in Paris und London die Frage, ob Deutschland sich diese beispiellose und vollkommene Einkesselung wohl gefallen lassen werde. (Seite 142.)

„Schon heute ist sicher, daß König Eduard jede direkte Auseinandersetzung zwischen Deutschland und Frankreich über Marokko verhindern wird. Weit hinter uns liegen die Zeiten vor und während des Burenkrieges, als in den Jahren 1899 bis 1901 Chamberlain nicht abgeneigt war, dem Deutschen Reiche einige Häfen an der atlantischen Küste Marokkos einzuräumen und sich mit Deutschland allein über Marokko zu verständigen. König Eduard ist heute entschlossen, dem eingekesselten Deutschland keinerlei Zugeständnisse zu machen. Diesen ruhigen, besonnenen Herrscher, dem jede Leidenschaft für das Militärwesen abgeht, schreckt die Möglichkeit eines Krieges gegen Deutschland nicht mehr

zurück. Diese seine Stellung zu Krieg und Frieden hat König Eduard am 9. und 10. Juni 1908 vor aller Welt dargetan. Aber nur die Eingeweihten verstanden international jede Nüance des Schauspiels von Reval. Ostentativ stellte König Eduard den General French und den Admiral Fisher dem Zaren vor.

„General French ist der Generalinspektor des englischen Landheeres und Admiral Fisher ist der Höchstkommandierende der englischen Flotte. General French befiehlt in dem kommenden Kriege die englische Landarmee auf dem Kontinent. Ihn mußte der Zar kennen lernen.

„Als der französische Ministerpräsident Rouvier in der zweiten Woche des Mai 1905 die letzte Hoffnung aufgab, daß es zwischen Deutschland und Frankreich über Marokko zur Verständigung kommen werde, schloß er mit England die geheime englisch-französische Militärkonvention ab, die in viel höherem Maße die Bezeichnung eines Schutz- und Trutzbündnisses verdient, als etwa das Bündnis zwischen Deutschland und Österreich-Ungarn. (Seite 143.) Deutschland hat Österreich-Ungarn nur beizustehen, wenn Österreich-Ungarn von Rußland angegriffen wird. England aber will Frankreich Beistand leisten auch in dem Falle, wenn Frankreich den Krieg gegen Deutschland eröffnet. So ist der Sinn dieser englisch-französischen Militärkonvention. Und so will es König Eduard.

„Unmittelbar nach dem Abschluß dieses wichtigsten aller gegenwärtig bestehenden Bündnisse, welches aber öffentlich noch heute in sehr geschickter Weise abgeleugnet wird, reiste General French mit zwei englischen Generalstabsoffizieren nach Frankreich, um längs der Meuse in Nordfrankreich das Terrain zu inspizieren, welches die englische Armee von 100 000 Mann unter seinem Oberbefehl zu besetzen hatte und noch hat. General French denkt gar nicht daran, diese Feststellung zu dementieren. Die Zeiten sind eben vorbei, wo man in England auf strenge Geheimhaltung des englisch-französischen Kriegsplanes Wert legte. Während General French mit seinen Generalstabsoffizieren in der Gegend von Sedan unter Führung der französischen Generalstäbler Tag für Tag studierte, besuchte der englische Botschafter in Berlin das Auswärtige Amt, um im Laufe der Unterhaltung anzudeuten, daß England im Falle eines deutsch-französischen Krieges an der Seite Frankreichs kämpfen werde.

„König Eduard weiß ganz genau, daß man in Berlin die Aufgabe des General French im Kriegsfall kennt. Wenn König Eduard dessenungeachtet den General French und den Admiral Fisher zu dem Familienfest in Reval zuzog, so wollte er Deutschland dadurch zu verstehen geben, daß zwischen England und Rußland eine Militärkonvention gegen Deutschland geschlossen werde. Aus dem Briefwechsel zwischen dem Deutschen Kaiser und Lord Tweedmouth ist bekannt, daß Admiral Fischer die Seele einer unternehmungslustigen Flottenpolitik ist. König Eduard will den Krieg nicht. Er will uns nur in wohlwollender Weise gewarnt haben. Wenn wir uns absolut fügen, geschieht uns nicht. (Seite 144.)

„Überdies will König Eduard den bewundernswerten Bau der

diplomatischen Einkesselung Deutschlands im Frieden noch vollständig beenden. Erst in den nächsten Monaten beginnt der wichtige Schlußakt des gewaltigen Baununternehmens. Österreich-Ungarn soll uns abspenstig gemacht werden. König Eduard wird diesen schwierigsten Teil der Aufgabe persönlich übernehmen. Wahrscheinlich wird man Österreich-Ungarn die künftige Erwerbung der ganzen europäischen Türkei mit Ausnahme von Konstantinopel versprechen.

„Jetzt ist der letzte Augenblick, wo Deutschland seine Kriegsrüstung mit äußerster Energie vermehren muß, wenn es nicht schweren Schaden erleiden will. Große Bewilligungen für die Vermehrung unserer Luft- und Seemacht werden aber bei dem zerrütteten Zustand unserer Finanzen von dem Reichstag nur zu erreichen sein, wenn ihm ein großes nationales Ziel vor Augen geführt wird.

„Eine Nation, die sich derartig einkesseln läßt, gibt freiwillig ihren Rang auf. Die einzig würdige Antwort auf diese Einkesselung ist eine riesenhafte Verstärkung unserer Kriegsrüstung.“ (S. 145.)

Diese von mir am 30. Juni 1908 veröffentlichten Details des englisch-französischen Abkommens sind ein historischer Beweis dafür, daß England auch dann Frankreich im Weltkrieg beigestanden haben würde, wenn wir nicht durch Belgien marschiert wären.“

In the 1880's Friedrich Engels anticipated the events of the First World War. Eduard Bernstein recounted that,

“Friedrich Engels had predicted something like this during the eighties when he warned me not to think lightly of a war with Russia. A war between Germany and Russia, he wrote, would automatically draw in France on the side of Russia.”¹²⁶⁰

In 1887, Frederick Engels knew that the First World War was coming and that it would destroy the Empires of Europe and leave them ripe for revolution,

“No other war is now possible for Prussia-Germany than a world war, and indeed a world war of hitherto unimagined sweep and violence. Eight to ten million soldiers will mutually kill each other off, and in the process devour Europe barer than any swarm of locusts ever did. The desolation of the Thirty Years' War compressed into three or four years and spread over the entire continent: famine, plague, general savagery, taking possession both of the armies and of the masses of the people, as a result of universal want; hopeless demoralization of our complex institutions of trade, industry and credit, ending in universal bankruptcy; collapse of the old states and their traditional statecraft, so that crowns will roll over the pavements by the dozens and no one be found to pick them up; absolute impossibility of foreseeing where this will end, or who will emerge victor from the general struggle. Only *one* result is absolutely sure: general exhaustion and the

creation of the conditions for the final victory of the working class.”¹²⁶¹

Before America entered the war, Germany was close to winning it. They would have settled it with a comparatively large degree of restraint and justice (compared to the punitive Treaty of Versailles, orchestrated by a large cabal of Jews, which destroyed Germany), had not America interceded on behalf of England. As it happened, the Germans knew that Zionists made a deal with England to bring America into the war on England’s side in exchange for the Balfour Declaration, but even before that declaration was made public and even before German Zionist financiers attempted to blackmail the German Government, the Germans knew that Wilson was maneuvering for war and sought a pretext. Wilson wanted a League of Nations and a Palestine Mandate, which would fulfill Jewish Messianic prophecy. Shortly before America declared war on Germany, *The New York Times* published the following article of 24 March 1917, on page 2,

**“*ACCUSES WILSON*
OF ‘CRIMINAL ERRORS’
Berlin Paper Says ‘Monstrous
Guilt of War’ Would Fall
On His Administration.”**

BERLIN, March 22, (via London, March 23.)—The Lokal-Anzeiger accuses President Wilson of criminal carelessness in his conduct of American-German relations. The paper says:

‘Dispatches from America and other neutral countries repeatedly play with the idea of the possibility of Germany according American ships different treatment from that given other neutral steamers on the ground that Germany must have an interest in avoiding a conflict with America. It seems a fact that America also is keeping alive the hope that at the last moment we may find a way to compromise with the American standpoint. After the Chancellor, as well as the other officials involved, has repeatedly emphasized that there can be no going back for us, it is only necessary now to lay stress upon the following:

‘The policy of President Wilson, since the breaking off of diplomatic relations, has been characterized by careless and criminal errors. He has played with the destinies of great peoples. He desires to make his further course depend upon whether Germany commits an overt act, that is, an openly hostile action against an armed American merchantman. At the same time he lets it be known that he has commanded these armed merchantmen to open fire on their part on all submarines immediately.

‘In the face of the reasons we have given the whole world as a basis for unrestricted submarine warfare, it is unparalleled rashness if the President risks the lives of American citizens in the careless belief that we will not dare

to injure them. Even apart from the fact that our naval authorities declare that it is practically impossible to distinguish American from non-American merchantmen, the German Government must emphatically decline to consider any discrimination. If President Wilson rashly wants war, he should start it and he will have it. On our side it only remains to assure him that we have put an end to negotiations about submarine warfare once and for all. The monstrous guilt for a German-American war, should it come, would fall alone upon President Wilson and his Government.”

On 2 April 1917 (Lenin left Switzerland and entered Petrograd on 3 April 1917), President Woodrow Wilson, in a speech grounded in hypocrisy, without provocation and with no vital American national interest at stake, called for the Congress of the United States of America to declare war on the German Nation,

“Gentlemen of the Congress:

I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible that I should assume the responsibility of making.

On the 3d of February last I officially laid before you the extraordinary announcement of the Imperial German Government that on and after the 1st day of February it was its purpose to put aside all restraints of law or of humanity and use its submarines to sink every vessel that sought to approach either the ports of Great Britain and Ireland or the western coasts of Europe or any of the ports controlled by the enemies of Germany within the Mediterranean. That had seemed to be the object of the German submarine warfare earlier in the war, but since April of last year the Imperial Government had somewhat restrained the commanders of its undersea craft in conformity with its promise then given to us that passenger boats should not be sunk and that due warning would be given to all other vessels which its submarines might seek to destroy, when no resistance was offered or escape attempted, and care taken that their crews were given at least a fair chance to save their lives in their open boats. The precautions taken were meagre and haphazard enough, as was proved in distressing instance after instance in the progress of the cruel and unmanly business, but a certain degree of restraint was observed. The new policy has swept every restriction aside. Vessels of every kind, whatever their flag, their character, their cargo, their destination, their errand, have been ruthlessly sent to the bottom without warning and without thought of help or mercy for those on board, the vessels of friendly neutrals along with those of belligerents. Even hospital ships and ships carrying relief to the sorely bereaved and stricken people of Belgium, though the latter were provided with safe-conduct through the proscribed areas by the German Government itself and were distinguished by unmistakable marks of identity, have been sunk with the same reckless lack

of compassion or of principle.

I was for a little while unable to believe that such things would in fact be done by any government that had hitherto subscribed to the humane practices of civilized nations. International law had its origin in the attempt to set up some law which would be respected and observed upon the seas, where no nation had right of dominion and where lay the free highways of the world. By painful stage after stage has that law been built up, with meagre enough results, indeed, after all was accomplished that could be accomplished, but always with a clear view, at least, of what the heart and conscience of mankind demanded. This minimum of right the German Government has swept aside under the plea of retaliation and necessity and because it had no weapons which it could use at sea except these which it is impossible to employ as it is employing them without throwing to the winds all scruples of humanity or of respect for the understandings that were supposed to underlie the intercourse of the world. I am not now thinking of the loss of property involved, immense and serious as that is, but only of the wanton and wholesale destruction of the lives of noncombatants, men, women, and children, engaged in pursuits which have always, even in the darkest periods of modern history, been deemed innocent and legitimate. Property can be paid for; the lives of peaceful and innocent people can not be. The present German submarine warfare against commerce is a warfare against mankind.

It is a war against all nations. American ships have been sunk, American lives taken, in ways which it has stirred us very deeply to learn of, but the ships and people of other neutral and friendly nations have been sunk and overwhelmed in the waters in the same way. There has been no discrimination. The challenge is to all mankind. Each nation must decide for itself how it will meet it. The choice we make for ourselves must be made with a moderation of counsel and a temperateness of judgment befitting our character and our motives as a nation. We must put excited feeling away. Our motive will not be revenge or the victorious assertion of the physical might of the nation, but only the vindication of right, of human right, of which we are only a single champion.

When I addressed the Congress on the 26th of February last, I thought that it would suffice to assert our neutral rights with arms, our right to use the seas against unlawful interference, our right to keep our people safe against unlawful violence. But armed neutrality, it now appears, is impracticable. Because submarines are in effect outlaws when used as the German submarines have been used against merchant shipping, it is impossible to defend ships against their attacks as the law of nations has assumed that merchantmen would defend themselves against privateers or cruisers, visible craft giving chase upon the open sea. It is common prudence in such circumstances, grim necessity indeed, to endeavour to destroy them before they have shown their own intention. They must be dealt with upon sight, if dealt with at all. The German Government denies the right of neutrals to use arms at all within the areas of the sea which it has proscribed, even in the

defense of rights which no modern publicist has ever before questioned their right to defend. The intimation is conveyed that the armed guards which we have placed on our merchant ships will be treated as beyond the pale of law and subject to be dealt with as pirates would be. Armed neutrality is ineffectual enough at best; in such circumstances and in the face of such pretensions it is worse than ineffectual; it is likely only to produce what it was meant to prevent; it is practically certain to draw us into the war without either the rights or the effectiveness of belligerents. There is one choice we can not make, we are incapable of making: we will not choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our nation and our people to be ignored or violated. The wrongs against which we now array ourselves are no common wrongs; they cut to the very roots of human life.

With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the Government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it, and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war.

What this will involve is clear. It will involve the utmost practicable cooperation in counsel and action with the governments now at war with Germany, and, as incident to that, the extension to those governments of the most liberal financial credits, in order that our resources may so far as possible be added to theirs. It will involve the organization and mobilization of all the material resources of the country to supply the materials of war and serve the incidental needs of the nation in the most abundant and yet the most economical and efficient way possible. It will involve the immediate full equipment of the Navy in all respects but particularly in supplying it with the best means of dealing with the enemy's submarines. It will involve the immediate addition to the armed forces of the United States already provided for by law in case of war at least 500,000 men, who should, in my opinion, be chosen upon the principle of universal liability to service, and also the authorization of subsequent additional increments of equal force so soon as they may be needed and can be handled in training. It will involve also, of course, the granting of adequate credits to the Government, sustained, I hope, so far as they can equitably be sustained by the present generation, by well conceived taxation. . . .

While we do these things, these deeply momentous things, let us be very clear, and make very clear to all the world what our motives and our objects are. My own thought has not been driven from its habitual and normal course by the unhappy events of the last two months, and I do not believe that the thought of the nation has been altered or clouded by them I have exactly the

same things in mind now that I had in mind when I addressed the Senate on the 22d of January last; the same that I had in mind when I addressed the Congress on the 3d of February and on the 26th of February. Our object now, as then, is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power and to set up amongst the really free and self-governed peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and of action as will henceforth ensure the observance of those principles. Neutrality is no longer feasible or desirable where the peace of the world is involved and the freedom of its peoples, and the menace to that peace and freedom lies in the existence of autocratic governments backed by organized force which is controlled wholly by their will, not by the will of their people. We have seen the last of neutrality in such circumstances. We are at the beginning of an age in which it will be insisted that the same standards of conduct and of responsibility for wrong done shall be observed among nations and their governments that are observed among the individual citizens of civilized states.

We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling towards them but one of sympathy and friendship. It was not upon their impulse that their Government acted in entering this war. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval. It was a war determined upon as wars used to be determined upon in the old, unhappy days when peoples were nowhere consulted by their rulers and wars were provoked and waged in the interest of dynasties or of little groups of ambitious men who were accustomed to use their fellow men as pawns and tools. Self-governed nations do not fill their neighbour states with spies or set the course of intrigue to bring about some critical posture of affairs which will give them an opportunity to strike and make conquest. Such designs can be successfully worked out only under cover and where no one has the right to ask questions. Cunningly contrived plans of deception or aggression, carried, it may be, from generation to generation, can be worked out and kept from the light only within the privacy of courts or behind the carefully guarded confidences of a narrow and privileged class. They are happily impossible where public opinion commands and insists upon full information concerning all the nation's affairs.

A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations. No autocratic government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants. It must be a league of honour, a partnership of opinion. Intrigue would eat its vitals away; the plottings of inner circles who could plan what they would and render account to no one would be a corruption seated at its very heart. Only free peoples can hold their purpose and their honour steady to a common end and prefer the interests of mankind to any narrow interest of their own.

Does not every American feel that assurance has been added to our hope for the future peace of the world by the wonderful and heartening things that have been happening within the last few weeks in Russia? Russia was known

by those who knew it best to have been always in fact democratic at heart, in all the vital habits of her thought, in all the intimate relationships of her people that spoke their natural instinct, their habitual attitude towards life. The autocracy that crowned the summit of her political structure, long as it had stood and terrible as was the reality of its power, was not in fact Russian in origin, character, or purpose; and now it has been shaken off and the great, generous Russian people have been added in all their naive majesty and might to the forces that are fighting for freedom in the world, for justice, and for peace. Here is a fit partner for a league of honour.

One of the things that has served to convince us that the Prussian autocracy was not and could never be our friend is that from the very outset of the present war it has filled our unsuspecting communities and even our offices of government with spies and set criminal intrigues everywhere afoot against our national unity of counsel, our peace within and without our industries and our commerce. Indeed it is now evident that its spies were here even before the war began; and it is unhappily not a matter of conjecture but a fact proved in our courts of justice that the intrigues which have more than once come perilously near to disturbing the peace and dislocating the industries of the country have been carried on at the instigation, with the support, and even under the personal direction of official agents of the Imperial Government accredited to the Government of the United States. Even in checking these things and trying to extirpate them we have sought to put the most generous interpretation possible upon them because we knew that their source lay, not in any hostile feeling or purpose of the German people towards us (who were, no doubt, as ignorant of them as we ourselves were), but only in the selfish designs of a Government that did what it pleased and told its people nothing. But they have played their part in serving to convince us at last that that Government entertains no real friendship for us and means to act against our peace and security at its convenience. That it means to stir up enemies against us at our very doors the intercepted note to the German Minister at Mexico City is eloquent evidence.

We are accepting this challenge of hostile purpose because we know that in such a government, following such methods, we can never have a friend; and that in the presence of its organized power, always lying in wait to accomplish we know not what purpose, there can be no assured security for the democratic governments of the world. We are now about to accept gage of battle with this natural foe to liberty and shall, if necessary, spend the whole force of the nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power. We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretence about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included: for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no

indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them.

Just because we fight without rancour and without selfish object, seeking nothing for ourselves but what we shall wish to share with all free peoples, we shall, I feel confident, conduct our operations as belligerents without passion and ourselves observe with proud punctilio the principles of right and of fair play we profess to be fighting for.

I have said nothing of the governments allied with the Imperial Government of Germany because they have not made war upon us or challenged us to defend our right and our honour. The Austro-Hungarian Government has, indeed, avowed its unqualified endorsement and acceptance of the reckless and lawless submarine warfare adopted now without disguise by the Imperial German Government, and it has therefore not been possible for this Government to receive Count Tarnowski, the Ambassador recently accredited to this Government by the Imperial and Royal Government of Austria-Hungary; but that Government has not actually engaged in warfare against citizens of the United States on the seas, and I take the liberty, for the present at least, of postponing a discussion of our relations with the authorities at Vienna. We enter this war only where we are clearly forced into it because there are no other means of defending our rights.

It will be all the easier for us to conduct ourselves as belligerents in a high spirit of right and fairness because we act without animus, not in enmity towards a people or with the desire to bring any injury or disadvantage upon them, but only in armed opposition to an irresponsible government which has thrown aside all considerations of humanity and of right and is running amuck. We are, let me say again, the sincere friends of the German people, and shall desire nothing so much as the early reestablishment of intimate relations of mutual advantage between us — however hard it may be for them, for the time being, to believe that this is spoken from our hearts. We have borne with their present government through all these bitter months because of that friendship — exercising a patience and forbearance which would otherwise have been impossible. We shall, happily, still have an opportunity to prove that friendship in our daily attitude and actions towards the millions of men and women of German birth and native sympathy, who live amongst us and share our life, and we shall be proud to prove it towards all who are in fact loyal to their neighbours and to the Government in the hour of test. They are, most of them, as true and loyal Americans as if they had never known any other fealty or allegiance. They will be prompt to stand with us in rebuking and restraining the few who may be of a different mind and purpose. If there should be disloyalty, it will be dealt with with a firm hand of stern repression; but, if it lifts its head at all, it will lift it only here and there and without countenance except from a lawless and malignant few.

It is a distressing and oppressive duty, gentlemen of the Congress, which

I have performed in thus addressing you. There are, it may be, many months of fiery trial and sacrifice ahead of us. It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts — for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other.”¹²⁶²

6 ZIONISM IS RACISM

Jews have always been tribalistic and racist. Ancient Jews dubbed themselves the “chosen people” of a racist and genocidal God, and in so doing justified their racism and bloodlust with religion. Institutionalizing their racism as a religion guaranteed them that their progeny would remain forever segregated from the outside world of sub-human “cattle”. The racism must have come before the religious mythology, because Jewish religious mythology is based upon supremacist racism.

“*The General Assembly [***] Determines that Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination.*”—UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NUMBER 3379¹²⁶³

“For thou *art* an holy people unto the LORD thy God: the LORD thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that *are* upon the face of the earth.”—*DEUTERONOMY 7:6*

6.1 Introduction

Deuteronomy, Chapter 7, states,

“When the LORD thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee, the Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than thou; 2 And when the LORD thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them, *and* utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them: 3 Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son. 4 For they will turn away thy son from following me, that they may serve other gods: so will the anger of the LORD be kindled against you, and destroy thee suddenly. 5 But thus shall ye deal with them; ye shall destroy their altars, and break down their images, and cut down their groves, and burn their graven images with fire. 6 For thou *art* an holy people unto the LORD thy God: the LORD thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that *are* upon the face of the earth. 7 The LORD did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye *were* the fewest of all people: 8 But because the LORD loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the LORD brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of

Pharaoh king of Egypt. 9 Know therefore that the LORD thy God, he *is* God, the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him and keep his commandments to a thousand generations; 10 And repayeth them that hate him to their face, to destroy them: he will not be slack to him that hateth him, he will repay him to his face. 11 Thou shalt therefore keep the commandments, and the statutes, and the judgments, which I command thee *this* day, to do them. 12 Wherefore it shall come to pass, if ye hearken to these judgments, and keep, and do them, that the LORD thy God shall keep unto thee the covenant and the mercy which he sware unto thy fathers: 13 And he will love thee, and bless thee, and multiply thee: he will also bless the fruit of thy womb, and the fruit of thy land, thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep, in the land which he sware unto thy fathers to give thee. 14 Thou shalt be blessed above all people: there shall not be male or female barren among you, or among your cattle. 15 And the LORD will take away from thee all sickness, and will put none of the evil diseases of Egypt, which thou knowest, upon thee; but will lay them upon all *them* that hate thee. 16 And thou shalt consume all the people which the LORD thy God shall deliver thee; thine eye shall have no pity upon them: neither shalt thou serve their gods; for that *will be* a snare unto thee. 17 If thou shalt say in thine heart, These nations *are* more than I; how can I dispossess them? 18 Thou shalt not be afraid of them: *but* shalt well remember what the LORD thy God did unto Pharaoh, and unto all Egypt; 19 The great temptations which thine eyes saw, and the signs, and the wonders, and the mighty hand, and the stretched out arm, whereby the LORD thy God brought thee out: so shall the LORD thy God do unto all the people of whom thou *art* afraid. 20 Moreover the LORD thy God will send the hornet among them, until they that are left, and hide themselves from thee, be destroyed. 21 Thou shalt not be affrighted at them: for the LORD thy God *is* among you, a mighty God and terrible. 22 And the LORD thy God will put out those nations before thee by little and little: thou mayest not consume them at once, lest the beasts of the field increase upon thee. 23 But the LORD thy God shall deliver them unto thee, and shall destroy them *with* a mighty destruction, until they be destroyed. 24 And he shall deliver their kings into thine hand, and thou shalt destroy their name from under heaven: there shall no man *be able to* stand before thee, until thou have destroyed them. 25 The graven images of their gods shall ye burn with fire: thou shalt not desire the silver or gold *that is* on them, nor take *it* unto thee, lest thou be snared therein: for it *is* an abomination to the LORD thy God. 26 Neither shalt thou bring an abomination into thine house, lest thou be a cursed thing like it: *but* thou shalt utterly detest it, and thou shalt utterly abhor it; for it *is* a cursed thing.”

Rabbi Dr. J. Loeph wrote in an article entitled, “Jüdischer Volksbegriff”, in the *Central-Verein Zeitung*, Volume 1, Number 2, (11 May 1922), p. 29,

“Jüdischer Volksbegriff.

Von Rabbiner Dr. J. L o e p h.

Der Begriff des „Jüdischen Volkes“ leidet in seiner Bedeutung unter derselben Unklarheit, die in der Regel mit dem Begriffe „Volk“ überhaupt verbunden ist. Man muß hier scharf zwischen sprachlicher Herleitung und dem herausgebildeten, mit Synonymen arbeitenden Sprachgebrauch unterscheiden, obwohl nicht zu leugnen ist, daß häufig im sprachlichen Ursprung schon der scheinbar weit davon entfernte Sinn des späteren Sprachgebrauchs verdeckt enthalten ist.

Beim Herausschälen der ursprünglichen Bedeutung von „Jüdischem Volk“ tut man am besten, auf die hebräischen Bezeichnungen für „Volk“ zurückzugehen. Es scheiden zunächst aus als Sammelbegriffe engerer Art *Mischpacha*=Familie, *Beth-aboth*=Sippe, *Schebet*=Stamm. Für „Volk“ hat die hebräische Sprache zwei Bezeichnungen, die häufig als Synonyma miteinander abwechseln, im Grunde aber ganz verschieden in ihrer Herleitung und rechten Anwendung sind: *Goj* und *Am*. *Goj* hängt mit der Wurzel *Gew*=Rücken, Rückgrat, aram. *Gew*=das Innerste zusammen. Wies dieses ein von Natur fest zusammenhängendes homogenes Ganzes ist (Skelett), als wenig veränderlicher Halt für das angeschlossene, ständig Veränderliche, so stellt das Wort *Goj* zweifellos in seiner ursprünglichen Bedeutung den Begriff des von einem Ahnherrn ausgehenden, in fortlaufender Geschlechtsfolge sich ausbreitenden und abzweigenden Stammes dar, der zum Volke sich weitet. Das Kennzeichnende ist die *A b s t a m m u n g* oder gemeinsamer ererbter Landbesitz, letzteres besonders in der Mehrzahl. Die Zusammengehörigkeit ist eine natürliche und braucht nicht bewußt zu sein. Es ist das griechische *Ethnos*—Volksstamm, Menschenklasse, wie die Septuaginta *Goj* stets übersetzt.

Am hängt grammatisch mit *Im*—„mit“ zusammen und bedeutet einen bewußten, auf *K u l t u r* und *S c h i c k s a l s g e m e i n s c h a f t* beruhenden Zusammenschluß stammlich oft ganz verschiedener Individuen und Körperschaften. Die Septuaginta übersetzt es regelmäßig mit *laos*—Volkshaufe, Masse, Menge von zusammengekommenen Menschen. Daher nennt Gott Israel selten *Goj*, wenn er nämlich den seinem Dienste geweihten Stamm (*Kadosch*) meint oder ihn als solchen mit anderen Völkerschaften vergleicht, meistens aber *Am*, wenn er sein persönliches Verhältnis zu der freiwillig ihm sich anschließenden, seinem Schutze anvertrauten, seiner Liebe oder Strafe im Schicksal zugewiesenen Gemeinschaft hervorheben will. Die jüdische Religions- und Schicksalsgemeinschaft „Israel“ wird nie als *Goj*, sondern stets als *Am* bezeichnet, weshalb auch Gott sein Volk niemals *Goji* (die einzige widersprechende Stelle im Zephanja, II, 9 ist ohne Bedeutung, da es hier ganz deutlich nicht auf die Bedeutung, sondern lediglich auf die Herstellung des Parallelismus ankommt), sondern stets *Ammi*, „mein Volk“, nennt, weil die Zugehörigkeit zu Gott weniger auf der Abstammung von Abraham

berührt—wenn diese auch nicht ganz außer acht gelassen ist—, als auf dem Wandel in Gottes Wegen, der durch den Gehorsam gegen seine besonderen, dem Volke Israel gegebenen Gebote zum Ausdruck kommt.

Im gegenwärtigen Sprachgebrauch verstehen die verschiedenen jüdischen Richtungen unter „Jüdischem Volk“ je nach ihrer Stellungnahme zum Rasse-, Glaubens- und jüdisch-politischen Standpunkt verschiedenes. Man muß also immer wissen, wer der Sprecher ist, um zu wissen, was mit „Jüdischem Volk“ gemeint ist.”

6.2 Political Zionism is a Form of Racism

Political Zionism has often been condemned as a form of racism by Jew and Gentile alike. The United Nations General Assembly passed a resolution number 3379 condemning Zionism as racism on 10 November 1975:

“3379 (XXX). Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 1904 (XVIII) of 20 November 1963, proclaiming the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and in particular its affirmation that ‘any doctrine of racial differentiation or superiority is scientifically false, morally condemnable, socially unjust and dangerous’ and its expression of alarm at ‘the manifestations of racial discrimination still in evidence in some areas in the world, some of which are imposed by certain Governments by means of legislative, administrative or other measures’,

Recalling also that, in its resolution 3151 G (XXVIII) of 14 December 1973, the General Assembly condemned, *inter alia*, the unholy alliance between South African racism and zionism,

Taking note of the Declaration of Mexico on the Equality of Women and Their Contribution to Development and Peace, 1975,⁴ proclaimed by the World Conference of the International Women’s Year, held at Mexico City from 19 June to 2 July 1975, which promulgated the principle that ‘international co-operation and peace require the achievement of national liberation and independence, the elimination of colonialism and neo-colonialism, foreign occupation, zionism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in all its forms, as well as the recognition of the dignity of peoples and their right to self-determination’,

Taking note also of resolution 77 (XII) adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its twelfth ordinary session,⁵ held in Kampala from 28 July to 1 August 1975, which considered ‘that the racist régime in occupied Palestine and racist régimes in Zimbabwe and South Africa have a common imperialist origin, forming a whole and having the same racist structure and being organically linked in their policy aimed at repression of the dignity and integrity of the

human being’,

Taking note also of the Political Declaration and Strategy to Strengthen International Peace and Security and to Intensify Solidarity and Mutual Assistance among Non-Aligned Countries,⁶ adopted at the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries held at Lima from 25 to 30 August 1975, which most severely condemned zionism as a threat to world peace and security and called upon all countries to oppose this racist and imperialist ideology,

Determines that Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination.

2400th plenary meeting

10 November 1975¹²⁶⁴

This resolution was revoked in 1991, when the Zionist influence increased in the United Nations, in part due to the fall of the Soviet Union.

When confronted with the facts some racist Zionists and some of their advocates, including Einstein and many of Einstein’s advocates, too often resort to smear tactics in lieu of reasoned arguments. The *Executive Council of the International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination* stated,

“On 10 November 1975 the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted resolution 3379 (XXX) determining ‘that Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination.’ The response of Zionists and their supporters to this resolution was, not to attempt to demonstrate that the finding was in error, but to mount a campaign designed to discredit the UN and to impugn the motives of the 72 member states voting in support of it.”¹²⁶⁵

Dr. Fayeze A. Sayegh stated,

“[. . .] I am not chagrined by verbal abuse—by the insolent railing, the name-calling, to which the Delegation of the United States has resorted, both inside and outside the United Nations, ever since 3 October. ‘Perverse,’ ‘obscene,’ ‘indecent,’ ‘lies’—these words have graced and punctuated the statements of the representatives of the United States. I am not chagrined and I am not disconcerted. Long, long ago, in my first elementary course in philosophy, I was told by my professors: Only he who has no argument resorts to name-calling.⁴⁷ Name-calling is no substitute for rational discourse; name-calling is an admission of intellectual bankruptcy.”¹²⁶⁶

6.3 Most Jews Opposed Zionism

Following the Russian revolution and other Bolshevik takeovers, there was a strong backlash against Zionists and Bolsheviks, who avowed segregationist and revolutionary stances that would render obliging persons disloyal to the nations in which they lived. Some successfully and unfairly portrayed all Jews, Bolsheviks, Zionists, Anarchists and Social Democrats as if one body, though nothing could have

been further from the truth. Those who wanted to stigmatize all Jews based upon the actions and beliefs of some Jews had an easier time of it, because the Zionists presumed to speak for all Jews. Of course, these radical speeches by radical Zionists “political Messiahs” only presumed to speak for all Jews, while in reality most Jews opposed this ultra-nationalistic ancient bigotry; as even the Zionist Bolshevik Adolf Hitler was forced to concede. Hitler, though pretending to doubt what he observed, wrote,

“[T]his was the *Zionists*. It looked, to be sure, as though only a part of the Jews approved this viewpoint, while the great majority condemned and inwardly rejected such a formulation.”¹²⁶⁷

In 1910, the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* stated in its article on Theodor Herzl, the most successful advocate of political Zionism,

“[Herzl] unexpectedly gained the accession of many Jews by race who were indifferent to the religious aspect of Judaism, but he quite failed to convince the leaders of Jewish thought, who from first to last remained (with such conspicuous exceptions as Nordau and Zangwill) deaf to his pleading.”

and in its article on “Zionism”,

“Dr Herzl was joined by a number of distinguished Jewish literary men, among whom were Dr Max Nordau and Mr Israel Zangwill, and promises of support and sympathy reached him from all parts of the world. The *haute finance* and the higher rabbinate, however, stood aloof.”

Political Zionism has always been a racist doctrine. Moses Hess’ Zionist book *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism* of 1862 was blatantly racist and mirrored Herbert Spencer’s “Social Darwinism”.¹²⁶⁸ In 1895, before the appearance of Herzl’s *The Jewish State*, Zionist Yehiel Michael Pines stated,

“The Jewish people is a race that is not by its nature capable of absorbing such an alien implantation.”¹²⁶⁹

Zionists spoke in racist terms throughout the history of the movement in its various forms and incarnations.¹²⁷⁰ Gerhard Holdheim stated in 1930,

“The Zionist programme encompasses the conception of a homogenous, indivisible Jewry on a national basis. The criterion for Jewry is hence not a confession of religion, but the all-embracing sense of belonging to a racial community that is bound together by ties of blood and history and which is determined to keep its national individuality.”¹²⁷¹

In 1930 the *Central-Verein*, an institution devoted to protecting Jews from anti-

Semitism, publicly confronted the Zionists' allegiance to the Nazis and to Nazi ideology in the Party's official organ.¹²⁷² The Zionists called for the extermination of the *CV*, and the *CV* declared that it would fight back on behalf of the vast majority of German Jews, who wished to remain German. Most German Jews fought against the Zionists in the war the Zionist Jews, whom they likened to Hitler, had declared on patriotic German Jews. In their war against patriotic German Jews, whom the Zionist Jews considered abnormal, unreasonable and improper Jews,¹²⁷³ the Zionists openly allied themselves with the the anti-Semites in the German Zionist Party's official organ the *Jüdische Rundschau*, on 13 June 1933, shortly after Hitler assumed power,

“Zionism recognizes the existence of the Jewish question and wants to solve it in a generous and constructive manner. For this purpose, it wants to enlist the aid of all peoples; those who are friendly to the Jews as well as those who are hostile to them, since according to its conception, this is not a question of sentimentality, but one dealing with a real problem in whose solution all peoples are interested.”¹²⁷⁴

The eleventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* in its article on “Zionism” of 1911 states,

“Mendelssohnian culture, by promoting the study of Jewish history, gave a fresh impulse to the racial consciousness of the Jews. The older nationalism had been founded on traditions so remote as to be almost mythical; the new race consciousness was fed by a glorious martyr history, which ran side by side with the histories of the newly adopted nationalities of the Jews, and was not unworthy of the companionship. From this race consciousness came a fresh interest in the Holy Land. It was an ideal rather than a politico-nationalist interest—a desire to preserve and cherish the great monument of the departed national glories. It took the practical form of projects for improving the circumstances of the local Jews by means of schools, and for reviving something of the old social condition of Judea by the establishment of agricultural colonies. In this work Sir Moses Montefiore, the Rothschild family, and the Alliance Israélite Universelle were conspicuous. More or less passively, however, the older nationalism still lived on—especially in lands where Jews were persecuted—and it became strengthened by the revived race consciousness and the new interest in the Holy Land.”

and in its article on “Anti-Semitism”, the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* wrote,

“In the first place there is the so-called Zionist movement, which is a kind of Jewish nationalism and is vitiated by the same errors that distinguish its anti-Semitic analogue (see ZIONISM).”

Constantin Brunner stated in 1918 that political Zionists were a worse enemy to Jews than were political anti-Semites. Political Zionists and political anti-Semites were close allies who paradoxically found common ground in bigoted segregation and who demonstrated the universality of human weaknesses. Constantin Brunner stated,

“Wer vertritt ihre Interessen, wer spricht denn überhaupt über die deutschen Juden außer den Judenhassern und — außer solchen, die in der Wahrheit ganz anderes vertreten als die wirklichen Interessen der deutschen Juden: die aber für die Vertreter der deutschen Juden genommen werden und damit deren Lage noch verschlimmern. Die lautesten Sprecher nämlich sind die aus andern, aus den östlichen Ländern eingewanderten Juden, die natürlich nicht sogleich ins deutsche Wesen hinein umwachsen: es bedarf (wovon später mehr) dreier Generationen, bis die Erziehung zur Nation vollendet ist, — zum Gentleman gar sind, wie die Engländer sagen, vier Generationen glücklicher Bedingungen nötig. Unmöglich können die neu eingewanderten Juden als zur deutschen Nation gehörig sich ansehen (so wenig wie Kants Großvater sich so ansehen konnte: Abstammung aus demselben Lande, Gemeinsamkeit der Geburt verbindet am leichtesten zur Nation, welches Wort von dem Worte natus, Geburt sich herleitet — das ist aber etwas ganz anderes als gemeinsamer Rassenursprung!), und sie dürfen sich nicht wundern, wenn sie von den Deutschen als Fremde angesehen werden. Auch den Deutschen jüdischer Abstammung sind sie fremd, ja ich sage nicht zu viel, wenn ich sage, sie sind manchem von diesen genau so fremd und unsympathisch, wie sie manchen Nichtjuden und wie manchen Nichtjuden die Juden überhaupt sind. Juden, die sich keinerlei Antisemitismus anders denn als Niederträchtigkeit vorstellen können, möchte ich raten, diese hier berührte Abneigung von Juden gegenüber Juden zu studieren: eine menschliche Schwäche, ein menschlicher Fehler, aber niederträchtig darf das nicht genannt werden, oder es sind alle die vielen Juden mit dieser Abneigung ebenso niederträchtig — als Nichtjuden geboren, wären sie Antisemiten. Die meisten jüdischen Deutschen hegen ein Vorurteil, manche ein sehr häßliches, gegen die neu eingewanderten Juden, und auch wo dies nicht der Fall ist, das bleibt doch immer: jene neu Eingewanderten haben nicht das Vaterland mit ihnen gemein und nicht das Sprachvaterland, und, selbst soweit sie Deutsch reden, nicht das Aussprachvaterland (was so viel ausmacht schon zwischen Nord- und Süddeutschen — wo leider noch so manches ausmacht!). Diese neu eingewanderten Juden vertreten einseitig das Religiöse, oder sie versinken schnell in den unter uns grassierenden Ästhetismus und die entkräftende Nietzschelei (weil sie, ohne die Tradition unsrer Kultur, bei starker Anpassungsfähigkeit und Heißhunger, sich anzupassen, urteilslos der herrschenden Mode verfallen); und sie, die Unglücklichen, die kein Vaterland haben, weder dort wo ihre Wiege stand, noch unter uns, wo ihre Gräber stehen werden, sie sind die Träger der zionistischen Sehnsucht. Durch diese Juden fremder Länder fast ebenso sehr,

wenn nicht noch mehr wie durch die Judenhasser, werden viele unter uns konfus gemacht und beeinträchtigt in ihrer deutschen Haltung.

Der Zionismus und der Judenhaß hängen aber aufs engste zusammen, wie Wirkung und Ursache. Der Zionismus ist die verkehrte Reaktivität der Juden, der Hereinfall der Juden auf den rassentheoretischen Judenhaß, — solcher Juden, die nicht einsehen können, daß es mit der Emanzipation langsam geht und unmöglich ohne Rückfälle vorangehen kann; welche Rückfälle also, bei der Natur der Menschheit und ihrer Geschichte, von psychologischer und historischer Berechtigung und Notwendigkeit sind. Historisch und psychologisch natürlich und unausbleiblich waren die politischen Rückschritte, die es bis zum Jahre 1869 gab, und ist auch — da seitdem, seit der damals ausgesprochenen verfassungsmäßigen volligen Emanzipation ein politischer Rückschritt nicht mehr möglich —, ist um so eher der gesellschaftliche Rückschritt, wie wir ihn jetzt erleben. Die staatlich anerkannte Freiheit und die gesellschaftlich anerkannte Freiheit sind zweierlei, trotzdem Staat und Gesellschaft im Grunde dasselbe sind und, was der Staat tut, die Gesellschaft tut. Aber jegliches Tun hat zweierlei Gesichter: bevor es getan und nachdem es getan ist; sowohl das rechte wie das verkehrte Tun hat diese zweierlei Gesichter. Die staatliche Emanzipation der Juden war das Tun der Gesellschaft vor der Verwirklichung: die eigentliche Emanzipation ist erst die der Wirklichkeit in der Gesellschaft; diese Emanzipation kann unmöglich so schnell in Gestaltung der Freiheit und alles Leben sich umsetzen, wie sie auf dem Papier der Verfassung vollständig geschrieben steht, aber sie hat doch bereits begonnen sich umzusetzen, das andre Gesicht der vollzogenen Emanzipation zeigt sich, und dagegen reagiert nun die Gesellschaft, als hätte sie gar nicht gewollt, was sie getan hat. Sie versteht sich selber nicht, sie hat wohl gewollt, sie will auch weiter (weil sie muß): sie kann nur noch nicht. Sie wird immer besser können, je mehr sie muß, und je mehr man ihr von dem abkämpft, was sie „geschenkt“ hatte. Hier von Geschenk zu reden, das gehört zur Selbstglorifikation der Menschen — Geschenke haben oftmals gute Gründe anderswoher als aus Zucker und Freiheit, und gar Freiheit?! Freiheit wird niemals geschenkt und kann niemals geschenkt werden, sie will erkämpft sein in langem Kampfe, darin es nicht immer nur Siege geben kann; und wie selber das Siegen immer auch ein Stück Unterliegen und Verlieren mit sich bringt, so haben ebenfalls die Niederlagen ihr Wertvolles. Was läßt sich Tröstlicheres und Wahreres sagen als das Sprichwort: „Ein Unglück ist besser als alle Ratschläge.“ Gut auch liest man bei Beaconsfield: „Ein Fehlschlag ist nichts, er kann verdient sein oder man kann ihm abhelfen: im ersten Falle bringt er Selbsterkenntnis, im zweiten ruft er eine neue Kombination hervor, die gewöhnlich siegreich ist.“ Aber die Menschen im allgemeinen, und also auch die Juden im allgemeinen, haben kürzere Gedanken und sind gar zu bald entmutigt; hinzu kommt noch der große Tiefstand der Emanzipationsidee in einigen Ländern, wo noch die Juden in mittelalterlichem Elend leben; dadurch wurden viele Juden unter uns vollends niedergeschlagen und verwirrt. So sind sie

hereingefallen auf die Rassentheorie der Judenhasser weit schlimmer als andre Deutsche; kopfunten stürzten sie in den Abgrund [*Footnote*: Das ist kein erfundener Scherz, sondern man kann es bei Zollschan, „Das Rassenproblem“ nachlesen, wie der Zionismus den Chamberlain zum Lehrmeister nimmt und dessen unsinnwüesteste Offenbarungen nachlallt.] Die übrigen Deutschen sind beinah ohne Rassenerinnerung, abgerechnet die Adligen, die aber gleichfalls allesamt immer noch tausendmal besser als mit i h r e n Vorfahren, mit Abraham, Isaak und Jakob Bescheid wissen — das sind Vorfahren, mit denen alle Deutschen Bescheid wissen, und mit Christus wissen alle Deutschen Bescheid: statt der Überlieferung von ihrer eigenen Rasse haben die Deutschen, haben überhaupt unsre Völker die Überlieferung von der jüdischen Rasse, wie unser Kulturzustand es mit sich bringt. Unter den übrigen Deutschen also, deren Rasse nicht so viel von sich selber spricht wie die Träger der Rassentheorie, konnte diese nichts andres hervorrufen als einen törichten, bald wieder verschwindenden Modeunfug: aber bei den Juden hat sie, wegen der Stärke der tatsächlich vorhandenen Rassenerinnerung, tatsächlich eine noch größere Steigerung des Rassenbewußtseins zur Folge gehabt; und einige Juden konnten auf die Konfundierung des Rassenbewußtseins mit der Nationalität derart konfus hereinfliegen, daß sie aus ihrer wirklichen Nationalität herausfielen. Das heißt eine Tür aufmachen, um ein Fenster zu schließen. Der Zionismus führt nicht nach Zion, sondern ins Ghetto, wenn auch nicht korporaliter, so doch mentaliter; ins Ghetto ohne Mauern, in die Absonderung nach Leben und Lebensgefühl. Wie konnten Deutsche jüdischer Abstammung von einer jüdischen Nation zu reden beginnen und aus der bösesten Verleumdung den Traum ihres größten Unsinnns machen! Wie konnten überhaupt Juden, die geschichtlichsten aller Menschen, mit der am höchsten hinaufreichenden geschichtlichen Erinnerung und mit dem lebendigsten geschichtlichen Wollen, wie konnten sie aus der Melodie geraten und so weit abirren zu derartigem geschichtslosen Pseudoideal! Die Juden eine Nation! Der österreichischer Herzl hat sie gewiß verwechselt mit den nach nationaler Selbständigkeit ringenden österreichischen Völkern, und andre haben Zionsehnsucht der frommgläubigen Juden mit politischem Heimweh, mit politischem Zionismus verwechselt; die doch aber nichts miteinander gemein haben. Ernsthaft nehmen läßt sich nicht einmal die Schwärmerei osteuropäischer Juden, die auf alle Weise verhindert werden, das Land, in welchem sie leben, als ihr Vaterland zu betrachten, und deren Herz denn immer noch in Jerusalem und Zion ist — nicht einmal diese Schwärmerei kann man ernsthaft nehmen, und sie hat noch weniger Aussicht als die gleiche Schwärmerei der Kreuzfahrer hatte, oder als die gleiche Schwärmerei so mancher noch bestehender christlicher chiliastischer Sekten hat. Gar aber unsre frommgläubigen Juden, die auf die Tage des Messias harren, wo die Völker ihre Schwerter zu Pflugscharen und ihre Spieße zu Sicheln machen, der Löwe Stroh ißt wie ein Rind und Säuglinge ihre Lust haben werden am Loch der Otter, — ach, schließt nicht unser Wachen Träume in sich wie

unser Schlafen? Jene frommgläubigen, jene traumgläubigen Juden mit ihrem Vertrauen auf die Verheißungen, mit ihrer Bibel, „dem aufgeschriebenen Vaterland der Kinder Gottes,“ sie harren wahrlich nicht auf ihr politisches Reich, sondern auf ein Wunder — das die Zionisten nimmer vollbringen werden, vielmehr heißt es von diesen Meschichim en masse und Verlockern zu einer falschen historischen Tat: „Deine Tröster verführen dich und zerstören den Weg, den du gehen sollst“; sie sind „Diener der Zerschneidung“, und der Zionismus ist wahrlich eher Antimessias als Messias zu nennen. Die Juden eine Nation!? In den verschiedenen Häusern der Stadt die zerschnittenen Stücke Braten auf den Tellern will ich eher einen lebendigen Ochsen nennen als die Juden eine Nation! Aber wären sie tausendmal eine Nation — ließe sich darum diese Nation in Palästina wieder einsetzen? Ein Nagel haftet in der Wand, ist er aber einmal herausgerissen, dann nützt kein ihn wieder in das alte Loch stecken; er hält da nicht mehr. — Wie es mit den Deutschen jüdischer Abstammung hinsichtlich der Nation steht, das wollen wir später betrachten, wo wir betrachten, wie es mit den übrigen Deutschen hinsichtlich der Nation steht. Das können wir erst, nachdem wir über den Staat und die politischen Parteien uns auseinandergesetzt haben.

Mit den Worten gegen den Zionismus möchte ich nicht mißverstanden werden — doch muß ich das Gesagte gesagt sein lassen auf die Wahrscheinlichkeit hin, mißverstanden zu werden. Davor bleibe ich wohl nicht bewahrt, trotz der ausdrücklich hinzugefügten Erklärung, daß ich eine jüdische Siedelung von osteuropäischen Juden, eine Siedelung mit Selbstverwaltung unter Staatshoheit eines der bestehenden Staaten als ein mit allen Mitteln und mit allen Opfern zu erstrebendes Ziel ansehe — von osteuropäischen Juden, weil sie entrechtet, entehrt und entmenschet werden, aus keinem andern Grunde, und nicht der osteuropäischen Juden; denn man kann überzeugt sein, daß auch für Osteuropa die Judenemanzipation kommen wird wie für Westeuropa. Aber was hat eine derartige jüdische Siedelung mit der Pseudonationalidee der Zionisten zu schaffen? die ebenso närrisch und gefährlich ist, wie es unter diesen Zionisten bereits unleidliche Chauvinisten gibt, deren zionistische Betätigungen gegen die Nichtzionisten manchmal nicht besser sind als Antisemitismus. Die Zionisten haben sich das Dogma *R a s s e u n d N a t i o n* auf die allerärgste Weise angeeignet und sind, als Assimilanten dieses Antisemitendogmas mit ihrer verhängnisvollen Agitation dafür, Feinde nicht allein der Emanzipation der Juden, sondern auch der Emanzipation der Menschheit oder der Kultur und damit auch der Grundidee des Judentums. (Ich meine hier nicht Männer wie Herzl, Nordau, Zangwill, die von ganz andrem Schlage sind und da niemals mitgingen — edle Männer, denen man bis in die letzten Ecken und Tiefen der Natur trauen kann, und die edel geirrt haben.) Der Zionismus ist die Traufe des Regens Antisemitismus, und die Zionisten sind den Juden gefährlicher als die Antisemiten. Indem die Zionisten den ungeheuersten aller Fehler begehen, die Juden zu isolieren und ihnen den lächerlichsten Nationalismus, den

anationalen und antinationalen Traumnationalismus aufzureden, bringen sie tatsächlich die Juden zu dem, weswegen die Antisemiten sie nur verleumdeten; es gibt nun Juden, von denen wahr ist, was Antisemiten behaupten, und gilt nicht länger: Antisemiten sagens, es ist Lüge. Die Antisemiten bestritten nur den Juden ihre Nationalität, die Zionisten aber machen sie derselben unwürdig und unfähig und morden sie in ihnen. Die Zionisten bilden eine Gefahr und Schwierigkeit, deren Größe von den Deutschen jüdischer Abstammung nicht verkannt werden darf; aber unser Grundsatz laute: Es gibt keine Gefahren! Sie sind dazu da, überwunden zu werden, jede Gefahr ist zu überwinden — Feuer kann nicht verbrennen, aber ertrinken. Es gibt keine Gefahren und Schwierigkeiten, oder es gibt kein Leben! Hindurch durch Judenhaß hier, Zionismus dort; wir werden immer kräftig genug sein, zu überwinden und auch noch die um uns herum zu stärken und mit uns emporzuführen. Der Zionismus wird unter uns um so weniger Boden gewinnen und um so schneller den gewonnenen wieder verlieren, je weniger Einfluß und Macht wir den Judenhassern über uns zulassen.”¹²⁷⁵

The dangerous rhetoric of racist Zionist Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis, and his Jewish racist compatriots, was rejected by most Jews, who were more sophisticated and enlightened in their beliefs. *The New York Times*, on 25 November 1917 (shortly after the Balfour Declaration was issued), in Section 9 on page 3, published an anti-Zionist appeal from Rabbi Dr. Samuel Schulman, which had first appeared in *The American Hebrew*, in which the Rabbi argued that Israel consisted of an international religious movement, not an individual nation. *The New York Times* published Professor Ralph Philip Boas’ lecture “Youth and Judaism” on 23 April 1917 on page 9, in which Boas, who was Jewish, condemned Jewish racism,

“Racialism the Great Danger.

‘The greatest danger, however, that stands in the way of the attempt of Judaism to reach its largest usefulness is racialism, that blind and unquestioning admission of one’s superiority. The basic idea of racialism seems to be this, that, since one is born a Jew, it is his duty to develop his Jewishness to the fullest extent without reference to the fact that his particular race may not have absorbed all the good gifts of God. To put the case as brutally as possible, racialism is uncritical egotism.

‘I am no assimilationist: I have no desire to see the Jews lose the qualities which they add to the commonwealth of nations, but I cannot but feel that there is something mechanical in the everlasting emphasis upon the things which make Jews different from other people. Why should a man always pride himself upon all the qualities, good and bad, which differentiate him from other people? There is something abhorrent in the throwing overboard of standards of value. Let us cultivate the good qualities of the Jewish race because they are good and refuse to cultivate the bad qualities just because they are Jewish.

‘Four dangers, then, do their best to prevent the Jew from vitalizing in the hearts of young men an ideal of discipline and responsibility, and so making a valuable contribution toward the settlement of the central problem of democracy—religious romanticism, humanitarian materialism, formalism, and racialism. What then is left? What can the Jew offer which will make against the mere expression of impulse and make for the concentration of energy? What can the Jew offer? I can answer in one word—Judaism.

‘Judaism, genuine and vital, Judaism freed from extravagance and excess. Judaism freed alike from formalism and false mysticism. Judaism, that religion the heart and soul of which is law, but law, magnetized by magnificent humanity.’”

The New York Times published Professor Ralph Philip Boas’ statement directly condemning political Zionism as anti-American and dangerous, on 16 December 1917, Section 4, page 4:

“PROGRAM OF ZIONISM MENACES JEWISH UNITY BY RALPH P. BOAS

THE fall of Jerusalem is one of the most romantic events of the great war, for it gives reality to what has for a generation been a dream—Zionism. That Zion with its memories and its romance should once more pass into the keeping of its ancient people, that God should once again be praised in the ancient liturgy in a new temple, that the ancient culture which gave Europe its religion should once more flourish—here are possibilities the realization of which might well stir the most pedestrian mind.

It is just because the Zionist program is near fulfillment that honest criticism must not be stifled. This is no time for a comfortable and easy acquiescence to what is after all a matter involving the future, not of a few thousand colonists, but of the whole Jewish world. For Zionism is not merely a proposal to erect a new State in Palestine; it is a program of life for Jews everywhere. The Zionists maintain that Judaism is a way of life. Judaism, they hold, presupposes a complete round of human activity. It presupposes certain theological beliefs and certain spiritual activities consequent upon these beliefs. It presupposes also a submission to the traditional discipline of Jewish law. It holds that such spiritual activity and such submission to discipline are impossible in countries which cannot make allowance for them, countries in which custom, prejudice, and convenience are all against separatism and individuality in everyday life.

Zionism maintains, therefore, that the only possible way for a man to be a complete Jew is to believe in Jewish theology, to order his spiritual life as that theology dictates, to obey faithfully the minute prescription of the

traditional Jewish law, to speak a Jewish language, to cultivate the Jewish arts, to live in a Jewish land under a Jewish government. The Zionist maintains, moreover, that Judaism is now confronted with a very real issue, preservation or extinction.

With the last of the compact European Jewries in process of dissolution, Judaism has no longer any central home. The result is gradual but inevitable assimilation, which can have only one end, the extinction of Judaism as a religion and of the Jews as a group.

Assimilation is the crux of the Jewish problem as the Zionists see it. Zionism demands, therefore, that Jews regard themselves as a nationality forming with a dozen other nationalities a union under the Stars and Stripes. It would consider America not as a 'melting pot,' but as a magnified Balkan peninsula. It would, if consistently interpreted, regard the individualism shown by the Germans in the United States and by the French Canadians in the Dominion as entirely justified, since these groups refuse to allow their individuality to be fused with others into a single national group. Zionism is therefore more than a romantic adventure; it is a very practical and momentous issue.

That Zionism has its dangers is obvious. And these dangers are the more vital, since it is likely that men carried away by sympathy with and admiration for success may fail to recognize them.

The gravest danger lies in a concept of German pseudo-science, the 'Jewish race.' The world sees only dimly that the riot of national romanticism which is upon us is the child of Kultur. The idea of a primitive unspoiled German race which in all respects was like an individual and which, therefore, was under the biological necessity of living its life as the plant lives, tirelessly and remorselessly—this idea is the father of the present insistence of self-styled nationalities on independent existence. Some men, instead of finding out by what right they ask for the creation of a new state, assume that the world should recognize their yearning for peculiarity as inspired by a kind of zoological necessity. The mere blind impulse to be one's self, to remain on earth as an individual, fundamental though it be, is after all a characteristic which one shares with the cabbage.

The fact is that there is no pure Jewish blood. The whole record of Judaism is a record of constant intermarriage and assimilation. Every one knows that Jews differ among themselves as much as Frenchmen, and that the class-concept 'Jew' is the product of loose observation of particular groups. All talk of race necessity in connection with Zionism is misleading. The only possible justification for Zionism is that it will enable Jews to live better lives. Zionists are continually maintaining that only in Palestine can Jews live nobly; that Judaism as a religion can live only where Jews have political autonomy. There is a causal relationship assumed here which needs to be proved. Even Ahad Ha'Am, perhaps the greatest of the Zionists, sometimes despaired because many Zionists could see only the political side of their movement, and it therefore paid no attention to its truly valuable

aspects, the Jewish culture, the Jewish religion, the Jewish ethics. What assurances have we that Jews, when tangled in the problems of political administration, will automatically become nobler and finer men. There is every assurance that they will not, for they must necessarily shift the burden of effort from religious and ethical achievement to political achievement.

Moreover, Zionism is continually emphasizing the breach between Jew and Christian which most of us are trying to bridge. As the child of anti-Semitism, it thrives on persecution. Its central argument is that Jews can never be at home in a 'foreign' land. It makes capital of every instance of petty intolerance and nourishes itself upon the ill-will which Jews are prone to fancy even when it is not present. The chip which many Jews bear more or less ostentatiously now that the yellow badge has been removed, some Zionists magnify into a veritable Pilgrim's burden which can drop from the bent back only upon the soil of Palestine. Zionists are continually heaping abuse upon the non-separatist, upon the man who has no desire to be different from other human beings and is very grateful that he does not have to be a marked man among men. Many of us do not believe that peculiarity is the most desirable thing in life. We honestly believe that the separation of church and state is one of the great blessings of life, and that among some Jews there is altogether too much inbreeding of ideas and sentiment. We honestly feel that Jews have still a few things to learn from others. We realize that we must continually make efforts to retain our Judaism, but if Judaism is so far gone that its only salvation lies in becoming a little State it had much better die and be done with the unequal struggle. As a mere survival it has only the value of a sentimental curiosity.

But one may grant all these things and still ask: If there are Jews who can be happy only in Palestine, why not let them go there and be happy? But such is not the real issue. Zionists want political independence. They want to speak as the Jewish people. In short, they want to arrogate a supremacy which non-Zionists can never dream of giving them without a struggle. Whether we will or no, the world insists upon looking at Jews as a unit. For what one Jew does, in the eyes of the world all Jews are responsible. We bear upon our backs the burden of many a Jew who is disgrace to the air he breathes. With such a spirit abroad, Zionists would, consciously or unconsciously, dragoon us into a citizenship and a nationality which we do not want. Every rash act of a Jewish politician would be the rash act of our brother. We will not be dragooned out of America into Palestine. It is all very well for Zionists to say that non-Zionists will not be affected by what goes on in a new Jerusalem, but they know that they are not facing the facts. Who of us Jews can escape being drafted into whatever is done by a 'Jewish people' under a 'Jewish flag'?

In its attempt to force unity upon all Jews, whether they want it or no, Zionism is on the brink of splitting Judaism irreconcilably. There are men who urge that now is the time for a new peace in Judaism, that with an approaching consummation Zionism ought to receive new confidence and

encouragement. Such a wish is far from fulfillment. Not harmony but disruption is in sight. It is inconceivable that American Jews should allow their future to be determined by the group of men who will control the Zionist State. They would have but one resource, to cast off their bonds and convince the world that Jews, truly American Jews, could not take the responsibility for men who attempted to reconcile loyalty to America with a foreign nationality.

Who knows what the future may bring forth? Who knows what entangling alliances an independent Palestine might form? One must remember Trotzky, Dernburg, and Hillquit. They, too, are Jews. No country now can escape international association. Those dreamers who think that Zion could occupy a splendid isolation in international politics have no sense of history. They make the same mistake as the dreamers who think that the puny protests of a Government at Jerusalem could end Jewish persecution everywhere. Just so long as genuinely active anti-Semitism which would call forth protest is possible, just so long will little States have no power. A condition of international good-will which will make the voice of a little State heard in the council of nations, will make of anti-Semitism an impossibility.

The future is clear. The complete Zionist program means a complete disruption of Jewish unity. With Zion an independent state every American Jew must become a Zionist and take responsibility for the acts of Zionists, or find some other name than Jew. No one, of course, can object to colonies of Jews in Palestine, or anywhere else. But, every Jew who values his independence and the Americanism of which he has become a part will object as never before to the complete Zionist program. What was once a dream has now become almost a reality. And as it becomes real it becomes, just because of its romantic associations, insidiously dangerous.”

In 1948, Zionist Mordecai Menahem Kaplan stated,

“Similarly American Jewry will for a long time have to give moral, political, and economic support to the Eretz Israel enterprise, which is the deciding factor in Israel’s struggle for survival in the modern world. [***] Judaism cannot function in a vacuum. It has to be geared to a living community. In that community all who wish to be known as Jews should be registered, and expulsion from it should deprive one of the right to use the name Jew.”¹²⁷⁶

In 1953, shortly after the State of Israel became a reality, Alfred M. Lilienthal, who is Jewish, reacted to the pressure placed on American Jews to support something foreign to them as if it were an unavoidable obligation,

“During the events which altered the relationship between the Kremlin and Israel the reaction in this country was to treat the Israeli crisis as if it were the crisis of the Jewish people all over the world. But if the political problems of

Israel continue to be the political responsibility of Jews in the United States, disaster must follow. Innumerable situations will involve Israel in policies and politics which nationals of no other country may dare underwrite. Next time, the enemy of Israel may not be the enemy of the United States. [***] This book has been written, against the concerned counsel of many who are close and dear to me, because I feel I owe a duty to my country above any duty I owe to my family and friends. [***] I have received innumerable admonitions ‘not to say anything that might harm the Jewish people.’ But, indeed, my efforts are intended to benefit American Jewry. Criticism expressed in these pages and directed against guilty leadership could involve all Jews only by the process of generalizing—the favorite weapon of anti-Semites. And yet, I do not underestimate for one moment the wrath that will descend upon me for having written this book. Every conceivable kind of pressure will be exerted, I am afraid, to prevent a fair consideration of the material set forth in its pages. [***] I have written this book because I, an American of Jewish faith, have not the slightest doubt that American Jewry, too, has a free choice—and must face the consequences of whatever it will choose. [***] In this one sense, the establishment of the State of Israel may yet prove to have been a providential blessing: now that those Jews who crave their separate nationhood can go to Israel, the last reason has been removed for the pernicious Jewish duality outside the Holy Land. Now each American Jew has been given a free choice to be either an American of Jewish faith or a nationalist Israeli in his own Middle East State. He can not be both. For him who cherishes the clannishness of particularism above everything else, there is only one honorable course—to emigrate to Israel. And the American Jew, who desires to harmonize his special religious beliefs with the universal pattern of American existence, will now have to cut all political ties with Zionism and the State of Israel. For American Judaism can survive only when it is so completely divorced from Israel as American Protestantism is divorced from England.”¹²⁷⁷

In 1965, Moshe Menuhin published an exposé of Jewish racism and tribalism entitled *The Decadence of Judaism in Our Time*. Menuhin knew that he would probably be attacked for revealing many truths and sought to shield his son from any potential Zionist retaliation. He wrote, among other things, in the preface of his book,

“It is not an easy or a pleasant job to perform; yet my very strong sense of duty and my anxiety compel me to undertake it. I am absolutely convinced of the truthfulness of my studies, observations and conclusions. I serve nobody’s interests, and I am paid by no one. Yet, though I carefully and honestly stick to facts, I know that I am bound to antagonize the fanatical and professional idealists among the ‘Jewish’ nationalists. Therefore, please remember this: my son Yehudi Menuhin is in no way responsible for any opinion expressed here on Jewish life. In fact, he knows nothing about this

spiritual adventure of mine. He has not read my manuscript. At this stage of our lives we are two wholly independent persons, fully emancipated from each other, intellectually and spiritually. Neither of us is answerable for the other. If the ‘father has eaten sour grapes. . . the son shall not bear the sin of the father. . .’¹²⁷⁸

Menuhin concluded his book,

“Those, however, who cannot make the indispensable adjustment in the new post-World Wars nuclear age, and who feel that they must withdraw from the general community in America and live apart as ‘Jewish’ nationals—let them be honest enough with themselves and withdraw completely by going to live in Israel. Above all, they must leave us alone as integrated Americans.

I have made my position witheringly clear. The time is immutably coming when we will have to face the awful question the ‘Jewish’ nationalists have imposed upon us: Are we American nationals, or Israeli nationals? We cannot and will not be both!

I can hear some ask naïvely or bitterly: Is it nice to wash dirty linen in public? Well, shall we wait helplessly until a catastrophe overtakes us here, when a few of us might have the hollow satisfaction of saying: ‘I told you so’? It will be much too late then. Must one contribute to the delinquency of presumptuous, fanatical and retrograde professional Jews who are running away with themselves? Must one be blind and join the complacent and silent Jews who help the destructive forces by sheer default?

The time has come to air and publicly expose this uncalled-for, self-engendered ‘Jewish problem’ that is being recklessly foisted upon us by ‘Jewish’ nationalists of the Old World. They are simply exploiting the goodness and kindness, as well as the sorrows and sympathies, of innocent, ignorant but warm-hearted Jews who feel that but for the grace of God, they too might have been turned into lampshades and soap in the crematoriums of Hitler’s Germany. The ‘Jewish’ nationalists now want us, American and English and other Western Jews, to become ‘refugees,’ manpower in a greater ‘Jewish homeland.’

My conscience had been bothering me ever since the Balfour Declaration came out in 1917 to undo the normal course of evolution of the Jews and of Judaism. I felt then that I could no longer belong to the ‘gang’ of which I was a dedicated member by indoctrination and brainwashing. I hope that this book will contribute to healthier and more independent thinking by innocent but misguided American and English Jews, as well as by Jews in other countries. I hope that it will also contribute to a better and more sympathetic understanding by the Gentile world of that great majority of innocent, loyal, grateful but confused Jews who now must win a new war of emancipation—an emancipation this time from their benighted fellow Jews, the ‘Jewish’ nationalists, who have perverted and degenerated the noble

heritage of universal Judaism.”¹²⁷⁹

Theodor Herzl gives evidence to the fact that from its very inception, most Jews vigorously opposed Zionism.¹²⁸⁰ The only way for Herzl, a self-appointed Messiah, to be successful was for him to increase and generate anti-Semitism and in so doing force the Jews from their homes in Europe, which they did not wish to leave.

Professor Arnold J. Toynbee was quoted in an article entitled, “Toynbee Predicts Gains by Judaism: Historian Assails Zionism as Akin to Anti-Semitism”, in *The New York Times* on 7 May 1961, on page 37,

“Zionism and anti-Semitism are expressions of an identical point of view[.] The assumption underlying both ideologies is that it is impossible for Jews and non-Jews to grow together into a single community, and that therefore a physical separation is the only practical way out. The watchword of anti-Semitism is ‘back to the medieval apartheid;’ the watchword of Zionism is ‘back to the medieval ghetto.’ All far-flung ghettos in the world are to be gathered into one patch of soil in Palestine to create a single consolidated ghetto there.”

The report on the First Zionist Congress in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 3 September 1897 on page 10 opened with the statement,

“The event which has been looked forward to with so much interest in a large section of the Jewish people and severely criticised in anticipation by another section has at length arrived—the Zionist Congress hasmet.”

In fact the “section” opposed was immensely greater than the “section” that approved of political Zionism, and the majority of Jews hated the Zionists and considered them mad.¹²⁸¹ Both the Old Testament (*Leviticus* 26. *Deuteronomy* 4:24-27; 28:15-68; 30:1-3. II *Chronicles* 7:19-22. *Jeremiah* 29:1-7) and the Babylonian Talmud, *Tractate Kethuboth* (also: “Ketubot”), 111a, make it clear that the Jews must not hasten the coming of the Messiah and must wait for the Messiah to establish a Jewish state, before emigrating to Palestine in large numbers. Israel Shahak and Norton Mezvinsky wrote in their book *Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel*,

“The Haredi objection to Zionism is based upon the contradiction between classical Judaism, of which the Haredim are the continuators, and Zionism. Numerous Zionist historians have unfortunately obfuscated the issues here. Some detailed explanation is therefore necessary. In a famous talmudic passage in *Tractate Ketubot*, page 111, which is echoed in other parts of the Talmud, God is said to have imposed three oaths on the Jews. Two of these oaths that clearly contradict Zionist tenets are: 1) Jews should not rebel against non-Jews, and 2) as a group should not massively emigrate to Palestine before the coming of the Messiah. (The third oath, not discussed here, enjoins the Jews not to pray too strongly for the coming of the Messiah,

so as not to bring him before his appointed time.) During the course of post-talmudic Jewish history, rabbis extensively discussed the three oaths. Of major concern in this discussion was the question of whether or not specific Jewish emigration to Palestine was part of the forbidden massive emigration. During the past 1,500 years, the great majority of traditional Judaism's most important rabbis interpreted the three oaths and the continued existence of the Jews in exile as religious obligations intended to expiate the Jewish sins that caused God to exile them."¹²⁸²

Christians believe that the Jews had broken the Covenant and that a new Covenant had been made (*Matthew* 12:30; 21:43-45. *Romans* 9; 11:7-8. *Galatians* 3:16. *Hebrews* 8:6-10). Thomas A. Kolsky wrote in his book *Jews Against Zionism*,

“The first vehement outburst by anti-Zionists occurred in 1897 at the time of the first Zionist congress. When news reached the German community in May 1897 that the Zionists were planning to hold their congress in Munich, German rabbis representing all shades of opinion, whom Herzl contemptuously dubbed *Protestrabbiner*, objected angrily and forced the Zionists to shift their gathering to Basle, Switzerland. In public protests in the Jewish *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums* on 11 June 1897 and in a number of German newspapers, including the *Berliner Tageblatt*, on 6 July 1897, the rabbis denounced Zionism as fanaticism, contrary to the teachings of the Jewish scriptures, and affirmed their undivided loyalty to Germany.³¹

In 1917 the negotiations between the British cabinet and the Zionists over the Balfour Declaration stirred up a sharp reaction against the Zionist movement among British Jews. Prominent Jewish communal leaders, such as Lucien Wolf, Claude Montefiore, and Laurie Magnus, denounced Zionism as an ally of anti-Semitism, warning that it undermined the security of Jews throughout the world. In a letter to the London *Times* on 14 May 1917, the prestigious Conjoint Foreign Committee, the recognized representative body of British Jews in matters affecting Jews abroad, declared that the emancipated Jews of England considered themselves a religious community without any separate national aspirations. In fact, the foremost anti-Zionist within the British government during the deliberations over the Balfour Declaration was Sir Edwin Montagu, a Jewish member of the cabinet, who equated support for Zionism with anti-Semitism and characterized Zionism as ‘a mischievous creed.’ This anti-Zionist agitation and especially Montagu’s influence undoubtedly contributed to diluting the final version of the Balfour Declaration: the change of the central phrase from ‘Palestine as the National Home,’ which the Zionists had suggested, to ‘in Palestine as a National Home’; and the inclusion of a safeguard clause providing for the protection of the civil and religious rights of the ‘non-Jewish communities in Palestine’ as well as ‘the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.’³²”¹²⁸³

The New York Times reported on 22 August 1897 on page 12,

“Jews Against Zionism.

A violent split has taken place among the Jews all over the world. It is caused by the new course which Zionism recently adopted, and which is to find practical expression at the Zionist Congress to be held at Basle on the 29th, 30th, and 31st inst.

The meaning of Zionism hardly needs explanation. Up till recently Zionism, as is known, had only a religious and philanthropic tendency, and found many adherents also among believing Christians in England. But since the persecution of the Jews began in Russia and Roumania some ten years ago, and since anti-Semitism in Austria and Germany made the social position of the Jews more intolerable than it was before, the thought of establishing a Jewish state, if possible in old Judea, has gained ground, not only among the Jews of those countries mentioned, but also among the Jews in the rest of the world. Many of them thought that a purely philanthropic movement would always be but a palliative, and would never lead to a solution of the Jewish question. The many millions spent by Barons Hirsch and Rothschild on colonizing have produced only very slight results. And so arose the idea of political independence. The once philanthropic Jewish party of Zionists adopted a wider programme, so that now Zionism actually connotes the revival of the Jewish nationality by the establishment of a Jewish state. In short, Zionism has become a political and social movement. The idea had its origin among the Jews of Eastern Europe, where they are more or less persecuted or oppressed, as in Russia and Roumania, and even, too, in Austria; but curiously enough the movement has been eagerly fostered by many Jews in America and England, where Jewish citizens enjoy full and equal liberty with their Gentile fellow-citizens. The consolidation of nationalities is a characteristic feature of our century. Italy, Greece, Roumania, Servia, and Bulgaria owe their existence to the principle of nationality, a principle no less powerful and perhaps no less erroneous than was that of the Crusades, but one that urges on the people of this century with an irresistible force. National integration is carried so far in Europe that petty peoples, whose very names have hardly reached your shores, peoples so insignificant that they have neither a literary nor a spiritual past, which have possessed a grammar and a dictionary of their own languages only for the last ten to twenty years, are struggling for their national individuality with greater zeal and passion than those displayed in their pursuit of all other worldly goods, important as the latter may be.

Jewish Students Hold Aloof.

Considering that tendency, it is no wonder that the idea of political resurrection has taken possession of that race which produced monotheism, and which during 2,000 years of oppression has given numerous proofs of intellectual vigor and vitality. Only a few years ago no educated Jew in England, Germany, or Russia would have dreamed of calling himself

anything but an Englishman, a German, or a Russian. To-day many are heard to say that they are only Jews. It is chiefly young people that has been seized with this unpatriotic tendency, which is so hurtful to them. At the universities of Berlin, Vienna, and other German towns the Jewish students have almost entirely given up the intercourse with the students of other creeds, which was carried on so pleasantly for decades. They have left all the common students' societies. In Vienna alone for some years there have been five academical societies for Jews only. With positively phantastic enthusiasm the young men cling to the dreamed-of ideal of a Jewish state. No doubt anti-Semitism in Austria and Germany has done a great deal to drive young Jews to this senseless and dangerous course. But it is not surprising that it has come to that. The Gentile university students are mostly anti-Semitic. But youth soon exaggerates and overflows. Formerly the brotherly understanding among the students of different races and religions was complete; creed and race were never thought of in their social intercourse. But now matters have utterly changed. Jewish students are met with blind racial hatred. No distinction is made; they are all socially banished. All noble qualities are denied them. They are declared to be nobodies. An insult from a Jew is no insult. At German universities dueling is still very usual. Jewish students are never challenged, or, it is said, a Jew is an unworthy individual, incapable of giving satisfaction.

Leaders of the Movement.

Political Zionism has been awakened and promoted chiefly by Dr. Herzl's book, 'Der Judenstaat,' (the Jewish State,) a clever but rather Utopian book, which was translated into all European languages immediately after its publication. Dr. Herzl and Dr. Max Nordau in Paris are the chief literary exponents of this new movement. Dr. Herzl has told me that the leaders are endeavoring first of all to organize a wholesale emigration of Jews from all countries. A 'Society of Jews' is to be formed; in London there are already considerable funds at its disposal. A plan has been formed for acquiring part of Palestine from Turkey and settling the immigrants there. Out of its funds the society would pay the Sultan a considerable annual tribute, on the strength of which he could raise a loan for the purpose of consolidating the disordered funds of his empire. In return he would protect the Jewish state, which would have complete self-government. The leaders hope for resolutions are to come which will lead to the execution of the scheme.

Meanwhile, however, a serious counter-movement has arisen, especially among the German Jews. Originally it was intended to hold the congress at Munich, but the German Jews protested against it. It has now become apparent that only a small number of the Jews in all countries favor these fantastic plans. As long as the projects were only on paper these objectors held their peace. But now that attempts are being made to carry them out, the great majority of thoughtful and serious Jews throughout the world have commenced a decided opposition to the unrealizable and damaging schemes. This majority emphatically denies the existence of a Jewish nationality, and

condemns the new Zionist postulates. The majority holds that creed alone unites the Jews of divers countries. They are quite different from one another in language, manners, customs, thought, and culture. Such heterogeneous elements could never be welded together into a state; they simply would not understand one another. But, apart from that, they feel themselves modern citizens of those lands in which their ancestors lived for centuries.

A Split Over the Congress at Basle.

The new theories are only likely to compromise their patriotism toward the countries they live in without helping the Jews of Eastern Europe. For even were it possible to found a state artificially and in a barren country such as Palestine now is, and which would require many years of hard labor to restore its former fruitfulness, they characterize it as madness that honest men should subject themselves to the protection of the ‘Great Assassin,’ whose conscience is so little troubled by the blood of tens of thousands. Could any state that began by connecting itself with the blackest crimes, the most barbarous and villainous maladministration, prosper? The German Jews have accordingly been the first to declare against Zionism. The rabbis of Berlin, Frankfort, Munich, Dresden, and Hamburg have issued a manifesto to their co-religionists to the effect that the establishment of a Jewish state would be contrary to the Messianic prophecies, and that Judaism lays upon its adherents the obligation to support and foster with all devotion and with all their might the state they live in. Accordingly the rabbis call upon the Jews to oppose the Zionist ideas as contrary to Judaism, but especially to keep away from the Basle Congress. Similar declarations are likely soon to be made by the Jews of other countries. Consequently it is doubtful if the congress, which is to be attended by Zionist Jews from all parts of the world, will in face of that split be able to proceed to the realization of these Utopian schemes.”

Note that the German Jews, the first Jews attacked by the Zionists’ Nazism, were the Jews who were most strongly opposed to Zionism, and that it is very strange that Albert Einstein, a German Jew, should have aligned himself with Eastern Jewish Zionists. One suspects his motives were opportunism. One further suspects that the Zionists targeted German Jews to suffer from especially harsh attacks of anti-Semitism.

Apostate Jews like *Hofprediger* Adolf Stöcker promoted German anti-Semitism in the highest places, and Austrian anti-Semitism arose in Austria under Karl Lueger, who had very close ties to the Jewish community and who asserted that he had the self-declared right to determine who was, and who was not, a Jew—meaning that he could protect those Jews who protected and promoted him, while destroying assimilatory Jewry.

The self-segregation of Jewish students in the West came more at the instigation of the newly emigrated Eastern Jews from Galicia and Russian, than from anti-Semites. The Jewish press fanned the flames of the Protestant versus Catholic struggles of the *Kulturkampf*, and their hypocritical, outrageous and vicious attacks

on Catholics and Christianity caused a surge in anti-Semitism even among Protestants, who could not help but be offended. Though the Jewish press felt free to express its intolerance towards Christians, they recoiled in horror should any criticism be directed at them and their campaign to discredit Catholicism and defame the priesthood and the Pope. Most Jews in Germany wanted only to assimilate and leave the intolerance of Jewish racism and tribalism, as well as the intolerance of anti-Semitism, in the past. The Zionists were determined to not let them succeed. The Zionists did not care about the survival of individuals. Rather they only cared about the survival of the “Jewish race”. Most Jews knew this and they feared and hated the Zionists. Though Christians focus on the immortality of the soul, Judaism places more emphasis on the immortality of the Jewish people, should they be righteous. The Zionists transitioned this belief system into pure racism and massive imposed martyrdom on assimilatory Jewry. The Zionists revived the ancient system of holocaust, of human sacrifices in the form of burnt offerings.

Herzl’s Zionism lacked broad appeal among Jews. Jew had to be forced into Palestine through violence. In 1897, after the first Zionist Conference, spiritual Zionist Ahad Ha’am wrote,

“We must admit to ourselves that the ‘ingathering of the exiles’ is unattainable by natural means.”¹²⁸⁴

In 1897, Ha’am acknowledged the belief of the “western” “political Zionists” that the “spiritual problem”—read “racial problem”—of remaining a Jew was,

“a product of anti-Semitism, and [was] dependent on anti-Semitism for its existence[.]”¹²⁸⁵

Klaus Polkehn wrote in his article “The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941”, *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pages 54-82, at 55 and 57,

“To the Zionist leaders, Hitler’s assumption of power held out the possibility of a flow of immigrants to Palestine. Previously, the majority of German Jews, who identified themselves as Germans, had little sympathy with Zionist endeavours. [***] These German Jews were overwhelmingly non or anti-Zionist, and prior to 1937, the Zionist Union for Germany (Zionistische Vereinigung für Deutschland (henceforth ZVFD) experienced great difficulty in gaining a hearing. [***] The attitude of the Zionists towards the encroaching menace of fascist domination in Germany was determined by some common ideological assumption: the fascists as well as the Zionists believed in unscientific racial theories, and both met on the same ground in their beliefs in such mystical generalizations as ‘national character (*Volkstum*) and ‘race’, both were chauvinistic and inclined towards ‘racial exclusiveness.’”

Given the opposition of the majority of Jews to Zionism, the conclusion the political Zionists of Einstein's ilk (who like Ha'am were mostly atheistic) drew was that since there was no supernatural means to force Jews to gather in Palestine, the unnatural means—which they sophistically called natural and good—the unnatural means of *anti-Semitism* was their only option to remove personal choice from individual Jews as to their own fate and force them to the desert. Many of these Zionist agitators survived the Holocaust in great comfort in America or in Switzerland, while their Jewish victims suffered and died. When eventually given the choice, many of these Zionist cheerleaders elected to live outside of Israel.

6.4 The Brotherhood of Anti-Semites and Zionists

The racism of political Zionists was often used to justify the racism of anti-Semites, and vice versa. The Nazis were quick to point out that the Zionists thought of Jews as a nation, not a religion.

After the Bolshevik Revolution and the First World War rocked the world, many criticized Jewish nationalism and Jewish racism. *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* wrote on 16 October 1920:

“Jewish Testimony on ‘Are Jews a Nation?’

‘I will give you my definition of a nation, and you can add the adjective ‘Jewish.’ A Nation is, in my mind, an historical group of men of a recognizable cohesion held together by a common enemy. Then, if you add to that the word ‘Jewish’ you have what I understand to be the Jewish Nation.’—THEODOR HERZL.

‘Let us all recognize that we Jews are a distinct nationality of which every Jew, whatever his country, his station, or shade of belief, is necessarily a Member.’—LOUIS D. BRANDEIS *Justice of the United States Supreme Court*.

THIS article is designed to put the reader in possession of information regarding the Jew's own thought of himself, as regards race, religion and citizenship. In the last article we saw the thought which Jewish representatives wish to plant in Gentile minds concerning this matter. The Senate committee which was to be convinced was made up of Gentiles. The witnesses who were to do the convincing were Jews.

Senator Simon Guggenheim said: ‘There is no such thing as a Jewish race, because it is the Jewish religion.’

Simon Wolf said: ‘The point we make is this * * * that Hebrew or Jewish is simply a religion.’

Julian W. Mack said: ‘Of what possible value is it to anybody to classify them as Jews simply because they adhere to the Jewish religion?’

The object of this testimony was to have the Jews classified under various national names, such as Polish, English, German, Russian, or whatever it might be.

Now, when the inquirer turns to the authoritative Jewish spokesmen who

speak not to Gentiles but to Jews about this matter, he finds an entirely different kind of testimony. Some of this testimony will now be presented.

The reader will bear in mind that, as the series is not written for entertainment, but for instruction in the facts of a very vital Question, the present article will be of value only to those who desire to know for themselves what are the basic elements of the matter.

It should also be observed during the reading of the following testimony that sometimes the term 'race' is used, sometimes the term 'nation.' In every case, it is recognized that the Jew is a member of a separate people, quite aside from the consideration of his religion.

First, let us consider the testimony which forbids us to consider the term 'Jew' as merely the name of a member of a religious body only.

Louis D. Brandeis, Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and world leader of the Zionist movement, says:

'Councils of Rabbis and others have undertaken at times to prescribe by definition that only those shall be deemed Jews who professedly adhere to the orthodox or reformed faith. But in the connection in which we are considering the term, it is not in the power of any single body of Jews—or indeed of all Jews collectively—to establish the effective definition. The meaning of the word 'Jewish' in the term 'Jewish Problem' must be accepted as co-extensive with the disabilities which it is our problem to remove * * * Those disabilities extend substantially to all of Jewish blood. The disabilities do not end with a renunciation of faith, however sincere * * * Despite the meditations of pundits or decrees of councils, our own instincts and acts, and those of others, have defined for us the term 'Jew.'" ('Zionism and the American Jews.')

The Rev. Mr. Morris Joseph, West London Synagogue of British Jews: 'Israel is assuredly a great nation * * * The very word 'Israel' proves it. No mere sect or religious community could appropriately bear such a name. Israel is recognized as a nation by those who see it; no one can possibly mistake it for a mere sect. To deny Jewish nationality you must deny the existence of the Jew.' ('Israel a Nation.')

Arthur D. Lewis, West London Zionist Association: 'When some Jews say they consider the Jews a religious sect, like the Roman Catholics or Protestants, they are usually not correctly analyzing and describing their own feelings and attitude. * * * If a Jew is baptized, or, what is not necessarily the same thing, sincerely converted to Christianity, few people think of him as no longer being a Jew. His blood, temperament and spiritual peculiarities are unaltered.' ('The Jews a Nation.')

Bertram B. Benas, barrister-at-law: 'The Jewish entity is essentially the entity of a People. 'Israelites,' 'Jews,' 'Hebrews'—all the terms used to denote the Jewish people bear a specifically historical meaning, and none of these terms has been convincingly superseded by one of purely sectarian nature. The external world has never completely subscribed to the view that the Jewish people constitute merely an ecclesiastical denomination. * * *'

(‘Zionism—The National Jewish Movement.’)

Leon Simon, a brilliant and impressive Jewish scholar and writer, makes an important study of the question of ‘Religion and Nationality’ in his volume, ‘Studies in Jewish Nationalism.’ He makes out a case for the proposition that the Religion of the Jews is Nationalism, and that Nationalism is an integral part of their Religion.

‘It is often said, indeed, that Judaism has no dogmas. That statement is not true as it stands.’ He then states some of the dogmas, and continues—‘And the Messianic Age means for the Jew not merely the establishment of peace on earth and good will to men, but the universal recognition of the Jew and his God. It is another assertion of the eternity of the nation. Dogmas such as these are not simply the articles of faith of a church, to which anybody may gain admittance by accepting them; they are the beliefs of a nation about its own past and its own future.’ (p. 14.)

‘For Judaism has no message of salvation for the individual soul, as Christianity has; all its ideas are bound up with the existence of the Jewish nation.’ (p. 20.)

‘The idea that Jews are a religious sect, precisely parallel to Catholics and Protestants, is nonsense.’ (p. 34.)

Graetz, the great historian of the Jews, whose monumental work is one of the standard authorities, says that the history of the Jews, even since they lost the Jewish State, ‘still possesses a national character; it is by no means merely a creed or church history. * * * Our history is far from being a mere chronicle of literary events or church history.’

Moses Hess, one of the historic figures through whom the whole Jewish Program has flowed down from its ancient sources to its modern agents, wrote a book entitled ‘Rome and Jerusalem’ in which he stated the whole matter with clearness and force.

‘Jewish religion,’ he says, ‘is, above all, Jewish patriotism.’ (p. 61.)

‘Were the Jews only followers of a certain religious denomination, like the others, then it were really inconceivable that Europe, and especially Germany, where the Jews have participated in every cultural activity, ‘should spare the followers of the Israelitish confession neither pains, nor tears, nor bitterness.’ The solution of the problem, however, consists in the fact that the Jews are something more than mere ‘followers of a religion,’ namely, they are a race brotherhood, a nation * * *’ (p. 71.)

Hess, like other authoritative Jewish spokesmen, denies that forsaking the faith constitutes a Jew a non-Jew. ‘* * * Judaism has never excluded anyone. The apostates severed themselves from the bond of Jewry. ‘And not even them has Judaism forsaken,’ added a learned rabbi in whose presence I expressed the above-quoted opinion.’

‘In reality, Judaism as a nationality has a natural basis which cannot be set aside by mere conversion to another faith, as is the case with other religions. A Jew belongs to his race and consequently also to Judaism, in spite of the fact that he or his ancestors have become apostates.’ (pp. 97-98.)

Every Jew is, whether he wishes it or not, solidly united with the entire nation.’ (p. 163.)

Simply to indicate that we have not been quoting outworn opinions, but the actual beliefs of the most active and influential part of Jewry, we close this section of the testimony with excerpts from a work published in 1920 by the Zionist Organization of America, from the pen of Jessie E. Sampter:

‘The name of their national religion, Judaism, is derived from their national designation. An unreligious Jew is still a Jew, and he can with difficulty escape his allegiance only by repudiating the name of Jew.’ (‘Guide to Zionism,’ p. 5.)

It will be seen that none of these writers—and their number might be multiplied among both ancients and moderns—can deny that the Jew is exclusively a member of a religion without at the same time asserting that he is, whether he will or not, the member of a nation. Some go so far as to insist that his allegiance is racial in addition to being national. The term ‘race’ is used by important Jewish scholars without reserve, while some, who hold the German-originated view that the Jews are an offshoot of the Semitic race and do not comprise that race, are satisfied with the term ‘nation.’ Biblically, in both the Old Testament and the New, the term ‘nation’ or ‘people’ is employed. But the consensus of Jewish opinion is this: the Jews are a separate people, marked off from other races by very distinctive characteristics, both physical and spiritual, and they have both a national history and a national aspiration.

It will be noticed how the testimony on the point of ‘race’ combines the thought of race and nationality, just as the previous section combined the thought of nationality with religion.

Supreme Justice Brandeis, previously quoted, appears to give a racial basis to the fact of nationality.

He says: ‘It is no answer to this evidence of nationality to declare that the Jews are not an absolutely pure race. There has, of course, been some intermixture of foreign blood in the three thousand years which constitute our historic period. But, owing to persecution and prejudice, the intermarriages with non-Jews which have occurred have resulted merely in taking away many from the Jewish community. Intermarriage has brought few additions. Therefore the percentage of foreign blood in the Jews of today is very low. Probably no important European race is as pure. But common race is only one of the elements which determine nationality.’

Arthur D. Lewis, a Jewish writer, in his ‘The Jews a Nation,’ also bases nationality on the racial element:

‘The Jews were originally a nation, and have retained more than most nations one of the elements of nationality—namely, the race element; this may be proved, of course, by the common sense test of their distinguishability. You can more easily see that a Jew is a Jew than that an Englishman is English.’

Moses Hess is also quite clear on this point. He writes of the

impossibility of Jews denying ‘their racial descent,’ and says: ‘Jewish noses cannot be reformed, and the black, wavy hair of the Jews will not turn through conversion into blond, nor can its curves be straightened out by constant combing. The Jewish race is one of the primary races of mankind that has retained its integrity, in spite of the continual change of its climatic environment, and the Jewish type has conserved its purity through the centuries.’

Jessie E. Sampter, in the ‘Guide to Zionism,’ recounting the history of the work done for Zionism in the United States, says: ‘And this burden was nobly borne, due partly to the commanding leadership of such men as Justice Louis D. Brandeis, Judge Julian W. Mack, and Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, partly to the devoted and huge labors of the old-time faithful Zionists on the Committee, such as Jacob de Haas, Louis Lipsky, and Henrietta Szold, and partly to *the aroused race consciousness of the mass of American Jews.*’

Four times in the brief preface to the fifth edition of ‘Coningsby,’ Disraeli uses the term ‘race’ in referring to the Jews, and Disraeli was proud of being racially a Jew, though religiously he was a Christian.

In The Jewish Encyclopedia, ‘the Jewish race’ is spoken of. In the preface, which is signed by Dr. Cyrus Adler as chief editor, these words occur: ‘An even more delicate problem that presented itself at the very outset was the attitude to be observed by the Encyclopedia in regard to those Jews who, while born within the Jewish community, have, for one reason or another, abandoned it. As the present work deals with the Jews as a race, it was found impossible to exclude those who were of that race, whatever their religious affiliations might have been.’

But as we are not interested in ethnology, the inquiry need not be contained further along this line. The point toward which all this trends is that the Jew is conscious of himself as being more than the member of a religious body. That is, Jewry nowhere subscribes in the persons of its greatest teachers and its most authoritative representatives, to the theory that a Jew is only ‘a brother of the faith.’ Often he is not of the faith at all, but he is still a Jew. The fact is insisted upon here, not to discredit him, but to expose the double minds of those political leaders who, instead of straightforwardly meeting the Jewish Question, endeavor to turn all inquiry aside by an impressive confusion of the Gentile mind.

It may be argued by the small body of so-called ‘Reformed Jews’ that the authorities quoted here are mostly Zionists. The reply is: there may be, and quite possible are, two Jewish programs in the world—one which it is intended the Gentiles should see, and one which is exclusively for the Jews. In determining which is the real Program, it is a safe course to adopt the one that is made to succeed. It is the Program sponsored by the so-called Zionists which is succeeding. It was made to succeed through the Allied Governments, through the Peace Conference, and now through the League of Nations. That, then, must be the true Jewish program, because it is hardly possible that the Gentile governments could have been led as they are being

led, were they not convinced that they are obeying the behests of the real Princes of the Jews. It is all well enough to engage the plain Gentile people with one set of interesting things; the real thing is the one that has been put over. And that is the program whose sponsors also stand for the racial and national separateness of the Jews.

The idea that the Jews comprise a nation is the most common idea of all—among the Jews. Not only a nation with a past, but a nation with a future. More than that—not only a nation, but a Super-Nation.

We can go still further on the authority of Jewish statements: we can say that the future form of the Jewish Nation will be a kingdom.

And as to the present problems of the Jewish Nation, there is plenty of Jewish testimony to the fact that the influence of American life is harmful to Jewish life; that is, they are in antagonism, like two opposite ideas. This point, however, must await development in the succeeding article.

Israel Friedlaender traces the racial and national exclusiveness of the Jews from the earliest times, giving as illustrations two Biblical incidents—the Samaritans, ‘who were half-Jews by race and who were eager to become full Jews by religion,’ and their repulse by the Jews, ‘who were eager to safeguard the racial integrity of the Jews’; also, the demand for genealogical records and for the dissolution of mixed marriages, as recorded in the Book of Ezra. Dr. Friedlaender says that in post-Biblical times ‘this racial exclusiveness of the Jews became even more accentuated.’ Entry into Judaism ‘never was, as in other religious communities, purely a question of faith. Proselytes were seldom solicited, and even when ultimately admitted into the Jewish fold they were so on the express condition that they surrender their racial individuality.’

‘For the purposes of the present inquiry,’ says Dr. Friedlaender, ‘it is enough for us to know that the Jews have always *felt* themselves as a separate race, sharply marked off from the rest of mankind. Anyone who denies the racial conception of Judaism on the part of the Jews in the past is either ignorant of the facts of Jewish history or *intentionally misrepresents them.*’

Elkan N. Adler says: ‘No serious politician today doubts that our people have a *political future.*’

This future of political definiteness and power was in the mind of Moses Hess when he wrote in 1862—mark the date!—in the preface of his ‘Rome and Jerusalem,’ these words:

‘No nation can be indifferent to the fact that in *the coming European struggle* for liberty, it may have another people as its friend or foe.’

Hess had just been complaining of the inequalities visited upon the Jews. He was saying that what the individual Jew could not get because he was a Jew, the Jewish Nation would be able to get because it would be a Nation. Evidently he expected that nationhood might arrive before the ‘coming European struggle,’ and he was warning the Gentile nations to be careful, because in that coming struggle there might be another nation in the list, namely, the Jewish Nation, which could be either friend or foe to any nation

it chose.

Dr. J. Abelson, of Portsea College, in discussing the status of 'small nations' as a result of the Great War, says: 'The Jew is one of these 'smaller nations,' and claims for the Jew what is claimed for the Pole, the Rumanian, and the Serbian, and on the same ground—that of nationality.

Justice Brandeis voices the same thought. He says:

'While every other people is striving for development by asserting its nationality, and a great war is making clear the value of small nations * * * Let us make clear to the world that we too are a nationality clamoring for equal rights * * *'

Again says Justice Brandeis: 'Let us all recognize that we Jews are a distinct nationality, of which every Jew, whatever his country, his station, or shade of belief, is necessarily a member.'

And he concludes his article, from which these quotations are made, with these words:

'Organize, organize, organize, until every Jew must stand up and be counted—counted with us, or prove himself, wittingly or unwittingly, of the few who are against their own people.'

Sir Samuel Montagu, the British Jew who has been appointed governor of Palestine under the British mandate, habitually speaks of the Jewish Kingdom, usually employing the expression 'the restoration of the Jewish Kingdom.' It may be of significance that the native population already refer to Sir Samuel as 'The King of the Jews.'

Achad Ha-Am, who must be regarded as the one who has most conclusively stated the Jewish Idea as it has always existed, and whose influence is not as obscure as his lack of fame among the Gentiles might indicate, is strong for the separate identity of the Jews as a super-nation. Leon Simon succinctly states the great teacher's views when he says:

'While Hebraic thought is familiar with the conception of a Superman (distinguished, of course, from Nietzsche's conception by having a very different standard of excellence), yet its most familiar and characteristic application of that conception is not to the individual *but to the nation—to Israel as the Super-Nation* or 'chosen people.' In fact, the Jewish nation is presupposed in all characteristically Jewish thinking, just as it is presupposed in the teaching of the Prophets.'

'In those countries,' says Moses Hess, 'which form a dividing line between the Occident and the Orient, namely, Russia, Poland, Prussia and Austria, there live millions of our brethren who earnestly believe in the restoration of *the Jewish Kingdom* and pray for it fervently in their daily services.'

This article, therefore, at the risk of appearing tedious, has sought to summon from many sides and from many periods the testimony which should be taken whenever the subject of Jewish nationalism comes under discussion. Regardless of what may be said to Gentile authorities for the purpose of hindering or modifying their action, there can be no question as

to what the Jew thinks of himself: He thinks of himself as belonging to a People, united to that People by ties of blood which no amount of creedal change can weaken, heir of that People's past, agent of that People's political future. He belongs to a race; he belongs to a nation; he seeks a kingdom to come on this earth, a kingdom which shall be over all kingdoms, with Jerusalem the ruling city of the world. That desire of the Jewish Nation may be fulfilled; it is the contention of these articles that it will not come by way of the Program of the Protocols nor by any of the other devious ways through which powerful Jews have chosen to work.

The charge of religious prejudice has always touched the people of civilized countries in a tender spot. Sensing this, the Jewish spokesmen chosen to deal with non-Jews have emphasized the point of religious prejudice. It is therefore a relief to tender and uninstructed minds to learn that Jewish spokesmen themselves have said that the troubles of the Jew have never arisen out of his religion, the Jew is not questioned on account of his religion, but on account of other things which his religion ought to modify. Gentiles know the truth that the Jew is not persecuted on account of his religion. All honest investigators know it. The attempt to shield the Jews under cover of their religion is, therefore, in face of the facts and of their own statements, an unworthy one.

If there were no other evidence, the very evidence which many Jewish writers cite, namely, the instant siding of the Jews one with another upon any and every occasion, would constitute evidence of racial and national solidarity. Whenever these articles have touched the International Jew Financier, hundreds of Jews in the lower walks of life have protested. Touch a Rothschild, and the revolutionary Jew from the ghetto utters his protest, and accepts the remark as a personal affront to himself. Touch a regular old-line Jewish politician who is using a government office exclusively for the benefit of his fellow Jews as against the best interests of the nation, and the Socialist and anti-government Jew comes out in his defense. Most of these Jews, it may be said, have lost a vital touch with the teachings and ceremonials of their religion, but they indicate what their real religion is by their national solidarity.

This in itself would be interesting, but it becomes important in view of another fact, with which the next article will deal, namely, the relation between this Jewish nationalism and the nationalism of the peoples among whom the Jews dwell.”

The issue of Jewish racism was raised in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* on 14 May 1921, quoting Leo N. Levi from *Memorial Volume: Leo N. Levi. I. O. B. B.*, Hamburger Print. Co., Chicago, (1905); and Louis Dembitz Brandeis' *The Jewish Problem; How to Solve It*, Zionist Essays Pub. Committee, New York, (1915):

“B’nai B’rith Leader Discusses the Jews

TO THE pro-Jewish spokesmen who have filled the air with cries of 'lies' and 'slander,' to those self-appointed guardians of 'American ideals' who rule out with rare finality all those who would dare suggest that possibly there is a hidden side of the Jewish Question, it must come as something of a jolt to be reminded that in this series there is scarcely a line that is without high Jewish authority.

The Protocols themselves are written for centuries in Jewish authoritative teachings and records. All the plans that have been described from time to time in these articles are written in the fundamental laws of the Jews. And all that the ancients have taught, the modern Jews have reaffirmed.

The writer of these articles has had to take constant counsel of prudence in his selection of material, for the Jews have always counted confidently on the fact that if the whole truth were told in one comprehensive utterance, no one would believe it. Thus, bigots and minds bursting with the discoveries they have made, have never been feared by the Jews. They counted on the incapacity of the non-Jews to believe or receive certain knowledge. They know that facts are not accepted on proof, but only on understanding. Non-Jews cannot understand why human beings should lend themselves to certain courses. They are, however, beginning to understand, and the proof is therefore becoming more significant.

There are yet more important revelations to be made, always following closely the best Jewish sources, and when these revelations are made, it will be impossible for the Jewish leaders to keep silent or to deny. The time is coming for American Jewry to slough off the leadership which has led it and left it in the bog. Leadership knows that. Indeed, it is amazing to discover the number of indications that the attempts made to suppress THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT have been made principally *to prevent the Jews reading it*. The leaders do not care how many non-Jews read these articles; but they do not desire their own people to read them. The Jewish leaders do not desire their people's eyes to be opened.

Why? Because, just now, only Jews can truly know whether the statements made in these articles are true or not. Non-Jews may know here and there, as their observations may confirm the printed statements. But informed Jews really *know*. And large numbers of the masses of the Jews really know. When they see the truth in all its relationships in these articles, the hitherto 'led' Jew may not be so tractable. Hence the effort to keep the non-Jewish point of view away from him.

In support of the statements that these articles have been based on Jewish authority, we quote today a series of declarations by one of the most able of the presidents of the B'nai B'rith, Leo N. Levi. Mr. Levi was American-born and died in 1904. He was a lawyer of distinction and attained the presidency of the international Jewish order, B'nai B'rith, in 1900. He took part in the international politics of his people and is credited with collaborating with Secretary of State John Hay on several important matters. The utterances

here quoted were for the most made while he was president of B'nai B'rith, but all of them were published the year after his death under B'nai B'rith auspices. There is therefore no question of their Jewishness.

Non-Jewish defenders of the Jewish program have pretended to much indignation because of references that have been made to the Oriental character of certain Jewish manifestations. The references in these articles have been two in number, once regarding Oriental sensuality as it has been introduced to the American stage by Jewish theatrical pandlers, and again in quoting Disraeli, the Jew who became premier of Britain, to the effect that the Jews—his people—were ‘Mosaic Arabs.’

But it never seemed to have occurred to Leo N. Levi to deny the Oriental character of his race. Instead, he asserted it. On page 104 of the B'nai B'rith memorial, he excuses certain social crudities of the Jew on the ground ‘that hailing originally from the Orient and having been compelled for twenty centuries to live in a society of his own, he has preserved in his tastes much that is characteristically Oriental.’ Again on page 116, he excused the multiplicity of religious rites as being due to the fact that the Jew ‘drew upon his Oriental imagination for a symbolism that appealed to his ideal emotions.’ On page 312, he speaks of the Jews’ ‘Oriental devotion to their parents.’ This easy recognition of the fact is commended to those bootlicking editors who, out of the vastness of their ignorance of the Jewish Question, have seen in the reference to Orientalism an ‘insult’ to the Jews and an unflinching indication of anti-Semitism.

The Jewish Question! Ah, that is another point which pro-Jewish spokesmen hasten to deny, but they will be somewhat disturbed by the candor with which true Jewish spokesmen admit the Question.

In a strong passage on page 101, Mr. Levi says:

‘If I have dwelt so long upon this subject, it is because I recognize that if the Jew has been denied so much that is rightfully his, he often claims more than is his due. One of these claims, most persistently urged, is that there is no Jewish Question; that a Jew is a citizen like any other citizen and that as long as he abides by the law and does not subject himself to criminal prosecution or civil action, his doings are beyond legitimate inquiry by the public at large.

‘This contention on his part would certainly be well based if he claimed nothing further than the right to live in peace, but when he demands social recognition the whole range of his conduct is a legitimate subject of inquiry against which no technical demurrers can be interposed . . . nor must the Jew be over-sensitive about the inquiry.

‘The inconsistencies and the un wisdom exhibited in the consideration of the Jewish Question are not to be found altogether on the side of those who are hostile to the Jews.’

‘Since then the refugees from Russia, Galicia and Rumania have raised the Jewish Question to commanding importance. Since then it has dawned on the world that *we are witnessing another exodus which promises soon to*

change the habitat of the Jews to the Western Hemisphere.' (Page 59)

'The Jewish Question cannot be solved by tolerance. There are thousands of well-meaning people who take to themselves great credit for exhibiting a spirit of tolerance toward the Jews.' (Page 98)

Mr. Levi also lays down rules for 'the study of the Jewish Question,' and he says that if they were followed the result 'would be startling at once to the Jews and the general public.' (Page 93) How far present Jewish leadership has departed from that frank and broad view taken by Mr. Levi, is everywhere evident.

Not that Mr. Levi was a critic of his people, but he was a lawyer who was accustomed to weighing facts, and he saw facts that weighed against his people. But he was pro-Jewish even in his most severe observations. He could make an attack on the rabbis, taunting them with the saying that 'many of you are 'rabbis for revenue only,' but he could also insist on Jewish solidarity and exclusiveness.

In this connection it may be interesting to see how strongly Mr. Levi supports the contention of Jewish leaders (as outlined in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* of October 9 and 16, 1920) that the Jews are a *race* and not merely a *religion*, a nation and not merely a church, and that the term 'Jew' is biological rather than theological. This is specially commended to the attention of those dim-minded shouters of 'religious prejudice,' who come into action whenever the Jewish Question is mentioned. (Of 'religious prejudice' there are many examples to give in future articles.)

'Certain it is that thus far the race and the religion have been so fused, as it were, that none can say just where the one begins and the other leaves off.' (Page 116)

Attacking the contention of the 'liberals' or 'reformed Jews' to the effect that 'Jew' is the name of a member of religious denomination, and not of a member of a certain race, Mr. Levi says:

'Nothing to my mind is more pregnant with error than this postulate of unreason. (Page 185) It is not true that the Jews are only Jews because of their religion.' (Page 189)

'The Jews are not simply an indiscriminate lot of people who hold to a common belief.' (Page 190)

'A native Eskimo, an American Indian might conscientiously adopt every tenet of the Jewish church, might practice every form and ceremony imposed by the Jewish laws and the Jewish ritual, and as far as the religion is concerned, be a Jew, but yet, no one who will reflect for a moment would class them with the Jews as a people. If the truth were known, a very large percentage of so-called Christians would be found to be believers in the essentials of the Jewish religion, and yet, they are not Jews.

'It requires not only that men should believe in Judaism, but that they should be the descendants in a direct line of that people who enjoyed a temporal government and who owned a country up to the time of the destruction of the second commonwealth.

‘That great event took away from the Jews their country and their temporal government; it scattered them over the face of the earth, *but it did not destroy the national and race idea* which was a part of their nature and of their religion.’

‘Who shall say, then, that the Jews are no longer a race ? . . . Blood is the basis and sub-stratum of the race idea, and no people on the face of the globe can lay claim with so much right to purity of blood, and unity of blood, as the Jews.’

‘If I have reasoned to any purpose, the inquiry of rights in the premises is not to be limited to Jews as exponents of a particular creed, but *to the Jews as a race.*’ (Pages 190-191)

‘The religion alone does not constitute the people. As I have already maintained, a believer in the Jewish faith does not by reason of that fact become a Jew. On the other hand, however, *a Jew by birth remains a Jew, even though he abjures his religion.*’ (Page 200)

This is the view of such men as Justice Brandeis, the Jew who sits on the Supreme Court of the United States. Justice Brandeis says, ‘Let us all recognize that we Jews are a distinct nationality *of which every Jew, whatever his country, his station, his shade of belief, is necessarily a member.*’

Believing all this, Mr. Levi subscribes to the Jewish law and practice of exclusiveness.

Describing the state of the Jews, Mr. Levi says (page 92): ‘The Jews have not materially increased or diminished in numbers for 2,000 years. They have made no proselytes to their religion . . . They have imbibed the arts, the literature and the civilization of successive generations, but have abstained very generally from intermixture of blood . . . They have infused their blood into that of other peoples but have taken little of other peoples into their own.’

As to intermarriage between the Jew and non-Jew, Mr. Levi calls it miscegenation. ‘In remote countries, sparsely populated, the choice may lie between such marriages and a worse relation.’ Those are his words on page 249. He does not advise the worse relation, but he has said quite enough to indicate the Jewish view of the case. He continues:

‘It seems clear to me that Jews should avoid marriages with Gentiles and Gentiles with Jews, *upon the same principle that we avoid marrying the insane, the consumptive, the scrofulitic or the Negro.*’ (Page 249)

This exclusiveness goes down through all human relations. The Jew has one counsel for non-Jews and another for himself in these matters. Of the non-Jew he demands as a right what he looks down upon as shady privilege. He uses the Ghetto as a club with which to bludgeon the non-Jew for his ‘bigotry,’ when as a fact he chooses the Ghetto for well-defined racial reasons. He condemns the non-Jew for the exclusion of the Jew from certain sections of society, when as a Jew his whole care is to keep himself unspotted from that very society to which he seeks entrance. The Jew insists

on breaking down non-Jewish exclusiveness while keeping his own. The non-Jewish world is to be public and common, the Jewish world is to be kept sacrosanct. Read the teachings of this enlightened leader of Jewry as published by the B'nai B'rith.

He favors the public school for non-Jewish children, not for Jewish children; they are to be kept separate: they are the choice stock of the earth:

'Because the government tenders free education, it does not follow that it must be accepted if education be made compulsory, it does not follow that government schools must be attended . . . As a citizen I favor free schools, because the education they afford, imperfect as it is, is better than none, and society is benefitted thereby; but as an individual I prefer to pay to support free schools and send my children to more select places.' (Page 253) He speaks of the fact that 'all classes of children frequent the public schools' as an argument against Jewish children going there.

'In my judgment, Jewish children should be educated in Jewish schools.' (page 254) 'Not only is it a positive and direct advantage to educate our children as Jews, but it is absolutely necessary to our preservation. Experience has shown that our young people will be weaned from our people if allowed indiscriminately to associate with the Gentiles.' (Page 255)

Discussing the possibility of Jews losing their crudeness, Mr. Levi asks, 'How shall we best accomplish that end ?' Then he quotes the frequent answer: 'Since the exemplars of gentility most abound among the Gentiles, we should associate with them as much as possible, in order to wear our own rudeness away.' He meets the suggestion this way:

'If gentlemen were willing to meet all Jews on a parity because they are Jews, we should doubtless derive much benefit from such association. But, while it is true that no gentleman refuses association with another because that other is a Jew, he will not, as a rule, associate with a Jew unless he be a gentleman. As we are far from being all gentlemen, we cannot reasonably expect to be admitted as a class into good society. So, better keep by ourselves,' concludes Mr. Levi. (Page 260)

That is, Mr. Levi admits the willingness of society to meet Jews on equal terms, as with all others, but not on unequal terms. And this being so, Mr. Levi holds they had better meet as little as possible, they had better keep apart; in the formative years, certainly, Jewish young people should be kept rigidly apart from non-Jews. The exclusiveness of which the Jews complain is their own. The Ghetto is not a corner into which the non-Jews have herded the Semites; the Ghetto is a spot carved out of the community and consecrated to the Chosen People and is therefore the best section of the city in Jewish eyes, the rest being 'the Christian quarter,' the area of the heathen. Mr. Levi himself admits on page 220 that there is no prejudice against the Jew in this country.

Certain wild-eyed objectors to the series of studies on the Jewish Question have made the assertion that THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT has declared cowardice to be a Jewish trait. That the statement is false as regards

this paper does not change the fact that the subject has been generally discussed in and out of army circles. If it ever becomes necessary to discuss it in these studies, the facts will be set forth as far as they are obtainable. But the point just now is that Mr. Levi has had somewhat to say which may repay reading:

‘Physical courage has always been an incident, not an element, of Jewish character. It has no independent existence in their make-up, and always depended on something else. With some exceptions this may be said of all Oriental people. The sense and fear of danger is highly developed in them, and there is no cultivation of that indifference to it which has distinguished the great nations of Western Europe.’ (Page 205)

Were a non-Jew to call attention to this difference between the Jews and others, he would be met with the cry of ‘anti-Semitism’ and he would be twitted with the fact that all his relatives may not have served in the war. Loudest to twit him would be those who served in what our soldiers called ‘the Jewish infantry,’ the quartermasters corps in the late National Army.

It is to this aversion to danger, however, that Mr. Levi attributes the Jews’ greatness among the nations. Other nations can fight, the Jews can *endure*, and that, he says, is greater. Note his words (the italics are his own)

‘Other nations may boast conquests and triumphs born of aggression, but though the fruits of victory have been manifold, they have not been enduring; *and it may be truly said that the nation whose greatness grows out of valor passes through the stages of discord and degeneracy to decay* In the virtue of endurance I believe the Jews have a safeguard against the decay that has marked the history of all other peoples.’

It appears, therefore, that the draft-dodger, if he can *endure* long enough, may yet come to own the country.

Jewish leaders have lately tried to minimize as ‘wild words’ the disclosures made by Disraeli with reference to the Jews’ participation in European revolutions. What Disraeli said can be found in his ‘Coningsby,’ or in the quotations made therefrom in THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT of December 18, 1920. With reference to the German Revolution of 1848, Disraeli wrote—before it had taken place:

‘You never observe a great intellectual movement in Europe in which the Jews do not greatly participate That mysterious Russian Diplomacy which so alarms Western Europe is organized and principally carried on by Jews. That mighty revolution which is at this moment preparing in Germany, and which will be, in fact, a second and greater Reformation, and of which so little is yet known in England, is entirely developing under the auspices of Jews.’

It is interesting, therefore, to hear Mr. Levi confirming from the American side those significant statements made by Disraeli.

‘The revolution of 1848 in Germany, however, influenced a great many highly educated Jews to come to America.’ (Page 181) ‘It is unnecessary to review the events of 1848; suffice it to say, that not a few among the

revolutionists were Jews, and that a considerable number of those who were proscribed by the government at home, fled to the United States for safety.’ (Page 182) These German Jews are now the arch-financiers of the United States. They found here complete liberty to exploit peoples and nations to the full extent of their powers. They still maintain their connections with Frankfort-on-the-Main, the world capital of International financial Jewry.

With these quotations from the speeches and writings of Leo N. Levi, a famous president of the B’nai B’rith, it would seem to be a fair question as to the reason for the denial and denunciation which have followed the making of these statements in the course of this series of studies. Leo N. Levi studied the Jewish Question because he knew a Jewish Question to exist. He knew that the Jewish Question was not a non-Jewish creation but appeared wherever Jews began to appear in numbers. They brought it with them. He knew the justice of many of the charges laid against the Jews. He knew the impossibility of disproving them, the futility of shrieking ‘anti-Semitism’ at them. He knew, moreover, that for the Jews to solve the Jewish Question by departing from the peculiar racial traditions of superiority, would be to cease to be Jews. Therefore, he threw his whole influence on the side of the Jews remaining separate, maintaining their tradition of The Chosen Race, looking upon themselves as the coming rulers of the nations, and there he left the Question just about where he found it.

But in the course of his studies he gave other investigators the benefit of his frank statements. He did not put lies into the mouths of his people. He was not endeavoring to maintain himself in position by prejudiced racial appeals. He looked certain facts in the face, made his report, and chose his side. Several times in the course of his argument, his very logic led him up to the point where, logically, he would have to cast aside his Jewish idea of separateness. But with great calmness he discarded the logic and clung to the Jewish tradition. For example:

‘The better to facilitate such happiness in every country and in every age, various kinds of organizations have existed as they exist today. The Jews have theirs.

‘For many reasons they are exclusive. In theory they should not be so. In our social organizations we should, in deference to the argument which I have already named, admit any congenial and worthy Gentile who honors us with his application. But what may be theoretically correct may be found practically wrong. It certainly is a wrong to exclude a worthy person because he does not happen to be a Jew; but on the other hand, where are you to draw the line?’

This is frankness to a fault. Of course, it is wrong, but the right is impractical! Logic goes by the boards in the face of something stronger. Mr. Levi is not to be blamed for having gone to his tribe. Every man’s place is with his tribe. The criticism belongs to the lick-spittle Gentile Fronts who have no tribe and become hangers-on around the outskirts of Judah, racial mongrels who would be better off if they had one-thousandth of the racial

sense which the Jew possesses.

This brief survey of the philosophy which Mr. Levi both lived and taught, amid which is shared by the leaders of American Jewry, is in strict agreement with Jewish principles all down the centuries. In his published addresses Mr. Levi does not touch upon all the implications of the separateness which he enjoins upon his nation. Why do they keep by themselves? What is it that keeps them distinct? Is it their religion? Very well; let us regard them as a sect of religious recluses and wish them well in their endeavors to keep themselves unspotted of the world. Is it their race? So their leaders teach. Race and nationality are strictly claimed. If this is so, there must be a political outlook. What is it? Palestine? Not that any one can notice. A great deal may be read about it in the newspapers, the newspapers in turn being supplied through the Associated Press with the Jewish Telegraph Agency's propaganda dispatches; but no one in Palestine notices the Land becoming more Jewish. Jewry's political outlook is world rule in the material sense. Jewry is an international nation. It is this, and nothing else, which gives significance to its financial, educational, propagandist, revolutionary and immigration programs."¹²⁸⁶

Even some leading "anti-Zionist Jews of America"¹²⁸⁷ saw the Jews as a distinct race and a people united by a common religion. Henry Morgenthau wrote in 1921,

"The proudest boast of all these men, and my proudest boast, is: 'I am an American.' None of us would deny our race or faith. We are Jews by blood. We are Jews, though of various sects, by religion."¹²⁸⁸

Returning to the racist segregationist Zionists of America, blackmailer Supreme Court Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis stated in 1915:

"The Jewish Problem; How to Solve It

THE SUFFERING of the Jews due to injustices continuing throughout nearly twenty centuries is the greatest tragedy in history. Never was the aggregate of such suffering larger than today. Never were the injustices more glaring. Yet the present is pre-eminently a time for hopefulness. The current of world thought is at last preparing the way for our attaining justice. The war is developing opportunities which make possible the solution of the Jewish problem. But to avail ourselves of these opportunities we must understand both them and ourselves. We must recognize and accept facts. We must consider our course with statesmanlike calm. We must pursue resolutely the course we shall decide upon; and be ever ready to make the sacrifices which a great cause demands. Thus only can liberty be won.

For us the Jewish Problem means this: How can we secure for Jews, wherever they may live, the same rights and opportunities enjoyed by non-Jews? How can we secure for the world the full contribution which Jews can make, if unhampered by artificial limitations?

The problem has two aspects: That of the individual Jew and that of Jews collectively. Obviously, no individual should be subjected anywhere, by reason of the fact that he is a Jew, to a denial of any common right or opportunity enjoyed by non-Jews. But Jews collectively should likewise enjoy the same right and opportunity to live and develop as do other groups of people. This right of development on the part of the group is essential to the full enjoyment of rights by the individual. For the individual is dependent for his development (and his happiness) in large part upon the development of the group of which he forms a part. We can scarcely conceive of an individual German or Frenchman living and developing without some relation to the contemporary German or French life and culture. And since death is not a solution of the problem of life, the solution of the Jewish Problem necessarily involves the continued existence of the Jews as Jews.

Councils of Rabbis and others have undertaken at times to prescribe by definition that only those shall be deemed Jews who professedly adhere to the orthodox or reformed faith. But in the connection in which we are considering the term, it is certainly not in the power of any single body of Jews, or indeed of all Jews collectively, to establish the effective definition. The meaning of the word Jewish in the term Jewish Problem must be accepted as co-extensive with the disabilities which it is our problem to remove. It is the non-Jews who create the disabilities and in so doing give definition to the term Jew. Those disabilities extend substantially to all of Jewish blood. The disabilities do not end with a renunciation of faith, however sincere. They do not end with the elimination, however complete, of external Jewish mannerisms. The disabilities do not end ordinarily until the Jewish blood has been so thoroughly diluted by repeated inter-marriages as to result in practically obliterating the Jew.

And we Jews, by our own acts, give a like definition to the term Jew. When men and women of Jewish blood suffer, because of that fact, and even if they suffer from quite different causes, our sympathy and our help goes out to them instinctively in whatever country they may live and without inquiring into the shades of their belief or unbelief. When those of Jewish blood exhibit moral or intellectual superiority, genius or special talent, we feel pride in, them, even, if they have abjured the faith like Spinoza, Marx, Disraeli or Heine. Despite the meditations of pundits or the decrees of council, our own instincts and acts, and those of others, have defined for us the term Jew.

Half a century ago the belief was still general that Jewish disabilities would disappear before growing liberalism. When religious toleration was proclaimed, the solution of the Jewish Problem seemed in sight. When the so-called rights of man became widely recognized, and the equal right of all citizens to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness began to be enacted into positive law, the complete emancipation of the Jews seemed at hand. The concrete gains through liberalism were indeed large. Equality before the law was established throughout the western hemisphere. The Ghetto walls crumbled; the ball and chain of restraint were removed in central and western

Europe. Compared with the cruel discrimination to which Jews are now subjected in Russia and Romania, their advanced condition in other parts of Europe seems almost ideal.

But the anti-Jewish prejudice was not exterminated even in those countries of Europe in which the triumph of civil liberty and democracy extended fully to Jews 'the rights of man.' The anti-Semitic movement arose in Germany a year after the granting of universal suffrage. It broke out violently in France, and culminated in the Dreyfus case, a century after the French Revolution had brought 'emancipation.' It expressed itself in England through the Aliens Act, within a few years after the last of Jewish disabilities had been there removed by law. And in the United States the Saratoga incident reminded us, long ago, that we too have a Jewish question.

The disease is universal and endemic. There is, of course, a wide difference between the Russian disabilities with their Pale of Settlement, their denial of opportunity for education and of choice of occupation, and their recurrent pogroms, and the German disabilities curbing university, bureaucratic and military careers. There is a wide difference also between these German disabilities and the mere social disabilities of other lands. But some of those now suffering from the severe disabilities imposed by Russia and Romania are descendants of men and women who in centuries before our modern liberalism enjoyed both legal and social equality in Spain and Southern France. The manifestations of the Jewish Problem vary in the different countries, and at different periods in the same country, according to the prevailing degrees of enlightenment and other pertinent conditions. Yet the differences, however wide, are merely in degree and not in kind. The Jewish Problem is single and universal. But it is not necessarily eternal. It may be solved.

Why is it that liberalism has failed to eliminate the anti-Jewish prejudice? It is because the liberal movement has not yet brought full liberty. Enlightened countries grant to the individual equality before the law; but they fail still to recognize the equality of whole peoples or nationalities. We seek to protect as individuals those constituting a minority; but we fail to realize that protection cannot be complete unless group equality also is recognized.

Deeply imbedded in every people is the desire for full development, the longing, as Mazzini phrased it, 'To elaborate and express their idea, to contribute their stone also to the pyramid of history.' Nationality like democracy has been one of the potent forces making for man's advance during the past hundred years. The assertion of nationality has infused whole peoples with hope, manhood and self-respect. It has ennobled and made purposeful millions of lives. It offered them a future, and in doing so revived and capitalized all that was valuable in their past. The assertion of nationality raised Ireland from the slough of despondency. It roused Southern Slavs to heroic deeds. It created gallant Belgium. It freed Greece. It gave us united Italy. It manifested itself even among the free peoples, like the Welsh, who had no grievance, but who gave expression to their nationality through the

revival of the old Cymric tongue. Each of these peoples developed because, as Mazzini said, they were enabled to proclaim 'to the world that they also live, think, love, and labor for the benefit of all.'

In the past it has been generally assumed that the full development of one people necessarily involved its domination over others. Strong nationalities are apt to become convinced that by such domination only does civilization advance. Strong nationalities assume their own superiority, and come to believe that they possess the divine right to subject other people to their sway. Soon the belief in the existence of such a right becomes converted into a conviction that duty exists to enforce it. Ways of aggrandizement follow as a natural result of this belief.

This attitude of certain nationalities is the exact correlative of the position which was generally assumed by the strong in respect to other individuals before democracy became a common possession. The struggles of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries both in peace and in war were devoted largely to overcoming that position as to individuals. In establishing the equal right of every person to development, it became clear that equal opportunity for all involves this necessary limitation: Each man may develop himself so far, but only so far, as his doing so will not interfere with the exercise of a like right by all others. Thus liberty came to mean the right to enjoy life, to acquire property, to pursue happiness in such manner and to such extent as the exercise of the right in each is consistent with the exercise of a like right by every other of our fellow-citizens. Liberty thus defined underlies twentieth century democracy. Liberty thus defined exists in a large part of the western world. And even where this equal right of each individual has not yet been accepted as a political right, its ethical claim is gaining recognition. Democracy rejected the proposal of the superman who should rise through sacrifice of the many. It insists that the full development of each individual is not only a right, but a duty to society; and that our best hope for civilization lies not in uniformity, but in wide differentiation. . . .

The difference between a nation and a nationality is clear; but it is not always observed. Likeness between members is the essence of nationality; but the members of a nation may be very different. A nation may be composed of many nationalities, as some of the most successful nations are. An instance of this is the British nation, with its division into English, Scotch, Welsh, and Irish at home; with the French in Canada; and throughout the Empire, scores of other nationalities. Other examples are furnished by the Swiss nation with its German, French and Italian sections; by the Belgian nation composed of Flemings and Walloons; and by the American nation which comprises nearly all the white nationalities. The unity of a nationality is a fact of nature; the unification into a nation is largely the work of man. The false doctrine that nation and nationality must be made co-extensive is the cause of some of our greatest tragedies. It is, in large part, the cause also of the present war. It has led, on the one hand, to cruel, futile attempts at enforced assimilation, like the Russianizing of Finland and Poland, and the

Prussianizing of Posen, Schleswig-Holstein, and Alsace-Lorraine. It has led, on the other hand, to those Panistic movements which are a cloak for territorial ambitions. As a nation may develop though composed of many nationalities, so a nationality may develop though forming parts of several nations. The essential in either case is recognition of the equal rights of each nationality.

W. Allison Philips recently defined nationality as, 'An extensive aggregate of persons, conscious of a community of sentiments, experiences, or qualities which make them feel themselves a distinct people.' And he adds: 'If we examine the composition of the several nationalities we find these elements: race, language, religion, common habitat, common conditions, mode of life and manners, political association. The elements are, however, never all present at the same time, and none of them is essential. . . . A common habitat and common conditions are doubtless powerful influences at times in determining nationality; but what part do they play in that of the Jews or the Greeks, or the Irish in dispersion?'

See how this high authority assumes without question that the Jews are, despite their dispersion, a distinct nationality; and he groups us with the Greeks or the Irish, two other peoples of marked individuality. Can it be doubted that we Jews, aggregating 14,000,000 people, are 'an extensive aggregate of persons'; that we are 'conscious of a community of sentiments, experiences and qualities which make us feel ourselves a distinct people,' whether we admit it or not?

It is no answer to this evidence of nationality to declare that the Jews are not an absolutely pure race. There has, of course, been some intermixture of foreign blood in the 3000 years which constitute our historic period. But, owing to persecution and prejudice, the intermarriages with non-Jews which occurred have resulted merely in taking away many from the Jewish community. Intermarriage has brought few additions. Therefore the percentage of foreign blood in the Jews of today is very low. Probably no important European race is as pure.

But common race is only one of the elements which determine nationality. Conscious community of sentiments, common experiences, common qualities are equally, perhaps more, important. Religion, traditions and customs bound us together, though scattered throughout the world. The similarity of experience tended to produce similarity of qualities and community of sentiments. Common suffering so intensified the feeling of brotherhood as to overcome largely all the influences making for diversification. The segregation of the Jew was so general, so complete, and so long continued as to intensify our 'peculiarities' and make them almost ineradicable.

We recognize that with each child the aim of education should be to develop his own individuality, not to make him an imitator, not to assimilate him to others. Shall we fail to recognize this truth when applied to whole peoples? And what people in the world has shown greater individuality than

the Jews? Has any a nobler past? Does any possess common ideas better worth expressing? Has any marked traits worthier of development? Of all the peoples in the world those of two tiny states stand preeminent as contributors to our present civilization, the Greeks and the Jews. The Jews gave to the world its three greatest religions, reverence for law, and the highest conceptions of morality. Never before has the value of our contribution been so generally recognized. Our teaching of brotherhood and righteousness has, under the name of democracy and social justice, become the twentieth century striving of America and of western Europe. Our conception of law is embodied in the American constitution which proclaims this to be a 'government of laws and not of men.' And for the triumph of our other great teaching, the doctrine of peace, this cruel war is paving the way.

While every other people is striving for development by asserting its nationality, and a great war is making clear the value of small nations, shall we voluntarily yield to anti-Semitism, and instead of solving our 'problem' end it by noble suicide? Surely this is no time for Jews to despair. Let us make clear to the world that we too are a nationality striving for equal rights to life and to self-expression. That this should be our course has been recently expressed by high non-Jewish authority. Thus Seton-Watson; speaking of the probable results of the war, said:

'There are good grounds for hoping that it [the war] will also give a new and healthy impetus to Jewish national policy, grant freer play to their splendid qualities, and enable them to shake off the false shame which has led men who ought to be proud of their Jewish race to assume so many alien disguises and to accuse of anti-Semitism those who refuse to be deceived by mere appearances. It is high time that the Jews should realize that few things do more to foster anti-Semitic feeling than this very tendency to sail under false colors and conceal their true identity. The Zionists and the orthodox Jewish Nationalists have long ago won the respect and admiration of the world. No race has ever defied assimilation so stubbornly and so successfully; and the modern tendency of individual Jews to repudiate what is one of their chief glories suggests an almost comic resolve to fight against the course of nature.'

Standing against this broad foundation of nationality, Zionism aims to give it full development. Let us bear clearly in mind what Zionism is, or rather what it is not.

It is not a movement to remove all the Jews of the world compulsorily to Palestine. In the first place there are 14,000,000 Jews, and Palestine would not accommodate more than one-third of that number. In the second place, it is not a movement to compel anyone to go to Palestine. It is essentially a movement to give to the Jew more, not less freedom; it aims to enable the Jews to exercise the same right now exercised by practically every other people in the world: To live at their option either in the land of their fathers or in some other country; a right which members of small nations as well as of large, which Irish, Greek, Bulgarian, Serbian, or Belgian, may now

exercise as fully as Germans or English.

Zionism seeks to establish in Palestine, for such Jews as choose to go and remain there, and for their descendants, a legally secured home, where they may live together and lead a Jewish life, where they may expect ultimately to constitute a majority of the population, and may look forward to what we should call home rule. The Zionists seek to establish this home in Palestine because they are convinced that the undying longing of Jews for Palestine is a fact of deepest significance; that it is a manifestation in the struggle for existence by an ancient people which has established its right to live, a people whose three thousand years of civilization has produced a faith, culture and individuality which enable it to contribute largely in the future, as it has in the past, to the advance of civilization; and that it is not a right merely but a duty of the Jewish nationality to survive and develop. They believe that only in Palestine can Jewish life be fully protected from the forces of disintegration; that there alone can the Jewish spirit reach its full and natural development; and that by securing for those Jews who wish to settle there the opportunity to do so, not only those Jews, but all other Jews will be benefited, and that the long perplexing Jewish Problem will, at last, find solution.

They believe that to accomplish this, it is not necessary that the Jewish population of Palestine be large as compared with the whole number of Jews in the world; for throughout centuries when the Jewish influence was greatest, during the Persian, the Greek, and the Roman Empires, only a relatively small part of the Jews lived in Palestine; and only a small part of the Jews returned from Babylon when the Temple was rebuilt.

Since the destruction of the Temple, nearly two thousand years ago, the longing for Palestine has been ever present with the Jew. It was the hope of a return to the land of his fathers that buoyed up the Jew amidst persecution, and for the realization of which the devout ever prayed. Until a generation ago this was a hope merely, a wish piously prayed for, but not worked for. The Zionist movement is idealistic, but it is also essentially practical. It seeks to realize that hope; to make the dream of a Jewish life in a Jewish land come true as other great dreams of the world have been realized, by men working with devotion, intelligence, and self-sacrifice. It was thus that the dream of Italian independence and unity, after centuries of vain hope, came true through the efforts of Mazzini, Garibaldi and Cavour; that the dream of Greek, of Bulgarian and of Serbian independence became facts.

The rebirth of the Jewish nation is no longer a mere dream. It is in process of accomplishment in a most practical way, and the story is a wonderful one. A generation ago a few Jewish emigrants from Russia and from Rumania, instead of proceeding westward to this hospitable country where they might easily have secured material prosperity, turned eastward for the purpose of settling in the land of their fathers.

To the worldly-wise these efforts at colonization appeared very foolish. Nature and man presented obstacles in Palestine which appeared almost

insuperable; and the colonists were in fact ill-equipped for their task, save in their spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice. The land, harassed by centuries of misrule, was treeless and apparently sterile; and it was infested with malaria. The Government offered them no security, either as to life or property. The colonists themselves were not only unfamiliar with the character of the country, but were ignorant of the farmer's life which they proposed to lead; for the Jews of Russia and Rumania had been generally denied the opportunity of owning or working land. Furthermore, these colonists were not inured to the physical hardships to which the life of a pioneer is necessarily subjected. To these hardships and to malaria many succumbed. Those who survived were long confronted with failure. But at last success came. Within a generation these Jewish Pilgrim Fathers, and those who followed them, have succeeded in establishing these two fundamental propositions:

First: That Palestine is fit for the modern Jew.

Second: That the modern Jew is fit for Palestine.

Over forty self-governing Jewish colonies attest to this remarkable achievement.

This land, treeless a generation ago, supposed to be sterile and hopelessly arid, has been shown to have been treeless and sterile because of man's misrule. It has been shown to be capable of becoming again a land 'flowing with milk and honey.' Oranges and grapes, olives and almonds, wheat and other cereals are now growing there in profusion.

This material development has been attended by a spiritual and social development no less extraordinary; a development in education, in health and in social order; and in the character and habits of the population. Perhaps the most extraordinary achievement of Jewish nationalism is the revival of the Hebrew Language, which has again become a language of the common intercourse of men. The Hebrew tongue, called a dead language for nearly two thousand years, has, in the Jewish colonies and in Jerusalem, become again the living mother tongue. The effect of this common language in unifying the Jew is, of course, great; for the Jews of Palestine came literally from all the lands of the earth, each speaking, excepting those who used Yiddish, the language of the country from which he came, and remaining, in the main, almost a stranger to the others. But the effect of the renaissance of the Hebrew tongue is far greater than that of unifying the Jews. It is a potent factor in reviving the essentially Jewish spirit.

Our Jewish Pilgrim Fathers have laid the foundation. It remains for us to build the superstructure.

Let no American imagine that Zionism is inconsistent with Patriotism. Multiple loyalties are objectionable only if they are inconsistent. A man is a better citizen of the United States for being also a loyal citizen of his state, and of his city; for being loyal to his family, and to his profession or trade; for being loyal to his college or his lodge. Every Irish American who contributed towards advancing home rule was a better man and a better

American for the sacrifice he made. Every American Jew who aids in advancing the Jewish settlement in Palestine, though he feels that neither he nor his descendants will ever live there, will likewise be a better man and a better American for doing so.

Note what Seton-Watson says:

‘America is full of nationalities which, while accepting with enthusiasm their new American citizenship, nevertheless look to some centre in the old world as the source and inspiration of their national culture and traditions. The most typical instance is the feeling of the American Jew for Palestine which may well become a focus for his *déclassé* kinsmen in other parts of the world.’

There is no inconsistency between loyalty to America and loyalty to Jewry. The Jewish spirit, the product of our religion and experiences, is essentially modern and essentially American. Not since the destruction of the Temple have the Jews in spirit and in ideals been so fully in harmony with the noblest aspirations of the country in which they lived.

America’s fundamental law seeks to make real the brotherhood of man. That brotherhood became the Jewish fundamental law more than twenty-five hundred years ago. America’s insistent demand in the twentieth century is for social justice. That also has been the Jews’ striving for ages. Their affliction as well as their religion has prepared the Jews for effective democracy. Persecution broadened their sympathies. It trained them in patience and endurance, in self-control, and in sacrifice. It made them think as well as suffer. It deepened the passion for righteousness.

Indeed, loyalty to America demands rather that each American Jew become a Zionist. For only through the ennobling effect of its strivings can we develop the best that is in us and give to this country the full benefit of our great inheritance. The Jewish spirit, so long preserved, the character developed by so many centuries of sacrifice, should be preserved and developed further, so that in America as elsewhere the sons of the race may in future live lives and do deeds worthy of their ancestors.

But we have also an immediate and more pressing duty in the performance of which Zionism alone seems capable of affording effective aid. We must protect America and ourselves from demoralization, which has to some extent already set in among American Jews. The cause of this demoralization is clear. It results in large part from the fact that in our land of liberty all the restraints by which the Jews were protected in their Ghettos were removed and a new generation left without necessary moral and spiritual support. And is it not equally clear what the only possible remedy is? It is the laborious task of inculcating self-respect, a task which can be accomplished only by restoring the ties of the Jew to the noble past of his race, and by making him realize the possibilities of a no less glorious future. The sole bulwark against demoralization is to develop in each new generation of Jews in America the sense of *noblesse oblige*. That spirit can be developed in those who regard their people as destined to live and to live

with a bright future. That spirit can best be developed by actively participating in some way in furthering the ideals of the Jewish renaissance; and this can be done effectively only through furthering the Zionist movement.

In the Jewish colonies of Palestine there are no Jewish criminals; because everyone, old and young alike, is led to feel the glory of his people and his obligation to carry forward its ideals. The new Palestinian Jewry produces instead of criminals, scientists like Aaron Aaronsohn, the discoverer of wild wheat; pedagogues like David Yellin, craftsmen like Boris Schatz, the founder of the Bezalel; intrepid *Shomrim*, the Jewish guards of peace, who watch in the night against marauders and doers of violent deeds.

And the Zionist movement has brought like inspiration to the Jews in the Diaspora, as Steed has shown in this striking passage from 'The Hapsburg Monarchy':

'To minds like these Zionism came with the force of an evangel. To be a Jew and to be proud of it; to glory in the power and pertinacity of the race, its traditions, its triumphs, its sufferings, its resistance to persecution; to look the world frankly in the face and to enjoy the luxury of moral and intellectual honesty; to feel pride in belonging to the people that gave Christendom its divinities, that taught half the world monotheism, whose ideas have permeated civilization as never the ideas of a race before it, whose genius fashioned the whole mechanism of modern commerce, and whose artists, actors, singers and writers have filled a larger place in the cultured universe than those of any other people. This, or something like this, was the train of thought fired in youthful Jewish minds by the Zionist spark. Its effect upon the Jewish students of Austrian universities was immediate and striking. Until then they had been despised and often ill-treated. They had wormed their way into appointments and into the free professions by dint of pliancy, mock humility, mental acuteness, and clandestine protection. If struck or spat upon by 'Aryan' students, they rarely ventured to return the blow or the insult. But Zionism gave them courage. They formed associations, and learned athletic drill and fencing. Insult was requited with insult, and presently the best fencers of the fighting German corps found that Zionist students could gash cheeks quite as effectually as any Teuton, and that the Jews were in a fair way to become the best swordsmen of the university. Today the purple cap of the Zionist is as respected as that of any academical association.

'This moral influence of Zionism is not confined to university students. It is quite as noticeable among the mass of the younger Jews outside, who also find in it a reason to raise their heads, and, taking their stand upon the past, to gaze straightforwardly into the future.'

Since the Jewish Problem is single and universal, the Jews of every country should strive for its solution. But the duty resting upon us of America is especially insistent. We number about 3,000,000, which is more than one fifth of all the Jews in the world, a number larger than comprised within any

other country except the Russian Empire. We are representative of all the Jews in the world; for we are composed of immigrants, or descendants of immigrants coming from every other country, or district. We include persons from every section of society, and of every shade of religious belief. We are ourselves free from civil or political disabilities; and are relatively prosperous. Our fellow-Americans are infused with a high and generous spirit, which insures approval of our struggle to ennoble, liberate, and otherwise improve the condition of an important part of the human race; and their innate manliness makes them sympathize particularly with our efforts at self-help. America's detachment from the old world problem relieves us from suspicions and embarrassments frequently attending the activities of Jews of rival European countries. And a conflict between American interests or ambitions and Jewish aims is not conceivable. Our loyalty to America can never be questioned.

Let us therefore lead, earnestly, courageously and joyously, in the struggle for liberation. Let us all recognize that we Jews are a distinctive nationality of which every Jew, whatever his country, his station or shade of belief, is necessarily a member. Let us insist that the struggle for liberty shall not cease until equality of opportunity is accorded to nationalities as to individuals. Let us insist also that full equality of opportunity cannot be obtained by Jews until we, like members of other nationalities, shall have the option of living elsewhere or of returning to the land of our forefathers.

The fulfillment of these aspirations is clearly demanded in the interest of mankind, as well as in justice to the Jews. They cannot fail of attainment if we are united and true to ourselves. But we must be united not only in spirit but in action. To this end we must organize. Organize, in the first place, so that the world may have proof of the extent and the intensity of our desire for liberty. Organize, in the second place, so that our resources may become known and be made available. But in mobilizing our force it will not be for war. The whole world longs for the solution of the Jewish Problem. We have but to lead the way, and we may be sure of ample cooperation from non-Jews. In order to lead the way, we need not arms, but men; men with those qualities for which Jews should be peculiarly fitted by reason of their religion and life; men of courage, of high intelligence, of faith and public spirit, of indomitable will and ready self-sacrifice; men who will both think and do, who will devote high abilities to shaping our course, and to overcoming the many obstacles which must from time to time arise. And we need other, many, many other men, officers commissioned and non-commissioned and common soldiers in the cause of liberty, who will give of their efforts and resources, as occasion may demand, in unfailing and ever strengthening support of the measures which may be adopted. Organization, thorough and complete, can alone develop such leaders and the necessary support.

Organize, Organize, Organize, until every Jew in America must stand up and be counted, counted with us, or prove himself, wittingly or unwittingly, of the few who are against their own people."¹²⁸⁹

There are too many instances of hypocrisy and of sophistry in Brandeis' statement to address them all. I will mention the call for democracy while imposing a tyrannous Jewish minority on a majority Moslem and Christian native population in Palestine in hopes of someday outnumbering the native population with a deliberate and orchestrated demographic shift to a majority Jewish population. Brandeis' arbitrary statement that there could never be any conflict of interest between loyalty to a Palestinian Jewish state and loyalty to the United States of America proves his disloyalty to one, the other, or both; and statements such as his gave ammunition to the anti-Semites of Russia and Germany who sought to mischaracterize all Jews as if disloyal, even though most Jews were not Zionists.

Fellow Zionists like Jakob Klatzkin were more honest than Brandeis and openly declared their disloyalty to their present home states—Brandeis was a notorious liar and a mediocre sophist. Numerous Israeli agents, many, if not most of whom were American Jews, have been investigated and prosecuted by the Government of the United States of America for espionage against America. Israel has stolen American weapons and weapons technology and sold them to enemies of the United States. Zionist Jewish bankers have financed America's worst enemies including Great Britain, the Confederacy, Imperial Japan, Bolshevik Russia, Nazi Germany, etc. and have consistently agitated for grossly destructive wars. Zionist Jewish bankers are responsible for more American war casualties than any other group. They have deliberately cost Americans oceans of blood and mountains of treasure. Michael Collins Piper argues that Mossad agents were involved in the assassination of United States President John Fitzgerald Kennedy and that they wanted him dead because Kennedy opposed the Israeli nuclear weapons program, a program which is not in the best interests of the United States.¹²⁹⁰ Zionist Jewish bankers have deliberately caused America's worst recessions and depressions. They have corrupted the American media and American politics.

Among the countless instances where Jews have been disloyal to their native countries, Egyptian Jews in collusion with the Israeli Government in "Operation Susannah" bombed American and British interests in Egypt and tried to make it appear that Egyptian Moslems had committed the terrorist atrocities that these Jews had committed at the behest of, and with the support of, the Israeli Government.¹²⁹¹ Israel has officially celebrated the disloyal Jews of the "Lavon Affair", who, without provocation, viciously attacked innocent Americans, Brits and Egyptians. In 1967, the State of Israel again committed an act of war against the United States of America and attempted to sink the *U. S. S. Liberty*, and to blame Egypt for the attack, so as to draw America into a broad war against its own best interests.¹²⁹²

Former Mossad agent Victor Ostrovsky wrote in his book *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad's Secret Agenda* (note that a "Sayanim" is a disloyal and deceitful Jew, who is prepared to betray his or her neighbors at any time in order to advance a perceived Israeli interest),

"The American Jewish community was divided into a three-stage action team. First were the individual *sayanim* (if the situation had been reversed and the United States had convinced Americans working in Israel to work

secretly on behalf of the United States, they would be treated as spies by the Israeli government). Then there was the large pro-Israeli lobby. It would mobilize the Jewish community in a forceful effort in whatever direction the Mossad pointed them. And last was B'nai Brith. Members of that organization could be relied on to make friends among non-Jews and tarnish as anti-Semitic whomever they couldn't sway to the Israeli cause. With that sort of one-two-three tactic, there was no way we could strike out."¹²⁹³

In 2006, Professors John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt wrote in their paper, "The Israel Lobby and U. S. Foreign Policy",

"The U.S. national interest should be the primary object of American foreign policy. For the past several decades, however, and especially since the Six Day War in 1967, the centerpiece of U.S. Middle East policy has been its relationship with Israel. The combination of unwavering U.S. support for Israel and the related effort to spread democracy throughout the region has inflamed Arab and Islamic opinion and jeopardized U.S. security.

This situation has no equal in American political history. Why has the United States been willing to set aside its own security in order to advance the interests of another state? One might assume that the bond between the two countries is based on shared strategic interests or compelling moral imperatives. As we show below, however, neither of those explanations can account for the remarkable level of material and diplomatic support that the United States provides to Israel.

Instead, the overall thrust of U.S. policy in the region is due almost entirely to U.S. domestic politics, and especially to the activities of the 'Israel Lobby.' Other special interest groups have managed to skew U.S. foreign policy in directions they favored, but no lobby has managed to divert U.S. foreign policy as far from what the American national interest would otherwise suggest, while simultaneously convincing Americans that U.S. and Israeli interests are essentially identical."¹²⁹⁴

In America, many ethnicities have resolved their sense of heritage in different ways. Stephen Steinlight wrote, *inter alia*,

"I'll confess it, at least: like thousands of other typical Jewish kids of my generation, I was reared as a Jewish nationalist, even a quasi-separatist. Every summer for two months for 10 formative years during my childhood and adolescence I attended Jewish summer camp. There, each morning, I saluted a foreign flag, dressed in a uniform reflecting its colors, sang a foreign national anthem, learned a foreign language, learned foreign folk songs and dances, and was taught that Israel was the true homeland. Emigration to Israel was considered the highest virtue, and, like many other Jewish teens of my generation, I spent two summers working in Israel on a collective farm while I contemplated that possibility. More tacitly and

subconsciously, I was taught the superiority of my people to the gentiles who had oppressed us. We were taught to view non-Jews as untrustworthy outsiders, people from whom sudden gusts of hatred might be anticipated, people less sensitive, intelligent, and moral than ourselves. We were also taught that the lesson of our dark history is that we could rely on no one. I am of course simplifying a complex process of ethnic and religious identity formation; there was also a powerful counterbalancing universalistic moral component that inculcated a belief in social justice for all people and a special identification with the struggle for Negro civil rights.”¹²⁹⁵

Brandeis intentionally confuses abstract ideals with peoples and circumstances. Peoples must interpret ideals and apply them to their interpretation of their circumstances. Different peoples with the same bill of ideals can come into conflict due to various circumstances and various interpretations of the same set of written ideals and different interpretations of the same set of circumstances. Different peoples can stress different ideals over others when choosing among the same set, etc. One group may change or abandon ideals as circumstances change due to demographic changes, wars, economic conditions, etc.; or by being misled, through mistakes or improvements, or because of perceived self-interest. When selecting that which constitutes the greater good, or the greater right, one side must prevail over the other.

Brandeis soon proved his own disloyalty to America by blackmailing the President of the United States and unnecessarily bringing America into a grossly destructive war, which was against America’s best interests. His “you’re either with us or against us” attitude toward assimilationist Jews, who were genuinely loyal to America, was typical of political Zionists, and is one reason why the Zionists were rejected by the vast majority of Jews, and the Zionists aided the anti-Semites in order to leave all persons of Jewish descent no option but to flee to a foreign state of the Zionists’ making, or perish at the hands of the political Zionists and their political anti-Semitic allies in their home countries.

Brandeis, like many political Zionists, saw the “melting pot”, to use Zangwill’s term, of America as an alleged degeneration of the Jewish race and longed for the segregation of the Ghetto in a “World Ghetto”¹²⁹⁶ for Jews in Palestine, to use Herzl’s term. Many Zionists lamented the loss of the forced segregation of the Ghetto. As but one example of many, anti-Semitic Zionist Aaron David Gordon stated,

“Our condition has changed strikingly in recent times, since the crumbling of the ghetto. The limited amount of independent life that still survived inside its walls has been destroyed while we, together with all mankind, have increased in knowledge, but at the expense of the spirit and of real life.”¹²⁹⁷

In 1924, racist Zionist Israel Zangwill wrote that Zionists wanted to segregate Jews in “Russia” in order to form an autonomous Jewish State. In his article, he points out that the only salvation to be had for Jews other than the “solution of the

Jewish question” through “dissolution” was to absolutely segregate Jews in Ghettos, be it in “Russia”, New York, or Palestine. Given that the Nazis fulfilled this Zionist’s objectives of segregating the Jews in large Ghettos meant for deportation and took away their national rights, as did the Communists, one has a right to ask if the Zionists were behind, or influential members of, both the Hitler and Stalin régimes. Were the Nazis and Communists herding up the Jews of Europe for involuntary deportation to Palestine, Madagascar or a segregated state in Russia or China at the request of Zionists, or as part of a Zionist plan? Were Hitler and Stalin, in their messiah complexes, hacking apart European civilization, killing off the Gentiles and destroying religion and culture, in fulfillment of Communist objectives—those of genocidal Judaism? Had the political Zionists come to the conclusion that just as politics would play the role of Jewish Messiah in the modern world, it would fulfill that role to the letter of the Torah by making good on Jewish prophesies of the destruction of the Gentiles and the horrific punishment of “disobedient” Jews? Zangwill wrote in 1924,

“It is true the situation may be modified if the Jewish republic now adumbrated in Russia, in the districts of Homel, Witebsk, and Minsk, really brings my own organization’s ideal of an autonomous Jewish territory into being. [***] Of this species of nationalism, however, no pure example exists; it is only a tendency. New York’s East Side comes nearest to it. But unless the East Side nationalists could be absolutely segregated from the general life in a close-barred Ghetto, they, and still more their children educated in the public schools, would be found responding to all the mass-emotions of the majority. [***] It was formally repudiated by Dr. Weizmann in a speech at Boston, but as even he cannot control the hot-heads or the muddle-heads of his movement, let me say here to any Diaspora nationalists that may happen to be in America that if they mean seriously that they are not merely sentimental sympathizers with the Palestine Jewry, as Irish-Americans are with Ireland, but that they are actual subjects of the Jewish National Home, they must naturally give up their American citizenship and all rights save those appertaining to resident aliens; a status which when proposed by a Belloc they are the first to cry out against. [***] The world’s contempt for the Jew is not wholly undeserved. A people, a faith, in so parlous a situation, lives not under peace conditions but under war conditions, and the standard of duty exacted from every Jew is not a peace standard but a war standard. [***] That is why Zionism cannot afford to become the blind and obsequious agent of any Power.”¹²⁹⁸

Even in its infancy, the First World War was seen as an opportunity by the Zionists to grab land, and Brandeis called for soldiers to appropriate land—allegedly in the defense of liberty and democracy. There has been an oft repeated charge that both world wars only served the cause of the Zionists, and that a third is coming on their behalf. Perhaps one day history will record the world wars as a second wave of crusades to take Palestine for Zionists, instead of Christians, and to force Jews to

emigrate there. Millions of completely innocent lives were lost due to political Zionist agitation.

Political Zionist leader Theodor Herzl, defamed Jews around the world as had John Chrysostom,¹²⁹⁹ Raymund Martin,¹³⁰⁰ Porchetus de Salvaticis,¹³⁰¹ Antonius Margaritha,¹³⁰² Martin Bucer,¹³⁰³ Johann Eck,¹³⁰⁴ Martin Luther,¹³⁰⁵ Diderot,¹³⁰⁶ Voltaire,¹³⁰⁷ Ludolf Holst,¹³⁰⁸ Richard Wagner,¹³⁰⁹ Wilhelm Marr,¹³¹⁰ Eugen Karl Dühring,¹³¹¹ and Edouard Adolphe Drumont.¹³¹² Herzl declared the Jews a separate “race” incapable of assimilating into other groups of human beings. Theodor Herzl declared that Jews must leave European nations, and if they refused, they should be forced to do so by any and all means including: deliberate deception, provoked anti-Semitism, blackmail of Christians, and Zionist sponsored forced governmental expulsion. Herzl also libeled Jews by declaring that they should become disloyal to any nation other than the Jewish nation, because of alleged “racial” incompatibility.

Herzl advocated the forced expulsion of the Jews from Europe, which he sought to provoke, to the Jewish financiers he wanted to finance it; by asserting that they could profiteer from racism, panic and the slave labor of Eastern European Jews.

The opening line of Herzl’s racist Zionist manifesto *The Jewish State* is a statement about economics and the rest reads like an archaic colonialistic business plan from the Roman Empire, promising exponential profits for all those who would invest in the scheme to segregate the Jews in a “World Ghetto”.¹³¹³ Herzl was not timid in his declarations that these financiers could control the trade between East and West by occupying Palestine and taking over the banking interests of the Sultan of Turkey, as well as forming new banks from smaller banks, potentially to put other larger banks out of business. Herzl promised the richest Jews of Western Europe palatial estates built with Eastern European Jews’ blood and sweat. He shamelessly appealed to the anti-Semites’ desire to see the Jews go, in order to encourage the governments of Europe to force the Jews of Europe out, so that these Jewish financiers could profit from the forced expulsion of the Jews.

In many respects, Herzl copied from Leon Pinsker’s *Auto-Emancipation*. Pinsker claimed that Jews were incapable of assimilation, were an advanced race unlike some others, and were a parasite people with a “surplus” of untouchables, whom Herzl thought could be put to slave labor for the benefit of rich Western Jews. Pinsker wrote in 1882,

“This is the kernel of the problem, as we see it: *the Jews comprise a distinctive element among the nations under which they dwell, and as such can neither assimilate nor be readily digested by any nation.* [***] The Jews are aliens who can have no representatives, because they have no country. Because they have none, because their home has no boundaries within which they can be entrenched, their misery too is boundless. The *general law* does not apply to the Jews as true aliens, but there are everywhere *laws for the Jews*, and if the general law is to apply to them, a special and explicit by-law is required to confirm it. Like the Negroes, like women, and unlike all free peoples, they must be *emancipated*. If, unlike the Negroes, they belong to an advanced race, and if, unlike women, they can produce not only women of

distinction, but also distinguished men, even men of greatness, then it is very much the worse for them. [***] It is precisely the great misfortune of our race that we do not constitute a nation, but are merely Jews. [***] Such being the situation, we shall forever remain a burden to the rest of the population, parasites who can never secure their favor. The apparent fact that we can mix with nations only slightly offers a further obstacle to the establishment of amicable relations. Therefore, we must see to it that the *surplus*, the unassimilable residue, is removed and elsewhere provided for. [***] Our greatest and ablest forces—men of finance, of science, and of affairs, statesmen and publicists—must join hands with one accord in steering toward the common destination. They would aim chiefly and especially at creating a secure and inviolable home for the *surplus* of those Jews who live as proletarians in the different countries and are a burden to the native citizens. [***] The wealthy may also remain even where the Jews are not willingly tolerated. But, as we have said before, there is a certain point of saturation beyond which their numbers may not increase, if the Jews are not to be exposed to the dangers of persecution as in Russia, Roumania, Morocco and elsewhere. It is this surplus which, a burden to itself and to others, conjures up the evil fate of the entire people. It is now high time to create a refuge for this surplus. We must occupy ourselves with the foundation of such a lasting refuge, not with the meaningless collection of donations for emigrants or refugees who forsake, in their consternation, an *unhospitable home* to perish in the abyss of a strange and unknown land.”¹³¹⁴

Herzl was no friend to the Jews of Europe. Herzl advocated asking Christians to pay for the forced expulsion of the Jews of Europe, which Herzl strove to bring about. He assured the Christians that no such economic disasters would occur as happened when the Jews fled the Czar’s pogroms and took with them their wealth. In statements certain to have provoked greed, Herzl promised that the expulsion of the Jews would be an economic boon and that Christians would profit by taking the jobs vacated by Jews and by managing the systems needed to expel them. The minutes of the Wannsee Conference of 1942¹³¹⁵ parallel many of the statements and proposals found in Herzl’s book *The Jewish State* of 1896. Herzl appealed to all the most base and simplistic sensibilities later manifest in Zionist Fascist propagandists like Adolf Hitler. Like Hitler, Herzl wrote in absolutes of: *us* versus *them*, fatalistic inevitabilities, total self-assuredness, the common enemy, the alleged impossibility of different races living together in harmony, the mythologies of immutable conspiring forces in history demanding segregation, the allegedly feeble nature of democracy, etc.—all the Darwinistic and Hegelian clichés of the day meant to justify inhumane Colonialism and Imperialism. Herzl, Syrkin, and other anti-Semitic Zionists believed the racial mythology that,

“Competition from the Jew was all the harder to face, because natural selection had made him an especially fierce adversary in business.”¹³¹⁶

Herzl delighted in deceiving people and appealed to their greed in order to induce them into actions they would not otherwise take. Like Zionists in general, Herzl had little regard for informed personal choice. Herzl wrote,

“I am absolutely convinced that I am right—though I doubt whether I shall live to see myself proved to be so. [***] The Jewish State is essential to the world, it will therefore be created. [***] We are a people—one people. We have honestly endeavored everywhere to merge ourselves in the social life of surrounding communities, and to preserve only the faith of our fathers. It has not been permitted to us. In vain are we loyal patriots, our loyalty in some places running to extremes; in vain do we make the same sacrifices of life and property as our fellow-citizens; in vain do we strive to increase the fame of our native land in science and art, or her wealth by trade and commerce. In countries where we have lived for centuries we are still cried down as strangers, and often by those whose ancestors were not yet domiciled in the land where Jews had already made experience of suffering. The majority may decide which are the strangers; for this, as indeed every point which arises in the commerce of nations, is a question of might. I do not here surrender any portion of our prescriptive right, for I am making this statement merely in my own name as an individual. In the world of today, and for an indefinite period it will probably remain so, might precedes right. Therefore it is useless for us to be loyal patriots, as were the Huguenots who were forced to emigrate. If we could only be left in peace. . . . But I think we shall not be left in peace. [***] Every nation in whose midst Jews live is, either covertly or openly, Anti-Semitic. The common people have not, and indeed cannot have, any historic comprehension. They do not know that the sins of the Middle Ages are now being visited on the nations of Europe. We are what the Ghetto made us. We have attained pre-eminence in finance, because mediæval conditions drove us to it. The same process is now being repeated. Modern conditions force us again into finance, now the stock-exchange, by keeping us out of all other branches of industry. Being on the stock-exchange, we are therefore again considered contemptible. At the same time we continue to produce an abundance of mediocre intellects which find no outlet, and this endangers our social position as much as does our increasing wealth. Educated Jews without means are now fast becoming Socialists. Hence we are certain to suffer very severely in the struggle between classes, because we stand in the most exposed position in the camps of both Socialists and capitalists. [***] In the principal countries where Anti-Semitism prevails, it does so as a result of the emancipation of the Jews. [***] When we sink, we become a revolutionary proletariat, the subordinate officers of the revolutionary party; when we rise, there rises also our terrible power of the purse. [***] Thus, whether we like it or not, we are now, and shall henceforth remain, a historic group with unmistakable characteristics common to us all. We are one people—our enemies have made us one in our despite, as repeatedly happens in history. [***] The Governments of all

countries scourged by Anti-Semitism will serve their own interests in assisting us to obtain the sovereignty we want. [***] This pamphlet will open a general discussion on the Jewish Question, avoiding, if possible, the creation of an opposition party. Such a result would ruin the cause from the outset, and dissentients must remember that allegiance or opposition are entirely voluntary. Who will not come with us, may remain. [***] Palestine is our ever-memorable historic home. The very name of Palestine would attract our people with a force of marvellous potency. Supposing His Majesty the Sultan were to give us Palestine, we could in return pledge ourselves to regulate the whole finances of Turkey. We should there form a portion of a rampart of Europe against Asia, an outpost of civilization as opposed to barbarism. The sanctuaries of Christendom would be safeguarded by assigning to them an extra-territorial status, such as is well known to the law of nations. We should form a guard of honor about these sanctuaries, answering for the fulfillment of this duty with our existence. This guard of honor would be the great symbol of the solution of the Jewish Question after eighteen centuries of Jewish suffering. [***] The Jewish Company is partly modelled on the lines of a great trading association. It might be called a Jewish Chartered Company, though it cannot exercise sovereign power, and has duties other than the establishment of colonial commerce. The Jewish Company will be founded as a joint-stock company subject to English jurisdiction, framed according to English laws, and under the protection of England. Its principal centre will be London. I cannot tell yet how large the Company's capital should be; I shall leave that calculation to our numerous financiers. But to avoid ambiguity, I shall put it at a thousand million marks (about £50,000,000); it may be either more or less than that sum. The form of subscription, which will be further elucidated, will determine what fraction of the whole amount must be paid in at once. The Jewish Company is an organization with a transitional character. It is strictly a business undertaking, and must be carefully distinguished from the Society of Jews. The Jewish Company will first of all see to the realisation of vested interests left by departing Jews. The method adopted will prevent the occurrences of crises, secure every man's property, and facilitate that inner migration of Christian citizens which has already been indicated. [***] At the same time the Company will buy estates, or, rather, exchange them. For a house it will offer a house in the new country, and for land, land in the new country; everything being, if possible, transferred to new soil in the same state as it was in the old. And this transfer will be a great and recognised source of profit to the Company. 'Over there' the houses offered in exchange will be newer, more beautiful, and more comfortably fitted, and the landed estates of greater value than those abandoned; but they will cost the Company comparatively little, because it will have bought the ground at a very cheap rate. [***] All the immense profits of this speculation in land will go to the Company, which is bound to receive this indefinite premium in return for having borne the risk of the undertaking. When the undertaking involves any risk, the profits must

be freely accorded to those who have borne it. But under no other circumstances will profits be permitted. In the co-relation of risk and profit is comprehended financial justice. [***] I said before that the Company would not have to pay these unskilled labourers. [***] The principle is: the furnishing of every necessitous man with easy, unskilled work, such as chopping wood, or cutting faggots used for lighting stoves in Paris households. This is a kind of prison-work *before* the crime, done without loss of character. It is meant to prevent men from taking to crime out of want, by providing them with work and testing their willingness to do it. Starvation must never be allowed to drive men to suicide; for such suicides are the deepest disgrace to a civilisation which allows rich men to throw tit-bits to their dogs. [***] But the Jewish Company will not lose one thousand millions; it will draw enormous profits from this expenditure. [***] Further and direct profit will accrue to Governments from the transport of passengers and goods, and where railways are State property the returns will be immediately recognisable. Where they are held by companies, the Jewish Company will make favourable terms for transport, in the same way as does every transmitter of goods on a large scale. [***] The capital required for establishing the Company was previously put at what seemed an absurdly high figure. The amount actually necessary will be fixed by financiers, and will in any case be a very considerable sum. There are three ways of raising this sum, all of which the Society will take under consideration. This Society, the great ‘Gestor’ of the Jews, will be formed by our best and most upright men, who must not derive any material advantage from their membership. Although the Society cannot at the outset possess any but moral authority, this authority will yet suffice to establish the credit of the Jewish Company in the nation’s eyes. [***] The easiest, most rapid, and safest would be by ‘la haute finance.’ The required sum would then be raised in the shortest possible time by our great body of financiers, after they had discussed the advisability of the cause. The great advantage of this method would be that it would avoid the necessity of paying in the thousand millions (to keep to the original cipher) immediately in its entirety. A further advantage would be, that the unlimited credit of these powerful financiers would be of considerable value to the Company in its transactions. Many latent political forces lie in our financial power, that power which our enemies assert to be actually and now as effective as we know it might be if we exercised it. Poor Jews feel only the hatred which this financial power provokes; its use in alleviating their lot as a body, they have not yet felt. The credit of our great Jewish financiers would have to be placed at the service of the National Idea. But should these gentlemen, who are naturally satisfied with their lot, decline to do anything for their co-religionists who are unjustly held responsible for the large possessions of certain individuals—should these great financiers refuse to co-operate—then the realisation of this plan will afford an opportunity for drawing a clear line of distinction between them and the rest of Judaism. The great financiers, moreover, will certainly not be asked to

raise an amount so enormous out of pure philanthropy; that would be expecting too much. The promoters and stock-holders of the Jewish Company are, on the contrary, intended to do a good piece of business, and they will be able to calculate beforehand what their chances of success are likely to be. For the Society of Jews will be in possession of all documents and references which may serve to define the prospects of the Jewish Company. The Society will also undertake the special duty of investigating with exactitude the extent of the new Jewish movement, so as to provide the Company promoters with thoroughly reliable information on the amount of support they may expect. The Society will also supply the Jewish Company with comprehensive modern Jewish statistics, thus doing the work of what is called in France a 'société d'études,' which undertakes all preliminary research previous to the financing of a great undertaking. Even so, the enterprise may not receive the valuable assistance of our money magnates. These might, perhaps, even try to oppose the Jewish movement by means of their secret servitors and agents. Such opposition we shall meet fairly and bravely. [***] The Company's capital might be raised without the assistance of a syndicate, by the direct imposition of a subscription on the public. Not only poor Jews, but also Christians who wanted to get rid of them, would subscribe their small quota to this fund. [***] The middle classes will involuntarily be drawn into the outgoing current, for their sons will be the Company's officials and employés over there.' [***] Great exertions will not be necessary to spur on the movement. Anti-Semites provide the requisite impetus. They need only do what they did before, and then they will create a love of emigration where it did not previously exist, and strengthen it where it existed before. Jews who now remain in Anti-Semitic countries do so chiefly because, even those among them who are most ignorant of history, know that numerous changes of residence in bygone centuries never brought them any permanent good. Any land which welcomed the Jews to-day, and offered them even fewer advantages than the future Jewish State would guarantee them, would immediately attract a great influx of our people. The poorest, who have nothing to lose, would drag themselves there. But I maintain, and every man may ask himself whether I am not right, that the pressure weighing on us arouses a desire to emigrate even among prosperous strata of society. Now our poorest strata alone would suffice to found a State; for these make the most vigorous conquerors, because a little despair is indispensable to the formation of a great undertaking. But when our desperadoes increase the value of the land by their presence and by the labour they expend on it, they make it at the same time increasingly attractive as a place of settlement to people who are better off. Higher and yet higher strata will feel tempted to go over. The expedition of the first and poorest settlers will be conducted by conjoint Company and Society, and will probably be additionally supported by existing emigration and Zionist societies. How may a number of people be concentrated on a particular spot without being given express orders to go there? There are certain Jews,

benefactors on a large scale, who try to alleviate the sufferings of their co-religionists by Zionist experiments. To them this problem also presented itself, and they thought to solve it by giving the emigrants money or means of employment. Thus the philanthropists said: 'We pay these people to go there.' Such a procedure is utterly at fault, and all the money in the world will not achieve its purpose. On the other hand, the Company will say: 'We shall not pay them, we shall let them pay us. We shall merely offer them some inducements to go.' A fanciful illustration will make my meaning more explicit: One of those philanthropists (whom we will call 'The Baron') and myself both wish to get a crowd of people on to the plain of Longchamps near Paris, on a hot Sunday afternoon. The Baron, by promising them 10 francs each, will, for 200,000 francs, bring out 20,000 perspiring and miserable people, who will curse him for having given them so much annoyance. Whereas I will offer these 200,000 francs as a prize for the swiftest race-horse—and then I shall have to put up barriers to keep the people off Longchamps. They will pay to go in: 1 franc, 5 francs, 20 francs. The consequence will be that I shall get the half a million of people out there; the President of the Republic will drive *a la* Daumont; and the crowds will enjoy and amuse themselves. Most of them will think it an agreeable walk in the open air, spite of heat and dust; and I shall have made by my 200,000 francs about a million in entrance money and taxes on gaming. I shall get the same people out there whenever I like; but the Baron will not—not on any account. I will give a more serious illustration of the phenomenon of multitudes where they are earning a livelihood. Let any man attempt to cry through the streets of a town: 'Whoever is willing to stand all day long through a winter's terrible cold, through a summer's tormenting heat, in an iron hall exposed on all sides, there to address every passer-by, and to offer him fancy wares, or fish, or fruit, will receive 2 florins, or 4 francs, or something similar.' How many people would go to the hall? How many days would they hold out when hunger drove them there? And if they held out, what energy would they display in trying to persuade passers-by to buy fish, fruit, and fancy wares? We shall set about it in a different way. In places where trade is active, and these places we shall the more easily discover, since we ourselves forms channels for trade to various localities; in these places we shall build large halls, and call them markets. These halls might be worse built and more unwholesome than those above mentioned, and yet people would stream towards them. But we shall use our best efforts, and we shall build them better, and make them more beautiful than the first. And the people, to whom we had promised nothing, because we cannot promise anything without deceiving them, these brave, keen business men will gaily create most active commercial intercourse. They will harangue the buyers unweariedly; they will stand on their feet, and scarcely think of fatigue. They will hurry off day after day, so as to be first on the spot; they will make agreements, promises, anything to continue bread-winning undisturbed. And if they find on Sabbath night that all their hard work has produced only 1

florin, 50 kreutzer, or 3 francs, or something similar, they will yet look forward hopefully to the next day, which may, perhaps, bring them better luck. We have given them hope. Would any one ask whence the demand comes which creates the market? Is it really necessary to tell them again? I pointed out before that the labour-test increased our gain fifteenfold. One million produced fifteen millions; and one thousand millions, fifteen thousand millions. This may be the case on a small scale; is it so on a large one? Capital surely yields a return diminishing in inverse ratio to its own growth? Inactive capital yields this diminishing return, but active capital brings in a marvellously increasing return. Herein lies the social question. Am I stating a fact? I call on the richest Jews as witnesses of my veracity. Why do these carry on so many different industries? Why do they send men to work underground and to raise coal amid terrible dangers for miserable pay? I cannot imagine this to be pleasant, even for the owners of the mines. For I do not believe that capitalists are heartless, and I do not take up the attitude of believing it. My desire is not to accentuate, but to smooth differences. Is it necessary to illustrate the phenomenon of multitudes, and their concentration on a particular spot, by references to pious pilgrimages? I do not want to hurt any one's religious sensibility by words which might be wrongly interpreted. I shall merely refer quite briefly to the Mohammedan pilgrimages to Mecca, the Catholic pilgrimages to Lourdes and to many other spots whence men return comforted by their faith, and to the holy Coat at Trier. Thus we shall also create a centre for the deep religious needs of our people. Our ministers will understand us first, and will be with us in this. [***] I imagine that Governments will, either voluntarily or under pressure from the Anti-Semites, pay certain attention to this scheme; and they may perhaps actually receive it here and there with a sympathy which they will also show to the Society of Jews. For the emigration which I suggest will not create any economic crises. Such crises as would follow everywhere in consequence of Jew-baiting would rather be prevented by the carrying out of my plan. A great period of prosperity would commence in countries which are now Anti-Semitic. For there will be, as I have repeatedly said, an intermigration of Christian citizens into the positions slowly and systematically evacuated by the Jews. If we are not merely suffered, but actually assisted to do this, the movement will have a generally beneficial effect. [***] Universal brotherhood is not even a beautiful dream. Antagonism is essential to man's greatest efforts. But the Jews, once settled in their own State, would probably have no more enemies, and since prosperity enfeebles and causes them to diminish, they would soon disappear altogether. I think the Jews will always have sufficient enemies, much as every nation has. But once fixed in their own land, it will no longer be possible for them to scatter all over the world. The diaspora cannot take place again, unless the civilization of the whole earth is destroyed; and such a consummation could be feared by none but foolish men. Our present civilization possesses weapons powerful enough for its self-defence.

Innumerable objections will be based on low grounds, for there are more low men than noble in this world. I have tried to remove some of these narrow-minded notions; and whoever is willing to fall in behind our white flag with its seven golden stars must assist in this campaign of enlightenment. Perhaps we shall have to fight first of all against many an evil-disposed, narrow-hearted, short-sighted member of our own race. Again, people will say that I am furnishing the Anti-Semites with weapons. Why so? Because I admit the truth? Because I do not maintain that there are none but excellent men amongst us? Again, people will say that I am showing our enemies the way to injure us. This I absolutely dispute. My proposal could only be carried out with the free consent of a majority of Jews. Individuals or even powerful bodies of Jews might be attacked, but Governments will take no action against the collective nation. The equal rights of Jews before the law cannot be withdrawn where they have once been conceded; for the first attempt at withdrawal would immediately drive all Jews rich and poor alike, into the ranks of the revolutionary party. The first official violation of Jewish liberties invariably brings about economic crisis. Therefore no weapons can be effectually used against us, because these cut the hands that wield them. Meantime hatred grows apace. The rich do not feel it much, but our poor do. Let us ask our poor, who have been more severely persecuted since the last renewal of Anti-Semitism than ever before. Our prosperous men may say that the pressure is not yet severe enough to justify emigration, and that every forcible expulsion shows how unwilling our people are to depart. True, because they do not know where to go; because they only pass from one trouble into another. But we are showing them the way to the Promised Land; and the splendid force of enthusiasm must fight against the terrible force of habit.”¹³¹⁷

Herzl proposed that,

“Supposing His Majesty the Sultan were to give us Palestine, we could in return pledge ourselves to regulate the whole finances of Turkey.”¹³¹⁸

Both sides of this bargain would appear to benefit the Zionists and take from Turkey. The Sultan of Turkey was in a financial crisis bought on by Jewish bankers, just as the Egyptian Khedive Ismail Pasha was in a financial crisis brought on by Jewish bankers when Disraeli purchased shares in the Suez Canal with the Bank of Rothschild.¹³¹⁹ But there were many reasons why the Zionists did not simply buy the land and end Turkey’s humiliation, as Herzl had proposed at the Zionist Congress of 1897, and as the Rothschilds had proposed long before.¹³²⁰

Herzl knew that the Jewish financiers who had caused the Turkish Empire’s financial crisis were willing to cure it in exchange for the land of Palestine, and that the Sultan would agree to that deal. The Zionists had additional leverage on the Sultan due to the Turkish attacks on Armenian Christians. Though Jewish bankers were ultimately responsible for these attacks, they threatened to inflame the Christian

world against the Turks. Herzl promised that he could improve the Sultan's public image, and prevent a Christian backlash against the Turkish Empire, through his contacts in the Jewish press. Herzl pledged that warm Jews in the media would bury the story of the Armenian attacks, and praise the Sultan and the Turkish Empire, if the Sultan would agree to sell Palestine to the Rothschilds. In 1902, an article published in *The American Monthly Review of Reviews* addressed some of the problems facing the Turkish Empire at the time Herzl tried to blackmail the Sultan,

“WHERE THE SULTAN FAILED.

Corrupt these pashas were. Many had come from low, and some were of ignoble, origin. Their birth was as varied as the races of the empire they administered but did not rule. The weakest Ottoman sultan does that. But they were undeniably able. They have disappeared. They have no successors. Palace has supplanted ministerial rule. Personal secretaries have taken the place of pashas. The grand vizierate has become an empty shade, unless Said Pasha change it. Nor is this likely. Able, shrewd, consummate diplomat, Abdul Hamid, for a decade and more equal to the task of inflicting on the European concert a fatal paralysis, until Austria acted alone in 1897, has proved unable to organize administration or to depute authority. The army he turned over to Goltz Pasha, and it is efficient, as the Greek war proved. The men are unpaid, but their cartridge-boxes are never empty. They are unshod, but their arms are serviceable. There are few or no ambulances, but the artillery is well horsed. The navy has disappeared. But in civil administration no man is secure. Imperial orders go above, below, and around. Some negro eunuch or palace underling may palsy the administration of a province or bring to disgrace by a secret order the ablest of valis, or provincial governors. Despotism in strong hands may prove both able and beneficent by organizing administration. But personal rule, smitten with a mania of fear of conspiracy, trusting no one, filling the empire with espionage, and selecting as instruments ignorant and ignoble personal attendants was certain to end in the collapse now clear.

For a season it prospered. In 1895, all held Abdul Hamid, doubtless, the subtlest schemer of his long line in generations, but in the broad sense successful. In twenty years, 1879-99, the population of the empire, excluding tributary states, grew from 21,000,000 to 25,000,000—above the average of West Europe. The value of real estate advanced down to 1895 in all Turkish cities. In those with which I am most familiar in eastern Turkey, a fair 25 per cent. increase or more, in twenty years. There was no Turkish city, and I met residents from all, where building was not in progress in this period. All complained of taxes and oppression, and in all population, buildings, and realty values were growing. Imports, 1878 to 1898, rose from (estimated) \$60,000,000 to \$120,000,000, and exports from \$35,000,000 to \$68,750,000, an increase which stands for prosperity. The principal railroad in Asiatic Turkey, Smyrna-Aidin, 318 miles, increased its gross earnings from £140,538 to £354,406 from 1883 to 1893, and later lost its dividends.

But while figures of this character could be multiplied, the government itself was passing from one abyss of bankruptcy to another, if the imperial revenue only, averaging, 1892-95, \$106,500,000—say \$4 per capita—were collected in taxes, the burden would not be heavy. A semi-civilized country can easily raise a pound sterling a head, and a country like the United States averaged \$16 in 1890, and did not feel the burden. But by universal consent, the Turkish revenue is extorted manifold by a system of farming the taxes and official peculation. The old government, by pashas, was ill. The new, by palace favorites, is worse. After wholesale repudiation in 1875,—the Porte compounded with its creditors in 1881,—Iradé, December 8-20, 1881, admitted the bailiff in the shape of a debt commission, and paid 1 per cent. on the unsecured debt. The nominal amount of the debt in 1875 was \$1,200,000,000. It was scaled to \$530,000,000 in 1881. In 1900, it was \$682 000,000,—no great increase as national debts go. It is all held abroad,—77 per cent. in France, 10 per cent. in Germany, 9 per cent. in England, and 4 per cent. in Austria.[*Footnote: London Statist, October 3, 1896.*] The aggregate national mortgage is not large—in all, in 1896, government, railroad, and other stocks, \$792,370,000 at par, \$397,125,000 quoted value, two thirds (67 per cent.) in France, 17 per cent. in Germany, 12 per cent. in England, and 4 percent, in Austria. A fair measure this of time pressure the diplomacy of these lands will on a pinch exert.

The debt commission collected \$12,876,207 in 1900, against \$9,998,230 in 1885—a fairly elastic revenue. An Oriental country whose salttax receipts grew in fifteen years from \$3,071,502 to \$3,729,721—twice as fast as population—plainly only needs decent administration for a prosperous budget. Instead, time treasury has wallowed for years in irretrievable deficits averaging \$5,000,000 to \$7,000,000, according to Sir Edward Vincent's last report. The treasury, a few weeks ago, borrowed a small sum for the most sacrosanct of all Moslem expenditures, the carpet and its escort, which the Sultan yearly, as caliph, sends to the Kaaba, at Mecca. it is as though the Pope had to raise a floating loan for the wine and wafer of the Easter eucharist. Every inquiry shows how easily the Turkish treasury might be solvent. Every week finds it unable to meet any expenditure.

ARMENIAN MASSACRE AND ITS CAUSE.

The Sultan's policy five years ago had, therefore, greatly reduced European interference in Turkish affairs, and greatly increased imperial authority, without securing either a stable budget or an efficient administration. Nothing is, perhaps, so dangerous in the affairs of state as unlimited power joined to none of the machinery which gives certainty to taxation or ordered action to authority. Such prosperity as had come was little felt by Moslems. There is that about the Moslem creed, code, and character which incapacitates for all practical affairs but war and rule. Turkish treasury accounts have always been kept by Greeks and Armenians. If a Turk owns land, some Christian keeps its rent-roll. If he has a business, Christian clerks manage it, If he owns mines or works the richer placer of official extortion,

some Christian engineer or scribe manages and manipulates his accounts. Such prosperity as there was through the twenty years of Abdul Hamid's reign, which seemed prosperous, went to Christians. In all the cities where massacre came, it was the Christian and Armenian quarter that was thriving and rising in value. Armenian villages were waxing rich, buying hand and renting it. Armenian bankers were making loans. When massacre fell in one city, not a signature was left known to Constantinople bankers. Western manufactures, which were ruining native handicrafts, were all handled by Armenians. Economic strain and stress produced by this disproportionate prosperity of the small Christian fraction, gaining in wealth, education, and political aspiration, was a perilous irritant to add to the pride of a ruling and soldier caste and the fanaticism kindled by Moslem renaissance. The match of administrative order, or even administrative suggestion, had only to be touched to these explosive conditions to bring the Armenian massacres.

Into their history, it is no purpose of mine to enter. Beyond all refutation, the Sultan successfully prevented European interference or the punishment that was due. But great crimes of state bring their own inexorable penalty. For five years, since time last of the massacres, the Sultan visibly lost ground. Awful as is massacre, communities recover, if order is restored. Over the Armenian plateau this has never come. In all the empire a blight has fallen on trade. The fall in wool ruined southeastern Turkey and it is estimated there are 40,000,000 sheep between the Black Sea and the Persian Gulf. The silk collapse laid North Syria in ruins, and brought Beirut to beggary. The capital has never recovered from the mere business shock of massacre. The Greek war broke credits on the Levantine coast. From the Greek revolution to Bulgarian independence, 1828-78, the dismemberment of the Turkish empire had been accompanied by the appearance of communities capable of self-government. Even Algeria-Tunis and Egypt, which have passed under foreign control, had not done so until a separate, albeit despotic, autonomy had been gained. Driven back to its Moslem limits, nothing like this has appeared in the empire, in twenty years. Crete is separated, the hardships of its going being a measure of the relatively larger Moslem population. In Turkey proper, neither improvement in the central administration nor provinces capable of autonomy appear. Without either, the empire sinks in the slough of difficulties created by racial and physical problems. For a season these and all reforms were held at bay. Macedonian autonomy, Armenian protection, equitable taxation, improved administration—all these pledges of the Berlin treaty in 1878 remain unperformed through twenty years of Europe and an empire both without initiative, and both controlled by the inertia of events, the fear of a general war, and the address at intrigue of Abdul Hamid.

But the lack of sound government and an honest ruler nothing compensates—not even material prosperity, increasing trade, growing population, schools, museums, revived Islamism, and all the fruits of the reign marshaled by court journals when the quarter-century of the Sultan was

celebrated. Instead, when collapse comes, as collapse has, and the powers, one by one, demonstrate the weakness of the empire, problems long postponed appear, as creditors haunt lesser lives in days of disaster.”¹³²¹

In the 1840's, the Rothschilds considered buying Palestine from the Turkish Empire. The real difficulties the Rothschilds faced did not come from the Turks, but rather from the Arabs, especially the Egyptians, and from the Christians, especially the Catholics. The Jews feared that the Arabs would swarm over them if the Jews took over Palestine, which had been managed by the Egyptians. The Jews expected that a Jewish migration *en masse* to Palestine, and especially to Jerusalem, and most especially if followed in short succession by the anointment of a Jewish King—no doubt a Rothschild, and the destruction of the Dome of the Rock and Al Aqsa Mosque in order to “rebuild” the Jewish Temple; as Jewish prophecy demanded, would provoke the Moslems to attack the Jews and wipe them out.

The reason the Rothschilds did not move more aggressively on Palestine, though they had the financial might to buy it, was that whenever they tested the world's reaction to their designs, they discovered that the Jews did not want to go, that the Arabs opposed them (as opposed to the Turks), and that the Catholics thought of them as the embodiment of the anti-Christ. The Rothschilds feared that the Christians would recognize the Biblical implications of Jewish financiers using their corruptly gotten gains to purchase Jerusalem, as the manifestation of the anti-Christ. The Jewish financiers feared that the Christians would join forces with Islam to crush the anti-Christ and the Jews, that is to say smite the Rothschilds and sack the Jews.

Zionist financiers realized that it would be a enormous risk to finance the endeavor, which would likely end up in a holy war they could not win. Though they prodded and probed over the course of many centuries, Jewish financiers made no move into the desert until the Holocaust of the Second World War primed the pump by making the Jews appear to be meek victims and no threat to the world in the form of the anti-Christ.

Over the centuries, Jews put out a tremendous amount of propaganda meant to undermine Christian beliefs and to make the Christians into the slavish guardians of the Jews, at the expense of the Christians' and the Moslems' own interests. The practice continues to this very day. Two Letters to the Editor of *The London Times* published on 26 August 1840 on page 6, evince the challenges the Rothschilds faced should they have bought Palestine outright, and these letters evince the Jewish propaganda meant to subvert Christianity and Islam, and to create an artificial enmity between the two religions, so that the Christians would slavishly guard the Jews against the Moslems when the Jews stole the Palestinians' homes and defiled their religion,

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—Every right-minded person must feel gratified at the general expression of interest in the Jewish nation which has been elicited by the recent sufferings of their brethren at Damascus. It is to be hoped that the public feeling will not be allowed to evaporate in the mere expression of

sympathy, but that some effectual measures may be adopted to prevent a recurrence of these atrocities, not merely in our own times, but in generations yet to come. We must not forget, when giving utterance to our indignation at the late transactions in the east, that but a few centuries have passed since our own country was the scene of similar enormities on a far larger scale. What reader of English history does not recall with shame and sorrow the wholesale tortures, executions, and massacres of the Jews who had sought shelter here, or who can estimate the amount of property seized and confiscated, or the number of hearts wrung by the endless repetition of cruelty and injustice? If in England they have till lately been thus treated, how can they look for more security elsewhere? Instead of wondering that they should become sordid and debased, the only cause for surprise is that any should rise to intelligence and respectability. Subject to the caprice and cruelty of any nation among whom they may dwell, fleeing from the persecutions of one only to meet with like treatment from another, having no city of refuge where they can be in safeguard, no single spot to call their own, they are in a more pitiable condition than the Indian of the forest, or the Arab of the desert.

‘The wild bird hath her nest, the fox his cave,
Mankind their country, Israel but the grave.’

Is this state of things always to continue? They think not. Though many hundreds of years of hope deferred might have been enough to quench the anticipations of the most sanguine, they still hope on, and turn with constant and earnest longing to the land of their forefathers. Their little children are taught to expect that they shall one day see Jerusalem. They purchase no landed property, and hold themselves in readiness at a few hours’ notice to revisit what they and we tacitly agree to call ‘their own land.’ It is theirs by a right which no other nation can boast, for God gave it to them, and though dispossessed of it for so many ages, it is still but partially peopled, and held with a loose hand and a disputed title by a hostile power, as if in readiness for their return.

There are political reasons arising from the present aspect of affairs in Russia, Turkey, and Egypt, which would make it to the interest not only of England but of other European nations, either by purchase or by treaty, to procure the restoration of Judea to its rightful claimants. About a year since, I heard it said by a German Jew, that a proposal had some time before been made by our (then) Government to the late Baron Rothschild, that he should enter into a negotiation for this purpose, and that he declined, assigning as a reason, ‘Judea is our own; we will not buy it, we wait till God shall restore it to us.’ The desirableness as well as the possibility of such a step seems daily to become more evident, but England has lately proved that she needs no selfish motives to induce her to discharge a debt of national honour and justice, or to perform an act of pure benevolence. The one now suggested would not, judging from appearances, cost 20,000,000*l.* of money, or be unaccomplished after 50 years of exertion, or be so vast and so laborious an

undertaking as the extinction of slavery throughout the world. It would be a noble thing for a Christian nation to restore these wanderers to their homes again. It would be a crowning point in the glory of England to bring about such an event. The special blessings promised in the Scriptures to those who befriend the Jews would rest upon her, and her sons and daughters would sit down with purer enjoyment to their domestic comforts when they thought that the persecuted outcasts of so many ages had, through their agency, been replaced in homes as happy and secure as theirs.

Hoping that some master mind may be led to take up this subject in all its bearings, and to form some tangible plan for its accomplishment, and that some Wilberforce may be raised up to plead for it by all the powerful and heart-stirring arguments of which it is capable,

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

AN ENGLISH CHRISTIAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—The extraordinary crisis of Oriental politics has stimulated an almost universal interest and investigation, and the fate of the Jews seems to be deeply involved with the settlement of the Syrian dilemma now agitating every Court of Christendom.

You have well and wisely recommended that a system of peaceful umpirage and arbitration should be adopted as the proper *role* of Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, and you have exposed the extreme absurdity which these Powers would commit if in their zeal for accommodating the quarrels of the Ottomans they should stir up bloody wars among themselves.

The peace of Europe and the just balance of its powers being therefore assumed as the grand desideratum, as the consummation most devoutly to be wished, I peruse with particular interest a brief article in your journal of this day relative to the restriction of the Jews in Jerusalem, because I imagine that this event has become practicable through an unprecedented concatenation of circumstances, and that moreover it has become especially desirable, as the exact expedient to which it is the interest of all the belligerent parties to consent.

The actual feasibility of the return of the Jews is no longer a paradox; the time gives it proof. That theory of the restoration of the Jewish kingdom, which a few years ago was laughed at as the phantasy of insane enthusiasm, is now calculated on as a most practical achievement of diplomacy.

Let us view the question more nearly. It is granted that the Jews were the ancient proprietors of Syria; that Syria was the proper heart and centre of their kingdom. It is granted that they have a strong conviction that Providence will restore them to this Syrian supremacy. It is granted that they have entertained for ages a hearty desire to return thither, and are willing to make great sacrifices of a pecuniary kind to the different parties interested, provided they can be put in peaceful and secure possession.

It is likewise notorious, that since the Jews have been thrust out of Syria,

that land has been a mere arena of strife to neighbouring Powers, all conscious that they had no legitimate right there, and all jealous of each other's intrusion.

Such having been the case, why, it may be asked, have not the Jews long ago endeavoured to regain possession of Syria by commercial arrangements? In reply it may be said, that though they have evidently wished to do so, and have made overtures of the kind, hitherto circumstances have mainly opposed their desires. For instance, they could not expect to purchase a secure possession of Syria from Turkey, while that empire, in the pride of insolent despotism, could have suddenly revoked its stipulations, and have seized on Jewish treasures, none venturing to call it to account. Nor could the Jews have ventured to purchase Syria while the right to that country was vehemently disputed between Turkey and Egypt, without any powerful arbitrators to arrange the right at issue, and lend sanction and binding authority to diplomatic documents.

Now, however, these obstacles and hindrances are in a great measure removed; all the strongest Powers in Europe have come forward as arbitrators and umpires to arrange the settlement of Syria.

Under such potent arbitrators, pledged to the performance of any conditions finally agreed on, I have reason to believe that the Jews would readily enter into such financial arrangements as would secure them the absolute possession of Jerusalem and Syria.

If such an arrangement were formed, one great cause of dissension between France and England would be at once removed; for both the Porte and Egypt are decidedly in want of money, and will gladly sell their respective rights in the Syrian territory. They themselves begin to see the folly of enacting the part of the dog in the manger; they will drop the apple of discord if they can get fair compensation for their trouble.

I know no reason, under such powerful umpires, why the Hebrews should not restore an independent monarchy in Syria, as well as the Egyptians in Egypt, or the Grecians in Greece.

As a practical expedient of politics, I believe it will be easier to secure the peace of Europe and Asia by this effort to restore the Jews, than by any allotment of Syrian territories to the Turks or Egyptians, which will be sure to occasion fresh jealousies and discords.

In offering these remarks, I have viewed the question merely as a lawyer and a politician, and proposed the restoration of the Jews as a sort of *tertium quid*, calculated to win the votes of several of the parties at issue. But, Sir, there is a higher point of view from which many of the readers of *The Times* may wish to regard this topic of investigation. Whichever way the restoration of the Jews may finally be brought about, there is no doubt that it is a subject frequently illustrated by Biblical prophecies.

I will, therefore, if I may do so without the vain and presumptuous curiosity which some of the neologists have manifested, endeavour to detail the opinion of the church on this subject in the words of some of her most

respectable writers.

It is generally supposed by Newton, Hales, Faber, and others, that the great prophetic period of 1,260 years is not very far from its termination. If they are right in this supposition, the period of the restoration of the Jews cannot be very remote.

These two contingencies are evidently connected by the prophet Daniel, who distinctly states that at the time of the end of this period there shall be great contests among the Eastern nations in Syria. And at that time (continues Daniel) shall Michael stand up, even the great Prince who standeth up for the children of the Jews, and there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, and at that time the Jews shall be delivered. (Daniel xii.)

Whatever this mysterious passage may imply, all the most learned expositors agree that it refers to the same crisis indicated by the author of the Apocalypse (Chapter xvi., verses 12, 16.) Most of these expositors seem to think that by the phrase 'drying up the great river Euphrates, that the way of the Kings of the East might be prepared,' we are to understand the diminution of the Turkish empire, that the Jews may regain their long lost kingdom of Syria.

I will not detain you by quoting a host of learned authorities in confirmation of this interpretation; but it may be important to hint, that the moral and intellectual position of the Jews in the present day, as well as their commercial connexions, has enabled them to assume a political sphere of activity at once lofty and extensive.

As to religion, they have of late years realized many of the predictions of Mendelssohn and D'Israeli. They have thrown off the absurd bigotry which once rendered them contemptible, and begin to give the New Testament and the writings of Christian divines that attention to which they are every way entitled among truth-searching and philosophic men. Though, perhaps, fewer positive conversions to Christianity have taken place than were expected by the clergy, still the Hebrew intellect has made within a few years past a wonderful approximation to that temper of impartial inquiry in which such books as *Grotius de Veritate* produce an indelible impression.

I believe that the cause of the restoration of the Jews is one essentially generous and noble, and that all individuals and nations that assist this world-renounced people to recover the empire of their ancestors will be rewarded by Heaven's blessing. [It was and is commonplace for Zionists to appeal to the superstitions of Christians and others with the myth that Jews have supernatural connections which will bless those who help Jews and punish those who do not. The real forces at work are generally control over public opinion through media, planted rumor and gossip; sophisticated intelligence networks; and the might of higher education and investment capital, or lack thereof, which can raise a nation above others, or destroy it. Whoever controls news outlets and financial institutions is the first to learn of events and investments, and to profit from them, or prevent them.—CJB]

Everything that is patriotic and philanthropic should urge Great Britain forward as the agent of prophetic revelations so full of auspicious consequence.

I dare not allow my mind to run into the enthusiasm on this subject which I find predominant among religious authors. I will, therefore, conclude with one quotation from *Hale's Analysis of Chronology*:—

‘The situation of the new Jerusalem,’ says this profound mathematician, ‘as the centre of Christ’s millenary kingdom in the Holy Land, considered in a geographical point of view, is well described by Mr. King in a note to his *Hymns to the Supreme Being*. How capable Syria is of a more universal intercourse than any other country with all parts of the world is most remarkable, and deserves to be well considered, when we read the numerous prophecies which speak of its future grandeur, when its people shall at length be gathered from all nations among whom they have wandered, and Sion shall be the joy of the whole earth.’

Your very obedient servant,

Aug. 17.

F. B.”

Many Christians were foolish and childish enough to be taken in by the Zionist propaganda promising them the joys of the apocalypse and their wonderful martyrdom for the sake of the Jews, but the Jews themselves wanted no part of it. The majority of Jews wanted nothing of the pseudo-Protestant movement, led by crypto-Jews, to banish them to the deserts of Palestine in the hopes that Jesus might return in the form of Rothschild. The Rothschilds were constantly testing to see if the Jews wanted to go to Palestine and consistently discovered that they did not. *The London Times* published the following set of queries on 17 August 1840 on page 3,

“SYRIA.—RESTORATION OF THE JEWS.

(From a Correspondent.)

The proposition to plant the Jewish people in the land of their fathers, under the protection of the five Powers, is no longer a mere matter of speculation, but of serious political consideration. In a Ministerial paper of the 31st of July an article appears bearing all the characteristics of a feeler on this deeply interesting subject. However, it has been reserved for a noble lord opposed to Her Majesty’s Ministers to take up the subject in a practical and statesmanlike manner, and he is instituting inquiries, of which the following is a copy:—

QUERIES.

‘1. What are the feelings of the Jews you meet with respect to their return to the Holy Land?

‘2. Would the Jews of station and property be inclined to return to Palestine, carry with them their capital, and invest it in the cultivation of the land, if by the operation of law and justice life and property were rendered secure?

‘3. How soon would they be inclined and ready to go back?

‘4. Would they go back entirely at their own expense, requiring nothing further than the assurance of safety to person and estate?’

5. Would they be content to live under the Government of the country as they should find it, their rights and privileges being secured to them under the protection of the European powers?’

‘Let the answers you procure be as distinct and decided and detailed as possible: in respect as to the inquiries as to property, it will of course be sufficient that you should obtain fair proof of the fact from general report.’

The noble Lord who is instituting these inquiries has given deep attention to the matter, and is well known as the writer of an able article in the *Quarterly* on the subject, in December, 1838.

In connexion with this, a deeply interesting discovery has been made on the south-west shores of the Caspian, enclosed in a chain of mountains, of the remnant of the Ten Tribes, living in the exercise of their religious customs in a primitive manner, distinct from the customs of modern Judaism. The facts which distinguish them as the remnant of that branch of the Jewish family are striking and incontrovertible, and are about to be given to the world. An intrepid missionary, the Rev. Mr. Samuel, of Bombay, has made the discovery, and resided amongst this people several months, under permission from the Russian Government, who directed him to institute inquiry concerning them.”

The Christians were led by crypto-Jews and their agents, and the Jews controlled the press, but there was still the risk that a Christian movement might arise which was true to the Christian faith and unwilling to destroy the Gentiles for the sake of the Jews. Given that the Jews did not want to go, and given the risks of a holy war that could result in the extermination of the Jews and with them the Rothschilds, the Rothschilds decided to wait for more favorable circumstances before purchasing Palestine and chasing out the Palestinians.

Since the Jews themselves did not wish to go to Palestine, and the Zionists’ potential financial backers feared that their investment would be lost due to a lack of Jewish interest and given the possibility that the Sultan would renege on the deal and take their money while the rest of the world stood idly by, the Rothschilds and their agents saved face by making it appear in the press that the Sultan wanted more than the Zionists were willing to give, and had recognized the value of Palestine to the British, the Germans, the Egyptians, the Russians and to Islam. Note that the Zionists’ offer in Herzl’s day was “to regulate the finances” of Turkey in exchange for Palestine, not to buy the territory. By managing the finances of the Sultan, as opposed to simply paying off his debts or transferring funds to him, the Zionists would have some means to retaliate against him, should the Sultan breach the contract—or if it simply suited their purposes—they were, after all, the cause of his financial difficulties in the first place.

Moses Hess quoted Ernest Laharanne’s *La nouvelle question d’Orient: Empires d’Egypte et d’Arabie. Reconstitution de la nationalité juive*, E. Dentu, Paris, (1860), whose prose reveals why the Rothschilds were forced to propagandize the Christians

and subvert Christianity, before moving into Palestine—which was also the primary cause of the Jews’ ancient war on Catholicism,

“I may, therefore, recommend this work, written, not by a Jew, but by a French patriot, to the attention of our modern Jews, who plume themselves on borrowed French humanitarianism. I will quote here, in translation, a few pages of this work, *The New Eastern Question*, by Ernest Laharanne.[*Footnote*: See note IX at end of book.]

‘In the discussion of these new Eastern complications, we reserved a special place for Palestine, in order to bring to the attention of the world the important question, whether ancient Judæa can once more acquire its former place under the sun.

‘This question is not raised here for the first time. The redemption of Palestine, either by the efforts of international Jewish bankers, or the nobler method, of a general subscription in which all the Jews should participate, has been discussed many times. Why is it that this patriotic project has not as yet been realized? It is certainly not the fault of pious Jews that the plan was frustrated, for their hearts beat fast and their eyes fill with tears at the thought of a return to Jerusalem

[*Footnote*: My friend, Armond L., who traveled for several years through the Danube Principalities, told me that the Jews were moved to tears when he announced to them the end of their suffering, with the words ‘The time of the return approaches.’ The more fortunate Occidental Jews do not know with what longing the Jewish masses of the East await the final redemption from the two thousand year exile. They know not that the patriotic Jew cannot suppress his cry of anguish at the length of the exile, even in the midst of his festive songs, as, for instance, the patriotic poem which is read on Chanukah, closes with the mournful call:

‘For salvation is delayed for us and there is no end to the days of evil.’

‘They asked me,’ continued my friend, ‘what are the indications that the end of the exile is approaching?’ ‘These,’ I answered, ‘that the Turkish and the papal powers are on the point of collapse.’]

‘If the project is still unrealized, the cause is easily cognizable. The Jews dare not think of the possibility of possessing again the land of their fathers. Have we not opposed to their wish our Christian veto? Would we not continually molest the legal proprietor when he will have taken possession of his ancestral land, and in the name of piety make him feel that his ancestors forfeited the title to their land on the day of the Crucifixion?

‘Our stupid Ultramontanism has destroyed the possibility of a regeneration of Judæa, by making the present of the Jewish people barren and unproductive. Had the city of Jerusalem been rebuilt by means of Jewish capital, we would have heard preachers prophesying, even in our progressive nineteenth century, that the end of the world is at hand and predictions of the

coming of the Anti-Christ. Yes, we have lived to see such a state of affairs, now that Ultramontanism has made its last stand in oratorical eloquence. In the sacred beehive of religion, we still hear a continuous buzzing of those insects who would rather see a mighty sword in the hands of the barbarians, than greet the resurrection of nations and hail the revival of a free and great thought inscribed on their banner. This is undoubtedly the reason why Israel did not make any attempt to become master of his own flocks, why the Jews, after wandering for two thousand years, are not in a position to shake the dust from their weary feet. The continuous, inexorable demands that would be made upon a Jewish settlement, the vexatious insults that would be heaped upon them and which would finally degenerate into persecutions, in which fanatic Christians and pious Mohammedans would unite in brotherly accord—these are the reasons, more potent than the rule of the Turks, that have deterred the Jews from attempting to rebuild the Temple of Solomon, their ancient home, and their State.”¹³²²

Hess, himself, wrote,

“It seems that extracts from the French pamphlet which I quoted to you, have awakened in you new thoughts. You think that the Christian nations will certainly not object to the restoration of the Jewish State, for they will thereby rid their respective countries of a foreign population which is a thorn in their side. Not only Frenchmen, but Germans and Englishmen, have expressed themselves more than once in favor of the return of the Jews to Palestine. You quote an Englishman who endeavored to prove, by Biblical evidence, the ultimate return of the Jews to Palestine and simultaneously also the conversion of the Jews to Christianity. Another Englishman attempts to prove that the present English dynasty is directly descended from the house of David and that the stone which plays such an important rôle in the coronation of English kings is the same on which Jacob’s head rested when he dreamt of the famous ladder. A third magnanimously offers all the English ships for the purpose of conveying to Palestine, free of charge, all the Jews who want to return there. These sentiments, however, seem to be, according to you, only a milder form of the desire, which in former ages expressed itself in frequent banishments of the Jews from Christian lands, for which mildness our people ought to be thankful. On the other hand, you see in such projects only a piece of folly which, in its final analysis, leads either to religious or secular insanity, and should not be taken into consideration. Such desires, moreover, if they come from pious Christians, would be opposed by all Jews. On the other hand, if pious Jews were the projectors, all Christians would object to the restoration; for as the latter would only consent to a return to Palestine on condition that the ancient sacrificial cult be reintroduced in the New Jerusalem, so would the former give its assistance to the plan, only on condition that we Jews would bring our national religion as a sacrifice to Christianity at the ‘Holy Sepulchre.’ And thus, you conclude,

all the national aspirations of the Jews must inevitably founder on the rock of differences of opinion.

Now if rigid Christian dogma and inflexible Jewish orthodoxy could never be revived by the living current of history, they would certainly place an insurmountable obstacle to the realization of our patriotic aspirations. The thought of repossessing our ancient fatherland can, therefore, be taken under serious consideration, only when this rigidity of orthodox Jews and Christians alike, will have relaxed. And it is beginning to relax already, not only with the progressive elements, but even with pious Jews and Christians. Moreover, the Talmud, which is the corner-stone of modern Jewish orthodoxy, long ago counseled obedience to the dictates of life.¹³²³

The Christians believed that the Jews had only one way to save themselves from ultimate annihilation, and that was to convert to Christianity. Even those Gentiles willing to help the Jews take Palestine from the Turks and the Palestinians knew that the Jews would be attacked unless they pretended to convert to Christianity. Hence the countless books calling for the “restoration to Palestine” that were published by Christians, and by crypto-Jewish Zionists pretending to be Christians, concurrently called for the conversion of the Jews. They knew that this was the only safe way to establish a Jewish colony in Palestine without provoking the Christians into a holy war. This also had the benefit of allying the Christians with the Jews against the Moslems. Again, the problem the Jewish Zionists faced was that the Jews did not want to go to Palestine, let alone pretend to convert to Christianity and then go to Palestine.

Very early on, Cyprian stated in his Twelfth Treatise, “Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews”, First Book, Testimony 24, that the Jews had but one option, other than extermination, to atone for the death of Christ,

“24. That by this alone the Jews can receive pardon of their sins, if they wash away the blood of Christ slain, in His baptism, and, passing over into His Church, obey His precepts.

In Isaiah the Lord says: ‘Now I will not release your sins. When ye stretch forth your hands, I will turn away my face from you; and if ye multiply prayers, I will not hear you: for your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean; take away the wickedness from your souls from the sight of mine eyes; cease from your wickedness; learn to do good; seek judgement; keep him who suffers wrong; judge for the orphan, and justify the widow. And come, let us reason together, saith the Lord: and although your sins be as scarlet, I will whiten [*Footnote: ‘Exalbabo.’*] them as snow; and although they were as crimson, I will whiten [*Footnote: ‘Inalbabo.’*] them as wool. And if ye be willing and listen to me, ye shall eat of the good of the land; but if ye be unwilling, and will not hear me, the sword [*Esau*] shall consume you; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken these things. [*footnote: Isa. i. 15-20.*]¹³²⁴

The Zionists had to carefully nurture an antagonism over the course of centuries in Europe against the Pope and depict him as the anti-Christ, and against Catholicism as the evil ecumenical Church of the Apocalypse, and against Islam and the Turks as heathens; so that Christians would not see the Jews and Judaism as the prophesied evil ecumenical Church of the Apocalypse headed by the anti-Christ—the Jews’ false Messiah; and so that the English Esau, or some other European force, would take Palestine from the Turks and give it to the Jews, who could then regulate the trade of the world. The best means to accomplish this monumental feat was to create anti-Catholic “reformations” and “second reformations” creating the Protestant and Puritan Churches, and for the Jews to pretend to convert to these Judaized Churches and form an alliance with Judaized “Christians” against Islam, while destroying Christianity along with Islam.

Herzl recalled the rôles of Esau and Jacob in his book *The Jewish State*, when he called on Europe, Esau, to guard Israel, Jacob,

“We should as a neutral State remain in contact with all Europe, which would have to guarantee our existence.”¹³²⁵

Anti-Popism had a history in England dating back at least to Jon Wycliffe, who anticipated many aspects of the Protestant Reformation and Communism—the modern Utopian substitute for original Christian mythology. The wanton corruption of the Popes—especially the Spanish Borgia Popes (Pope Callixtus III, who waged war on the Turks, and his nephew Alexander VI, who waged war on Catholicism), made for fertile ground for the reformers who would convert Catholicism to Judaism and eventually atheism. This ground was tilled by Cabalist Jews and supposedly anti-Semitic Jews who claimed to have converted to Christianity, like: Konrad Mutian (a. k. a. Conradus Mutianus Rufus), Johann Reuchlin, Pico della Mirandola, Jakob Questenberg, Jakob ben Jehiel Loans, Obadja Sforno of Cesena, Johann Pfefferkorn, etc. Note that in the dualistic and dialectical terms of the Cabalah, anti-Semites and the defenders of Judaism serve the same purpose—the segregation of Jews.¹³²⁶

For centuries, the British and the Jews did what they could to diminish the power of Turkey and Egypt, fully achieving their Apocalyptic vision by the end of the First World War. As a supposedly Protestant English Zionist stated in a letter to the Editor of 17 August 1840, published in *The London Times*, on 26 August 1840, on page 6,

“Whatever this mysterious passage may imply, all the most learned expositors agree that it refers to the same crisis indicated by the author of the Apocalypse (Chapter xvi., verses 12, 16.) Most of these expositors seem to think that by the phrase ‘drying up the great river Euphrates, that the way of the Kings of the East might be prepared,’ we are to understand the diminution of the Turkish empire, that the Jews may regain their long lost kingdom of Syria.”

Joseph Mede, of Cambridge, iterated this call for war against the Turks for the benefit of the Jews—under the guise of scripture—in the 1600's, and countless others

echoed his call.¹³²⁷ The Euphrates of Moslem might in the Middle East continues to evaporate under the influence of our present day Zionists, and with it the dignity of humankind is lost to the night.

The first act of the First Zionist Conference in 1897 was to pass a resolution thanking the Sultan of Turkey, who, at the instigation of Jews and crypto-Jews, was committing atrocities against the Armenians. Crypto-Jews were the motive force behind the Sultan's atrocities against Armenian Christians. Jewish bankers, and crypto-Jewish bankers posing as Greek and Armenian Christians, managed the Sultan's accounts and led him into bankruptcy, while they, themselves, became immensely wealthy at the expense of the Turkish Empire. Jews prompted the Sultan to retaliate against innocent Armenian Christians, falsely blaming them for the theft, and diverting attention from the criminal Jews. The willingness of the political Zionists to fund and forgive (with their admitted corruption of the press) Jewish-Turkish atrocities began with their beginning and culminated in the genocide of the Armenians after the Sultan's Government was overthrown by the "Young Turks" in 1915—a group led by crypto-Jewish¹³²⁸ positivist revolutionaries whose philosophies stemmed from Henri de Saint-Simon and Auguste Comte—philosophies which were popular among Jewish intellectuals, especially in Vienna. Thomas R. Bransten wrote in his compilation of David Ben-Gurion's *Memoirs*,

*"No Messiah but nineteenth-century positivism as coupled to Biblical affirmation of the Jews' historical place in the land of Israel prompted their massive return."*¹³²⁹

The Armenians are among the most ancient group of Christians—Christians whom some Jews have long sought to destroy. The Armenians were unwise enough to sponsor the Zionist venture in Palestine and publicly endorsed the Balfour Declaration in hopes that it would protect them from the Turks, not realizing that the Young Turks were massacring the Armenians in the millions at the instigation of their crypto-Jewish leadership. The Armenian leaders were corrupted by Zionist Jews and betrayed the Armenian People.

Herzl makes clear his evil intentions in his diaries. Herzl's deceit was earlier exposed in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* in 1911 in an article on "Zionism". The Zionists had cut a deal with the Sultan through Newlinsky to use their influence in the news media to control public opinion concerning the atrocities the Turks had committed against the Armenians at the instigation of the Jews,

"The most encouraging feature in Dr Herzl's scheme was that the Sultan of Turkey appeared favourable to it. The motive of his sympathy has not hitherto been made known. The Armenian massacres had inflamed the whole of Europe against him, and for a time the Ottoman Empire was in very serious peril. Dr Herzl's scheme provided him, as he imagined, with a means of securing powerful friends. Through a secret emissary, the Chevalier de Newlinsky, whom he sent to London in May 1896, he offered to present the Jews a charter in Palestine provided they used their influence in the press and

otherwise to solve the Armenian question on lines which he laid down. The English Jews declined these proposals, and refused to treat in any way with the persecutor of the Armenians. When, in the following July, Dr Herzl himself came to London, the Maccabean Society, though ignorant of the negotiations with the Sultan, declined to support the scheme. None the less, it secured a large amount of popular support throughout Europe, and in 1910 Zionism had a following of over 300,000 Jews, divided into a thousand electoral districts. The English membership is about 15,000. [***] Modern Zionism is vitiated by its erroneous premises. It is based on the idea that anti-Semitism is unconquerable, and thus the whole movement is artificial. Under the influence of religious toleration and the naturalization laws, nationalities are daily losing more of their racial character. The coming nationality will be essentially a matter of education and economics, and this will not exclude the Jews as such. With the passing away of anti-Semitism, Jewish nationalism will disappear. If the Jewish people disappear with it, it will only be because either their religious mission in the world has been accomplished or they have proved themselves unworthy of it.”

Note the self-imposed pressure on early political Zionists to promote anti-Semitism, which was not considered by most Jews at the time to be nearly so unconquerable as Herzl had portrayed it, for without a dramatic increase of anti-Semitism brought about by the Zionists themselves, political Zionism, which was founded on the premise that Jews were incapable of assimilation, had no *raison d'être* and no hope of success. Political Zionism was premised on the success of anti-Semitism; which gave the Zionists the incentive to spread, not eliminate, anti-Semitism. The political Zionists became fanatical in this mission to generate anti-Semitism—unprecedentedly virulent anti-Semitism—because they convinced themselves that the survival of their divine race depended upon their ability to make the world hate and persecute Jews.

No one loved Herzl and his pamphlet more than the anti-Semites. Herzl wrote in his diary,

“the Pressburg anti-Semite Ivan von Simonyi [***] Loves me!”¹³³⁰

and,

“In the beginning we shall be supported by anti-Semites through a *recrudescence** of persecution (for I am convinced that they do not expect success and will want to exploit their ‘conquest.’)”¹³³¹

and,

“The anti-Semites will become our most dependable friends, the anti-Semitic countries our allies.”¹³³²

Herzl declared the virtue and justice, in his perverse mind, of anti-Semitism,

“[W]e want to let respectable anti-Semites participate in our project [***] Present-day anti-Semitism can only in a very few places be taken for the old religious intolerance. For the most part it is a movement among civilized nations whereby they try to exorcize a ghost from out of their own past. [***] The anti-Semites will have carried the day. Let them have this satisfaction, for we too shall be happy. They will have turned out to be right because they *are* right. They could not have let themselves be subjugated by us in the army, in government, in all of commerce, as thanks for generously having let us out of the ghetto. Let us never forget this magnanimous deed of the civilized nations. [***] Thus, anti-Semitism, too, probably contains the divine Will to Good, because it forces us to close ranks, unites us through pressure, and through our unity will make us free.”¹³³³

In 1897, Herzl told the First Zionist Congress,

“The feeling of communion, of which we have been so bitterly accused, had commenced to weaken when anti-Semitism attacked us. Anti-Semitism has restored it. We have, so to speak, gone home. Zionism is the return home of Judaism even before the return to the land of the Jews.”¹³³⁴

Max Nordau wrote in 1905,

“Anti-Semitism has also taught many educated Jews the way back to their people.”¹³³⁵

Benjamin Disraeli, who was to become the Prime Minister of England, wrote in 1844, referring to Jews as the “superior race” and the “pure persecuted race”,

“And every generation they must become more powerful and more dangerous to the society which is hostile to them. Do you think that the quiet humdrum persecution of a decorous representative of an English university can crush those who have successively baffled the Pharaohs, Nebuchadnezzar, Rome, and the Feudal ages? The fact is, you cannot destroy a pure race of the Caucasian organization. It is a physiological fact; a simple law of nature, which has baffled Egyptian and Assyrian Kings, Roman Emperors, and Christian Inquisitors. No penal laws, no physical tortures, can effect that a superior race should be absorbed in an inferior, or be destroyed by it. The mixed persecuting races disappear; the pure persecuted race remains.”¹³³⁶

The Zionists sponsored anti-Semitism: 1) By raising the issue wherever and whenever they could promoting the idea of the “common enemy” to Jews to lead them into panic and segregation. 2) By smearing famous figures of all ethnic groups

including those Jewish financiers who would not fund them. 3) By smearing and intimidating assimilationists. 4) By promoting racial segregation as if it had a scientific basis. 5) By censoring ideas contrary to their own and otherwise manipulating the press and politicians as best they could. 6) By promoting the massive emigration of Eastern European Jews to the West believing it would provoke and agitate anti-Semitism—as is reflected in Einstein’s actions and speeches in the late Teens through the Twenties of the Twentieth Century. The political Zionists even used *agents provocateur* to spread anti-Semitism and the political Zionists founded anti-Semitic societies, societies which produced the Nazis.

Herzl was a corrupt journalist, and he established the precedent of the political Zionists’ frequent attempts to corrupt the mass media, which has continued through to Robert Maxwell¹³³⁷ and beyond. Benjamin Harrison Freedman’s writings and speeches document the political Zionists’ tactics of smear and distraction, which are manifest in abundance in their shameless and dishonest promotion of Einstein, who is for them not merely a national hero, but a saint. The Jewish industrialist Benjamin Harrison Freedman warned Americans in the immediate post-World War II period, as quoted by Douglas Reed in 1951,

“Mr. Freedman, some time before Mr. Truman’s ‘proudest moment,’ wrote: ‘The threat of Political Zionism to the welfare and security of America is little realized. . . . There may soon take place in Palestine an explosion which will set off another world war. . . . The influence of the Zionist organization reaches into the inner policy-making groups of nearly every government in the world—particularly into the Christian West. This influence causes these groups to adopt pro-Zionist policies which are often in conflict with the real interests of the peoples they govern. This condition exists in the United States. . . New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Massachusetts and California control 151 electoral votes out of a total of 531. In these states are concentrated the overwhelming majority of Americans of Jewish faith. In these states Jews hold the balance of power. Zionists claim that they can ‘deliver’ this vote. Although a great majority of American Jews are not Zionists . . . the Zionist minority has found means to silence them, and to convince nearly everybody that anti-Zionism means being anti-Jewish. In the light of this, and in the light of past elections, the present administration, with its eye on the next elections (which President Truman’s supporters won) ‘has been strongly pro-Zionist. The pro-Zionist, politically motivated declarations of the President have been accepted throughout the world as official statements of American foreign policy. Yet it has always been a cardinal principle of American policy that all civilized peoples have a right to enjoy their own freedom. . . . Soviet Communism will succeed in its attempt to conquer the world in direct proportion to the support which America gives to Zionism. . . . It will take courage for Americans of whatever origin to think these facts through and take public positions upon them. They will be smeared. They will be slandered. Already, Zionists have been able to bring about economic ruin of many Christians and Jews who have dared challenge

the right to claim Palestine for a Jewish national State.”¹³³⁸

In 1955, James Rorty called Benjamin Freedman a “Jewish anti-Semite”,

“One of McGinley’s angels is the Jewish anti-Semite Benjamin Freedman, who told the Armed Services Committee on December 12, 1950 that he had given \$15,000 to *Common Sense*.”¹³³⁹

Arnold Forster wrote in his book *Square One* of 1988,

“And I said that we knew the purpose of the trip was to seek documentation for the case against Mrs. Rosenberg from one Benjamin Freedman, an affluent, self-hating apostate Jew who had spent untold thousands of dollars purchasing, reprinting and disseminating widely the anti-Jewish materials produced by the nation’s worst professional anti-Semites. I told, too, how the two men, the one from Fulton Lewis’ office, the other on the senator’s staff, had carried a letter of introduction to Freedman from Gerald L. K. Smith, one of the most notorious bigots in the United States.”¹³⁴⁰

Retired Congressman Paul Findley has written extensively on political Zionism’s undue influence in shaping American public opinion and of its interference in American politics.¹³⁴¹ Douglas Reed published many scathing indictments of political Zionism and of political Zionism’s negative impact on the world.¹³⁴²

Here are but a few of examples of the corruption of the press and of Herzl’s intended manipulation of the press to smear those who disagreed with him, to cover-up and forgive atrocities, and to corruptly control public opinion—but a small sample taken from the *many* to be found in Herzl’s diaries:

“But if he does, I shall smash him, incite popular fanaticism against him, and demolish him in print [***] I shall probably make enemies of the big Jews. Well, this is going to be apparent from the attacks or the silence of the servile part of the press. [***] I am writing de Haas a few compliments for Mr. Prag, and am authorizing him at the same time to publish the Turkish ambassador’s denial in the press—only the substance, not the wording. [***] I must endeavor to gain influence over a newspaper. I can have such influence only as an owner of shares. [***] Let the gentlemen found or buy one large daily paper in London and one in Paris. There are papers that yield a good profit and on which the Fund would not lose anything. The politics of the Jews should be conducted through these papers, for or against Turkey, depending on circumstances, etc. On the outside, the papers need not be recognizable as Jewish sheets. [***] Here I wish to insert *incidemment* something that will show how easily we can transplant many of our customs. The newspapers which are now being hawked as Jewish sheets—and rightly so, I believe—will have editions over there, like the Paris edition of the *New York Herald*. The news will be exchanged between both sides by cable. After all,

we shall remain in contact with our old homelands. Gradually the demand for newspapers will increase, the colonial editions will grow, the Jewish editors will move overseas, leaving the Gentile ones by themselves. Little by little and imperceptibly, the Jewish papers will turn into Gentile papers, until the overseas editions are as independent as the European ones. It is an amusing thought in this serious plan that many a government will be willing to help us for that reason alone. [etc. etc. etc.]”¹³⁴³

Samuel Landman wrote in 1936,

“In the early years of the War great efforts were made by the Zionist Leaders, Dr. Weizmann and Mr. Sokolow, chiefly through the late Mr. C. P. Scott of the *Manchester Guardian*, and Sir Herbert Samuel, to induce the Cabinet to espouse the cause of Zionism.”¹³⁴⁴

Herbert Samuel was a highly religious Jew and an ardent Zionist who must have known the significance of the Messianic prophecies. His family were Jewish bankers and bullion merchants. P. W. Wilson wrote in 1922,

“For many years, I have known Sir Herbert Samuel and watched his career. He and his family belong to the stricter and more orthodox section of the Jewish community in Britain. In business, they are bankers and bullion merchants, an enterprise which depends for its success upon a meticulous accuracy of method and reliability of character. It is this high standard of personal responsibility that Herbert Samuel has applied to all his conduct as a British Minister in England and as the executive in Palestine.”

Many of the leaders and ambassadors that Americans and the British have sent to predominantly Moslem lands have been Jewish—notably, but by no means limited to, the appointment of the racist political Zionist and Orthodox Jew Herbert Louis Samuel as the High Commissioner of Palestine in 1920.¹³⁴⁵

There is yet another odd aspect to Herzl’s book *The Jewish State*. Why did someone as intelligent as Herzl say such foolish racist things, and why did he so heavily stress financial incentives? Herzl had earlier spoken far more rationally.

Such irrational reversals as Herzl’s usually derive from insanity, a desire for revenge or from greed. Herzl focused on money in his pamphlet *Judenstaat* and in his book *Altneustadt*, and may have been a mouthpiece for a few of the financiers who stood to profit from the “scheme”—though many are known to have opposed him. The Anglicans had been trying to finance Zionism at least since the 1830’s. Herzl received the early support of the Jewish financier Baron Hirsch and desperately sought the support of the Rothschild family, where he apparently was initially not so well received. However, the Balfour Declaration was addressed to Lord Rothschild and the Rothschilds had been trying to take Palestine for a very long time. Perhaps they sensed that Herzl was after their money. Perhaps the relationship between Herzl and the Rothschilds was indirect, or perhaps it was better than we

have yet learned.

Another possibility is that Herzl was suddenly struck with a Messiah complex, and he does speak in his diaries of how famous he will become and does reveal that he was obsessed with his cause—but all this can also be attributed to greed. Messiahs don't usually proselytize to the checkbook, nor deny their alleged divinity. However, Herzl did once dream of the Messiah, and the Anglican Zionist William Henry Hechler tried to lead Herzl to believe that he was the Messiah—but Herzl resisted any personal association with Messianic prophecy. Again, the Anglicans had been trying to finance Zionism for quite some time and sought assurances for the Jewish financiers that should the Jews buy Palestine from the Sultan, the Sultan would be unable to renege on the deal. Herzl was very careful to promote his venture as a secular enterprise so as to alleviate any Christian concerns that he was the anti-Christ. Given the pressure on Herzl to conceal any religious motivations he may have had, it is difficult to discern if he or his backers were not in fact motivated to fulfill Jewish Messianic prophecy, or if he was simply a greedy opportunist who took advantage of the religious aspirations of those wealthier than he.

The usual explanation for Herzl's change of attitude is that the success of some anti-Semitic politicians, like Karl Lueger in Austria, and the crisis of the Dreyfus Affair, prompted the change, but if Herzl genuinely believed that this converted all Jews into one people and rendered impossible the coexistence of this people with others, he was alone in his delusion. Herzl often mentions Eugen Karl Dühring's racist book *Die Judenfrage als Racen-, Sitten- und Culturfrage: mit einer weltgeschichtlichen Antwort*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, (1881); which profoundly affected him, and perhaps inspired his racism, or at least gave him a source to copy.¹³⁴⁶ Nathan Birnbaum, the Zionist, accused Herzl of profiteering from Zionism, which appears to be the most plausible explanation for Herzl's sudden interest in raising money and casting the Jews out of Europe.¹³⁴⁷

Herzl, who is seen by some as a prophet—Herzl, who congratulated anti-Semites on their supposed wisdom—Herzl, the fool, believed that he could provoke governments to expel Jews with complete impunity—Herzl stated on 14 June 1895,

“They cannot throw us into the sea, at least not all of us, nor burn us alive. After all, there are societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals everywhere. What, then? They would finally have to find us some piece of land on the globe—a world ghetto, if you please.”¹³⁴⁸

and in his book *The Jewish State* of 1896, Herzl's fatal hubris was again unleashed,

“Again, people will say that I am furnishing the Anti-Semites with weapons. Why so? Because I admit the truth? Because I do not maintain that there are none but excellent men amongst us? Again, people will say that I am showing our enemies the way to injure us. This I absolutely dispute. My proposal could only be carried out with the free consent of a majority of Jews. Individuals or even powerful bodies of Jews might be attacked, but Governments will take no action against the collective nation. The equal

rights of Jews before the law cannot be withdrawn where they have once been conceded; for the first attempt at withdrawal would immediately drive all Jews rich and poor alike, into the ranks of the revolutionary party. The first official violation of Jewish liberties invariably brings about economic crisis. Therefore no weapons can be effectually used against us, because these cut the hands that wield them.”¹³⁴⁹

Leon Pinsker had stated in 1882,

“We waged the most glorious of all guerrilla struggles with the peoples of the earth, who with one accord wished to destroy us. But the war we have waged—and God knows how long we shall continue to wage it—has not been for a fatherland, but for the wretched maintenance of millions of ‘Jew peddlers.’ [***] When an individual finds himself despised and rejected by society, no one wonders if he commits suicide. But where is the deadly weapon to give the *coup de grace* to the scattered limbs of the Jewish nation, and then who would lend his hand to it! The destruction is neither possible nor desirable. Consequently, we are bound by duty to devote all our remaining moral force to re-establishing ourselves as a living nation, so that we may ultimately assume a more fitting and dignified role among the family of the nations.”¹³⁵⁰

The Zionists later used Einstein, then a celebrity, as an attraction to lure in crowds, and with them, cash, just as Herzl had planned. In return, Einstein, Herzl’s proposed prize horse, was able to bask in the limelight he so loved. Einstein, as a political personality, was especially vulnerable to Herzl’s racist belief system. Einstein generally hated Gentile Germans and was an impressionable and simplistic absolutist, who sought his opinions in the writings of others, and who formed generalized, stereotypical opinions expressed in absolutes. Einstein spoke of the “common destiny” of Jews in all of the countries of the world, of “our race”, of Jews “sticking together”, of ties of “blood”, of the “Gentile world”, of the “whole Jewish people”, of the “salvation for the race”, etc.¹³⁵¹ While asserting his Zionist racism, Einstein would sometimes soften his statements, and mask his Jewish racism and supremacism, by asserting that he would prefer a world in which all human beings were brothers in the spirit of internationalism, but such a world did not exist because of anti-Semitism and he had to face facts and so practiced racism in order to protect himself from racism. Some anti-Semites had already justified segregation in the same terms as Einstein. Some anti-Semites claimed that they would prefer a Utopian world with universal brotherhood in the true Christian spirit, but that Zionist racism made such a world impossible and they just had to face facts and protect themselves from Jewish racists.¹³⁵²

Weizmann, Blumenfeld and Ginsberg ordered Einstein around, and he dutifully followed them until tensions and divisions arose among the Zionists. It is a myth that all Zionists were Communists or, alternatively, that all were right-wing extremists, though many did tend towards extremes as was natural for a fledgling movement

caught in the tumult of turbulent times. There was a great deal of infighting among the political Zionists. The most common theme among Zionists was racism. Ber Borochov, a Marxist Zionist, cited Marx and Engel's materialistic racism in an effort to justify Zionism.¹³⁵³ Racist Zionist Moses Hess, who was condemned to death in the German Revolution of 1848 and who had worked with Marx and Engels, opposed the dogmatic approach of communistic materialistic determinism, and preferred nationalistic Socialism—like the Nazis later would.

The Zionists were able to corrupt the press and to promote anti-Semitism, so that the anti-Semites would force European governments to force the Jews to leave Europe and assist in the expulsion of Jews to Palestine. Herzl, even before the Russian revolution, but after the French Revolution and the revolutions of 1848, played on the fear European governments had of the Jewish mission to rule the world by deposing monarchies through revolution, and in so doing the political Zionists reinforced anti-Semitism. Herzl unwisely believed that he could threaten the governments of the world,

“The governments will give us their friendly assistance because we relieve them of the danger of a revolution which would start with the Jews—and stop who knows where!”¹³⁵⁴

Herzl wrote in his book *The Jewish State*,

“When we sink, we become a revolutionary proletariat, the subordinate officers of the revolutionary party; when we rise, there rises also our terrible power of the purse. [***] Again, people will say that I am furnishing the Anti-Semites with weapons. Why so? Because I admit the truth? Because I do not maintain that there are none but excellent men amongst us? Again, people will say that I am showing our enemies the way to injure us. This I absolutely dispute. My proposal could only be carried out with the free consent of a majority of Jews. Individuals or even powerful bodies of Jews might be attacked, but Governments will take no action against the collective nation. The equal rights of Jews before the law cannot be withdrawn where they have once been conceded; for the first attempt at withdrawal would immediately drive all Jews rich and poor alike, into the ranks of the revolutionary party. The first official violation of Jewish liberties invariably brings about economic crisis. Therefore no weapons can be effectually used against us, because these cut the hands that wield them.”¹³⁵⁵

However, it is clear from Herzl's book *The Jewish State* of 1896, that Herzl knew that the Jews of various nations were loyal to their homelands and would never leave Europe and America in large enough numbers of their own volition. Herzl took it upon himself, as self-appointed pseudo-Messiah, to generate political conditions whereby the Jews would have no choice but to leave. This political Zionist policy of provoking anti-Semitism fit in well with Einstein's desire to avoid criticism by dangerously stigmatizing scientific disagreement as if anti-Semitism, *per se*.¹³⁵⁶ In

this way Einstein accomplished two ends with one tactic. He generated and increased anti-Semitic sentiments in academia and he publicly smeared anyone who disagreed with him or threatened to expose him.

6.5 Albert Einstein Becomes a Cheerleader for Racist Zionism

Albert Einstein actively campaigned for Herzl's racism and traveled to America in April of 1921 in order to promote it. Einstein brought a "secretary", Salomon Ginzberg, the son of the famous Zionist leader Ha-Am. Ginzberg apparently had little respect for Einstein. He ridiculed Einstein for one of Einstein's "speeches"—a pre-Goebbels-like plea for ethnic unity behind a lone *Führer*,¹³⁵⁷

"You have one leader — Weizmann. Follow him and no other!"¹³⁵⁸

Ginzberg and Einstein's second wife failed to persuade Albert to return to his rehearsed lines, when Einstein was interviewed by *The New York Times Book Review* quoted herein. Note that Einstein's "secretary" repeated lines from Einstein's Zionist arrival speech—much to Einstein's annoyance. This speech was covered in *The New York Times* in a story which began on the front page and spilled over onto page 13, on 3 April 1921, reprinted herein. The interview in the *New York Times Book Review* was arranged for Einstein to promote his book, and to raise money for Zionists, not for Einstein to babble and boast.

But why, in contrast to his pro-American attitude in that interview, was Einstein so bitter after he had left America? The Zionists quibbled among themselves in America and the trip turned out to be a disappointment for them. The American Zionists wanted to proceed slowly and to maintain the bonds Jews had to the many nations of the world. Few wanted to venture from their comfortable mansions in America to tame the deserts of Palestine. European Zionists were more militant and isolationist, and resented the fact that masses of Jews could not be persuaded to voluntarily emigrate to Palestine.

6.5.1 While Zionists and Sycophants Hailed Einstein, Most Scientists Rejected Him and "His" Theories

In addition to Zionist strife and infighting, which caused Einstein problems during his trip to America, Einstein's scientific work was not so well-received, nor so perfect, as his present day advocates would have us believe. As a result, Albert Einstein had quite a rough time in America, where he was again and again challenged for his plagiarism and for his irrationality.¹³⁵⁹ The same was true in Germany. The same was true in England. Louis Essen wrote,

"But there have always been its critics: Rutherford treated it as a joke: Soddy called it a swindle: Bertrand Russell suggested that it was all contained in the Lorentz transformation equations and many scientists commented on its contradictions. These adverse opinions, together with the fact that the small

effects predicted by the theory were becoming of significance to the definition of the unit of atomic time, prompted me to study Einstein's paper. I found that it was written in imprecise language, that one assumption was in two contradictory forms and that it contained two serious errors."¹³⁶⁰

John T. Blankart stated in 1921,

"The 'Kinertia' articles offer food for thought when considered in connection with the colossal claims made by Einstein's supporters concerning his almost super-human originality. In fact, one begins to doubt the justice of these claims and to wonder if the charges made by a fast growing group of German scientists who, like E. Gehrcke, P. Lenard, and Paul Weyland, hold that Einstein is both a plagiarist and a sophist, are not, after all, true. We have done little justice in the above to the rare dialectic skill with which Dr. Einstein has applied his intellectual anæsthesia to the minds of his readers. All intellectual obstructions have been removed, and the reader is prepared to venture forth boldly into the mysterious realm of 'curved' space *whose geometrical properties depend upon the matter present*. This most curious inference of Einstein is the master stroke in his skillful massing of inconsistent sophistries."¹³⁶¹

Einstein once asked,

"Do I have something of a charlatan or a hypnotist about me that draws people like a circus clown?"¹³⁶²

Paul Weyland¹³⁶³ and Ernst Gehrcke¹³⁶⁴ proved that Einstein's rise to fame was a "mass suggestion" fed by the insecurities of some of the authorities, and by the press, who would frequently misrepresent the facts, and misrepresented the views of many leading authorities, who were in reality mostly opposed to relativity theory. Weyland pointed out that Einstein obviously could not defend himself or "his" theories, because Einstein relied upon the *ad hominem* attack of calling his opponents "anti-Semites", instead of refuting their arguments in a rational manner.

Ernst Gehrcke and Stjepan Mohorovičić pointed out that Einstein rose to prominence, not because "his" theories were sound, but rather because his hangers-on, his connections in the press, and his racist smears intimidated the scientific community and deliberately inhibited the debate, with their frenzied personal attacks and their proven threats of violence, smears and career infringement against any who would question Einstein. Bruno Thüring, in 1941, stated that the acceptance of the theory of relativity resulted from a "mass psychosis" brought about by Jewish led propaganda, intimidation and the career infringement of anyone who opposed the dogmatism of Einstein.¹³⁶⁵ Ernst Mach considered Einstein a charlatan, and Mach, too, categorized the theory of relativity as a "mass suggestion"—even before the terrible hype of the 1919 eclipse observations.

We know Mach's opinion from a letter which Čeněk Dvořák wrote to Mach on

19 August 1915,

“The best contemporary physicists would agree with you about the exaggerated speculation, mass suggestion, and modish tendencies in modern physics.”¹³⁶⁶

Arvid Reuterdaahl was quoted in the *Minneapolis Sunday Tribune* on 20 November 1921, after Einstein’s humiliating departure from America,

“Einstein Foes
Prove Theory
False Claim
Twin Cities Mathematical
Association Hears Talk
on Relativity.
Former Exponents Are Now
Sorry, Says St. Thomas
Engineering Dean.

Einstein’s theory of relativity, which created a stir in the scientific world when first promulgated, is rapidly being rejected by the leading scholars of Europe and America. Prof. Arvid Reuterdaahl told members of the Twin Cities Mathematical association last night at the Minnesota Union, University of Minnesota.

Professor Reuterdaahl, who has been a vigorous opponent of Einsteinism since its inception, is dean of the department of engineering and architecture at St. Thomas college.

‘Seething in Revolt.’

‘It is literally true that Europe is seething in revolt against the yoke of Einsteinism,’ Professor Reuterdaahl declared. ‘The eminent thinkers of Europe emphatically object to the steam roller methods used by the Einsteinian propagandists.

‘The affair of Einstein was overdone and as a result the entire world is united, not only against a palpable fallacy, but also against the questionable methods by which this fallacy was flaunted before an unsuspecting public as a super-truth.’

A score of eminent scientists of both Europe and America were named by Professor Reuterdaahl as actively opposed to the Einstein theory.

‘Even in England where Einsteinism has been firmly entrenched since the findings of the English polar expedition were made known, the rebellion is gaining strength,’ he said. ‘In the front rank of the English expedition we find Prof. W. D. Ross of Oxford, and the celebrated mathematicians Gaynor and

Whitehead.’

Professor Reuterdaahl asserted that the leading astronomers of the United States are now either directly denying the truth of Einstein’s theory or openly doubting the correctness of its contentions.

Majority Opposed.

‘It is no longer an intellectual misdemeanor to doubt the validity of his speculations,’ he said, “Undoubtedly the great majority of American scientists are today solidly opposed to the theories of Einstein. Many of those scientists who succumbed to the mass psychology of his trumpet blasts now sincerely wish that they had remained discreetly neutral.

Doctor T. J. J. See, professor of mathematics, United States navy, and director of the Mare island observatory, California, was said by Professor Reuterdaahl to be one of the leading opponents of the theory in America.

‘It is truly a sad ending to a perfect Einsteinian day,’ he said, ‘A camouflaged formula successfully used to gather renown is finally shown by an American scientist to be contrary to that great law which serves as the basic foundation of the entire structure of science.’”

The *Minneapolis Evening Tribune* of 5 May 1921 wrote,

“Scientists Rally to
Support Reuterdaahl
in Fight on Einstein
Mysterious ‘Kinertia’ Attacks
Theory and Thanks
Minnesota Man.
‘Fantastic Jazz of Mathematical
Symbols,’ Says Dr. S. P.
Skidmore.”

American scientists are rallying to the support of Professor Arvid Reuterdaahl of St. Thomas college in his fight against Doctor Albert Einstein, including the mysterious ‘Kinertia,’ to whom Professor Reuterdaahl gives credit for originating the theory of relativity.

Professor Reuterdaahl has received a statement signed by ‘Kinertia,’ through an intermediary in New York, in which the scientist again attacks Einsteinism and thanks the St. Thomas dean for his efforts to prove the theory false.

All Write to Reuterdaahl.

Doctor Sydney P. Skidmore of Philadelphia, Dr. W. E. Glanville, noted astronomer of Baltimore, and Dr. Robert P. Browne, author of ‘Mystery of Space,’ are others who have communicated with Professor Reuterdaahl.

Doctor Skidmore says:

‘Einsteinism is a fantastic jazz of mathematical symbols, devoid of quanta, in a dance hall floored by a parquetry of ifs, supposings and assumptions, and has no application to anything in the realm of objective truth.’

Doctor Glanville likens the Einstein theory to a newly discovered drug which is brought forth and acclaimed as a universal scientific panacea. He also compares Einsteinism to a great deflated scientific bubble. Doctor Brown assures Professor Reuterdahl that he will be allied in the fight ‘against the mathematical usurpations of Einstein and relativity.’

Doubts Efficiency of Test.

‘In the critical portion of the article just sent me by ‘Kinertia’ he points out some of the outstanding errors in Einstein’s theory,’ said Reuterdahl today. ‘He expresses serious doubt that the solar spectrum test proposed by Einstein to prove his theory will be confirmative in its result. ‘Kinertia’ states:

‘‘In dynamics, acceleration and weight are not forces or physical causes. This is the dangerous ground Einstein assumes in his apparent anxiety to relegate forces to the waste basket because they disappear in the parallelogram law; he proposes to substitute uniform antecedents in place of natural causation.’

‘‘Kinertia,’ moreover, demands that Einstein be consistent in his application of the motion of acceleration. In order to be consistent, ‘Kinertia’ holds, Einstein must develop a law which provides that bodies at the earth’s surface be pushed from its center with the same acceleration with which falling bodies are apparently drawn toward it.

What Differentials Show.

‘‘Kinertia’ further states:

‘Einstein’s differentials only show that either case would suffice if the acceleration was the same.’

He concludes his article with this pertinent statement:

‘Science wants more than agnosticism; it wants to know the absolute truth, before accepting any such theory; even if d’Alembert’s static ghost is dressed in Hamiltonian functions.’”

Hubert Goenner contended that,

“Also, a majority of theoretical physicists in Germany moved away from a theory with little potential for experiments and testable consequences.”¹³⁶⁷

This view is supported by the record, for example the *St. Paul Dispatch* wrote on 3 April 1921, that Einstein had run away from Germany to America to hide from his critics,

“EINSTEIN ON RUN, SAYS LETTER TO REUTERDAHL

Albert Einstein, denounced by the opponents of his alleged ‘discoveries,’ is on the run, according to a letter received from Dr. Hermann Fricke, physicist and astronomer of Berlin, dated August 19, by Prof. Arvid Reuterdaahl, dean of the department of engineering and architecture at St. Thomas college, and author of ‘Einstein and the New Science,’ an attack on the Einstein theory, recently published.

Einstein’s popularity has waned, the Berlin scientist writes, and he says also that a large edition of Prof. Reuterdaahl’s book is to be published in the German capital.

Dr. J. G. A. Goedhart, astronomer at Amsterdam, writes that Einstein has left Germany and has taken a professorship at the university in Leiden Holland. Circulation of Prof. Reuterdaahl’s book in Holland, and also in Sweden, is to be undertaken by foreign scientists opposed to the Einstein theory.”

Nobel Prize laureate Johannes Stark wrote in 1922,

“V o r w o r t

Die deutsche Physik macht gegenwärtig eine Krisis durch. Es kämpfen in ihr zwei Richtungen miteinander. Einsteins und durch den Dogmatismus der Quantentheorie hat eine theoretische Richtung einen beherrschenden Einfluß gewonnen, welcher die physikalische Wissenschaft grundsätzlich zu schädigen begonnen hat, indem sie deren Quellen mehr in der gedanklichen Konstruktion als in der Erfahrung sucht und diese zur Dienerin der Formel machen will. Ihr gegenüber findet sich die experimentelle Richtung in der Verteidigungsstellung; sie sieht die Quelle der Physik in der Beobachtung und Messung und in der Theorie ein heuristisches und systematisches Hilfsmittel für die Gewinnung und Darstellung der physikalischen Erkenntnis. Es kann kein Zweifel darüber bestehen, welche Richtung schließlich die Oberhand gewinnen wird. Die vorliegende Schrift hat die Aufgabe, durch die rückhaltlose Kritik von experimenteller Seite her die Entwicklung der gegenwärtigen Krisis in der deutschen Physik zu beschleunigen.

[***]

Die vorstehenden Ausführungen über das Verhältnis der physikalischen Theorie zur Erfahrung enthalten nichts Neues und in späterer Zeit mag einem Leser ihre Wiederholung als überflüssig erscheinen. In der gegenwärtigen Zeit ist es aber gegenüber dem anspruchsvollen Auftreten moderner Theorien notwendig, an sie zu erinnern. Für die Überschätzung der Theorie und die Unterschätzung der Beobachtung ist ein Ausspruch Einsteins, des Schöpfers der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie, kennzeichnend. Anfangs dieses Jahres hielt Herr E i n s t e i n in Berlin vor einem auserwählten Kreis von Wissenschaftern, Wirtschaftlern und Politikern einen Vortrag über die neuere Entwicklung der physikalischen Forschung. Gegen den Schluß desselben äußerte er sich zusammenfassend über die Quantentheorie des

Atoms folgendermaßen: man dürfe erwarten, daß die Theorie bald imstande sein werde, die Eigenschaften der chemischen Atome und ihre Reaktionen vorauszuberechnen, so daß sich die mühevollen zeitraubenden experimentellen Arbeiten der Chemiker erübrigen würden. Als ich diese lobpreisende Überschätzung der Theorie mitanhörte, mußte ich aus Höflichkeit gegen den Gastgeber an mich halten, um nicht in Lachen auszubrechen. Aber danach war ich über die Leichtfertigkeit empört, mit welcher Herr E i n s t e i n, der von dem breiten Publikum herausgestellt wird, eine Auffassung verbreitet, welche auf die Dauer großen Schaden stiften muß. Herr E i n s t e i n sollte sich einmal eingehender mit der Erfahrung der anorganischen und organischen Chemie befassen, dann würde ihm klar werden, wie ungeheuer übertrieben seine theoretischen Erwartungen im Gebiete der Chemie sind und wie wenig gerade diese Wissenschaft die immer erneute Erfahrung entbehren kann. Es würde auch lehrreich für ihn sein, zu sehen, wie erstaunlich weit sich diese Wissenschaft fast allein auf Grund der Erfahrung ohne die mathematische Hilfe der Theorie entwickelt hat.

II. Die Stellung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie Einsteins in der Physik und die Propaganda für sie.

Wenn die Bedeutung einer Theorie proportional der Zahl der Abhandlungen, Bücher und Vorträge über sie wäre, so müßte die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie E i n s t e i n s als die weitaus bedeutendste Theorie aller Zeiten gewertet werden. Denn über keine Theorie in der Physik ist bisher von berufener und unberufener Seite soviel geschrieben und geredet worden wie über sie; es ist für sie seit Jahren in aller Welt sowohl in wissenschaftlichen Zeitschriften wie in Flugschriften und in der Tagespresse eine Propaganda getrieben worden, wie sie bisher unbekannt in der physikalischen Wissenschaft war. Diese Propaganda und der Einfluß des E i n s t e i n schen Kreises ist in erster Linie für das Überwuchern der Theorie in der gegenwärtigen Physik, für die Unterschätzung der experimentellen Forschung und für die Vernachlässigung der angewandten Physik in Unterricht und Forschung verantwortlich zu machen. Mit Recht haben bereits L e n a r d [*Footnote:* P. L e n a r d, Über Relativitätstheorie, Äther, Gravitation, S. Hirzel, Leipzig 1921.] und G e h r c k e Einspruch gegen die Fiktionen der E i n s t e i n schen Relativitätstheorie erhoben und auch W. W i e n [*Footnote:* W. W i e n, Die Relativitätstheorie, Joh. Ambr. Barth, Leipzig 1921.] hat zu physikalischer Besinnung in dem Für und Wider um sie gemahnt. Aber L e n a r d s und G e h r c k e s Kritik wurde von der Seite E i n s t e i n s als persönliche Beleidigung aufgefaßt und in unsachlicher Weise beantwortet. Und trotzdem die Auseinandersetzungen über die E i n s t e i n sche Theorie auf der Nauheimer Naturforscherversammlung in

persönlicher Hinsicht höchst unerquicklich und in sachlicher Hinsicht unfruchtbar waren, und obwohl seitdem kein unbestrittener Fortschritt in der experimentellen Prüfung der Theorie erfolgt ist, soll auf der diesjährigen Naturforscherversammlung in Leipzig die E i n s t e i n'sche Theorie wieder einem Kreise vorgeführt werden, der nur zu einem kleinen Teile aus Physikern besteht.

Bei dieser Lage der Dinge ist eine kritische Auseinandersetzung mit der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie hinsichtlich ihrer physikalischen Bedeutung und der Propaganda für sie dringend geboten.

Von einer physikalischen Theorie ist zu verlangen, daß sie an ihre Spitze eine grundlegende Aussage über eine Beziehung zwischen physikalischen Größen stellt. So liegt der mechanischen Wärmetheorie der Gedanke von der wechselseitigen Umwandelbarkeit von Wärme und Arbeit zugrunde, der M a x w e l l'schen Theorie der Gedanke der raumzeitlichen Verknüpfung von elektrischer und magnetischer Feldstärke. Welche grundlegende Aussage über eine zahlreiche Erscheinungen umfassende Beziehung zwischen physikalischen Größen stellt nun Einstein an die Spitze seiner allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie? Er selbst versteht unter „allgemeinem Relativitätsprinzip“ die Behauptung: „Alle Bezugskörper K, K' usw. sind für die Naturbeschreibung (Formulierung der allgemeinen Naturgesetze) gleichwertig, welches auch deren Bewegungszustand sein mag.“ An einer anderen Stelle derselben Schrift bezeichnet Einstein als exakte Formulierung seines allgemeinen Relativitätsprinzips folgende Aussage: „Alle Gauss'schen Koordinatensysteme sind für die Formulierung der allgemeinen Naturgesetze prinzipiell gleichwertig.“

Wie selbst der Nichtphysiker erkennt, macht das so formulierte allgemeine Relativitätsprinzip keine Aussage über eine Beziehung zwischen physikalischen Größen, sondern über die formal-mathematische Darstellung von physikalischen Gesetzen. Entsprechend seinem formal-mathematischen Grundgedanken ist es darum überhaupt nicht unter die physikalischen Theorien in dem oben umschriebenen Sinne zu rechnen, sondern gehört in das Grenzgebiet zwischen Physik, Mathematik und Erkenntnistheorie. In dem formal-mathematischen Grundgedanken der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie ist es denn auch gelegen, daß Nichtphysiker, vor allem Erkenntnistheoretiker und Mathematiker, sie mit Eifer aufgegriffen und in zahlreichen Abhandlungen und dicken Schriften auf ihre Weise ausgearbeitet haben. Wenn ich dieser Art Relativitätsliteratur, welche vorzügliche philosophische oder mathematische Leistungen darstellen mögen, jeglichen Wert für die physikalische Wissenschaft abspreche, so werde ich zwar von den Einsteinianern als armseliger Banause abgetan werden, dies kann mich aber nicht hindern, meinerseits als Physiker mein Urteil über die physikalische Bedeutung des allgemeinen Relativitätsprinzips zu bekennen und sogar folgende Blasphemie auszusprechen: Wäre E i n s t e i n mit seiner Theorie doch von Anfang unter die Mathematiker und Philosophen gegangen! Die deutsche Physik wäre dann vielleicht von dem lähmenden

Gift des Gedankens verschont geblieben, man könne aus geistreichen Fiktionen („Gedankenexperimenten“) mit Hilfe mathematischer Operationen physikalische Erkenntnisse oder, wie es in der Regel heißt, das „Weltbild“ gewinnen.

Der Vorwurf der physikalischen Inhaltslosigkeit trifft die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie Einsteins ins Herz und diejenigen ihrer Verteidiger, welchen mein Urteil nicht von vornherein gleichgültig ist, werden sich beeilen mir entgegenzuhalten, daß die Relativitätstheorie doch zu bestimmten Folgerungen von sachlich-physikalischem Inhalt gelange, so zu einer Aussage über den Einfluß des Gravitationsfeldes auf die Lichtpflanzung und auf die optischen Eigenfrequenz chemischer Atome. Ist bis jetzt der Ausgangspunkt der Relativitätstheorie vom physikalischen Standpunkt aus beurteilt worden, so kommen wir mit der Antwort auf den vorstehenden Einwand zur physikalischen Beurteilung der methodischen Seite der Theorie. Ich gebe vorweg zu, daß die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie zu sachlich-physikalischen Folgerungen gelangt. Indes haben diese ihre Wurzel nicht allein in ihrem formal-mathematischen Grundgedanken, sondern auch in den sachlich-physikalischen Zutaten bei seiner mathematischen Verarbeitung, so vor allem in der Verknüpfung des Gravitationsfeldes mit der beschleunigten Bewegung und in der Verwertung der Tatsache von Proportionalität der schweren und der trägen Masse.

Die Art der Verarbeitung des Grundgedankens der Relativitätstheorie entspricht ebensowenig den an eine physikalische Theorie zu stellenden Forderungen wie ihr Grundgedanke selbst. Wie oben dargelegt wurde, ist eine physikalische Theorie in erster Linie für den experimentellen Physiker bestimmt; sie soll da, wo sie nicht seine Messungen zusammenfassend beschreibt, sondern Vorhersagen macht, auch für denjenigen Experimentalphysiker verständlich sein, welcher nicht die Kenntnisse des Fachmathematikers besitzt. Wie steht es in dieser Hinsicht mit E i n s t e i n s allgemeiner Relativitätstheorie? Zwar E i n s t e i n glaubte seine Theorie selbst dem Nichtphysiker verständlich machen zu können; seiner „gemeinverständlicher“ Schrift [*Footnote*: A. E i n s t e i n, Über die spezielle und die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie, 51.-55. Tausend. F. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig.] über sie, die in mehr als 50 000 Stück verbreitet ist, schickt er nämlich folgende Sätze voraus: „Das vorliegende Büchlein soll solchen eine möglichst exakte Einsicht in die Relativitätstheorie vermitteln, die sich vom allgemein wissenschaftlichen, philosophischen Standpunkt für die Theorie interessieren, ohne den mathematischen Apparat der theoretischen Physik zu beherrschen. Die Lektüre setzt etwa Maturitätsbildung und — trotz der Kürze des Büchleins — ziemlich viel Geduld und Willenskraft beim Leser voraus.“

E i n s t e i n war also der Meinung, daß für das Verständnis seiner Relativitätstheorie die Kenntnis der höheren Mathematik nicht nötig sei. In Wirklichkeit ist wohl noch keine Theorie in der physikalischen Literatur mitgeteilt worden, welche so schwer verständlich gewesen wäre wie die

E i n s t e i n s c h e Relativitätstheorie. Hierfür zeugt schon die Tatsache, daß man es für nötig hielt, sie durch zahlreiche Bücher selbst dem physikalischen und mathematischen Fachmann verständlich zu machen. Und auf der Seite ihrer Verteidiger hat man sich heute gegenüber der Kritik von Experimentalphysikern hinter die bequeme Ausrede zurückgezogen, sie besäßen nicht die höhere mathematische Bildung, welche zum Verständnis der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie notwendig sei. Diejenigen Physiker, welche an ihr Kritik üben, verfügen nach ihnen nicht über dies nötige mathematische Begabung, um sie zu verstehen; sie werden gegenüber den Relativitätstheoretikern in eine tiefere Klasse verwiesen. Diese Behandlung ist selbst einem Physiker von den experimentellen Leistungen und mathematischen Kenntnissen L e n a r d s von Seite E i n s t e i n s und seiner Anhänger widerfahren. Indes sprechen diese Theoretiker, welche so überlegen nicht bloß die höhere, sondern die höchste mathematische Bildung für das Verständnis der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie fordern, dieser selbst das Urteil. Sie vergessen in Selbsteingenommenheit, daß die Theorie in der Physik nicht Selbstzweck, nicht allein für den Theoretiker und den Mathematiker da ist, sondern daß sie eine Hilfe für den Experimentalphysiker sein, seine Arbeit anregen oder formal abschließen soll. Für eine Theorie, welche dieser Forderung nicht genügt, sollte in physikalischen Zeitschriften kein Platz sein.

Die Übertreibung ins Abstrakte und Formale, die Beschränkung auf das intellektuelle Spiel mit den mathematischen Definitionen und Formeln kommt in der E i n s t e i n s c h e n Relativitätstheorie vor allem in der absichtlichen Ignorierung des Äthers zum Ausdruck. Gewiß kann man physikalische Beziehungen zwischen materiellen Körpern in mathematischen Formeln unter Absehen vom Äther zwischen ihnen darstellen. Wird aber damit der Begriff des Äthers überflüssig, wird damit die Tatsache der Existenz des Äthers aus der Welt geschafft? In einer der Ansprachen auf der Nauheimer Naturforscherversammlung wurde es von einem Nichtphysiker als eine naturwissenschaftliche Großtat E i n s t e i n s gefeiert, daß er den Äther abgeschafft habe. Soll man lachen über diese Wertschätzung einer vermeintlichen Großleistung E i n s t e i n s, oder soll man empört sein über die von seinen Fiktionen angerichtete Verwüstung. Nein, die gefeierte Abschaffung des Äthers durch E i n s t e i n ist nicht eine Großtat, sondern der Versuch zu einem verheerenden Rückschritt in der physikalischen Wissenschaft. Die Einführung des Äthersbegriffes in die Optik und in die Elektrodynamik, das anschauliche Denken mit ihm hat sich in der Physik als außerordentlich fruchtbar erwiesen; der Äther ist durch die physikalische Forschung eines Jahrhunderts aus einer Hypothese zu einer Tatsache geworden. Eine Physik ohne den Äther ist keine Physik. E i n s t e i n ist wohl selbst ob seiner Großtat der Abschaffung des Äthers bange geworden; denn in neuerer Zeit scheint er in einem Vortrag den Äther wieder einführen zu wollen, freilich ist es nicht der alte abgeschaffte Äther, sondern eine Art E i n s t e i n s c h e r Relativitätsäther.

Man mag nun zugeben, daß die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie weder in ihrem Grundgedanken noch in ihrer Entwicklung den Anforderungen genügt, welche von physikalischer Seite an eine physikalische Theorie zu stellen sind. Es könnte aber doch sein, daß ihr das große Verdienst zuzusprechen wäre, die Entdeckung neuer Erscheinungen veranlaßt zu haben und daß ihre Folgerungen experimentell bestätigt worden sind. Es ist darum zu prüfen, ob dies für die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie zutrifft. Drei Erscheinungen sind es, welche in dieser Hinsicht in Betracht kommen.

Da ist zunächst die Anomalie in der Perihelbewegung des Merkurs; sie war bereits vor Aufstellung der Relativitätstheorie aus der astronomischen Beobachtung bekannt. Ihr Betrag schien früher genau mit der Rechnung nach der Relativitätstheorie übereinzustimmen; dies ist indes nach einer kürzlich erschienenen Nachprüfung durch G r o ß m a n n zum mindesten fraglich geworden. Aber selbst wenn die Übereinstimmung vorhanden wäre, könnte durch sie die Richtigkeit der Relativitätstheorie noch nicht als erwiesen gelten. Denn es gibt noch eine andere Möglichkeit (Annahme interplanetarer Massen) zur Deutung jener Anomalie.

Denn soll die Relativitätstheorie durch den Nachweis der Ablenkung des Fixsternlichtes beim Vorbeigang an der Sonne bestätigt worden sein. Es muß zugestanden werden, daß der Gedanke eines Einflusses des Gravitationsfeldes auf die Lichtbewegung ursprünglich und wertvoll ist. Es erfordert allerdings die geschichtliche Gerechtigkeit, die Priorität dieses Gedankens S o l d n e r zuzuerkennen, der ihn bereits vor hundert Jahren, wenn auch auf Grund einer anderen Annahme über das Wesen des Lichtes zur Grundlage einer theoretischen Abhandlung in den Annalen der Physik und Chemie gemacht hat. Wie steht es aber mit der experimentellen Bestätigung dieser zweiten Folgerung der Relativitätstheorie? Bisher liegen nur Beobachtungen bei einer einzigen Sonnenfinsternis vor. Wer die für derartige Messungen notwendige Meßtechnik zu beurteilen und den Wert von Meßdaten, welche nahe der Grenze der Meßgenauigkeit liegen, abzuwägen versteht, der wird erklären, daß durch jene Beobachtungen lediglich wahrscheinlich gemacht ist, daß Lichtstrahlen, wenn sie nahe bei der Sonne verlaufen, aus ihrer anfänglichen Richtung etwas abgelenkt werden. Von einer quantitativen Bestätigung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie durch jene Beobachtungen kann jedoch nicht die Rede sein. Die Ablenkung von Lichtstrahlen in der Nähe der Sonne kann einen anderen Grund haben, als in der Relativitätstheorie angenommen wird.

Die dritte Folgerung der Relativitätstheorie behauptet, daß durch die Wirkung eines Gravitationsfeldes, z. B. durch dasjenige an der Sonne, die optischen Eigenfrequenzen der chemischen Atome etwas verkleinert, also die ihnen entsprechenden Spektrallinien etwas nach Rot verschoben werden. Die bis jetzt in dieser Hinsicht vorliegenden Messungen widersprechen sich in ihrem Ergebnis hinsichtlich der Relativitätstheorie. Amerikanische und deutsche Beobachter, welche mit einer guten Technik arbeiteten, erklären, daß eine Rotverschiebung von Sonnenlinien in dem von der Theorie

geforderten Betrag nicht vorhanden ist. Wieder andere deutsche Beobachter und ein französischer behaupten, sie hätten die von E i n s t e i n gefolgerte Rotverschiebung der Sonnenlinien gefunden. Es steht also Behauptung wider Behauptung und es kann nur durch neue, mit besonderer Umsicht durchgeführte Messungen die Entscheidung gebracht werden. Diese neuen Messungen sollten ohne jegliche Voreingenommenheit für und wider die Theorie unternommen werden. Bei dem Lesen des Berichtes über sie sollte man nicht den Eindruck haben, daß sie in der Absicht durchgeführt und zurechtgemacht wurden, um die Theorie zu bestätigen. Und der spektralanalytische Fachmann wird mit Zurückhaltung und theoretischer Skepsis an die Deutung einer geringen Verschiebung von Linien im Sonnenspektrum gegenüber ihrer Lage im Spektrum irdischer Lichtquellen herangehen. Weiß er doch, daß es eine Reihe von Wirkungen gibt, welche geringe Verschiebungen von Spektrallinien hervorbringen, und da uns die Bedingungen an der Oberfläche der Sonne nicht genügend bekannt sind, so wird er an die Beweisführung zugunsten einer besonderen Wirkung hohe Anforderungen stellen.

In keinem der drei Fälle, welche in der Regel als Beweise für die Richtigkeit der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie angeführt werden, liegen also die Verhältnisse so, daß ein vorsichtiger Physiker anerkennen könnte, daß die Richtigkeit der E i n s t e i n schen Relativitätstheorie erwiesen sei; er kann höchstens zugeben, daß es nicht ausgeschlossen ist, daß weitere verfeinerte Messungen eine Übereinstimmung zwischen den Folgerungen der Theorie und den Beobachtungen ergeben. Und es kann der Relativitätstheorie darum noch nicht das Verdienst zugesprochen werden, neue Entdeckungen veranlaßt zu haben.

Bedenkt man, daß die „Bestätigung“ der E i n s t e i n schen Theorie noch aussteht, nimmt man dazu, daß ihr Grundgedanke formal-mathematisch ist und das Verständnis ihrer Entwicklung hohe mathematische Kenntnisse erfordert, so versteht man nicht, wie mit einer solchen Theorie eine so unerhörte Propaganda getrieben werden konnte, wie es bisher mit keiner anderen Theorie der Fall gewesen ist. Weit über den Kreis der wenigen physikalischen und mathematischen Fachleute hinaus, welche sie zu beurteilen vermögen, wurde sie dem urteilslosen Publikum in angeblich gemeinverständlichen Schriften, in der Tagespresse, in öffentlichen Vorträgen und im Salon als höchste und tiefste naturwissenschaftliche Weisheit angepriesen. Und zuletzt scheute man nicht einmal vor dem Unfug zurück, Illustrationen zur Relativitätstheorie im Film dem Kinopublikum vorführen zu lassen. Diese Propaganda fand in der Zeit der politischen und sozialen Revolution einen fruchtbaren Boden, redete sie doch von dem Umsturz unserer bisherigen Anschauungen von Raum und Zeit und von einer die Welt umspannenden Theorie. Sie lag auch insofern dem Geiste der letzten Jahre, als ihre jüngsten Jünger mit großen Worten ihre Weisheit vortragen konnten, ohne auf die Wirklichkeit Rücksicht nehmen zu brauchen.

E i n s t e i n ist der Vorwurf nicht zu ersparen, daß er sich dem

Hinauszerrn seiner Theorie auf den Jahrmarkt nicht entgegengesetzt hat, die Propaganda seiner Freunde und Anhänger gewähren ließ, ja Schriften von Dilettanten zum Ruhme seiner Theorie ermunterte. Er mag es entrüstet zurückweisen, mit seinen Vortragsreisen ins Ausland selbst Propaganda für seine Theorie getrieben zu haben. Gut. Aber hinsichtlich seiner Auslandsreisen halte ich es für notwendig, daß ihm bei dieser Gelegenheit folgender Hinweis gegeben wird.

In einem Artikel im Berliner Tageblatt hat sich Einstein zu internationaler Gesinnung bekannt. Gleichwohl ist es nicht zu verstehen, daß er ohne Rücksicht auf die furchtbare Bedrückung des deutschen Volkes durch die Franzosen einer französischen Einladung zu einem Vortrag in Paris in diesem Frühjahr Folge geleistet, ja im Anschluß daran sogar darauf gehalten hat, auf einer Automobilfahrt sich die „verwüsteten“ Gegenden (les régions dévastées) zeigen zu lassen. E i n s t e i n lebt doch in Deutschland, und ist Mitglied amtlicher deutscher Ausschüsse, vor allem Direktor eines Kaiser-Wilhelm-Instituts; da hätte er mit Rücksicht darauf soviel Takt haben müssen, die Reise nach Paris zu einer Zeit zu unterlassen, wo der französische Druck besonders stark war. Und wenn er dies nicht von selbst einsah, so hätten es ihm seine Freunde, die ihm sonst so rasch beispringen, bedeuten sollen. Daß über die Franzosenreise E i n s t e i n s große deutsche Tageszeitungen telegraphisch berichteten, daß sie nicht von selbst daran Kritik übten, ja nicht einmal einen Einspruch dagegen aus physikalischen Kreisen aufnahmen, ist ein trauriges Zeichen von dem deutschen Verfall.

Doch zurück zur Propaganda für die Relativitätstheorie! Während sie sich selbst keine Schranken setzte, nahmen E i n s t e i n und seine Anhänger sogar eine Kritik aus Fachkreisen sehr übel auf. So warf er L e n a r d, einem unserer tiefsten und gewissenhaftesten Denker, im Berliner Tageblatt (27. Aug. 1920) Oberflächlichkeit vor und G e h r c k e s [*Footnote: G e h r c k e* ist der Kampf gegen die Relativitätstheorie übel bekommen; trotz seiner zahlreichen hervorragenden experimentellen Arbeiten wird er von Fakultäten nicht für ein physikalisches Ordinat vorgeschlagen.] Kritik unterstellte er unsachliche Motive.

Auch der Fernerstehende erkennt beim Lesen der vorstehenden Ausführungen, daß durch die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie ein Zwiespalt zwischen den Physikern aufgerissen worden ist. Experimentell gerichtete Physiker lehnen sich gegen den nach ihrer Meinung unphysikalischen Geist der Relativitätstheorie und gegen die maßlose Propaganda für sie auf; deren Anhänger werfen ihnen dafür Beschränktheit, Mangel an mathematischer Bildung oder gar unsachliche Motive vor. Ferner fühlt selbst der Fernerstehende, daß die experimentelle Begründung einer so umstrittenen Theorie noch nicht gesichert sein kann und daß es unangebracht ist, eine Theorie, über welche selbst die physikalischen und mathematischen Fachleute noch im Streit liegen, vor den weiten Kreis der Laien bis herab zum Kinopublikum zu bringen.

Bei dieser Lage der Dinge muß es auf physikalischer Seite als ein

bedauerlicher Mißgriff bezeichnet werden, daß für die Hundertjahr-Feier der Gesellschaft deutscher Naturforscher und Ärzte in diesem Jahre in Leipzig als Thema für die erste allgemeine Sitzung die Relativitätstheorie in Aussicht genommen wurde. Daß dies nach den Auseinandersetzungen in Nauheim geschehen konnte, ist, wie ich bereits bemerkte, ein Zeichen für das Überwuchern der Theorie. Man lasse uns Physiker endlich eine Zeitlang in Ruhe mit der bis zum Überdruß abgehandelten Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie! Man warte endlich einige Jahre mit der Propaganda für sie, bis ihre Folgerung durch zuverlässige Beobachtungen geprüft sind!”¹³⁶⁸

The New York Times stated in 1923,

“It was reported in January from Berlin that fifty German physicists, mathematicians and philosophers were ‘seriously grieved’ to see public opinion misled by the suggestion that the Theory of Relativity is the solution of the problems of the universe, and by the concealment of the fact that many savants, ‘including the most distinguished,’ do not accept this theory as a proved hypothesis, but look upon it as fiction.”¹³⁶⁹

This was quoted in a press release Thomas Jefferson Jackson See issued to the *Associated Press* on 18 April 1923. It appears to paraphrase a flier distributed at the meeting of the *Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Ärzte* in Leipzig in 1922.¹³⁷⁰ T. J. J. See concluded his press release with the rhetorical question,

“Under the circumstances is it any wonder that some of us who owe a duty of Truth to the Public, should be obliged to vigorously contest the unauthorized and indefensible conclusion that the observed refraction of starlight near the Sun is a confirmation of the discredited Doctrine of Relativity?”

See later published similar statements in *The San Francisco Journal* on 20 May 1923 in an article entitled, “Einstein a Second Dr. Cook?”

One sees that it wasn’t just the Germans who were disgusted with Einstein, his theories, his self-promotion and his plagiarism. As Einstein himself professed, it was only in America that his theories were generally accepted and where he was loved, a fact he found comical. Einstein made a scathing, ethnocentric, misogynist and hateful denouncement of America and American scientists.¹³⁷¹ However, in America, See, Reuter Dahl and Poor wrote several articles exposing Einstein as a fraud. Each complained of censorship of their efforts to expose Einstein.

French savants had little love for Einstein. *The New York Times* reported on 4 April 1922 on page 21:

“Einstein Breaks Engagement In Paris, Fearing Hostility

PARIS, April 3.—Professor Albert Einstein of the University of Berlin, who recently delivered his first lecture here under the auspices of the College

of France and had a notable reception, canceled an engagement to attend the session of the Academy of Sciences today in order to avoid a hostile manifestation.

Some of the members of the academy had decided as a protest against his presence to rise and leave the hall as soon as he entered.”

The New York Times reported on 5 April 1922 on page 21:

“PLEDGED TO SNUB EINSTEIN.

30 French Scientists Would Have Left if He Had Attended Meeting.

PARIS, April 4.—The failure of Professor Albert Einstein to pay his formal visit to the French Academy of Sciences yesterday was due to the fact that he had received a friendly warning that the occasion would be made embarrassing by a certain element of that distinguished body. This statement is in L’Oeuvre. Scoring French scientists for their unbelievable narrowness, L’Oeuvre declares that thirty members had pledged themselves, if Professor Einstein made his appearance, to leave the hall in a body.”

The New York Times reported on 16 November 1922 on the front page that the Russians had condemned Einstein’s theory:

“Einstein Theory ‘Bourgeois’ And Dangerous, Say Russians

PARIS, Nov. 15.—A message from Moscow to the Echo de Paris says that Professor Albert Einstein has been solemnly excommunicated by the Russian Communists.

At a special council meeting held in order to examine the question the Russian Communist Party condemned the Einstein theory as being ‘reactionary of nature, furnishing support for counter-revolutionary ideas’; also as being ‘the product of the bourgeois class in decomposition.’

Professor Timirazeff presented a long report to the council in which he discussed whether Einstein’s theories could be reconciled with the theory of materialism. He decided that they could not, and because, in his opinion, they led to ‘pure idealism,’ the council pronounced condemnation.”

Irving Levy published the following comment in *The New York Times*, on 2 March 1936, page 16,

“The relativity theory advanced by Professor Einstein is held in such uncomprehending awe by the vast majority of people that it is not generally known there exists a far from unanimous acceptance of it in the scientific world.”

So we see that, contrary to the popular history told today, Einstein was internationally known as a sophist and a plagiarist when he came to America in 1921. Einstein tried to head off any criticism he might face in America by

stigmatizing any criticism of him, or of the theory of relativity as if “anti-Semitism” *per se* before he even stepped off the boat onto America’s shores.¹³⁷² He was a coward who hid behind the power of Jewish tribalism.

6.5.2 Hypocritical and Cowardly Einstein Plays the “Race Card” and Cripples Scientific Progress

Like his cowardly Zionist comrades, hypocritical Einstein “played the race card.” In an effort to change the subject from his plagiarism and fallacious theories, which subject was beginning to destroy his fame, Einstein smeared anyone and everyone who would dare question him or the theory of relativity as if an anti-Semite *per se* in *The New York Times* on 3 April 1921 on pages 1 and 13, and bear in mind that *The New York Times*, itself, reported that relativity theory was “much-debated”,

“PROF. EINSTEIN HERE, EXPLAINS RELATIVITY

‘Poet in Science’ Says It Is a
Theory of Space and Time,
But It Baffles Reporters.

SEEKS AID FOR PALESTINE

Thousands Wait Four Hours to
Welcome Theorist and His
Party to America.

A man in a faded gray raincoat and a flopping black felt hat that nearly concealed the gray hair that straggled over his ears stood on the boat deck of the steamship Rotterdam yesterday, timidly facing a battery of cameramen. In one hand he clutched a shiny briar pipe and with the other clung to a precious violin. He looked like an artist—a musician. He was.

But underneath his shaggy locks was a scientific mind whose deductions have staggered the ablest intellects of Europe. One of his traveling companions described him as an ‘intuitive physicist’ whose speculative imagination is so vast that it senses great natural laws long before the reasoning faculty grasps and defines them.

The man was Dr. Albert Einstein, propounder of the much-debated theory

of relativity that has given the world a new conception of space, and time and the size of the universe.

Dr. Einstein comes to this country as one of a group of prominent Jews who are advocating the Zionist movement and hope to get financial aid and encouragement for the rebuilding of Palestine and the founding of a Jewish university. He is of medium height, with strongly built shoulders, but an air of fragility and self-effacement. Under a high, broad forehead are large and luminous eyes, almost childlike in their simplicity and unworldliness.

Thousands Welcome Him.

With him as fellow-travelers were Professor Chaim Weizmann, President of the Zionist World Organization, discoverer of trinitrotoluol, and head of the British Admiralty laboratories during the war; Michael Ussichkin, a member of the Zionist delegation to the Paris Peace Conference and now Resident Chairman of the Zionist Commission in Palestine, and Dr. Benzion Mossinson, President of the Hebrew Teachers Organization in Palestine.

The party was welcomed at the Battery by thousands of fellow-Jews who had waited there for hours.

The crowds were packed deeply along the Battery wall, waving Jewish flags of white with two blue bars, wearing buttons with Zionist inscriptions, and cheering themselves hoarse as the police boat John F. Hylan drew near. Dozens of automobiles were parked near the landing, and when the welcoming committee and the visitors had entered them they started uptown to the Hotel Commodore, preceded by a police escort. They turned into Second Avenue, where the sidewalks were lined nearly all the way uptown with thousands who waved hands and handkerchiefs and shouted welcome to the visitors.

Professor Einstein was reluctant to talk about relativity, but when he did speak he said most of the opposition to his theories was the result of strong anti-Semitic feeling. He was amused at attempts by reporters to get some idea of his theory by questioning him, and he did his best to make his answers as simple as possible. He spoke through an interpreter.

A Theory of Space and Time.

The interview took place in the Captain's cabin, where Professor Einstein was almost surrounded by seekers after knowledge. He was asked to define his theory.

'It is a theory of space and time, so far as physics are concerned,' he said.

'How long did it take you to conceive your theory?'" he was asked.

'I have not finished yet,' he said with a laugh. 'But I have worked on it for about sixteen years. The theory consists of two grades or steps. On one I have been working for about six years and on the other about eight or nine years.

'I first became interested in it through the question of the distribution and expansion of light in space; that is, for the first grade or step. The fact that an iron ball and a wooden ball fall to the ground at the same speed was perhaps the reason which prompted me to take the second step.'

He was asked about those who oppose his theory, and said:

‘No man of culture or knowledge has any animosity toward my theories. Even the physicists opposed to the theory are animated by political motives.’

When asked what he meant, he said he referred to anti-Semitic feeling. He would not elaborate on this subject, but said the attacks in Berlin were entirely anti-Semitic.

Dr. Einstein said the theory was a step in the further development of the Newtonian theory. He hoped to lecture at Princeton on relativity before he left the country, he said, as he felt grateful to the Faculty of Princeton, which was the first college to become interested in his work.

Poses for Moving Picture Men.

As the questioners gave up their attempts to seek further elucidation of the Einstein principles, the professor laughed and said:

‘Well, I hope I have passed my examination.’

Professor Einstein’s interview came soon after he had escaped the moving picture men. As they ground away at their machines, ordering him about, he seemed at first bewildered, then amused. He posed with other members of his party and with Mrs. Einstein for nearly half an hour, and then almost ran away, shaking his head in exasperation and refusing to do any more.

‘Like a prima donna,’ he exclaimed.

‘He does not like to be, what you call it, a showcase,’ said Mrs. Einstein. ‘He does not like society, for he feels that he is on exhibition. He would rather work and play his violin and walk in the woods.’

‘Do you understand his theory?’ Mrs. Einstein was asked.

‘Oh, no,’ she said, laughing, ‘although he has explained it to me so many times. I understand it in a general way, but in its details it is too much for a woman to grasp. But it is not necessary for my happiness.’

Dr. Einstein was an inspirational worker, she said. When he was engaged on some problem, ‘there was no day and no night,’ but in his periods of relaxation he went for weeks without doing anything in particular but dream and play on his violin. Whenever he became weary in the midst of his work he went to the piano or picked up his violin and rested his mind with music.

‘He improvises,’ she explained. ‘He is really an excellent musician.’

Mozart and Brahms His Favorites.

On the ship, when a concert was held Dr. Einstein played selections from Mozart, of whose work he is particularly fond, on the violin. Brahms is another of his favorites.

‘I never met Professor Einstein before this voyage,’ said Professor Weizmann, who is a great admirer of his fellow-scientist. ‘He has a singularly sweet and lovable nature, and is exceedingly simple in his habits of life. I have talked with him many times about his work, and he is glad to speak of it when he can find some one who is interested and at least partly capable of understanding it. I do not entirely, for when I get beyond the atom I am lost.’

‘When he was called ‘a poet in science’ the definition was a good one. He seems more an intuitive physicist, however. He is not an experimental physicist, and although he is able to detect fallacies in the conceptions of physical science, he must turn his general outlines of theory over to some one else to work out. That would be readily understandable to a man of science. He first became interested in mathematics when he was 14 years old, and his work is his life. He spends most of his time reading and thinking when he is not playing his violin.’

Professor Weizmann also is accompanied by his wife. He and the other Zionist visitors, during their visit of several weeks, will endeavor to interest American Jews in the Zionist movement and obtain money and moral support for both the national Zionist idea and for the university.

Dr. Weizmann Explains Mission.

‘It is a great satisfaction to me as President of the Zionist Organization to find myself for the first time in the Union States,’ said Dr. Weizmann. ‘The cause of the Jewish national home in Palestine has from the first appealed to the generous instincts of the American people and owes much to the sympathetic support it has consistently received from leaders of public opinion in the United States.’

‘Our primary object is to confer with the American Zionists who have, under the distinguished leadership of Justice Brandeis, Judge Mack and other representative American Jews, rendered invaluable services to the Zionist movement during the past few critical years. In the task of reconstruction in Palestine, for which the time has now arrived, it is confidently expected that the American Zionists will play an equally conspicuous and honorable part. In this connection we hope to enlist the active interest of American Jews in the Keren Hayesod, or Foundation Fund, the central fund for the building up of the Jewish National Home, to which Jews throughout the world are being called upon to contribute to the utmost limit of their resources.’

‘Professor Einstein has done us the honor of accompanying us to America in the interest of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Zionists have long cherished the hope of creating in Jerusalem a centre of learning in which the Hebrew genius shall find full self-expression and which shall play its part as interpreter between the Eastern and Western worlds. Professor Einstein attaches the utmost importance to the early inauguration of the Jerusalem university and is prepared when the time arrives personally to associated himself within its activities—a course in which there is reason to hope he will be followed by other Jewish scholars and scientists of world-wide reputation.’

Einstein to Work for University.

Professor Einstein will devote most of his time while here to advocating support of the university by American Jews.

‘The establishment of such a university has been for a long time one of the most cherished plans of the Zionist organization,’ he said. ‘But for the outbreak of the war it would have materialized in 1914, when a site was

actually purchased on the Mount of Olives. In 1918 the foundation stone was laid by Dr. Weizmann. Since then the university site has been extended and a building purchased in which it will be possible for a beginning to be made. There is also a library of 30,000 volumes which is rapidly growing.

‘Plans have been worked out both for the complete university of the future and for a comparatively modest beginning. The time has now come to insure the immediate realization of the latter. Such is the importance attached by the Zionist Organization to the spiritual values in the Zionist national home that even at this moment, when the organization is faced with tremendous tasks of immigration and colonization, and is concentrating all efforts upon the Palestine Foundation Fund, an exception is made in favor of the university to which a special branch of the fund is devoted.

‘I know of no public event which has given me such delight as the proposal to establish a Hebrew university in Jerusalem. The traditional respect for knowledge which Jews have maintained intact through many centuries of severe hardship made it particularly painful for us to see so many talented sons of the Jewish people cut off from higher education and study, and knocking vainly at the doors of universities of Eastern and Central Europe.

Home For Spiritual Life.

‘Others who have gained access to the regions of free research only did so by undergoing a painful, even dishonoring, process of assimilation which crippled and robbed them again and again of their cultural leaders. The time has now come when our spiritual life will find a home of its own. Distinguished Jewish scholars in all branches of learning are waiting to go to Jerusalem, where they will lay the foundation of a flourishing spiritual life and will promote the intellectual and economic development of Palestine.

‘Notwithstanding the crude political realism of our times and the materialistic atmosphere in which it has enveloped us, there are visible none the less glimmerings of a nobler conception of human aspirations, such as were expressed in the part played by the American people in world politics. And so we come from sick and suffering Europe with feelings of hope, being convinced that our spiritual aims will command the full sympathy of the American nation and will receive enthusiastic approval and powerful support from our Jewish brethren in the United States.’

The Zionists were met down the bay by a delegation from the Mayor’s committee of welcome, Captain Abraham Tulin, who served as American liaison officer with General Mangin’s army in the war; Dr. Schmarya Levin, who was member of the first Russian Duma and of the Cadet Party in Russia, and Magistrate Bernard Rosenblatt. They were delayed by the quarantine examination and were not able to board the Rotterdam until nearly 1 o’clock. On the way up the bay they had lunch with Professor Einstein, Professor Weizmann and others in the party, and remained with them on the ship until sundown. As it was the Sabbath their religion prevented them from leaving until that time.

that fell over his ears, stood on the boat deck of the steamship Rotterdam today, timidly facing a battery of camera men. In one hand he clutched a shiny briar pipe and the other clung to a violin.

Dr. Albert Einstein, discoverer of the famous theory of relativity, which has given the world a new conception of space and time, looks like a musician, and he is.

Dr. Einstein comes to this country as one of a group of prominent Jews, advocating the Zionist movement. They hope to get financial aid and encouragement for the rebuilding of Palestine and the founding of a Jewish university.

Amused by Questions.

The scientist was reluctant to talk about relativity. He was greatly amused at the attempts of reporters to search out by their questions some idea of what his theory is, and did his best to make his answers as simple as possible. He does not speak English and answered through an interpreter.

‘It is a theory of space and time, so far as physics are concerned,’ he said.

‘How long did it take you to conceive your theory?’ he was asked.

‘I have not finished yet,’ he said with a laugh. ‘But I have worked on it for about sixteen years. The theory consists of two grades or steps. On one I have been working for about six years and on the other about eight or nine years.’

Iron and Wooden Balls.

‘I first became interested in it through the question of the distribution and expansion of light in space. That is, for the first grade or step. The fact that an iron ball and a wooden ball fall to the ground at the same speed was perhaps the reason which prompted me to take the second step.’

He was asked about those who opposed his theory, and said:

‘No man of culture or knowledge has any animosity toward my theories. Even the physicists opposed to the theory are animated by political motives.’

Asked what he meant, he said he referred to anti-semitic feeling. He would not elaborate on this subject, but said that the attacks in Berlin were entirely anti-semitic.

Develops Newton’s Theory.

Dr. Einstein said that the theory is a step in the further development of the Newtonian theory. He hopes to lecture at Princeton on relativity before he leaves the country, as he feels grateful to the faculty of Princeton, which was the first college to become interested in his work.

‘Do you understand his theory,’ Mrs. Einstein was asked.

‘O, no,’ she said, ‘although he has explained it to me so many times. I understand it in a general way, but it is too subtle for a woman to grasp. Still it is not necessary for my happiness.’”

Einstein called anti-Semitic, among other things, the thesis of Gehrcke and Weyland that: Einstein’s promotion mirrored Hans Christian Andersen’s fairy tale *The Emperor’s New Clothes*; that, the overblown public reaction to the theory of

relativity was a “mass suggestion” and a “mass psychosis”; and Gehrcke and Weyland’s criticism that theory of relativity had not been proven correct and was instead contradicted by St. John’s experiments; and Gehrcke and Weyland’s accusation that Einstein’s theory, while promoted as a radically new development, was not a new idea, but was derived from Lorentz and others. Einstein, himself, had complained to Heinrich Zangger on 24 December 1919,

“[T]his business reminds one of the tale of ‘The Emperor’s New Clothes,’ but it is harmless tomfoolery.”¹³⁷³

Einstein endorsed and plagiarized Gehrcke and Weyland’s other views, which he had called anti-Semitic in 1920, on 3 April 1921, and would again plagiarize Gehrcke and Weyland’s ideas when Einstein returned to Europe and was again interviewed by the press. *The Chicago Tribune* reported on 4 April 1921 on page 6,

“EINSTEIN, TOO, IS PUZZLED; IT’S AT PUBLIC INTEREST

Can’t See Why Theories Are Widely Discussed.

New York, April 3.—[Special]—Prof. Albert Einstein, the German scientist, who is visiting this country, today discussed his famous ‘relativity’ theory with reporters.

Before going into details with the reporters, Prof. Einstein exploded the accepted story that he had said only twelve men in the world were capable of understanding it. He thinks most scientists understand his theories and added that his students in Berlin understand them perfectly.

No theory can be susceptible of absolute proof, he added, and mentioned that an American scientist, St. John, is now conducting experiments which seem to give results at variance with the Einstein theory.

‘The two theories, that of St. John and my own, have not yet been brought into harmony,’ Prof. Einstein said. ‘The subject dealt with is that of the wave lengths in the spectrum. It is impossible at the present stage of the experiments to say what the result will be.’

Calls for Psychologist.

Prof. Einstein was rather puzzled to account for the public interest in his conception of time and space, and said the public attitude seemed to call for a psychologist who could determine why persons who are not generally interested in scientific work should be interested in him.

‘It seems psycho-pathological,’ he said, with a laugh.

When it was suggested that perhaps people were interested because he seemed to give a new conception of the universe, which, next to the idea of God, has been the subject of the most fascinating speculations of the mind, he agreed that such might be the case.

‘The theory has a certain bearing in a philosophical sense on the conception of the universe,’ he said, ‘but not from the scientific point of view. Its great value lies in the logical simplicity with which it explains apparently conflicting facts in the operation of natural law. It provides a more simple method. Hitherto science has been burdened by many general assumptions of a complicated nature.’

Not a Radical Departure.

Two of the great facts explained by the theory are the relativity of motion and the equivalence of mass of inertia and mass of weight, said Prof. Einstein.

‘There has been a false opinion widely spread among the general public,’ he said, ‘that the theory of relativity is to be taken as differing radically from the previous developments in physics from the time of Galileo and Newton—that it is violently opposed to their deductions. The contrary is true. Without the discoveries of every one of the great men of physics, those who laid down preceding laws, relativity would have been impossible to conceive and there would have been no basis for it. Psychologically, it is impossible to come to such a theory at once without the work which must be done before. The four men who laid the foundations of physics on which I have been able to construct my theory are Galileo, Newton, Maxwell, and Lorenz.’

Man in Street Needn’t Worry.

Whatever the value of relativity, it will not necessarily change the conceptions of the man in the street, said Prof. Einstein.

‘The practical man does not need to worry about it,’ he said. ‘From the philosophical aspect, however, it has importance, as it alters the conceptions of time and space which are necessary to philosophical speculations and conceptions. Up to this time the conceptions of time and space have been such that if everything in the universe were taken away, if there was nothing left, there would still be left to man time and space. But under this theory even time and space would cease to exist, because they are unalterably bound up with the conceptions of matter.’

The reporters did not argue the point.”

The New York Times responded to Einstein’s “PSYCHOPATHIC RELATIVITY” on 5 April 1921 on page 18, and quoted Einstein on 8 July 1921 on page 9,

““You ask whether it makes a ludicrous impression on me to observe the excitement of the crowd for my teaching and my theory, of which it, after all, understands nothing? I find it funny and at the same time interesting to observe this game.

‘I believe quite positively that it is the mysteriousness of what they

cannot conceive which places them under a magic spell. One tells them of something big which will influence all future life, of a theory which only a small group, highly learned, can comprehend. Big names are mentioned of men who have made discoveries, of which the crowd grasps nothing. But it impresses them, takes on color and the magic power of mystery, and thus one becomes enthusiastic and excited.”

Einstein wrote to Max Born on 15 September 1950, in the context of politics,

“And the idiotic public can be talked into anything.”¹³⁷⁴

Among those who actively opposed relativity theory, as it was expressed by Einstein—who, according to Einstein’s assertions, must have been uncultured, ignorant anti-Semites—we find Hendrik Antoon Lorentz, Max Abraham, Alfred North Whitehead, Ernst Mach, Albert Abraham Michelson, Friedrich Adler, Henri Bergson, Oskar Kraus, Melchior Palágyi, [etc. etc. etc.]. Clearly, Einstein lied about a very serious matter, and, what is worse, Einstein was himself a racist instigator and a political agitator; and, therefore, a hypocrite and a deliberate inciter of “racial” discord.

6.5.3 What is Good for Goose is not Good for the Goyim

The political Zionists emphasized their mistaken belief that Jews are a distinct race incapable of assimilation, and that Jews constitute a foreign nation within Germany. Einstein’s anti-assimilationist rhetoric would later find its match in Philipp Lenard’s segregationist belief in “Aryan Physics”. Nobel Prize laureate Philipp Lenard was reacting to the Jews’ bigoted assertions of their distinct racial characteristics and the Zionists’ open declarations of their disloyalty to Germany.¹³⁷⁵ Many Jews viewed Physics in expressly racist terms long before Lenard joined their ranks.¹³⁷⁶

Following the racial mythologies of Gobinaeu and Renan, Philipp Lenard joined the Jewish movement to segregate science and wrote of “Aryan Physics”. Like many Jews before him, Lenard artificially distinguished between “German Physics” and “Jewish Physics” in 1936. Johannes Stark and Wilhelm Müller adopted this nomenclature in 1941 at the behest of the Zionist Nazis.¹³⁷⁷

Racist Jews provided the segregationist dogma. For example, there was the segregated “Jüdisch-Russisch Wissenschaftliches Verein” (Russian-Jewish Scientific Society) which participated in the foundation of the modern Zionist movement with its leaders Shmarya Levin, Leo Motzkin, Nachman Syrkin, Victor Jacobson, Arthur Hantke, Heinrich Löwe, Zelig Soskin, Willi Bambus, and many others.¹³⁷⁸ In the late 1800's men like Theodor Mommsen and Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu were criticizing segregated Jewish associations, which they rejected as bigoted and segregated institutions.¹³⁷⁹

Just as some Christians felt uncomfortable around Eastern Jews, some Eastern Jews felt uncomfortable around Christians and found them dirty and disgusting. These Jews refused to eat at the same table with Christians, who did not oblige their

Kosher laws.

In the early 1800's there was an influential movement to promote “Jewish science”. At the time, some Jews were forced to feign Christian conversion if they wished to become university professors. In 1822, Gans, Zunz and Moser created the *Verein für Kultur und Wissenschaft der Juden*, a segregated Jewish institution which offered Jews an alternative to an insincere and degrading baptism. They published a journal on “Jewish science”, the *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* published from 1822-1823.¹³⁸⁰ There was also the *Jeschurun. Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* published from 1856-1870 by Joseph Kobak in German and Hebrew; and the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums* published from 1851-1939 by Rudolf Kuntze of the *Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, Dresden.

Albert Einstein traveled to America in order to raise money¹³⁸¹ for an ethnically segregated “Jewish university”¹³⁸² or “Hebrew University” in Jerusalem. Many Zionists asserted that Jews had to be segregated in order to manifest their superior Jewish racial characteristics, which had lain dormant in the Diaspora. In accord with Jewish Messianic prophecy, they asserted that the Jewish race would again shine and lead the world of thought if only they could be “restored” to Palestine and segregated and at long last be permitted to be “Jews” and be relieved of the burden of being pseudo-Gentiles. Even after the Holocaust, Einstein was still calling for the segregation of Jewish students from Gentile students, which he argued was the only solution to the problem of anti-Semitism. Peter A. Bucky quoted Albert Einstein,

“I think that Jewish students should have their own student societies. [***] One way that it won't be solved is for Jewish people to take on Christian fashions and manners. [***] In this way, it is entirely possible to be a civilized person, a good citizen, and at the same time be a faithful Jew who loves his race and honors his fathers.”¹³⁸³

Shortly after World War One, Zionist Shmuel Hugo Bergmann wrote to Einstein,

“[. . .]whether you, Professor, whom the world rightly calls the greatest Jewish scientist, but above all whom we love and value also as a person—whether you would be willing to participate in this conference and help us with its preparation. I do not need to say how happy the Jewish people would be if *you* could be appointed to its university, but that is a question for the future.”¹³⁸⁴

Albert Einstein stated,

“Antisemitism must be seen as a real thing, based on true hereditary qualities, even if for us Jews it is often unpleasant. I could well imagine that I myself would choose a Jew as my companion, given the choice. On the other hand I would consider it reasonable for the Jews themselves to collect the money to support Jewish research workers outside the universities and to

provide them with teaching opportunities.”¹³⁸⁵

and,

“The psychological root of anti-Semitism lies in the fact that the Jews are a group of people unto themselves. Their Jewishness is visible in their physical appearance, and one notices their Jewish heritage in their intellectual works, and one can sense that there are among them deep connections in their disposition and numerous possibilities of communicating that are based on the same way of thinking and of feeling. The Jewish child is already aware of these differences as soon as it starts school. Jewish children feel the resentment that grows out of an instinctive suspicion of their strangeness that naturally is often met with a closing of the ranks. [***] [Jews] are the target of instinctive resentment because they are of a different tribe than the majority of the population.”¹³⁸⁶

Maja Winteler-Einstein wrote in her biography of her brother Albert Einstein,

“His later advocacy of Zionism and his activities on its behalf came from this impulse: less in accordance with and on the basis of Jewish teachings than from an inner sense of obligation toward those of his race for whom an independent working place for scholarly activity in the sciences should be created, where they would not be discriminated against as Jews.”¹³⁸⁷

Albert Einstein wrote to Paul Ehrenfest on 8 November 1919,

“This university will contribute toward making less Jewish talent, particularly in Poland and Russia, have to go wretchedly to waste.”¹³⁸⁸

6.5.3.1 Supremacist and Segregationist Jewish “Neo-Messianism”

After emancipation, Jews had initially faced the dilemma that if they sought to become a professor they had to convert, at least on paper, to Christianity. In 1822, Gans, Zunz and Moser created a segregated Jewish institution in order to offer an alternative to the often insincere baptisms of Jews. They called their society the *Verein für Kultur und Wissenschaft der Juden*, which published the *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*. The association attracted Heinrich Heine, but soon disbanded. Heine, Gans and countless others took the baptismal plunge and the integration of Jews into Christian society began—some would later say in effort to undermine Gentile society.

Several articles appeared in *La Revue de Paris* in 1928 under the title “Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme: Henri Heine et Karl Marx”, in which “Salluste”, a pseudonym, argued that Communism was a “neo-Messianic” scheme created by Heinrich Heine and Karl Marx, by means of which they meant to fulfill Judaic Messianic prophecies.¹³⁸⁹ Salluste further argued that the Jewish societies which

grew out of Moses Mendelssohn's reformation movement, had organized to subvert Gentile cultures and religions and replace them with Judaized culture and world revolution—fulfilling Judaic Messianic myth under the pretext of a secular movement for progress. This movement also manifested itself in the arrogance of the “Jewish Mission” of “reformed” Judaism.

On 22 September 1922, a Jewish Bolshevik Zionist apologist who published under the pseudonym “Mentor”,¹³⁹⁰ on pages 13 and 14 of *The Jewish Chronicle*, confirmed that the “Jewish Mission” was to subvert other nations, cultures and religions in the name of “peace” and to force Gentiles to comply to the will of the Jews,

“‘What are the Jews Doing?’

By MENTOR.

WHEN I wrote in this column last week, I had no idea that the premonitions to which I alluded, of another great catastrophe of like sort to the war that began in 1914, would so soon be justified. Within a few hours of my words appearing in print a document was issued by the British Government, threatening the beginning of a war of which, once started, no man could foretell the end. Hardly was the last issue of the *Jewish Chronicle* published than we seemed whirled back in a sudden instant to the time eight years ago that preluded the terrible world-struggle that lasted through nearly five years. There were rumours of war; there were ominous movements of politicians from the four corners of the kingdom, which newspapers interpreted as meaning all sorts of things. The evil birds of Militarism were foregathering. Like vultures they flew to gather their prey. Stories were bruited abroad, craftily designed to work upon the sentiments and the emotions of the people. Reasons and excuses, arguments and assurances, were cleverly designed, so that when the dogs of war were unleashed, proof of the inevitability and the justification for starting wholesale murder, for man going out to kill his fellow man, might be prudently provided beforehand. As I write, the situation—as it is termed—seems, if anything, a good deal less dangerous than it did at the beginning of the week. That is because those who were for war, those who were willing if not anxious to resort to arms in order to fight about a dispute instead of adjusting it by negotiation, have not received the encouraging response from the country which they had evidently hoped would come to them. Once bit twice shy! All the conventional paraphernalia of diplomats and politicians were again employed by the men of war as they were used eight years ago. Then their assurances were accepted, and men believed they could by war accomplish a great deal. Now, some of the public at least are wiser, and recollect the fraud, the chicanery, the double-dealing, the falsity, and the two-facedness which were so largely responsible for the determination of this country to enter into war eight years ago. They know that the same people are up to the same dodges, that the like people are bent

on the like wiles, and the country this time has put a large discount upon all the mongering for War. The experience of the Great War has thus not been wholly lost, and there seems a healthy disposition, in more than one quarter, to regard the Minister who leads this country into war as *ipso facto* unfitted to hold the trust he has dishonoured by muddlement. There is proved to be now a looking upon war as the crowning disaster of any nation, not as its glory, as a visitation and not as a proud happening.

Jewish Doctrine and Christian.

If war is averted, if those responsible for the Government of the country finding war 'no go,' because the people will have none of it, have to seek other means for adjusting international differences, then the incident which looked so grave at the beginning of the week will have been of advantage. For it will have shown at least one Government that the way of war is not the easiest at hand for them for settling any disputes that may arise. So far, so good; and if that spirit of antagonism to and hatred and—if you will—fear of war be maintained, so that men, beginning by disliking it, will go on to loathe and detest it, then we shall have made a long stride to the abolition of war and the arbitrament of the sword, and towards that condition which is the Jewish ideal; when man shall no longer lift up sword against man, nor learn war any more. [*Isaiah 2:4*] I call that the Jewish ideal, but we Jews have not a monopoly of it. Peace is a Christian ideal, too. Indeed, Christianity goes much farther, and is a doctrine of non-resistance to evil. Judaism does not teach that; it is far more practical and far more human. But if Christianity were really practised and the Christian spirit were truly in the souls of those who profess Christianity, war would be impossible. But a Jew is here writing for Jews, and it is because peace is a Jewish ideal that I revert to this question here and now—now, because we are on the threshold of the most sacred days in the Jewish calendar, when the Jew, if ever, is brought into close contact with the Almighty, when, if ever, he feels strong upon him the duty which is his as a Jew.

The Jewish Mission.

And I ask: What are the Jews doing in the war against war, the war which the King himself the other day said is the only war worth while; the war for Civilisation, for salving Humanity, for making the life of men and women in the world tolerable and bearable; the war against one of the most fertile roots of poverty with its fruits of hunger, and vice, and disease—what are the Jews doing in the war for which the King of Kings long ago conscripted certainly every Jew? I suppose the answer will reach me that Jews ought not, as such and of themselves, to be expected to take any definite part in such a campaign. I shall be told that war is really a political matter, and that Jews have no politics of their own, they share in the politics of the nations of which they are citizens. But this argument, carried to its logical conclusion, would place the Jew in such a position that the whole of the claim which he has made concerning his place in the world, and in respect to the Judaism he

professes, would have to be seriously overhauled. How can a Jew be true to Jewish teachings, to the teachings of the Prophets, to Rabbinical teaching, to all that Judaism connotes for the Jew, unless Peace on earth and Goodwill among men be believed in by him and hoped for by him? How can he pray, as he constantly prays, from year end to year end, and day by day, for peace, and yet not mean it and not wish it? And if he means it and wishes it, then how can he place even his duty to the State (if it is conceivable that his duty to the State can involve war as a principle) before his duty to his God? The Christian does it. He worships a Divinity that he hails as the emblem of peace. He invokes the one whom he regards as Messiah, the harbinger of peace. He subscribes to the doctrine of Peace enunciated by the great Founder of his faith, and yet he contrives instruments of violence, engines of slaughter, and all the hellish devices for maintaining War on earth and illwill towards men. But that is a matter for Christians. That they do thus is no reason, and assuredly no justification for Jews doing likewise. Following the multitude to do evil is not Jewish work. And so I ask again, just as we are slipping into yet another New Year: What are the Jews doing so that war shall cease from the earth, so that peace may reign and goodwill prevail among the children of men?

Our Separateness.

What are the Jews doing? It is a pertinent and not an impertinent question; because it asks, though not in those words, how is the Jew justifying his existence? We elect to remain a separate people. In every country and in every land we segregate ourselves from our fellow-citizens, and throughout the ages we have obstinately (as our enemies term it), faithfully as we believe, kept ourselves apart as a separate people. For what? Some Jews will tell you that we have refused to assimilate in the sense of losing ourselves in the multitudes surrounding us, because we have all along been conscious of being a separate national entity. So we have maintained our separateness in the hope that some day our national being would be restored. This, put very broadly, is the attitude of Zionists and Jewish Nationalists. But all Jews are not one or the other. The majority are neither, or at least care not at all for either striving. Their idea of Jewish separateness is altogether another. They say that we Jews have kept apart in order to carry on, amid the nations of the world, a Jewish Mission. That mission, so it is claimed, comprises our weaning other peoples away from error of thought and sin of action to a true conception of God. It means that we have to urge the breaking up of all idols and securing allegiance alone to the Almighty Governor of the universe. Very well, let us accept, for the purpose of argument, the contention of these fellow Jews that their separateness is maintained alone for the Mission potentialities of our people. Then I would ask: What are they doing in the way of propagating that Mission? Some of them argue that although it is true they are not actively engaged in spreading the message of Israel, or in preaching its truths to those of other faiths, they are doing service to the mission passively in the living of their lives. Their

example, they say, is even better than precept. Surely this is a paltering with the question; it is an excuse, a subterfuge, and it makes the whole idea of the Mission of Israel not alone the sham that it is with those who thus argue, but a ridiculous parody of every idea of the purpose and the object which any mission worthy of the name must have.

The Jew's Contribution.

This paltry excuse for neglect of the call of the Mission of Israel does not rob us of the right to ask: What is the Jew doing in pursuance of what he believes to be his mission to Mankind? The answer must be: precious little. We are standing at the dawn of a New Year. We are about to reach another milestone in our history. Is the Jew to go on year by year in the same meaningless, chaotic existence, just living, just existing without a worthy purpose as Jew; for mere material selfish objects, as a people without an ideal, without an aspiration? Broadly speaking, there are only two possible ideals for Jews, the National ideal and the Mission of Israel ideal. They are not antagonistic or even mutually exclusive. For the Jewish Nationalist also believes—believes very strongly—in the Mission of Israel, but believes, too, that it is impossible of accomplishment without national existence in a Jewish land. But taking the Jewish position as it is, either aspiration, if the Jew be true to it, will justify his separateness among the nations of the world. But if he nourish neither of those ideals, as is the way with thousands and thousands of Jews, then the *raison d'être* of his existence is *nil*, the part he plays in the world is a mirage. He is a mere parasite, and he justifies nothing so much as the indictment that is made by some enemies of our people. They denounce us because we remain separate as a people, and yet take no count of any service which we should do as Jews for the common benefit of Mankind. Well, if there be any reality in the Mission of Israel ideal, then I ask again: What are the Jews doing? What part are they taking in the war against war, in leading men from violence and slaughter and murder in the wholesale, back or rather forward to ways of peace, to ways of goodwill and happiness among men. We are doing precious little, even as individual Jews. As a Jewish people, we are doing nothing.

Here surely, as I have more than once suggested, is a great and glorious opportunity for the Jewish People. They do not want to be a separate nation. They wish to be separate among the nations of the world. Very well, then let them justify that aspiration. All the trouble Jews encounter is traceable to nothing so surely as to the fact that they are despised. And they are despised, not as individuals—as individuals even anti-Semites respect Jews—but because, however commendable individual Jews may be, whatever service individual Jews may have done for the world and for civilisation—and Dr. Joseph Jacobs left a posthumous work showing how great had been the service of individual Jews in that respect—as a people Jews contribute nothing to the service of mankind. We do not cultivate a Jewish culture; we are not known for any great or enduring office which we perform. But suppose we carried on our mission, our God-given mission as the bringers

and the promoters of peace, as the bearer of that great ideal, is it not palpable that there would be something we should be doing by which we should win the respect of mankind? Because sooner or later, after misunderstanding had passed away and misrepresentation and vituperation had evaporated, the world would come to acknowledge itself our debtors for the good we should have effected. It seems to me that in the times in which we live—with the constant menace and danger of war, with the ineffable wickedness which allows great talent and scientific attainment to be misused and misapplied, as they are being misused and misapplied in devising means for carnage, for bloodshed, for violence, for all the indescribable horror comprised in war—and particularly at this hour when we are entering into the most solemn moments of conclave—the Jew with his God—it is not inapt to ask: What are the Jews doing in the war that alone matters, the war against war? I ask it here and now, because the hearts of my fellow-Jews, attuned at this season to higher thoughts and loftier aspirations, may bethink themselves that there is a great evil in the world, the greatest evil that mankind and civilisation have to contend against. And mayhap there will arise in their souls a determination, each one as he can and where he can, to do what he can—thus making it a Jewish mission—so as to roll away the menace of war from the path that humanity is treading.”

If the “Jewish Mission” were truly to convince the Peoples of the world that monotheism is the most rational choice among extant religions, then Jews would be applying themselves to this task, but they are not. Instead, it appears that where Jews involve themselves in religious questions, they are most often ridiculing other religions. Far from inviting other Peoples to join Judaism, Jewish leaders instead attempt through their disproportionate control of media and education to destroy all religious beliefs in other Peoples, including the monotheism of Christianity and Islam—save the false beliefs they have instilled in Dispensationalist Christian Zionists who serve as their slavish and gleefully suicidal “Esau” to their “Jacob”. The true nature of the “Jewish Mission” is made obvious by the actions of Jewish leaders and is spelled out in Jewish religious literature. It is to destroy other cultures, religions, nations and “races”. It is not a mission of peace and tolerance, rather it is a mission of segregation, “race” hatred, Jewish supremacy, war and death. As the Jewish book of *Exodus* 34:11-17 states, the “Jewish Mission” is to:

“11 Observe thou that which I command thee *this* day: behold, I drive out before thee the Amorite, and the Canaanite, and the Hittite, and the Perizzite, and the Hivite, and the Jebusite. 12 Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither thou goest, lest it be for a snare in the midst of thee: 13 But ye shall destroy their altars, break their images, and cut down their groves: 14 For thou shalt worship no other god: for the LORD, whose name *is* Jealous, *is* a jealous God: 15 Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and they go a whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods, and *one* call thee, and thou eat of his

sacrifice; 16 And thou take of their daughters unto thy sons, and their daughters go a whoring after their gods, and make thy sons go a whoring after their gods. 17 Thou shalt make thee no molten gods. [King James Version]”

The Jewish book of *Obadiah* states,

“1 The vision of Obadiah. Thus saith the Lord GOD concerning Edom: We have heard a message from the LORD, and an ambassador is sent among the nations: ‘Arise ye, and let us rise up against her in battle.’ 2 Behold, I make thee small among the nations; thou art greatly despised. 3 The pride of thy heart hath beguiled thee, O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, thy habitation on high; that sayest in thy heart: ‘Who shall bring me down to the ground?’ 4 Though thou make thy nest as high as the eagle, and though thou set it among the stars, I will bring thee down from thence, saith the LORD. 5 If thieves came to thee, if robbers by night—how art thou cut off!—would they not steal till they had enough? If grape-gatherers came to thee, would they not leave some gleaning grapes? 6 How is Esau searched out! How are his hidden places sought out! 7 All the men of thy confederacy have conducted thee to the border; the men that were at peace with thee have beguiled thee, and prevailed against thee; they that eat thy bread lay a snare under thee, in whom there is no discernment. 8 Shall I not in that day, saith the LORD, destroy the wise men out of Edom, and discernment out of the mount of Esau? 9 And thy mighty men, O Teman, shall be dismayed, to the end that every one may be cut off from the mount of Esau by slaughter. 10 For the violence done to thy brother Jacob shame shall cover thee, and thou shalt be cut off for ever. 11 In the day that thou didst stand aloof, in the day that strangers carried away his substance, and foreigners entered into his gates, and cast lots upon Jerusalem, even thou wast as one of them. 12 But thou shouldest not have gazed on the day of thy brother in the day of his disaster, neither shouldest thou have rejoiced over the children of Judah in the day of their destruction; neither shouldest thou have spoken proudly in the day of distress. 13 Thou shouldest not have entered into the gate of My people in the day of their calamity; yea, thou shouldest not have gazed on their affliction in the day of their calamity, nor have laid hands on their substance in the day of their calamity. 14 Neither shouldest thou have stood in the crossway, to cut off those of his that escape; neither shouldest thou have delivered up those of his that did remain in the day of distress. 15 For the day of the LORD is near upon all the nations; as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee; thy dealing shall return upon thine own head. 16 For as ye have drunk upon My holy mountain, so shall all the nations drink continually, yea, they shall drink, and swallow down, and shall be as though they had not been. 17 But in mount Zion there shall be those that escape, and it shall be holy; and the house of Jacob shall possess their possessions. 18 And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and

the house of Esau for stubble, and they shall kindle in them, and devour them; and there shall not be any remaining of the house of Esau; for the LORD hath spoken. 19 And they of the South shall possess the mount of Esau, and they of the Lowland the Philistines; and they shall possess the field of Ephraim, and the field of Samaria; and Benjamin shall possess Gilead. 20 And the captivity of this host of the children of Israel, that are among the Canaanites, even unto Zarephath, and the captivity of Jerusalem, that is in Sepharad, shall possess the cities of the South. 21 And saviours shall come up on mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be the LORD'S. [version of the Jewish Publication Society]"

"Salluste" alleged that Heinrich Heine pulled out of these movements which grew from Moses Mendelssohn's Jewish reformation, not because Heine sincerely wished to disassociate from the Jewish destruction of Western Civilization, but because these groups had begun to draw attention to themselves and Heine wanted his views to be kept secret, and shied away from the political pressure placed on these subversive organizations. Salluste later republished his articles in book form, *Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme: Henri Heine et Karl Marx*, Jules Tallandier, Paris, (1930); and his ideas were championed by Denis Fahey in his book *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935); and later by Robert H. Williams, *The Ultimate World Order—As Pictured in "The Jewish Utopia"*, CPA Book Publisher, Boring, Oregon, (1957?).

In 1845, *The North American Review* wrote of the Frankist-style forces in the Jewish community Salluste later described,

"We might confidently look for reformers under such a system as Rabbinism; and, even without the name of reformation, for wide departures from the Talmud, either towards the 'old paths,' or to infidelity. The man who in modern times exerted the most commanding influence on Judaism was Moses Mendelssohn. He was born at Dessau, in 1729, was carefully educated in the Bible and Talmud, but was thrown upon Hebrew charity in Berlin, at the age of thirteen. Following the bent of his own genius, and stimulated by various associations, he left the dreary paths of tradition, to pursue the intricate but flowery ways of Gentile philosophy. He even improved the German language, in which he wrote with great taste. The influence of his works and his example was soon manifest. An enthusiasm for German literature and science was awakened among the Jewish people, when they beheld their kinsman ranking with the first scholars of the age. 'Parents wished to see their children like Mendelssohn. Rashi and Kimchi, the Shulchan, Aruch, and Josaphoth, were laid on the shelf. Schiller and Wieland, Wolff and Kant, were the favorite books of the holy nation.' Mendelssohn was very strict in Talmudical observances, and did not in his works directly oppose them; yet he certainly intended to undermine Rabbinism, and covertly labored to obliterate superstitions and prejudices, and to render his religion consistent with free intercourse between Jew and

Gentile, and with the palpable benefits of modern progress in letters and refinement in manners. After all, he was probably at best but a deist; and he certainly lacked that directness, candor, and earnestness of purpose, which true-hearted reformers have usually manifested. Christians must deny to Judaism that vitality which is essential to its maintenance upon the true basis even of a pure pre-Messianic creed. As a system, though not indeed strictly in each individual, it must ever oscillate between Rabbinism, or the like, and rationalism,—finding no stable, middle, spiritual ground.

Mendelssohn died in 1786; but others arose to carry out his innovations. A Jewish literary and philosophical society was formed at Königsberg, in 1783, which supported the first Jewish periodical ever published,—a journal devoted to the cause of reform. The ‘new light’ rapidly spread; and now Mendelssohnism, in different varieties, inclined more or less to the Talmud, or to infidelity, is the religion of a great majority of the Jews in all Europe west of Poland, into which country itself, especially Austrian Poland, the revolution has in some degree extended. The ‘Jews of the New Temple,’ or ‘Rational’ or ‘Reformed Jews,’ as they are called, where their numbers have not secured peaceable ascendancy, have generally seceded from the Talmudists; who, on their own part, where the so-called reformation has made good progress, adhere to the Talmud scarcely even in name.

The creed of the new sect has never appeared in an authoritative shape, but may be gathered from their writings and practices. The believers in it agree, that the Jews are no longer a chosen people, in the sense hitherto commonly received. They reject the Talmud, professing to receive the Hebrew Scriptures as the true basis of religious belief, and as a divine revelation; though after explaining away their inspiration, and the miracles recorded in them, on rationalistic principles. Regarding the Mosaic institutions as never abrogated, they consider, however, that most of their requirements are applicable only to a state of national establishment in Palestine; and therefore hold, that, until the unknown period of the Messiah’s advent, and Israel’s restoration, such laws only are to be observed as are necessary to preserve the essence of religion, or useful to form pious ecclesiastical communities, and which do not interfere with Gentile governments, with any of the existing relations of life, or with intellectual culture. The synagogue service has been remodelled; and the modern languages have been generally substituted for the Hebrew. A weekly lecture has taken the place of the semi-annual sermons of the Rabbinists. Contrary to the precept of the Talmud, instrumental music is introduced into public worship. ‘The question of organ or no organ,’ says a late journal devoted to the Jews, ‘divides Judaism on both sides of the Atlantic.’

Before long, the latitudinarian views of the leaders in this movement clearly discovered themselves; and there was a temporary reaction in favor of Rabbinism, to which the more devout among their converts receded. Yet the new system has signally prevailed and flourished. It is in France, perhaps, that the Jews have thrown off most completely the trammels of

Judaism,—indeed, of all religion. They now style themselves *French Israelites*, or *Israelitish Frenchmen*, according to the doctrine of Napoleon's Sanhedrim; and seem anxious to amalgamate themselves more and more with the nation at large. Most of their leaders are infidels, undisguisedly aiming to obliterate all the common notions about a Messiah, as utterly superstitious; referring the prophecies of his advent—which they still nominally treat as prophecies—to the political emancipation of the Jews in the various lands of their sojourn. 'The Regeneration,' a journal published at Paris by some of their most learned and influential men, has represented the French Revolution as the coming of the Messiah, bringing, first, judgment, then, liberty and peace. The grand rabbi of Metz, a few years ago, in addressing the Jews of his district, spoke thus:—

'God has permitted different religions, according to the different necessities of men, in the same way as he has created different plants, different animals, and men of different characters, genius, constitutions, physiognomies, and colors. Consequently, all religions are salutary for those who are born in these religions; consequently, we must respect all religions. All men, without distinction of religion, will be partakers of eternal beatitude, provided they have practised virtue in this life.'

On the 12th of June last, a voluntary Jewish synod met at Brunswick, composed of twenty-five eminent rabbins, from various parts of the continent. It was the first of a proposed succession of annual synods, to deliberate on Jewish affairs. They sat eight days, passed various resolutions proposing important changes, and declared their concurrence in all the decisions of Napoleon's Sanhedrim. The Jews of England, though visibly influenced by residence in so enlightened a kingdom, were all nominally Rabbinites, until, within the last four or five years, a reforming party seceded in London whence their principles and denomination—'British Jews—have since gradually spread. Even among those who remained, great difference of opinion prevails as to Talmudical observances. Both there and in this country, the Portuguese Jews seem most active in the work of revolution. The tide of Jewish emigration to the United States is rapidly swelling; and as it comes from many lands, it exhibits a variety of hue. But the voluntary emigrant is ever and characteristically a lover of change; and here the Talmud has little sway, and that rapidly declining. Mr. Leeser represents the Bible alone as the basis of the Jewish faith and in the whole article already referred to, does not so much as mention the Talmud. He edits, at Philadelphia, 'The Occident and American Jewish Advocate,' the first Jewish periodical established in this country. Soon after its establishment, 'The Israelite,' a weekly German paper, devoted to the same cause, and also published in Philadelphia, was announced; whether this still survives, we know not. Mr. Leeser expects a literal Messiah, —not God, or a son of God, but a mere man, eminently endowed, like Moses, to accomplish all that is foretold of him. He protests against some of the decisions of the late Brunswick synod, particularly the one reaffirming the *dictum* of the French

Sanhedrim, that Jews might intermarry with Gentiles. He has long had in his congregation a Sabbath school, or a school for religious instruction, held, not on the seventh day, but on the Christian Sabbath, which Christian observance makes necessarily a day of convenient leisure for the purpose.

Among the stricter Jews, all over the world, the expectation of Messiah's advent is becoming more and more anxious. They not unfrequently talk, though without serious purpose, of embracing Christianity, should he not appear within a certain time. Migration to the Holy Land is visibly increasing. Multitudes from all parts of the world would hasten thither, could they become possessors of the dear soil, and enjoy reasonable protection. Mr. Noah proposes, that Christian societies and governments interested in the welfare of the Jews should exert their influence to procure these advantages for them in their native land of promise. The suggestion deserves notice.

Of modern efforts for the conversion of Israel to Christianity we can speak but briefly. The chief extraordinary obstacles which have hitherto opposed such efforts have been, a bigotry which treated the bare thought of investigating Christianity as a heinous sin, and which was ever prepared to stifle free inquiry by persecution; the character of Talmudical education, which disqualified the pupil for independent judgment; and accumulated prejudices against a religion too often exemplified only by profligate persecutors. But all these obstacles are gradually sinking away; nor does growing infidelity appear so formidable as the superstition and fanaticism which have given place to it. Moreover, the spirit of inquiry, and the dissensions kindled by the progress of the revolution which Mendelssohn commenced, are favorable to Christian effort. We shall speak only of what Protestants have done."¹³⁹¹

Salluste quoted a rather famous letter which had for decades been attributed to the "Neo-Messianist" Baruch Lévy (a pseudonym?), which was allegedly written to Karl Marx, and which mirrors many of racist Zionist Moses Hess' statements, and which further anticipates Michael Higger's philo-Semitic Messianic book *The Jewish Utopia*. The Lévy letter stated,

"The Jewish people as a whole will itself be the Messiah. It will reign over the world by intermixing the other races of mankind and by eliminating borders and monarchies, which are a defense against particularism, and by the establishment of a world-wide Republic, which will universally grant the Jews the right of citizenship. In this new organization of humanity, the children of Israel who are now spread over the entire surface of the globe, all of the same race and the same traditions—without, however, forming a distinct nationality—will exclusively become the leaders, without ever meeting opposition, especially if they manage to set some segment of the working masses on a stable course. The governments of the Nations which form the Universal Republic will all pass into the hands of the Jews without any effort, as a reward for the victory of the proletariat. The ruling Judaic

race will then be able to eliminate personal property, and will control all of the public's wealth. Thus the promise of Talmud will have been fulfilled, which states that in the messianic era the Jews will hold the wealth of all the people of the world under their lock and key."

*"Le peuple juif pris collectivement sera lui-même son Messie. Son règne sur l'Univers s'obtiendra par l'unification des autres races humaines, la suppression des frontières et des monarchies, qui sont le rempart du particularisme, et l'établissement d'une République Universelle qui reconnaîtra partout les droits de citoyens aux Juifs. Dans cette organisation nouvelle de l'Humanité, les fils d'Israël répandus dès maintenant sur toute la surface du globe, tous de même race et de même formation traditionnelle sans former cependant une nationalité distincte, deviendront sans opposition l'élément partout dirigeant, surtout s'ils parviennent à imposer aux masses ouvrières la direction stable de quelques-uns d'entre eux. Les gouvernements des Nations formant la République Universelle passeront tous, sans effort, dans des mains israélites, à la faveur de la victoire du prolétariat. La propriété individuelle pourra alors être supprimée par les gouvernants de race judaïque qui administreront partout la fortune publique. Ainsi se réalisera la promesse du Talmud que, lorsque les Temps du Messie seront venus, les Juifs tiendront sous leurs clefs les biens de tous les peuples du monde."*¹³⁹²

Rabbi Liber doubted the authenticity of this letter and published a polemic against "Salluste", stating, *inter alia*,

"Salluste quotes but one letter, which is enough to impress the novice, from the 'neo-messianist' Baruch Lévy to Karl Marx. Who is this Baruch Lévy? From where is this text taken? It is a mystery. Until proven otherwise, I hold this letter to be a forgery. Let me assure the reader. There exists, in the antisemitic literature, a whole series of false letters of the same tone, manufactured in more or less clandestine dispensaries, to say nothing of the 'Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion', that forgery by officers of the Czar's police, whose origin was definitively unmasked¹."

"Salluste cite seulement une lettre, assez impressionnante pour les novice, du «néo-messianiste» Baruch Lévy à Karl Marx. Qui est ce Baruch Lévy? D'où est tiré ce texte? Mystère. Jusqu'à preuve du contraire, je tiens cette lettre pour *un faux*. Que le lecteur ne se récrie pas. Il existe, dans la littérature antisémite, toute une série de fausses lettres du même ton, fabriquées dans des officines plus ou moins clandestines, sans parler des «Protocoles des Sages de Sion», cette forgerie de policiers tsaristes dont l'origine a été définitivement démasquée¹."¹³⁹³

Salluste responded by quoting from numerous Jewish sources which justified his

conclusions, though apparently without directly touching upon the provenance of the “Baruch Lévy” letter—which reappeared in Salluste’s book of 1930.¹³⁹⁴ Morris Kominsky argued that the letter was a hoax.¹³⁹⁵ Kominsky rather unconvincingly relies upon Herbert Aptheker’s conclusion that the letter is a hoax on its face and does not appear to Aptheker to resemble anything else attributed to Marx, his correspondents or Marxism, in Aptheker’s experience.¹³⁹⁶ In any event, it is interesting that such accusations should be attributed to Marx’s correspondent. It is even more interesting that Michael Higger’s book of 1932, *The Jewish Utopia*,¹³⁹⁷ unabashedly advocates nearly the exact same plan as the letter from “Lévy” to Marx. These, however, have a common source in the Hebrew Bible, and in the virulently anti-Christian and anti-Gentile Talmud and Cabalistic literature.

When Salluste republished the Lévy letter in 1930, Salluste added the following notation, which did address the provenance of the letter and which states that though letter might be of dubious origin it had been in circulation for almost half a century without raising a protest, that Marx’s correspondence was purged of unflattering materials before it was published, and that the letter agreed with common sentiments among current authors and fit the current situation perfectly,

“(1) Ce texte d’une lucidité prodigieuse, et dont chaque phrase paraît s’appliquer à la situation politique et sociale du monde à l’époque où nous écrivons (1928), est connu depuis près d’un demi-siècle. Il a été cité pour la première fois au Congrès Antisémite de Berlin, en 1888, puis reproduit à plusieurs reprises en France, et pour la dernière fois à notre connaissance, en 1919. Son insertion dans notre étude n’en a pas moins provoqué une véritable fureur chez nos contradicteurs, et l’on verra plus loin que le rabbin Liber nous accuse carrément de faux à ce sujet. . .

Nous nous permettons d’observer: 1^o que le fait que cette lettre ne figure pas dans la Correspondance de Karl Marx ne prouve rien contre l’authenticité de la pièce, les gendres du prophète judéo-communiste, Paul Lafargue et Charles Longuet, n’ayant livré à l’impression les lettres de leur beau-père et de ses correspondants qu’après les avoir soigneusement expurgés; 2^o que la lettre ci-dessus a été citée à plusieurs reprises, depuis quarante ans, sans soulever la moindre protestation de la part d’autorités juives tout aussi qualifiées que M. le rabbin Liber; 3^o que les idées contenues dans cette lettre sont absolument conformes à celles exprimées, sous une forme très voisine, par d’autres écrivains juifs contemporains, tels que MM. Edmond Fleg, Barbusse, André Spire, etc., etc.; 4^o qu’en admettant même que le document soit d’origine incertaine, tout ce qui se passe dans le monde quarante ans après sa production, spécialement au point de vue de la judaïsation des partis révolutionnaires, montre que son auteur était admirablement renseigné.”¹³⁹⁸

This “Neo-Messianism” of Communism, which manifested itself in the French Revolution as a political Messiah, is truly the Paleo-Messianism of Deutero-Isaiah (*Isaiah*, Chapters 40-66, or 40-55 if one accepts the theory of Trito-Isaiah). Today “Neo-Messianism” bears the title of “political Zionism”. Moses Hess based his racist

political Zionism and his Communism on the ancient Jewish Messianic prophecies, not those of a personal messiah, but of the Jewish People as Messiah, the Jewish People as the master race. But Communism was only one side of the Jewish Messianic coin. Jewish Capitalists sought to control all the wealth of the world by accumulating it through corrupt means, and by hoarding gold—even by melting down the coins of the nations. Like the Communists, whom they funded, the Jewish Capitalists sought to ruin the nations with wars and with debt, and by destroying their cultures, religions and educational institutions. They also sought to Judaize them.

Joseph Klausner wrote of the concept of the Jewish People as Messiah and master race—the usurper of the nations, and of the wealth of the world—in his book *The Messianic Idea in Israel: From Its Beginnings to the Completion of the Mishnah*. In his analysis, we can find the dogmatic Judaic basis for the persecution of the Jews who chose not to be political Zionists by the Zionist Nazis; and the persecution and oppression of the Gentiles by the Jewish People. Klausner wrote, *inter alia*,

“And kings shall be thy foster-fathers,
And queens thy nursing mothers;
They shall bow down to thee
with their face to the earth,
And lick the dust of thy feet (49:23).

For all the enemies of Judah will be cut off, and all who lift themselves up against her will not succeed (49:17-19, 25-26; 54:17)—just as the prophet had said in his prophecies of the first period. So great will be the *political success*. And *material prosperity* will not be less. ‘O thou afflicted one, storm-tossed, uncomforted!’—the prophet turns toward the beloved homeland in great compassion—

Behold, I will set thy bases with beryl,¹⁸
And lay thy foundations with sapphires.
And I will make thy pinnacles of rubies,
And thy gates of carbuncle stones,
And all thy border of jewels (54:15—12).

At the same time spiritual blessings will multiply:

And all thy children shall be taught of the LORD;
And great shall be the peace of thy children (54:13).

For Zion will be established in righteousness (54:14), Jerusalem will be ‘the Holy City,’ and the uncircumcised and unclean will no more enter it (52:1)—just as Ezekiel had said. In spite of all the universalism of the prophet, which we shall soon see in all its glory, his nationalism is not diminished, just as in spite of all his spirituality his political and worldly

hopes are not impaired. The Gentiles will exalt Israel as the Chosen People, as their kings bow down to the earth before him and lick the dust of his feet. The Gentiles, therefore, will not be equal to Israel in glory and honor,¹⁹ although all of them will become sons of God because all of them will be called by the name of the LORD. Israel will remain the center, while the Gentiles will be only points on the circumference.

On what basis should Israel have an advantage over the rest of the nations? The answer could have been only this: because Israel will teach the knowledge of the LORD and ethical insight to all peoples. But this answer was the result of a long evolution of ideas and the cause of a new chain of profound ideas closely bound together by their own nature.

Not *all* the people of Israel have acknowledged the LORD; among this Chosen People are evil ones and sinners, who do not wish to know the LORD and to walk in His ways. Only the prophets and their disciples are the servants of the LORD, and only they have spread His teaching in Israel—and for this they have been persecuted by their own people, slain like Uriah the son of Shemaiah, or cast into cisterns and into prison like Jeremiah. Thus the one attempting to spread the knowledge of the LORD and the love of the good, that is, to *benefit* the people, is forced to endure many *evils* for the LORD's sake and to take comfort in the hope that finally the sinful people will acknowledge and understand that the servant of the LORD was in the right.

The people Israel is the only nation within which is the knowledge of the LORD and the recognition of the good; therefore it must disseminate these two things among the other peoples, as the prophets disseminate them within it. This ethical demand was already made by the pre-Exilic prophets from Amos to Zephaniah and Jeremiah. And if the Exilic and post-Exilic prophets saw that Israel was suffering greatly, that its land was laid waste and its Temple ruined, that it had gone into exile among the Gentiles and become in its political weakness an object of mockery and derision among them, verily—unless the prophet and his disciples were willing to conclude that the God of Israel had no power or ability to save His people and that the whole idea of the choice of the people Israel is only vanity and emptiness—there was left to them only the conclusion that just as the prophet suffers without having committed a fault, suffers from the transgressors among his own people whom he is seeking to benefit, that is to say, *takes upon himself the iniquity of others*, so suffers also the people Israel from other peoples more sinful than Israel, because Israel seeks to benefit them. In other words, *the people Israel takes upon itself the iniquity of all the rest of the peoples, the iniquity of the whole world*. What the prophet is to Israel, Israel becomes to all the world: the servant of the LORD, holding up the standard of the highest righteousness in the world and suffering for his pursuit of good.

This is the profound conception that lies hidden in 42:1-7; 49:1-9; 50:4-9; 52:13-15 plus 53:1-12. The ancient Jewish interpreters were divided as to whether these passages refer to the prophet alone or to the whole people

Israel. The early Christians, from Paul the Apostle (Acts 8:32-35) onward, saw in them a reference to the sufferings and death of Jesus of Nazareth. (As a matter of fact, some of his career did resemble what is described in Chapter 53; and the rest of his career is *intentionally* portrayed in the Gospels in such a manner that the events appear to have happened in fulfillment of the words in this chapter.) Some modern Christian scholars wish to see in these passages a description of the fate of Zerubbabel or Jehoiachin (Sellin), or of some other great man of Israel who lived in the middle of the sixth century B.C.E. (Duhm).²⁰ After what I said above by way of explanation, it should now be clear that the prophet could not separate his own fate, as one persecuted for his pursuit of good, from the fate of his disciples and of all the servants of the LORD, whom he considered to be the real nucleus of the people Israel, the Israel in whom the LORD 'will be glorified' (49:3). Thus everything said in these chapters can and must be related in one process both to the prophet and to the whole Jewish nation: the servants of the LORD are this nation's chosen remnant, to which alone belongs the future.²¹

Nevertheless, there is a kernel of Messianism—not Christian, but completely Jewish Messianism—in these chapters.

I have already said in a number of places that the Jewish Messiah is composite in his nature: in him are some of the politico-worldly virtues of the king and some of the ethico-spiritual virtues of the prophet. In the period of the Second Isaiah there was no place for an individual political Jewish Messiah, as was said above; and apart from the reference to 'the sure mercies of David' we do not find this subject mentioned at all by the prophet of consolation to Zion. But precisely because the ethico-spiritual virtues of the Messiah were exalted and became the shining symbols of Messianism, the bearer of Messianism came to be either the individual 'servant of the LORD,' the prophet, or the collective 'servant of the LORD,' the best of the people Israel. Thus the *whole* people Israel *in the form of the elect of the nation* gradually became *the Messiah of the world, the redeemer of mankind*. This Messiah must suffer just as the prophet suffers. Here also punishment precedes redemption; but this punishment is unique: it comes as a penalty *for the sin of others*. And it redeems the world; for if Israel had not been willing to suffer and to spread the knowledge of God and of pure morality in the earth, the world would have remained sunk in sin against religion and morality. And for this punishment, bringing good to all peoples except Israel, this people receives a worthy reward in 'the end of days' [future age], in that it becomes 'a light to the Gentiles,' in that it is placed in the center of mankind.

This, *in its broadest aspects*, is the content of those chapters which treat of the servant of the LORD. In it are included the spiritual, the universalistic, Messianic expectations of the people Israel, expectations which serve to supplement the nationalistic, the worldly, and the political expectations of which I have already spoken above. Therefore it is impossible to pass over them in silence; they must be presented as completely as possible here, since

the greatness of their value for the development of Messianism in the future is incalculable.

The servant of the LORD, 'Israel in whom He will be glorified,' suffers, and it seems that he has labored in vain and spent his strength for nothing; but actually his accomplishment is great and his reward is with the LORD, who says to him:

It is too light a thing that thou shouldst be My servant
To raise up the tribes of Jacob,
And to restore the survivors of Israel (the nationalistic expectation);
I will also give thee for a light of the nations,
That My salvation may be unto the end of the earth (49:1-6).

And not only for 'a light of the nations' but also for 'a covenant of the people' (49:8)—as Deutero-Isaiah had said in his earlier prophecies (42:6). 'The Redeemer and the Holy One of Israel' promises His servant, whom He has chosen and who was despised and abhorred and 'a slave of rulers' (from this it seems clear that even here the meaning does not apply to the prophet alone),²² that 'kings shall see and arise (before him), princes, and they shall prostrate themselves (49:7)—something which the prophet had already promised to the whole people Israel (49:23).'¹³⁹⁹

6.5.3.2 It is Alright for Jews to Claim that "Einstein's Theories" are "Jewish", but Goyim Dare Not Say It

As the Twentieth Century arrived, the situation of the Jews had greatly improved in Germany. Relations between Jews and Christians were quite amicable and Jews frequently married Christians. The political Zionists saw the rapidly increasing process of assimilation as a threat to their racial heritage. The political Zionists had few qualms about forwarding their goals of racial segregation by corrupt means. They learned from the Dreyfus affair that Jews could be unified by the charge of anti-Semitism. It immediately became their favored means to unite and organize their members, to raise funds, and to segregate. It was also their favorite means to censor their critics, which was nothing new. The Jews attempted to censor the Egyptians, Romans and Greeks with false claims of "anti-Semitism" more than two thousand years ago.

There are often political forces involved in the appointment of professorships and the rejection of literature antagonistic to the agenda of any given publication. Ethnically biased institutions inhibit the progress of science; whether they are forced into segregation, as was often the case in Russia, or elect to be segregated, as was also often the case in Russia. Graduates streaming out of ethnically oriented schools sometimes obtain positions of power throughout the world and carry their bigotry with them. Jews were the victims of ethnic bias throughout the Nineteenth Century. It taught them to organize and to act as a unified force and in particular instances, the tables were turned. Few other groups were as successful at creating and maintaining

societies, hospitals, associations and charities as the Jews of the early Twentieth Century—no one had the power of the press or as much money at their disposal as the Jews. Some Germans became resentful and felt that they were being pushed out of their own institutions. They tended to blame the *Ostjuden* who had immigrated from the East to cities like Berlin.¹⁴⁰⁰

The political Zionists thrived on the tension that existed between *Ostjuden* and the traditional Gentile Germans following the German loss in the First World War. German Jews found themselves caught in the middle of this struggle for the national identity of Germany. Following the Second World War, after the Zionists had had their revenge on assimilatory German Jewry, they continued to ridicule German Jews in Israel, as reported in *Time Magazine* in 1948,

“In other lands the German Jews tend to look upon themselves as the aristocrats of Jewry (although they give precedence to the Sephardic families from Spain and Portugal). In Palestine the recent German aliyah is looked down upon and made the butt of the same kind of joke that German Jews in the U.S. used to hurl at their Russian brethren.

Israel calls the German Jew a *yecki* (roughly: squarehead), laughs at his naiveté. Many of the *yecki* are physicians (of that great, devoted band of German-Jewish doctors) and they have a hard time adjusting to the land. Many try chicken farming, going about it in that highly scientific Teuton way which makes the Polish and Russian Israelis guffaw. They say that when one *yecki* found a sick chicken he sent all the way to India for a serum, inoculated every one of his flock. They tell of a *yecki* with an old dry cow who asked a Polish Jew to sell it for him. The Pole found a Russian Jew to whom he said: ‘This is a fine young cow; she gives six liters of milk every day.’ The *yecki*, standing by, said: ‘Well, well, that I didn’t know; I’d like to buy her back.’ To new arrivals the Eastern Jews say: ‘Did you come here from conviction—or from Germany?’¹⁴⁰¹

There are allegations that Ashkenazi Jews later practiced genocide against the Sephardic Jews in Israel, by irradiating them with x-ray machines under the pretext that they were treating them for ringworm. This allegedly occurred under David Ben-Gurion’s leadership.

There is terrible enmity between the Sephardim and Ashkenazim in Israel.¹⁴⁰² The article “Israel” in the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia: A Translation from the Third Edition*, Volume 10, Macmillan, New York, (1976), pp. 477-484, at 478, states,

“Jews make up more than 85 percent of the population (1970); Arabs (14.6 percent) and a small number of Armenians make up the rest. Arabs are subjected to harsh racial discrimination. More than half of the Jewish population is made up of immigrants from Europe, Asia, Africa, and America. The various ethnic groups of the Jewish population of Israel are unequal in terms of social position. The sabras (Jews born in Israel) enjoy the special confidence of the chauvinist ruling circles: next in position are the

Ashkenazim (immigrants from Europe). Jewish immigrants from the countries of Asia and Africa are subjected to discrimination. The official language is Hebrew; however, some Jews do not know it, and Yiddish, Ladino (close to Spanish), Arabic, English, and other languages are used in everyday life. Jewish believers practice Judaism. The Arabs are Sunni Muslims, although some are Druze and Christians. The Armenians are Christians.”

Ethnic pride (and insecurity resulting from both fairminded and unfair attacks) often resulted in pro-Jewish ethnic mythologies, which anti-Semites used as examples to criticize Jews in general, much to the delight of the political Zionists. Bruno Thüring wrote, citing Salomon Wininger’s *Grosse jüdische National-Biographie mit mehr als 8000 Lebensbeschreibungen namhafter jüdischer Männer und Frauen aller Zeiten und Länder, ein Nachschlagewerk für das jüdische Volk und dessen Freunde*, in seven volumes, Druck “Orient”, Cernauti, (1925-1936); and Theodor Lessing’s *Der jüdische Selbsthaß*, Zionistischer Bücher-Bund, Berlin, (1930):

“So können wir also verstehen, wenn der betreffende Referent in der großen jüdischen Nationalbiographie (Wininger) in die Worte ausbricht: „Ptolemäus und Kopernikus waren als Forscher Waisenknaben gegen Einstein, der Raum und Zeit ins Wanken bringt. Kopernikus stürzte die absolute Ruhe der Erde, Einstein aber stürzte den Absolutismus überhaupt. Nichts ist ‚wirklich‘, für jeden Beobachter ist das Weltbild ein anderes, aber jeder hat recht.“

Daß aber das Judentum sich auch bewußt war, in diesen Dingen das eigene Selbst zum Ausdruck gebracht zu sehen, zeigt eine Stelle aus dem Buche: „Der jüdische Selbsthaß“ von dem Juden Theodor Lessing:

„Die durch das Wachstum der nichteuklidischen Geometrien möglich gewordenen neuen Wissensgebiete, die Anzahlen-, die Mengen-, die reine Mannigfaltigkeitslehre, das Auflösen der mit dem Unendlichen auf jenen Wissensgebieten verknüpften Paradoxien und die Relativierung auch der letzten Konkretheit und Anschaulichkeit zugunsten des absoluten Kalküls, das war das Werk eigentlich jüdischer Intelligenzen wie Georg Cantor, Alfred Fränkel, Alfred Pringsheim, Arthur Schoenflies, Felix Hausdorff, Ludwig Kronecker, Alfred¹) Sommerfeld, bis schließlich durch Michelson, Minkowski und Einstein die Weltwende, die Überwindung des Aristoteles, Newton und Kant erzwungen wurde. Es ist, als ob diese Kohorte sich verschworen hätte, das letzte arme Restchen sinnfälliger Gestaltlichkeit zu verflüchtigen.“¹⁴⁰³

Zionist Theodor Lessing also stated that,

“Vor nahezu einem Menschenalter, etwa um die gleiche Zeit, da das Werk Weiningers erschien, veröffentlichte ich eine Abhandlung zur Psychologie

der Mathematik, welche zu zeigen suchte, daß die damals mächtig einsetzende Geometrisierung der Physik und Arithmetisierung der Geometrie und der schon damals sich ankündigende Aufstieg der „Relativitätslehre“ eng zusammenhänge mit der Seele jüdischer Menschen.¹⁴⁰⁴

In 1850 and 1869, the German composer Richard Wagner published a scathing indictment of Jews as, in his view, tending to be inherently incompetent in the arts—as, in Wagner’s view, too often mere poseurs and cultural parasites lacking natural talent.¹⁴⁰⁵ Wagner’s essays have doubtless unnecessarily led to lingering insecurity in the German Jewish community and its decedents. Zionist Leon Pinsker disdainfully referred to the accusation in 1882, “to reproach us with a lack of men of genius!”¹⁴⁰⁶ Burton J. Hendrick wrote in his 1923 defense of Jewish Americans from the accusation that they dominated finance,

“Wagner, in his essay on ‘The Jews and Music’ denies them creative power in this art. They have lesser lights—a Mendelssohn, a Meyerbeer, an Offenbach; they have no Beethoven, no Mozart, or—he might have added—no Wagner. In poetry they have a Heine, but no Milton, no Byron, no Keats, no Wordsworth. In the drama they possess several figures of minor importance, but where is the Jewish Shakespeare or Molière or Schiller? In statesmanship they have a Disraeli, but no Cromwell or Pitt or Washington or Lincoln. What Jewish orator is there to put in the same class with Burke or Fox or Sheridan or Webster? What Jewish jurist ranks with Blackstone, Lord Mansfield, or John Marshall? In philosophy indeed the Jews do possess one man of the very first rank, Spinoza, and that exception to the generalization made above must be noted; but in science is there any Jewish name to put beside Copernicus or La Place or Galileo or Newton or Darwin—unless, indeed, the recent work of Einstein may ultimately include him in these exalted ranks? Even in that branch in which the Jews have been especially active and in which they have demonstrated great ability, medicine and surgery, their names by no means occupy the first place. Run over the list of the great medical discoveries of the last three centuries from that of the circulation of the blood to that of bacteriology; the most impressive fact is that the vast majority of the preeminent brains are Gentiles. Even in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, when Jewish scholarship in this country and in Europe has had free scope, the great accomplishments have been made by non-Jews. Probably the greatest medical achievements of modern times were the discovery of vaccination, of anæsthetics, and of bacteriology; the first was English, the second American, the third French. Indeed it would probably be possible to mention half a dozen American achievements—such as anæsthetics, ovariectomy, Marion Sims’ work in gynecology, Dr. Beaumont’s discovery of the laws of digestion, Dr. Holmes’s discovery of the contagiousness of child bed fever, Dr. Walter Reed’s work in yellow fever—to which Jewish medical science can present few parallels. In this department, as in the arts, the Jewish minds lack the great faculty of

creation: Jewish medical scientists, such as Metchnikoff, Ehrlich, and Wasserman, have important achievements to their credit, but their work consists in elaborating principles discovered by other men; the work of the three mentioned, for example, is all based upon the original investigations of Pasteur. Nor is it any sufficient answer to point to the comparatively small number of Jews, for one of the most certain teachings of history is that the genius of a people, and the proportion of great men it produces has no relation to its numbers. The genius of the English people had its finest flowering in the days of Elizabeth, when the population of the little island was less than two million. The genius of the Greeks reached its most eloquent expression in the days of Pericles when the population was only a few hundred thousand. The small numbers of the Jews as compared with Gentiles is therefore no reason why they should not have produced a great array of geniuses of the first class if, as we have been taught to believe, we are dealing with a race of supermen.”¹⁴⁰⁷

It is quite probable that such Wagnerian venom played no small rôle in the psychological need of some Jews to deceitfully promote Einstein as if greater than Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Huyghens and Newton; and to promote the deceit that Einstein’s work was unprecedented and of an exclusively “Jewish” character. The desire to discredit the Wagnerian view also provided racist and tribalistic Jews with an incentive to Judaize Gentile culture, and to take over university departments so as to promote their own interests and encourage Jews to achieve and fulfill their sensibilities, while discouraging the advancement of Gentiles, thereby inhibiting the progress of the Jews’ perceived competition.

Immediately after Einstein’s humiliating retreat from America and at a critical moment in the Zionist movement, *The London Times* wrote on 14 June 1921 on page 8, referring to the occasion of Einstein’s lecture at King’s College:

“LORD HALDANE, who presided, said they were there to give a British welcome to a man of genius. (Cheers.) The highest knowledge was a possession of which the world at large was proud, and genius knew no frontier. That morning he had been touched to observe that his distinguished guest had left his house to gaze on the tomb of Newton in Westminster Abbey. What Newton was to the 18th century Einstein was to the 20th century. In the lecture they were about to hear they would find a new point in the theory of relativity which had never been so definitely stated. Einstein had given a new conception of the universe, a conception, he thought, more revolutionary than that of Galileo, Copernicus, or Newton. He had taught them to think of the universe of externality as relative in its reality to knowledge. Reality was relative, not merely our knowledge of it. He had given a view which brought us back to the deeper meaning of knowledge itself.

The new doctrine, added Lord Haldane, had come from a man distinguished by his desire, if possible, to efface himself and yet impelled by

the unmistakable power of genius which would allow the individual of whom it had taken possession to rest for one moment. Professor Einstein had two great qualities for his task. He had a command of the tremendous instrument of mathematics as complete, at least, as that of any man alive. He had something more, a creative imagination akin to that of the poet. He fashioned creations apparently out of nothing in the way that genius alone could do. He was, too, a musician who played with a feeling and insight not always found in even the very best professionals. He was a master of the violin as well as of mathematics. The 20th century had produced one of the greatest thinkers that the last 500 years had seen and they were proud to be there to welcome him. (Cheers.)”

Einstein, himself, admitted that he was no mathematician. He was an absolutist and his ideas were not original and others expressed these ideas far more cogently than he was ever able to express them.

Even before Wagner, long before Wagner, Jews suffered under false accusations that they were incapable of creative thought. Josephus wrote in his ancient polemic in defense of the Jews, *Against Apion*,

“Hence hath arisen that accusation which some make against us, that we have not produced men that have been the inventors of new operations, or of new ways of speaking; for others think it a fine thing to persevere in nothing that has been delivered down from their forefathers, and these testify it to be an instance of the sharpest wisdom when these men venture to transgress those traditions; whereas we, on the contrary, suppose it to be our only wisdom and virtue to admit no actions nor supposals that are contrary to our original laws; which procedure of ours is a just and sure sign that our law is admirably constituted; for such laws as are not thus well made are convicted upon trial to want amendment.”¹⁴⁰⁸

Jews did suffer from the rigid dogmatism of Judaism, which inhibited their progress in the ancient world and during the Enlightenment. The uncreative indoctrination of Jewish scholars in the beliefs of the Talmud and in the learning of the Hebrew language also tended to destroy their ability to think independently and creatively.

Adolf Hitler attacked Jews as if uncreative and parasitic in many of his speeches. Following Rathenau’s murder in 1922, Hitler spent a month in jail. When he was released, he stated,

“That is the lurking danger, and the Jew can meet it in one way only—by destroying the hostile national intelligentsia. That is the inevitable ultimate goal of the Jew in his revolution. And this aim he must pursue; he knows well enough his economics brings no blessing: his is no master-people: he is an exploiter: the Jews are a people of robbers. He has never founded any civilization, though he has destroyed civilizations by the hundred. He possesses nothing of his own creation to which he can point. Everything that

he has is stolen. Foreign peoples, foreign workmen build him his temples, it is foreigners who create and work for him: it is foreigners who shed their blood for him. He knows no 'people's army': he has only hired mercenaries who are ready to go to death on his behalf. He has no art of his own: bit by bit he has stolen it all from the other peoples or has watched them at work and then made his copy. He does not even know how merely to preserve the precious things which others have created: as he turns the treasures over in his hand they are transformed into dirt and dung. He knows that he cannot maintain any State for long. [***] All that the Jew cannot do. And because he cannot do it, therefore all his revolutions must be 'international'. They must spread as a pestilence spreads. He can build no State and say 'See here! Here stands the State, a model for all. Now copy us!' He must take care that the plague does not die, that it is not limited to one place, or else in a short time this plague-hearth would burn itself out. So he is forced to bring every mortal thing to an international expansion. For how long? Until the whole world sinks in ruins and brings him down with it in the midst of the ruins."¹⁴⁰⁹

At the Nuremberg *Parteitag* in 1937, Hitler stated,

"The people which has thus through Jewish agitators been driven into madness, reinforced by non-social elements liberated from the prisons, now destroys its own national intelligentsia on the scaffold and the Jew without scruple and without conscience is supreme. The Jew is himself completely uncreative: he may in many countries hold 90 per cent. of the positions in the intellectual world, but he never discovered, formed, or conceived the elements of knowledge, culture, or art, and the same is true in trade. Therefore of necessity, if he wishes to hold power for any length of time in a country, he must proceed to a bloody annihilation of the former intellectual upper class; otherwise he would soon be conquered once more by this superior intelligence."¹⁴¹⁰

The Jewish Bolsheviks made it a priority to mass murder the intellectual elite of the Gentiles in the nations they conquered, while elevating educated and intelligent Jews into positions of power and comparative wealth. Hitler, as a good Bolshevik, did much to destroy the intellectual class of Germany, and to ruin its educational institutions.

The charge that Jews are incapable of producing great minds in the arts and science has resulted in an unnecessary insecurity among Jews. This may be why some have a pro-Einstein ethnic bias and so violently oppose the exposure of the truth which results in the loss of one of "their" supposed greats. This is not only a mistake on their part, it is unnecessary, as there have been many great minds of Jewish descent in history, and even were there not, the insecurity which results in zealous hero worship is artificial and destructive and ultimately results in arrogance and cultural stagnation, as was recognized even before the time of Josephus.

Albert Einstein realized that the cult of personality surrounding him was destructive to science and to progress. He was very much aware of the fact that people believed in what he said out of blind faith—not because it was true or because it was logical, but merely because the miraculous “Einstein” had said it and the press had applauded it. It worried him that people had surrendered their individuality, their ability to make their own judgements, to his authority; but he worried privately and enjoyed the limelight.¹⁴¹¹

The shameless hype of Einstein as if equal to, or greater than, Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, Huyghens and Newton,¹⁴¹² was begun by Alexander Moszkowski, who was familiar with Eugen Karl Dühring’s work, and favored by Einstein,¹⁴¹³ who was also familiar with Dühring’s work. Dühring’s book *Robert Mayer, der Galilei des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. Eine Einführung in seine Leistungen und Schicksale*, E. Schmeitzner, Chemnitz, (1880); provided Moszkowski with the inspiration to call Einstein the Galileo of the Twentieth Century. Moszkowski’s shameless hype was likely a direct response to Dühring’s accusation of 1881,

“If one surveys the history of the Jewish tribe as a whole, one finds immediately how it has not managed a fibre of real science in its national existence. [***] Where, however, is — to recall only the development of science since Copernicus, Kepler, Galilei, Huyghens, etc. — the Jew, to whom, in these significant centuries too, even a single natural scientific discovery is due?”¹⁴¹⁴

Houston Stewart Chamberlain later repeated the insult. Ironically, Jewish litterateurs countered the charge that Jews were uncreative, by plagiarizing their critics.

Paul Ehrenfest, who opposed the dishonest promotion of Einstein as the “Jewish Newton”, wrote to him on 9 December 1919,

“I hear, for ex., that your accomplishments are being used to make propaganda, with the ‘Jewish Newton, who is simultaneously an ardent Zionist’ (I personally haven’t *read* this yet, but only *heard* it mentioned). [***] But I cannot go along with the propagandistic fuss with its *inevitable* untruths, precisely *because* Judaism is at stake and *because* I feel myself so thoroughly a Jew.”¹⁴¹⁵

Communist Zionist Nachman Syrkin thought that Jews had an innate “national character”. He wrote in 1898,

“The peculiar literature, thought, and sentiment of the Jewish masses, which stamp them unmistakably with a well-defined national character, are clearly reflected in Jewish socialism.”¹⁴¹⁶

The pro-Jewish promoter A. A. Roback wrote in his book *Jewish Influence in Modern Thought*, that racial characteristics happily gave Jews the edge in creating the theory of relativity; which, according to Roback, was a Jewish creation, one

might even say, according to Roback, a racially predetermined Jewish physics resulting from uniquely Jewish biological forces. Roback even thought it a shame that Lorentz was not Jewish, made much of the fact that most everyone considered Lorentz to be Jewish, stated that Lorentz looked Jewish, and then demeaned Lorentz' contribution to the theory. Roback wrote in 1929,

“It is common knowledge that the man whose name is most intimately associated with the theory of relativity is a Jew of unmistakable Semitic origin and avowedly nationalistic tendencies. Albert Einstein has already taken his place with Galileo, Kepler, Copernicus and Newton in the forefront of scientific achievement. But it is not generally known that the doctrine of relativity has been reared, so to speak, on a Jewish foundation. [***] If Michelson, Minkowski, Levi-Civita, and other Jews all had a hand with Einstein in the establishment of the great principle, only as a result of chance or coincidence, then the line between a coincidence and a miracle almost vanishes. In self-defense for broaching this delicate subject, I may call attention to the fact that the issue between the House of Israel and the principle of relativity has already been picturesquely and good-humoredly brought up by a non-Jew. [***] It is my belief that a theory, principle or even law, *must be in us before we can discover it in nature.* [***] In the development of the relativity theory, it is perhaps significant that the Jewish stamp is found at almost every turn. Were Einstein, alone of all Jewry, responsible for the vast physical transformation, the connection between relativity and the Jews could be regarded as wholly fortuitous, but where the names of Michelson, Levi-Civita, Minkowski, Born, and Silberstein are all associated, in a more or less intimate way, with Einstein's achievement, one begins to feel that the ‘Elders of Zion’ have unwittingly conspired to explain the world's most baffling phenomena, and apparently have met with success.”¹⁴¹⁷

Roback and Lenard were kindred spirits. Some have asserted that Lenard was a crypto-Jew.¹⁴¹⁸

Roback was inspired by L. Roth, who also went too far in 1927 in his essay *Jewish Thought in the Modern World*,

“In the same way, what is perhaps the most remarkable of modern intellectual movements, the development in mathematical physics, is largely the result of the labours of the Jews Michelson, Minkowski, Einstein, and Weyl, while its philosophical interpretation (as a part of a vast body of other fruitful work in the general history and evaluation of the sciences) is being furthered by the insight of Cassirer, Brunschvicg, and Meyerson. Yet truth is its own witness and its own judge, and it is absurd to discuss it in terms of its discoverers. Like many other pioneers these men are of Israel, but their work is for the whole world.”¹⁴¹⁹

These statements were made at a time when Jews were characterized by anti-Semitic Jewish Zionists as “parasites” feeding off of the nations. Many Jews began to doubt their ability to live independently of a “host”.¹⁴²⁰ One can certainly understand the need to correct that injustice and self-doubt, but it would more than have sufficed to have simply told the truth without distorting and exaggerating the facts in a way that did gross injustice not only to history and to the public which was lied to, but also to the many philosophers, mathematicians and scientists whose legacies were stolen and whose good reputations were destroyed for the sake of promoting mediocre Jewish minds.

Racist Jews tried to justify themselves by claiming that if race is the standard, then the Jews are a superior race. For example, Ignatz Zollschan stated at least as early as 1914, referring to his book, *Das Rassenproblem unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der theoretischen Grundlagen der jüdischen Rassenfrage*, W. Braumüller, Wien, (1910),

“JEWISH QUESTIONS

I.

The Cultural Value of the Jewish Race

The cultural value of the Jewish race has long been established by students of history and philosophy. A race whose genius has created all prevailing religions among all civilized nations, a race whose spiritual heroes have given to the world the principles of freedom and justice, a race whose sons have for thousands of years made vast contributions to the advance of civilization—such a race unquestionably represents a useful member in the family of nations. And yet a minute, scientific investigation of this problem, from the point of view of anthropology and biology, is urgently needed.

For, at the present time, some writers are busily engaged in disseminating the view that the Jews are no race at all; that modern Jews are not descendants of the ancient Hebrews, and are accordingly no Jews, but merely adherents of the Mosaic creed. Should this opinion prove to be correct, we would naturally have no right to appeal to the achievements of the Jewish intellect in ancient times. If this view is right, then all the facts enumerated above must be eliminated, when we consider the cultural value of the Jewish race. This opinion, however, can easily be refuted by anthropological arguments. But far more serious and more dangerous are the theories of a different kind, which pretend to be the result of strictly scientific research.

These theories do not deny that the Jews of to-day are the descendants of the Jews of ancient times, but assert that both modern and ancient Jews represent an inferior racial element, and that they are injurious to the State and Society in whose midst they dwell. The anti-Semitic theories, of which H. Stewart Chamberlain is now the foremost exponent, are as follows:

The Jewish race has developed its characteristics on lines diametrically opposed to those of the rest of mankind. The inoculation of the characteristics of the Jewish race in other nations would be a great menace

to the latter. Above all, however, the Jews deserve to be contemned and despised for their spiritual inferiority. The Semites have never created anything great and comprehensive. They never founded a great organized State. Loyalty, respect for the great, and nobility of character in general, are entirely unknown among the Jews. In all these thousands of years they have not rendered any exceptionally great service in the domain of philosophy, science and art. There are a number of talented Jews, but they have no surpassing genius. The Semitic race, accordingly, is far below the Aryan race. Even the religious genius, which has been, ascribed to the Jews, does not exist, according to Chamberlain. It is just the Jews, he maintains, who are the least gifted in matters of religion. Even the Negro is above them in this respect.

Now anyone familiar with modern tendencies and with the latest literature, will recognize the reality of these disgraceful attacks, and will understand that should such theories be allowed to remain unanswered, they would become a great political danger. It is very desirable, therefore, that we should employ the same weapons as our opponents: that is to say, the weapons of anthropology, sociology and natural science, to investigate the social value of the Jews.

It is unfortunately impossible, you realize, to solve this problem in a single lecture. In the short time allotted to me, I can only give a rough outline of a sketch, to show the manner in which our opponents argue in order to attain such results, and to point out the method we are to choose in our refutation.

It has hitherto been the commonly accepted theory, that in remote antiquity all the nations, from the East Indians to the Britons, from the Greeks to the Norwegians, formed one common race—the Aryan. The great historians of human culture, and especially Renan, propounded the theory, that all great things that were achieved by German industry, British energy, Roman power, Greek art and Indian philosophy, were due to this common Aryan spirit. With these they compared the cultural achievements of the Semites, and arrived at the conclusion that the Semites have indeed achieved much in the field of religion, but have been surpassed by far by the Aryans, in all other domains. To this Aryan theory, which was important enough in itself, there has, in the course of the last decade, been added another one, which is of infinitely greater significance. What is the purport of this new theory, and what relation does it bear to our subject?

The well-known migration of natives, which entirely devastated the south of Europe at the end of classical antiquity was, according to this theory, not an isolated event, but the last link of a chain of such migrations from the Germanic North. These migrations were the consequence of the overcrowded population of these countries, the soil of which became diminished on account of the encroachment of the sea and through glaciation. The severity of the glacial period made the struggle for existence very strenuous, and only the fittest survived. This struggle made it necessary to exert all bodily and

mental power. And thus arose in these cold regions a blond, well-built nation, endowed to the highest degree with vitality and mental activity.

When the population became overcrowded, part of this race crossed the Alps, and inhabited in prehistoric times all countries in Southern Europe, the northern coast of Africa, and the western and southern parts of Asia. Some of these stocks even came to China and Japan, and even further. We indeed find to-day in all these countries, men of high stature, blue eyes, blond hair, and long heads. These men are considered the descendants of those men of the prehistoric migrations.

Many problems now appear to be solved. In the first place, we understand why the Aryan speech is so widely spread. For these wanderers brought their language along with them. Hence all the languages, of all the kindred nations from India to the Atlantic Ocean, are related. But this is not the only problem that is solved. It was discovered that the blood-relationship reaches much further. A reason was finally found for the phenomenon that there are so many blond and dolichocephalic, that is, longheaded people, in the South. The explanation was simple. Anthropologically, they belonged to the nations that hailed from the North. This newly won experience is even applied to the Jews. For instance, Esau was red; King David was blond; Jesus, too, as it is sometimes claimed, was blond—hence those men, as well as modern blond Jews, were not pure Semites, but descendants of the Amorites; that is to say, of a race that hailed from the North and which, according to Chamberlain, had a great share in the composition of the Jewish race.

It is claimed, that scientific inquiry has succeeded in demonstrating that great achievements, which history ascribes to the Jews, are due to these non-Jewish elements. Furthermore, that scientific inquiry appears to establish the fact that many of these great achievements were not at all produced by the Jews, but were borrowed by them from the neighboring nations. Thus the most important elements of Jewish culture are supposed to be derived from Babylon and Egypt; and the bulwarks of their religion are supposed to be borrowed from the Sumero-Accadians. But, according to Chamberlain and the politico-anthropological school, these Sumero-Accadians were dolichocephalic—longheaded—and hence of Aryan; of Northern origin.

All these Aryan Germanic natives, according to this theory, had in common, certain characteristics of soul and mind, as well as of creative genius. And in consequence of those creative characteristics, all the enumerated nations had already, in remotest antiquity, attained their high classical culture. To-day, however, all these Oriental countries are almost entirely excluded from cultural creations. The historian of human culture has often occupied himself with this question. But the solution of this problem is only apparently difficult. For in our own times also, only the Germanic nations are politically, economically, spiritually and artistically, the standard-bearers of idealism and progress. These anthropologists find that all the great and important achievements have proceeded from men of Germanic extraction. An explanation was thus found for nearly all striking phenomena.

For through these migrations in remote antiquity, not only Germanic blood, but also Germanic power and energy, and Germanic intellectual productivity were imported to the South. Along with their blood and language these Northern hordes, also brought, according to this theory, to the South, their high and gigantic cultural ability; while the primitive inhabitants of the latter countries had lived in an intellectual lethargy. Thanks to these invasions, all the oriental nations of antiquity were enabled to attain the loftiest summit of civilization. But as the northern blood of that uncultured primitive population was slowly and gradually waning, these primitive nations fell back to their present-day inactivity and sluggishness. Their cultural value was reduced, in proportion to the dilution of the quality of their blood. The decline of Greece and Rome is thus easily explained by the anthropologists, through the waning of the fair-complexioned race elements. For the cultural value of a nation stands in direct relations to its racial value. And this racial value depends on the quantity of northern blood which still flows in its veins. Hence the racial value of the Jews is very insignificant, according to the teaching of Gobineau, the politico-anthropological school and Chamberlain.

According to Chamberlain, the Jews are, apart from this, a bastard nation, which arose through the mingling of racially different nations: Semitic Arabs, Aryan Amorites and Syrian Hittites. It is this bastard character which is responsible for the unusual inferiority of the Jewish race.

I am extremely sorry that I am not in a position to discuss here in detail the anthropology of the Semites. For, although theories explained here appear far-fetched at first sight, they are, nevertheless, important. It would by far lack due emphasis, were I merely to explain to you that these theories are incorrect. It is necessary to enter deeply into this question, in order to see how fundamentally wrong these theories are, and that in many cases just the opposite is true. But one must enter into linguistic and pre-historical, as well as into sociological and anthropological investigation, and into a study of the laws of heredity, if one wishes even to begin to criticize this system. By investigating the history of human culture we find, to take only a single example, that no Aryans ever existed at all, and that identity of language does not permit us to draw any conclusions about identity of race. For, according to this language theory, all negroes in South America would be pure Spaniards and all negroes of North America would be pure Anglo-Saxons! Languages are altered and transformed through political and social influences, so that two neighboring and kindred nations may by chance speak different languages. Thus the Jews of to-day collectively speak all the languages of the world except their own. And thus, also, the Persian or the Armenian, who is supposedly Aryan, is, according to all anthropological characteristics without any doubt, more akin to the Semitic Syrian than to the Iberian or Norwegian. For this reason alone, it is impossible to speak of the contrast between the Semites and the Aryans.

But more significant than these linguistic considerations are the

anthropological investigations themselves, of too technical a nature to be discussed here in detail, concerning which I must refer you to my book on this subject. The researches about this matter force upon us the conclusion that the Germanic race theory is from beginning to end untenable and without foundation.

All this is, however, only a part of that which an impartial investigation into the material reveals, but even this is sufficient to prove the whole proud edifice of these theorists to be only a house of cards, which can offer no resistance to a keen critic. But anthropological inquiry yields still more important results. For the division of the races of man, according to their historical development—and this is the only division possible to-day—arrives at conclusions diametrically opposed to those maintained by these theorists.

When we enter into the study of anthropology, we find an entirely different grouping of nations. On account of the glaciation of the Alps, the entire white Caucasian race was, for many thousand years after the glacial period, divided into two unequal groups of nations differing, therefore, from each other, in their development and physiognomy; the land in the cold regions north of the Alps was inhabited by the fair-complexioned group—the Xanthochroic or light-haired—and the land south of the Alps was populated by a darker-haired group—the Melanochroic. To the Xanthochroic belong the Slavonic-Keltic-Germanic nations; while to the Melanochroic, south of the Alps, belong the nations of Southern Europe, North Africa, and the white nations of Asia. To the southern group belong, accordingly, the Jews and other Semites, as well as the East Indians, Persians, Sumero-Accadians, Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, etc.

According to the dogma of the race theorists, innate ability is determined by birth, and nations of the same race must necessarily be equally gifted. The Jews, according to this division, are of the same race as the nations enumerated above, and hence their innate ability must in no respect differ from that of the Indians, Sumero-Accadians and Greeks. The racial value of the Jews must, therefore, be the same as that of those nations of which the race theory treated; namely, of all Aryan nations except those of the Germanic group. For just as the Germanic nations distinguished themselves among the Xanthochroic group, so did the Jews excel among the Melanochroic types. That group to which the Germans belong, entered the stage of civilization only as late as the 13th century, and it is only in the very late periods that it assumed a leading role in the advance of European culture. The nations of the other group had a high state of civilization in remotest ages, and some of them, for instance, the Egyptians and Babylonians, stood thousands of years ago, at the highest stage of classical development. As Greeks and Romans they created the classical culture, and as Moors, Byzantines and Italians, they were the authors of post-classical civilization.

Is it, however, at all true, that innate ability depends upon race, and that every race has its specific racial peculiarities which invariably adhere to it

forever, under all conditions and circumstances? Is there an innate racial soul which never changes? Are the psychical bases of various races really fundamentally different? It is true that there are different racial characteristics and abilities. But do these fundamental racial peculiarities remain the same throughout all ages or are they subject to the laws of change?

This is a problem with which Science has interested itself for more than a century. Formerly it was merely a subject for philosophic speculation, but it has now entered into the field of experimental investigation. In the field of heredity two views are now current, that of Lamarck, who insists upon the adaptability and changeability of characteristics in the entire organic world, and that of Weissmann, who maintains that the specific character always remains the same. However interesting it may be to pursue this theme in detail, I must confine myself to a brief resume of the results obtained from a historico-philosophical analysis and further study of the laws of heredity. The theory that acquired characteristics are not transmissible and that the specific character is absolutely constant, can now be regarded as exploded. As it is impossible to give details on this point in a single lecture, I must again refer you to my book for a fuller discussion. What applies to the entire organic world applies with greater force to man. It is therefore not true that we are justified in assuming specific racial psychical powers for each race. It is indeed true that the Greeks distinguished themselves by their artistic sense and the Romans by their energy, and that the peculiarities of the Italians differed from those of the Scandinavians. But the reason for these differences are to be found in their historical and social environment. The inductive method of historical investigation shows that the internal character of these nations changed, when the external conditions altered fundamentally. Thus the so-called innate family virtues of the Jews may be lost, when they come in disturbing environments. It is equally untrue that the essential psychical differences of the various races can be demonstrated by natural science, in the sense that all pre-eminent Frenchmen must distinguish themselves by their *esprit*, and Germans can only excel as poets and thinkers, and that the specific ability of the ancient Greeks lay only in art, that of the ancient Indians only in philosophy, that of the Romans only in conquest and control, and that of the Jews only in Commerce.

The psychology of a people changes at the various stages of culture through which it passes. Most people pass through the same stages of 'Volkspsychologie,' at one stage or another of their existence, and this 'Volkspsychologie' is the product of the particular stage. There is a peculiar psychology of hunters and husbandmen, of scholars and merchants; a distinct psychology of the inhabitants of the country and of the inhabitants of the city. This is the same among all races. There would accordingly be more justification to speak of a psychology of stages than of a psychology of races. The quality of the capability of a nation does not depend upon its race, but upon environment, the stage of development through which it at the moment

happens to be passing, and upon the influences of tradition.

And yet when we consider the capacity and psychical intellectual ability of a nation, we cannot say that it is immaterial from which race it descended. The descendants of one race may indeed be more gifted than those of another. The explanation is to be found in the past experience of that stock. In the entire organic world, we find that every being developed and perfected those organs which were mostly employed. The limb which is most exercised, grows best. When it was necessary, therefore, for a certain species to develop its brain to the highest perfection—when a certain race, by its own free-will or by force of circumstances, devoted itself to work which required it to perfect the brain, it necessarily follows that the descendants of such a race have the advantage over the descendants of another race. The quality of their ability, as was remarked above, depends upon environment, the stage of development and the influences of tradition; but the quantity of their capacity, the magnitude and intensity of their ability does not depend upon environment, but upon race, or rather upon the cultural activity of their ancestors. This is, therefore, a factor of heredity.

Now with what people and with what race was the cultural activity of their ancestors greater than with the Jews? For with the Jews study was a religious duty, and those among them who did not possess a high degree of intellectual activity were not fit for the struggle for existence. In consequence of the intensive cultural activity of their ancestors, the Jews must possess the maximum sum of innate ability.

This result is obtained from the theory of heredity. Anthropology, as we have shown, points to the contrast between the Xanthochroic and Melanochroic. But this contrast also led us to a conclusion different from that taught in the schools. All those nations which achieved the great things, and created the intellectual monuments, belong to the same groups of races to which the Jews belong. This would be the inference from the mode of distributing the intellectual ability, if we are to maintain with the race theorists, that nations derived from the same race are equally gifted. I merely wish to hint at this conclusion.

But the racial pride of the Semites does not require them to employ any speculative demonstration and logical deductions, which may perhaps be considered as sophistry. The simple, but forceful historical facts in themselves render all other demonstrations unnecessary. The principal reproach cast upon the Jews by their foes, that the Semitic race lacks creative genius, stands self-condemned in the light of the result of modern research, which considers Mesopotamia, the cradle of all the Semites, as the place where civilization originated. And furthermore, no period of history is more neglected by these theorists than the golden age of Semitic culture in Spain. They pass over in silence the influence that that period had on the development of modern Europe. There is an unbroken chain of evidence to prove that the origin of Humanism and of the Renaissance of which Europe is so proud, can be traced to the Semites, Jews and Arabs, in Spain The Jew

indeed among the nations, who draw upon his resources and in whose midst he lives, is only one of the heirs of his own past achievements.

There is, however, another important question which waits an answer. We have seen that the Jews and the other Semitic nations were the torch-bearers of civilization. In ancient times the Babylonians, Phoenicians, and Carthaginians took an active part in advancing human culture, while in mediaeval times the Arabs achieved wonders, and were the leading and creative genius of all that is great. How is it that now, as it seems, the Jews are merely receptive and reproductive, but do not produce anything really new? An explanation of this phenomenon is to be found in the social structure of presentday Jewry.

In Mesopotamia, Palestine, and finally in Spain, these nations lived in accordance with their own culture. They did not confine themselves to one branch of industry, but, like all other nations of the earth, cultivated all sorts of trades. But the unnatural historical development of the Jews, and the quite unnatural distribution of professions of to-day must inevitably produce unnatural results. The social structure of present-day Jewry is unsound. The keen struggle for existence stifles much that is really great and profound, so that for the most part only those that are commercially fit are able to rise. In consequence of the present-day development, which is contrary to the law of natural selection, Judaism of to-day cannot fully bring out its dormant powers, and its cultural energies cannot be brought into complete action.

The development of great talents finds a favorable field among such nations, ashaving grown to fruition with their soil—owing to their calm and stable pursuits, have the necessary leisure to think and contemplate for its own sake. But in a commercial community where the struggle for existence is still more intensified by political and economic conditions, such talents are crippled or lie fallow and rusty. It is due to this influence, which is contrary to the law of natural selection, that the Jews are extremely ambitious. Prof. Werner Sombart erroneously takes this as the principal characteristic of the Jewish race. In addition to those disadvantages, we must take account of the destruction of the old religious and Ghetto environment, in which the people were at least complete after their fashion. Ours is a period of hollow and empty transition. The inner distraction and disruption of our people in this transition, have caused this characteristic to be considered as the principal feature of the Jewish race. It is very unfortunate that, owing to exceedingly superficial reasoning, the noble personalities are left out of account. The mediocre and obtrusive Jews are in evidence, and they form the criterion for the entire Jewry. The gross, misleading picture which arose through the social structure of Jewry in the diaspora depicted the Jew as the type opposed to all that is lofty in humanity.

The peculiar environment brought it about, that the actual conditions could not have been different from what they are to-day. Under the conditions existing at present, the Jews cannot attain that richly productive activity which in remote antiquity their ancestors developed in Mesopotamia,

and later on in the Pyrhenean peninsula. And yet even to-day, under the most discouraging circumstances, the Jews have created not only the modern system of capital, or not only a large number of prominent workers in purely intellectual domains, but they are also the creators of the new currently dominant tendencies of knowledge. One at once thinks—to mention only a few—of Hertz and Ehrlich, of Marx and Stahl, of Spinoza and Bergson, and of Georg Kantor in mathematics. One sees that your profound thinkers have very often created also in heterogeneous cultures, a transvaluation of all intellectual, ethical and religious values, a radical change and renewal of the whole spiritual life. One wonders what their cultural value would be under healthy and normal circumstances. We fear to draw any definite conclusion on this point, lest it should sound exaggerated and speculative, to say the least.

Through the conscious efforts of numerous generations of thinkers and statesmen and through the influence of religion, a nation of pure blood, not tainted by diseases of excess or immorality, of a highly developed sense of family purity, and of deeply rooted, virtuous habits, would develop an exceptional intellectual activity. Furthermore, the prohibition against mixed marriage provided that these highest ethnical treasures should not be lost, through the admixture of less carefully bred races. This prohibition brought it about that heredity, which is the first factor in the formation of a race, should exercise its power in a most beneficial way, and thus the racial qualities are not only transmitted from generation to generation, but are gradually heightened.

Thus from the striving after eternal existence (which was likewise a commandment of the Deity), there resulted that natural selection which has no parallel in the history of the human race. In the struggle for existence imposed upon this nation, which was shaken by fire and sword, by the hardest economic and moral oppression, and by constant enticements to fall away, only those individuals who were morally and physically strong could survive and propagate.

Thus the Jews form an ancient, chaste race of a maximum cultural value. If a race that is so highly gifted were to have the opportunity of again developing its original power, nothing could equal it as far as cultural value is concerned.

We thus admit that, despite the extraordinary share that the modern Jews contribute to the advance of civilization, their achievements are only an insignificant part of that which they could have produced under normal conditions. The philosopher Eduard von Hartmann, who can by no means be regarded as a friend of the Jews, has admirably expressed himself on this point when he says:

The conflicting position of Judaism makes it impossible for the Jews to produce anything new in the field of a Jewish national culture, which does not exist, or in the field of the national culture of other nations. But the versatility of Judaism and the originality of its comprehension are

sufficiently large to enable it to adapt itself to alien national cultures of various kinds, and by good fortune sometimes to reach as far as that borderline, which divides talent from genius.' This proves, at least, there is nothing against the assumption, that should a Jewish national culture exist, the old productivity of Judaism would manifest itself once more.

I have made no reference in this lecture to the enormous influence of the religions to which Judaism gave birth. There is hardly any parallel for such activity in the cultural world. Nor have I spoken of the Jewish spirit, that is to say, Judaism in a broader sense, that lies hidden in these religions and in the most important intellectual movements of modern times, as, for instance, in Philosophy and Socialism. I have purposely confined myself to the services rendered by the Sernites in other domains, to the material culture, and to the investigation of our problem from the point of view of pure Natural Science.

I am satisfied if I have been able to show you, that even if the Jewish people should prove itself unequal to the task of carrying out its wonderful mission, namely, to realize its dormant potentialities, no stigma of belonging to an inferior race can be attached to it in the name of Science."¹⁴²¹

In agreement with Philipp Lenard's later view that "Jewishness" could be seen in intellectual works published by Jews, Einstein stated sometime "after 3 April 1920",

"The psychological root of anti-Semitism lies in the fact that the Jews are a group of people unto themselves. Their Jewishness is visible in their physical appearance, and one notices their Jewish heritage in their intellectual works, and one can sense that there are among them deep connections in their disposition and numerous possibilities of communicating that are based on the same way of thinking and of feeling. The Jewish child is already aware of these differences as soon as it starts school. Jewish children feel the resentment that grows out of an instinctive suspicion of their strangeness that naturally is often met with a closing of the ranks. [***] [Jews] are the target of instinctive resentment because they are of a different tribe than the majority of the population."¹⁴²²

Viktor G. Ehrenberg, Hedwig Born's father, wrote to Einstein on 23 November 1919,

"So it uplifts the heart and strengthens one's faith in the future of mankind when one sees the researchers of all nations prostrating themselves before a man of Jewish blood, who thinks and writes in the German language, in full recognition of his greatness."¹⁴²³

The Zionist United States Supreme Court Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis wrote in a letter dated 1 March 1921,

“You have doubtless heard that the Great Einstein is coming to America soon with Dr. Weizmann, our Zionist Chief. Palestine may need something more now than a new conception of the Universe or of several additional dimensions; but it is well to remind the Gentile world, when the wave of anti-Semitism is rising, that in the world of thought the conspicuous contributions are being made by Jews.”¹⁴²⁴

Brandeis’ racist views were, in part, a reaction to the views of the ancients who asserted that the Judeans produced nothing new, and men like Bauer, Marx, Wagner, Dühring and Houston Stewart Chamberlain, who asserted that Jews, with their dogmatic and obedient monotheism, detested anything new and repressed science and art. Ada Sterling wrote in *The Jew and Civilization* published in 1924,

“NOTWITHSTANDING the honor which the world of scientists yields to their Jewish confrères, the Messrs. Michaelson, Bergson, Einstein, and a host of lesser men, who, nevertheless, have made and are making continually, great discoveries toward improving conditions of life for humanity, there have been published, and recently, a vast amount of deliberate mispraisement of the Jew in science as in other departments of life, and ingenious arguments, the purpose of which is to minimize his present-day worth, and to deny his race a position among the pioneers in the field of physics. It is not surprising if the uninformed, overwhelmed by the dogmatic positiveness of such a rabid foe to the Jews as Mr. Chamberlain—who angrily deplores that ‘Walhalla and Olympus became depopulated because the Jewish priests wished it so’—should take on similar prejudice and beliefs; or that they should accept his violent assertions when he declares that it was the Jews’ scorn of science which long retarded the spread of knowledge along scientific lines. Nor is it to be wondered at if the uneducated, seeing in a news-sheet a belittling allusion to the uselessness of star-measuring should find themselves repeating such idle estimates of the scientific seekers, especially in connection with the measuring of Betelgueuse.

Mr. Chamberlain’s statement is an interesting admission in more ways than one. It ascribes to a people strictly ‘inferior’, and he so names them over and over again, powers which only a distinctly superior people could possess. This contradiction is a common characteristic, as has been pointed out in another connection, of the resolute anti-Semite; but few so often display it as does the writer just referred to. He pronounces the Jews ‘mentally sterile’, and presently shows them to be the most mentally active people in the world, dangerously creative in fact; he undertakes to prove them the most money-worshipping race in the world—by means of a characteristic with which he invests the matriarch Rebekah—and denies them wit enough to invent numerals.

To prove their stupidity he says that in sharp business transactions ‘one Armenian is a match for three Jews.’ He resorts, as well, to quoting Apion’s

time-worn accusation—ascribing it to Wellhausen—that ‘the Jews never invented anything,’ and he attaches a deal of indexed learning to prove that the race has never even been near to ‘grasping the eel of science’; to prove, as well, that all the Jewish people knew—they with a known history of three thousand years, and a traditional one of many thousands more—they borrowed, he says, from their young neighbors, the Greeks, who came into existence 800 B. C.’¹⁴²⁵

The dangers of a racist Jewish reaction to any criticism of Jews are many, and the racism of Brandeis and his ilk only serve to inhibit the progress of science and the uninhibited criticism of scientific theories. Brandeis and Sterling are wrong to make a “racial” defense and to assume that all criticisms are completely false, merely because they are false in their “racial” aspects. Ironically, Brandeis and Sterling reinforce the racism they ought to have attempted to discredit. Sterling continued, arrogantly parroting the lies many racist Jews told to promote Einstein,

“As each new ascent in knowledge is made possible by the plane attained by our predecessors, so it has been said that the Morley-Michelson experiments are the starting-point whence arises the Einstein theories on Equivalents and Relativity, which latest discovery of the Jewish mind, though yet to be proven, have been greeted by the scientists of the age as ‘probably the most profound and far-reaching application of mathematics to the phenomena of the material universe that the world has ever known’; one which ‘takes us behind our present ideas about space, time and matter to the primitive reality out of which we have built up those ideas’. Professor Thomson says Mr. Wells had a pretty clear idea of it all before Einstein’s theory appeared; but, he adds, Einstein takes us a big step farther. He asked a question which nobody had asked before him: ‘Is the space and time interval which separates two events the same for everybody?’

[***]

The Einstein Theory, while still, in part, under experiment, nevertheless has already solved problems that had worried great mathematicians for generations. To test it, England sent out an important expedition, for the purpose of photographing the stars whose light passed near the sun, when it was in eclipse. The ‘Theories’ stood the test; more, strikingly verified them. ‘Einstein’s Theory’, say the editors of ‘The Outline of Science’, shows, further, ‘that there is something in the nature of an ultimate entity in the universe’ though even yet we know nothing intelligible about it; but, these authorities believe it will presently be made clear through the Einstein discoveries that the whole universe has been created by the mind itself.

To what insignificant proportions do fanatical critics shrink before the blaze of scientific accomplishment which haloes the modern Jew, and this, not alone because of his exploration of the spaces of the sky, not alone for setting back of the horizon to take in undreamed of worlds, but because, too, great men of the race, regardless alike of fame, and of profit, work on in the

secret quiet of 'Science's holy cell', seeking tirelessly and often finding panaceas for the relief of humanity's ills!

But, great as are the findings of the race in the broader fields of physics, to the individual they are of less instant value than are the mysteries of life which chemists, physicians and other scientists of the race may be credited with. At these, too, we will now glance."¹⁴²⁶

7 NAZISM IS ZIONISM

Zionists have always employed the bogey of “anti-Semitism” to force Jews into segregation. After thousands of years of planning and work, the Jewish bankers had finally accumulated enough wealth to buy Palestine and destroy the Gentile world in fulfillment of Jewish Messianic prophecy. They only lacked one resource needed to become King of the Jews, the Holy Messiah. That one last necessary ingredient for fulfillment of the prophecies of the End Times was the Jewish People, the majority of whom rejected Zionism. The Jewish bankers had an ancient solution for that problem. They manufactured an anti-Semitic dictator who segregated the Jews and filled them with the fear of God. Palestine was for the fearful remnant. Those who would not obey were to have their necks broken and be thrown into the well.

“The way I see it, the fact of the Jews’ racial peculiarity will necessarily influence their social relations with non-Jews. The conclusions which—in my opinion—the Jews should draw is to become more aware of their peculiarity in their social way of life and to recognize their own cultural contributions. First of all, they would have to show a certain noble reservedness and not be so eager to mix socially—of which others want little or nothing. On the other hand, anti-Semitism in Germany also has consequences that, from a Jewish point of view, should be welcomed. I believe German Jewry owes its continued existence to anti-Semitism.”—ALBERT EINSTEIN¹⁴²⁷

“Hitler will be forgotten in a few years, but he will have a beautiful monument in Palestine. You know the coming of the Nazis was rather a welcome thing. So many of our German Jews were hovering between two coasts; so many of them were riding the treacherous current between the Scylla of assimilation and the Charybdis of a nodding acquaintance with Jewish things. Thousands who seemed to be completely lost to Judaism were brought back to the fold by Hitler, and for that I am personally very grateful to him.”—EMIL LUDWIG¹⁴²⁸

“[H]ad I been a Jew, I would have been a fanatical Zionist. I could not imagine being anything else. In fact, I would have been the most ardent Zionist imaginable.”—ADOLF EICHMANN¹⁴²⁹

7.1 Introduction

The Old Testament's solution to the Jewish question was two-fold. If the Jews obeyed God and remained segregated, God would give them the land from the Nile to the Euphrates. Note that the Jews were not the original inhabitants of the land and that they promised it to themselves. If the Jews did not obey God and assimilated into the Gentile world, they would be laid to waste in the lands in which they dwelt, and the righteous remnant—the most racist Jews—would steal the Promised Land from its original inhabitants. Note that racist Jews created this religious mythology and only racist Jews feel obliged to fulfill it.

The Old Testament taught racist Jews to subvert Gentile society. They suppressed the advancement of the Gentile world as best they could by taxing the people with wars and perpetual strife, which left the nations in debt. They fomented highly destructive revolutions, often by scapegoating fellow Jews. They did whatever they could to prevent Gentiles from accumulating wealth and dominating politics, the universities, the professions and the press. Always a minority, racist Jews have no regard for democratic principles. They are religious fanatics, who pretend that they are the master race elected by God to rule the world (*Isaiah* 65; 66).

7.2 Blut und Boden—A Jewish Ideal

Judaism is a racist and genocidal world view; in that it creates the mythology of a master race, the “chosen people”, tied to a specific “Holy Land”, who are after world domination following their deliberate destruction of other nations. This warmongering tribe believes in a God that exterminates their enemies in order to enthrone them as rulers of the Earth. Many who have spoken out against Judaism are repelled by what they consider to be a slavish loyalty to a mythology which denigrates the nobility and the dignity of the individual human being—especially the non-believer and all who are not “racially” allied with the supposedly master race of Judeans. They argue that it is irrational to utilize an imaginary “God” as the fundamental source of logical deduction for all that is said to be moral. They sought something more synthetic and rational. When searching for a religion to replace Judaic and Christian mythologies, Schopenhauer and Wagner adopted the mythologies of metempsychosis reincarnation of the “Aryans” as the supposedly true product of the “racial instincts” of the “Aryan race”—as opposed to the slavish and destructive Judaic and Christian mythologies, which many anti-Semites believed stemmed from the inferior and corrosive “racial instincts” of the Jews.

Many modern Zionists embraced these racist systems of thought and spoke in Nazi-like terms of “the end justifies the means”, or “hevlei Mashiah”, in order to justify their deliberate destruction of the Earth for the sake of Israel. Zionist Judah Leon Magnes criticized their “Joshua methods” and arrogance. Magnes captured their prevalent beliefs,

“There is the *Wille zur Macht*, the state, the army, the frontiers. We have been in exile; now we are to be masters in our own Home. We are to have a Fatherland, and we are to encourage the feelings of pride, honor, glory that are part of the paraphernalia of the ordinary nationalistic patriotism. In the

face of such danger one thinks of the dignity and originality of that passage in the liturgy which praises the Lord of all things that our portion is not like theirs and our lot not like that of all the multitude.”¹⁴³⁰

The farce of Jewish Zionist nationalistic supremacy reached a very low point when Martin Buber argued that the Zionist beliefs in their master race were superior to the Nazis’ assertions that they constituted a master race of the “chosen”; because God chose the Jews, and the Nazis just chose themselves; and, therefore, the Jews were entitled to their racism, while the Nazis were not,

“It is asserted that every great people regards itself as the chosen people; in other words, awareness of peculiarity is interpreted as a function of nationalism in general. Did not the National Socialists believe that Destiny had elected the German people to rule the entire world? [***] Our doctrine is distinguished from their theories in that our election is completely a demand. [***] Israel was chosen to become a true people, and that means God’s people.”¹⁴³¹

The origins of the Judeans lie in the Canaanites, and others. There never were “Israelites”. The mythology of a man named Moses, who led “his people” out of Egypt, lacks evidentiary archeological support. It is likely that the Judeans’ Torah originates with the Egyptian monotheism of Pharaoh Akhenaton IV.

Judaism and Christianity were the products of fancy, not fact. The philosophy of Philo “Judæus” is in many respects strikingly similar to the philosophy of Jesus, and one need only mix in some of Æsop’s legend and fables with Heraclitean and Platonic philosophy to arrive at the teachings of Christ as the recasting of Mosaic (Egyptian) and Greek monotheism in Greek dialectic terms as expressed by Essenian Jews—which is especially clear in the oldest known texts in their original languages. The life story of Jesus mirrors many of the much older myths of Mithras,¹⁴³² whom the Roman soldiers worshiped as their Sun god. The apocalyptic myths of Christianity were first stated by the Jewish apocalyptic writers not long before Christianity emerged from the wreckage of Judaism. Some argue that the entire gospels may have been fabrications written by Alexandrian and Essenian Jews in their efforts to incorporate Greek philosophy, sayings and superstitions into Judaism in a form of Christianity which would appeal to the Romans. Some of the ancient Greeks argued that Judaism is itself a plagiarism of the Greek philosophers.

When the Romans rejected this highly Helenized Judaism of Christianity and campaigned against the Jews, some of the Jews themselves may have then changed the stories that they had written, in order to make it appear that they, too, had opposed the Heretic “Jesus”, which “name” may be interpreted simply as “Jew” or “Judean”. Agrippa and Alexander Lysimachus are then said to have persecuted the early Christians.¹⁴³³ Those who clung to Christianity took the Helenization of Judaism even further in their apologies to the Romans by trying to convince them that this form of Judaism was Greek in nature. The Romans greatly admired and thoroughly copied Greek culture and religion and it was a sound stratagem to attempt

to convince the Romans that Christianity was Greek in nature, and, after all, it was. The early Christians also took on the Judaic penchant for religious fanaticism, proselytizing and the Judaic love of martyrdom. Jews of the Diaspora in general tended to segregate and considered themselves an independent nation, regardless of where they happened to live at the time. This troubled many who worried where their loyalties lay. Many have argued that the Jews were dispersed throughout the civilized world long before the Romans tossed them out of Palestine.

According to some, the Jewish segregationist habit of forming a “nation within a nation” predated the Roman imposed Diaspora. Though the story of the Egyptian captivity is fabricated, it evinces a segregationist spirit in the earliest Jewish works. Schiller wrote in his *Die Sendung Moses*,

“Die Hebräer kamen, wie bekannt ist, als eine einzige Nomadenfamilie, die nicht über 70 Seelen begriff, nach Ägypten und wurden erst in Ägypten zum Volk. Während eines Zeitraums von ungefähr vierhundert Jahren, die sie in diesem Land zubrachten, vermehrten sie sich beinahe bis zu zwei Millionen, unter welchen sechshunderttausend streitbare Männer gezählt wurden, als sie aus diesem Königreich zogen. Während dieses langen Aufenthalts lebten sie abgesondert von den Ägyptern, abgesondert sowohl durch den eigenen Wohnplatz, den sie einnahmen, als auch durch ihren nomadischen Stand, der sie allen Eingebornen des Landes zum Abscheu machte und von allem Anteil an den bürgerlichen Rechten der Ägypter ausschloss. Sie regierten sich nach nomadischer Art fort, der Hausvater die Familie, der Stammfürst die Stämme, und machten auf diese Art einen Staat im Staat aus, der endlich durch seine ungeheure Vermehrung die Besorgnis der Könige erweckte.”

Exodus 1:8-14 and 3:2 taught the Jews that oppression strengthened their “race” and ultimately increased their numbers, and note the ancient declaration made by the Jews themselves (the story is a fabrication) that the Jews were a dangerously disloyal nation within a nation, note also the image of enduring a holocaust,

“8 Now there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph. 9 And he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel *are* more and mightier than we: 10 Come on, let us deal wisely with them; lest they multiply, and it come to pass, that, when there falleth out any war, they join also unto our enemies, and fight against us, and *so* get them up out of the land. 11 Therefore they did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses. 12 But the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew. And they were grieved because of the children of Israel. 13 And the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigour: 14 And they made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar, and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field: all their service, wherein they made them serve, *was* with rigour. [***] 3:2 And the angel of the LORD appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and he looked, and, behold, the bush

burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed.”

While it is true that the myth of the Hebrews in Egypt is the story of a nation within a nation, the relevant point is that the Jews were spread out across the ancient world long before the Romans sacked Jerusalem. They tended to live in highly segregated communities, which hypocritically insisted upon religious freedom for Jews, while proscribing the exercise of all other religions in their communities. Jewish intolerance and hypocrisy was typified in the age old refrain that the “Jews are a nation within a nation.” Therefore, they are a disloyal and potentially treacherous force in all other nations. Zionists played on this common conception to create animosity towards Jews, which would leave them with no choice but to found an independent nation on conquered soil.

Zionist Napoleon Bonaparte stated,

“The Jews must be considered as a nation, and not as a sect. They are a nation within a nation.”¹⁴³⁴

Thomas Jefferson declared that Jews constitute a nation within a nation. Daniel J. Boorstein wrote in his book *The Americans: The Colonial Experience*,

“The Society of Friends had become a kind of international conspiracy for Peace and for primitive Christian perfection. Some years after the Revolution, Thomas Jefferson called them ‘a religious sect . . . acting with one mind, and that directed by the mother society in England. Dispersed, as the Jews, they still form, as those do, one nation, foreign to the land they live in. They are Protestant Jesuits, implicitly devoted to the will of their superior, and forgetting all duties to their country in the execution of the policy of their order.’”¹⁴³⁵

Adolf Stoecker stated in 1879,

“The Jews are and remain a people within a people, a state within a state, a separate tribe within a foreign race.”¹⁴³⁶

Richard Gottheil, while not taking the harsh position that a Jew must be loyal only to Palestine, stated in 1898,

“We believe that the Jews are something more than a purely religious body; that they are not only a race, but also a nation; though a nation without as yet two important requisites — a common home and a common language.”¹⁴³⁷

Gottheil repeated this in a pamphlet and also stated in 1898,

“Zionism has sought and has found for us a basis which is a broader one than the religious one (and on which all religious distinctions vanish), that of race

and of nationality. And even though we do not know it, and even though we refuse to recognize it, there are forces which are unconsciously making for the same end, working out in spite of us the will of Almighty God. Never before has such intelligent interest been taken by the Jews in their own past history. Germany has become honeycombed with societies for the study of Jewish history. Vienna, Hamburg, and Frankfurt have associations for the preservation of Jewish art. The Société des Etudes Juives, the American Jewish Historical Society, the Anglo-Jewish Historical Society, the Maccabeans in London, the Judaeans in New York, the Council of Jewish Women, the Chautauqua Assembly meetings—all of these and many others are working in the same direction. They are welding the people of Israel together once more. They are not religious societies, mark you. They rest upon the solid basis of common racial and national affinity. [***] Nay! it would seem to me that just those who are so afraid that our action will be misinterpreted should be among the greatest helpers in the Zionist cause. For those who feel no racial and national communion with the life from which they have sprung should greet with joy the turning of Jewish immigration to some place other than the land in which they dwell. They must feel, e.g., that a continual influx of Jews who are not Americans is a continual menace to the more or less complete absorption for which they are striving. But I must not detain you much longer. Will you permit me to sum up for you the position which we Zionists take in the following statements: We believe that the Jews are something more than a purely religious body; that they are not only a race, but also a nation; though a nation without as yet two important requisites—a common home and a common language.”¹⁴³⁸

Zionist racist Max Nordau declared at least as early as 1905,

“The first Zionist congress solemnly proclaimed in the face of the attentive world that the Jews are a nation, and that they do not desire to be absorbed by other nations.”¹⁴³⁹

Zionist Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook proclaimed,

“After our race was weaned [***] This people was fashioned by God to speak of His Glory; it was granted the heritage of the blessing of Abraham so that it might disseminate the knowledge of God, and it was commanded to live its life apart from the nations of the world. [***] It is a grave error to be insensitive to the distinctive unity of the Jewish spirit, to imagine that the Divine stuff which uniquely characterizes Israel is comparable to the spiritual content of all the other national civilizations. [***] It is a fundamental error to [***] discard the concept that we are a chosen people. We are not only different from all the nations, set apart by a historical experience that is unique and unparalleled, but we are also of a much higher and greater spiritual order.”¹⁴⁴⁰

Zionist leader Nachum Goldman stated,

“Diaspora Jewry (all Jews outside Palestine) has to overcome the conscious or subconscious fear of so-called double loyalty. It has to be convinced that it is fully justified in tying up its destiny with Israel’s. It has to have the courage to reject the idea that Jewish communities owe loyalty only to the states where they live.”¹⁴⁴¹

and,

“Judaism can have nothing in common with Germanism, if we go by the standards of race, history and culture, and the Germans have the right to prevent the Jews from intruding into the affairs of their folk. [***] The same demand I raise for the Jewish folk, as against the German. The tragedy of the situation consists in the fact that it is not yet possible to establish the rule whereby the Jews should be assisted to move toward their state in Palestine. The Jews are divided into two categories, those who admit that they belong to a race distinguished by a history thousands of years old and those who don’t. The latter are open to the charge of dishonesty. [***] *It is true that the participation of Jews in subversive movements and in the overthrow of the German government in November, 1918, was extraordinarily strong.* This is to be regretted since as a consequence of these activities, the Jewish people lost forces which could have been useful in its own folkist affairs.”¹⁴⁴²

Before political Zionism took root, the cry that Jews form a nation within a nation was long considered an anti-Semitic outburst. Haman was quoted in *Esther* 3:8,

“And Haman said unto king Ahasuerus, There is a certain people scattered abroad and dispersed among the people in all the provinces of thy kingdom; and their laws *are* diverse from all people; neither keep they the king’s laws: therefore it *is* not for the king’s profit to suffer them.”

Zionist Edmond Flegg tells us that he was initially surprised that some Jews had adopted the rhetoric of anti-Semites,

“It was then that, for the first time, I heard of Zionism. You cannot imagine what a light that was, my child! Remember that, at the period of which I am writing, this word Zionism had never yet been spoken in my presence. The anti-Semites accused the Jews of forming a nation within the nations; but the Jews, or at any rate those whom I came across, denied it. And now here were the Jews declaring: ‘We are a people like other peoples; we have a country just as the others have. Give us back our country.’”¹⁴⁴³

The Zionist ideologist Jakob Klatzkin stated, among other things, in his book of

1921 *Krisis und Entscheidung im Judentum; der Probleme des modernen Judentums*, Second Enlarged Edition, Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, pages 61-63, and 118:

“ [I applaud] the contribution of our enemies in the continuance of Jewry in eastern Europe. [***] We ought to be thankful to our oppressors that they closed the gates of assimilation to us and took care that our people were concentrated and not dispersed, segregatedly united and not diffusedly mixed [***] One ought to investigate in the West and note the great share which antisemitism had in the continuance of Jewry and in all the emotions and movements of our national rebirth . [***] Truly our enemies have done much for the strengthening of Judaism in the diaspora. [***] Experience teaches that the liberals have understood better than the antisemites how to destroy us as a nation. [***] We are, in a word, naturally foreigners; we are an alien nation in your midst and we want to remain one.”¹⁴⁴⁴

“Man vergegenwärtige sich, wie groß der Anteil unserer Feinde am Fortbestand des Judentums im Osten ist. [. . .] Wir müßten beinahe unseren Bedrängern dankbar sein, wenn sie die Tore der Assimilation vor uns schlossen und dafür Sorge trugen, daß unsere Volksmassen konzentriert und nicht zerstreut, abgesondert geeint und nicht zerklüftet vermischt werden[. . .] Man untersuche es im Westen, welchen hohen Anteil der Antisemitismus am Fortbestand des Judentums und an all den Regungen und Bewegungen unserer nationalen Wiedergeburt hat. [. . .] Wahrlich, unsere Feinde haben viel zur Stärkung des Judentums in der Diaspora beigetragen. [. . .] Und die Erfahrung lehrt, daß die Liberalen es besser als die Antisemiten verstanden haben, uns als Volk zu vernichten. [. . .] Wir sind schlechthin Wesensfremde, sind — wir müssen es immer wiederholen — ein Fremdvolk in eurer Mitte und wollen es auch bleiben.”

Klatzkin gave credence to the accusations of Friedrich Wilhelm Ghillany in the 1840's (Ghillany,¹⁴⁴⁵ among other things, accused Jews of ritual murder near the time of the Damascus Affair, and published important critical texts on the history and divinity of Jesus),

“[The Jews] have been an alien, foreign element within Germany for more than a thousand years. We must either help them towards the land of their fathers, or fuse completely with them. . . . But it would be best for Europe if they were to emigrate. . . to Palestine. . . or to America.”¹⁴⁴⁶

Prominent Zionist and author of the *Encyclopaedia Judaica; das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Jakob Klatzkin wrote in Hebrew in a work published in 1925,

“The national viewpoint taught us to understand the true nature of antisemitism, and this understanding widens the horizons of our national

outlook. [***] In the age of enlightenment antisemitism was included among the phenomena that are likely to disappear along with other forms of prejudice and iniquity. The antisemites, so the rule stated, were the laggard elements in the march of progress. Hence, our fate is dependent on the advance of human culture, and its victory is our victory. [***] In the period of Zionism, we learned that antisemitism was a psychic-social phenomenon that derives from our existence as a nation within a nation. Hence, it cannot change, until we attain our national end. But if Zionism had fully understood its own implications, it would have arrived, not merely as a psychosociological explanation of this phenomenon, but also as a justification of it. It is right to protest against its crude expressions, but we are unjust to it and distort its nature so long as we do not recognize that essentially it is a defense of the integrity of a nation, in whose throat we are stuck, neither to be swallowed nor to be expelled. [***] And when we are unjust to this phenomenon, we are unfair to our own people. If we do not admit the rightfulness of antisemitism, we deny the rightfulness of our own nationalism. If our people is deserving and willing to live its own national life, then it is an alien body thrust into the nations among whom it lives, an alien body that insists on its own distinctive identity, reducing the domain of their life. It is right, therefore, that they should fight against us for their national integrity. [***] Know this, that it is a good sign for us that the nations of the world combat us. It is proof that our national image is not yet utterly blurred, our alienism is still felt. If the war against us should cease or be weakened, it would indicate that our image has become indistinct and our alienism softened. We shall not obtain equality of rights anywhere save at the price of an explicit or implied declaration that we are no longer a national body, but part of the body of the host-nation; or that we are willing to assimilate and become part of it. [***] Instead of establishing societies for defense against the antisemites, who want to reduce our rights, we should establish societies for defense against our friends who desire to defend our rights. [***] When Moses came to redeem the children of Israel, their leaders said to him, ‘You have made our odor evil in the eyes of Pharaoh and in the eyes of his servants, giving them a sword with which to kill us.’ Nevertheless, Moses persisted in worsening the situation of the people, and he saved them.”¹⁴⁴⁷

7.3 Zionism is Built on Lies and Hatred

Bernard Lazare tells us of the plagiarism and forgeries of some Alexandrian Jews in their efforts to lay claim to the contributions of Greek minds and of the hatred directed by some toward the Jews and from some Jews toward the Gentiles,

“Why were the Jews hated in all those countries, in all those cities? Because they never entered any city as citizens, but always as a privileged class. Though having left Palestine, they wanted above all to remain Jews,

and their native country was still Jerusalem, i.e., the only city where God might be worshiped and sacrifices offered in His Temple. They formed everywhere republics, as it were, united with Judea and Jerusalem, and from every place they remitted monies to the high priest in payment of a special tax for the maintenance of the Temple the didrachm.

Moreover, they separated themselves from other inhabitants by their rites and their customs; they considered the soil of foreign nations impure and sought to constitute themselves in every city into a sort of a sacred territory. They lived apart, in special quarters, secluded among themselves, isolated, governing themselves by virtue of privileges which were jealously guarded by them, and excited the envy of their neighbours. They intermarried amongst themselves and entertained no strangers, for fear of pollution. The mystery with which they surrounded themselves excited curiosity as well as aversion. Their rites appeared strange and gave occasion for ridicule; being unknown, they were misrepresented and slandered.

At Alexandria they were quite numerous. According to Philo, Alexandria was divided into five wards. Two were inhabited by the Jews. The privileges accorded to them by Caesar were engraved on a column and guarded by them as a precious treasure. They had their own Senate with exclusive jurisdiction in Jewish affairs, and they were judged by an ethnarch. They were ship-owners, traders, farmers, most of them wealthy; the sumptuousness of their monuments and synagogues bore witness to it. The Ptolemies made them farmers of the revenues; this was one of the causes of popular hatred against them. Besides, they had a monopoly of navigation on the Nile, of the grain trade and of provisioning Alexandria, and they extended their trade to all the provinces along the Mediterranean coast. They accumulated great fortunes; this gave rise to the *invidia auri Judaici*. The growing resentment against these foreign cornerers, constituting a nation within a nation, led to popular disturbances; the Jews were frequently assaulted, and Germanicu, among others, had great trouble protecting them.

The Egyptians took revenge upon them by deriding their religious customs, their abhorrence of pork. They once paraded in the city a fool, Carabas by name, adorned with a papyrus diadem, decked in a royal gown, and they saluted him as king of the Jews. Under Philadelphus, one of the first Ptolemies, Manetho, the high-priest of the Temple at Heliopolis, lent his authority to the popular hatred; he considered the Jews descendants of the Hyksos usurpers, and said that that leprous tribe had been expelled for sacrilege and impiousness. Those fables were repeated by Chaeremon and Lysimachus. It was not only popular animosity, however, that persecuted the Jews; they had also against them the Stoics and the Sophists. The Jews, by their proselytism, interfered with the Stoics; there was a rivalry for influence between them, and, notwithstanding their common belief in divine unity, there was opposition between them. The Stoics charged the Jews with irreligiousness, judging by the sayings of Posidonius and Apollonius Molo; they had a very scant knowledge of the Jewish religion. The Jews, they said,

refuse to worship the gods; they do not consent to bow even before the divinity of the emperor. They have in their sanctuary the head of an ass and render homage to it; they are cannibals; every year they fatten a man and sacrifice him in a grove, after which they divide among themselves his flesh and swear on it to hate strangers. 'The Jews, says Apollonius Molo, are enemies of all mankind; they have invented nothing useful, and they are brutal.' To this Posidonius adds: 'They are the worst of all men.'

Not less than the Stoics did the Sophists detest the Jews. But the causes of their hatred were not religious, but, I should say, rather literary. From Ptolemy Philadelphus, until the middle of the third century, the Alexandrian Jews, with the intent of sustaining and strengthening their propaganda, gave themselves to forging all texts which were capable of lending support to their cause. The verses of Aeschylus, of Sophocles, of Euripides, the pretended oracles of Orpheus, preserved in Aristobulus and the Stromata of Clement of Alexandria were thus made to glorify the one God and the Sabbath. Historians were falsified or credited with the authorship of books they had never written. It is thus that a History of the Jews was published under the name of Hecataeus of Abdera. The most important of these inventions was the Sibylline oracles, a fabrication of the Alexandrian Jews, which prophesied the future advent of the reign of the one God. They found imitators, however, for since the Sibyl had begun to speak, in the second century before Christ, the first Christians also made her speak. The Jews would appropriate to themselves even the Greek literature and philosophy. In a commentary on the Pentateuch, which has been preserved for us by Eusebius,¹⁷ Aristobulus attempted to show that Plato and Aristotle had found their metaphysical and ethical ideas in an old Greek translation of the Pentateuch. The Greeks were greatly incensed at such treatment of their literature and philosophy, and out of revenge they circulated the slanderous stories of Manetho, adapting them to those of the Bible, to the great fury of the Jews; thus the confusion of languages was identified with the myth of Zeus robbing the animals of their common language. The Sophists, wounded by the conduct of the Jews, would speak against them in their teaching. One among them, Apion, wrote a Treatise against the Jews. This Apion was a peculiar individual, a liar and babbler, to a degree uncommon even among rhetors, and full of vanity, which earned him from Tiberius the nickname 'Cymbalum mundi.' His stories were famous; he claimed to have called out, by means of magic herbs, the shade of Homer, says Pliny.

Apion repeated in his Treatise against the Jews the stories of Manetho, which had been previously restated by Chaeremon and Lysimachus, and supplemented them by quoting from Posidonius and Apollonius Molo. According to him, Moses was 'nothing but a seducer and wizard,' and his laws contained 'nothing but what is bad and dangerous.'¹⁸

As to the Sabbath, the name was derived, he said, from a disease, a sort of an ulcer, with which the Jews were afflicted, and which the Egyptians called sabbatosim, i.e., disease of the groins.

Philo and Josephus undertook the defence of the Jews and fought the Sophists and Apion. In *Contra Apionem*, Josephus is very severe on his adversary. ‘Apion,’ says he, ‘is as stupid as an ass and as imprudent as a dog, which is one of the gods of his nation.’ Philo, on the other hand, prefers to attack the Sophists in general, and if he mentions Apion at all, in his *Legatio ad Caium*, it is merely because Apion was sent to Rome to prefer charges against the Jews before Caligula.”¹⁴⁴⁸

The Old Testament makes many references to the diseases of the Egyptians afflicting the Jews, which probably included leprosy, syphilis and other sexually transmitted diseases. This tends to indicate that the Judeans learned monotheism from an expelled group of Egyptians, or perhaps from the Hyksos.

The Russian Jewess Helena Petrovna Blavatsky wrote of the ancient Jews’ enmity towards the rest of humanity and spoke of Jewish phallic worship, which was also practiced by the Turkic Khazars, who adopted Judaism and became one of the major bloodlines of today’s Ashkenazi Jews—the Orthodox and Ultra-Orthodox of whom worship the Talmud,¹⁴⁴⁹

“But phallic worship has developed only with the gradual loss of the keys to the inner meaning of religious symbols; and there was a day when the Israelites had beliefs as pure as the Âryans have. But now Judaism, built *solely* on phallic worship, has become one of the latest creeds in Asia, and theologically a religion of hate and malice toward everyone and everything outside themselves. Philo Judæus shows what was the genuine Hebrew faith. The Sacred Writings, he says, prescribe what we ought to do, *commanding us to hate the heathen and their laws and institutions*. They did hate Baal or Bacchus worship publicly, but left its worst features to be followed secretly. It is with the Talmudic Jews that the grand symbols of nature were the most profaned.”¹⁴⁵⁰

Jews took great offense at the claim often made in antiquity that they were decedents of the Egyptians and that Moses was an Egyptian priest. The Egyptian Pharaoh Akhenaton IV, is considered by many today to have been the father of monotheism and the Biblical stories of Moses’ background appear rather implausible, are apparently close copies of other ancient myths, and tend to indicate that Moses was an Egyptian by birth and descent, perhaps even the Egyptian Pharaoh Akhenaton IV.

Among many such “blasphemies”, Apion claimed that the Jews practiced human sacrifices, and would fatten up a Greek for the slaughter each year in the Temple, sacrifice the Greek in the woods, feast on the Greek’s viscera and swear a curse of hatred upon the Greeks. The Jews, especially Jewish royalty, had practiced Baal worship, and the worship of Baal and of Moloch entailed human sacrifices. Christianity is a Jewish tale of human sacrifice not unlike Moloch worship—though Jesus was sacrificed on the cross, not the funeral pyre. The Old Testament contains many verses which make reference to human sacrifices, for example *Genesis 22:1-*

18; *Exodus* 8:26;13:2. *Joshua* 13:14. *Judges* 11:29-40. I *Kings* 13:1-2. II *Kings* 16:3-4; 17:17; 21:6; 23:20-25. II *Chronicles* 28:1-4; *Jeremiah* 7:3; 19:5; 32:35. *Ezekiel* 16:20-21; 20:26, 31; 23:37. and *Leviticus* 27:28-29:

“28 Notwithstanding, no devoted thing, that a man shall devote unto the LORD of all that he hath, *both* of man and beast, and of the field of his possession, shall be sold or redeemed: every devoted thing *is* most holy unto the LORD. 29 None devoted, that shall be devoted of men, shall be redeemed; *but* shall surely be put to death.”

And *Leviticus* 20:1-7 admonishes Jews not to allow sacrifices of their own children to Moloch, indicating that Jewish child sacrifices were occurring, and perhaps prescribing that they should be made to the “Lord”, Baal, instead of to Moloch:

“1 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, 2 Again, thou shalt say to the children of Israel, Whosoever *he be* of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn in Israel, that giveth *any* of his seed unto Molech; he shall surely be put to death: the people of the land shall stone him with stones. 3 And I will set my face against that man, and will cut him off from among his people; because he hath given of his seed unto Molech, to defile my sanctuary, and to profane my holy name. 4 And if the people of the land do any ways hide their eyes from the man, when he giveth of his seed unto Molech, and kill him not: 5 Then I will set my face against that man, and against his family, and will cut him off, and all that go a whoring after him, to commit whoredom with Molech, from among their people. 6 And the soul that turneth after such as have familiar spirits, and after wizards, to go a whoring after them, I will even set my face against that soul, and will cut him off from among his people. 7 Sanctify yourselves therefore, and be ye holy: for I *am* the LORD your God.”

Beyond this, Judaism, as a religious doctrine which revolves around a fabricated history, depends upon repeated instances, and prophecies, of the sacrifice of masses of human beings in genocides directed by God—ultimately the mass murder of all Gentiles and apostate Jews as a human sacrifice to God for the sake of Zionism and the remnant of “righteous” Jews.

Josephus recounts some of Apion’s tales, among them,

“Now, although I cannot but think that I have already demonstrated, and that abundantly more than was necessary, that our fathers were not originally Egyptians, nor were thence expelled, either on account of bodily diseases, or any other calamities of that sort; yet will I briefly take notice of what Apion adds upon that subject; for in his third book, which relates to the affairs of Egypt, he speaks thus:—‘I have heard of the ancient men of Egypt, that Moses was of Heliopolis, and that he thought himself obliged to follow the

customs of his forefathers, and offered his prayers in the open air, toward the city walls; but that he reduced them all to be directed toward sunrising, which was agreeable to the situation of Heliopolis: that he also set up pillars instead of gnomons, under which was represented a cavity like that of a boat, and the shadow that fell from their tops fell down upon that cavity, that it might go round about the like course as the sun itself goes round in the other.' [***] He then assigns a certain wonderful and plausible occasion for the name of Sabbath, for he says, that 'when the Jews had travelled a six days' journey, they had swellings on their groins; and that on this account it was that they rested on the seventh day, as having got safely to that country which is now called Judea; that then they preserved the language of the Egyptians, and called that day the Sabbath, for that malady of swellings on their groin was named Sabbatosis by the Egyptians.' [***] And as for this grammatical translation of the word Sabbath, it either contains an instance of his great impudence or gross ignorance; for the words Sabbo and Sabbath are widely different from one another; for the word Sabbath in the Jewish language denotes rest from all sorts of work; but the word Sabbo, as he affirms, denotes among the Egyptians the malady of a swelling in the groin. [***] He adds another Grecian fable, in order to reproach us. In reply to which, it would be enough to say, that they who presume to speak about divine worship, ought not to be ignorant of this plain truth, that it is a degree of less impurity to pass through temples, than to forge wicked calumnies of its priests. Now, such men as he are more zealous to justify a sacrilegious king than to write what is just and what is true about us, and about our temple; for when they are desirous of gratifying Antiochus, and of concealing that perfidiousness and sacrilege which he was guilty of, with regard to our nation, when he wanted money, they endeavour to disgrace us, and tell lies even relating to futurities. Apion becomes other men's prophet upon this occasion, and says, that 'Antiochus found in our temple a bed, and a man lying upon it, with a small table before him, full of dainties, from the [fishes of the] sea, and the fowls of the dry land; that this man was amazed at these dainties thus set before him; that he immediately adored the king, upon his coming in, as hoping that he would afford him all possible assistance; that he fell down upon his knees, and stretched out to him his right hand, and begged to be released; and that when the king bade him sit down, and tell him who he was, and why he dwelt there, and what was the meaning of those various sorts of food that were set before him, the man made a lamentable complaint, and with sighs, and tears in his eyes, gave him this account of the distress he was in; and said that he was a Greek, and that as he went over this province, in order to get his living, he was seized upon by foreigners, on a sudden, and brought to this temple, and shut up therein, and was seen by nobody, but was fattened by these curious provisions thus set before him: and that truly at the first such unexpected advantages seemed to him matter of great joy; that after a while they brought a suspicion upon him, and at length astonishment, what their meaning should be; that at last he inquired of the servants that came to

him, and was by them informed that it was in order to the fulfilling a law of the Jews, which they must not tell him, that he was thus fed; and that they did the same at a set time every year: that they used to catch a Greek foreigner, and fatten him thus up every year, and then lead him to a certain wood, and kill him, and sacrifice with their accustomed solemnities, and taste of his entrails, and take an oath upon this sacrificing a Greek, that they would ever be at enmity with the Greeks; and that then they threw the remaining parts of the miserable wretch into a certain pit.’ Apion adds further, that ‘the man said there were but a few days to come ere he was to be slain, and implored of Antiochus that, out of the reverence he bore to the Grecian gods, he would disappoint the snares the Jews laid for his blood, and would deliver him from the miseries with which he was encompassed.’”¹⁴⁵¹

Many such charges of “ritual murder” were made against Jews throughout history. They have become known as “blood libels”. One of the more famous of these is the story of Saint Simon of Trent. In Rev. S. Baring-Gould, *The Lives of the Saints*, New and Revised Edition, John Grant, Edinburgh, (1914), pp. 447-449,

“S. SIMON, BOY M.
(A.D. 1475.)

[Roman Martyrology. Authority :—The Acts of Canonization by Benedict XIV., and the Acts published in the Italian immediately after the event took place.]

THROUGH the Middle Ages, in Europe the Jews were harshly treated, suffering from sudden risings of the people, or from the exactions of princes and nobles. Tales of murder of Christian children were trumped up against them. This was, perhaps, the case in Trent, where on Tuesday in Holy Week, 1475, the Jews met to prepare for the approaching Passover, in the house of one of their number named Samuel, and it was agreed between three of them—Samuel, Tobias, and Angelus—that a child should be crucified, as an act of revenge against their tyrants, and of hatred against Christianity. The difficulty, however, was how to get one. Samuel sounded his servant Lazarus, and attempted to bribe him into procuring one, but the suggestion so scared the fellow, that he packed up all his traps and ran away. On the Thursday, Tobias undertook to get the boy, and going out in the evening, whilst the people were in church during the singing of Tenebræ, he prowled about till he found a child sitting on the threshold of his father’s door in the Fossati Street, aged twenty-nine months, and named Simon. The Jew began to coax the little fellow to follow him, and the boy did so, and he conducted him to the house of Samuel, where he was put to bed, and given raisins and apples to amuse him.

In the mean time the parents, Andrew and Mary, missing their child, began to seek him everywhere, but not finding him, and night falling darkly upon them, they returned, troubled and alarmed to their home.

During the night, when all was still, a Jew named Moses took the child from its bed, and carried it into the vestibule of the synagogue, which formed

a part of the house of Samuel, and sitting down on a bench began to strip the infant; a handkerchief being twisted round its throat to prevent it from crying. Then stretching out his limbs in the shape of a cross they began the butchery of the child, cutting the body in several places, and gathering his blood in a basin. The child being half dead, they raised him on his feet, and whilst two of them held him by the arms, the rest pierced his body on all sides with their awls.

When the child was dead, they hid the body in a cellar behind the barrels of wine.

All Friday the parents sought their son, but found him not, and the Jews, alarmed at the proceedings of the magistrates, who had taken the matter up, and were making investigations in all quarters, consulted what had better be done. They could not carry the body away, as every gate was watched, and the perplexity was great. At length they determined to dress the body again and throw it into the stream which ran under Samuel's window, but which was there blocked by an iron cage in which the refuse was caught. Tobias was to go to the bishop and chief magistrates and tell them that there was a child's body entangled in the grate, and he hoped that by thus drawing attention to it all suspicion of having been implicated in the murder would be diverted from him and his co-religionists.

This was done, and when John de Salis, the bishop, and James de Sporo, the governor, heard the report of the Jew, they at once went, and the body was removed before their eyes, and conveyed to the cathedral, followed by a crowd. As, according to a popular mediæval superstition, blood is supposed to flow from the wound when the murderer approaches, the officers of justice examined the body as the crowds passed it; and they noticed that blood exuded as Tobias approached. On the strength of this the house of Samuel and the synagogue were examined, and blood and other traces of the butchery were found in the cellar, and in the place where the deed had been done, and the bowl of blood was discovered in a cupboard. The most eminent physicians were called to investigate the condition of the corpse, and they unanimously decided that the child could not have been drowned, as the body was not swollen, and as there were marks on the throat of strangulation. The wounds they decided were made by sharp instruments like awls and knives, and could not be attributed to the gnawing of water-rats. The popular voice now accusing the Jews, the magistrates seized on the Jews and threw them into prison, and on the accusation of a renegade Jew named John, who had been converted to Christianity seven years before, and who declared that the Jews had often sought to catch and kill a child, and had actually done this elsewhere, more than five of the Jews were sentenced to be broken on the wheel, and then burnt.

The blood found in the basin is preserved in the cathedral of Trent, and the body of the child is also enshrined there in a magnificent mausoleum. Such is the story. A boy was drowned, and his body gnawed by rats. This was worked up into a charge against the Jews, to excuse a massacre and

plunder of the unfortunate Hebrews.”

Josephus’ denials of the charge that the Jews fabricated the “history” of the Israelites include attempted refutations of many ancient scholars, but Josephus has proven less than reliable and there is no ancient evidence yet found to support his views on the origins of the Israelites and Jews. Among the ancients who saw the Jews as Egyptians was Strabo, who wrote,

“[I]t is inhabited in general, as is each place in particular, by mixed stocks of people from Aegyptian and Arabian and Phoenician tribes; for such are those who occupy Galilee and Hiericus [*Footnote: Jericho*] and Philadelphia and Samaria, which last Herod surnamed Sebastê. [*Footnote: i. e. in Latin, ‘Augusta,’ in honour of Augustus Caesar.*] But though the inhabitants are mixed up thus, the most prevalent of the accredited reports in regard to the temple at Jerusalem represents the ancestors of the present Judaeans, as they are called, as Aegyptians. [***] Moses, namely, was one of the Aegyptian priests, and held a part of Lower Aegypt, as it is called, but he went away from there to Judaea, since he was displeased with the state of affairs there, and was accompanied by many people who worshipped the Divine Being. [***] Now Moses, saying things of this kind, persuaded not a few thoughtful men and led them away to this place where the settlement of Jerusalem now is[.]”¹⁴⁵²

If these many voices from antiquity (Herodotus, Ptolemy of Medes, Apion, Chaeremo, Diodorus, Lysimachus, Tacitus and Strabo) speak the truth, yet another tenet of racist Zionist mythology is proven false.

Not only ancient voices are raised against Zionist myth. Philip R. Davies also discredits Zionist folklore in his book *In Search of “Ancient Israel”*, JSOT Press, Sheffield, England, (1992). In addition, A. Arnaiz-Villena, N. Elaiwa, C. Silvera, A. Rostom, J. Moscoso, E. Gómez-Casado, L. Allende, P. Varela, and J. Martínez-Laso, published an important paper, “The Origin of Palestinians and Their Genetic Relatedness with other Mediterranean Populations”, *Human Immunology*, Volume 62, Number 9, (2001), pp. 889-900; which discredited Zionist legend, but which has been removed from the publication’s website (*see also: A. Nebel, et al., “High-Resolution Y Chromosome Haplotypes of Israeli and Palestinian Arabs Reveal Geographic Substructure and Substantial Overlap with Haplotypes of Jews”, Human Genetics*, Volume 107, Number 6, (December, 2000), pp. 630-641.). In an article by Robin McKie, in *The Observer* (Guardian Unlimited), “Journal Axes Gene Research on Jews and Palestinians”, (25 November 2001), McKie claims,

“Academics who have already received copies of *Human Immunology* have been urged to rip out the offending pages and throw them away. Such a drastic act of self-censorship is unprecedented in research publishing and has created widespread disquiet, generating fears that it may involve the suppression of scientific work that questions Biblical dogma.”¹⁴⁵³

The exodus is a painful topic for some political Zionists, because, in addition to the loss of another pillar in the temple of their racist beliefs, the story of the exodus has long been a source of inspiration in times of crisis for the Jews in general and has come to symbolize the many long struggles many Jews have endured in their efforts to maintain their “race”, their religion and their “nation”. The reassuring story gives a promise of hope which many Jews believe carried them through to the promised land. It is perhaps this romantic and sentimental love of the promised land that enabled the political Zionists, who were motivated in no small part by greed, to gain some support in their attempts to risk all and join forces with the anti-Semites in a racist call for segregation in the first half of the Twentieth Century, which ultimately had horrific consequences. George Henry Borrow wrote in *The Zincoli* in 1841,

“If there be one event in the eventful history of the Hebrews which awakens in their minds deeper feelings of gratitude than another, it is the exodus, and that wonderful manifestation of olden mercy still serves them as an assurance that the Lord will yet one day redeem and gather together his scattered and oppressed people. ‘Art thou not the God who brought us out of the land of bondage?’ they exclaim in the days of their heaviest trouble and affliction. He who redeemed Israel from the hand of Pharaoh is yet capable of restoring the kingdom and sceptre to Israel.”¹⁴⁵⁴

Like the ancients, Sigmund Freud again questioned the origins of Judaism in 1938, arguing that Moses was an Egyptian, in his book *Moses and Monotheism*,¹⁴⁵⁵ and he was attacked for it by some fellow Jews, who were concerned that if this question were further explored, the answers might profit the anti-Semites. The Nazis had already begun to inflict their cowardly violence against defenseless Jews, and Freud himself wisely left his beloved Vienna. Many have stated that the Old Testament contains nothing new and was plagiarized from many sources including the Monotheism of the Egyptian Pharaoh Amenhotep IV, a. k. a. Akhenaton. Many believe that David’s *Psalms* 104 is plagiarized from Akhenaton’s *Great Hymn to the Aten*.

The theory that the “Israelites” were Egyptians, who were expelled from Egypt due to their diseases and depravity, fits some of the plague stories and their related counterparts in Egyptian texts as contagions among the Hyksos, which stories otherwise rely upon divine intervention. The Hyksos conquerors were known as lepers, and may be the source of many of the legends of “Israelites”. The dietary and other laws of the Jews, and their practice of circumcision, burial of the dead, etc. are carry-overs from an Egyptian heritage—Egyptian priests emphasized cleanliness and completely shaved their bodies. Egyptians were circumcised and did not eat swine flesh, which was considered to be a source of leprosy. Disease may have been brought in by the Hyksos, who then infected other Egyptians—though the existence of the Hyksos is established, the existence of the ancient Israelites is not, and they were clearly fictions created by the Judeans, who may have received Egyptian lore from expelled Hyksos travellers, or from expelled Egyptian priests.

Publius Cornelius Tacitus wrote in his *Histories*, Book V, Chapters 2-8, of

70AD—the year Jerusalem is thought by some to have been destroyed, that the Jews were lepers among the Egyptians, who were expelled. Tacitus tells us that Moses rejected Egyptian gods due to the affliction his people suffered (there are recurring accusations of worship of the golden calf), and out of spite Moses sacrificed the animals the Egyptians worshiped and turned to monotheism as a means of uniting his group behind a belief system foreign to all others. Tacitus claimed that Jews do not eat swine flesh, because this animal carried the leprosy which afflicted them. Tacitus wrote, among other things,

“Most writers, however, agree in stating that once a disease, which horribly disfigured the body, broke out over Egypt; that king Bocchoris, seeking a remedy, consulted the oracle of Hammon, and was bidden to cleanse his realm, and to convey into some foreign land this race detested by the gods. The people, who had been collected after diligent search, finding themselves left in a desert, sat for the most part in a stupor of grief, till one of the exiles, Moyses by name, warned them not to look for any relief from God or man, forsaken as they were of both, but to trust to themselves, taking for their heaven-sent leader that man who should first help them to be quit of their present misery.”¹⁴⁵⁶

Tacitus concludes,

“5. This worship, however introduced, is upheld by its antiquity; all their other customs, which are at once perverse and disgusting, owe their strength to their very badness. The most degraded out of other races, scorning their national beliefs, brought to them their contributions and presents. This augmented the wealth of the Jews, as also did the fact, that among themselves they are inflexibly honest and ever ready to shew compassion, though they regard the rest of mankind with all the hatred of enemies. They sit apart at meals, they sleep apart, and though, as a nation, they are singularly prone to lust, they abstain from intercourse with foreign women; among themselves nothing is unlawful. Circumcision was adopted by them as a mark of difference from other men. Those who come over to their religion adopt the practice, and have this lesson first instilled into them, to despise all gods, to disown their country, and set at nought parents, children, and brethren. Still they provide for the increase of their numbers. It is a crime among them to kill any newly-born infant. They hold that the souls of all who perish in battle or by the hands of the executioner are immortal. Hence a passion for propagating their race and a contempt for death. They are wont to bury rather than to burn their dead, following in this the Egyptian custom; they bestow the same care on the dead, and they hold the same belief about the lower world. Quite different is their faith about things divine. The Egyptians worship many animals and images of monstrous form; the Jews have purely mental conceptions of Deity, as one in essence. They call those profane who make representations of God in human shape out of perishable

materials. They believe that Being to be supreme and eternal, neither capable of representation, nor of decay. They therefore do not allow any images to stand in their cities, much less in their temples. This flattery is not paid to their kings, nor this honour to our Emperors. From the fact, however, that their priests used to chant to the music of flutes and cymbals, and to wear garlands of ivy, and that a golden vine was found in the temple, some have thought that they worshiped father Liber, the conqueror of the East, though their institutions do not by any means harmonize with the theory; for Liber established a festive and cheerful worship, while the Jewish religion is tasteless and mean.”¹⁴⁵⁷

Tacitus was familiar with the Old Testament which is filled with stories of mass murder and of genocides allegedly sanctioned—insisted upon—perpetrated—by God. King David, a great hero of the work, was a treacherous murderer. It is truly a brutal and bloody religious mythology and largely a fabricated and horrific¹⁴⁵⁸ history of racism, misogyny, martyrdom, world domination, slavery, rape, genocide, infanticide, cannibalism and human sacrifice.¹⁴⁵⁹ The disgustingly low level of the Talmud is vividly displayed in the Rabbis pedophilia in *Kethuboth* 11a and 11b, where the learned discuss their conclusion that a girl under the age of three who has sexual intercourse with a grown man can later lawfully claim to be a virgin for the purposes of marriage, because her hymen will have since grown back. According to these religious leaders, a grown woman who fornicates with a prepubescent boy can likewise claim to be a virgin. *Kethuboth* 11b,

“A small boy who has intercourse with a grown-up woman makes her [as though she were] injured by a piece of wood. [*Footnote*: Although the intercourse of a small boy is not regarded as a sexual act, nevertheless the woman is injured by it as by a piece of wood.] [***] It means⁵ this: When a grown-up man has intercourse with a little girl it is nothing, for when the girl is less than this, [*Footnote*: Lit., ‘here’, that is, less than three years old.] it is as if one puts the finger into the eye; [*Footnote*: I.e., tears come to the eye again and again, so does virginity come back to the little girl under three years. Cf. *Nid.* 45a.] but when a small boy has intercourse with a grown-up woman he makes her as ‘a girl who is injured by a piece of wood,’”¹⁴⁶⁰

The *Sanhedrin* 69a states that a girl of three years and one day can enter marriage if an adult male rapes her, and that she can be passed to her husband’s brother, should her husband die, by his having raped her,

“A maiden aged three years and a day may be acquired in marriage by coition, and if her deceased husband’s brother cohabited with her, she becomes his. The penalty of adultery may be incurred through her; [if a *niddah*,] she defiles him who has connection with her, so that he in turn defiles that upon which he lies, as a garment which has lain upon [a person afflicted with gonorrhoea]. If she married a priest, she may eat of *terumah*;

if any unfit person cohabits with her, he disqualifies her from the priesthood. If any of the forbidden degrees had intercourse with her, they are executed on her account, but she is exempt.³ [69*b*] But why so: may she not prove to be barren, her husband not having married her on such a condition?⁵ Hence it must be that we take into account only the majority, and the majority of women are not constitutionally barren! No. The penalty incurred on her account is a sacrifice, [but not death]. But it is explicitly stated, ‘They are executed on her account?’—That refers to incest by her father. But the statement is, If *any* of the forbidden degrees had intercourse with her?⁶—Hence this [Mishnah] refers to a husband who explicitly accepted her under all conditions.”¹⁴⁶¹

Shabbath 133 commands a mohel who performs a circumcision to suck on the wounded penis with his mouth and draw blood into his mouth—a process referred to as *metzitzah b’peh*. This tradition continues to this day and may result in the transmission of the herpes virus and other diseases from the mohel to the baby.¹⁴⁶² *Shabbath* 133*a* states,

“*MISHNAH*. WE PERFORM ALL THE REQUIREMENTS OF CIRCUMCISION ON THE SABBATH. WE CIRCUMCISE,¹ UNCOVER [THE CORONA],² SUCK [THE WOUND],³ AND PLACE A COMPRESS AND CUMMIN UPON IT.⁴ IF ONE DID NOT CRUSH [THE CUMMIN] ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH, HE MUST CHEW [IT] WITH HIS TEETH AND APPLY [IT TO THE WOUND]; IF HE DID NOT BEAT UP WINE AND OIL ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATH,⁵ EACH MUST BE APPLIED SEPARATELY. WE MAY NOT MAKE A HALUK⁶ FOR IT IN THE FIRST PLACE, BUT MUST WRAP A RAG ABOUT IT. IF THIS WAS NOT PREPARED FROM THE EVE OF THE SABBATH, ONE WINDS IT ABOUT HIS FINGER⁷ AND BRINGS IT, AND EVEN THROUGH ANOTHER COURTYARD.”¹⁴⁶³

Shabbath 133*b* states,

“WE SUCK OUT, etc. R. Papa said: If a surgeon does not suck [the WOUND], it is dangerous and he is dismissed. It is obvious? Since we desecrate the Sabbath for it, it is dangerous?⁶—You might say that this blood is stored up, therefore he informs us that it is the result of a wound, and it is like a bandage and cummin: just as when one does not apply a bandage and cummin there is danger, so here too if one does not do it there is danger.”^{7,1464}

The Jewish Encyclopedia in its article “Circumcision” states,

“**Mezizah:** By this is meant the sucking of the blood from the wound. The mohel takes some wine in his mouth and applies his lips to the part involved in the operation, and exerts suction, after which he expels the mixture of wine and blood into a receptacle (see Fig. 4, below) provided for the purpose. This procedure is repeated several times, and completes the

operation, except as to the control of the bleeding and the dressing of the wound.”¹⁴⁶⁵

The Talmud contains numerous obvious lies and fables, as Johannes Buxtorf pointed out.¹⁴⁶⁶

This ancient mythology and fabricated history, Judaism, of course, does not reflect upon the majority of modern ethnic Jews, most of whom have not read it, let alone believed in it; and, speaking anecdotally, the vast majority of those who genuinely believed in these works and prophecies whom your author has encountered, were fundamentalist Dispensationalist Christians, not ethnic Jews. Moderns enjoy the inheritance of a great many loving and wise Jewish and Christian philosophers, who have tried to construct a dignified and beautiful religion from the brutal past, as has been the case with many human groups and their various ancient religions. However, there are even today large and influential Jewish and Christian political movements which still adhere to the ancient bigotry and genocidal designs of Judaism, and they pose a genuine and substantial threat to humanity, for when the means are attained for achieving their ends, it is likely that they will win over many more adherents and carry out their ancient religious mandates with the religious fanaticism and disregard for human life and individual freedom they have displayed throughout their treacherous history.

The history of anti-Semitism to the time of political Zionism, as it was understood at the time political Zionism was formulated, is documented in brief in the eleventh edition of *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1910) in its article “Anti-Semitism” and in greater detail in Bernard Lazare’s *Antisemitism: Its History and Causes* of 1894. Both contain detailed references to the literature of the period and are more apologetic to the views of anti-Semites than we are today in the post-Holocaust world. Lazare’s work is especially noteworthy for its rejection of the mythology of the distinction of separate human races, which has since been bolstered by genetic research, and which foreshadowed Franz Boas’ cultural anthropology.

In very early Christian times, Marcion declared that the God of the Old Testament, the Creator God of the Jews, was a hateful and genocidal maniac, as revealed in the Old Testament—was in essence the Devil, and that Christ was of a different, loving supreme God; which view was, of course, greatly offensive to Jews. Tertullian¹⁴⁶⁷ and others slandered Marcion, and his views, though initially popular, eventually fell out of favor—thought they were in part revived by Friedrich Delitzsch in 1920, who openly criticized the God of the Old Testament and the Jews who created Him.¹⁴⁶⁸ St. John Chrysostom accused the Jews with the alleged selfaccusation iterated in Matthew 27:25, “[Jesus’] blood be upon us [Jews] and upon our children.”¹⁴⁶⁹ Other such passages appear in the New Testament and were perhaps added to generate and/or justify animosity against Jews. Matthew 23:31-39 states:

“Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. *Ye* serpents, *ye* generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?

Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and *some* of them ye shall kill and crucify; and *some* of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute *them* from city to city: That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, *thou* that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under *her* wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed *is* he that cometh in the name of the LORD.”

Luke 11 gives a somewhat different account. I *Thessalonians* 2:14-16 states,

“For ye, brethren, became followers of the churches of God which in Judaea are in Christ Jesus: for ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they *have* of the Jews: Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men: Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost.”

John 8:44-45 states,

“Ye are of *your* father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it. And because I tell *you* the truth, ye believe me not.”

Revelation 2:9:

“I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich) and I *know* the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but *are* the synagogue of Satan.”

Revelation 3:9:

“Behold, I will make them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie; behold, I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee.”

St. Chrysostom placed the blame for Christ’s crucifixion on the Jews as a religious group and employed scripture to defame them, calling them evil tempters

and proselytizers, and instructed all Christians to refrain from contact with Jews; and most importantly, in his view, to refrain from practicing Jewish rituals and to avoid the synagogues, which he claimed were places of demon worship, brothels and theaters—much like the Canaanite temples. The cries for segregation sounded throughout the Dark Ages, and Jews were forced into “Ghettos” and were denied many rights. This lasted well into the 1800's and in the 1900's became the means for segregation and mass expulsion at the instigation of the political Zionists, who sought after a “world ghetto”¹⁴⁷⁰ in order to preserve the alleged racial purity of Jews.

Christians were forbidden to charge usurious interest rates when loaning money, because, *inter alia*, Aristotle had declared that the practice of Usury was unethical and a form of stealing.¹⁴⁷¹ This view was adopted by Christians. Hence, Christians did not often loan money to those who were most desperate for it, because there was no reward to compensate the risk. Jews were not so inhibited against Gentiles, though usury against fellow Jews was discouraged (*Deuteronomy* 15; 23:20), and Jews had always been skilled financiers long before Christianity emerged, though the Christians are most often blamed today for the usury of Jews given that they sometimes limited the ability of Jews to own land or work in agriculture or certain industries.¹⁴⁷² Exercising self-discipline and freed from the burdens of funding armies and instead profiteering from them, these financiers accumulated great wealth, compounding their fortunes with exorbitant interest rates that led Gentile societies into ruin. When governments wished to conduct wars, or when they ran into financial difficulties, or when they needed money to build palaces, or buy ships, or bribe other nations, or to pay ransoms, they often turned to these Jewish financiers for funds.¹⁴⁷³ No one loans such large sums of money without considering the risks involved and applying a rate of interest commensurate to the risk that will make the transaction profitable. As such, some Jews, who were otherwise segregated, gained access to the ruling classes of Europe and naturally exercised a tremendous measure of influence over the destiny of the European powers—which involvement by those who considered themselves foreigners was very much resented.

During their forced (and in many instances voluntary) segregation in the Ghettos, the Jews evolved a strong Bourgeoisie class, which thrived on city life, and, following emancipation, became a competitive threat to the underdeveloped Bourgeoisie class of the Gentiles, who had not emerged from the feudal system as advanced and prepared for city living as had the Jews—which was especially true in Russia. From the most ancient times of their history, the Jews stressed the value of educating of their young. Josephus noted long ago in his *Against Apion*,

“Our principal care of all is this, to educate our children well[.]”¹⁴⁷⁴

In the 1870's in the newly formed German nation, Jewish financiers were heavily involved in the many scandals which led to financial hardships for the general population, and this was generalized into a general hatred for Jews by Wilhelm Marr and Otto Glogau¹⁴⁷⁵—though it was Edward Lasker, who was Jewish, who on 14 January 1873 called the attention of the Prussian Diet to the crisis and indicted Bethel Henry Strousberg, who was also Jewish, on 7 February 1873.¹⁴⁷⁶ These

scandals were soon followed by the “Black Friday” of 9 May 1873 in Vienna, where the police closed the stock market, which had collapsed under the weight of widespread Jewish corruption. Such corruption also took place in the American stock market, where pools run by Jewish financiers would run up stock prices to bilk the comparatively poor, who had bought shares on margin. It was common knowledge that Jewish financiers kept specific reporters in their pockets. These corrupt cabals would bribe newspaper correspondents to write favorable reviews of certain companies in order to lure in poorer investors. The rich would then sell the stock for a profit, and then sell it short, for an additional profit. These profits were stolen from the middle class and the comparatively poor. This eventually resulted in the Great Depression.

There were many accusations made in the 1800's of undue and disproportionate Jewish influence in the newspapers by Friedrich Wilhelm Ghillany;¹⁴⁷⁷ and perhaps most notably by Richard Wagner, who charged that Jewish influences had destroyed his career after he had published an essay which was critical of undue Jewish influence; and by Eugen Karl Dühring, who, like Wagner, charged that Jews controlled the press and manipulated public opinion in a grossly destructive way, converting high culture into something cheap, base and banal; as well as by Adolf Stoecker,¹⁴⁷⁸ who called for segregation, as the racist Zionist Albert Einstein later would. Dühring wrote in 1881 that the promotion of Spinoza, Heine, Lessing, Lassal, etc. by some Jews was overblown and degenerative and resulted from dishonest self-advertisement. Heinrich von Treitschke and Wilhelm Marr also alleged in the Nineteenth Century that Jews controlled the press. Treitschke, who most famously stated, “Die Juden sind unser Unglück!” wrote in 1879,

“The little man can no longer be talked out of the fact that the Jews write the newspapers. Therefore, he won’t believe them any longer. Our newspaper system owes a great deal to Jewish talents. From the first the trenchancy and acuity of the Jewish spirit found a fruitful field. But here, too, the effect was ambiguous. Börne was the first to introduce a characteristically shameless tone into our journalism.”¹⁴⁷⁹

The accusation of undue Jewish influence in journalism again spiked when the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, which advocated Jewish control over all important media outlets, became infamous in 1920.¹⁴⁸⁰ Many pointed to the pride some Jews took of their disproportionate rôle in the media of New York and Berlin.

Dühring’s attacks probably resulted in an insecurity that led many to dishonestly hype Einstein beyond all reasonable limits in order to establish in the public mind that Jews were not only capable of creative thought, but were the most significant thinkers. Dühring wrote, *inter alia*,

“For a century, the emergence of the Jews, as well as its precisely not modest propaganda for everything which belongs to their race, has had the greatest share in the fact that Spinoza has come more to the foreground. [***] Heine has formed something out of Romanticism and has moreover plagiarized

great models like the British poet Byron down to his own level. [***] Those small people, like Mr. Marx, who conducted even from London, but under the name of Socialism, a so-called worker's association, in truth however a Jewish alliance, showed wherever they erred in science, noteworthy talent really only in their literary shamelessness. In this way Mr. Marx had drawn along his Jews so discreetly to a formless and eccentric fragmentary book which he produced from himself without any talent, after unmentionably long toils, that these people were soon speaking of a Marxist century. The humour however became complete only when rather similarly people spoke of a Jewish century; for this entire so-called science in which such propagandistic Jews made a business aims, in its way, also not at the supposed happiness of the nations but at the merging of all nations into a Jewish kingdom. [***] The Jews, who do not create anything even in science, but even there only conduct business with the products and the work of another may occasionally put on the market individual talents and especially acquisitive talents—the creative power and genius, however, remain always foreign to them. [***] One needs only to consider the advertisements with which the Jews seek at present, at any cost, to raise their Lessing up to a god after they have for a century raised his fame ten times more than what he is worth with all the arts of false praise. The business which the Jewish press and Jewish literature have always systematically made out of bringing a powerful overvaluation of Lessing into the public has recently been carried out indeed to the point of disgust. The Jewish newspaper writers have raised the author of that flat Jewish piece which is entitled *Nathan der Weise* over the greatest authors and poets and declared him to be, for example, the greatest German, to say something against whom would be a *lèse Majesté*. [***] The preceding hurried treatment is however based here only on the fact that the overvaluation of Lessing by the Jews forms the example lying closest at hand, and the most popular, of the effects of the most unashamed Jewish advertisement, and that Lessing himself, together with Börne and Heine, represents a group of literary renown which must be briefly characterized as a Jewish group and be separated from the really creative and truly original greats like Voltaire, Rousseau, Bürger, Byron, to a certain extent also Goethe, Schiller, and Shelley. If the Jews did not have the daily press in their hands, it would not have been possible to falsify the truth with so many tears before the eyes of the peoples, to displace the natural judgement and force everywhere an interested Jewish opinion in its place. [***] Their inherited lack of imagination is the cause of their aversion to clear illustration, and correspondingly also a reason of the religious statutes founded by them. [***] In this coarse and base material direction also lies a chief reason of the incapacity of the Jews to prove themselves creative in science and art. [***] Some talent, which however remains far removed from creative genius and mostly indeed only apes, is all that is found exceptionally among individual Jews. Almost always, however, this talent is, above all, one of appropriation and of trading with the

intellectual accomplishments of others. [***] That is now the same Lasalle on whom the Jews later pride themselves in their lack of better racial comrades, and whom they glorify, in spite of everything which he has effected against the bourgeoisie and therewith also against themselves, with the most unashamed advertisements.”¹⁴⁸¹

Wagner may have had an axe to grind, due to his inability to live within his means, and as an historical witness, his claims need be scrutinized with an especial care. Dühring also believed that “Jewish elements” had interfered with his career. In 1882, Franz Mehring quoted a Jewish author who criticized Jews for, among other things, “the malicious gloating when veritable conspiracies deprived of their livelihoods people who were suspected of anti-Jewish feelings[.]”¹⁴⁸²

Some Germans, such as Wilhelm Marr, Eugen Karl Dühring and Friedrich Nietzsche, saw Christianity as an evolution of Jewish dogma, and wished to rid Germany of both “foreign” influences of a “slavish” philosophy that thrived not because of any intrinsic worth, but instead from the manipulation of human frailty and an appeal to the human will to everlasting life which renders us gullible. Dühring saw the “Jewish question” as a racial question—a viewpoint also taken by the political Zionists, most especially Theodor Herzl—who learned it from Dühring.¹⁴⁸³ Before Dühring and Herzl was the racist Zionist Socialist writer Moses Hess, who advocated a biological and “racial” answer to the “Jewish question”.

As early as Justin Martyr, Christians argued that God had given them the “prophetic gifts” promised to the Jews. Though the Jews saw their life eternal as the eternal life of the Jewish People, Christians personalized this prophetic gift to give each individual eternal life, thereby taking the nationalistic racism out of Judaism and greatly increasing the allure of the religion to Gentiles. The Jews’ Talmud and *Zohar* considered Jesus an insane imposter who had brought them great suffering, an alleged imposter who had been called the “whore’s son” in antiquity, and they continued to ridicule Jesus calling him the “hanged rogue”. Segregation among neighbors led to increasing suspicions, and many allegations accrued, some of which defamed the Jews, some of which defamed the Christians. The Jews were accused of murdering Christian babies in order to use their blood in Passover rituals, of desecrating the Host, etc. Conversely, some Jews accused Gentiles of murdering their babies.¹⁴⁸⁴

Martin Luther; angered by the Jews’ refusal to convert to Christianity, and their Talmudic writings which call the Virgin Mary a whore (Mary Magdalene) and Jesus the “whore’s son” and “the hanged man”,¹⁴⁸⁵ decried the Jews’ racism and genocidal plans in the strongest of terms, and claimed that they were no longer the “chosen people” because a loving God could not have inflicted the misery upon them that they had suffered in the intervening 1,500 years since the death of Christ, and that God was punishing them for having rejected His Son. In the 1500’s, Martin Luther wrote, among other things,

“Further, they presume to instruct God and prescribe the manner in which he is to redeem them. For the Jews, these very learned saints, look upon God as

a poor cobbler equipped with only a left last for making shoes. This is to say that he is to kill and exterminate all of us Goyim through their Messiah, so that they can lay their hands on the land, the goods, and the government of the whole world. And now a storm breaks over us with curses, defamation, and derision that cannot be expressed with words. They wish that sword and war, distress and every misfortune may overtake us accursed Goyim. They vent their curses on us openly every Saturday in their synagogues and daily in their homes. They teach, urge, and train their children from infancy to remain the bitter, virulent, and wrathful enemies of the Christians.”¹⁴⁸⁶

Jewish Bolshevism and Nazism very nearly accomplished all these Messianic goals for the Jews in the Twentieth Century.

George Henry Borrow recorded in his book of 1841, *The Zincoli*, that,

“There are certainly some points of resemblance between the children of Roma [Gypsies, as in *Egypt*, though in reality of Indian origin] and those of Israel. Both have had an exodus, both are exiles and dispersed amongst the gentiles, by whom they are hated and despised, and whom they hate and despise, under the names of Busnees and Goyim; both, though speaking the language of the Gentiles, possess a peculiar tongue, which the latter do not understand, and both possess a peculiar cast of countenance, by which they may, without difficulty, be distinguished from all other nations; but with these points the similarity terminates. The Israelites have a peculiar religion, to which they are fanatically attached, the Romas have none, as they invariably adopt, though only in appearance, that of the people with whom they chance to sojourn; the Israelites possess the most authentic history of any people in the world, and are acquainted with and delight to recapitulate all that has befallen their race, from ages the most remote; the Romas have no history, they do not even know the name of their original country, and the only tradition which they possess, that of their Egyptian origin, is a false one, whether invented by themselves or others; the Israelites are of all people the most wealthy, the Romas the most poor; poor as a Gypsy being proverbial amongst some nations, though both are equally greedy of gain; and finally, though both are noted for peculiar craft and cunning, no people are more ignorant than the Romas, whilst the Jews have always been a learned people, being in possession of the oldest literature in the world, and certainly the most important and interesting.”¹⁴⁸⁷

Max Nordau stated, *inter alia*, in his address to the First Zionist Congress in 1897 published in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 3 September 1897 on pages 7-9, at 8 and 9,

“In the Ghetto, the Jew had his own world; it was to him the sure refuge which had for him the spiritual and moral value of a parental home. Here were associates by whom one wished to be valued, and also could be valued; here was the public opinion to be acknowledged by which was the aim of the

Jew's ambition. To be held in low esteem by that public opinion was the punishment for unworthiness. Here all specific Jewish qualities were esteemed, and through their special development that admiration was to be obtained which is the sharpest spur to the human mind. What mattered it that outside the Ghetto was despised that which within it was praised? The opinion of the outside world had no influence, because it was the opinion of ignorant enemies. One tried to please one's co-religionists, and their applause was the worthy contentment of his life. So did the Ghetto Jews live, in a moral respect, a real full life. [***] Before the emancipation the Jew was a stranger among the peoples, but he did not for a moment think of making a stand against his fate. He felt himself as belonging to a race of his own, which had nothing in common with the other people of the country. The emancipated Jew is insecure in his relations with his fellow-beings, timid with strangers, suspicious even toward the secret feeling of his friends. His best powers are exhausted in the suppression, or at least in the difficult concealment of his own real character. For he fears that this character might be recognized as Jewish, and he has never the satisfaction of showing himself as he is in all his thoughts and sentiments. He becomes an inner cripple, and externally unreal, and thereby always ridiculous and hateful to all higher feeling men, as is everything that is unreal. All the better Jews in Western Europe groan under this, or seek for alleviation. They no longer possess the belief which gives the patience necessary to bear sufferings, because it sees in them the will of a punishing but yet loving God."

In 1898, Zionist Communist Nachman Syrkin wrote,

"This sense of their higher religious estate, rooted in the general cast of the Jewish spirit, was the source of their morale in their war with the world. [***] How did the Jews react to the world? The religious-psychological difference had already sown the seed of estrangement and hatred between Christian and Jew, and the many troubles the Jews had suffered added to their bitterness. Huddling together with his brethren in the ghetto, the Jew gritted his teeth, cursed the enemy, and dreamed of revenge, the vengeance of heaven and earth."¹⁴⁸⁸

The Talmud, *Shabbath 89a*, states that Jewish hatred of all other peoples proceeded from Mount Sinai. The Old Testament book of *Deuteronomy*, Chapter 7, instructs the Jews to commit genocide against the other peoples of the Earth and *Numbers*, Chapter 24, prophesies a Messiah from the seed of Jacob who will exterminate all the other nations, all of the descendants of Esau, all of the rest of humanity.

Albert Einstein was not above hypocrisy, hatemongering and smear campaigns to achieve his personal political ends. Einstein had a reputation as a rabid anti-assimilationist, which is to say that Einstein was a rabid racist segregationist. On 15 March 1921, Kurt Blumenfeld wrote to Chaim Weizmann,

“Einstein [***] is interested in our cause most strongly because of his revulsion from assimilatory Jewry.”¹⁴⁸⁹

Einstein, who had himself married outside his religion, ethnicity and “race” over his mother’s racist objections, avowed (in nationalistic and racist terms Hitler would later use),

“To deny the Jew’s nationality in the Diaspora is, indeed, deplorable. If one adopts the point of view of confining Jewish ethnical nationalism to Palestine, then one, to all intents and purposes, denies the existence of a Jewish people. In that case one should have the courage to carry through, in the quickest and most complete manner, entire assimilation.

We live in a time of intense and perhaps exaggerated nationalism. But my Zionism does not exclude in me cosmopolitan views. I believe in the actuality of Jewish nationality, and I believe that every Jew has duties towards his coreligionists. [***] [T]he principal point is that Zionism must tend to strengthen the dignity and self-respect of the Jews in the Diaspora. I have always been annoyed by the undignified assimilationist cravings and strivings which I have observed in so many of my friends.”¹⁴⁹⁰

Racist and alarmist Hitler sounded very much like racist and alarmist Einstein,

“Only today, when the same deplorable misery is forced on many millions of Germans from the Reich, who under foreign rule dream of their common fatherland and strive, amid their longing, at least to preserve their holy right to their mother tongue, do wider circles understand what it means to be forced to fight for one’s nationality. [***] The elemental cry of the German-Austrian people for union with the German mother country, that arose in the days when the Habsburg state was collapsing, was the result of a longing that slumbered in the heart of the entire people — a longing to return to the never-forgotten ancestral home. [***] Gradually I began to hate them. All this had one good side: that in proportion as the real leaders or at least the disseminators of Social Democracy came within my vision, my love for my people inevitably grew. [etc. etc. etc.]”¹⁴⁹¹

The racist legacy of political Zionism lingers. Israeli Supreme Court Justice Haim Cohn was quoted in *The London Times* on 25 July 1963 on page 8:

“It is one of the bitterest ironies of fate that the same biological or racist approach which was propagated by the Nazis and characterized the infamous Nuremberg laws should, because of an allegedly sacrosanct Jewish tradition, become the basis for the official determination or rejection of Jewishness in the state of Israel.”¹⁴⁹²

When some Jews attempted to help the Falasha, the “black Jews” of Ethiopia, to

emigrate to Israel in the early 1980's, they initially received little help from the Israeli Government.¹⁴⁹³

7.4 The Hypocritical Vilification of Caligula—Ancient Jewish Historians are not Credible

In the era of Philo the Jew, the Roman Emperor Gaius Caesar Augustus Germanicus (a. k. a. *Caligula*) had, pursuant to Roman custom, declared himself a god and demanded that the Jews worship him and instructed the Jews of Alexandria to erect statues to him and to swear by his name. This was an intolerable request and constituted sacrilege for the Jews. However, it was the normal practice of a Roman Emperor and the Jews themselves had often desecrated the temples of other religions and committed genocide against many other peoples, in order to spare the honor of their “jealous God”,

“Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God *am* a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth *generation* of them that hate me; [***] For thou shalt worship no other god: for the LORD, whose name is *Jealous, is* a jealous God: [***] For the LORD thy God *is* a consuming fire, *even* a jealous God. [***] (For the LORD thy God *is* a jealous God among you) lest the anger of the LORD thy God be kindled against thee, and destroy thee from off the face of the earth.”¹⁴⁹⁴

and they believed, “The LORD *is* a man of war: the LORD *is* his name.”¹⁴⁹⁵ Among the many such acts we find in *Deuteronomy* 7:4-6,

“4 For they will turn away thy son from following me, that they may serve other gods: so will the anger of the LORD be kindled against you, and destroy thee suddenly. 5 But thus shall ye deal with them; ye shall destroy their altars, and break down their images, and cut down their groves, and burn their graven images with fire. 6 ¶ For thou *art* a holy people unto the LORD thy God: the LORD thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that *are* upon the face of the earth.”

Many of the ancient Greeks and Egyptians of Alexandria hated the Jews who lived there;¹⁴⁹⁶ because, in addition to their hypocritical religious intolerance, the Jews of Alexandria had exercised monopoly control over many markets, were tax collectors, and employed other corrupt means to accumulate vast fortunes and draw off the gold of other peoples.¹⁴⁹⁷ Manetho and Apion exposed Judaism as a vulgar and hateful religion, which was filled with lies, plagiarisms and historical deceptions. The *Septuagint* (which corrupted Judaism to somewhat soften and render less obvious the Jews’ quest for world domination, their racism and their religious and historical fabrications) was in part a work meant to placate the Greeks and the Egyptians. In the early Christian Era, Marcion, Clement, Origen, and many others,

again exposed the hateful nature of Judaism. The Jews were largely successful in attacking these early critics, through deceitful “Christian” reactionaries. They grew less successful at suppressing anti-Judaism as time went on and they faced Cyprian, Chrysostom, and many other Christians, who would not tolerate Jewish proselytizing, Jewish intolerance and Jewish anti-Christianism. The cruder attacks tended to be the more successful.

As is evident in Philo the Jew’s writings, the Jews of Alexandria virulently defamed the Egyptians and Greeks, and treated all other religions with utter and expressed contempt and otherwise degraded their neighbors in the harshest terms—terms that would later be applied to Christians and then to Moslems in the Talmud and Cabalistic literature. Among many examples, Philo stated,

“The greater portion of these men ere Egyptians, wicked, worthless men, who had imprinted the venom and evil disposition of their native asps and crocodiles on their own souls, and gave a faithful representation of them there.”¹⁴⁹⁸

The Bible and Talmud also treat Egyptians as if sub-human animals.¹⁴⁹⁹ Rabbi Meir Kahane quoted *Midrash Tehillim* 22:1, on 23 May 1986,

“Each Jew took his dog and put his foot on the throat of a dead Egyptian and said to his dog: Eat of the hand that enslaved me; eat of the heart that showed me no pity.”¹⁵⁰⁰

Philo the Jew’s racist hatred and hypocrisy are even more apparent in his essay *Flaccus* than in his *On the Embassy to Gaius*—which will be addressed here in detail. He asserts in *Flaccus* that Jews have a right to their religion and the rights and privileges of all other countries, but that Judea is a holy place and cannot be violated by any other religion, while demanding that the Egyptians, whom he loathes, give up their lands to Jews and allow Jews to dominate their chief cities and political life through the Roman leaders they have bought, while the Egyptians, whom he describes as subhuman, struggle in poverty and slavery in their own lands. In those superstitious times, Philo repeatedly threatens people with the power of his God, and concludes, “that the nation of the Jews is not left destitute of the providential assistance of God.”¹⁵⁰¹ However, it is clear in his self-indulgent stories that the governing force “behind the scenes”¹⁵⁰² was the corrupt influence of Philo’s money, not God, on the Romans—a fact well-known to Caligula, who allegedly became archenemy of the Jews.

According to the stories of the ancient Jews, Caligula, who, like all Roman Emperors of his era, believed himself to be a god, demanded that a statue of him be placed in the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem, due to an act of hypocrisy by some of the Jews of Jamnia, who demanded that other peoples obey their Jewish laws in the Jewish holy land, while the Jews refused to obey the laws of Rome.

The Jews hypocritically forbade Gentiles to practice Gentile religions in Judea, or in any of the sections of foreign cities with large Jewish populations, while

demanding that Jews be given religious freedom throughout the world. Jewish hypocrisy and intolerance offended the Romans' sense of justice. Tacitus wrote,

“Quite different is their faith about things divine. The Egyptians worship many animals and images of monstrous form; the Jews have purely mental conceptions of Deity, as one in essence. They call those profane who make representations of God in human shape out of perishable materials. They believe that Being to be supreme and eternal, neither capable of representation, nor of decay. They therefore do not allow any images to stand in their cities, much less in their temples. This flattery is not paid to their kings, nor this honour to our Emperors. From the fact, however, that their priests used to chant to the music of flutes and cymbals, and to wear garlands of ivy, and that a golden vine was found in the temple, some have thought that they worshiped father Liber, the conqueror of the East, though their institutions do not by any means harmonize with the theory; for Liber established a festive and cheerful worship, while the Jewish religion is tasteless and mean.”¹⁵⁰³

According to the stories of the ancient Jews, the Jews of Jamnia violated a religious monument to Caligula by destroying it on the grounds that it violated Jewish religious laws, then were shocked to learn that Caligula would retaliate by violating the Jewish Temple with a statue of himself. Instead of realizing their hypocrisy, Jews like Philo and Josephus instead heaped defamation upon defamation on people who sought social justice and the equitable distribution of wealth—the people of Alexandria and other cities where the Jews were a privileged, segregated and intolerant class. Philo records,

““You know the principal and primary cause of all; for that indeed is universally known to all men. [Caligula] desires to be considered a god; and he conceives that the Jews alone are likely to be disobedient; and that therefore he cannot possibly inflict a greater evil or injury upon them than by defacing and insulting the holy dignity of their temple; for report prevails that it is the most beautiful of all the temples in the world, inasmuch as it is continually receiving fresh accessions of ornament and has been for an infinite period of time, a never-ending and boundless expense being lavished on it. And as he is a very contentious and quarrelsome man, he thinks of appropriating this edifice wholly to himself. (199) And he is excited now on this subject to a much greater degree than before by a letter which Capito has sent to him.

‘Capito is the collector of the imperial revenues in Judaea, and on some account or other he is very hostile to the nations of the country; for having come thither a poor man, and having amassed enormous riches of every imaginable description by plunder and extortion, he has now become afraid lest some accusation may be brought against him, and on this account he has contrived a design by which he may repel any such impeachment, namely,

by calumniating those whom he has injured; (200) and a circumstance which we will now mention, has given him some pretext for carrying out his design.

‘There is a city called Jamnia; one of the most populous cities in all Judaea, which is inhabited by a promiscuous multitude, the greatest number of whom are Jews; but there are also some persons of other tribes from the neighbouring nations who have settled there to their own destruction, who are in a manner sojourners among the original native citizens, and who cause them a great deal of trouble, and who do them a great deal of injury, as they are continually violating some of the ancestral national customs of the Jews. (201) These men hearing from travellers who visit the city how exceedingly eager and earnest Gaius is about his own deification, and how disposed he is to look unfavourably upon the whole race of Judaea, thinking that they have now an admirable opportunity for attacking them themselves, have erected an extemporaneous altar of the most contemptible materials, having made clay into bricks for the sole purpose of plotting against their fellow citizens; for they knew well that they would never endure to see their customs transgressed; as was indeed the case.

(202) ‘For when the Jews saw what they had done, and were very indignant at the holiness and sanctity and beauty of the sacred place being thus obscured and defaced, they collected together and destroyed the altar; so the sojourners immediately went to Capito who was in reality the contriver of the whole affair; and he, thinking that he had made a most lucky hit, which he had been seeking for a long time, writes to Gaius dilating on the matter and exaggerating it enormously; (203) and he, when he had read the letter, ordered a colossal statue gilt all over, much more costly and much more magnificent than the rich altar which had been erected in Jamnia, by way of insult to be set up in the temple of the metropolis, having for his most excellent and sagacious counsellors Helicon, that man of noble birth, a chattering slave, a perfect scum of the earth, and a fellow of the name of Apelles, a tragic actor, who when in the first bloom of youth, as they say, made a market of his beauty, and when he was past the freshness of youth went on the stage; (204) and in fact all those who go on the stage selling themselves to the spectators, and to the theatres, are not lovers of temperance and modesty, but rather of the most extreme shamelessness and indecency.

‘On this account Apelles was taken into the rank of a fellow counsellor of the emperor, that Gaius might have an adviser with whom he might indulge in mocking jests, and with whom he might sing, passing over all considerations of the general welfare of the state, as if everything in every quarter of the globe was enjoying profound peace and tranquillity under the laws.

(205) ‘Therefore Helicon, this scorpion-like slave, discharged all his Egyptian venom against the Jews; and Apelles his Ascalonite poison, for he was a native of Ascalon; and between the people of Ascalon and the inhabitants of the holy land, the Jews, there is an irreconcilable and never-ending hostility although they are bordering nations.’

(206) When we heard this we were wounded in our souls at every word he said and at every name he mentioned; but those admirable advisers of admirable actions a little while afterwards met with the fit reward of their impiety, the one being bound by Gaius with iron chains for other causes, and being put to the torture and to the rack after periods of relief, as is the case with people affected with intermittent diseases; and Helicon was put to death by Claudius Germanicus Caesar, for other wicked actions, that, like a madman as he was, he had committed; but there occurrences took place at a later date.”¹⁵⁰⁴

The book of *Esther*, Chapter 3, tells another story in which retribution was sought against Jews for their failure to abide by the laws of the nations in which they lived—though the Jews hypocritically forbade the practice of any other religion in their presence:

“1 After these things did king Ahasuerus promote Haman the son of Hammedatha the Agagite, and advanced him, and set his seat above all the princes that *were* with him. 2 And all the king’s servants, that *were* in the king’s gate, bowed, and revered Haman: for the king had so commanded concerning him. But Mordecai bowed not, nor did *him* reverence. 3 Then the king’s servants, which *were* in the king’s gate, said unto Mordecai, Why transgressest thou the king’s commandment? 4 Now it came to pass, when they spake daily unto him, and he hearkened not unto them, that they told Haman, to see whether Mordecai’s matters would stand: for he had told them that he *was* a Jew. 5 And when Haman saw that Mordecai bowed not, nor did him reverence, then was Haman full of wrath. 6 And he thought scorn to lay hands on Mordecai alone; for they had shewed him the people of Mordecai: wherefore Haman sought to destroy all the Jews that *were* throughout the whole kingdom of Ahasuerus, *even* the people of Mordecai. 7 In the first month, that *is*, the month Nisan, in the twelfth year of king Ahasuerus, they cast Pur, that *is*, the lot, before Haman from day to day, and from month to month, *to* the twelfth *month*, that *is*, the month Adar. 8 And Haman said unto king Ahasuerus, There is a certain people scattered abroad and dispersed among the people in all the provinces of thy kingdom; and their laws *are* diverse from all people; neither keep they the king’s laws: therefore it *is* not for the king’s profit to suffer them. 9 If it please the king, let it be written that they may be destroyed: and I will pay ten thousand talents of silver to the hands of those that have the charge of the business, to bring *it* into the king’s treasuries. 10 And the king took his ring from his hand, and gave it unto Haman the son of Hammedatha the Agagite, the Jews’ enemy. 11 And the king said unto Haman, The silver *is* given to thee, the people also, to do with them as it seemeth good to thee. 12 Then were the king’s scribes called on the thirteenth day of the first month, and there was written according to all that Haman had commanded unto the king’s lieutenants, and to the governors that *were* over every province, and to the rulers of every people of every

province according to the writing thereof, and *to* every people after their language; in the name of king Ahasuerus was it written, and sealed with the king's ring. 13 And the letters were sent by posts into all the king's provinces, to destroy, to kill, and to cause to perish, all Jews, both young and old, little children and women, in one day, *even* upon the thirteenth *day* of the twelfth month, which *is* the month Adar, and *to take* the spoil of them for a prey. 14 The copy of the writing for a commandment to be given in every province was published unto all people, that they should be ready against that day. 15 The posts went out, being hastened by the king's commandment, and the decree was given in Shushan the palace. And the king and Haman sat down to drink; but the city Shushan was perplexed."

To this day, there are Zionists who want to force all Gentiles, and especially Palestinians, out of Jerusalem (*Isaiah* 52:1), and even out of Israel and "Greater Israel" from the Nile to the Euphrates.¹⁵⁰⁵ They follow the ancient law of the *halakha* that only Jews and Judaism be permitted in the "Holy Land", while hypocritically insisting that Jews be permitted religious freedom, be permitted citizenship and be enfranchised in all other lands. Yehoshafat Harkabi noted that Rabbi Meir Kahane wrote in modern times,

"The Arabs of Israel are a desecration of God's name. Their non-acceptance of Jewish sovereignty over the Land of Israel is a rejection of the sovereignty of the God of Israel and of his kingdom. Removing them from the land is therefore more than a political matter. It is a religious matter, a religious obligation to wipe out the desecration of God's name. Instead of worrying about the reactions of the Gentiles if we act, we should tremble at the thought of God's wrath if we do not act. Tragedy will befall us if we do not remove the Arabs from the land, since redemption can come at once in its full glory if we do, as God commands us. . . . Let us remove the Arabs from Israel and hasten the Redemption (*Thorns in Your Eyes*, pp. 244-245)."¹⁵⁰⁶

Yehoshafat Harkabi noted that Maimonides wrote long ago,

"An affirmative precept is enjoined for the destruction of idolatry and its worshippers, and everything made for its sake. . . . In the Land of Israel, it is a duty actively to chase out idolatry until we have exterminated it from the whole of our country. Outside of the holy land, however, we are not so commanded; but only that whenever we acquire any territory by conquest, we should destroy all the idolatry found there (*Hilkhoh Avodah Zara*, ch. 7:1)."¹⁵⁰⁷

and,

"It is forbidden to show them mercy, as it was said, 'nor show mercy unto them' (Deut. 7:2). Hence, if one sees one of them who worships idols

perishing or drowning, one is not to save him. . . . Hence you learn that it is forbidden to heal idolators even for a fee. But if one is afraid of them or apprehends that refusal might cause ill will, medical treatment may be given for a fee but not gratuitously. . . . The foregoing rules apply to the time when the people of Israel live exiled among the nations, or when the Gentiles' power is predominant. But when Israel is predominant over the nations of the world, we are forbidden to permit a gentile who is an idolator to dwell among us. He must not enter our land, even as a temporary resident; or even as a traveler, journeying with merchandise from place to place, until he has undertaken to keep the seven precepts which the Noachides were commanded to observe (*Hilkhot Avodah Zara*, ch. 10:8).¹⁵⁰⁸

Philo the Jew also records that attempts were planned to bribe Helicon, but that he could not be bribed, and to control Caligula through Macro, who was close friends with Flaccus of Alexandria—at that time friendly to the Jews of Alexandria; and Philo records conversations that must either have been the product of his imagination, or the result of the corrupt use of agents within the Roman government. It appears that the schemes and conspiracies alleged in Philo's writings did not occur, but that he and others were the ones attempting to exert their influence in Rome and sought to maintain a privileged status at the expense of others. Philo relentlessly smears Caligula and Gentile peoples. The ancient slanders against Caligula are actually quite similar to the life history of Mausolus, whose tomb was one of the seven wonders of the ancient world. It was an Old Testament habit for Jews to defame all other peoples and to plagiarize their beliefs and their historical stories.

Philo threatens that a Jewish God will punish all who contradict the wishes of the Jews and sees no hypocrisy in his demand that all people on Earth obey Jewish law, lest there be civil war instigated by Jews; while the Jews refused to obey the laws of Rome. Philo wrote, quoting Caligula,

“‘If any people in the bordering countries, with the exception of the metropolis itself, wishing to erect altars or temples, nay, images of statues, in honour of me and of my family are hindered from doing so, I charge you at once to punish those who attempt to hinder them, or else to bring them before the tribunal.’ (335) Now this was nothing else but a beginning of seditions and civil wars, and an indirect way of annulling the gift which he appeared to be granting. For some men, more out of a desire of mortifying the Jews than from any feelings of loyalty towards Gaius, were inclined to fill the whole country with erections of one kind or another. But they who beheld the violation of their national customs practised before their eyes were resolved above all things not to endure such an injury unresistingly.”¹⁵⁰⁹

Great enmity existed between the Egyptians, Greeks and Jews of Alexandria; in part because the Jews maintained themselves as a privileged and segregated class. As often happens in places of great wealth discrepancy and wealth condensation, Egyptians and Greeks looted Jewish estates in their quest for social justice.

According to Philo, Flaccus reduced the two Jewish sectors of the city into one smaller parcel and quarantined the Jews in it. According to Josephus, three ambassadors of Alexandria called upon the Emperor. One of the ambassadors, Apion, criticized the Jews.¹⁵¹⁰ Another ambassador was Philo the Jew, who was the brother of the wealthiest man in the world, Alexander Lysimachus. Philo's own accounts, however, reveal that Josephus misrepresented the history. Though it appears that Philo was himself a liar, and Josephus simply corrupted Philo's fantasies. There is, however, redeeming value in analyzing their accounts, which exhibit Jewish double standards and duplicity in the ancient world.

There were, in Philo's accounts, two meetings of the embassies of Jewish Alexandria with Caligula (Gaius or Caius). Philo the Jew, who attended both meetings, makes no mention of Apion. Whereas Philo himself stated that the Emperor treated him cordially at the first meeting,

“For it appeared good to present to Gaius a memorial, containing a summary of what we had suffered, and of the way in which we considered that we deserved to be treated; (179) and this memorial was nearly an abridgment of a longer petition which we had sent to him a short time before, by the hand of king Agrippa; for he, by chance, was staying for a short time in the city, while on his way into Syria to take possession of the kingdom which had been given to him; (180) but we, without being aware of it, were deceiving ourselves, for before also we had done the same, when we originally began to set sail, thinking that as we were going before a judge we should meet with justice; but he was in reality an irreconcilable enemy to us, attracting us, as far as appearance went, with favourable looks and cheerful address; (181) for, receiving us favourably at first, in the plains on the banks of the Tiber (for he happened to be walking about in his mother's garden), he conversed with us formally, and waved his right hand to us in a protecting manner, giving us significant tokens of his good will, and having sent to us the secretary, whose duty it was to attend to the embassies that arrived, Obulus by name, he said, ‘I myself will listen to what you have to say at the first favourable opportunity.’

So that all those who stood around congratulated us as if we had already carried our point, and so did all those of our own people, who are influenced by superficial appearances. (182) But I myself, who was accounted to be possessed of superior prudence, both on account of my age and my education, and general information, was less sanguine in respect of the matters at which the others were so greatly delighted. ‘For why,’ said I, after pondering the matter deeply in my own heart, ‘why, when there have been such numbers of ambassadors, who have come, one may almost say, from every corner of the globe, did he say on that occasion that he would hear what we had to say, and no one else? What could have been his meaning? for he was not ignorant that we were Jews, who would have been quite content at not being treated worse than the others; (183) but to expect to be looked upon as worthy to receive especial privileges and precedence, by a master

who was of a different nation and a young man and an absolute monarch, would have seemed like insanity. But it would seem that he was showing civility to the whole district of the Alexandrians, to which he was thus giving a privilege, when promising to give his decision speedily; unless, indeed, disregarding the character of a fair and impartial hearer, he was intending to be a fellow suitor with our adversaries and an enemy of ours, instead of behaving like a judge.”¹⁵¹¹

Josephus misrepresented the story in his *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book 18, Chapter 8, and stated that the Emperor, angered by what Apion (a person Josephus wished to defame) had allegedly told him, refused to hear Philo the Jew, and only then ordered that a statue of Caligula be erected in the Temple. Josephus wrote,

“CHAPTER VIII.

Embassy of the Jews to Caius—Caius sends Petronius
into Syria to make war against the Jews.

THERE was now a tumult arisen at Alexandria, between the Jewish inhabitants and the Greeks; and three ambassadors were chosen out of each party that were at variance, who came to Caius. Now one of these ambassadors from the people of Alexandria was Apion, (29) who uttered many blasphemies against the Jews; and, among other things that he said, he charged them with neglecting the honors that belonged to Caesar; for that while all who were subject to the Roman empire built altars and temples to Caius, and in other regards universally received him as they received the gods, these Jews alone thought it a dishonorable thing for them to erect statues in honor of him, as well as to swear by his name. Many of these severe things were said by Apion, by which he hoped to provoke Caius to anger at the Jews, as he was likely to be. But Philo, the principal of the Jewish embassy, a man eminent on all accounts, brother to Alexander the alabarch, (30) and one not unskillful in philosophy, was ready to betake himself to make his defense against those accusations; but Caius prohibited him, and bid him begone; he was also in such a rage, that it openly appeared he was about to do them some very great mischief. So Philo being thus affronted, went out, and said to those Jews who were about him, that they should be of good courage, since Caius’s words indeed showed anger at them, but in reality had already set God against himself.

Hereupon Caius, taking it very heinously that he should be thus despised by the Jews alone, sent Petronius to be president of Syria, and successor in the government to Vitellius, and gave him order to make an invasion into Judea, with a great body of troops; and if they would admit of his statue willingly, to erect it in the temple of God; but if they were obstinate, to conquer them by war, and then to do it. Accordingly, Petronius took the government of Syria, and made haste to obey Caesar’s epistle. He got

together as great a number of auxiliaries as he possibly could, and took with him two legions of the Roman army, and came to Ptolemais, and there wintered, as intending to set about the war in the spring. He also wrote word to Caius what he had resolved to do, who commended him for his alacrity, and ordered him to go on, and to make war with them, in case they would not obey his commands. But there came many ten thousands of the Jews to Petronius, to Ptolemais, to offer their petitions to him, that he would not compel them to transgress and violate the law of their forefathers; 'but if,' said they, 'thou art entirely resolved to bring this statue, and erect it, do thou first kill us, and then do what thou hast resolved on; for while we are alive we cannot permit such things as are forbidden us to be done by the authority of our legislator, and by our forefathers' determination that such prohibitions are instances of virtue.' But Petronius was angry at them, and said, 'If indeed I were myself emperor, and were at liberty to follow my own inclination, and then had designed to act thus, these your words would be justly spoken to me; but now Caesar hath sent to me, I am under the necessity of being subservient to his decrees, because a disobedience to them will bring upon me inevitable destruction.' Then the Jews replied, 'Since, therefore, thou art so disposed, O Petronius! that thou wilt not disobey Caius's epistles, neither will we transgress the commands of our law; and as we depend upon the excellency of our laws, and, by the labors of our ancestors, have continued hitherto without suffering them to be transgressed, we dare not by any means suffer ourselves to be so timorous as to transgress those laws out of the fear of death, which God hath determined are for our advantage; and if we fall into misfortunes, we will bear them, in order to preserve our laws, as knowing that those who expose themselves to dangers have good hope of escaping them, because God will stand on our side, when, out of regard to him, we undergo afflictions, and sustain the uncertain turns of fortune. But if we should submit to thee, we should be greatly reproached for our cowardice, as thereby showing ourselves ready to transgress our law; and we should incur the great anger of God also, who, even thyself being judge, is superior to Caius.'

When Petronius saw by their words that their determination was hard to be removed, and that, without a war, he should not be able to be subservient to Caius in the dedication of his statue, and that there must be a great deal of bloodshed, he took his friends, and the servants that were about him, and hasted to Tiberias, as wanting to know in what posture the affairs of the Jews were; and many ten thousands of the Jews met Petronius again, when he was come to Tiberias. These thought they must run a mighty hazard if they should have a war with the Romans, but judged that the transgression of the law was of much greater consequence, and made supplication to him, that he would by no means reduce them to such distresses, nor defile their city with the dedication of the statue. Then Petronius said to them, 'Will you then make war with Caesar, without considering his great preparations for war, and your own weakness?' They replied, 'We will not by any means make war with

him, but still we will die before we see our laws transgressed.’ So they threw themselves down upon their faces, and stretched out their throats, and said they were ready to be slain; and this they did for forty days together, and in the mean time left off the tilling of their ground, and that while the season of the year required them to sow it. (31) Thus they continued firm in their resolution, and proposed to themselves to die willingly, rather than to see the dedication of the statue.

When matters were in this state, Aristobulus, king Agrippa’s brother, and Heleias the Great, and the other principal men of that family with them, went in unto Petronius, and besought him, that since he saw the resolution of the multitude, he would not make any alteration, and thereby drive them to despair; but would write to Caius, that the Jews had an insuperable aversion to the reception of the statue, and how they continued with him, and left of the tillage off their ground: that they were not willing to go to war with him, because they were not able to do it, but were ready to die with pleasure, rather than suffer their laws to be transgressed: and how, upon the land’s continuing unsown, robberies would grow up, on the inability they would be under of paying their tributes; and that Caius might be thereby moved to pity, and not order any barbarous action to be done to them, nor think of destroying the nation: that if he continues inflexible in his former opinion to bring a war upon them, he may then set about it himself. And thus did Aristobulus, and the rest with him, supplicate Petronius. So Petronius, (32) partly on account of the pressing instances which Aristobulus and the rest with him made, and because of the great consequence of what they desired, and the earnestness wherewith they made their supplication, — partly on account of the firmness of the opposition made by the Jews, which he saw, while he thought it a terrible thing for him to be such a slave to the madness of Caius, as to slay so many ten thousand men, only because of their religious disposition towards God, and after that to pass his life in expectation of punishment; Petronius, I say, thought it much better to send to Caius, and to let him know how intolerable it was to him to bear the anger he might have against him for not serving him sooner, in obedience to his epistle, for that perhaps he might persuade him; and that if this mad resolution continued, he might then begin the war against them; nay, that in case he should turn his hatred against himself, it was fit for virtuous persons even to die for the sake of such vast multitudes of men. Accordingly, he determined to hearken to the petitioners in this matter.

He then called the Jews together to Tiberias, who came many ten thousands in number; he also placed that army he now had with him opposite to them; but did not discover his own meaning, but the commands of the emperor, and told them that his wrath would, without delay, be executed on such as had the courage to disobey what he had commanded, and this immediately; and that it was fit for him, who had obtained so great a dignity by his grant, not to contradict him in any thing: — ‘yet,’ said he, ‘I do not think it just to have such a regard to my own safety and honor, as to refuse

to sacrifice them for your preservation, who are so many in number, and endeavor to preserve the regard that is due to your law; which as it hath come down to you from your forefathers, so do you esteem it worthy of your utmost contention to preserve it: nor, with the supreme assistance and power of God, will I be so hardy as to suffer your temple to fall into contempt by the means of the imperial authority. I will, therefore, send to Caius, and let him know what your resolutions are, and will assist your suit as far as I am able, that you may not be exposed to suffer on account of the honest designs you have proposed to yourselves; and may God be your assistant, for his authority is beyond all the contrivance and power of men; and may he procure you the preservation of your ancient laws, and may not he be deprived, though without your consent, of his accustomed honors. But if Caius be irritated, and turn the violence of his rage upon me, I will rather undergo all that danger and that affliction that may come either on my body or my soul, than see so many of you to perish, while you are acting in so excellent a manner. Do you, therefore, every one of you, go your way about your own occupations, and fall to the cultivation of your ground; I will myself send to Rome, and will not refuse to serve you in all things, both by myself and by my friends.'

When Petronius had said this, and had dismissed rite assembly of the Jews, he desired the principal of them to take care of their husbandry, and to speak kindly to the people, and encourage them to have good hope of their affairs. Thus did he readily bring the multitude to be cheerful again. And now did God show his presence to Petronius, and signify to him that he would afford him his assistance in his whole design; for he had no sooner finished the speech that he made to the Jews, but God sent down great showers of rain, contrary to human expectation; (33) for that day was a clear day, and gave no sign, by the appearance of the sky, of any rain; nay, the whole year had been subject to a great drought, and made men despair of any water from above, even when at any time they saw the heavens overcast with clouds; insomuch that when such a great quantity of rain came, and that in an unusual manner, and without any other expectation of it, the Jews hoped that Petronius would by no means fail in his petition for them. But as to Petronius, he was mightily surprised when he perceived that God evidently took care of the Jews, and gave very plain signs of his appearance, and this to such a degree, that those that were in earnest much inclined to the contrary had no power left to contradict it. This was also among those other particulars which he wrote to Caius, which all tended to dissuade him, and by all means to entreat him not to make so many ten thousands of these men go distracted; whom, if he should slay, (for without war they would by no means suffer the laws of their worship to be set aside,) he would lose the revenue they paid him, and would be publicly cursed by them for all future ages. Moreover, that God, who was their Governor, had shown his power most evidently on their account, and that such a power of his as left no room for doubt about it. And this was the business that Petronius was now engaged

in.

But King Agrippa, who now lived at Rome, was more and more in the favor of Caius; and when he had once made him a supper, and was careful to exceed all others, both in expenses and in such preparations as might contribute most to his pleasure; nay, it was so far from the ability of others, that Caius himself could never equal, much less exceed it (such care had he taken beforehand to exceed all men, and particularly to make all agreeable to Caesar); hereupon Caius admired his understanding and magnificence, that he should force himself to do all to please him, even beyond such expenses as he could bear, and was desirous not to be behind Agrippa in that generosity which he exerted in order to please him. So Caius, when he had drunk wine plentifully, and was merrier than ordinary, said thus during the feast, when Agrippa had drunk to him: 'I knew before now how great a respect thou hast had for me, and how great kindness thou hast shown me, though with those hazards to thyself, which thou underwentest under Tiberius on that account; nor hast thou omitted any thing to show thy goodwill towards us, even beyond thy ability; whence it would be a base thing for me to be conquered by thy affection. I am therefore desirous to make thee amends for every thing in which I have been formerly deficient; for all that I have bestowed on thee, that may be called my gifts, is but little. Everything that may contribute to thy happiness shall be at thy service, and that cheerfully, and so far as my ability will reach.' (34) And this was what Caius said to Agrippa, thinking he would ask for some large country, or the revenues of certain cities. But although he had prepared beforehand what he would ask, yet had he not discovered his intentions, but made this answer to Caius immediately: That it was not out of any expectation of gain that he formerly paid his respects to him, contrary to the commands of Tiberius, nor did he now do any thing relating to him out of regard to his own advantage, and in order to receive any thing from him; that the gifts he had already bestowed upon him were great, and beyond the hopes of even a craving man; for although they may be beneath thy power, [who art the donor,] yet are they greater than my inclination and dignity, who am the receiver. And as Caius was astonished at Agrippa's inclinations, and still the more pressed him to make his request for somewhat which he might gratify him with, Agrippa replied, 'Since thou, O my lord! declarest such is thy readiness to grant, that I am worthy of thy gifts, I will ask nothing relating to my own felicity; for what thou hast already bestowed on me has made me excel therein; but I desire somewhat which may make thee glorious for piety, and render the Divinity assistant to thy designs, and may be for an honor to me among those that inquire about it, as showing that I never once fail of obtaining what I desire of thee; for my petition is this, that thou wilt no longer think of the dedication of that statue which thou hast ordered to be set up in the Jewish temple by Petronius.'

And thus did Agrippa venture to cast the die upon this occasion, so great was the affair in his opinion, and in reality, though he knew how dangerous

a thing it was so to speak; for had not Caius approved of it, it had tended to no less than the loss of his life. So Caius, who was mightily taken with Agrippa's obliging behavior, and on other accounts thinking it a dishonorable thing to be guilty of falsehood before so many witnesses, in points wherein he had with such alacrity forced Agrippa to become a petitioner, and that it would look as if he had already repented of what he had said, and because he greatly admired Agrippa's virtue, in not desiring him at all to augment his own dominions, either with larger revenues, or other authority, but took care of the public tranquillity, of the laws, and of the Divinity itself, he granted him what he had requested. He also wrote thus to Petronius, commending him for his assembling his army, and then consulting him about these affairs. 'If therefore,' said he, 'thou hast already erected my statue, let it stand; but if thou hast not yet dedicated it, do not trouble thyself further about it, but dismiss thy army, go back, and take care of those affairs which I sent thee about at first, for I have now no occasion for the erection of that statue. This I have granted as a favor to Agrippa, a man whom I honor so very greatly, that I am not able to contradict what he would have, or what he desired me to do for him.' And this was what Caius wrote to Petronius, which was before he received his letter, informing him that the Jews were very ready to revolt about the statue, and that they seemed resolved to threaten war against the Romans, and nothing else. When therefore Caius was much displeased that any attempt should be made against his government as he was a slave to base and vicious actions on all occasions, and had no regard to what was virtuous and honorable, and against whomsoever he resolved to show his anger, and that for any cause whatsoever, he suffered not himself to be restrained by any admonition, but thought the indulging his anger to be a real pleasure, he wrote thus to Petronius: 'Seeing thou esteemest the presents made thee by the Jews to be of greater value than my commands, and art grown insolent enough to be subservient to their pleasure, I charge thee to become thy own judge, and to consider what thou art to do, now thou art under my displeasure; for I will make thee an example to the present and to all future ages, that they may not dare to contradict the commands of their emperor.'

This was the epistle which Caius wrote to Petronius; but Petronius did not receive it while Caius was alive, that ship which carried it sailing so slow, that other letters came to Petronius before this, by which he understood that Caius was dead; for God would not forget the dangers Petronius had undertaken on account of the Jews, and of his own honor. But when he had taken Caius away, out of his indignation of what he had so insolently attempted in assuming to himself divine worship, both Rome and all that dominion conspired with Petronius, especially those that were of the senatorian order, to give Caius his due reward, because he had been unmercifully severe to them; for he died not long after he had written to Petronius that epistle which threatened him with death. But as for the occasion of his death, and the nature of the plot against him, I shall relate

them in the progress of this narration. Now that epistle which informed Petronius of Caius's death came first, and a little afterward came that which commanded him to kill himself with his own hands. Whereupon he rejoiced at this coincidence as to the death of Caius, and admired God's providence, who, without the least delay, and immediately, gave him a reward for the regard he had to the temple, and the assistance he afforded the Jews for avoiding the dangers they were in. And by this means Petronius escaped that danger of death, which he could not foresee."¹⁵¹²

Note the Greek-like fairytale nature of Josephus' religious story, with its superstitious threats by God, its miracles and omens, its morals, its cunning heroes and villains, and its fatalistic resolution through divine wisdom making all right in the world, demonstrating the power of the Jewish God and the blessings received by those who obeyed His will, and the fall of those who disobeyed it through fatal hubris.

According to Josephus' spurious account, after being refused an audience with the Emperor, Philo the Jew then slandered the Emperor and threatened him, declaring that God would exact vengeance upon him. In his alleged anger, the Emperor ordered that Publius Petronius be made president of Syria and sent him to Judea with Roman armies to erect a statue of the Emperor in the Temple, demanding that the Jews worship Caligula as god.

However, Philo the Jew, quoting another, informs us that Caligula had already issued his order that his image appear in the Temple in the form of statue before meeting with the ambassadors, the first time,

“And he with difficulty, sobbing aloud, and in a broken voice, spoke as follows: ‘Our temple is destroyed! Gaius has ordered a colossal statue of himself to be erected in the holy of holies, having his own name inscribed upon it with the title of Jupiter!’”¹⁵¹³

Josephus' account contradicts Philo the Jew's own account, that it was the Jews' destruction of a shrine to Caligula in Jamnia that provoked Caligula to retaliate by demanding that they place a statue of him in the Temple. In addition, whereas Philo accuses Helicon of putting thoughts into Caligula's head, Josephus changes the story to blame Apion—the same Josephus who made such a show of declaring his honesty and virtue as a historian, while defaming the Greeks, in his work *Against Apion*—in which Josephus recklessly defames Apion and the Egyptians with still more shrill lies. Of course, the fact that Josephus' account is dishonest does not render Philo's account accurate, though it is certainly more plausible.

The entire story appears to be a canard meant to artificially fulfil prophecies and may simply be a repetition of the story of Antiochus Epiphanes, who was also said to be mad, and who also desecrated the Temple with a statue of a foreign god, and who had pigs sacrificed at the altar of the Temple which he converted to the worship of Zeus. Antiochus Epiphanes was said to be the first of a line of what Christians call the “anti-Christ”; and Jews fear that another anti-Messiah will rise in Syria, which

may well explain why the Neo-Conservative Jews in America are pushing America towards war with Syria, another obvious reason being their desire for a greater Israel from the Nile to the Euphrates, and perhaps most ominously *Isaiah* 17:1 states, “The burden of Damascus. Behold, Damascus *is* taken away from *being* a city, and it shall be a ruinous heap.”

Some doubt whether the Temple actually was at the site of the Dome of the Rock and the Al Aqsa Mosque. The Roman Emperor Hadrian built a temple of Jupiter on the site claimed for the Jewish Temple, and the remains which are extant today of an ancient temple may be the remains of Hadrian’s temple to Jupiter. The supposed first Temple of Solomon probably never existed. The Samaritans placed Solomon’s Temple at Mount Gerizim (*John* 4:20).¹⁵¹⁴ Some hold that the Temple was at the Gihon Spring, which made a better location for a temple, given that it had a spring available to wash away the blood from sacrifices.¹⁵¹⁵

According to Josephus, the Jews declared that they would die before they would see the Temple defiled. In his story, the Jews lay with their throats bare for forty nights aware that war with the Romans was futile and declared that they should be killed before their laws were defiled and their Temple desecrated—an account that is false on its face. According to Josephus, Publius Petronius, speaking as if a monotheistic Jew himself (Philo implies that Petronius, Augustus and Julia Augusta were Jewish converts), declared that he could not commit such an injustice against a people behaving so nobly and called upon the “power of God” to help him persuade the Emperor to change his mind. This speech is a figment of Josephus’ imagination. According to Josephus, Petronius sent out a letter informing Caligula that he would rather die himself than follow such an unfair order. This, too, is a figment of Josephus’ imagination. The letter instead attempted to persuade Caligula that it would be impractical to place the statue in the Temple before the crops were harvested and gave other justifications for delay.

In Philo’s account, it was the Jewish King Agrippa who courted death, not the Roman Petronius. Philo reproduced Agrippa’s supposed words,

“O master, that your Agrippa may not be driven wholly to forsake life; for I shall appear (if you do not do so) to have been released from bondage, not for the purpose of being saved, but for that of being made to perish in a more conspicuous manner. [***] command me at once to be put out of the way. For what advantage would it be to me to live, who place my whole hopes of safety and happiness in your friendship and favour?”¹⁵¹⁶

Not only did Petronius not offer to commit suicide, Philo tells us that he planned to run away to Alexandria,

“[Petronius] himself was intending, as is said, to sail to Alexandria in Egypt[.]”¹⁵¹⁷

During this period of civil disobedience, the Jews could not attend to their occupations and so could not pay tribute to the Romans, and, should the Romans

murder them, could never increase the wealth of Rome. While a sit-down strike may have occurred, it did not occur in the fashion of Josephus' fancy. The Jewish King Herod Agrippa was closely associated with, and literally indebted to, Alexander Lysimachus, Philo the Jew's wealthy brother, and to Caligula who had made him King.

According to Josephus, Herod Agrippa tricked Caligula, his friend and supporter. King Herod Agrippa, who oppressed the first followers of Christ (*Acts 12*) and ruled over the lands of Judea—intervened on behalf of the Jews by getting Caligula drunk and flattering him, compelling Caligula to offer Agrippa, the man he had made King, such graces in return, lest he appear less noble than Agrippa. According to Josephus' accounts, when Caligula asked Agrippa what it is that he might desire, Agrippa asked Caligula to free the Jews from the requirement of erecting a statue to the worship of Caligula in the Temple. Caligula allegedly agreed.

In the meanwhile, according to Josephus' fictional account, Publius Petronius' letter reached Caligula, who ordered that Publius Petronius must follow through on his pledge to kill himself before committing such an injustice against so many good people. Amazingly, Caligula was assassinated by Cassius Chaerea of the Prætorian Guard before his letter reached Publius Petronius, and so slow was the ship dispatched to deliver his order to Publius Petronius, that news of Caligula's assassination reached Publius Petronius before Caligula's letter, and both Publius Petronius and the sanctity of the Temple were spared by divine providence. This story of guile is a fabrication meant to save Agrippa's honor, the honor of the Temple and of the Jewish people; while concomitantly smearing the Romans and threatening all with the power of the Jewish God.

We must be on guard against the ethnic bias shown by "historians" like Josephus, who fantasize and distort in order to embellish their image and the image of their people, while smearing others. (It would be inappropriate and cumbersome to name all of the discrepancies between Josephus' and Philo's story in this place.) Max Born and Philipp Frank lied about events in the early 1920's in much the same way Josephus lied about the history of Caligula—in order to protect the image of their humiliated saint and to smear those who opposed Einstein with deliberate lies. Jewish tribalism has many ill effects and the dishonesty of no small number of Jewish historians is one of them.

Contrary to the accounts of Josephus, Philo the Jew stated that Agrippa coincidentally called upon Caligula and had no knowledge of the unfolding events. Caligula communicated to Agrippa that something was terribly wrong by staring through him, and then informed Agrippa of his plan to place a statue of himself in the Temple, at which point Agrippa went into shock and passed out. When he had somewhat recovered—with the help of drugs—Agrippa wrote a long and passionate letter to Caligula, pleading with him to not defile the Temple. Caligula appeared to relent somewhat and wrote to Petronius. However, Philo makes clear that this was a delaying tactic by Caligula, one made after Petronius' deceitful delaying tactics. Caligula constructed an even greater statue in Rome than that which he had ordered Petronius, governor of Syria, to construct in Sidon. In this way, Caligula was able to install the statue in the Temple before the Jews could in any way organize to obstruct

him. He had used their tactics against them and outwitted them. Philo wrote,

“What advantage, then, was gained? some one will say; for even when they were quiet, Gaius was not quiet; but he had already repented of the favour which he had showed to Agrippa, and had re-kindled the desires which he had entertained a little while before; for he commanded another statue to be made, of colossal size, of brass gilt over, in Rome, no longer moving the one which had been made in Sidon, in order that the people might not be excited by its being moved, but that while they remained in a state of tranquillity and felt released from their suspicions, it might in a period of peace be suddenly brought to the country in a ship, and be suddenly erected without the multitude being aware of what was going on.

XLIII. (338) And he was intending to do this while on his voyage along the coast during the period which he had allotted for his sojourn in Egypt. For an indescribable desire occupied his mind to see Alexandria, to which he was eager to go with all imaginable haste, and when he had arrived there he intended to remain a considerable time, urging that the deification about which he was so anxious, might easily be originated and carried to a great height in that city above all others, and then that it would be a model to all other cities of the adoration to which he was entitled, inasmuch as it was the greatest of all the cities of the east, and built in the finest situation in the world. For all inferior men and nations are eager to imitate great men and great states.”¹⁵¹⁸

Though Josephus would have us believe that the sanctity of the Temple was preserved through the wit and cunning of Agrippa, the humanity of Petronius who had converted to Judaism, and the will of God; Philo the Jew informs us that all the synagogues in the world were violated with statues of Caligula, and the Temple, the holy of holies, was indeed made a temple to Caligula, and that Philo the Jew and all the ambassadors of the Jews recanted and worshiped Caligula as the god Jupiter,

“So great therefore was his inequality of temper towards every one, and most especially towards the nation of the Jews to which he was most bitterly hostile, and accordingly beginning in Alexandria he took from them all their synagogues there, and in the other cities, and filled them all with images and statues of his own form; for not caring about any other erection of any kind, he set up his own statue every where by main force; and the great temple in the holy city, which was left untouched to the last, having been thought worthy of all possible respect and preservation, he altered and transformed into a temple of his own, that he might call it the temple of the new Jupiter, the illustrious Gaius. [***] We have now related in a concise and summary manner the cause of the hatred of Gaius to the whole nation of the Jews; we must now proceed to make our palinode to Gaius.”¹⁵¹⁹

The fact that Philo the Jew’s account differs from Josephus’ account does not

mean that either man told the truth. Josephus, however, has been discredited and his story is false on its face, with its physical impossibilities. Philo was a participant in the events. Artifacts from the period confirm Philo's story to the extent that Jewish religious artifacts and temple carvings from the period bear images of Roman gods.

It would be very interesting to discover that Jews, or Jewish Christians, not the Romans, were the ones to destroy the Jewish Temple, which had been desecrated by the statue, the idol, of a foreign god. Such an event would be in keeping with the story of Christ and would explain the dispersal of the Jews as their self-fulfillment of Judaic prophetic myth. The Jews were bound by God to destroy any and all idolatrous temples in Jerusalem, and if Philo's story is true, the Jews were duty bound to ruin the formerly Jewish Temple and all others like it. It would be like them to blame this on the Romans and use the hatred of the Romans as a means to preserve what was left of the unity of their disintegrating nation.

Caligula was not the only Roman Emperor who has been smeared by historians in order to preserve Jewish honor. Nero has been blamed for the burning of Rome, which was more likely carried out by Jews, who resented being forced to worship Roman gods and the Emperor of Rome, and who resented the Roman occupation. Though it is claimed that Nero blamed the Christians for the fire in order to deflect suspicions that he had set it, others have claimed that Nero's Jewish wife Poppæa urged him to blame the Christians¹⁵²⁰ in order to protect the Jews from retaliation against them, and is so doing not only burned Rome, but also put to death many Gentiles who had the audacity to pretend to be Jews. The murders of the Christians often took the form of human sacrifices. Nero is said to have killed Poppæa by kicking her in the stomach while pregnant, which is perhaps symbolic of an attempted abortion. Their first child died as an infant and was declared a deity, almost as if the child were a sacrifice.

The intercession of Poppæa into Roman-Jewish relations is interesting on another point. She allegedly persuaded Nero to allow the Jews to shield the Temple from the Romans' view, so that religious sacrifices could be made in complete privacy. Jews were often accused of human sacrifice and the Old Testament repeatedly mentions Jews sacrificing their children by "passing them through the fire". One bone of contention among more modern Jews who debated Zionism and the reconstruction of the Temple was whether or not the sacrifices of animals should be resumed. Among racist Jews, Gentiles have long been considered animals. Judaism has long called on Gentiles to sacrifice themselves in the name of God in wars fought on Israel's behalf. Esau was destined to soldier for Jacob.

Idolatry was nothing new to the Jews. Solomon was an idolater who supposedly constructed the Temple with magic, employing both demons and angels to build it. This is an instance of Jewish Dualism, the belief that ultimate power can only be attained by the use of both good and evil forces, both of which stem from God. Posidonius and Apollonius Molo charged the Jews with worshiping the head of an ass. When Moses came down from Mount Sinai with the Commandments, he found his brother Aaron and their people worshiping a Golden Calf they had made from golden earrings molten in a pot (*Exodus* 32). Some believe that Jewish sects to this day worship the Golden Calf, which is symbolic of wealth accumulation, and in

some minds, of the “Beast” Baal. The Hebrews called God “Baal” and Jacob called God “El”, who was Baal’s father. The Frankists openly advocated the deliberate practice of evil, accused fellow Jews of using Christian blood in their rituals, and taught their followers to, “acquire wealth even in deceitful and crooked ways.”¹⁵²¹

Jews oftentimes worshiped the earthly and devilish “Covenant of Baal” (*Exodus* 32. *Leviticus* 26:30. *Numbers* 22:41. *Judges* 6:25, 31; 8:33; 9:4; 11:31, 39. *I Kings* 14:22-24; 16:31-33; 18:18-19, 26; 19:10, 14, 18; 22:53. *II Kings* 3:2-3; 8:18, 27; 10:18-28; 11:18; 16:3-4; 17:10, 16-18, 23; 18:4-5; 21:6; 22:5; 23:5, 12, 32, 37; 24:9, 19. *I Chronicles* 12:5 (“Bealiah”); *II Chronicles* 23:17; 24:7; 28:1-4. *Jeremiah* 7:3, 9, 31; 11:12-13; 17:2; 19:5, 13; 32:29, 35. *Ezekiel* 14:11. *Hosea* 2:16)—a. k. a. Baal-Berith (*Judges* 8:33, 9:4), also called El-Berith (*Judges* 9:46), Baal-Zebub (*II Kings*, 1:2, 3, 6, 16. *Shabbath* 83b. *Sanhedrin* 63b), Baal-Peor (*Numbers* 25:1-9, 18; 31:16. *Deuteronomy* 3:29. *Joshua* 22:17. *Hosea* 9:10. *Psalms* 106:28 [eating the sacrifices of the dead]), Baal-Habab, Baal-Moloch (*II Chronicles* 28:1-4)—the God of Flies, the Golden Calf, the religion of Devil worship and human sacrifices (*Genesis* 22:1-18. *Exodus* 8:26; 13:2. *Leviticus* 27:28-29. *Joshua* 13:14. *Judges* 11:31, 39. *I Kings* 13:1-2. *II Kings* 16:3-4; 17:17; 21:6; 23:20-25. *II Chronicles* 28:1-4. *Jeremiah* 7:3; 19:5; 32:35. *Ezekiel* 16:20-21; 20:26, 31; 23:37.)

Ancient Jews kept secrets hidden behind the screen of the Temple in the Holy of Holies. The Temple had a secret area where only the High Priest was allowed to enter and it contained the Ark of the Covenant. The Ark was covered in gold, and embellished with golden rings, which facilitated movement and which might have been symbolic of the Golden Calf and of the earrings used to make it. Might the Ark have contained the Golden Calf? Aaron, who had introduced the worship of the Golden Calf, was the first High Priest. The cover of the Ark had two Cherubim on it, which were forbidden by the very Commandments it was said to house:

“3 Thou shalt have no other gods before me. 4 Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of *any thing* that *is* in heaven above, or that *is* in the earth beneath, or that *is* in the water under the earth: 5 Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God *am* a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth *generation* of them that hate me;”—*Exodus* 20:3-5

Solomon’s Temple contained Solomon’s Molten Sea—a giant pot perhaps symbolizing the smelting pot used to melt the gold Aaron used to cast the Golden Calf. The Molten Sea sat upon twelve oxen, three facing each of the four points of the compass, or the winds (*I Kings* 7:23-26. *II Chronicles* 4:2-5, 15) of Baal. God commanded that golden offerings be made to the Ark (*I Samuel* 6:8). Solomon’s Temple was filled with carved Cherubim covered in Gold. The oracle and its *giant* Cherubim were covered in gold (*I Kings* 6). The forbidden images of angels might well have been erected in reverence of the fallen angels said to have bred with human females and to have introduced evil to the world (*Genesis* 6:1-5. *I Enoch*) and may have reflected the tradition of Dualism present in the story of Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel, and Jacob and Esau.

The New Testament ascribes Satanic aspects to some Jews. *John* 8:44-45 states,

“Ye are of *your* father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it. And because I tell *you* the truth, ye believe me not.”

Revelation 2:9:

“I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich) and I *know* the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but *are* the synagogue of Satan.”

Revelation 3:9:

“Behold, I will make them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie; behold, I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee.”

John 7:1 tells that,

“After these *things* Jesus walked in Galilee: for he would not walk in Jewry, because the Jews sought to kill him.”

Caligula did unto the Jews as the Jews did unto others. Ancient Jews were religious zealots blind to their own arrogance and hypocrisy. Philo the Jew’s family, in collusion with Agrippa and Claudius, murdered Caligula. Philo must have been deeply gratified to have served up this revenge upon Caligula—if any of these events actually took place.

Philo the Jew and Josephus went to great lengths to defame Caligula, and their characterizations have prevailed through history. There is, though, another side to the story. Jews hypocritically demanded religious freedom and religious tolerance from others, but forbid others from practicing their religions, from worshiping their gods and idols, from building their temples of perishable materials, in any districts predominantly inhabited by Jews. Alexandrian Jews were resented for their control of markets, tax collecting and corruption, as well as their segregationist religion and nationalism, and the Roman Emperor was not so disliked as they were in the nations—in fact, Caligula was loved and they were often hated. Philo the Jew decries the civil wars he alleges Caligula caused, but only hints at the social injustice and rampant corruption in those cities which prompted revolts against Jews, and Philo admits that the worship of Caligula was only a pretext for attempts to obtain social justice. Philo betrays the religious arrogance and bigotry of the Alexandrian Jews. Quoting Caligula, Philo wrote,

“If any people in the bordering countries, with the exception of the metropolis itself, wishing to erect altars or temples, nay, images of statues, in honour of me and of my family are hindered from doing so, I charge you at once to punish those who attempt to hinder them, or else to bring them before the tribunal.’ (335) Now this was nothing else but a beginning of seditions and civil wars, and an indirect way of annulling the gift which he appeared to be granting. For some men, more out of a desire of mortifying the Jews than from any feelings of loyalty towards Gaius, were inclined to fill the whole country with erections of one kind or another. But they who beheld the violation of their national customs practised before their eyes were resolved above all things not to endure such an injury unresistingly. [***] What is this that you say? Do you, who are a man, seek to take to yourself the air and the heaven, not being content with the vast multitude of continents, and islands, and nations, and countries of which you enjoy the sovereignty? And do you not think any one of the gods who are worshipped in that city or by our people worthy of any country or city or even of any small precinct which may have been consecrated to them in old time, and dedicated to them with oracles and sacred hymns, and are you intending to deprive them of that, that in all the vast circumference of the world there may be no visible trace or memorial to be found of any honour or pious worship paid to the true real living God? (348) Truly you are suggesting fine hopes to the race of mankind; are you ignorant that you are opening the fountains of evils of every kind, making innovations, and committing acts of audacious impiety such as it is wicked to do and even to think of? [***] For if he were to give us up to our enemies, what other city could enjoy tranquillity? What city would there be in which the citizens would not attack the Jews living in it? What synagogue would be left uninjured? What state would not overturn every principle of justice in respect of those of their countrymen who arrayed themselves in opposition to the national laws and customs of the Jews? They will be overthrown, they will be shipwrecked, they will be sent to the bottom, with all the particular laws of the nation, and those too which are common to all and in accordance with the principles of justice recognized in every city.”¹⁵²²

And wealthy Philo betrays another of his motives, one less noble than the preservation of the honor of his religion and that of his nation, which he eventually betrayed,

“For [Caligula’s] designs were prepared against all those in authority and all those possessed of riches, and especially against those in Rome and those in the rest of Italy, by whom such quantities of gold and silver had been treasured up that even if all the riches of all the rest of the habitable world had been collected together from its most distant borders, it would have been found to be very inferior in amount. On this account he began, he, this hater of the citizens, this devourer of the people, this pestilence, this destructive

evil, began to banish all the seeds of peace from his country, as if he were expelling evil from holy ground [***] Is it fitting now to compare with these oracles of Apollo the ill-omened warning of Gaius, by means of which poverty, and dishonor, and banishment, and death were given premature notice of to all those who were in power and authority in any part of the world?"¹⁵²³

After Caligula was assassinated, Claudius took the throne—with the assistance, one might even say, at the insistence of King Agrippa—and exacted vengeance upon the enemies of the Jews. Claudius was intimate friends with Philo the Jew's brother, Alexander Lysimachus, long before the assassination took place. Alexander Lysimachus was also steward to Claudius' mother Antonia. Caligula had imprisoned Alexander Lysimachus. Claudius set Alexander Lysimachus free. Claudius executed the assassins of Caligula, made Agrippa, the Great Herod's grandson, not only King of Judea, but also of Samaria, and Claudius issued an edict in two forms, as repayment to the Jews who had given him the throne,

“Now about this time there was a sedition between the Jews and the Greeks, at the city of Alexandria; for when Caius was dead, the nation of the Jews, which had been very much mortified under the reign of Caius, and reduced to very great distress by the people of Alexandria, recovered itself, and immediately took up their arms to fight for themselves. So Claudius sent an order to the president of Egypt to quiet that tumult; he also sent an edict, at the requests of King Agrippa and King Herod, both to Alexandria and to Syria, whose contents were as follows: ‘Tiberius Claudius Cæsar Augustus Germanicus, high priest, and tribune of the people, ordains thus: Since I am assured that the Jews of Alexandria, called Alexandrians, have been joint inhabitants in the earliest times with the Alexandrians, and have obtained from their kings equal privileges with them, as is evident by the public records that are in their possession, and the edicts themselves; and that after Alexandria had been subjected to our empire by Augustus, their rights and privileges have been preserved by those presidents who have at divers times been sent thither; and that no dispute had been raised about those rights and privileges, even when Aquila was governor of Alexandria; and that when the Jewish ethnarch was dead, Augustus did not prohibit the making such ethnarchs, as willing that all men should be so subject [to the Romans] as to continue in the observation of their own customs, and not be forced to transgress the ancient rules of their own country religion; but that, in the time of Caius, the Alexandrians became insolent towards the Jews that were among them, which Caius, out of his great madness and want of understanding, reduced the nation of the Jews very low, because they would not transgress the religious worship of their country, and call him a god: I will therefore that the nation of the Jews be not deprived of their rights and privileges, on account of the madness of Caius; but that those rights and privileges which they formerly enjoyed be preserved to them, and that they

may continue in their own customs. And I charge both parties to take very great care that no troubles may arise after the promulgation of this edict.’

And such were the contents of this edict on behalf of the Jews that was sent to Alexandria. But the edict that was sent into the other parts of the habitable earth was this which follows: ‘Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, high priest, tribune of the people, chosen consul the second time, ordains thus: Upon the petition of King Agrippa and King Herod, who are persons very dear to me, that I would grant the same rights and privileges should be preserved to the Jews which are in all the Roman empire, which I have granted to those of Alexandria, I very willingly comply therewith; and this grant I make not only for the sake of the petitioners, but as judging those Jews for whom I have been petitioned worthy of such a favor, on account of their fidelity and friendship to the Romans. I think it also very just that no Grecian city should be deprived of such rights and privileges, since they were preserved to them under the great Augustus. It will therefore be fit to permit the Jews, who are in all the world under us, to keep their ancient customs without being hindered so to do. And I do charge them also to use this my kindness to them with moderation, and not to show a contempt of the superstitious observances of other nations, but to keep their own laws only. And I will that this decree of mine be engraven on tables by the magistrates of the cities, and colonies, and municipal places, both those within Italy and those without it, both kings and governors, by the means of the ambassadors, and to have them exposed to the public for full 30 days, in such a place whence it may plainly be read from the ground.’¹⁵²⁴

This edict continued a long tradition of governmental edicts which granted Jews special privileges and which ensured religious tolerance towards Jews, while granting the Jews the privilege of being intolerant. Ancient Jews did not accord the peoples they had vanquished religious freedom and were intolerant even of their neighbors’ religious beliefs, which they forbade and sought to completely destroy. The book of *Ezra*, Chapter 6, provides an example both of the special privileges allegedly accorded to ancient Jews, and of the hatred of ancient Jews against the “heathens”, as well as the use of the Jewish God as a superstitious granter of gifts to those who sponsor the Jews—the gods of various peoples were often used as a threat to curse or to bless enemies or friends in the ancient world, a mythology which continues today (Zionists curried, and curry, favor for their cause among Christians by promising them uninhibited access to the holy sites and the fulfilment of religious prophecy). Note also the use of the wealth of other nations for the construction of the Temple, and the hypocrisy lying in the fact that a monument to Caligula was destroyed by a people who demanded religious tolerance for themselves. It must be borne in mind that the accounts of *Ezra* may be fabrications as may the alleged “roll”:

“Then Darius the king made a decree, and search was made in the house of the rolls, where the treasures were laid up in Babylon. 2 And there was found

at Achmetha, in the palace that *is* in the province of the Medes, a roll, and therein *was* a record thus written: 3 In the first year of Cyrus the king, *the same* Cyrus the king made a decree *concerning* the house of God at Jerusalem, Let the house be builded, the place where they offered sacrifices, and let the foundations thereof be strongly laid; the height thereof threescore cubits, *and* the breadth thereof threescore cubits; 4 *With* three rows of great stones, and a row of new timber: and let the expenses be given out of the king's house: 5 And also let the golden and silver vessels of the house of God, which Nebuchadnezzar took forth out of the temple which *is* at Jerusalem, and brought unto Babylon, be restored, and brought again unto the temple which *is* at Jerusalem, *every one* to his place, and place *them* in the house of God. 6 Now *therefore*, Tatnai, governor beyond the river, Shethar-boznai, and your companions the Apharsachites, which *are* beyond the river, be ye far from thence: 7 Let the work of this house of God alone; let the governor of the Jews and the elders of the Jews build this house of God in his place. 8 Moreover I make a decree what ye shall do to the elders of these Jews for the building of this house of God: that of the king's goods, *even* of the tribute beyond the river, forthwith expenses be given unto these men, that they be not hindered. 9 And that which they have need of, both young bullocks, and rams, and lambs, for the burnt offerings of the God of heaven, wheat, salt, wine, and oil, according to the appointment of the priests which *are* at Jerusalem, let it be given them day by day without fail: 10 That they may offer sacrifices of sweet savors unto the God of heaven, and pray for the life of the king, and of his sons. 11 Also I have made a decree, that whosoever shall alter this word, let timber be pulled down from his house, and being set up, let him be hanged thereon; and let his house be made a dunghill for this. 12 And the God that hath caused his name to dwell there destroy all kings and people, that shall put to their hand to alter *and* to destroy this house of God which *is* at Jerusalem. I Darius have made a decree; let it be done with speed. 13 ¶ Then Tatnai, governor on this side the river, Shethar-boznai, and their companions, according to that which Darius the king had sent, so they did speedily. 14 And the elders of the Jews builded, and they prospered through the prophesying of Haggai the prophet and Zechariah the son of Iddo. And they builded, and finished *it*, according to the commandment of the God of Israel, and according to the commandment of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes king of Persia. 15 And this house was finished on the third day of the month Adar, which was in the sixth year of the reign of Darius the king. 16 ¶ And the children of Israel, the priests, and the Levites, and the rest of the children of the captivity, kept the dedication of this house of God with joy, 17 And offered at the dedication of this house of God a hundred bullocks, two hundred rams, four hundred lambs; and for a sin offering for all Israel, twelve he goats, according to the number of the tribes of Israel. 18 And they set the priests in their divisions, and the Levites in their courses, for the service of God, which is at Jerusalem; as it is written in the book of Moses. 19 ¶ And the children of the captivity kept the passover

upon the fourteenth *day* of the first month. 20 For the priests and the Levites were purified together, all of them *were* pure, and killed the passover for all the children of the captivity, and for their brethren the priests, and for themselves. 21 And the children of Israel, which were come again out of captivity, and all such as had separated themselves unto them from the filthiness of the heathen of the land, to seek the LORD God of Israel, did eat, 22 And kept the feast of unleavened bread seven days with joy: for the LORD had made them joyful, and turned the heart of the king of Assyria unto them, to strengthen their hands in the work of the house of God, the God of Israel.”

Alexander Lysimachus was the wealthiest man in the world. He decorated the Temple with gold. Alexander Lysimachus’ son, Philo the Jew’s nephew, Marcus Julius Alexander married Agrippa’s daughter Bernice. Ironically, Alexander Lysimachus’ other son, Tiberius Julius Alexander, allegedly abandoned Judaism, became procurator of Judea and prefect of Egypt and took part in the attacks on Jerusalem. The facts tend to indicate that the family of Philo the Jew, the wealthiest family in the world, assassinated Caligula in the defense of the Temple, Jewish law and the Jews of Alexandria—truly speaking, also in defense of their wealth and privilege, and to free Alexander Lysimachus. Then the Jews did what they were bound to do by their religion.

Josephus’ story of Publius Petronius is implausible, and it is far more likely that Caligula never intended to withdraw his order that a statue of him be placed in the Temple, and that Claudius and Philo the Jew’s family conspired to murder him. Claudius attained the throne, and Philo the Jew received the edict favoring the Jews, the freedom of his brother, and corrupt influence in the Roman government, which enabled him to maintain a privileged status for the Jews of the ancient world—though this was short-lived.

Philo the Jew, also known as Philo of Alexandria, is most famous for Hellenizing the Jewish faith with mystical writings on the Pentateuch, a Hellenization carried out in earnest in Alexandria, with, among other things the translation of the Torah into Greek in the Septuagint with Heraclitean and Platonic language and overtones. Many ancients claimed that the Old Testament itself was a plagiarized fabrication by the Judeans, who had no known authentic ancient history of their own and instead cobbled one together *circa* 500-450 BC, copying the beliefs of the Egyptians, Greeks and others.

In the 1870's, Julius Wellhausen¹⁵²⁵ set out to prove the contention that the Old Testament was of comparatively recent origin and that the Pentateuch had multiple authors. He established that the Old Testament signifies the creation of the new religion of Judaism and not the history of Israel. His work was popular and well-received.

[7.5 All the Best Zionists are Anti-Semites](#)

The worst enemy of the common Jew has always been the Zionist.

In 1932, Einstein stated, referring to the “deplorably high development of nationalism everywhere”—his own rabid Zionism excepted,

“The introduction of compulsory service is therefore, to my mind, the prime cause of the moral collapse of the white race, which seriously threatens not merely the survival of our civilization but our very existence. This curse, along with great social blessings, started with the French Revolution, and before long dragged all the other nations in its train.”¹⁵²⁶

Einstein complained to Lorentz on 12 January 1920 that even well-educated persons fell victim to “the illiberal nationalistic standpoint.”¹⁵²⁷ Einstein called “Nationalism” an “ugly name”.¹⁵²⁸ Einstein’s Zionist hypocrisy did not go unnoticed. He was asked why he stood firmly against Gentile nationalism, while making Zionist nationalism his primary purpose in life. According to Thüning, the *Jüdische Presse* reported on 29 May 1929,

“Man fragte [Einstein], warum er als Verfechter aller internationalen Interessen, als Gegner aller nationalistischen Bestrebungen die jüdische nationale Sache zu seiner eigenen mache. Er erklärte seinen Standpunkt durch ein Gleichnis: Wer einen rechten Arm hat und davon spricht und immer davon spricht, ist ein Narr. Wem aber rechte Arm fehlt, der darf alles tun, um sich das fehlende Glied zu ersetzen. Daher sei er in einer Welt, in der jedes Volk die Bedingungen des nationalen Lebens hat, ein Feind des Nationalismus, als Jude aber ein Anhänger der jüdisch-nationalen Idee, weil den Juden die notwendige und natürliche Voraussetzung ihres nationalen Lebens fehlt.”

This clearly elucidates Einstein’s nationalistic perspective, which mirrored the Nazis’ nationalistic perspective. The Nazis simply pursued the same false reasoning as Einstein and asserted that their right arm was infected with Einstein’s self-described foreign and disloyal nationalists. Einstein agreed with the Nazis and saw them as the salvation of the Jews.

Therein lies the potential danger of Einstein’s segregationism. Segregationist nationalism is bound to lead to genocidal nationalism. Einstein’s tacit premise that citizenry and nationhood be based on ancient territory, ethnicity, race and religion—on *Blut und Boden*, instead of the sovereignty of a group of living persons in a territory, whether homogenous or heterogeneous in its ethnicities and religions, was racist bigotry—commonly held bigotry, but bigotry nonetheless. Einstein’s Zionist nationalism, which was no different from Nazi nationalism, would disconnect Jews around the world from the nations in which they were citizens. His racist nationalism definitely did not conform with his internationalist views, which were premised upon a community of nations, which implies a human family. In addition, Einstein voluntarily amputated his right arm, though he pretended that his self-inflicted wound was a congenital defect. Einstein was born a German, not a Palestinian. But Einstein’s hypocrisy, his system of double standards, his desire that

the Gentiles be consumed in wars and that the Jews reestablish a State and rule the world, were nothing new. They were Judaism.

Einstein was an advocate of world government and a segregated “Jewish State”. While this seemed a contradiction to many, including many Jews, especially many secular Jews, Einstein was merely expressing his loyalty to Jewish Messianic myth. Given Einstein’s racist Zionism, it is clear that Einstein wished for a day when Jews would rule a world devoid of Gentile government and that they would be segregated from, and reign over, the “Goyim”, to use Einstein’s term. “Internationalism” was a code word for a world devoid of Gentile government—a Jewish Messianic prophecy. “Zionism” was a code word for Jewish supremacy reigning over the world from Jerusalem in the Jewish Nation. Einstein’s “Internationalism” and Einstein’s “Zionism” need no reconciliation, they are one in the same objective—Judaism. Rather those who are confused by Einstein’s apparent contradictions need only read the Hebrew Bible, where the Jewish prophets tell the Jews to reconstruct the Jewish State and at the same time destroy all the Gentile governments of the world.

After World War II had ended, Einstein’s friend Peter A. Bucky also questioned the apparent contradiction in Einstein’s political philosophy. Bucky asked Einstein how he reconciled his Zionism with his anti-Nationalism. As a good racist Zionist Jew was wont to do, Einstein exploited modern anti-Semitism to legitimize racist Jewish Nationalism which is at least 2,500 years old,

“I think that [nationalism] is justified in this special case because the world has forced the Jews to entrench themselves with the continued existence of anti-Semitism.”¹⁵²⁹

Einstein felt that Jews owed anti-Semites a great debt of appreciation for forcing Jews to “entrench themselves”. He must also have known that the Zionists created the Nazis to force reluctant assimilating Jews to Palestine. Einstein dreaded a world without anti-Semitism, without segregation and without segregated racist Jews like himself. The incentive for Jews to create anti-Semitism is clear. There is abundant evidence that leading Jews have again and again down through history created and sponsored anti-Semitism. In the racist Zionist’s view, racist segregationist Judaism and the Jewish tribe cannot continue to exist without manufacturing anti-Semitism to keep them alive.

Given that the vast majority of German Jews during Einstein’s lifetime vehemently opposed his bigotry, it is especially odd that Einstein was so unenlightened and so racist. His own children were assimilated Jews, and he hated them for it.¹⁵³⁰ Whereas most German Jews considered the racism of Zionist Eastern Jews primitive and uncivilized, Einstein considered assimilation uncivilized and inhuman, because Einstein believed that European Gentiles were sub-human and incapable of civilization. His Zionist sponsors created wars for, among other things, the purpose of discrediting Gentile government. Einstein owed his fame to Zionists, who used him to publicize their cause. Einstein was more loyal to the Zionists’ racism, than he was to his own children. Racism buttered Einstein’s bread, his children wanted eat it, though he wouldn’t let them—they were sub-human. Fellow

Jewish racists kept Einstein in the spotlight and shielded him from criticism.

Einstein, himself, echoed and endorsed the views of the anti-Semites in an interview in which he again revealed himself to be a racist and a segregationist. Zionists intentionally provoked and sought to inspire anti-Semitism, and anti-Semites welcomed the openly racist positions of the Zionists.¹⁵³¹ Einstein went along with the crowd of prominent political Zionists who openly stated that anti-Semitism is welcomed, encouraged and useful to the Zionists. They based their myth on Spinoza's declaration that emancipation leads to assimilation and that the Jews only exist in modern times because glorious anti-Semitism kept them segregated.¹⁵³²

Prominent Zionist and author of the *Encyclopaedia Judaica; das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Jakob Klatzkin stated in 1925,

“The national viewpoint taught us to understand the true nature of antisemitism, and this understanding widens the horizons of our national outlook. [***] In the age of enlightenment antisemitism was included among the phenomena that are likely to disappear along with other forms of prejudice and iniquity. The antisemites, so the rule stated, were the laggard elements in the march of progress. Hence, our fate is dependent on the advance of human culture, and its victory is our victory. [***] In the period of Zionism, we learned that antisemitism was a psychic-social phenomenon that derives from our existence as a nation within a nation. Hence, it cannot change, until we attain our national end. But if Zionism had fully understood its own implications, it would have arrived, not merely as a psychosociological explanation of this phenomenon, but also as a justification of it. It is right to protest against its crude expressions, but we are unjust to it and distort its nature so long as we do not recognize that essentially it is a defense of the integrity of a nation, in whose throat we are stuck, neither to be swallowed nor to be expelled. [***] And when we are unjust to this phenomenon, we are unfair to our own people. If we do not admit the rightfulness of antisemitism, we deny the rightfulness of our own nationalism. If our people is deserving and willing to live its own national life, then it is an alien body thrust into the nations among whom it lives, an alien body that insists on its own distinctive identity, reducing the domain of their life. It is right, therefore, that they should fight against us for their national integrity. [***] Know this, that it is a good sign for us that the nations of the world combat us. It is proof that our national image is not yet utterly blurred, our alienism is still felt. If the war against us should cease or be weakened, it would indicate that our image has become indistinct and our alienism softened. We shall not obtain equality of rights anywhere save at the price of an explicit or implied declaration that we are no longer a national body, but part of the body of the host-nation; or that we are willing to assimilate and become part of it. [***] Instead of establishing societies for defense against the antisemites, who want to reduce our rights, we should establish societies for defense against our friends who desire to defend our rights. [***] When Moses came to redeem the children of Israel, their leaders

said to him, ‘You have made our odor evil in the eyes of Pharaoh and in the eyes of his servants, giving them a sword with which to kill us.’ Nevertheless, Moses persisted in worsening the situation of the people, and he saved them.”¹⁵³³

Klaus J. Herrmann has collected a great deal of evidence related to Zionist racism in his presentation, “Historical Perspectives on Political Zionism and Antisemitism”, *Zionism & Racism: Proceedings of an International Symposium*, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Tripoli, (1977), pp. 197-210. At page 197, Herrmann states, [quoting Constantin Brunner, *Der Judenhass und die Juden*, Berlin, (1918), p. 112; and Ernst Ludwig Pinner, “Meine Abkehr vom Zionismus”, *Los vom Zionismus*, J. Kauffmann, Frankfurt, (1928), pp. 32-33; and referencing Houston Stewart Chamberlain, *Die Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, F. A. Bruckmann, München, (1899), English translation by John Lees, *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, John Lane, New York, (1910)—see: F. Kahn, “H. St. Chamberlain (Eine Charakteristik)”, *Jüdische Rundschau*, Volume 25, Nummer 63/64, (10 September 1920), pp. 499-500, for a contemporary view of the impact on Jews of Chamberlain’s much-read book. His book was popular among Zionists and the English translation of it received a long and favorable review in the *Times Literary Supplement* of 15 December 1910, pp. 500-501.]:

“Jews,’ wrote Brunner, ‘have been taken in by the racial theories of the Jew-haters;’ and he accused the Zionists of having taken as their teacher the notorious racist and forger of scholarly documentation Houston Stewart Chamberlain, whose ‘confused nonsense revelations’ had been ‘restammered’ in a Zionist book on the subject of race. ‘How could Germans of Jewish background begin to talk of a Jewish nation, and to fashion of the worst calumny the dream of their greatest nonsense!’¹

One of Brunner’s disciples, Ernst Ludwig Pinner, who had been a Zionist earlier, bitterly accused the Zionists of having

taken up Europe’s newest nonsense, namely racial theory as the justification of national emotion. Racial arrogance and racial hate poison national emotion, as did previously religious arrogance and religious hatred. Today it is race which is exalted as the banner in whose name everything is justified.

Pinner also designated the Zionists as ‘Jews infected by the sickness of racial insanity . . . because, similar to the Jew-haters, they drew political consequences out of race-consciousness.’² Pinner did absolve Zionists of ‘preaching arrogance and hatred;’³ whether or not he would have done so in later years remains open to conjecture.”

At pages 204-205, Klaus J. Herrmann quotes the Zionist ideologist Jakob

Klatzkin who stated, among other things, in his book of 1921 *Krisis und Entscheidung im Judentum; der Probleme des modernen Judentums*, Second Enlarged Edition, Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, pages 61-63, and 118:

“[I applaud] the contribution of our enemies in the continuance of Jewry in eastern Europe. [***] We ought to be thankful to our oppressors that they closed the gates of assimilation to us and took care that our people were concentrated and not dispersed, segregatedly united and not diffusedly mixed [***] One ought to investigate in the West and note the great share which antisemitism had in the continuance of Jewry and in all the emotions and movements of our national rebirth. [***] Truly our enemies have done much for the strengthening of Judaism in the diaspora. [***] Experience teaches that the liberals have understood better than the antisemites how to destroy us as a nation. [***] We are, in a word, naturally foreigners; we are an alien nation in your midst and we want to remain one.”¹⁵³⁴

“Man vergegenwärtige sich, wie groß der Anteil unserer Feinde am Fortbestand des Judentums im Osten ist. [. . .] Wir müßten beinahe unseren Bedrängern dankbar sein, wenn sie die Tore der Assimilation vor uns schlossen und dafür Sorge trugen, daß unsere Volksmassen konzentriert und nicht zerstreut, abgesondert geeint und nicht zerklüftet vermischt werden[. . .] Man untersuche es im Westen, welchen hohen Anteil der Antisemitismus am Fortbestand des Judentums und an all den Regungen und Bewegungen unserer nationalen Wiedergeburt hat. [. . .] Wahrlich, unsere Feinde haben viel zur Stärkung des Judentums in der Diaspora beigetragen. [. . .] Und die Erfahrung lehrt, daß die Liberalen es besser als die Antisemiten verstanden haben, uns als Volk zu vernichten. [. . .] Wir sind schlechthin Wesensfremde, sind — wir müssen es immer wiederholen — ein Fremdvolk in eurer Mitte und wollen es auch bleiben.”

Some Jews, and some critics of the Jews, have for thousands of years asserted that Jews always form a separate state within the nations they inhabit. This they attribute to the Jewish religion, with its one God to rule over all—Jews being the chosen people who will one day receive the Messiah who will assist them in ruling the world after all other nations are destroyed, which fatalistic belief system inspires the nationalism many Jews have expressed in the Diaspora.

When Zionists like Herzl, Klatzkin and Rabbi Meir Bar-Ilan, who stated in 1922,

“We have no ‘church’ that is not also concerned with matters of state, just as we have no state which is not also concerned with ‘church’ matters—in Jewish life these are not two separate spheres.”¹⁵³⁵

confirmed that these ancient religious, nationalistic and political aspirations were current in modern Europe, where Jews had been emancipated, it caused many to view Jews not only with suspicion, but with contempt, most especially so because

radical revolutionary organizations were often led by, and populated with, Jews in disproportionate numbers to Gentiles. Many leading figures warned the public that the Bolshevik Jews were seeking world domination. They wanted to end the immigration of Eastern European Jews to Germany, and to expel Eastern European Jews from Germany. The Bolshevik Jews had already conducted successful, though short-lived, revolutions in German territory. Many of the Jews emigrating to Germany from the East were the descendants of the Frankists, who had pledged themselves to destroy the Gentile nations by means of deception and revolution. Frankist Jews were often crypto-Jews who hid their Jewish ethnicity in order to deceive Christians who might not otherwise trust them, to place the blame for their actions on other peoples so as to cause an unjust hatred towards those innocent peoples, and to prevent a backlash against Jews for the vile actions Jews were taking against other peoples. The Talmud teaches the Jews that they can sin against others with immunity if they hide the fact that they are Jewish such that Jews will not be attacked in retaliation. *Moed Katan 17a* states,

“R’ IL’AI SAYS: [***] IF A PERSON SEES THAT HIS evil INCLINATION IS OVERWHELMING HIM, [***] HE SHOULD GO TO A PLACE WHERE THEY DO NOT RECOGNIZE HIM [***] AND CLOTHE HIMSELF IN BLACK AND WRAP HIMSELF IN BLACK, [***] AND HE SHOULD DO WHAT HIS HEART DESIRES, [***] AND HE SHOULD NOT DESECRATE THE NAME OF HEAVEN OPENLY.”¹⁵³⁶

An alternative translation:

“For R. Il’ai says, If one sees that his [evil] *yezer*⁵ is gaining sway over him, let him go away where he is not known; let him put on sordid⁶ clothes, don a sordid wrap and do the sordid deed that his heart desires rather than profane the name of Heaven openly.”^{7,1537}

Albert Einstein stated in the *Berliner Tageblatt* on 30 December 1919,

“It is quite likely that there are Bolshevik agents in Germany, but they undoubtedly hold foreign passports, have at their disposal ample funds and cannot be seized by any administrative measures. The big profiteers among the Eastern European Jews have certainly, long ago, taken precautions to elude arrest by officials. The only [Jews] affected would be *those poor and unfortunate ones*, who in recent months made their way to Germany under inhumane privations, in order to look for work here.”¹⁵³⁸

Albert Einstein was himself a racist; and, therefore, a hypocrite when criticizing the racism of others. John Stachel wrote,

“While he lived in Germany, however, Einstein seems to have accepted the then-prevalent racist mode of thought, often invoking such concepts as ‘race’

and ‘instinct,’ and the idea that the Jews form a race.”¹⁵³⁹

On 8 July 1901, Einstein wrote to Winteler,

“There is no exaggeration in what you said about the German professors. I have got to know another sad specimen of this kind — one of the foremost physicists of Germany.”¹⁵⁴⁰

Einstein wrote to Besso sometime after 1 January 1914,

“A free, unprejudiced look is not at all characteristic of the (adult) Germans (blinders!).”¹⁵⁴¹

After the war Einstein and some of his friends alluded to much earlier conversations with Einstein where he had correctly predicted the eventual outcome of the war. In his diaries, Romain Rolland recorded his conversations with Einstein in Switzerland at their meeting of 16 September 1915,

“What I hear from [Einstein] is not exactly encouraging, for it shows the impossibility of arriving at a lasting peace with Germany without first totally crushing it. Einstein says the situation looks to him far less favorable than a few months back. The victories over Russia have reawakened German arrogance and appetite. The word ‘greedy’ seems to Einstein best to characterize Germany. [***] Einstein does not expect any renewal of Germany out of itself; it lacks the energy for it, and the boldness for initiative. He hopes for a victory of the Allies, which would smash the power of Prussia and the dynasty. . . . Einstein and Zangger dream of a divided Germany—on the one side Southern Germany and Austria, on the other side Prussia. [***] We speak of the deliberate blindness and the lack of psychology in the Germans.”¹⁵⁴²

Einstein’s dreams during the First World War remind one of the “Carthaginian Peace” of the Henry Morgenthau, Jr. plan for the destruction of Germany following the Second World War. Morgenthau worked with Lord Cherwell (Frederick Alexander Lindemann), Churchill’s friend and advisor, who planned to bomb German civilian populations into submission. Lindemann studied under Einstein’s friend, Walther Nernst, who worked with Fritz Haber, a Jewish developer of poisonous gas. James Bacque argues that the Allies, under the direction of General Eisenhower, starved hundreds of thousands, if not millions of German prisoners of war to death. Dwight David Eisenhower was called “the terrible Swedish-Jew” in his yearbook for West Point, *The 1915 Howitzer*, West Point, New York, (1915), p. 80. He was also called “Ike”, as in. . . Eisenhower? The Soviets also abused countless German POW’s after the Second World War.¹⁵⁴³

Einstein often spoke in genocidal and racist terms against Germany, and for the Jews and England, and he betrayed Germany before, during and after the war.

Einstein wrote to Paul Ehrenfest on 22 March 1919,

“[The Allied Powers] whose victory during the war I had felt would be by far the lesser evil are now proving to be *only slightly* the lesser evil. [***] I get most joy from the emergence of the Jewish state in Palestine. It does seem to me that our kinfolk really are more sympathetic (at least less brutal) than these horrid Europeans. Perhaps things can only improve if only the Chinese are left, who refer to all Europeans with the collective noun ‘bandits.’”¹⁵⁴⁴

While responsible people were trying to preserve some sanity in the turbulent period following World War I, Zionists like Albert Einstein sought to validate and encourage the racism of anti-Semites. The Dreyfus Affair taught them that anti-Semitism had a powerful effect to unite Jews around the world. The Zionists were afraid that the “Jewish race” was disappearing through assimilation. They wanted to use anti-Semitism to force the segregation of Jews from Gentiles and to unite Jews, and thereby preserve the “Jewish race”. They hoped that if they put a Hitler into power—as Zionists had done in the past, they could use him to herd up the Jews and force the Jews into Palestine against their will. This would also help the Zionists to inspire distrust and contempt for Gentile government, while giving the Zionists the moral high-ground in international affairs, despite the fact that the Zionists were secretly behind the atrocities. Theodor Herzl wrote in his book *The Jewish State*,

“Oppression and persecution cannot exterminate us. No nation on earth has survived such struggles and sufferings as we have gone through. Jew-baiting has merely stripped off our weaklings; the strong among us were invariably true to their race when persecution broke out against them. This attitude was most clearly apparent in the period immediately following the emancipation of the Jews. Later on, those who rose to a higher degree of intelligence and to a better worldly position lost their communal feeling to a very great extent. Wherever our political well-being has lasted for any length of time, we have assimilated with our surroundings. I think this is not discreditable. Hence, the statesman who would wish to see a Jewish strain in his nation would have to provide for the duration of our political well-being; and even Bismarck could not do that. [***] The Governments of all countries scourged by Anti-Semitism will serve their own interests in assisting us to obtain the sovereignty we want. [***] Great exertions will not be necessary to spur on the movement. Anti-Semites provide the requisite impetus. They need only do what they did before, and then they will create a love of emigration where it did not previously exist, and strengthen it where it existed before. [***] I imagine that Governments will, either voluntarily or under pressure from the Anti-Semites, pay certain attention to this scheme; and they may perhaps actually receive it here and there with a sympathy which they will also show to the Society of Jews.”¹⁵⁴⁵

Albert Einstein wrote to Max Born on 9 November 1919, and encouraged anti-

Semitism and advocated segregationism (one must wonder what rôle Albert's increasing racism played in his divorce from Mileva Marić—a Gentile Serb),

“Antisemitism must be seen as a real thing, based on true hereditary qualities, even if for us Jews it is often unpleasant. I could well imagine that I myself would choose a Jew as my companion, given the choice. On the other hand I would consider it reasonable for the Jews themselves to collect the money to support Jewish research workers outside the universities and to provide them with teaching opportunities.”¹⁵⁴⁶

In 1933, the Zionists publicly declared their allegiance to the Nazis. They wrote in the *Jüdische Rundschau* on 13 June 1933,

“Zionism recognizes the existence of the Jewish question and wants to solve it in a generous and constructive manner. For this purpose, it wants to enlist the aid of all peoples; those who are friendly to the Jews as well as those who are hostile to them, since according to its conception, this is not a question of sentimentality, but one dealing with a real problem in whose solution all peoples are interested.”¹⁵⁴⁷

On 21 June 1933, the Zionists issued a declaration of their position with respect to the Nazi régime, in which they expressed a belief in the legitimacy of the Nazis' racist belief system and condemned the anti-Fascist forces.¹⁵⁴⁸

Michele Besso wrote that it might have been Albert Einstein's racism and bigotry which caused him to separate from his first wife Mileva Marić in 1914. Besso wrote to Einstein on 17 January 1928,

“[. . .]perhaps it is due in part to me, with my defense of Judaism and the Jewish family, that your family life took the turn that it did, and that I had to bring Mileva from Berlin to Zurich[.]”¹⁵⁴⁹

The hypocrisy of racist Zionists often manifested itself in this way. Many had “intermarried”. Racist Zionist Moses Hess was married to a Christian Gentile prostitute named Sybille Pritsch.

Einstein may have been effected by his mother's early racist opposition to his relationship with Marić. Another factor in the Einsteins' divorce was, of course, Albert's incestuous relationship with his cousin Else Einstein, and his desire to bed her daughters, as well as his general promiscuity. Albert Einstein opposed his sister Maja's marriage to Gentile Paul Winteler on racist grounds, and Albert thought they should divorce. Albert Einstein wrote to Michele Besso on 12 December 1919, “No mixed marriages are any good (Anna says: oh!)”¹⁵⁵⁰ Besso, himself, was married to a Gentile, Anna Besso-Winteler. Denis Brian wrote,

“When asked what he thought of Jews marrying non-Jews, which, of course, had been the case with him and Mileva, [Albert Einstein] replied with a

laugh, ‘It’s dangerous, but then all marriages are dangerous.’”¹⁵⁵¹

On 3 April 1920, Einstein wrote, criticizing assimilationist Jews,

“And this is precisely what he does *not* want to reveal in his confession. He talks about religious faith instead of tribal affiliation, of ‘Mosaic’ instead of ‘Jewish’ because the latter term, which is much more familiar to him, would emphasize affiliation to his tribe.”¹⁵⁵²

Albert Einstein often referred to Jews as “tribesmen” and Jewry as the “tribe”. Fellow German Jew Fritz Haber was outraged at Albert Einstein’s racist treachery and disloyalty. Einstein confirmed that he was disloyal and a racist, and was obligated,

“[. . .] to step in for my persecuted and morally depressed fellow tribesmen, as far as this lies within my power[.]”¹⁵⁵³

After declaring that Jewish children segregate due to natural forces and that they are “different from other children”,¹⁵⁵⁴ not due to religion or tradition, but due to genetic features and “heritage”, Einstein continued his 3 April 1920 statement,

“With adults it is quite similar as with children. Due to race and temperament as well as traditions (which are only to a small extent of religious origin) they form a community more or less separate from non-Jews. [***] It is this basic community of race and tradition that I have in mind when I speak of ‘Jewish nationality.’ In my opinion, aversion to Jews is simply based upon the fact that Jews and non-Jews are different. [***] Where feelings are sufficiently vivid there is no shortage of reasons; and the feeling of aversion toward people of a foreign race with whom one has, more or less, to share daily life will emerge by necessity.”¹⁵⁵⁵

Einstein made similar comments in a document dated sometime “after 3 April 1920”. Einstein was in agreement with Philipp Lenard that a “Jewish heritage” could be seen in intellectual works published by Jews. Einstein stated,

“The psychological root of anti-Semitism lies in the fact that the Jews are a group of people unto themselves. Their Jewishness is visible in their physical appearance, and one notices their Jewish heritage in their intellectual works, and one can sense that there are among them deep connections in their disposition and numerous possibilities of communicating that are based on the same way of thinking and of feeling. The Jewish child is already aware of these differences as soon as it starts school. Jewish children feel the resentment that grows out of an instinctive suspicion of their strangeness that naturally is often met with a closing of the ranks. [***] [Jews] are the target of instinctive resentment because they are of a different tribe than the

majority of the population.”¹⁵⁵⁶

In a draft letter of 3 April 1920, Einstein wrote that children are conscious of “racial characteristics” and that this alleged “racial” gulf between children results in conflicts, which instill a sense of foreignness in the persecuted child. Einstein wrote,

“Unter den Kindern war besonders in der Volksschule der Antisemitismus lebendig. Er gründete [s]ich auf die den Kindern merkwürdig bewussten Rassenmerkmale und auf Eindrücke im Religionsunterricht. Thätliche Angriffe und Beschimpfungen auf dem Schulwege waren häufig, aber meist nicht gar zu böseartig. Sie genügten immerhin, um ein lebhaftes Gefühl des Fremdseins schon im Kinde zu befestigen.”¹⁵⁵⁷

Einstein’s racism was perhaps a defense mechanism to depersonalize the attacks he faced as a child and to counter the hurt with a sense of communal love, and communal hatred. Like Adolf Stoecker before him,¹⁵⁵⁸ Albert Einstein advocated the segregation of Jewish students. Peter A. Bucky quoted Albert Einstein,

“I think that Jewish students should have their own student societies. [***] One way that it won’t be solved is for Jewish people to take on Christian fashions and manners. [***] In this way, it is entirely possible to be a civilized person, a good citizen, and at the same time be a faithful Jew who loves his race and honors his fathers.”¹⁵⁵⁹

Einstein stated,

“We must be conscious of our alien race and draw the logical conclusions from it. [***] We must have our own students’ societies and adopt an attitude of courteous but consistent reserve to the Gentiles. [***] It is possible to be [***] a faithful Jew who loves his race and honours his fathers.”¹⁵⁶⁰

On 5 April 1920, Einstein repeated what he had heard from his political Zionist friends, who believed that anti-Semitism was necessary to the preservation of the “Jewish race”,

“Anti-Semitism will be a psychological phenomenon as long as Jews come in contact with non-Jews—what harm can there be in that? Perhaps it is due to anti-Semitism that we survive as a race: at least that is what I believe.”¹⁵⁶¹

and,

“I am neither a German citizen, nor is there in me anything that can be described as ‘Jewish faith.’ But I am happy to belong to the Jewish people, even though I don’t regard them as the Chosen People. Why don’t we just let the Goy keep his anti-Semitism, while we preserve our love for the likes of

us?"¹⁵⁶²

This letter was published in the *Israelitisches Wochenblatt für die Schweiz*, on 24 September 1920, on page 10. It became famous and was widely discussed in newspapers and was used as a political issue. Einstein's racism had already become a weapon for critics of the Jews to wield against German Jews loyal to the Fatherland. Einstein ridiculed the *Central-Verein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens*, an organization that combated anti-Semitism and vigorously defended and celebrated Jews, because Einstein sought to promote anti-Semitism and because Einstein believed that being "Jewish" was a racial, not a religious, condition. Einstein knew quite well that the letter had been published. The *C. V.* contacted him about it and published a statement regarding it in their periodical *Im deutschen Reich* in March of 1921,

“So wurde auch in einzelnen Versammlungen der bekannte Brief des Naturforschers Professor Einstein, den dieser an den Central-Verein gerichtet hat, und in welchem er die Bestrebungen des Central-Vereins ablehnt, weil sie zu national-deutsch und zu wenig jüdisch orientiert seien, zum Gegenstand der Erörterungen gemacht. Dieser Brief hat in der öffentlichen Erörterung der jüdischen und judengegnerischen Presse in den letzten Monaten und auch bei den Wahlen eine gewisse Rolle gespielt und Anlaß zu den verschiedenartigsten Betrachtungen je nach der Parteistellung der Versammlungsredner und der verschiedenen Zeitungen gegeben. So hat sich z. B. die jüdisch-nationale „Wiener Morgenzeitung“ veranlaßt gesehen, den Central-Verein in wenig vornehmer Weise anzugreifen und ihn wegen seines nationaldeutschen Standpunktes zu verdächtigen. Diese Angriffe würden durch die Auffassung von Professor Einstein nicht gedeckt worden sein, wenn die „Wiener Morgenzeitung“ gewußt hätte, daß Professor Einstein ohne nähere Kenntnis der Bestrebungen und der Arbeit des Central-Vereins seinen Brief geschrieben und keineswegs an eine Veröffentlichung, die nur durch eine Indiskretion erfolgt ist, gedacht hat. Erst nach der Veröffentlichung hat er von der Art und Weise der Tätigkeit des Central-Vereins Kenntnis erhalten und hat, wie mit gutem Grund versichert werden kann, infolge dieser Kenntnis eine wesentlich andere Auffassung vom Werte der Arbeit unseres Central-Vereins gewonnen. Auch dieser Vorfall sollte Anlaß geben, Urteile in der Öffentlichkeit erst dann zu fällen, wenn die Sachlage einigermaßen geklärt ist.”¹⁵⁶³

On 24 May 1931, the *Sunday Express* of London published an interview it claimed it had had with Einstein while he was visiting Oxford. The interview contained inflammatory statements similar to those published in the *Israelitisches Wochenblatt für die Schweiz* on 24 September 1920. These statements were repeated in several German language newspapers across Europe together with scathing editorial indictments of Einstein. Einstein claimed that no interview had taken place

and the quotations were taken from a letter he had written eleven years prior. Einstein stated in a letter to Michael Traub of 22 August 1931 that this letter had never been published,¹⁵⁶⁴ though it had been published and Einstein knew quite well that it had been published.

Einstein accused the *Central-Verein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens e. V.* of instigating the “forgery”. The *C.V.* denied that it was behind the publication in the *Sunday Express* and invited Einstein to respond in their official organ the *Central-Verein Zeitung*. Einstein took the opportunity and stated, “Es wurden mir schon wiederholt Auszüge aus einem Artikel der „S u n d a y E x p r e ß“ zugesandt, aus denen ich ersehe, daß es sich **um eine glatte Fälschung** handelt. Ich habe in O x f o r d überhaupt kein einziges Zeitungsinterview gegeben. Der Inhalt ist eine böswillige Entstellung eines vor elf Jahren geschriebenen, nicht für die Oeffentlichkeit bestimmten Briefes.”¹⁵⁶⁵ He affirmed in 1931 that he had made the statements and did not repudiate them.

In 1932, Einstein stated, referring to the “deplorably high development of nationalism everywhere”—his own rabid Zionism excepted,

“The introduction of compulsory service is therefore, to my mind, the prime cause of the moral collapse of the white race, which seriously threatens not merely the survival of our civilization but our very existence. This curse, along with great social blessings, started with the French Revolution, and before long dragged all the other nations in its train.”¹⁵⁶⁶

Einstein had a reputation as a rabid anti-assimilationist, which is to say that Einstein was a rabid racist segregationist. On 15 March 1921, Kurt Blumenfeld wrote to Chaim Weizmann,

“Einstein [***] is interested in our cause most strongly because of his revulsion from assimilatory Jewry.”¹⁵⁶⁷

Einstein stated in 1921,

“To deny the Jew’s nationality in the Diaspora is, indeed, deplorable. If one adopts the point of view of confining Jewish ethnical nationalism to Palestine, then one, to all intents and purposes, denies the existence of a Jewish people. In that case one should have the courage to carry through, in the quickest and most complete manner, entire assimilation. We live in a time of intense and perhaps exaggerated nationalism. But my Zionism does not exclude in me cosmopolitan views. I believe in the actuality of Jewish nationality, and I believe that every Jew has duties towards his coreligionists. [***] [T]he principal point is that Zionism must tend to strengthen the dignity and self-respect of the Jews in the Diaspora. I have always been annoyed by the undignified assimilationist cravings and strivings which I have observed in so many of my friends.”¹⁵⁶⁸

In 1921, Einstein declared, referring to Eastern European Jews,

“These men and women retain a healthy national feeling; it has not yet been destroyed by the process of atomisation and dispersion.”¹⁵⁶⁹

Einstein wrote in the *Jüdische Rundschau*, on 21 June 1921, on pages 351-352,

“This phenomenon [*i. e.* Anti-Semitism] in Germany is due to several causes. Partly it originates in the fact that the Jews there exercise an influence over the intellectual life of the German people altogether out of proportion to their number. While, in my opinion, the economic position of the German Jews is very much overrated, the influence of Jews on the Press, in literature, and in science in Germany is very marked, as must be apparent to even the most superficial observer. This accounts for the fact that there are many anti-Semites there who are not really anti-Semitic in the sense of being Jew-haters, and who are honest in their arguments. They regard Jews as of a nationality different from the German, and therefore are alarmed at the increasing Jewish influence on their national entity. [***] But in Germany the judgement of my theory depended on the party politics of the Press[.]”¹⁵⁷⁰

Einstein also stated,

“The way I see it, the fact of the Jews’ racial peculiarity will necessarily influence their social relations with non-Jews. The conclusions which—in my opinion—the Jews should draw is to become more aware of their peculiarity in their social way of life and to recognize their own cultural contributions. First of all, they would have to show a certain noble reservedness and not be so eager to mix socially—of which others want little or nothing. On the other hand, anti-Semitism in Germany also has consequences that, from a Jewish point of view, should be welcomed. I believe German Jewry owes its continued existence to anti-Semitism.”¹⁵⁷¹

Nazi Zionist Joseph Goebbels, sounding very much like political Zionist Albert Einstein, was quoted in *The New York Times*, on 29 September 1933, on page 10,

“It must be remembered the Jews of Germany were exercising at that time a decisive influence on the whole intellectual life; that they were absolute and unlimited masters of the press, literature, the theatre and the motion pictures, and in large cities such as Berlin, 75 percent of the members of the medical and legal professions were Jews; that they made public opinion, exercised a decisive influence on the Stock Exchange and were the rulers of Parliament and its parties.”

On 1 July 1921, Einstein was quoted in the *Jüdische Rundschau* on page 371,

“Let us take brief look at the *development of German Jews* over the last hundred years. With few exceptions, one hundred years ago our forefathers still lived in the Ghetto. They were poor and separated from the Gentiles by a wall of religious tradition, secular lifestyles and statutory confinement and were confined in their spiritual development to their own literature, only relatively weakly influenced by the forceful progress which intellectual life in Europe had undergone in the Renaissance. However, these little noticed, modestly living people had one thing over us: *Every one of them belonged with all his heart to a community*, into which he was incorporated, in which he felt a worthwhile member, in which nothing was asked of him which conflicted with his normal processes of thought. Our forefathers of that era were pretty pathetic both bodily and spiritually, but—in social relations—in an enviable state of mental equilibrium. Then came emancipation. It offered undreamt of opportunities for advancement. The isolated individual quickly found their way into the upper financial and social circles of society. They eagerly absorbed the great achievements of art and science which the Occidentals¹⁵⁷² had created. They contributed to the development with passionate affection, and themselves made contributions of lasting value. They thereby took on the lifestyle of the Gentile world, turning away from their religious and social traditions in growing masses—took on Gentile customs, manners and mentality. It appeared as if they were being completely dissolved into the numerically superior, politically and culturally better organized host peoples, such that no trace of them would be left after a few generations. The complete eradication of the Jewish nationality in Middle and Western Europe appeared to be inevitable. However, it didn’t turn out that way. It appears that racially distinct nations have instincts which work against interbreeding. The adaptation of the Jews to the European peoples among whom they have lived in language, customs and indeed even partially in religious practices *was unable to eliminate all feelings of foreignness* which exist between Jews and their European host peoples. In short, this spontaneous feeling of foreignness is ultimately due to a loss of energy.¹⁵⁷³ For this reason, *not even well-meant arguments can eradicate it*. Nationalities do not want to be mixed together, rather they want to go their own separate ways. A state of peace can only be achieved by mutual tolerance and respect.”

Einstein stated that Jews should not participate in the German Government,

“I regretted the fact that [Rathenau] became a Minister. In view of the attitude which large numbers of the educated classes in Germany assume towards the Jews, I have always thought that their natural conduct in public should be one of proud reserve.”¹⁵⁷⁴

Einstein merely parroted the Zionist Party line. Werner E. Mosse wrote,

“While the leaders of the CV saw it as their special duty to represent the interests of the German Jews in the active political struggle, Zionism stood for. . . systematic Jewish non-participation in German public life. It rejected as a matter of principle any participation in the struggle led by the CV.”¹⁵⁷⁵

In 1925, Einstein wrote in the official Zionist organ *Jüdische Rundschau*,

“By study of their past, by a better understanding of the spirit [Geist] that accords with their race, they must learn to know anew the mission that they are capable of fulfilling. [***] What one must be thankful to Zionism for is the fact that it is the only movement that has given many Jews a justified pride, that it has once again given a despairing race the necessary faith, if I may so express myself, given new flesh to an exhausted people.”¹⁵⁷⁶

On 12 October 1929, Albert Einstein wrote to the *Manchester Guardian*,

“In the re-establishment of the Jewish nation in the ancient home of the race, where Jewish spiritual values could again be developed in a Jewish atmosphere, the most enlightened representatives of Jewish individuality see the essential preliminary to the regeneration of the race and the setting free of its spiritual creativeness.”¹⁵⁷⁷

Einstein’s public racism eventually waned, but he continued to publicly express his segregationist philosophy in the same terms as anti-Semites, as well as his belief that Jews “thrived on” and owed their “continued existence” to anti-Semitism.

Einstein stated in December of 1930 to an American audience,

“There is something indefinable which holds the Jews together. Race does not make much for solidarity. Here in America you have many races, and yet you have the solidarity. Race is not the cause of the Jews’ solidarity, nor is their religion. It is something else—which is indefinable.”¹⁵⁷⁸

Einstein’s confusing public statement perhaps resulted from his desire to promote multi-culturalism in America, which had the benefit of freeing up Jewish immigration to the United States.¹⁵⁷⁹ Einstein was also likely parroting, or trying to parrot, a fellow anti-assimilationist political Zionist whose pamphlet was well known in America, Solomon Schechter and his *Zionism: A Statement*, Federation of American Zionists, New York, (1906), in which Schechter states, among other things, “Zionism is an ideal, and as such is indefinable.”

Einstein stated in 1938,

“JUST WHAT IS A JEW?”

The formation of groups has an invigorating effect in all spheres of human striving, perhaps mostly due to the struggle between the convictions and aims represented by the different groups. The Jews, too, form such a

group with a definite character of its own, and anti-Semitism is nothing but the antagonistic attitude produced in the non-Jews by the Jewish group. This is a normal social reaction. But for the political abuse resulting from it, it might never have been designated by a special name.

What are the characteristics of the Jewish group? What, in the first place, is a Jew? There are no quick answers to this question. The most obvious answer would be the following: A Jew is a person professing the Jewish faith. The superficial character of this answer is easily recognized by means of a simple parallel. Let us ask the question: What is a snail? An answer similar in kind to the one given above might be: A snail is an animal inhabiting a snail shell. This answer is not altogether incorrect; nor, to be sure, is it exhaustive; for the snail shell happens to be but one of the material products of the snail. Similarly, the Jewish faith is but one of the characteristic products of the Jewish community. It is, furthermore, known that a snail can shed its shell without thereby ceasing to be a snail. The Jew who abandons his faith (in the formal sense of the word) is in a similar position. He remains a Jew.

[***]

WHERE OPPRESSION IS A STIMULUS

[***]

Perhaps even more than on its own tradition, the Jewish group has thrived on oppression and on the antagonism it has forever met in the world. Here undoubtedly lies one of the main reasons for its continued existence through so many thousands of years.¹⁵⁸⁰

Albert Einstein was parroting racist political Zionist leader Theodor Herzl, who wrote in his book *The Jewish State*,

“Oppression and persecution cannot exterminate us. No nation on earth has survived such struggles and sufferings as we have gone through. Jew-baiting has merely stripped off our weaklings; the strong among us were invariably true to their race when persecution broke out against them. This attitude was most clearly apparent in the period immediately following the emancipation of the Jews. Later on, those who rose to a higher degree of intelligence and to a better worldly position lost their communal feeling to a very great extent. Wherever our political well-being has lasted for any length of time, we have assimilated with our surroundings. I think this is not discreditable. Hence, the statesman who would wish to see a Jewish strain in his nation would have to provide for the duration of our political well-being; and even Bismarck could not do that. [***] The Governments of all countries scourged by Anti-Semitism will serve their own interests in assisting us to obtain the sovereignty we want. [***] Great exertions will not be necessary to spur on the movement. Anti-Semites provide the requisite impetus. They need only do what they did before, and then they will create a love of emigration where it did not previously exist, and strengthen it where it existed before. [***] I

imagine that Governments will, either voluntarily or under pressure from the Anti-Semites, pay certain attention to this scheme; and they may perhaps actually receive it here and there with a sympathy which they will also show to the Society of Jews.”¹⁵⁸¹

Einstein’s statements and those of other like-minded racist Zionists threw fuel on the fire and were reflective of the spirit and tone enunciated in *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, Number 9, which states (no matter who wrote it),

“Nowadays, if any States raise a protest against us, it is only *pro forma* at our discretion, and by our direction, for their anti-Semitism is indispensable to us, for the management of our lesser brethren.”¹⁵⁸²

Many Zionist leaders espoused racist nationalism, which made them the darlings of the Nazis, the Nazis they had put into power. Joachim Prinz wrote, among other things, a racist polemic against assimilation in his book published in Germany in the Hitler-era, *Wir Juden* of 1934,

“Die Theorie der Assimilation ist zusammengebrochen. Kein Schlupfwinkel birgt uns mehr. Wir wünschen an die Stelle der Assimilation das Neue gesetzt: *das Bekenntnis zur jüdischen Nation und zur jüdischen Rasse*. Ein Staat, der aufgebaut ist auf dem Prinzip der Reinheit von Nation und Rasse, kann nur vor dem Juden Achtung und Respekt haben, der sich zur eigenen Art bekennt. Nirgendwo kann er in diesem Bekenntnis mangelnde Loyalität dem Staate gegenüber erblicken. Er kann keine anderen Juden wollen, als die Juden des klaren Bekenntnisses zum eigenen Volk. Er kann keine liebedienerischen, kriecherischen Juden wollen. Er muß von uns das Bekenntnis zur eigenen Art fordern. Denn nur jemand, der *eigene* Art und *eigenes* Blut achtet, wird den Respekt vor dem *nationalen Willen anderer Nationen* haben können.

In dem Bekenntnis des Juden zu seiner eigenen Nation, in seiner Gewißheit, in sich sein eigenes Blut zu tragen, seine eigene Vergangenheit und seine eigene Art — wird er erst beginnen, die Distanz vor den Erlebnissen der anderen Nationen zu wahren, die notwendig ist, um ein ehrliches Miteinander und eine anständige Nachbarshaft zu halten. In dem Augenblick, in dem dieses Bekenntnis zur jüdischen Nationalität die Mehrheit der Judenheit ergreift, beginnt *die erste ehrliche Aussprache zwischen Juden und Nichtjuden*.”¹⁵⁸³

Prinz wrote of the supposed suicide of the emancipated Jews through assimilation in *liberal* states, and he despised liberalism. His goal was to preserve the alleged purity of the Jewish race in a Jewish nation, *i. e.* the expulsion of the Jews to a new territory which allowed the Zionists to enforce racial segregation. Prinz wrote,

“The brochure of the baptized Jew Karl *Marx* on the Jewish question is an anti-Jewish pamphlet and an autobiographical entry in the chapter of Jewish self-hatred.”

“Die Broschüre des getauften Juden Karl *Marx* über die Judenfrage ist ein antijüdisches Pamphlet und ein autobiographischer Beitrag zum Kapitel des jüdischen Selbsthasses.”¹⁵⁸⁴

Prinz was not alone in his condemnation of Karl Marx’s anti-Semitism.¹⁵⁸⁵ Hitler and Prinz had much in common. Lenni Brenner documents Prinz’ and the Zionists’ kinship with the Nazis’ nationalistic and racial views in his book *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*.¹⁵⁸⁶

Dietrich Bronder and Hennecke Kardel¹⁵⁸⁷ state that the top leadership of the Nazi Party and the orchestrators of the “final solution” were of Jewish descent, including Adolf Hitler,¹⁵⁸⁸ Adolf Eichmann, Reinhard Heydrich, Rudolf Hess (member of the *Thule-Gesellschaft*, an organization Zionists created to promote anti-Semitism in order to force Jews to accept Zionism), Dietrich Eckart (member of the *Thule-Gesellschaft*), Alfred Rosenberg (member of the *Thule-Gesellschaft*), Julius Streicher (member of the *Thule-Gesellschaft*), Joseph Goebbels, and Hans Frank (member of the *Thule-Gesellschaft*). Dietrich Bronder wrote in 1964,

“Aus den eigenen Untersuchungen des Verfassers über die führenden Nationalsozialisten sei hier nur mitgeteilt, daß sich unter 4000 Männern der Reichsführung 120 Ausländer von Geburt befanden, viele mit einem oder zwei Elternteilen ausländischer Herkunft und ein Prozent sogar jüdischer Abkunft — also im Sinne der NS-Rassengesetze „untragbar“.

a) So rechnen zu den Auslandsgeborenen:

Reichsminister und Führerstellvertreter Rudolf Heß (Ägypten); Reichsminister Darré (Argentinien); Gauleiter und Staatssekretär E. W. Bohle und der Reichskommissar Herzog von Sachsen-Coburg (England); Generaloberst Löhr (Jugoslawien); General der Waffen-SS Phleps (Rumänien); Reichsärztführer und Staatssekretär Dr. Conti und der Berliner Oberbürgermeister Lippert (Schweiz); NSKK-Obergruppenführer G. Wagner (Frankreich); sowie aus Rußland: Reichsminister und Reichsleiter Alfred Rosenberg und die NS-Reichshauptamtsleiter Brockhausen, Dr. von Renteln und Schickedanz, Reichsminister Backe, Präsident Dr. Neubert, Staatsrat Dr. Freiherr von Freytag-Loringhoven und Bischof J. Beermann.

b) Darüber hinaus stammten von einem oder beiden ausländischen Elternteilen (u. v. a.):

Der Reichsjugendführer Baldur von Schirach, Generaloberst Rendulic sowie der Generaldirektor Gustav Krupp von Bohlen-Halbach.

c) Selbst jüdischer Abkunft bzw. mit jüdischen Familien verwandt waren: der Führer und Reichskanzler Adolf Hitler; seine Stellvertreter, die Reichsminister Rudolf Heß und Reichsmarschall Hermann Göring; die

Reichsleiter der NSDAP Gregor Strasser, Dr. Josef Goebbels, Alfred Rosenberg, Hans Frank und Heinrich Himmler; die Reichsminister von Ribbentrop (der mit dem berühmten Zionisten Chaim Weizmann, dem 1952 verstorbenen ersten Staatsoberhaupt von Israel, einst Brüderschaft getrunken hatte) und von Keudell; die Gauleiter Globocznik (der Judenvernichter), Jordan und Wilhelm Kube; die hohen SS-Führer und z. T. in der Judenvernichtung tätigen Reinhard Heydrich, Erich von dem Bach-Zelewski und von Keudell II; die Bankiers und alten Förderer Hitlers vor 1933 Ritter von Stauß (Vizepräsident des NS-Reichstages) und von Stein; der Generalfeldmarschall und Staatssekretär Milch, der Unterstaatssekretär Gauß; die Physiker und Alt-Pg.'s Philipp von Lenard und Abraham Esau; die Uralt-Pg.'s Hanffstaengel (NS-Auslandspressechef) und Prof. Haushofer (s. S. 190).¹⁵⁸⁹

Inferences can be drawn that these crypto-Jewish Nazi leaders were either motivated by self-hatred, or they were front men under the control of Herzlian political Zionists. Both may have been true of the genocidal Nazi Party leaders. Bryan Mark Rigg estimates the total number of Jewish soldiers and sailors in the Nazi military perhaps ranged upwards to 150,000.¹⁵⁹⁰

Many Zionists hated themselves and Jews in general and defamed Jews in their literature, especially the relatively impoverished and uneducated Jews of the East, whom the Zionists tried to bribe into migrating to Palestine, though they only largely succeeded in capturing ne'er-do-wells. Herzl considered himself to be a sleazy ultra-Jew in the most pejorative sense of which he could conceive to use the term "Jew". Herzl justified himself by generalizing his character flaws as if they were a racial "Jewish" trait. He hated the masses of poor Jews from the East and the rich Jews of the West, who wanted to assimilate.

In 1845, *The North American Review* wrote of the snobbish class hatred common among Jews, the inter-Jewish racism which has long plagued Jews, and the various dogmatic Jewish sects hatefully at odds with one another (note the misogyny and dogmatic indoctrination of Jews, which continues to this day,¹⁵⁹¹ and which manifests itself in, among other things, virulent Jewish censorship of others),

“As the Jews were anciently divided into several religious sects,—the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the Essenes,—so we find them distinguished at the present day. Their chief modern denominations, some of which represent the more ancient, are the Caraites, the Zabathaites, the Chasidim, the Rabbinists, or Talmudists, and the Reformed Jews. The Samaritans

[Footnote: Mixed descendants of a remnant of the ten tribes left in their own land, and of the Assyrians colonized among them. 2 Kings, xvii. 24, &c. In Christ's time they had a temple on Mount Gerizim, which they held more sacred than Mount Zion and its temple. They receive only the Pentateuch, and perhaps the Books of Joshua and Judges, which are found among them; but confidently wait for the Messiah, and observe the Mosaic laws more

strictly than even the Jews. Wolff found fifty families of them at the foot of Gerizim, and they have also been met with in other parts of Palestine and in Egypt.]

are not to be classed among them, though akin to them in many respects. The main point of difference between most of these sects, though not the only one, respects the Talmud. The *Talmud*—a word that means *doctrine*—is a voluminous work of two parts,—the *Mishna*, that is the *second law*, and the *Gemara*, or *completion*. The former, consisting of a divine interpretation of the written law, say the Talmudists, was given to Moses at the same time with that delivered on Mount Sinai, together with rules for its exegesis, all to be orally handed down; and by him it was made known to the whole people, and specially committed to his successors. These traditions were collected in the *Mishna*, a work ascribed to Judah Hannasi,—the Holy, as he is usually called,—about the middle of the second century. Many glosses upon this text soon accumulated, which the Rabbi Jochanan, about the year 230, threw together in the form of a perpetual commentary upon it, entitled the *Gemara*; and this, with the *Mishna*, is called the Jerusalem Talmud; though sometimes the *Mishna*, and sometimes the *Gemara* alone, is, by synecdoche, called the Talmud. About a century later, Ashi and Abhina, distinguished Babylonian rabbins, compiled a much larger collection of opinions, which, with the *Mishna*, is styled the Babylonian Talmud, a work held in much higher esteem than the other, and generally understood when the Talmud, without further specification, is mentioned. It has commonly been published in twelve large folios. The other is comprised in a single folio. The Talmud has been justly described as ‘containing things frivolous and superstitious, impieties and blasphemies, absurdities and fables.’ As an example of all these in one,—God is represented as having contracted impurity by the burial of Moses, and as washing in fire to cleanse himself. These traditions, many of them the same by which, in Christ’s time, the Jews ‘made the commandment of God of none effect,’ since then, in accumulated instances, have been used to destroy the force of the Old Testament Scriptures; which, indeed, Rabbinites consider of very little importance.

[***]

Rabbinism is the Catholic faith, from which all these sects are, in modern phrase, dissenters. It is the lineal descendant of Pharisaism, and distinguished by its blind adherence to the Talmud. The estimation in which strict Rabbinites hold this book is unbounded. ‘He that has learned the Scripture, and not the *Mishna*,’ says the *Gemara*, ‘is a blockhead.’ Isaac, a distinguished rabbi, says, ‘Do not imagine that the written law is the foundation of our religion, which is really founded on the oral law.’ The Rabbinical doctrine is, ‘The Bible is like water, the *Mishna* like wine, and the *Gemara* like spiced wine.’ Some even say, that ‘to study the Bible is but a waste of time.’ For strict Rabbinism, a melancholy compound of superstition and fanaticism, we must look to Poland, Russia, Hungary, and Palestine, of which we speak,

in describing the system. In those countries, the Rabbinists, or Talmudists, discountenance as profane all other study than that of the Bible and Talmud, but are very careful to educate their sons in their religious lore. The Talmud forbids teaching females more than their appropriate domestic arts. 'Whoever instructs his daughter in the Bible is as if he instructed her in abominations.' But it is a disgrace, if boys are not taught to read the Hebrew Bible. The rich provide teachers for their own children, and either permit the poorer to share this provision, or aid them in obtaining masters. So honorable is the office of teacher made, that a bare support is enough generally to secure a competent one. The ordinary method of instruction is very simple. The child, when four years old, is taught the Hebrew letters, and then to pronounce words, the meaning of which he afterwards learns from his tutor; and thus proceeds, without grammar or dictionary, until he can translate the Pentateuch with tolerable ease. Then he begins at Genesis to study exegetically, surrendering his mind, however, entirely to the guidance of some Jewish commentator; and, from first to last, never forming an independent judgment, but implicitly following tradition, and of course never detecting its gross perversions of the Bible. Some stop short of this commentary, with which others conclude their education; while others still, whose parents can afford it, especially if they display quickness in study and fondness for it, pass on to the Talmud,—first the Mishna, then the Gemara, each with its rabbinical commentaries. As an evidence of the ardor sometimes manifested in these studies, and of complete devotion to them, we are told, that a traveller, some years ago, met three young educated rabbins, who 'were born and lived to manhood in the middle of Poland, and yet knew not one word of its language.' A Jewish youth, distinguished for proficiency in Talmudical learning, is anxiously sought in marriage for the daughters of wealthy parents; who look not only at the certain honor of such an alliance, but also at the chance, thus increased, of the Messiah's coming in their line. On the other hand, the Talmud designates by the name of 'people of the land,' equivalent to *peasantry*, those educated in the Bible alone, or not at all; and represents them as an inferior class, fit only for servile labor, with whom others may not intermarry; applying Deut. xxvii. 21,—'Cursed be he that lieth with any manner of beast.' Indeed, the Talmud authorizes every species of oppression towards such, giving them the hope of heaven only if they submit. The Jewish 'peasant' is a servant of servants, ground down by those who have learned, by being oppressed, the art of oppression. In Russia and Poland, where the Jews collect the government taxes among themselves, the rabbins make the peasantry pay nearly the whole. This class, too, where the Jews regulate the conscription, must furnish all the soldiers required.

Some other characteristics of the strict Rabbinists may be briefly noticed. They are the lowest of the Jews in point of morals, and this is sufficiently accounted for by the gross immorality of many Talmudical precepts. On the great yearly *Day of Atonement*, complete absolution from all past sins is pronounced, and from all religious vows, bonds, and oaths taken since the

last preceding, and until the next, atonement. This latter absolution, contained in a prayer denominated *col nidre*, being supposed by Christians to extend to all oaths and obligations, civil as well as religious, which the Jews deny, has caused them much trouble in some parts of Europe. The Talmud teaches, moreover, that no respect is due to a Gentile's, or an unlearned Jew's, rights of property; and it accumulates other abominable doctrines, too numerous, and some of them too vile, to mention. Indeed, the modern Rabbinical Jews are generally, in practice, superior to the precepts of the Talmud. They believe in a purgatory, and pray for the souls of the dead; they hold that all Hebrews will rise in the Holy Land, those dying elsewhere rolling painfully under ground until they reach that soil; and that 'all Israel hath part in eternal life.' The dead buried in the Holy Land are expected to be the first to rise in the Messiah's day; and so strong has been the desire of burial there, that in the seventeenth century large quantities of Jewish bones were yearly sent thither to be interred. Ship-loads of this melancholy freight might often be seen at Joppa. They believe that a council properly constituted is infallible, and practically, by their implicit confidence in the Talmud, they make the ancient rabbins their 'fathers.' They place a high estimate on the merits of good works, especially those of a ceremonial kind. Thus, though the reading of the Bible is considered hardly a good act, and even as a positive waste of time, the act of taking out the Pentateuch from its depository in the synagogue, and the duty of standing on the left side of the reader, and of closing and removing the roll after service, are considered highly meritorious, and the privilege of performing them is often sold to the highest bidder. A pilgrimage to the Holy Land, much more to pass one's life there, is a superlative merit. They place great confidence in the supererogatory merits of their ancient saints, especially of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, for the males, and of Sarah, Rebekah, and Leah, for females. They have daily morning and evening prayer in the synagogue; and all the prayers for public and private devotion are prescribed, and in Hebrew; for the Talmud affirms, that the angels who receive them understand no other language. Women, servants, and children under twelve years of age, are not required to observe the hours of prayer. The Jews of the Holy Land are, perhaps, singular in praying to saints, and honoring and even worshipping relics. They never approach the supposed stones of the temple, some of which are much worn by kissing, without removing their shoes. Every spot where a saint is supposed to be buried is a place of prayer and pilgrimage. The Talmudists do not allow women to attend the synagogue, until they are married; and then, in Poland, Russia, and the East, they occupy a separate apartment.

Public worship among the Talmudical Jews is, for the most part, where the civil power has not interfered, very irreverent and disorderly. A missionary at Beyroot saw comfits thrown among the people in the synagogue, when particular portions of the service were read, *to show the sweetness of the law!* and the audience—some of the adults, and all the boys—tumbling over one another in the scramble for them on the floor. The

Talmud declares, that, in observing the feast of Purim, ‘Every man must get so drunk, that he cannot distinguish between the phrases, *Blessed be Mordecai*, and *Cursed be Haman*.’ While the Talmud imposes many burdensome ceremonies in addition to the Mosaic institutions, it also furnishes multiplied expedients for lightening the latter; and a fertile ingenuity, newly exercised for each emergency, or perpetuated in legendary rules, has extended the dispensation to every desirable point. Stephens, in his travels in the Holy Land, lodged with a Jew, who would not suffer a lamp, lighted the day before, to be extinguished on the Sabbath; but ‘described an admirable contrivance he had invented for reconciling appetite with duty;—an oven, heated the night before to such a degree, that the process of cooking was continued during the night, and the dishes were ready when wanted on the Sabbath.’ Yet even the Talmudical Jews are generally superior in morals to their Christian neighbours, especially in the point of female purity. No wonder they hate the New Testament, reading it only through the profligate and intolerant conduct of their persecutors.

Hospitality and alms-giving to their brethren are sacred duties among all the Jews. A large majority of those in Palestine are paupers, and, for their support, contributions, averaging fourteen thousand dollars a year, are made in different parts of Europe, deposited at Amsterdam, and thence transmitted to Beyroot. Jerusalem, Hebron, Tiberias, and Saphet are holy cities in Jewish esteem, and in all the Italian synagogues money-boxes are kept, marked, ‘For Jerusalem,’ ‘For Saphet,’ &c. The largest collections are in Amsterdam. Leghorn sends about four thousand dollars. But the poor unlearned Jews of Palestine are greatly oppressed by the rabbins, and generally defrauded, wholly or in part, of their share in these charities. When the Hebrew quarter at Smyrna was destroyed by fire, in 1841, Mr. Rothschild, of Vienna, gave 20,000 francs for the sufferers. He and his brothers have lately offered 100,000 francs for founding a Jewish hospital at Jerusalem. Sir Moses Montefiori, during his late visit to Palestine, contributed munificently to the wants of his poor brethren there.”¹⁵⁹²

Lenni Brenner cites numerous examples of defamations against Jews by the Jewish Zionists Maurice Samuel, Ben Frommer, Micah Yosef Berdichevsky, Yosef Chaim Brenner¹⁵⁹³ and Aaron David Gordon.¹⁵⁹⁴ One could add Theodor Herzl’s, Berl Katzenelson’s¹⁵⁹⁵ and Vladimir Jabotinsky’s¹⁵⁹⁶ names to the list. Mussolini called Jabotinsky a “Jewish Fascist” and David Ben-Gurion found Adolf Hitler’s writings reminiscent of Jabotinsky’s.¹⁵⁹⁷ Lenni Brenner wrote, quoting Chaim Greenberg,

“In March 1942 Chaim Greenberg, then the editor of New York’s Labour Zionist organ, *Jewish Frontier*, painfully admitted that, indeed, there had been:

a time when it used to be fashionable for Zionist speakers (including

the writer) to declare from the platform that ‘To be a good Zionist one must be somewhat of an anti-Semite’. . . To this day Labor Zionist circles are under the influence of the idea that the Return to Zion involved a process of purification from our economic uncleanness. Whosoever doesn’t engage in so-called ‘productive’ manual labor is believed to be a sinner against Israel and against mankind.’¹⁵⁹⁸

Martin Luther accused the Jews of not sharing the societal burden of manual labor. The ancients also made such accusations against the Jews. Zionists like Theodor Herzl emphasized that Jews must engage in manual labor in their proposed segregated society, so that their gene pool would not be corrupted by foreign laborers, and Herzl stressed his assertions that the poor Jews of Galicia and Eastern Europe were well accustomed to manual labor. Echoing the charges of anti-Semites, Herzl and other Zionists publicly accused the Jews of being “parasites”—to use their term—and the Zionists wanted Jews to take up farming and manual labor allegedly so as to cease to be “parasites”. They had other ulterior motives. Racists, and there was no one more racist than the Zionists, had long argued that conquered peoples exacted a vengeance of the vanquished by outbreeding, and by overwhelming the cultures of nations which used them as slave labor. The Zionists wanted to avoid any such occurrence by using exclusively Jewish labor in the “Jewish Homeland”. They also wanted to strengthen their gene pool, which they believed had been weakened by the ghetto system and urbanization. In addition, in the early 1920’s, some, like Lord Sydenham, complained that the Zionists were exporting Jews of poor character from the East to Palestine, people who were not fit for, nor skilled in, the farmwork that was needed in Palestine. Beyond this, Jewish laws forbids non-Jews to live in Jerusalem, even in Greater Israel, and the racist Jews needed a Jewish slave labor force of Eastern European Jews to build them a new nation without violating Jewish law.

Indeed, one of the first objectives of the Jewish Bolshevists was to train Eastern European Jews to farm and perform the trades. A. Borisow wrote in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 22 September 1922 on page 16,

“Nep and the Jews.

A New Element in Soviet Russia.

BY A. BORISOW.

A new persecutor has arisen to plague our long-suffering Russian Jewry in the form of the New Economic Policy, familiarly known in Russia as the ‘Nep.’

Most people will look up in surprise when they hear me describe the ‘Nep,’ the far-famed and much-heralded New Economic Policy of the Soviet Government, as a persecutor. For does not ‘Nep’ mean the renunciation of the Communist illusions, liberation from the bureaucratic Soviet institutions,

the reintroduction of trade into the country, the circulation of money, the right of possession of land and factories? All that is surely a blessing to the Jewish population, mainly an urban and commercial element, and yet I stigmatise it as a persecutor!

Still I repeat that the 'Nep' in Russia is a persecutor of the Jews. During the whole of the last two years the Jews have not suffered economically so much as they have during the few months since the introduction of the 'Nep.' It is not for nothing that the Jews translate the initials of the 'Nep' as the 'Nestchastnaja' ('luckless') Economic Policy.

What is it that the 'Nep' has brought us?

To begin with, it has reduced the number of officials. Many of the Soviet institutions have been closed down. In most of the others, 50 to 60 per cent. of the staff has been dismissed. Viewed on its merits, this is most welcome. It will mean a decrease in the heavy taxation which went to keep all these officials. But for the Jewish population it is a terrible blow. It is no secret that the Soviet institutions, especially in the cities, were staffed almost entirely by Jews. About three-quarters of the total number of officials were Jews. Tens of thousands of Jewish intellectuals and semi-intellectuals, lawyers, journalists and doctors, managed to earn a crust of bread in the service of the Soviet institutions. They formed the majority of the lettered population. Now they are dismissed, driven out into the streets, condemned to unemployment and to starvation. That is the first blessing which the 'Nep' has brought to the Jews.

Trade in Russia has again become free. People are allowed to exchange commodities, to buy and sell. As that was the usual occupation of the majority of the Jews in pre-war Russia, it should be an excellent thing for the Jews. There is no need now to fear that the 'Cheka' will come down on the traders and have them shot for speculation.

But what is the result?

The reintroduction of trade has meant the annihilation of everything that has been done to foster productive work among the Jews. During the four years of Communism in Russia, the foundations of the old economic order were undermined.

With fire and sword the Communists wiped out every trace of trading in the country. They put a stop to what they called 'speculation.' The 'Cheka' drove our *Luftmenschen* by the fear of death into productive work. No one imagined there would ever be a return to the old conditions. Lest they died of hunger, they were compelled to adapt themselves to the new conditions. They learned some kind of handicraft, or they took to agriculture. Productive co-operatives sprang up in the towns. The younger generation, especially, took to establishing agricultural co-operatives. Thousands of young men and women joined the *Hechaluz*, joined together in a rigid discipline in order to take up agriculture as their life work. The Jewish population, under compulsion, became if not proletarianised, in the sense of becoming a factory population, at least labourised—engaged in direct labour. They did

productive work instead of engaging in barter.

And now the 'Nep' has come, and stamped out all these hopeful signs, put a stop to all this new endeavour which has meant so much adaptation and hard work. It has killed the co-operatives, and the *Hechaluz* groups. People have left their handicrafts, their agricultural work, and they have again started their small trading—not only those who were traders in the pre-Revolution period, but also people who had never before in their lives had anything to do with commerce or barter. Men who were intellectuals, lawyers, writers, Government officials, have hailed the 'Nep' as the liberator. People who had grown tired of hungering, who had sold their last garment in order to get a dry crust of bread, who could no longer stand being herded together, ten of them in an unheated cellar, have become drunk with the lust of making money. Hundreds of millions of roubles, they heard, could be made by engaging in trade. So they went into trade. They are 'Nepping.'

It would be ridiculous to blame anyone for that. All we can do is to deplore it. But we must regret that the forced and unwilling, yet nevertheless healthy work of transition of a large part of the Jewish population to productive work has been brought to nothing.

If the 'Nep' at least provided the people with the means of livelihood, if those who have thrown away their handicraft and their agriculture, in order to engage in trade improved their economic position, there would be some sort of justification even for the loss.

Business in Russia to-day is conducted by the million. The slightest transaction involves tens of millions. Where are the people to obtain these huge initial sums with which to start their businesses? Nobody had any money. Most of those who have started in business have sold their effects down to their very last plate or spoon in order to get some sort of a starting capital. They buy up goods for several tens of millions and they sell them again at some hundreds per cent. profit. Splendid, it seems at first sight. But in the interval which the transaction takes to complete, the rate of exchange has generally fallen to such an extent that the total sum realised buys less than the original sum had purchased. Sixty million roubles, for example, to-day buy about as much as 20 to 25 millions bought a short while ago. Nominally, the 'Nep' man has become richer. Actually, he has become poorer.

There is an anecdote in circulation among these 'Nep' people which will serve as an apt illustration.

Somebody bought in the Urals five waggon-loads of nails, brought them to Moscow and sold them at a tremendous profit. He went back again to the Urals, but this time he was unable to get more than three waggon-loads of nails for his money. He came back to Moscow, sold them again at an immense profit, and went back to the Urals. This time he managed to buy no more than one waggon-load of nails. And so it went on and on, until at last he went to the Urals with a simply colossal sum, but all he could get for it was just one nail. So he took that nail and hitched a rope to it and hanged

himself.

It is not difficult to earn money, but to become rich or even to make a decent livelihood is impossible, especially with the State shearing the 'Nep' people unmercifully. They are taxed to an enormous extent. And it is not to be wondered at that hundreds and thousands of Jews who at first petitioned for permits to become 'Neppists' are now returning their permits to the Government asking to be released from the honour of being among the builders of the New Economic Policy.

But it is not easy to give it up. When the shopkeepers in Homel, staggering under their heavy taxation, declared a sort of strike, refusing to open their shops and engage in business, they were denounced as counter-revolutionaries, and one of the leaders of the 'Yewsekzie,' the notorious Merejin, published two inflammatory articles in the 'Emess' denouncing the 'first attack by the Jewish bourgeoisie against the Soviet Government,' and demanding that they should be punished as traitors.

Naturally, not all the 'Nep' people go through the same kind of thing. As always, there are exceptions, and there are individuals who have made fortunes, especially in Moscow, which is to-day the greatest, perhaps the only trading centre in Russia. It is to Moscow that the Jews are flocking from every part of the country. Till recently things were not so bad in Minsk, where people managed to do well on contraband trade with Poland. But now there is a Customs office at the railway station in Minsk; all goods are thoroughly examined, and permission to bring goods back into Russia is given only to those who agree to smuggle illegal Communist literature into Poland.

Things are somewhat better for those families who have children over the age of twelve, able to travel round the villages, buy up goods and bring them home to their parents to sell. To have several grown-up children to-day in Russia means to be a rich man. Each child is a bread-winner. So from their earliest days children are being brought up to trade. Speculation is again becoming the forte of the Jews. All education is neglected, in order to train the children to become good business people. Of ideals it is better to say nothing at all.

But the most fortunate under the "Nep" are those families who have been down with typhus. That is an exceptional bit of luck. These people have no fear of again contracting the disease, so they travel about along the railway lines, and bring goods to their homes. There are very few others who will venture to set foot in a train, for the compartments are generally the homes of lice and contagion. They are consequently becoming monopolists. People who want to have things done for them in distant parts usually have to employ these typhus people, who get a good proportion of the profits.

A few individuals become rich, speculating in diamonds and in the exchange rate. The overwhelming majority, however, scuttle about the place like poisoned rats, buying and selling, working sixteen hours in the day, thinking of nothing in the world except their little businesses, and at the end

of it all they have gained hardly anything.

Economically, 'Nep' has brought nothing but demoralisation into the life of Russian Jewry.

The moral degeneration is appalling. The mentality of the few new rich is disgusting. Everything is to their view concentrated within their little business transactions. The hunger for profits is stronger than anything else in the world, more potent than social or intellectual interests, for which there is no room left in their minds. A 'Nep' man who has really done well will never give anything away unless he is given a place of honour on some committee or other. The rule of the day in Jewish life in Russia is that 'he who has the money gets the honey.' The few new rich 'Nep' people are the rulers of Jewish life. The old social order has been broken up. The former communal workers have emigrated or have become the poorest of the poor. New people have taken their place.

The story of the 'Nep' is not finished yet. We will not venture to prophesy what it may bring to Russian Jewry in the future. But there is no doubt about what it is to-day. It is a persecution. It is not a New Economic Policy, but, as they say a 'luckless' economic policy."

In an age of Social Darwinism, the Zionists promoted the idea that only young and strong Jews should emigrate to Palestine and that they alone should avoid death at the hands of the Nazis. The infamous stories of the selection process of the SS, whereby healthy Jews of childbearing age were selected to survive, while others were selected to die, was, if true, most likely a Zionist directive meant to undue the supposed genetic damage of the ghettos. The Nazis were also infamous for forcing Jews to perform strenuous manual labor, literally working the old and the weak to death.¹⁵⁹⁹ This practice fulfilled several Zionist objectives—killing off the old and the weak—training Jews to do the dirty work that would be needed to be done in Palestine—fulfilling Jacob's Biblical rôle as an agrarian—and ensuring that the Holy Land would become predominantly Jewish, almost exclusively Jewish, which is also a Biblical goal and one the racist Israelis are still attempting to achieve today. The Nazis devoted a great deal attention to identification of "Jewish racial traits".

While the Zionist Nazis favored Zionist Jews and helped to usher them out of Nazi occupied lands, the Zionist Nazis targeted assimilatory Jewry and Orthodox Jewry, who were largely opposed to Zionism. The Zionists hoped to persuade both assimilated Jews and Orthodox Jews to violate their sensibilities and the Talmud and emigrate to Palestine *en masse* after the Second World War. The Zionists viciously punished these assimilated and Orthodox Jews who had opposed the Zionists after the First World War. The following article appeared in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 11 April 1919 on page 10,

“Jewish Factions in the Polish Parliament.

————— COPENHAGEN [F. O. C.]

When the leaders of the Jewish factions in Poland rose in Parliament to explain the Jewish policy and demands in the new State, there was only one

note of agreement struck by them, namely, the loyalty of the Jews to Poland and their goodwill towards the State. Otherwise, a sharp conflict of opinions manifested itself between the Jewish Nationalists (the Zionists and the People's Party) and the Orthodox Group (to which the Assimilation Party also leans on Jewish National questions). The former demanded national minority rights for the Jews, whereas the latter claimed equal rights only. Rabbi Perlmutter, on behalf of the Orthodox Party (speaking in the House without uncovering), declared that he desired to see a great Poland sweeping to the sea. M. Prilutzky, on behalf of the Jewish Nationalists, claimed National rights for the Jews, including special schools and the right to employ Yiddish in Courts of Justice and in State documents. He had a very hostile reception, members shouting at him: 'Let America grant such demands first, and we shall follow.'

Rabbi Halpern replied to M. Prilutzky that the Orthodox Party, which, as he believed, formed the preponderating group of Jews in Poland, only demanded equal rights. He stated that the Jews loved Poland, and that they believed the declarations of the Polish Party leaders that the Jews would get equal rights. He expressed the fear that the Nationalists would impair the relations between the Poles and the Jews."

Many Jews were aware of the fact that the Zionists were sponsoring anti-Semitism and that Zionists agreed with the precepts of anti-Semitism—were themselves anti-Semites. Some Zionists loudly protested against this truth. On 3 September 1897 on page 12, an article in *The Jewish Chronicle* paraphrased Dr. Birnbaum's statement at the First Zionist Congress,

"Dr. BIRNBAUM mentioned that it had often been contended that Zionism was but a reaction against anti-Semitism. It had not been denied that the growth of Zionism coincided with that of anti-Semitism, and, therefore, the conclusion was arrived at that the former only existed at the mercy of the latter. This was a complete mistake. It should be remembered that every movement had its causes and impetus. Through the former it obtained its pioneers, and through the latter its troops. Zionism could proudly say of itself that all who stood at its head had either long left the anti-Semitic impetus behind them, or that from the beginning their belief originated in the anomaly of the existence of a Jewish people. The want of a land of their own caused this anomaly to be the greater. There was a sentimental feeling in favour of Palestine, but sentiment would not suffice because the land whither they would go did not need special attraction; any country in which their distress would cease would be attractive; what they required was a land which would be able to keep them once they were there, till the grand process of converting them from a mercantile people into a people devoted to all callings, especially agriculture, had been completed, and they would no longer hanker after the flesh pots of Egypt [*Exodus* 16:3]. Palestine was the only country able to accomplish this. The second reason in favour of

Palestine was the benefits that would be conferred not on Jews alone, but on mankind in general. A Jewish people in Palestine would not alone be the medium between the social-ethical and political-aesthetical elements of Europeism, but also the long-sought medium between the East and the West. No people is so apt for this as the Jews with their inherited Oriental qualities and their acquired European character. No country is so fitted to be the territorial medium as Palestine, with its proximity to Europe and to the Suez Canal, and as being the inevitable station on the railway to India. Fears had been expressed for the future of the Holy Sepulchre if Jews became the masters of Palestine, but by making the Christian holy places extra-territorial the difficulty would be overcome and all fears would be dissipated.”

Much of what Birnbaum stated echoed the sophistry contained in Theodor Herzl’s book *The Jewish State*. If the Zionists were genuinely interested in the best interests of humanity, they would have propped up the Turkish Empire, instead of trying to tear it down. It was the Turkish Empire which had the potential to fulfill the rôles the Zionist European Jews artificially claimed as their own. The Zionists knew that a large Jewish presence in Palestine would have the exact opposite effect of what they claimed. Instead of bringing peace to the region, it would inflame the Moslems and Catholics against the Jews and against one another. The Zionists tossed out the bait that the Suez Canal was of vital interest to European trade, and then falsely asserted that a Jewish presence would secure that interest, when in fact the Jews knew quite well that a Jewish presence would jeopardize European interests by instigating religious conflict. There was nothing that prevented the British and the French from maintaining productive relations with Moslems, other than Jewish Messianic designs.

The Jews did not want to secure the Suez for the sake of the Europeans, rather the Jews wanted the Northern European and British Protestants to secure Palestine for the Jews and protect them from the Catholics and the Muhammadans who would be inflamed by a Jewish colonization of their Holy Lands and shrines. Jewish intolerance of other religions remains a threat today, when Jewish Israelis attack Christians in Bethlehem, violate international law in Jerusalem, and seek to destroy the militaries and societies in Moslem countries, so that the Moslems will have no means with which to fight back when the Jews and Dispensationalist Christians destroy the Dome of the Rock and Al Aqsa Mosque and build a Jewish Temple in their place. The Israelis are also using the military of the United States to take over the territory of Greater Israel, which they know will eventually pass into their hands.

Beginning in the late 1800’s, Jewish Zionists heavily promoted anti-Semitism and anti-Semites. Crypto-Jews founded and led anti-Jewish societies, which were financed with Jewish bankers’ money. The most prominent Nazis were crypto-Jewish Frankists—Zionist propagandists in anti-Semite’s clothing, *agents provocateur*, including Alfred Rosenberg, who took his political ideology from Houston Stewart Chamberlain, Liebenfels and List. Theodor Herzl took his racist political ideology from Eugen Karl Dühring, making Dühring an influence on both Herzlian Zionist racist mythology and Nazi racist mythology.¹⁶⁰⁰ Before Dühring was

the Jewish racist Zionist Moses Hess, who created National Socialist racism. Dietrich Eckart proposed that a demagogue should lead the Germans to drive out the Jews—long a Zionist objective.

In 1909, Zionist Max Nordau presented a character profile for the successful revolutionary that fit Hitler, Lenin and Stalin.¹⁶⁰¹ Nordau, though born and raised in Austro-Hungary, called himself a German, parroted the *Übermensch* philosophy, ridiculed Judaism and Christianity, copied the Germanic Hegelian dialectic, then called the modern world and those philosophers he was copying “degenerate”—a favorite word of Lombroso, who was Jewish,¹⁶⁰² and the Nazis.¹⁶⁰³ Disraeli, Nordau and Zollschan promoted the alleged superiority of the “blonde Nordic race” in order to promote the segregation of their own “Jewish race”. They asserted that the German and the Jew were superior races to the Slav and the Negro.

Cesare Lombroso,¹⁶⁰⁴ who was Jewish,¹⁶⁰⁵ advocated the extermination of alleged criminal phenotypes. His theories later became the model for the Nazis’ gassing of political opponents, criminals, the insane and the infirm. Jewish Zionist Max Nordau was in many senses the archetype Nazi. Many Nazis and anti-Semites were of Jewish origin. Both the Zionists and the Nazis loathed the Slavic “race” and brought about its downfall in modern times. They also attempted to wipe out the blonde “race” of Nordics they pretended to admire.

The Old Testament is filled with stories of Jews massacring other Jews and of human sacrifice. The Old Testament and the Talmud instruct pious Jews to kill Jews who abandon Judaism, especially those who sincerely convert to other religions, as well as heathen priests.¹⁶⁰⁶ While addressing the justifications given by religious Zionist terrorists for Yigal Amir’s murder of Yitzhak Rabin, Jessica Stern wrote in her book *Terror in the Name of God: Why Religious Militants Kill*,

“According to the halakah, the rulings of Din Mosser and Din Rodef apply to those Jews who have committed the most despicable crime imaginable—the betrayal of their fellow Jews. The punishment of the Mosser—a person who hands over sacred Jewish property to the gentile—as well as that of the Rodef—a person who murders or facilitates the murder of Jews—shall be death. Since the execution of the Mosser or the Rodef is aimed at saving the lives of other Jews, there is no need for a trial.”¹⁶⁰⁷

The political Zionists considered non-Zionist Jews to be traitors and they believed assimilation would lead to the death of the mythical “Jewish race”. Moses Hess wrote,

“The most touching point about these Hebrew prayers is, that they are really an expression of the collective Jewish spirit; they do not plead for the individual, but for the entire Jewish race. The pious Jew is above all a Jewish patriot. The ‘new’ Jew, who denies the existence of the Jewish nationality, is not only a deserter in the religious sense, but is also a traitor to his people, his race and even to his family. If it were true that Jewish emancipation in exile is incompatible with Jewish nationality, then it were the duty of the

Jews to sacrifice the former for the sake of the latter. This point, however, may need a more elaborate explanation, but that the Jew must be above all a Jewish patriot, needs no proof to those who have received a Jewish education. Jewish patriotism is not a cloudy Germanic abstraction, which dissolves itself in discussions about being and appearance, realism and idealism, but a true, natural feeling, the tangibility and simplicity of which require no demonstration, nor can it be disposed of by a demonstration to the contrary. ”¹⁶⁰⁸

Anti-Semitism was very useful to both the Communists and the Zionists. Politically active anti-Semitic demagogues like Lueger, Ahlwardt, Treitschke and Stoecker had numerous Jewish connections, as did Adolf Hitler—some even had Jewish blood, as did Hitler. Anselm von Rothschild stated that Stoecker was an apostate Jew. The Rothschilds wanted desperately to buy Palestine and establish a Jewish state there, with a Rothschild sitting as king of the world, but the Rothschilds lacked broad Jewish support. The political Zionists later concluded that they could only obtain Jewish support in a climate of advanced anti-Semitism. *The Chicago Tribune*, on 12 December 1881 on page 6, reprinted a letter from Rothschild to Stoecker:

“BARON ROTHSCHILD.

The Letter Written by Him in Defense of the Jews.

Baron Anselm von Rothschild, of Vienna, wrote the annexed letter to Hof-Prediger Stoecker, of Berlin, the instigator of the anti-Semitic agitation in Germany:

VIENNA, November, 1881.—*To the Court Preacher Stoecker*—SIR: If I am correctly informed, your physician once advised you to take plenty of exercise, and since then you have been almost constantly employed in anti-Semitic movements. This matter really concerns me very little, for, thank God, Austria has not yet advanced so far on the path of intelligence and refinement as to possess a ‘Judenhetze,’ such as the cultivated city of Berlin can boast of. But still I should like to call the attention of your reverence to certain grave errors which have crept into your speech recently delivered in the German Parliament.

You said in that address, ‘Behind me stand the millions.’ You are mistaken: the millions stand behind me, and if you doubt this you are respectfully invited to visit my counting-house, where ample proofs shall be given you. You contend that ‘the Jewish usurers have ruined all classes of people.’ Now, pray tell me, my dear Court-Preacher, who goes to the Jewish usurer? Is it not those whose credit is exhausted? And if their fellow-men will not trust them any longer, are they not already ruined before they seek their last resort—the Jewish usurer? This is only another of many cases where the Jew is made the scapegoat for the offenses of his neighbors. [A Gentile, or Gentile government, could be easily forced to seek loans from a Jewish usurer through the agitation of the Jewish press for war, or an infinite

number of other corrupt means—as evinced by the Jewish financiers’ destruction of Russia.]

You say further that the Jews, out of all proportion to their numbers, assisted by talent and capital, exercise a mighty influence in the community. I am really surprised that this should surprise you. As if talent had not, from time immemorial, held the sceptre. Would you rather that this world should be ruled by fools than by wise men? And as far as the disproportion of our numbers is concerned we Jews cannot help but feel highly flattered if we possess more talent than our Gentile countrymen. And as for our power as capitalists this is the result of our business genius and our economy. Why do not the Christians imitate us? Do we hinder them from earning money or from saving it? [The answer to this question is obviously yes. Jewish power, wealth and influence in the press result from Jewish racism and Jewish tribalism, and the Cabalist and Talmudic doctrines which encourage Jews to take advantage of Christian integrity in order to exploit Christians. Rich Jews promoted honesty and decentralized power among the Gentiles, while promoting dishonesty and tribalism among their own. This gave the Jews an advantage, which could only be overcome by the Gentiles’ sinking to the debased level of the foe, or expelling it. Rothschild’s racist arrogance is ample proof of the fact, and if the Gentiles had truly leveled the playing field by sinking to Rothschild’s level, they would have quickly crushed the Jews.]

‘The Jews should be more modest,’ you say. It is true that modesty is a most desirable virtue, suited alike to Jew and Gentile, but as Goethe has it, ‘Only scoundrels are modest.’ Now, among the Jews there are so few scoundrels, and then really it is much easier for a Court Preacher to be modest than for a Jew. If a Court Preacher displays that commendable virtue, his flock will bow before him and exclaim, ‘So mighty and yet so modest.’ Let a Jew be modest and he is kicked and spurned, and the mob say, ‘Serves him right.’ [The reality is that the rich Jews concentrated their wealth and shared it with neither Gentile nor poor Jew. This concentration of wealth gave the Jews enormous power and the resentment this corrupt and undemocratic warmongering power caused was directed at poor Jews, often through the machinations of rich Jews, who sought to keep their poor brethren segregated.]

You aver that the Jew in Lessing’s ‘Nathan’ is no Jew at all, but a Christian. With the same right I might say the Court Preacher Stoecker is no Christian, but an apostate Jew who has banded himself with some barbarous relics of the Middle Ages to prosecute a miserable anti-Semitic agitation. But I will not say this, as I would not desire to so grossly insult my co-religionists. [It is highly interesting that Rothschild called Stoecker an apostate Jew.]

Your friend Bachem is of the opinion that the people are backing him. I will admit that there is a people in his wake, but as a German philosopher once said: ‘There are enough wretches in the world to back any bad cause.’ Your friend also indulges in the crushing accusation that the Jews are grain

speculators. Now, do you know who was the first speculator in grain? None other than Jew, Joseph, in Egypt, although at that time there was no Court Preacher to discover any crime in his action, and the people were grateful to him. [The Egyptian people were not grateful to Joseph, who brought them into slavery (*Genesis* 47).]

In one of your discourses you once exclaimed: ‘Look at Herr von Bleichroeder. He has more money than all the evangelical preachers put together.’ Now, I am sure that Herr von Bleichroeder has never said: ‘Look at Court Preacher Stoecker. He earns more money by a single sermon than a hundred Jewish firms do in a whole year.’

In conclusion, if you will not admit that the Jews have any good qualities, you will at least not envy them for the little money they may possess. In spite of their wealth they cannot prevent, in the year of 1881, the formation of an agitation against them, what would become of them if they had no money? It is true the Jews put some value on wealth, and I must say that I would rather be a rich Jew than a poor Christian. But then, are there not poor Christians who would rather be rich Jews? Even you, most reverent sir, might, perhaps, be willing to change positions with me (and I flatter myself that you would not make so bad a bargain). For myself, I can only say that if I were not Rothschild, I should still be very far from wishing myself the Court Preacher Stoecker. Very respectfully, A. VON ROTHSCHILD.”

Under the heading “Foreign Articles”, the following statement appeared in *Niles’ Weekly Register*, Volume 17, Number 427, (13 November 1819), p. 169,

“Mr. Rothschild, the great London banker, indignant at the persecution of his Jewish brethren in Germany, has refused to take bills upon any of the cities in which they are persecuted; and great embarrassments to trade have been experienced in consequence of his determination. ☞It is intimated that the persecution of the Jews is in part owing to the fact, that Mr. Rothschild and his brethren were among the chief of those who furnished the ‘legitimates,’ with money to forge chains for the people of Europe.”

There would not have been agitations against the Jews, if the Jews in the press had not attacked Christianity and if the Jewish financiers had not attacked Europe with perpetual war¹⁶⁰⁹ throughout the Nineteenth Century. That “little money” in the hands of the Rothschilds alone amounted to some, or one might say “sum” \$3,400,000,000.00, acquired through deceitful and inhuman means. It is interesting, though not at all unusual, that Stoecker was a Jew and was behind the anti-Jewish agitation. The same could be said of Goebbels, Streicher, Heydrich, Frank, etc., and, no doubt, Rothschild.

The outspoken Mayor of Vienna Karl Lueger proclaimed that he decided who was, and who was not, a Jew, meaning that he could protect those Jews who helped him—those Jews who put him in power in order to spread anti-Semitism. He had Jewish backers and was an agent for their agenda. Anti-Semite Hermann Ahlwardt

advocated the segregation of Jews in the Reichstag in 1895. The segregation of Jews was a Zionist objective. Ahlwardt spoke in anti-assimilationist terms Theodor Herzl would soon use in his book *The Jewish State*. Adolf Stoecker also raised his voice to advocate segregation in the schools, as did racist Zionist Albert Einstein. The dogma of segregation had both Zionist and anti-Semitic origins—for example racist Zionist Moses Hess' *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage* of 1862 and anti-Semite Eugen Karl Dühring's *Die Judenfrage als Racen-, Sitten- und Culturfrage: mit einer weltgeschichtlichen Antwort* of 1881. Hermann Ahlwardt stated to the Reichstag in 1895,

“A Jew who was born in Germany does not thereby become a German; he is still a Jew. Therefore it is imperative that we realize that Jewish racial characteristics differ so greatly from ours that a common life of Jews and Germans under the same law is quite impossible because the Germans will perish.”¹⁶¹⁰

Jewish Zionist Bernard Lazare wrote in 1894,

“Everything is tending to bring about such a consummation. Such is the irony of things that antisemitism which everywhere is the creed of the conservative class, of those who accuse the Jews of having worked hand in hand with the Jacobins of 1789 and the Liberals and Revolutionists of the nineteenth century, this very antisemitism is acting, in fact, as an ally of the Revolution. Drumont in France, Pattai in Hungary, Stoecker and von Boeckel in Germany are co-operating with the very demagogues and revolutionists whom they believe they are attacking. This antisemitic movement, in its origin reactionary, has become transformed and is acting now for the advantage of the revolutionary cause. Antisemitism stirs up the middle class, the small tradesmen, and sometimes the peasant, against the Jewish capitalist, but in doing so it gently leads them toward Socialism, prepares them for anarchy, infuses in them a hatred for all capitalists, and, more than that, for capital in the abstract. And thus, unconsciously, antisemitism is working its own ruin, for it carries in itself the germ of destruction.

Such, then, is the probable fate of modern antisemitism. I have tried to show how it may be traced back to the ancient hatred against the Jews; how it persisted after the emancipation of the Jews, how it has grown and what are its manifestations. In every way I am led to believe that it must ultimately perish, and that it will perish for the various reasons which I have indicated, because the Jew is undergoing a process of change; because religious, political, social, and economic conditions are likewise changing; but above all, because antisemitism is one of the last, though most long lived, manifestations of that old spirit of reaction and narrow conservatism, which is vainly attempting to arrest the onward movement of the Revolution.”¹⁶¹¹

Dietrich Eckart¹⁶¹² promoted Adolf Hitler as a viable anti-Semitic demagogue,

though many thought that Hitler appeared to be a Jewish actor or comedian spoofing an anti-Semitic demagogue, and they laughed at him. Eckart said,

“The best would be a worker who knows how to talk. . . . He doesn’t need much brains, politics is the stupidest business in the world, and every marketwoman in Munich knows more than the people in Weimar. I’d rather have a vain monkey who can give the Reds a juicy answer, and doesn’t run away when people begin swinging table legs, than a dozen learned professors. He must be a bachelor, then we’ll get the women.”¹⁶¹³

In 1934, Jacob R. Marcus incorrectly predicted that Nazis would not carry the Holocaust, because so many of its prominent leaders were, by Nazism’s own standards, “sub-human”,

“The present National Socialist government is too shrewd, in spite of its racial commitments, to lend itself to such extravaganzas. It wants no Brahmanic caste-system in which even the shadow of a low caste Hindu is a pollution. It knows that any attempt toward racial eugenics along purely Nordic lines would disrupt present day Germany with its half-dozen racial strains. Nordicism, if it were literally true to itself, would mean the exclusion from the German state of the following non-Nordic types: the late Paul von Hindenburg; Streicher, the rabid anti-Semitic Nuremberg journalist; Ley, the head of the National Socialist Labor Front; Goebbels, Minister of National Enlightenment and Propaganda; and finally, Hitler, himself. Here is a racial analysis of Hitler made in 1929 by the racial-hygienist, Professor von Gruber, then President of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences and a member of the racially-minded Pan-American Association:

‘For the first time I saw Hitler at close range. Face and head of poor race, mongrel, low slanting forehead, ugly nose, broad cheek bones, small eyes, dark hair. A short brushlike mustache, no broader than the nose, gives the face a defiant touch. The facial expression is not that of a man who has complete control of himself but of one who is aroused to frenzy. Repeated twitching of the facial muscles. When through, expression of contented self-reliance.’ (*Essener Volkswacht*, Nov. 9, 1929.)¹⁶¹⁴

The exposure of the active involvement of Zionists with the Nazi hierarchy—even as instigators of the entire Nazi movement—is shocking, but one is reminded of the willingness of some Jewish religious fanatics to commit suicide and to submit to genocide in order to preserve the integrity of the holy land and of the “race” of the “chosen”. Racists like the Jewish Zionist Meir Kahane thrived on conflict. Kahane asked Jews to rejoice at the United Nations Resolution which acknowledged that Zionism is a form of racism. He hoped that it would lead to strife between Gentiles and Jews, because he believed that this would ultimately lead to the destruction of the Gentile world, as Jewish prophecy foretold. Kahane hoped that the entire world would turn against Israel, and falsely tied all Jews to Israel, in the

hopes that Jews would be humiliated and then the Gentiles would be destroyed by God, in the form of Zionist subversion. Kahane succinctly wrote, *inter alia*,

“The banding together by the nations of the world against Israel is the guarantee that their time of destruction is near and the final redemption of the Jew at hand.”¹⁶¹⁵

Jessica Stern, in her book *Terror in the Name of God: Why Religious Militants Kill*, writes of Jews who are willing,

“to risk a world war in pursuit of religious redemption for the Jewish people.”^{30,1616}

Baruch Kimmerling wrote,

“At the center of this culture of death is the remembrance of martyrs—Jews who, in Zionist ideology, had to die so that the state might be born. [***] *A triumphal creed shadowed by death, Zionism transformed the catastrophes of Jewish history into nationalist fables of redemption.*”¹⁶¹⁷

Though Kahane has been rejected by the vast majority of Jews, and by the majority of Israelis, his message is in keeping with Judaism. Kahanism has a romantic allure to some Jews of a promise of community and common enemy. That battles with their better natures and Kahanism threatens to become a broad movement if not checked and exposed again and again as the hateful mythology that it is. This lust for persecution and martyrdom in order to bring death upon the enemies of the Jews, real or imagined enemies, is an ancient tradition for Jews. It is clearly advocated in the writings of Philo the Jew and Josephus, as well as those of Theodor Herzl. Philo the Jew vilified the Egyptians and Caligula with lies—as did Josephus with even more outrageous lies. Josephus fabricated the myth of Masada. These legendary lies are ingrained in the psyches of those who see these lies as their history and who have a “Masada Complex” of imagined persecution and martyrdom.¹⁶¹⁸ Many modern Jews have created an unhealthy culture of death and persecution around the Holocaust—some say the Holocaust has become a new religion.¹⁶¹⁹

In the book of *Numbers*, Chapter 25, Jews were commanded by God to commit genocide against Jews who had assimilated. According to the *Gospel of John* 11:47-53, Caiaphas chose to execute Jesus in order to preserve the nation of the Jews and to gather back its supposedly chosen people:

“47 Then gathered the chief priests and the Pharisees a council, and said, What do we? for this man doeth many miracles. 48 If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation. 49 And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, 50 Nor

consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. 51 And this spake he not of himself: but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; 52 And not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad. 53 Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death.”

The book of *Matthew* 1:21-23 states that “Jesus”—the Jew—was meant to rescue the Jewish Nation,

“21 And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins. 22 Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, 23 Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us.”

If the New Testament is a fiction in part, or in whole, it is a fabrication that fixes blame for the destruction of the Temple and of Jerusalem on Jesus—from the Jewish point of view, instead of on the corruption of some leading Jews against the Roman government and the murder of Caligula for defiling the Temple. It also makes Jesus a means by which to preserve and consolidate the Jewish nation—a human sacrifice. If the New Testament is authentic, then Jesus’ murder was a ploy, which enabled Jewish leaders to secure the unity of their people. In either event, the founding of Christianity—the story of the crucifixion of Christ—was a nationalistic attempt to unite the Jews of the world through human sacrifice—an alleged unity that some Jews have since sought and continue to seek at all costs to the themselves and without any regard for the rights and interests of others, both selflessly and selfishly willing to lead the world into an apocalyptic war in order to preserve their nationalistic vision.

At this critical time when humanity faces many important decisions and should be planning for the future of the survival of the human race, the tiny and insignificant country of Israel with a population of only six million receives grossly disproportionate attention on the world stage, draining off resources and time that the other six-and-one-half-billion human beings cannot afford to spare. Humanity would be better served to devote its resources to more important problems and simply impose an equitable solution to the problems in the Middle East with overwhelming force, or overwhelming disinterest. Though it seems the racist Jews will never rest until they have murdered off the Gentiles in way or another.

Early Christians inherited their love of martyrdom from the Jews and mostly were Jews. Ancient writers assert that ancient Jews believed that death by martyrdom was a certain means to immortality. One is further reminded of the countless failed attempts to form a Jewish nation and the desperation of the Zionists to find a means to achieve their ends because they believed the “Jewish race” was on the verge of extinction. The political Zionists embraced anti-Semitism as that meanest of means.

It is a fact that the Nazis in their writings and in their speeches promoted the

Zionists, and that the Zionists in their writings and in their speeches promoted anti-Semitism and the Nazis. It is also a fact that the Zionists advocated the racist position that Jews cannot and should not assimilate and were a foreign, disloyal, and combative nation within Germany.

This common interest between Nazis and Zionists includes financial collusion between Zionists and anti-Semites—the type of financial collusion Herzl advocated in his book *The Jewish State*. Herzl, who exhibited a psychopathic personality, held the majority of the Jews in low regard, and was eager to “sacrifice” them for his cause. His philosophical descendants were even more inhumane. Of course, the guilt of the Zionists who fomented the political climate which precipitated the Holocaust in no way abrogates the guilt of the many Germans and Europeans who participated in murdering millions of innocent men, women and children in the Holocaust and the Second World War. It serves as a warning to us all of the power held by those who mold public opinion and the possibilities for good or evil that control over that force holds. It is presently in the hands of the Zionists and has been for centuries.

7.5.1 Nazism is a Stalking Horse for Zionism and Communism

Adolf Hitler was a former Bolshevik with connections to members of the *Thule-Gesellschaft*—a subversive organization founded by crypto-Jewish Zionists on the Illuminati model to foment an anti-Semitic revolution that would force the Jews out of Europe and into Palestine.¹⁶²⁰ Hitler was filmed marching in the funeral procession of Jewish Communist Kurt Eisner, who led a short-lived Soviet Republic in Munich at the end of the First World War. Hitler was a Bolshevik and a Zionist with many strong ties to the Jewish community. He surrounded himself with Jews and crypto-Jews throughout his life.

To many of his contemporaries, Hitler appeared to be a Jewish actor, comically spoofing a ranting anti-Semitic demagogue. Many of Hitler’s contemporaries knew that Hitler was a Red subversive who was trying to weasel his way into power through Jew-baiting, and pretending to fight Bolshevism, in order to convert Germany into a Zionist Bolshevik nation led by crypto-Jews. This was a common Communist tactic. At the same time, American Jewish Communists were also Jew-baiting and trying to attract a following through the use of anti-Semitic propaganda in an effort to use anti-Jewish prejudice as a means to fulfill Jewish prophecy and put Jews in power around the world. This was an old Frankist trick. One could even say that Christianity served the same purpose.

The Soviet Union tried to subvert Moslem nations with anti-Israeli positions meant to lure Moslem nations into turning Communist and to make it appear that Israel was a necessary ally to the United States and Western Europe. If the Moslem nations had gone Communist, Israel, which itself had a Communist Party, would then have had complete control over those nations, which undoubtedly would have been ruled by crypto-Jews or Jewish agents. In a short period of time, the Moslem faith would have been proscribed, and the Moslems, even in the oil rich nations, would have found themselves completely ruined and in abject poverty. The current President of Iran is serving Israel’s interests by making anti-Israeli statements which

serve as a spurious pretext for war. The Israelis have placed crypto-Jews and Jewish agents in power throughout the Middle East and have organized anti-Israeli terrorist organizations so as to provide Israel with pretexts to attack and dehumanize Moslems.

The Nazi Party's platform of "The 25 Points" published on 24 February 1920 was so obviously Bolshevistic, that Adolf Hitler had to apologize for it on 13 April 1928 in order to appease the German Capitalists who had sponsored Hitler believing he would fight Bolshevism and fatten their pockets with profitable wars against the Bolsheviks,

"On April 13th, 1928, Adolf Hitler made the following declaration:

It is necessary to reply to the false interpretation on the part of our opponents of Point 17 of the Programme of the N.S.D.A.P.

Since the N. S. D. A. P. admits the principle of private property, it is obvious that the expression 'confiscation without compensation' merely refers to possible legal powers to confiscate, if necessary, land illegally acquired, or not administered in accordance with national welfare. It is directed in accordance with national welfare. It is directed in the first instance against the Jewish companies which speculate in land.

Munich, April 13th, 1928.

(signed) Adolf Hitler."¹⁶²¹

The Nazis wanted to eliminate class differences, abolish personal property and make businesses communal.

Nazism was in many respects quite Marxist. When the NSDAP began, many in the *Freikorps* believed that Adolf Hitler was a Communist and that the Nazis were "Reds". The term "NAZI" comes from the party's name, *Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei*, or "National Socialist German Worker's Party"; which sounded very much like the older Communist parties *Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiter-Verein*, or "Universal German Worker's Union"; and *Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei*, or "Social Democrat Worker's Party". Ernst Röhm, Chief of the *SA*, was very liberal minded and sought support from Communists. Gregor Strasser was another Communist Nazi. When Hitler made it very clear that he would protect the interests of the wealthy capitalists who supported him financially, while stating that he reserved the right to confiscate land for the State, it confused many Socialists who weren't sure whether Hitler embraced Socialism or Capitalism. Though the Nazis sought to distance themselves from Bolshevism, their propaganda of revolution and worker's rights was often directly copied from Bolshevik propaganda.

Indeed, archival footage shows that Hitler marched with a detachment from his regiment in the funeral procession of the Jewish Communist Kurt Eisner in February of 1919.¹⁶²² Eisner was shot after the Bavarian Revolution in November, 1918. Hitler's group wore both red and black armbands to sponsor Socialism and to mourn the death of a Socialist revolutionary. Soon thereafter, Bolsheviks established a Soviet Republic in Bavaria, and Adolf Hitler became a spokesman for the Soviet Counsel. After the Bolshevik Revolution was suppressed, Hitler began to work for

the Right as an anti-Bolshevist and an anti-Jewish propagandist. But he soon showed his true colors as a devoted Communist Red working towards a controlled opposition when he turned the rightist party to the left and converted the DAP into the NSDAP. In the Bolshevist totalitarian tradition, Hitler eventually destroyed all political parties but his. Like other crypto-Jewish Bolshevist tyrants, he wanted a thoroughly homogenous State with only one political party, Socialism.

Hermann Rauschning, who was himself at one time a powerful Nazi leader, wrote several books in the late 1930's and early 1940's, which alleged that many Nazis were essentially Bolshevist revolutionaries and that Hitler was in many respects seen by them as a Marxist revolutionary.¹⁶²³ Rauschning knew in advance that Hitler would turn on Russia. Rauschning, who made it clear that he believed Hitler hated Bolshevists, stated in 1939,

“There has been from the beginning in the National Socialist Party a group favoring close alliance with Soviet Russia. [***] It insisted upon the need to create this continental line as the foundation for a new world order — not through war, but through an alliance with Russia. After all, the advocates of this scheme said, it mattered little whether the vast empire was National Socialist or Bolshevist. The differences were, in their opinion, of no importance as against the larger world-revolutionary tasks of rational economic planning, of creating the new social order, and a ‘just’ redistribution of the world’s wealth. It was not of such paramount importance, in the end, whether Germans or Russians would come out on top in this close symbiosis of Germany and Russia. What really mattered was the finish of the democratic order, free economy, and capitalism. Though he did not accept these ideas, Hitler never rejected them.”¹⁶²⁴

Though he was considered highly credible for many years, several researchers have discredited Rauschning’s claim to have had numerous conversations with Hitler, and he is today disregarded as a historical witness to Hitler’s personality.¹⁶²⁵ Regardless of these facts and allegations, many of Rauschning’s general predictions came true and he was a witness to, and a member of, the inner circles of the Nazi hierarchy. His statements with respect to the redder tones of Nazism are verified by the actions and beliefs of Ernst Röhm and the fact that many sincere Socialists became uneasy and began to leave the Party in the 1930's when it became clear that Capitalism was still king. Adolf Hitler was more devoted to Zionism than to Communism. He was put into power to create a “Jewish State” and for those who put him in power, Communism was a transitory means to achieve that end.

The seemingly paradoxical accusation, that both Capitalism and Marxism are ultimately centralized Jewish movements, can be explained in many ways. It is usually dismissed as paranoia sponsored by *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, which presents a plan to pit Liberals against Conservatives, in order to weaken and confuse both groups, and in order to control all government from behind the scenes without detection and regardless of which political persuasion is in power at any particular time in any given place. Jewish financiers had sponsored an arms build

up in opposing empires, which led to the First World War, through their control of news media by direct ownership, tribal loyalty and with advertising dollars. Their media control gave them control over public opinion and control over politicians. Jewish financiers funded the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in order to free the Jews there from the Pale of Settlement and to seize the reins of power in Russia and rob the nation of its vast wealth. The artificial struggle between Capitalists and Communists weakened peoples and states and left them vulnerable to Jewish exploitation and totalitarian control. The constant war resulting from the battles of Capitalism and Communism suppressed the masses, weakened the nations in preparation for world revolution, and enriched the Jewish arms dealers and bankers.

A large branch of the Nazis, primarily under the leadership of Ernst Röhm, were in greater sympathy with the Communists than the Zionists. The industrialists who sponsored Hitler were vehemently anti-Communist Capitalists. Hitler was more of a Zionist than a Communist. He knew that the primary goal of Communism was to destroy Gentile society. Hitler's primary goal was the establishment of the "Jewish State". Like many top Bolshevik dictators, he did not care about the working class.

The Zionists hated the Capitalism that enabled and sponsored Jewish assimilation and the Zionists hated the anti-nationalistic Communism which led to "Red Assimilation". This is why Bolshevism morphed into Nazism, which destroyed both assimilationist Capitalism and assimilationist Communism. Zionist Berl Katzenelson stated,

"[. . .]they enjoy emancipation purchased through assimilation in capitalistic France and communistic Russia[. . .]"¹⁶²⁶

Racist political Zionist Theodor Herzl stated in his book *The Jewish State*,

"When we sink, we become a revolutionary proletariat, the subordinate officers of the revolutionary party; when we rise, there rises also our terrible power of the purse. [***] Again, people will say that I am furnishing the Anti-Semites with weapons. Why so? Because I admit the truth? Because I do not maintain that there are none but excellent men amongst us? Again, people will say that I am showing our enemies the way to injure us. This I absolutely dispute. My proposal could only be carried out with the free consent of a majority of Jews. Individuals or even powerful bodies of Jews might be attacked, but Governments will take no action against the collective nation. The equal rights of Jews before the law cannot be withdrawn where they have once been conceded; for the first attempt at withdrawal would immediately drive all Jews rich and poor alike, into the ranks of the revolutionary party. The first official violation of Jewish liberties invariably brings about economic crisis. Therefore no weapons can be effectually used against us, because these cut the hands that wield them."¹⁶²⁷

The Nazis' attacks on Jews aided the Zionists' agenda of forcing rich assimilationist Jews towards Zionism, and punishing them for their opposition to it,

as was accomplished by brutal Nazi persecution; while concurrently eliminating the sanctuary that Marxist nations afforded liberated Jews; as was accomplished by the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union—these being major objectives of both Theodor Herzl and Chaim Weizmann, as evinced in Herzl's diaries¹⁶²⁸ and Weizmann's autobiography.¹⁶²⁹ Hitler's strategies in some ways copied those of Napoleon and in some ways were opposites of those of Napoleon. Both Napoleon and Hitler were Zionists who seemingly irrationally attacked Russia in order in part to force, or to enable, Jews to move to Palestine. Both had Zionist allies and both fit the Zionist mold of a dictator. Napoleon sought to fulfill the Zionist dream of the Jews with philo-Semitism. After Napoleon failed, Hitler sought to fulfill the Zionist dream of the Jews with anti-Semitism, and succeeded.

In an article in 1943 in which he acknowledged that the First World War freed the Jews of central and eastern Europe then led to rabid anti-Semitism, and in which he acknowledged that the Zionists had allies in the newspapers of New York and in American Presidents from "Wilson down", Zionist Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver emphasized the importance of America to Zionism and called for "American Israel" to unite behind Zionism. Hillel also recognized the repeated Zionist connections between revolutions, emancipation, assimilation, anti-Semitism and world war,

"The story of Jewish emancipation in Europe from the day after the French Revolution to the day before the Nazi revolution is the story of political positions captured in the face of stubborn and sullen opposition, which left our emancipated minority in each country encamped within an unbeaten and unreconciled opposition, so that at the slightest provocation, as soon as things got out of order, the opposition returned to the attack and inflicted grievous wounds. And in our day, stirred by the political and economic struggles which have torn nations apart, this never-failing, never-reconciled opposition swept over the Jewish political and economic positions in Europe and completely demolished them. There is a stout black cord which connects the era of Fichte in Germany with its feral cry of 'hep, hep,' and the era of Hitler with its cry of 'Jude verrecke.' The Damascus affair of 1840 links up with the widespread reaction after the Revolution of 1848—the Mortara affair of Italy; the Christian Socialist Movement in the era of Bismarck; the Tisza-Eszlar affair in Hungary; the revival of blood accusations in Bohemia; the pogroms in the eighties in Russia; *La France Juive* and the Dreyfus affair in France; the pogroms of 1903; the Ukrainian blood baths after the last war, and the human slaughter houses of Poland in this war."¹⁶³⁰

Some political Zionists wanted to unite the Jews of the world, gather them together and forcibly expel them to Palestine, punishing those who had abandoned Israel with death as was prophesied in the Old Testament. German Bolshevik movements were often led by Eastern European Jews. Anti-Bolshevik movements were also led by Eastern European Bolshevik Jews, who wanted a controlled opposition they could use to sponsor revolutions which would ultimately place them in power in fulfillment of Jewish Messianic prophecy. This controlled opposition

became known as “The Trust”. They followed the example of “Judas”—the “Jew”, who placed “Jesus”—the “Jew” on the throne of the Messiah by betraying him and fulfilling the Old Testament Jewish prophecy, which saved the Jewish Nation (*Zechariah* 11:12. *Matthew* 27:9).

The Jewish bankers may well have been inspired by the story of Judas the “Jew” and Jesus the “Jew” to betray the Jews of Europe into a Holocaust of the Jewish bankers’ design, and in so doing to have fulfilled Jewish prophecy. Note that the story of Jesus and Judas is suspiciously similar to the story of Julius Cæsar and Brutus—the story of a man who would be king and his friend turned betrayer who caused his murder and so saved the nation. Note further that the parallel between Judas and Brutus was captured in the story of Dante’s *Inferno*, and that John Wilkes Booth, the Jewish actor who assassinated President Lincoln perhaps at the behest of the Jewish bankers, likened himself to Brutus.

Eastern European Jews were the most ardent political Zionists. The Bolsheviks were among the most dogmatic thinkers, the most ruthless and undemocratic tyrants the world has ever known; and, like the Nazis, they had no compunctions about forcing people into acts they would not voluntarily commit. Both the Nazis and the Bolsheviks outlawed all rival political parties in territories under their control. Their rigid dogmatism and totalitarianism were typically Judaic, as were their terror tactics and genocides meant to segregate Jews.

Throughout its existence, the Nazi regime preached revolution by the working class. Like many totalitarian Socialist regimes, National Socialism punished free thought and banned all political parties other than National Socialism. While preaching the superiority of the “Nordic race”, it subverted the intellectual growth of Northern Europe and promoted *Gleichschaltung* and the *Ermächtigungsgesetz*, which enslaved and degraded the German People in the same way Stalin enslaved the Soviets. This resulted in the degradation of German culture and the growth of the decadent mythologies of *Germanenorden*.

Hitler attacked German and European society in the exact way he alleged that Jews sought to undermine it. In the name of rescuing Europe from Jewish Bolshevism, Hitler immediately destroyed the intellectual classes who opposed him or who even had the potential to oppose him. It was obvious that Hitler was an agent of the Bolsheviks and the Zionists, and was accomplishing their goals. Jewish leadership yet again used anti-Semitism as means to put Jewish agents into power who would ruin Gentile nations and segregate Jews.

The hypocrisy of Hitler’s attacks on Jews versus his own assumption of dictatorial powers¹⁶³¹ was apparent in an interview he gave to Anne O’Hare McCormick which was published in *The New York Times* on 10 July 1933. As early as 8 April 1933, in the “Topics of the Times” Section of *The New York Times* on page 12, the following statement appeared,

“‘HITLER’s chief enemy, over whose prostrate body he has ridden to victory, is ‘Marxianism.’ But Marxianism and Hitlerism are really brothers. They are both the offspring of the Absolute of Hegelian dialectic. KARL MARX, riding the theory of materialistic determinism to death, and HITLER, setting out to

reconstruct Christianity on a purely Aryan basis, are equally good illustrations of what the German mind is likely to do when it gets hold of a formula.”

The commonality of the oppression of both Bolshevist and Nazi Socialist dictatorships, and the common totalitarianism, was so obvious to so many that Goebbels protested loudly that Nazism was not Bolshevism—despite the fact that it was. In response to the comparison of Hitlerism to Stalinism in the *London Times*,¹⁶³² Goebbels gave a speech in 1935, “Communism with the Mask Off”, in which he stated, *inter alia*,

“In the beginning of August, this year, one of the most authoritative English newspapers published a leading article entitled ‘Two Dictatorships’, in which a naive and misdirected attempt was made to place before the readers of the paper certain alleged similarities between Russian Bolshevism and German National Socialism. This article gave rise to an extraordinary amount of heated discussion in international centres, which was only another proof of the fact that an astonishing misconception exists among the most prominent West European circles as to the danger which communism presents to the life of the individual and of the nation. Such people still cling to their opinion in face of the terrible and devastating experiences of the past eighteen years in Russia.

The author of the article stated that the two symbols which are to-day opposed to one another, namely that of Bolshevism and National Socialism, stand for regimes which ‘in essential structure are similar and in many of their laws—their buttresses—are identical. The similarity is moreover increasing’. He went on to say:

‘In both countries are the same censorships on art, literature, and of course the Press, the same war on the intelligentsia, the attack on religion, and the massed display of arms, whether in the Red Square or the Tempelhofer Feld.’

‘The strange and terrible thing is’, he declared, ‘that two nations, once so widely different, should have been schooled and driven into patterns so drably similar.’”¹⁶³³

The Times truly touched a Nazi nerve. Cesare Santoro wrote in his book *Hitler Germany as Seen by a Foreigner*, Second Edition, Internationaler Verlag, Berlin (1939), page 59,

“A particularly vehement and outspoken speech was delivered on this occasion by the Reich Minister of Propaganda, Dr. Goebbels, who is the most fertile orator in new Germany, a master of the art of polemics and endowed with a rare gift for irony, and whose persuasive eloquence played a decisive part in the development of the party, especially in Berlin. In the speech in question Dr. Goebbels cited an article in a leading London

newspaper which pointed out a certain analogy between the Russian and German systems. With the help of extensive statistical and other material, Dr. Goebbels showed that the author of the article had not taken the trouble to study the fundamental and essential principles either of National Socialism or of Bolshevism; and that he was consequently not qualified to appreciate the differences which separate them.”

In 1938, Nesta Helen Webster stated that Fascism and Bolshevism were commonly considered to be the same thing, in Chapter 4, “Bolshevism and Fascism”, of her book, *Germany and England*, Boswell, London, (1938). She tried to convince her readers that Nazism was not Bolshevism, in spite of the obvious parallels.

Adolf Hitler was *Time Magazine*’s “Man of the Year” for 1938. The article on Hitler in the 2 January 1939 issue of *Time* stated,

“The Fascintern, with Hitler in the driver’s seat, with Mussolini, Franco and the Japanese military cabal riding behind, emerged in 1938 as an international, revolutionary movement. Rant as he might against the machinations of international Communism and international Jewry, or rave as he would that he was just a Pan-German trying to get all the Germans back in one nation, Führer Hitler had himself become the world’s No. 1 International Revolutionist—so much so that if the oft-predicted struggle between Fascism and Communism now takes place it will be only because two revolutionist dictators, Hitler and Stalin, are too big to let each other live in the same world. [***] Most cruel joke of all, however, has been played by Hitler & Co. on those German capitalists and small businessmen who once backed National Socialism as a means of saving Germany’s bourgeois economic structure from radicalism. [***] Hard-pressed for food-stuffs as well as funds, the Nazi regime has taken over large estates and in many instances collectivized agriculture, a procedure fundamentally similar to Russian Communism.”¹⁶³⁴

One of the major mistakes Germany had made in the First World War was to make it easy for England to enter the war. Many have asserted that Goebbels and Hitler thought that England would stay out of the approaching second war as long as England believed that Germany would safeguard Western Europe from Bolshevism. In fact, it did not matter whether England entered the war, or not. Stalin and Hitler would not rest until Eastern Europe came under Bolshevik control. Most of the world’s Jews lived in Eastern Europe.

It worried Nazi leadership when they learned that the British public had discovered that Nazism was a twin bother to Bolshevism. German Jewish bankers and German industrialists had financed the Nazis and the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia.¹⁶³⁵ Some German industrialists were duped into sponsoring the attack on the Soviets, because they were glad to learn that the Nazis would attack the anti-Capitalistic Bolsheviks (whom the German industrialist had helped to put into power—they were then also the dupes of Jewish bankers, who promised them

victory over Pan-Slavism and unlimited access to Russia's vast wealth—the German industrialists did not know that the Bolsheviks would mass murder 30 million Gentiles in the first six years of their reign). They believed that perpetual war would make them rich beyond their wildest dreams.

Gentile German industrialists had become increasingly concerned by the Bolshevik Nazis, who were planning to nationalize industry. In order to dispel their fears, Hitler arrested and murdered the most outspoken Communists in the Nazi Party including Ernst Röhm and Gregor Strasser in the infamous “night of the long knives” on 30 June 1934 and 1 July 1934. After Hitler slaughtered the most obvious Bolsheviks in the Nazi Party, and concurrently killed off any potential rivals less inclined to Zionism than himself, coal magnate Emil Kirdorf reassured his fellow industrialists that Hitler was their man. Some say Emil Kirdorf was half Jewish. He had long financed and promoted Adolf Hitler and even promoted Hitler's little book to his industrialist friends: A. Hitler, *Der Weg zum Wiederaufstieg*, H. Bruckmann, München, (1927).

The Nazis used both the threat of Bolshevism and the alleged need for *Lebensraum* as pretexts to attack Poland and then the Soviets in order to destroy Eastern Europe and ready it for a Communist takeover, and to attack the defenseless Jewish families who lived in the East and segregate them, then, it was planned, force them into a “Jewish State”. The Zionist Winston Churchill had issued the same carrot and stick threats at the same time. Churchill helped Zionist Adolf Hitler to turn Eastern Europe into a Communist bloc and to create the State of Israel—all of this vast destruction, communization and the ruin of Gentile nations and peoples, took place in the name of protecting the world from Jewish Bolshevism.

In 1932, Goebbels combined Bolshevik propaganda with anti-Semitic propaganda and misrepresented Marxism in order to mask his advocacy of its ideals. Goebbels adopted Socialism while presenting it as nationalistic racism, as opposed to *international* communism, which the Nazis attributed to “Jews”.¹⁶³⁶ However, this was exactly what racist Zionist Communist National Socialist Moses Hess had proposed in the mid-Nineteenth Century. In addition, the Nazis called for world revolution as loudly as had Trotsky.

When the Nazis strengthened their hand, the Nazi propaganda, which had initially declared that Nazism differed from Bolshevism in that it was limited to a German revolution, became international, or multinational, and declared itself to be on a “world mission” to stamp out “international Bolshevism”. Russian Bolshevism had criminalized anti-Semitism on pain of death, which political Zionists feared would cause the extinction of the “Jewish race” in the East through assimilation. On this point, as with so many others, the Zionists and Nazis supported one another. Santoro continued on page 60,

“This last argument put forward by Dr. Goebbels reveals one of the main reasons of the hostility to Bolshevism manifested by the new Germany—namely, the predominance in the development of the Bolshevik creed of Jewish elements similar to those which National Socialism considers to have been the chief cause of all the evils that befell Germany after the

World War, and which have now been completely eliminated from German public life. Hitler combats Russian Bolshevism for the same motive which dictated his hostility to Marxism in Germany, which was likewise dominated by Jewish influence.

From an international point of view it is interesting to note that for the first time an allusion was made in the speech of Dr. Goebbels to the 'world mission' of Hitler as champion in the struggle against Bolshevism outside the German frontiers. 'If' (said Dr. Goebbels) 'Germany which has been redeemed and united in the spirit of National Socialism takes the lead, at the head of all those groups which are animated by a similar spirit, in this struggle against international Bolshevism, she is convinced that over and above her national aims she has a world mission to fulfil, on the successful issue of which the fate of all civilised nations will depend.'"

The Bolsheviks were always nihilistic. They wanted to tear down society. They did not care whether Hitler won, or Stalin won, because in either event the revolution won, which is to say humanity lost. Hitler and Stalin initially had a pact which troubled unaware Jewish Communists in America, but under this pact which brought peace, they could not impart the destruction to Europe both men sought. When the time was right, they started the war the Jews had been planning for centuries.

7.5.2 Hitler and Goebbels Reveal Their True Motives at War's End

Joseph Goebbels, who was called the "little rabbi" in school, revealed himself as a Bolshevik yet again at the end of the war when the Nazis and Bolsheviks had crushed the spirit of Eastern Europe and readied it for a Communist takeover. Goebbels rejoiced in Hitler's "Nero Order", which called for the destruction of Germany, for the destruction of "the last so-called achievements of the bourgeois nineteenth century".¹⁶³⁷

Hitler issued the "Nero Order" on 19 March 1945 and demanded the destruction of German infrastructure, industry, etc. in the hopes that the German People would be annihilated—which was his Bolshevik and Zionist goal from the very beginning. Goebbels stated,

"If the Führer were to meet an honourable death in Berlin, with Europe falling to the Bolsheviks, within five years at the latest, the Führer would become a legendary personality and National Socialism mythic, because he would have been sanctified by this greatest and last act, and all the human frailties which today people criticise him for would be wiped away at one stroke."¹⁶³⁸

One might conclude that Goebbels believed that Hitler would be revealed as a Bolshevik who had conquered Europe for the world revolution the Nazis had been preaching in a chorus with the Bolsheviks from the beginnings of the Nazi movement. One might alternatively conclude that Goebbels believed that Hitler

would be seen as a hero because he had opposed the Bolsheviks, who would certainly impose terror on a conquered Europe. An eyewitness account of some of Goebbels' last words provides us with a means to determine his intentions—to determine that he was as an *agent provocateur* for the Bolsheviks—and the Zionists,

“the German people deserved the fate that awaited them. . . . [Goebbels] remarked cynically that the German people had after all chosen this fate themselves. ‘In the referendum on Germany’s quitting the League of Nations they chose in a free vote to reject a policy of subordination and in favour of a bold gamble. Well, the gamble hadn’t come off. . . . Yes, that may surprise some people, including my colleagues. But have no illusions. I never compelled anybody to work for me, just as we didn’t compel the German people. They themselves gave us the job to do. Why did you work with me? Now, you’ll have your little throat cut.’ Striding towards the door, [Goebbels] turned round once more and shouted: ‘but the earth will shake as we leave the scene.’”¹⁶³⁹

Goebbels murdered his wife and children at the end of the war. He was never close to them. He preferred dark-haired Jewish women to his “Aryan” wife.

In the last days of the war on 16 April 1945, Hitler proclaimed,

“For the last time the Jewish-Bolshevik deadly foe has come forth with his masses to attack. He is seeking to destroy Germany and to exterminate our people. Many of you soldiers from the East already know yourselves what fate threatens above all German women and children. While the elderly, menfolk and children will be murdered, women and girls will be degraded into barrack-room whores. The rest will be marched off to Siberia.”¹⁶⁴⁰

The best means Hitler had to ensure that the Bolsheviks would impose this horrible fate on the Germans was for the Nazis to continue to fight the Soviets and to resist any attempts at a negotiated peace that would end the destruction of Germany and it secure its borders from a Soviet takeover. Nazi leaders Rudolf Hess and Heinrich Himmler sought peace at the beginning, and at the end of the war, and both were silenced by the British. Goebbels relished the fact that the crimes the Nazis committed against the Jews would mean that the Germans would have to fight to the very end and consume themselves.

Hitler continued the war in the knowledge and the hopes that his failure to seek peace terms would lead to the destruction of Germany and the extermination of the German People, and note that he knew that the war was killing off the best of the German’s genetic stock,

“If the war is to be lost, the nation will also perish. This fate is inevitable. There is no need to consider the basis of a most primitive existence any longer. On the contrary it is better to destroy even that, and to destroy it ourselves. The nation will have proved itself the weaker and the future will

belong exclusively to the stronger Eastern nation. Those who remain alive after the battles are over are in any case only inferior persons, since the best have fallen.”¹⁶⁴¹

Hitler stated,

“That is the decision. To save everything here, and only here, and to deploy the last man, that is our duty.”¹⁶⁴²

Hitler, who had once stated that Oliver Cromwell was his hero¹⁶⁴³—Oliver Cromwell who had emancipated the Jews and welcomed them to England—Cromwell the Puritan revolutionary who had declared the Pope in Rome to be the anti-Christ—this Adolf Hitler likened himself to Napoleon, the revolutionary who had emancipated the Jews of Europe—Napoleon who had fought to take Palestine for the Jews—Napoleon who had suicidally attacked Russia in order to emancipate its Jews and bring them to Palestine—Adolf Hitler iterated the nihilistic Bolshevistic mantra:

“I have been Europe’s last hope. She proved incapable of refashioning herself by means of voluntary reforms. She showed herself impervious to charm and persuasion. To take her I had to use violence.

Europe can be built only on a foundation of ruins. Not material ruins, but ruins of vested interests and economic coalitions, of mental rigidity and narrow-mindedness. Europe must be refashioned in the common interest of all and without regard for individuals. Napoleon understood this perfectly.

I, better than anyone else, can well imagine the torments suffered by Napoleon, longing, as he was, for the triumph of peace and yet compelled to continue waging war, without ceasing, and without seeing any prospect of ceasing—and still persisting in the hope eternal of at last achieving peace.”¹⁶⁴⁴

Like Napoleon, Hitler was viewed by his subjects as a messiah.

Hennecke Kardel entertained the possibility of links between Jewish self-hatred among the Nazi hierarchy, Nazism, Bolshevism, Zionism and Jewish financing in his book *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974); English translation *Adolf Hitler: Founder of Israel*, Modjeskis’ Society Dedicated to Preservation of Cultures, San Diego, (1997). Though it is often claimed that Hitler and other Nazi leaders who were of mixed Jewish descent, or in some instances pure Jewish descent, were self-hating Jews; it is more likely that they hated the “Aryans” far more, their eternal enemy Esau, whom they did so much to destroy.

Zionist racist Moses Hess stated in 1862 that the only obstacle to the success of Zionism was the reluctance of cultured Jews to accept their fate and move to Palestine. Hess forecast the Nazi régime in 1862, established most of its tenets, and predicted that the assimilatory aspirations of cultured Jews would “be shattered only by a blow from without,” a blow that would “close their ephemeral existence”. Hess concluded his racist Zionist treatise *Rome and Jerusalem* with the apocalyptic

forecast:

“In contradistinction to orthodoxy, which cannot be destroyed by an external force without at the same time endangering the embryo of Jewish Nationalism that slumbers within it, the hard covering that surrounds the hearts of our cultured Jews will be shattered only by a blow from without, one that world events are already preparing; and which will probably fall in the near future. The old frame-work of European Society, battered so often by the storms of revolution, is cracking and groaning on all sides. It can no longer stand a storm. Those who stand between revolution and reaction, the mediators, who have an appointed purpose to push modern Society on its path of progress, will after society becomes strong and progressive, be swallowed up by it. The nurses of progress, who would undertake to teach the Creator himself wisdom, prudence and economy; those carriers of culture, the saviors of Society, the speculators in politics, philosophy and religion, will not survive the last storm. And along with the other nurses of progress our Jewish reformers will also close their ephemeral existence. On the other hand, the Jewish people, along with other historical nations will, after this last catastrophe, the approach of which is attested by unmistakable signs of the times, receive its full rights as a people.

‘Remember the days of old,
 Consider the years of many generations;
 Ask thy father and he will tell thee,
 Thy elders and they will inform thee,
 When the Most High divided to the nations
 their inheritance,
 When he separated the sons of Adam,
 He set the bounds of the peoples
 According to the number of the Children of
 Israel.’[Footnote: Deut. xxxii, 7-8.]

Just as after the last catastrophe of organic life, when the historical races came into the world’s arena, there came their division into tribes, and the position and rôle of the latter was determined, so after the last catastrophe in social life, when the spirit of humanity shall have reached its maturity, will our people, with the other historical people, find its legitimate place in universal history.”¹⁶⁴⁵

When the pressure from without of Nazism failed to persuade the cultured Jews of Europe to move to Palestine, Hitler set out to fulfill his promise of 1939,

“If international finance Jewry in and outside Europe succeeds in plunging the peoples into another world war, then the end result will not be the Bolshevization of the earth and the consequent victory of Jewry but the

annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe.”¹⁶⁴⁶

“Wenn es dem internationalen Finanzjudentum in und außerhalb Europas gelingen sollte, die Völker noch einmal in einen Weltkrieg zu stürzen, dann wird das Ergebnis nicht der Sieg des Judentums sein, sondern die Vernichtung der jüdischen Rasse in Europa!”¹⁶⁴⁷

The Jewish Nazi tyrant of Poland, Dr. Hans Frank, stated at a Cabinet Session on 16 December 1941,

“As far as the Jews are concerned, I want to tell you quite frankly, that they must be done away with in one way or another. The Fuehrer said once: should united Jewry again succeed in provoking a world war, the blood of not only the nations which have been forced into the war by them, will be shed, but the Jew will have found his end in Europe”¹⁶⁴⁸

Did the crypto-Jewish Zionists Adolf Hitler and Hans Frank mean that they would exterminate the Jews of Europe in death camps, or did they mean that they would deport the Jews of Europe to Palestine as a final solution to the Jewish question? Frank was a long-term Zionist who wanted to segregate the Jews in Polish concentration camps and then ship them to Palestine—not to say that he did not intend to kill off a large percentage of his brethren in the process. In the fall of 1933 in Nuremberg on *Reichsparteitag*, Frank stated that his goal was to secure a “Jewish State”,

“Unbeschadet unseres Willens, uns mit den Juden auseinanderzusetzen, ist die Sicherheit und das Leben der Juden in Deutschland staatlich, reichsamtlich und juristisch nicht gefährdet. Die Judenfrage ist rechtlich nur dadurch zu lösen, dass man an die Frage eines jüdischen Staates herangeht.”¹⁶⁴⁹

The Zionists had always viewed wealthy Jewish assimilationists as their arch-enemy in their struggle to force Jews to Palestine against their will. Hitler’s last testament states, among other things,

“But I left no doubt about the fact that if the peoples of Europe were again to be treated as so many packages of shares by these international money and finance conspirators, then the people who bear the real guilt for this murderous struggle would also have to answer for it: the Jews! It also left no doubt that this time we would not permit millions of European children of Aryan descent to die of hunger, or millions of grown-up men to suffer death, or hundreds of thousands of women and children to be burned and bombed to death in the cities, without the real culprit suffering his due punishment, though in a more humane way.”¹⁶⁵⁰

Hitler was put into power by political Zionists to create an anti-Semitic Bolshevik revolution in Europe that would destroy the intellectual class, all forms of Monarchy and would place the working class proletariat in the hands of absolute Jewish rule in achievement of the Messianic vision of racist Zionists like Moses Hess and Theodor Herzl. Since it was the goal of political Zionists to eliminate the sanctuary that Marxism afforded Jews, Hitler preached anti-Semitism while concurrently preaching “World Revolution”, *i. e.* thinly veiled Bolshevism. Among Adolf Hitler’s first anti-Semitic statements after leaving Bolshevism to become an anti-Semitic propagandist was his assertion that the fight against Bolshevism meant the extirpation of the Jews—which was also a goal of the political Zionists.¹⁶⁵¹ Hitler later inexplicably attacked the Soviet State in which Jews were becoming assimilated. Hitler attempted to create an anti-Semitic Bolshevik tyranny in Europe and to found a Jewish State to provide a homeland for forcibly expelled Jews. Liebenfels, Rosenberg and the other architects of Nazi ideology had always sponsored Zionism as a right of expelled Jews, in full agreement with Theodor Herzl’s prescriptions for a final resolution to the Jewish question.

Why did not the Russian Bolsheviks do to the Jews what the Nazis later would, if Jewish leadership controlled both movements? There are several reasons. While some Zionists predicted that assimilation would take place after the revolution emancipated the Jews, there were also many Zionists who hoped that the Russian People were too anti-Semitic and the Jews were of Russia were too racist and tribalistic for assimilation to occur in the East. Another reason is that the Zionists hoped to found a “Jewish State” soon after the war and they wanted to maintain Russia as a source of wealth and power and leverage against the Moslems of the Middle East, or, alternatively, they wanted to found a “Jewish State” in formerly Soviet territory. Yet another reason is that there were far greater numbers of Jews in Russia than in Germany, and the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia would not as easily have succeeded with a Nazi-style party platform, which, given the Jewish propaganda of the time, would not have appeared to have differed greatly from the Czar’s platform as depicted in the press. There are several other more obvious reasons.

The Nazis eventually and inevitably lost their perpetual war of revolution on the world. Hitler’s posthumously published sequel to his *Mein Kampf*, which sequel was written in 1928, asserted that “eternal war” was a doomed proposition. He must have known that his completely unnecessary declarations of war against the United States and the Soviet Union were suicidal to the German Nation.¹⁶⁵² He knew the history of the First World War. It seems that he was either a complete fool, or was bent on destroying Germany, Communizing Europe and founding a “Jewish State” at the expense of the World. Given that Hitler’s régime so exactly fulfilled Jewish Messianic prophecy, and given that Hitler had so many relations with Zionists, and further given that Jews who sought to fulfill those Jewish Messianic prophecies put Adolf Hitler into power, the “coincidences” are too many and too unlikely to have been the products of chance.

[7.5.3 Zionists and Communists Delight in Massive Human Sacrifices to the](#)

Jewish Messianic Cause

The Second World War ended in 1945 with Albert Einstein's 1915 vision of a divided and destroyed Germany made real. Communism was infinitely stronger than before the war and it looked as if France, Greece, Italy, Germany and even England, in their weakened state, would succumb to it. Zionists used the Nazis' crimes against Jews, which the Zionist Jews intentionally caused, to justify the formation of the State of Israel, and the theft of Palestine, and the perpetual vilification of the Moslems.

Since the ancient Diaspora, all previous attempts to found a State of Israel had failed and the outlook for Jews after the First World War was near total assimilation, and, in the racist minds of political Zionists, the consequent extermination of the "Jewish race". They were, in fact, desperate enough to create the Nazis as a means achieve their ends and they believed Jewish Messianic prophecy fully justified their treachery.

In 1921, political Zionist Jakob Klatzkin stated,

"[I applaud] the contribution of our enemies in the continuance of Jewry in eastern Europe. [***] We ought to be thankful to our oppressors that they closed the gates of assimilation to us and took care that our people were concentrated and not dispersed, segregatedly united and not diffusedly mixed [***] One ought to investigate in the West and note the great share which antisemitism had in the continuance of Jewry and in all the emotions and movements of our national rebirth . [***] Truly our enemies have done much for the strengthening of Judaism in the diaspora . [***] Experience teaches that the liberals have understood better than the antisemites how to destroy us as a nation. [***] We are, in a word, naturally foreigners; we are an alien nation in your midst and we want to remain one."¹⁶⁵³

In 1898, Nachman Syrkin wrote,

"Nonetheless, the enemy has *always* considered the Jews a nation, and they have always known themselves as such."¹⁶⁵⁴

In 1945, after the Zionist Nazi atrocities, Albert Einstein callously reminded the world of the Balfour Declaration and the Palestine Mandate in order to exploit the tragedy of the Holocaust the Zionists had deliberately caused. Einstein used the Holocaust to justify the fulfilment of his pre-Nazi political Zionist agenda. Einstein asserted that the Holocaust proved that the world thought of the Jews as a nation. Genocidal human sacrifice had long been a Judaic tradition, and in more recent times, Friedrich Engels made it clear that the Communists were comfortable with human sacrifices amounting to ten million lives lost in order to prepare the way for revolution and Communist world dominance. In 1887, Frederick Engels knew that the First World War was coming and that it would destroy the Empires of Europe and leave them ripe for revolution,

“No other war is now possible for Prussia-Germany than a world war, and indeed a world war of hitherto unimagined sweep and violence. Eight to ten million soldiers will mutually kill each other off, and in the process devour Europe barer than any swarm of locusts ever did. The desolation of the Thirty Years’ War compressed into three or four years and spread over the entire continent: famine, plague, general savagery, taking possession both of the armies and of the masses of the people, as a result of universal want; hopeless demoralization of our complex institutions of trade, industry and credit, ending in universal bankruptcy; collapse of the old states and their traditional statecraft, so that crowns will roll over the pavements by the dozens and no one be found to pick them up; absolute impossibility of foreseeing where this will end, or who will emerge victor from the general struggle. Only *one* result is absolutely sure: general exhaustion and the creation of the conditions for the final victory of the working class.”¹⁶⁵⁵

In 1945, Einstein wrote, among other things,

“[The Jews’] status as a uniform political group is proved to be a fact by the behavior of their enemies. Hence in striving toward a stabilization of the international situation they should be considered as though they were a nation in the customary sense of the word. [***] In parts of Europe Jewish life will probably be impossible for years to come. In decades of hard work and voluntary financial aid the Jews have restored the soil of Palestine to fertility. All these sacrifices were made because of trust in the officially sanctioned promise given by the governments in question after the last war, namely that the Jewish people were to be given a secure home in their ancient Palestinian country. To put it mildly, the fulfillment of this promise has been but hesitant and partial. Now that the Jews—especially the Jews in Palestine—have in this war too rendered a valuable contribution, the promise must be forcibly called to mind. The demand must be put forward that Palestine, within the limits of its economic capacity, be thrown open to Jewish immigration. If supranational institutions are to win that confidence that must form the most important buttress for their endurance, then it must be shown above all that those who, trusting to these institutions, have made the heaviest sacrifices are not defrauded.”¹⁶⁵⁶

Einstein’s statements prove that the human sacrifice of countless Jewish lives in the Zionist Holocaust had not changed the nationalistic racism of the political Zionists at all, but rather had strengthened their hand—in fulfillment of the Zionists’ expressed plans. The racist Zionists had no regrets over their mass murder of Jews and they rejoiced at their slaughter of Gentiles. In the 1890’s, Bernard Lazare iterated the Zionist mantra:

“It is because the Jews are a nation that anti-Semitism exists. [***] If the cause of anti-Semitism is the existence of the Jews as a nationality, its effect

is to make this nationality more tangible for the Jews, to make them more aware of the fact that they are a people.”¹⁶⁵⁷

Albert Einstein told Peter A. Bucky that the Holocaust had the benefit of uniting “all the Jews in the world”:

“But the suffering had not been in vain, in Einstein’s view. He felt that the Jews who died in Hitler’s pogroms had strengthened the bond uniting all of the Jews in the world.”¹⁶⁵⁸

Einstein was simply repeating the Zionist party line, as expressed by Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver in 1943,

“Should not, I ask you fellow Jews, ought not, the incalculable and unspeakable suffering of our people and the oceans of blood which we have shed in this war and in all the wars of the centuries; should not the myriad martyrs of our people, as well as the magnificent heroism and the vast sacrifices of our brave soldier sons who are today fighting on all the battle fronts of the world—should not all this be compensated for finally and at long last with the re-establishment of a free Jewish Commonwealth?”¹⁶⁵⁹

Did it occur to no one that the world, including the Jews, would be far better off if racist Zionism and Jewish tribalism were eradicated, rather than further justified, as a result of yet another massive Jewish tragedy? What, other than Jewish racism, prevented a massive drive for assimilation world-wide after the Holocaust?

7.5.4 Einstein Lulls Jews into Complacency—The Zionist Trap

After the Second World War and the Holocaust were over, few Jews wanted to emigrate to Palestine, despite the racist Zionists’ best efforts to destroy their lives and make it impossible for them to live anywhere else. They had had enough of racist segregation. The Zionists then again employed corruption and the manipulation of public opinion to coerce Jews into moving to Palestine against their will and better natures.¹⁶⁶⁰

Einstein had long known that the Zionists would put a Hitler into power to attack European Jewry. Paul Ehrenfest made an interesting comment in an 8 February 1920 letter to Albert Einstein—a racist political Zionist who believed that anti-Semitism was the salvation of the Jews. Ehrenfest stated that the Zionists had commissioned a Hitler to save them from assimilation,

“Something quite discontinuous is about to happen in Europe now, isn’t that true?—And on this occasion a devil will surely come, on special commission to grab all Jews in Europe *uniformly* and *synchronously* by the scruff of the neck and give them a tremendous shake. Will the great miracle then happen that our prophets foresee, which will awaken and unite us all, orthodox and

atheists alike, to a new living faith?—Maybe you have already seen something of it, even just a hint? I can't see it anywhere yet.”¹⁶⁶¹

Ehrenfest had earlier written to Einstein that an old and very influential Zionist Prof. Oppenheim had warned him that Zionists ought not to mix with secular Jews, who were not, in his view, Jews at all.¹⁶⁶² A sorry fate awaited secular Jews at the hands of the anti-Semites the Zionists had commissioned on special order. After stating that it was not in his nature to lie to the public with the dishonest Zionist propaganda claiming that Einstein was a “Jewish Newton”, Ehrenfest expressed doubts about acting immorally and wrote to Einstein on 9 December 1919,

“But God only knows, this old man may be right: maybe salvation of the masses can only be bought by the *hardest* sacrifice—sacrificing the last remnants of ‘purity.’ [Please don’t read this as elegant empty words!]—Well, maybe that’s how it is—but then my powers do not suffice.”¹⁶⁶³

Disturbed that Jews were perpetually defining themselves by a persecution myth—this many years, decades, centuries, before the appearance of the Holocaust the Zionists themselves created—a myth which made their lives easier in that it gave them unfair advantages in society and unburdened them from an existential quest for *Self*; Ralph Philip Boas identified many of the circumstances in America in 1921, which led to the Holocaust in Europe, including Jewish racism, the Jewish love of manufactured martyrdom, the lack of a genuine *raison d’être* for Judaism in the Twentieth Century, and the need of a common enemy to prevent the Jews from extinction through assimilation—the glorification of the myth that Gentile kindness is the worst enemy of the Jews and that anti-Semitism is the Jews’ salvation from integration:

“DESPITE the fact that we are ceasing to persecute people who disagree with us in religion or politics, we only dimly realize that one of the greatest evils of persecution is the fact that it saves its victims the trouble of justifying themselves. Persecution begets martyrdom, a glory as lacking in reason as its progenitor. Whether Sir Roger Casement was right or not is now only an academic question; his execution, by enshrining him forever in the Pantheon of Irish martyrs, makes the heart rather than the mind his judge. So it is with the Jews. Jews have not troubled themselves to justify, on any rational ground, the tenacious fight of their race against the storms of nineteen centuries of persecution. The fight has been its own justification. Obviously, a race that has endured what theirs has withstood must have some glorious mission to perform; to define that mission would be an element of positive weakness, since their enemies would then have a chance to meet them on the ground of reason, where their peculiar virtues, tenacity, single-mindedness, and pliant heroism, would avail them nothing.

It is, therefore, a happy chance for the American Jew that his age-long persecution has either ended or has degenerated into petty social

discrimination. For he must now realize that the day has gone when he could justify himself by recalling his heroic miseries. In other days and other countries he faced only the problems of existence. New ideas and opportunities could not pass the walls of the ghetto; custom made adherence to old ceremonies and beliefs not only easy but imperative. The Sabbath was the one day on which the Jew could be a man instead of a thing; the recurrent holidays gave him his one outlet for the emotions rigidly suppressed in daily life; the study and analysis of the Law and the Talmud furnished the intellectual exercise that his eager mind was denied in the schools and the learned circles of the country which tolerated him. The very fact that he was confined within a pale, therefore, made it easy for him to keep his race a distinct entity.

But now, if he is unable to find a rational ground for his religious and racial unity, he will meet a foe more insidious than persecution—the gradual disintegration of race and religious consciousness within the faith. Ironically enough, what pales, pogroms, and ghettos could not accomplish, freedom promises to bring to pass. So the time has come when the Jew in America must decide what he is going to do with and for himself; his enemies can no longer save him the effort of decision.

[***]

What is true of Europe is true also of the United States: the Jew occupies a position the importance of which is out of all proportion to his numbers. Hence the problem of Judaism is of real interest in America, because the influence which the Jew can have upon social life and the current political and financial situation depends almost entirely upon his mode of life and manner of thought. [***] What the Jew is going to do with this self-consciousness may, to Christians, seem of little moment. It is not of that loyal kind which moves men to blow up munition factories, or to plant bombs in steamships. For others, doubtless, its implications are not of great importance. For himself, however, they are everything. His self-consciousness colors his whole point of view. It is not a simple thing. It is compounded of many factors. It is both racial and religious; it makes him both hopeful and despondent; it gives cause both for pride and for a feeling of inferiority; it makes him clannish, and it makes him long for a wider field of acquaintance. [***] Judaism is clannish. Jews undoubtedly hang together. The combination of persecution with its inevitable concomitant, self-justification, acts as a centripetal force in driving Jews upon themselves. Just as Jews have the almost grotesque notion that a man will make his philosophic and religious convictions ‘jibe’ with his birth, so they have the wholly grotesque notion that a man should choose his friends and his wife from the small group among whom he happens to be born, though later education and environment may move him a thousand miles away. The results of this clannishness are paradoxical. For instance, the average Jew is sure that the chief reason why Anti-Semitism is everywhere ready to show its ugly head, is jealousy of the splendid history and the extraordinary

business ability of the race. At the same time he subconsciously assumes the inferiority which has long been attributed to him, covering his feelings, however, by uncalled-for justification and bitter opposition to all criticism. It is torture to him, for example, that *The Merchant of Venice* should be read in the public schools. Who can blame him? For Shylock, although undoubtedly an exaggerated character, nevertheless makes concrete those qualities the portrayal of which hurts because it bears the sting of truth.

The development of committees 'On Purity of the Press' in Jewish societies, and the extraordinary wire-pulling over the Russian treaty and the Immigration bill, show to what lengths this consciousness can go. It is impossible for the Jew to be entirely at ease in the world. He is introspective and suspicious, often unhappy, always sure that, for good or ill, he is a marked man among men.

There are three attitudes which Jews in this country take toward their problem—a few as a result of having thought it through, the majority as a result of the forces of inertia, environment, or chance, forces of which they themselves are perhaps not aware. Some Jews attempt to get rid of their self-consciousness by separating from the group. They deliberately set out to convince themselves that there is no difference between them and other men, and that they can act and live in all respects like other American citizens. A second group find their fellow Jews entirely satisfactory. They are conscious of a difference between themselves and others, but, living as they do in large cities where the Jewish community numbers hundreds of thousands, they feel no need of association with non-Jews other than that which they get in business. They are rich, or at least well-to-do; they have all the comforts that money can buy; they occupy fine streets and build expensive synagogues. They are willing, not only to accept their group-consciousness, but to develop it to the fullest extent by means of societies and fraternal orders. In the third place, there is a small group of Jews keenly conscious of their race, who would like to make Judaism vital as a great religion and a great tradition. They differ from the second group in that they not only accept their individuality but try to justify it. It is not sufficient for them that there should be enough Jewish organizations and undertakings to make a respectable year-book: they are interested in showing why such organizations should exist. They not only *are* Jews, but they *want to be* Jews; they want to feel that Judaism really has a mission to fulfill and a message to carry to the questioning world.

The Jew who attempts to solve his problem by separating from his community must leave the great centres of Jewish life and go to some small town where he may make a fresh start. There he will find himself in an anomalous position. He will have neither the support that comes from rubbing elbows with one's own kind, nor the mental and moral stiffening that comes from active opposition. He will be simply an odd fish, and as such will be subject, not to antagonism, but to curiosity. What cordiality he meets with is the cordiality of curiosity. He is a strange creature, similar—on a far lower

scale of interest—to a Chinese traveler or a Hindu student. He is engaged in conversation on the ‘Jewish problem,’ or Jewish customs and history, until he sickens with trading on the race-consciousness that he is striving to forget. With cruel kindness his friends impress upon him that his Judaism ‘makes no difference,’ with the result that he finds himself anticipating every imminent friendship by a clear statement of his race, lest the friendship be built upon the sands of prejudice. His social relations must be above reproach. A hasty word, an ill-considered action, in other men to be put down to idiosyncrasy, in him is attributed to his birth. Even when there exists the frankest and most open friendship, he is continually seeing difficulties. The fathers have eaten a sour grape and the children’s teeth are set on edge. The self-consciousness that he learned in youth reappears in maturity. Whether he will or no, a Jew he remains.

If he finds his situation intolerable he may, of course, utterly and completely deny his Jewish affiliation. He may consort with Christians, join a Christian church, marry a Christian wife, and tread under foot the old associations that will occasionally cast a disagreeable shadow across his life. Unfortunately for such a solution, a cloud still hangs about the idea of apostasy. Such a refuge seems to a man of honor despicable. It is a cowardly procedure, surely, to deny one’s birth and sail under false colors, the more so since, though it does no harm to others, it gains advantage for one’s self. Why should it be treason for a Jew to abandon his religion and forget his birth any more than for a Frenchman or a Swede to do so? Probably for the reason that no one cares whether a man was born in France or not, whereas in certain circles it makes a great deal of difference if a man was born in Jewry. Furthermore, Christians feel strongly that the Jew who forsakes the religion into which he was born, does so, not because his eyes have been opened upon the truth, but because he sees in apostasy definite material advantages. The Jew who would take this means of obtaining peace, therefore, would find himself cursed by an irrational idealism which can disturb while it cannot fortify and achieve.

If, however, he returns to some great centre of Jewish life and attempts to affiliate with his own people, he is in a perilous position. He is more than likely to meet with distrust where he seeks sympathy. Jews are so extremely sensitive to criticism and so keenly conscious of the social discrimination which they encounter from Christians, that they can hardly believe that a man who seems to have lived for several years on an equal footing with Christians has not either denied his birth, in which case he has been a traitor, or has not certain qualities of mind which, since they have been palatable to Christians, must be severely critical of Jews.

And, indeed, they have, perhaps, a measure of justice in their position. It is impossible for a Jew to live apart from his race for several years without looking upon his people with a new light. For one thing, distance has enabled him to focus. He has learned to sympathize more than a little with those hotel-keepers whose ban upon Jews is a terrible thorn in the flesh of the man

whose money ought to take him anywhere. He has come to see that the clannishness of Jews serves only to intensify what social discrimination may exist, and to make present in the imagination much that does not. He has realized that persecution is not necessarily justification, and that because a Jew was blackballed at a fashionable club does not prove that he was a man of first-rate calibre. And finally, he has perceived that there is an arrogance of endurance as well as an arrogance of persecution, and that for a man to be continually assuming that people are taking the trouble to despise him for his birth, is to postulate an importance that does not exist.

On the other hand, he has, because of his distance, idealized Judaism. In his retirement he studied the history of his people; he thrilled with their martyrdom; he marveled at their tenacity and their fortitude. He built up for himself on the cobweb foundation of boyhood memories, visions of the simple nobility of Jewish ritual and ceremonies, and vague ideals of an inspiring religious faith. He may, perhaps, have met, far more frequently than ill-will, a sentimental and unbalanced adulation of Jews. The cult of the new is with us, and the history, the folk-lore, the literature, and the customs of Judaism have, for many people who pride themselves on their social liberality, the fascination of novelty. It is the easiest thing in the world for a Jew to yield to this sentimental tolerance, and to view his people in a rosy light.

It is, therefore, something of a shock to him when he reënters a great Jewish community, for he finds that the great mass of American Jews have sunk into a comfortable materialism. What persecution could not accomplish, success in business has brought to pass. The innate qualities of the Jew could not save him from the fate of the Christian who has become rich in a hurry—grossness and self-conceit. That Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked is as true now as it ever was, and there is little reason to expect that the race which was hopelessly cankered by national prosperity in the days of Solomon can escape a similar fate in the twentieth century. [***] The sad result is that in prosperity the Jewish self-consciousness ceases to be religious and becomes merely racial.

[***]

The number of immigrants, or children of immigrants, from countries where for centuries they have been trained in an atmosphere of slavish cunning and worship of money, who become rich, is almost incredible. In Russia, Galicia, or Roumania, they cultivated a self-respect by rigid adherence to dignified and beautiful customs; in America the florid exuberance of newly acquired wealth cannot be dignified. Clannishness, exclusion from circles of good taste and good breeding, the infiltration of the parvenu East-European Jews, and imitation of the most obvious aspects of Americanism—its flamboyant and tasteless materialism—all combine to make the thoughtful Jew sadly question what hope lies in the bulk of the Jews who live in the great American cities.

[***]

[Zionism] is actuated by a spirit of helpfulness and by an ideal of racial unity. [***] Aided by persecution and poverty, [American Judaism] furnished admirable discipline to a race naturally stubborn and tenacious. Persecution, poverty, and discipline gone, what is left?—an indistinct monotheism joined to an ethical tradition never formulated into a system, and only vaguely defined. None of the great Jewish philosophers ever succeeded in establishing a Jewish creed; indeed, there was no need of one when common suffering wrought so effectual a bond. [***] At all events it must be remembered that, since the problem of Judaism comes from intense self-consciousness, persecution and sentimental tolerance are both bad for the Jew. The one saves him the trouble of seeking out his reason for existence; the other flatters him into a belief that there is no necessity for the search. If men will treat Jews like other people, instead of nourishing their age-long notions of peculiarity, they will make it easier for time to settle the Jewish problem as it settles all others.”¹⁶⁶⁴

Kurt G. W. Ludecke wrote in 1937 of Moses Pinkeles, a. k. a. Trebitsch Lincoln, a. k. a. Arthur Trebitsch, a Jew who marched with anti-Semites in the streets of Berlin, scripted their statements, and who funded Adolf Hitler and paid for his Nazi purchase of the newspaper *Münchener Beobachter* from the Thule Society, which became the Nazi Party’s official organ the *Völkischer Beobachter*,

“Another encounter in Vienna lives in my memory as something even more extraordinary. Some one introduced me to Arthur Trebitsch, and I spent a whole evening with him. His name was somewhat known through his books, *Geist und Judentum* and *Deutscher Geist oder Judentum?*, but I for my part had never heard of him; so I found myself quite unprepared for the strange discussion which ensued.

Arthur Trebitsch was a peculiar and pathetic personality, a full-blooded Jew who was an apostate from his people and his religion; who uncompromisingly attacked the Jew and the Jewish spirit in his speeches and writings, yet could not enter into the Gentile world with which he strove to ally himself. Whether the attitude which turned his life into a tragedy sprang from his mind or his emotions, I cannot say. This was the first time I had talked at length with an intellectual and erudite Jew about the German-Jewish problem, and though even among Gentiles I was now discovering a widespread doubt of the Nazi program, I was amazed to find that Trebitsch still passionately endorsed it.

Trebitsch did not consider himself a Jew, either spiritually or physically, in spite of his two Jewish parents. Convinced that he was the result of a phenomenon which biologists call “mutation,” he presented himself as a Gentile. Seriously believing that he looked very much like Houston Stewart Chamberlain, the declared scientific enemy of the Jewish people, he produced as proof one of his pamphlets which showed their pictures facing each other. Looking at his eyes and fair hair, I had to agree that the

photographs bore a striking resemblance.

Never before had I considered the Jewish problem from the standpoint of the individual Jew who finds much to condemn in his own people and dares to say so. Trebitsch was an extreme case; yet some of his findings were sound. Discovering that his people were resentful of criticism, he had turned his coat—without finding it any warmer. My mind reverted at once to the two famous apostates, Spinoza and Uriel de Acosta, who were excommunicated from the synagogues, and I reflected that there is no more sorrowful destiny than that which overtakes those who alienate their own people without making friends elsewhere.

Trebitsch sought to convince me that he could be a valuable ally in the Nazi struggle. Intuition and reason told me to remain reserved. But it was distressing to witness the despair of this exhausted and high-strung man, who beyond question was sincere. Ostracized on one side and rejected on the other, he was indeed an outcast. The tragic overtones of our interview made a deep impression on me, and at the earliest moment I spoke about him at length with Rosenberg. Needless to say, there was no place for him in the Party.”¹⁶⁶⁵

Douglas Reed wrote in 1938 of Moses Pinkeles, a. k. a. Ignatz (Ignatius) Trebitsch-Lincoln, a Jew who financed Hitler, and of Zionists who sponsored Hitler,

“Oblivion for a few years, and then came the Kapp Putsch in Germany, the first of the Nationalist conspiracies to overthrow the democratic liberal regime that was so kind to the Jews, and reinstate the big business men, big landlords, monarchists, militarists, in the seats of the mighty in Germany. Who was a leading figure in this short-lived seizure of power? Trebitsch Lincoln, now a German die-hard. Among the other sympathizers was a relatively unknown man, one Adolf Hitler. Trebitsch Lincoln on the side of the anti-Semites? Of course, he was a Christian. [***] If you doubt me, think of Trebitsch Lincoln leading the anti-Semites down the Wilhelmstrasse to the seat of power. But I can show you the modern counterpart of Trebitsch Lincoln, and I don’t mean those pro-Hitler Jews who were said by rumour to have marched round Berlin in the early Nazi days carrying a banner with the legend ‘Hinaus mit uns!’—‘Chuck us out!’”¹⁶⁶⁶

Eustace Mullins, Ezra Pound’s authorized biographer, stated on Daryl Bradford Smith’s radio program *The French Connection*, that the German-Jewish bankers Warburg and Oppenheimer marched with the Nazis carrying signs that read “throw us out”.

Prominent Zionist and author of the *Encyclopaedia Judaica; das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Jakob Klatzkin stated in 1925,

“The national viewpoint taught us to understand the true nature of antisemitism, and this understanding widens the horizons of our national

outlook. [***] In the age of enlightenment antisemitism was included among the phenomena that are likely to disappear along with other forms of prejudice and iniquity. The antisemites, so the rule stated, were the laggard elements in the march of progress. Hence, our fate is dependent on the advance of human culture, and its victory is our victory. [***] In the period of Zionism, we learned that antisemitism was a psychic-social phenomenon that derives from our existence as a nation within a nation. Hence, it cannot change, until we attain our national end. But if Zionism had fully understood its own implications, it would have arrived, not merely as a psychosociological explanation of this phenomenon, but also as a justification of it. It is right to protest against its crude expressions, but we are unjust to it and distort its nature so long as we do not recognize that essentially it is a defense of the integrity of a nation, in whose throat we are stuck, neither to be swallowed nor to be expelled. [***] And when we are unjust to this phenomenon, we are unfair to our own people. If we do not admit the rightfulness of antisemitism, we deny the rightfulness of our own nationalism. If our people is deserving and willing to live its own national life, then it is an alien body thrust into the nations among whom it lives, an alien body that insists on its own distinctive identity, reducing the domain of their life. It is right, therefore, that they should fight against us for their national integrity. [***] Know this, that it is a good sign for us that the nations of the world combat us. It is proof that our national image is not yet utterly blurred, our alienism is still felt. If the war against us should cease or be weakened, it would indicate that our image has become indistinct and our alienism softened. We shall not obtain equality of rights anywhere save at the price of an explicit or implied declaration that we are no longer a national body, but part of the body of the host-nation; or that we are willing to assimilate and become part of it. [***] Instead of establishing societies for defense against the antisemites, who want to reduce our rights, we should establish societies for defense against our friends who desire to defend our rights. [***] When Moses came to redeem the children of Israel, their leaders said to him, ‘You have made our odor evil in the eyes of Pharaoh and in the eyes of his servants, giving them a sword with which to kill us.’ Nevertheless, Moses persisted in worsening the situation of the people, and he saved them.”¹⁶⁶⁷

Who was the “devil” the political Zionists commissioned to shake up the Jews of Europe? When Hitler came to power, some Zionists asked all Jews to let him do as he wished. Some Zionists even hailed him as their savior.

Leon Simon wrote in the introduction to a collection of Einstein’s Zionist works, that emancipation posed a greater threat to the Jewish “race” than the problems of the unemancipated. Hitler soon thereafter unemancipated the Jews. Simon wrote in 1930, *inter alia*,

“THERE are two main ways of approach to Zionism. One starts from those

Jews who are made to suffer for being Jews, the other from the smaller number who are not. In the one case Zionism means the transfer of masses of Jews from countries in which they are obviously not wanted to a country which they might call their own; in the other case it means the re-creation in Palestine of a Hebraic type of life, which will be regarded by all Jews as the embodiment of their own distinctive outlook and ideals, and will thus help to counteract the inevitable tendency of the Jews, when they are not driven back on themselves by external restrictions, to lose their sense of being a separate people.

Of these two conceptions of Zionism, the former has the more direct and obvious appeal. The fact that masses of Jews are made to suffer for the crime of being Jews and wishing to remain Jews is too patent to call for demonstration; and, while it is true that in some countries Jewish disabilities have been removed so far as that can be done by statute, bitter experience engenders a sceptical attitude towards the idea that universal emancipation will provide a panacea for the Jew's troubles. In the first place, the countries with the largest numbers of Jews are not all eager to admit them to full equality; and in the second place, even where equality has been accorded, dislike of the Jew often makes itself felt too strongly for his liking or comfort. Hence, from the point of view of a Jew who wishes to see his people better off in the world than it is to-day, or has been these many centuries, there is much to commend a scheme which sets out to cut at the root of the trouble by removing all the victims of anti-Semitism to a land of their own. By contrast with this perfectly simple and intelligible idea, the other conception of Zionism appears abstruse, almost other-worldly. The problem to which it offers a solution is one of which the existence, let alone the urgency, is not, readily realised by ordinary men and women. It requires no great exercise of thought or imagination to appreciate the unenviable position of the Jewish masses, or the desirability of transporting them to a safe home of refuge. It is less easy to recognise that the emancipated Jew presents, from the point of view of Jewish survival, at least as difficult a problem as the unemancipated; that the very removal of restrictions on the political and economic freedom of the Jews in this or that country creates conditions which are more inimical than persecution to the maintenance of whatever is worthily distinctive of the Jew as such; that the consequent disintegration of an ancient people, involving the disappearance of one of the world's great cultures, is even more tragic than the material ills of the Jewish masses; and that the paramount need of the hour is a safe home of refuge for the Jewish spirit.¹⁶⁶⁸

7.5.4.1 Depressions Make for Fertile Ground for Anti-Semitic Zionist Dictators

Hitler had little political success until the Great Depression hit the world. The Depression, together with immense funding from Jewish financiers and from industrialists, propelled Hitler to power in early 1933. Samuel Untermyer called for

a boycott of Germany in 1933, and chastised Jewish bankers for financing Adolf Hitler and Nazism,

“Revolting as it is, it would be an interesting study in psychology to analyze the motives, other than fear and cowardice, that have prompted Jewish bankers to lend money to Germany as they are now doing. It is in part their money that is being used by the Hitler régime in its reckless, wicked campaign of propaganda to make the world anti-Semitic; with that money they have invaded Great Britain, the United States and other countries where they have established newspapers, subsidized agents and otherwise are spending untold millions in spreading their infamous creed.

The suggestion that they use that money toward paying the honest debts they have repudiated is answered only by contemptuous sneers and silence. Meantime the infamous campaign goes on unabated with ever increasing intensity to the everlasting disgrace of the Jewish bankers who are helping to finance it and of the weaklings who are doing nothing effective to check it.”¹⁶⁶⁹

The political Zionists learned from the financial crisis of 1873, that a financial catastrophe would provide an opportunity to promote political anti-Semitism, which was their goal. At least as early as 1914, Ignatz Zollschan stated,

“In Germany, in the west European states, and in the United States of America, which enjoy a great economic and political prosperity, and, moreover, have no great percentage of Jewish population, the expropriation of the Jews cannot come into consideration. But should stagnation and depression take the place of prosperity, conditions similar to those in eastern Europe may be expected. In order to verify this statement, we need only cast our glance upon the so-called foundation-years in Germany, and upon the financial crisis in the year 1873. For it was then that birth was given to political anti-Semitism in Germany.”

In 1898, Communist Zionist Nachman Syrkin wrote that economic hardships resulted in increased anti-Semitism and the success of criminal anti-Semitic politicians.¹⁶⁷⁰

7.5.4.2 Einstein a Subtle Hitler Apologist

When the “Hitlerites” showed their strength in the elections, political might paid for by Jewish financiers, Einstein and some other Zionist leaders told Jews not worry but to close ranks and unite. Of course, should Hitler lead the country into war, it would benefit bankers, investors, and factory owners. Hitler’s anti-Semitism benefitted the political Zionists. An article entitled “Fascists Walk Out of Berlin Council”, *The New York Times* on 19 September 1930 on page 9 quoted the *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, which quoted Albert Einstein,

“There is no reason for despair,’ declared Professor Einstein, ‘for the Hitler vote is only a symptom, not necessarily of anti-Jewish hatred but of momentary resentment caused by economic misery and unemployment within the ranks of misguided German youth. I hope that the momentary fever and wave will rapidly fall.

‘During the more dangerous Dreyfus period almost the entire French nation was to be found in the anti-Semitic camp. I hope that as soon as the situation improves the German people will also find their road to clarity.’”

Einstein acted as a Nazi apologist and tried to subvert any organized Jewish reaction to Hitler—he effectively promoted Hitler at a critical time in history. Many Jews in Germany failed to respond to Hitler’s victory with an organized reaction, in part because treacherous Jews like Albert Einstein led them to believe that Hitler would soon be unseated and that Nazism was an ephemeral malady they need not bother too much about.

At a time when anti-Zionist Jews were desperately trying to organize all Jews to fight against the Fascists, while many Zionists were encouraging the Fascists,¹⁶⁷¹ Einstein wanted to remove Jews from Germany and was confused by his own racist hypocrisy. Following Hitler’s election victory in 1933, Albert Einstein commented, merely parroting the Zionist Party line,¹⁶⁷²

“For the time being, I see the National Socialist movement as merely a product of the current economic crisis and the teething pains of the Republic. The solidarity of the Jews is for me an eternal commandment, but I feel a specific reaction to the election results would be entirely inappropriate.”

“Ich sehe in der nationalsozialistischen Bewegung einstweilen nur eine Folgeerscheinung der momentanen wirtschaftlichen Notlage und eine Kinder-Krankheit der Republik. Solidarität der Juden halte ich immer für geboten, aber eine besondere Reaktion auf das Wahlergebnis für ganz unzweckmässig.”¹⁶⁷³

At the time Einstein made this cavalier statement, he knew that the Nazis were going to annihilate the Jews of Europe—as did Zionist Nazi apologist Ludwig Lewisohn, the dear friend, and the lover, of the famous Hitler-promoter George Sylvester Viereck.¹⁶⁷⁴ Albert Einstein wrote to Gustav Bucky on 15 July 1933,

“I really do believe that any action aimed at keeping Jews in Germany would have the effect of speeding up their annihilation.”¹⁶⁷⁵

In 1933, Einstein told British Prime Minister (1923-1929, 1935-1937) Stanley Baldwin of Hitler’s plan for world conquest and that Hitler would perhaps cause a new world war. Baldwin, who was later criticized for not preparing England to face Germany, told Einstein that Great Britain had her allies.¹⁶⁷⁶ Einstein did take a firmer stand against the Nazis and against the Prussian Academy of Sciences in 1933 than

many Zionists, and was accused of public anti-Germanism by that Academy. In this exchange, Einstein fought for the rights of Jews to human dignity and the right to equality under the law. What Einstein meant by “annihilation” in 1933 is not necessarily clear. He may have meant the rooting out of Jews from Germany by cutting off their means of earning a living and forcing them to Palestine—as the Nazis and Zionists had planned,¹⁶⁷⁷ or he may have meant mass murder.

7.5.5 Einstein’s Seething Racist Hatred and Rabid Nationalism

The smear tactics of Zionists are well known. Einstein’s smear tactics gained him and his defenders an international reputation as agitators and reckless defamers. A “Biographical Sketch” issued to U. S. Army Intelligence sometime in 1940 stated,

“The origin of the case is that in Berlin, even in the political free and easy period of 1923 to 1929, the Einstein home was known as a Communist center and clearing house. Mrs. and Miss Einstein were always prominent at all extreme radical meetings and demonstrations. When the German police tried to bridge some of the extreme Communist activities, the Einstein villa at Wannsee was found to be the hiding place of Moscow envoys, etc. The Berlin conservative press at the time featured this, but the authorities were hesitant to take any action, as the more radical press immediately accused these reporters as being Anti-Semites.”¹⁶⁷⁸

The historic record bears out the accusation that Einstein and his sponsors had the means and the will to smear innocents in their efforts to redirect public attention away from their own vile actions. It had become a habit for them, and they took every opportunity, no matter how unjustified, to raise the issue of race, paint themselves as victims of racist oppression, and often went so far as to accuse innocent persons of racism. The ridiculous extremes of this political maneuvering were manifest long before the Holocaust, and reached across the English Channel.

In 1919, hypocritical, racist, ethnocentric and insulting Einstein smeared all Germans, all English, and the reporter who had helped to promote him,

“A final comment. The description of me and my circumstances in *The Times* shows an amusing feat of imagination on the part of the writer. By an application of the theory of relativity to the taste of readers, today in Germany I am called a German man of science, and in England I am represented as a Swiss Jew. If I come to be regarded as a *bête noire*, the descriptions will be reversed, and I shall become a Swiss Jew for the Germans and a German man of science for the English!”¹⁶⁷⁹

Einstein, either directly, or through someone else, took his line from Bernard Lazare’s *L’Antisémitisme: Son Histoire et Ses Causes* of 1894,

“In general the Jews, even the revolutionaries, have kept the Jewish spirit,

and if they have given up religion and faith, they have nevertheless been formed, thanks to their ancestry and their education, by the influence of Jewish nationalism. This is true in a very special fashion of the Jewish revolutionaries who lived in the first half of this century. Heinrich Heine and Karl Marx are two typical examples. Heine is held to be German in France. In Germany he is accused of being French. He was above all a Jew."¹⁶⁸⁰

A couple of years after Einstein made his comment, in June of 1921, *The Jewish Chronicle* reported,

"The *Times* of Monday last, by the by, published an interview with Einstein. The interviewer gave minute personal descriptions of the remarkable scientist, and yet did not venture to suggest that he was a Jew. If (the *Jewish World* comments) he had been a Bolshevik or a reprehensible character of any kind, we doubt not the fact would have dawned upon the *Times* correspondent that he was a Jew, and would have found place in what he had to say. Strange how circumstances alter one's point of view!"¹⁶⁸¹

Strange, indeed, that no matter what a *Times* correspondent said about Einstein; either Einstein, or some extremist among his supporters, would viciously smear that correspondent as a bigot, without any grounds whatsoever. And for what purpose? This appears to have been a habit for them, a pernicious habit and a divisive habit meant to perpetuate, intensify and generate hatred, fear and conflict—for political Zionist purposes.

Einstein's ardent nationalism became so extreme, that it played into the hands of his political foes, and became an example for their generalizations. Max Nordau described the pernicious habits of racists, with no small measure of hypocrisy, in his address to the First Zionist Congress in 1897,

"No one has ever tried to justify these terrible accusations by facts. At most, now and then, an individual Jew, the scum of his race and of mankind, is triumphantly cited as an example, and contrary to all laws of logic, the example is made general. This tendency is psychologically correct. It is the practice of human intellect to invent for the prejudices, which sentiment has called forth, a cause seemingly reasonable. Probably wisdom has long been acquainted with this psychological law, and puts it in fairly expressive words: 'If you have to drown a dog,' says the proverb, 'you must first declare him to be mad.' All kinds of vices are falsely attributed to the Jews, because one wishes to convince himself that he has a right to detest them. But the pre-existing sentiment is the detestation of the Jews."¹⁶⁸²

Einstein detested Germans throughout his life. He hated Germans long before the Nazi Party was formed. Einstein's racist nationalism rivaled and perhaps even surpassed Physics in Einstein's self-image, making him the ideological twin of the Nazis—one who wanted to exterminate the Germans—one who wanted to

exterminate all Gentile Europeans. He was described in the *Daily Graphic* as,

“A man of the most simple tastes, he lives in a lofty flat in Berlin. He is an indifferent linguist, and will lecture in German, but he has a passion for music, and beyond this his scientific pursuits and his work for Zionism comprise his sole interests.”¹⁶⁸³

While hiding from Arvid Reuterdaahl’s challenge to a public debate,¹⁶⁸⁴ Einstein announced through his secretary Salomon Ginzberg during his famous stay in America,

“I came here with one object—the promotion of the establishment of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. [***] The great purpose of my mission to this country must not be overshadowed by my theory. I will be here a short time, and all of that time must be devoted to the great Palestine reconstruction project.”¹⁶⁸⁵

Einstein stated in an interview following his visit to America,

“I really went on behalf of the Jewish cause. Yes, I have placed my name and indeed my self in the service of the Zionist movement to make propaganda for Palestine, and the true purpose of the America trip was to collect money for a fund to establish a university in Jerusalem.”¹⁶⁸⁶

Nationalism became so consuming a personal passion for Einstein, that he took advantage of his fraudulently-based fame to promote the political cause. R. S. Shankland stated,

“About publicity Einstein told me that he had been *given* a publicity value which he did not *earn*. Since he had it he would use it if it would do good; otherwise not. [*Emphasis found in the original*]”¹⁶⁸⁷

His famous trip to America was not made to promote or celebrate the theory of relativity, but to promote his personal vision of nationalism and to raise money for this cause. Though this was absolutely his right, many found Einstein’s exploitation of his scientific fame for political purposes distasteful—to the point of being disgraceful.

As early as February of 1914, loyal German Jews publicly protested against anti-German Zionism. Albert Einstein was a virulently racist oddity among German Jews. German Jews knew quite well that the Zionists were planning to deliberately place all Jews in harm’s way and ruin Germany. *The New York Times* wrote on 8 February 1914, Section 3, page 3,

“PROTEST AGAINST ZIONISTS.

German-Jewish Organizations Say They Harm Jews and Fatherland.

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

BERLIN, Feb. 7.—Several Jewish organizations of Germany have joined in a protest against what they call the ‘insidious German national Chauvinism,’ which is being carried on in the name of German Jews by German Zionists.

It is alleged that the Zionists are resorting to methods that must bring the whole Jewish cause into disrepute at home and abroad and sow seeds of discord between Christians and Jews in Germany itself.

The protest, which has taken the form of a strong public statement, addressed to the press of the country, urges that the mere matter of faith which separates German Jews from their fellow-citizens must not be exploited by overzealous co-religionists to the disadvantage of both Jews and the Fatherland.”

In 1930, some German Jews demanded that Albert Einstein stop using his scientific fame to promote racism, disloyalty and “interracial” strife. *The New York Times* reported on 7 December 1930 on page 11,

“The National German-Jewish Union, a small group of extreme nationalist and anti-Zionist Jews, protested against Professor Einstein using his world-fame as a scientist for ‘propagating Zionism.’”

After the Second World War, Jews again criticized Einstein for his nationalistic Zionism. Einstein responded,

“In my opinion condemning the Zionist movement as ‘nationalistic’ is unjustified. [***] Thus already our precarious situation forces us to stand together irrespective of our citizenship.”¹⁶⁸⁸

Einstein parroted the Zionist dogma that ethnic, racial and religious unity among peoples of Jewish descent around the world constituted a sovereignty without physical borders, which should be organized around a community in Palestine, but which sovereign status should be intrinsic to anyone of Jewish descent anywhere in the world—since a Jewish dispersion had allegedly taken place two thousand years ago. Theodor Herzl stated that anti-Semitism was justified and that the only means to end it was segregation. Chaim Weizmann made it very clear that Zionism is not a form of self-defense against prejudice, but is instead an indefensible product of Jewish bigotry. Weizmann proclaimed,

“The sufferings of Russian Jewry never were the cause of Zionism. The fundamental cause of Zionism was, and is, the ineradicable national striving of Jewry to have a home of its own—a national center, a national home with a national Jewish life.”¹⁶⁸⁹

German Jews around the world had largely assimilated into various nations and cultures and were often quite successful. They were leading and highly productive members of their societies. Eastern European Jews were often living in intolerable conditions and sought to emigrate to the West. They looked to their religious brethren in the West for help, but were often resented and rejected, because they clung to their ancient Jewish racism, and their desire to flee their neighbors and their call to other Jews in other countries was itself a manifestation of their racist tribalism.

Many German Jews feared that these clannish Easterners would inspire anti-Semitism and resented their presence.¹⁶⁹⁰ Weizmann feared that the Russian Revolution would put an end to Zionism, because it achieved the freedom of Russian Jews,

“At that time the whole world—and the Jews more than anyone else—had been thrilled by the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia, and the establishment of the liberal Kerensky regime.”¹⁶⁹¹

Weizmann was a rabid anti-assimilationist.¹⁶⁹² He wasn’t simply after social justice for Jews. Weizmann was after self-imposed segregation of the Jews.

The Zionists are the product of an ancient racist and genocidal religious mythology. This religious mythology is largely political and racist, and it affects even secular Jews, some of whom view it as the product of Jewish genes, and therefore of intrinsic value in defining Jews and their actions. The prophets need not have been inspired by God, for they were inspired by a yet more divine source, Jewish blood. The creation myth was turned on its head such that some secular Jews stated that the Jews created a fellow Jew, “God”, to express the urges of their “Jewish blood”—their “Jewish soul”. Those many secular Jews who rejected this racist viewpoint, also could not have helped but have been somewhat affected by the legacy of centuries of Jewish culture which had evolved in the continuing presence of religious Jewish racism.

The Hebrew Bible contains numerous stories of the segregation, punishment and genocide of assimilationist Jews by anti-assimilationist Jews. For example, *Numbers*, Chapter 25, states:

“And Israel abode in Shittim, and the people began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab. 2 And they called the people unto the sacrifices of their gods: and the people did eat, and bowed down to their gods. 3 And Israel joined himself unto Baal-peor: and the anger of the LORD was kindled against Israel. 4 And the LORD said unto Moses, Take all the heads of the people, and hang them up before the LORD against the sun, that the fierce

anger of the LORD may be turned away from Israel. 5 And Moses said unto the judges of Israel, Slay ye every one his men that were joined unto Baal-peor. 6 ¶ And, behold, one of the children of Israel came and brought unto his brethren a Midianitish woman in the sight of Moses, and in the sight of all the congregation of the children of Israel, who *were weeping before* the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. 7 And when Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron the priest, saw *it*, he rose up from among the congregation, and took a javelin in his hand; 8 and he went after the man of Israel into the tent, and thrust both of them through, the man of Israel, and the woman through her belly. So the plague was stayed from the children of Israel. 9 And those that died in the plague were twenty and four thousand. 10 ¶ And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, 11 Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron the priest, hath turned my wrath away from the children of Israel, while he was zealous for my sake among them, that I consumed not the children of Israel in my jealousy. 12 Wherefore say, Behold, I give unto him my covenant of peace: 13 and he shall have it, and his seed after him, even the covenant of an everlasting priesthood; because he was zealous for his God, and made an atonement for the children of Israel. 14 Now the name of the Israelite that was slain, *even* that was slain with the Mid'i-anitish woman, *was* Zimri, the son of Salu, a prince of a chief house among the Simeonites. 15 And the name of the Midianitish woman that was slain *was* Cozbi, the daughter of Zur; he *was* head over a people, *and* of a chief house in Midian. 16 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, 17 Vex the Midianites, and smite them: 18 for they vex you with their wiles, wherewith they have beguiled you in the matter of Peor, and in the matter of Cozbi, the daughter of a prince of Midian, their sister, which was slain in the day of the plague for Peor's sake.”

Since many Zionists were atheists, or pretended to be atheists to assuage Christian and Moslem concerns, as well as secular and religious Jewish fears, and since Herzl and others had made Zionism a political question rather than a religious question, Zionism became strictly a matter of racist segregation.

There was a definite rift between Eastern European Jews and German Jews, who feared that the presence of these Easterners, especially when led by rabidly racist Zionists, would inspire and intensify anti-Semitism. Einstein and Weizmann wanted to force Western European Jews into sponsoring the emigration of Eastern European Jews—who appeared in Western Europe like peoples from another time—and who would make a suitable slave labor force for the Zionists.¹⁶⁹³ In turn, these highly racist Eastern European Jews resented the assimilationist Western Jews. Many of the Jews of Palestine also resented the Eastern European Jews for creating conflicts in Palestine, where Jews, Moslems and Christians had been living together in peace.

A racist unity among Jews had long been a goal of the political Zionists despite the resistance they encountered from Jews around the world. Max Nordau wrote, soon after the First Zionist Congress in Basel in August of 1897:

“Die Voraussetzung des politischen Zionismus ist, dass es ein jüdisches Volk gibt. Das gerade leugnen die Assimilationsjuden und die von ihnen besoldeten geistlosen, salbungsvoll schwatzenden Rabbiner.”

and,

“{*Margin Note: Die Assimilanten*} Viele Juden, namentlich des Westens, haben innerlich vollkommen mit dem Judenthum gebrochen und sie werden es wahrscheinlich bald auch äusserlich thun, und wenn nicht sie, dann ihre Kinder oder Enkel. Diese wünschen ganz unter ihren christlichen Landsleuten aufzugehen. Sie empfinden es als schwere Störung, dass andere Juden neben ihnen ihr besonderes Volksthum laut verkünden und reinlich Scheidung zwischen sich und den anderen Völkern fordern. Ihre grosse Angst ist, in ihrem Geburtslande, dessen freie Bürger sie sind, als Fremde bezeichnet zu werden. Sie fürchten, dass man dies mehr als je vorher thun wird, wenn ein grosser Theil des jüdischen Volkes offen die Rechte eines selbständigen Volkes für sich fordert, und nun gar, wenn erst irgendwo in der Welt wirklich ein politisches und culturelles Centrum des Judenthums entsteht, um das sich Millionen national geeinigter Juden gruppieren.

{*Margin Note: Zwei Millionen gegen zehn*} Alle diese Gefühle der Assimilationsjuden sind verständlich. Sie sind auch von ihrem Standpunkt aus berechtigt. Aber sie haben keinen Anspruch darauf, dass der Zionismus ihnen zu Liebe Selbstmord begehe. Die Juden, die in ihrem Geburtslande zufrieden und glücklich sind und die Zumuthung, es aufzugeben, empört zurückweisen, sind etwa ein Sechstel des jüdischen Volkes, sagen wir 2 Millionen von zwölf. Die übrigen fünf Sechstel, zehn Millionen, fühlen sich in ihrem Aufenthaltsorte sehr unglücklich und sie haben auch allen Grund dazu. Diesen zehn Millionen ist nicht zuzumuthen, dass sie sich für immer widerstandlos in ihre Knechtschaft fügen, dass sie jedes Streben nach Erlösung aus ihrer Noth aufgeben, bloss damit das Behagen der zwei Millionen glücklicher und zufriedener Juden nicht gestört werde.”¹⁶⁹⁴

Theodor Herzl wrote of the utility of using Eastern European Jewish peasants as a slave labor force in his book *The Jewish State* and in his diaries. The Zionist Nazis helped the political Zionists to train this slave labor force and to condition them to accept their fate. After the Holocaust, Chaim Weizmann tried to blame assimilatory Jews for the tragic events the Zionists deliberately caused,

“[Rathenau’s] attitude was, of course, all too typical of that of many assimilated German Jews; they seemed to have no idea that they were sitting on a volcano; they believed quite sincerely that such difficulties as admittedly existed for German Jews were purely temporary and transitory phenomena, primarily due to the influx of East European Jews, who did not fit into the framework of German life, and thus offered targets for anti-Semitic attacks.”¹⁶⁹⁵

Joachim Prinz explored the issue in his book *Wir Juden*, Erich Reiss, Berlin, (1934), pp. 50-55. Albert Einstein wrote to Max Born on 22 March 1934 that the same impediments Western European Jews had placed against the immigration of Eastern European Jews during their migration to the West were now being instituted against German Jews by the Jews of America, France and England,

“It is particularly unfortunate that the satiated Jews of the countries which have hitherto been spared cling to the foolish hope that they can safeguard themselves by keeping quiet and making patriotic gestures, just as the German Jews used to do. For the same reason they sabotaged the granting of asylum to German Jews, just as the latter did to Jews from the East. This applies just as much in America as in France and England.”¹⁶⁹⁶

Einstein’s personality interfered with his attempts to open up immigration for Eastern European Jews and his bigoted hatred worked against his cause. In the long run, Einstein’s racism and provocative statements proved horrifically counter-productive and deliberately aided anti-Semitic racists in their ascent to power in Europe, which might have been his goal all along. Einstein later avowed that the plan for the inhuman carnage of which many Europeans and European governments eventually proved capable under Zionist leadership, appeared in Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*, which was written in the 1920’s.¹⁶⁹⁷ He knew well what to expect.

Hitler’s mentor, Dietrich Eckart, who was a member the Zionists’ anti-Semitic propaganda school the *Thule-Gesellschaft*, exploited Jewish racism and anti-Germanism for propaganda purposes. Dietrich Eckart wrote, quoting Hitler, in Eckart’s *Der Bolschewismus von Moses bis Lenin: Zwiegespräch zwischen Adolf Hitler und mir*,

“‘Send me a box full of German soil, so that I can at least symbolically defile the accursed country,’ wrote the German Jew, Börne; [Notation: Ludwig Börne (alias Löb Baruch), *Briefe aus Paris* (Hamburg, 1832), I.] and Heinrich Heine sniffed out Germany’s future from a toilet bowl. [Notation: Heinrich (alias Chaim) Heine, *Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen* (1844).] The physicist, Einstein, whom the Jewish publicity agents celebrate as a second Kepler, explained he would have nothing to do with German nationalism. He considered ‘deceitful’ the custom of the Central Association of German Citizens of Jewish Faith [Notation: *Zentralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens*. {Translator}] of concerning themselves only with the religious interests of the Jews and not with their racial community also. A rare bird? No, only one who believed his people already safely in control, and thus considered it no longer necessary to keep up pretenses. In the Central Association itself, the mask has already fallen. A Dr. Brünn frankly admitted there that the Jews could have no German national spirit. [Notation: Artur Brünn, *Im Deutschen Reich* (the periodical of the *Zentralverein*) 1913, No. 8.] We always mistake their unprincipled exertions to accommodate themselves to all and everyone for impulses of the heart. Whenever they see

an advantage to be gained by adopting a certain pose, they never hesitate, and certainly wouldn't let ethical considerations stand in their way. How many Galician Jews have first become Germans, then Englishmen, and finally Americans! And every time in the twinkling of an eye. With startling rapidity they change their nationality back and forth, and wherever their feet touch, there resounds either the 'Watch on the Rhine,' or the 'Marsellaise,' or 'Yankee Doodle.' Dr. Heim does not once question the fact that our Warburgs, our Bleichroders, or our Mendelssohns are able to transfer their patriotism as well as their residence of today to London or to New York on the morrow. 'On the sands of Brandenburg an Asiatic horde!' Walther Rathenau once blurted out about the Berlin Jews. [*Notation: Walther Rathenau, Berliner Kulturzentren, 1913. Rathenau was a Jewish war profiteer in World War I and later a minister in the Weimar government. He was executed by German patriots in 1922. {Translator}*] He forgot to add that the same horde is on the Isar, the Elbe, the Main, the Thames, the Seine, the Hudson, the Neva, and the Volga. And all of them with the same deceit toward their neighbors."¹⁶⁹⁸

Should Albert Einstein be forgiven as an ethnocentric and racist victim of his time and political affiliations, who defended "his people" from what appeared to him to be a threat to their very existence—the dangers of assimilation and philo-Semitism? Early on, Jews with far more sense than Einstein organized to defend themselves from the fanatical and racist Zionists, knowing that the political games of the racists on both sides of the "Jewish question" would result in tragedy and trauma for the world's Jews. Klaus J. Herrmann wrote,

"To counter the coalition of antisemites and Zionists, in 1912, within the Association for Liberal Judaism, a number of distinguished leaders of Germany's Jewish communities decided to form an *Anti-Zionist Committee*. This Committee [***] took on the task of 'enlightening the German Jews on and combating Zionism.'"¹⁶⁹⁹

Paul Ehrenfest saw the harm racist and segregationist Zionist Jews were doing to his fellow Jews.¹⁷⁰⁰ Since all reasonable Jews knew the destruction that would inevitably follow from Einstein's ideology, Einstein should have known it, and indeed he did know it. One outgrowth of these anti-Zionist organizations, which formed to protect themselves, is Neturei Karta. Rabbi Moshe Shonfeld documented the collaboration of the Zionists with the Nazis and the deliberate human sacrifice of innocent Jews in order to establish the "Jewish State".¹⁷⁰¹ Numerous other Jewish authors have chastised Zionist Jews for their behavior towards other Jews during the Holocaust.¹⁷⁰² Rabbi E. Schwartz published a statement on behalf of the American Neturei Karta in *The New York Times* on 18 May 1993,

"To achieve the goal of statehood the Zionists have always deliberately provoked anti-Semitism. [***] Their interest was not to save Jews, on the

contrary, more spilling of Jewish blood would strengthen their demand of the nations for the creation of their state.”¹⁷⁰³

Albert Einstein, the “Person of the Century” who sought to promote and foment anti-Semitism wherever he went, stated in 1921,

“On the other hand, anti-Semitism in Germany also has consequences that, from a Jewish point of view, should be welcomed. I believe German Jewry owes its continued existence to anti-Semitism.”¹⁷⁰⁴

Contrast this with Nobel Peace Prize laureate Elie Wiesel’s statement in 1968,

“Every Jew, somewhere in his being, should set apart a zone of hate—healthy, virile hate—for what the German personifies and for what persists in the German. To do otherwise would be a betrayal of the dead.”¹⁷⁰⁵

Lieutenant General Rafael Eytan, outgoing Chief of Staff of the Israeli Army, stated on 12 April 1983,

“When we have settled the land, all the Arabs will be able to do about it will be to scurry around like drugged roaches in a bottle.”¹⁷⁰⁶

Wiesel has stressed his view that the Holocaust should be seen as a uniquely tragic event in History. However, this exclusivist view of Jewish History predates the Holocaust by at least a century, for example in a statement from 1845,

“The sufferings of the Jews—whether the ‘wringing out of the dregs of a cup of trembling’ from Jehovah, or not—have far exceeded all other experience, and the common measure of human endurance.”¹⁷⁰⁷

After the First World War Einstein and some of his friends alluded to much earlier conversations with Einstein where he had correctly predicted the eventual outcome of the war. In his diaries, Romain Rolland recorded his conversations with Einstein in Switzerland at their meeting of 16 September 1915,

“What I hear from [Einstein] is not exactly encouraging, for it shows the impossibility of arriving at a lasting peace with Germany without first totally crushing it. Einstein says the situation looks to him far less favorable than a few months back. The victories over Russia have reawakened German arrogance and appetite. The word ‘greedy’ seems to Einstein best to characterize Germany. [***] Einstein does not expect any renewal of Germany out of itself; it lacks the energy for it, and the boldness for initiative. He hopes for a victory of the Allies, which would smash the power of Prussia and the dynasty. . . . Einstein and Zangger dream of a divided Germany—on the one side Southern Germany and Austria, on the other side

Prussia. [***] We speak of the deliberate blindness and the lack of psychology in the Germans.”¹⁷⁰⁸

Einstein’s dreams during the First World War remind one of the “Carthaginian Peace” of the Henry Morgenthau, Jr. plan for the destruction of Germany following the Second World War. Morgenthau worked with Lord Cherwell (Frederick Alexander Lindemann), Churchill’s friend and advisor, who planned to bomb German civilian populations into submission. Lindemann studied under Einstein’s friend, Walther Nernst, who worked with Fritz Haber, a Jewish developer of poisonous gas. James Bacque argues that the Allies, under the direction of General Eisenhower, starved hundreds of thousands, if not millions of German prisoners of war to death. Dwight David Eisenhower was called “the terrible Swedish-Jew” in his yearbook for West Point, *The 1915 Howitzer*, West Point, New York, (1915), p. 80. He was also called “Ike”, as in. . . Eisenhower? The Soviets also abused countless German POW’s after the Second World War.¹⁷⁰⁹

Einstein often spoke in genocidal and racist terms against Germany, and for the Jews and England, and he betrayed Germany before, during and after the First World War. Einstein wrote to Paul Ehrenfest on 22 March 1919,

“[The Allied Powers] whose victory during the war I had felt would be by far the lesser evil are now proving to be *only slightly* the lesser evil. [***] I get most joy from the emergence of the Jewish state in Palestine. It does seem to me that our kinfolk really are more sympathetic (at least less brutal) than these horrid Europeans. Perhaps things can only improve if only the Chinese are left, who refer to all Europeans with the collective noun ‘bandits.’”¹⁷¹⁰

Einstein avowed *circa* 3 April 1920, that,

“If what anti-Semites claim were true, then indeed there would be nothing weaker, more wretched, and unfit for life, than the German people”.¹⁷¹¹

Einstein avowed that the anti-Semites’ beliefs were true. Therefore, Einstein must have believed at least as early as 1920 that the Germans ought to be exterminated. When discussing the meaning of life, Einstein spoke to Peter A. Bucky about persons and creatures who “[do] not deserve to be in our world” and are “hardly fit for life.”¹⁷¹² Einstein’s language is quite similar to the language of Hitler’s “T4” “*Euthanasia-Programme*”.

After siding with Germany’s enemies in the First World War—while living in Germany, and after intentionally provoking Germans into increased anti-Semitism, which he thought was good for Jews, and after defaming German Nobel Prize laureates in the international press to the point where they felt obliged to join Hitler’s cause, which cause eventually resulted in the genocide of Europe’s Jews; Einstein sponsored the production of genocidal weapons to mass murder Germans, whom he had hated all of his life, in the famous letter to President Roosevelt that Einstein signed urging Roosevelt to begin the development of atomic bombs. Einstein signed

this letter before the alleged mass murder of Jews had begun.¹⁷¹³

Genocidal Einstein callously asserted that the use of atomic bombs on civilian populations was “morally justified”. I quote Einstein without delving into the question of who first bombed civilian centers,

“It should not be forgotten that the atomic bomb was made in this country as a preventive measure; it was to head off its use by the Germans, if they discovered it. The bombing of civilian centers was initiated by the Germans and adopted by the Japanese. To it the Allies responded in kind—as it turned out, with greater effectiveness—and they were morally justified in doing so.”¹⁷¹⁴

Einstein advocated genocidal collective punishment,

“The Germans as an entire people are responsible for these mass murders and must be punished as a people if there is justice in the world and if the consciousness of collective responsibility in the nations is not to perish from the earth entirely.”¹⁷¹⁵

and,

“It is possible either to destroy the German people or keep them suppressed; it is not possible to educate them to think and act along democratic lines in the foreseeable future.”¹⁷¹⁶

Albrecht Fölsing has assembled a compilation of post-WW II quotations by Albert Einstein, which evince Einstein’s lifelong habit of stereotyping people based on their ethnicity. Einstein again expressed his hatred after the war—a temptation Max Born had resisted,

“With the Germans having murdered my Jewish brethren in Europe, I do not wish to have anything more to do with Germans, not even with a relatively harmless Academy. [***] The crimes of the Germans are really the most hideous that the history of the so-called civilized nations has to show. [***] [It was] evident that a proud Jew no longer wishes to be connected with any kind of German official event or institution. [***] After the mass murder committed by the Germans against my Jewish brethren I do not wish any publications of mine to appear in Germany.”¹⁷¹⁷

Einstein wrote to Born on 15 September 1950 that his pathological hatred towards Germans predated the Nazi period,

“I have not changed my attitude to the Germans, which, by the way, dates not just from the Nazi period. All human beings are more or less the same from birth. The Germans, however, have a far more dangerous tradition than any

of the other so-called civilized nations. The present behavior of these other nations towards the Germans merely proves to me how little human beings learn even from their most painful experiences.”¹⁷¹⁸

and on learning that Born would return to Germany, Einstein wrote on 12 October 1953,

“If anyone can be held responsible for the fact that you are migrating back to the land of the mass-murderers of our kinsmen, it is certainly your adopted fatherland — universally notorious for its parsimony.”¹⁷¹⁹

Einstein wanted to carry out the extermination of the Germans he had been planning for many decades before the Holocaust. Einstein could not forgive the fact that other nations forgave the Germans and did not take the opportunity the Zionists had created for the complete extermination of the German People, the extermination of Amalek.

7.5.6 The Final Solution of the Jewish Question is Zionism, but the Final Solution of the German Question is Extermination

The generally accepted history of the Wannsee-Konferenz of 20 January 1942 holds that the Nazis first proposed the party policy of the genocidal extermination of Jews on this date. Lesser known today is the fact that a Jewish American named Theodor Newman Kaufman advocated the genocidal sterilization of all Germans as a “final solution” in 1941 in his book *Germany Must Perish!*, Argyle Press, Newark, New Jersey, (1941), for which an ad was posted in *The New York Times* on 1 March 1941 on page 13. Kaufman had called for the sterilization of all Americans in 1939.

Kaufman promoted his book by sending out small black cardboard coffins with a note inside which read, “Read GERMANY MUST PERISH! Tomorrow you will receive your copy,” to leading figures and persons in the media. This was followed by a copy of the book the next day. This book was briefly noted in “Latest Books Received”, *The New York Times*, (16 March 1941), Book Reviews Section, pp. 28-30, at 29; which simply states, “A plan for permanent peace among civilized nations.” *Time Magazine*, under the heading “A Modest Proposal”, described the odd book, the strange method by which Kaufman had promoted it, and the peculiar history of Theodor Newman Kaufman, who claimed to have known members of Winston Churchill’s family.¹⁷²⁰ In an interesting aside, Albert Einstein’s personal physician, Professor Janos Plesch, became Winston Churchill’s personal physician.¹⁷²¹

Kaufman’s book advocating the genocide of Germans was known to most Germans. *Germany Must Perish!* was condemned in German publications, which alleged that President Roosevelt had sponsored it and had even written passages in it. The book, which proposed the genocide of the Germans, provoked attacks on Jews in Germany.¹⁷²² To the Germans, *Germany Must Perish!* represented the climax of the generalized vilification of all Germans propagandized by enemies of Germany

in the First World War, like Émile Durkheim.¹⁷²³ At least as early as the 1860's, recalling the myth of Esau and Amalek, Zionist racist and National Socialist Moses Hess¹⁷²⁴ argued that the “German race” had a genetically programmed antagonism towards the “Jewish race”—the implication being that one must destroy the other in order to survive. Hess cushions his blows by mentioning enlightened Germans who have supposedly overcome their alleged genetic compulsions to destroy Jews, but his genocidal hatred of Germans is clear.

Hess was an interesting figure. He married a Christian prostitute. He wrote together with Marx, then criticized him. Hess created many of the elements of National Socialism that would eventually become the National Socialist German Worker's Party, or “Nazi” Party.

With Kaufman's *Germany Must Perish!* as evidence, the Nazis told the German public that the Americans, under the direction of Jews, planned to exterminate the “German race” if the Allies won the war. This life and death struggle between the “German race” and the “Jewish race” was foretold in Hess' book of 1862, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English: *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918).

Goebbels proclaimed that the inhumane crimes Germans had committed against Jews compelled Germany to fight to the very end, thereby maximizing German and Allied and European casualties and the destruction of Europe. At the end of the war, Hitler called for Germans to kill themselves, because they had proven themselves unworthy to live in the fight for survival. Some have alleged that Hitler was sent to destroy Germans, who many Jews had alleged were genetic or cultural enemies of Jews predisposed to destroy them. Hitler destroyed Europe with perpetual war and he destroyed “Red Assimilationist” Jews in order to punish them and to shock American Jews into embracing Zionism.

Einstein's genocidal statements hint at the proposed measures advocated in Kaufman's book of 1941. Among other things, Kaufman wrote,

“A final solution: Let Germany be policed forever by an international armed force? *Even if such a huge undertaking were feasible life itself would not have it so. As war begets war, suppression begets rebellion. Undreamed horrors would unfold.* Thus we find that there is no middle course; no act of mediation, no compromise to be compounded, no political or economic sharing to be considered. There is, in fine, no other solution except one: That Germany must perish forever from this earth! [***] There remains then but one mode of ridding the world forever of Germanism — and that is to stem the source from which issue those war-lusted souls, by preventing the people of Germany from ever again reproducing their kind. This modern method, known to science as Eugenic Sterilization, is at once practical, humane and thorough. Sterilization has become a byword of science as the best means of ridding the human race of its misfits: the degenerate, the insane, the hereditary criminal. [***] The population of Germany, excluding conquered and annexed territories, is about 70,000,000, almost equally divided between male and female. To achieve the purpose of German extinction it would be

necessary to only sterilize some 48,000,000—a figure which excludes, because of their limited power to procreate, males over 60 years of age, and females over 45. [***] Reviewing the foregoing case of sterilization we find that several factors resulting from it firmly establish its advocacy. Firstly, no physical pain will be imposed upon the inhabitants of Germany through its application, a decidedly more humane treatment than they will have deserved. As a matter of fact it is not inconceivable that after Germany's defeat, the long-suffering peoples of Europe may demand a far less humane revenge than that of mere sterilization. Secondly, execution of the plan would in no way disorganize the present population nor would it cause any sudden mass upheavals and dislocations. The consequent gradual disappearance of the Germans from Europe will leave no more negative effect upon that continent than did the gradual disappearance of Indians upon this.”¹⁷²⁵

Perhaps inspired by the accusations against Jews of poisoning the wells in the 1300's, some Jews unsuccessfully attempted revenge against the Germans for the Holocaust after the Second World War by poisoning the water supply of Germany. Tom Segev wrote in his book *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*,

“Kovner therefore set six million German citizens as his goal. He thought in apocalyptic terms: revenge was a holy obligation that would redeem and purify the Jewish people. The group divided into cells, each with a commander. Their primary goal, Plan A, was ‘to poison as many Germans as possible.’ Plan B was to poison several thousand former SS men in the American army's POW camps. Reichman succeeded in infiltrating some members of the group into the Hamburg and Nuremberg water companies. Kovner went to Palestine to bring the poison—and, he hoped, to receive the blessing of the Haganah.”¹⁷²⁶

It is often alleged that a group of high ranking Nazi officials met at a conference in Wannsee and settled on a plan to exterminate the Jews of Europe in concentration camps. There is a purported transcript of this meeting. Some have disputed the authenticity of the minutes of the Wannsee-Konferenz. At any rate, the minutes of the Wannsee Conference do not contain any statements plotting the deliberate murder of the Jews or the extermination of all Jews. The “final solution of the Jewish question” proposed in the purported minutes of the Wannsee Conference was not murder or complete extermination; but was instead the deportation of Jews to the East in conformity with the wishes of the Zionist Jews.¹⁷²⁷

Zionist Nazi propagandist Julius Streicher affirmed at the Nuremberg Trials that the Nuremberg Laws of 1935 were patterned after Jewish Law,

“Yes, I believe I had a part in it insofar as for years I have written that any further mixture of German blood with Jewish blood must be avoided. I have written such articles again and again; and in my articles I have repeatedly emphasized the fact that the Jews should serve as an example to every race,

for they created a racial law for themselves—the law of Moses, which says, ‘If you come into a foreign land you shall not take unto yourself foreign women.’ And that, Gentlemen, is of tremendous importance in judging the Nuremberg Laws. These laws of the Jews were taken as a model for these laws. When, after centuries, the Jewish lawgiver Ezra discovered that notwithstanding many Jews had married non-Jewish women, these marriages were dissolved. That was the beginning of Jewry which, because it introduced these racial laws, has survived throughout the centuries, while all other races and civilizations have perished.”¹⁷²⁸

Dr. Marx asked Julius Streicher,

“Were you of the opinion that the 1935 legislation represented the final solution of the Jewish question by the State?”¹⁷²⁹

Streicher responded that Zionism was the final solution of the Jewish question,

“With reservations, yes. I was convinced that if the Party program was carried out, the Jewish question would be solved. The Jews became German citizens in 1848. Their rights as citizens were taken from them by these laws. Sexual intercourse was prohibited. For me, this represented the solution of the Jewish problem in Germany. But I believed that another international solution would still be found, and that some day discussions would take place between the various states with regard to the demands made by Zionism. These demands aimed at a Jewish state.”¹⁷³⁰

Nazi Secretary of State in the Interior Ministry Wilhelm Stuckart, who attended the Wannsee-Konferenz, was questioned by Robert M. W. Kempner at his Nuremberg trial and denied that the extermination of the Jews was discussed,

“No, I don’t believe that I am wrong in saying that there was no discussion of the final solution of the Jewish question, in the sense in which it is now understood.

KEMPNER: Heydrich related clearly, in your presence, what it was about?

STUCKART: That is absolutely out of the question—otherwise I would have known what it meant.”¹⁷³¹

Refer to the Nuremberg trial transcripts of 22 November 1945, where Stuckart was quoted as referring to the “final solution” in the late 1930's, as a political solution, some years before the Wannsee-Konferenz occurred, meaning the formation of a “Jewish State”. This quotation was cited prior to the first appearance of the purported “Protocols of the Wannsee Conference”. Again, some have called into questions the authenticity of these “Protocols”.

Though Eichmann stated that the “final solution” had always meant a Zionistic political solution to him, Eichmann alleged many years after the war that he had heard from third party sources that Hitler changed course in the middle of the war and planned to exterminate the Jews.¹⁷³² David Irving has argued that Hitler never had any such plan.

Accusations that Hitler was out to exterminate the Jews predated the Holocaust by many years, and served the interests of the Zionists, just as the Holocaust served and serves the interests of the Zionists. *The New York Times* reported on 8 February 1923, on page 3, in an article entitled, “SAYS FORD AIDS ROYALISTS. Auer Charges Financial Help to Bavarian Anti-Semites.”:

“Henry Ford was accused of financing a Bavarian monarchist revolution by Herr Auer, Vice President of the Bavarian Diet, who came to Berlin today to report to President Ebert on the situation. Herr Auer informed The Tribune that Henry Ford’s financial as well as moral backing had been given to Bavarian revolution-makers during the past year because a part of the program of Herr Hitler, leader of the Monarchists, is the extermination of the Jews in Germany.”

It would be interesting to determine the exact German word Auer used, which had been translated as “exterminate”. Was it *Ausrottung*, or perhaps *Vernichtung*? There has been a dispute over the meaning of Hitler’s many statements against the Jews in the original German, which hinges on whether or not he meant to simply rid Germany of Jews by deporting them, or whether he was out to exterminate all Jews. At the time, Hitler was calling for the expulsion of Jews from Bavaria and from all German lands. The money scandal drew attention in the newspapers in Germany, but most attention was paid to the French connection. Hitler’s agent Kurt G. W. Ludecke failed in his attempts to solicit monies for the Nazis from Henry Ford.¹⁷³³

The “Hamburg Resolutions of the German Social Reform Party” proclaimed in 1899,

“The strivings of Zionism are a fruit of the antisemitic movement. [***] Unfortunately [any hope that all Jews will emigrate to Palestine] appears to be infeasible. [***] As such, [the Jewish question] should be solved in common with other nations and result finally in full separation, and—if self-defense demands—in final annihilation [*Vernichtung*] of the Jewish race.”¹⁷³⁴

Adolf Hitler wrote in an article entitled “Staatsmänner oder Nationalverbrecher” in the *Völkischer Beobachter*, Volume 35, Number 22, (15 March 1921), p. 1-2, that the fight against Bolshevism in Russia entailed the rooting out (*Ausrottung*) of the Jews. On 30 January 1939 Hitler famously threatened before the Reichstag that if Jewish finance again led the world into war, it would not mean a victory for “world Jewry”, but “the annihilation [*Vernichtung*] of the Jewish race in Europe”,

“If international finance Jewry in and outside Europe succeeds in plunging

the peoples into another world war, then the end result will not be the Bolshevization of the earth and the consequent victory of Jewry but the annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe.”¹⁷³⁵

“Wenn es dem internationalen Finanzjudentum in und außerhalb Europas gelingen sollte, die Völker noch einmal in einen Weltkrieg zu stürzen, dann wird das Ergebnis nicht der Sieg des Judentums sein, sondern die Vernichtung der jüdischen Rasse in Europa!”¹⁷³⁶

The Jewish Zionist Nazi tyrant of Poland, Dr. Hans Frank, stated at a Cabinet Session on 16 December 1941,

“As far as the Jews are concerned, I want to tell you quite frankly, that they must be done away with in one way or another. The Fuehrer said once: should united Jewry again succeed in provoking a world war, the blood of not only the nations which have been forced into the war by them, will be shed, but the Jew will have found his end in Europe”¹⁷³⁷

Did the crypto-Jewish Zionists Adolf Hitler and Hans Frank mean that they would exterminate the Jews of Europe in death camps, or did they mean that they would deport the Jews of Europe to Palestine as a final solution to the Jewish question? Frank was a long-term Zionist who wanted to segregate the Jews in Polish concentration camps and then ship them to Palestine—not to say that he did not intend to kill off a large percentage of his brethren in the process. In the fall of 1933 in Nuremberg on *Reichsparteitag*, Frank stated that his goal was to secure a “Jewish State”,

“Unbeschadet unseres Willens, uns mit den Juden auseinanderzusetzen, ist die Sicherheit und das Leben der Juden in Deutschland staatlich, reichsamtlich und juristisch nicht gefährdet. Die Judenfrage ist rechtlich nur dadurch zu lösen, dass man an die Frage eines jüdischen Staates herangeht.”¹⁷³⁸

The expression “final solution of the Jewish question (*or*: “problem”)” was a commonplace in the parlance of the Zionists long before the Wannsee Konferenz.¹⁷³⁹ Jewish Zionist Nahum Sokolow wrote in the introduction of his *History of Zionism* of 1919,

“The progress of modern civilization has come to be regarded as a sort of ‘Messiah’ for the final solution of the Jewish problem.”¹⁷⁴⁰

Sokolow spoke in reference to the “Jewish mission” of reformed Jews under the influence of Moses Mendelssohn. The Zionists believed this “final solution of the Jewish problem” resulted in fatal assimilation, whereas the Zionists were pitching Palestine as the “final solution of the Jewish problem”. Many others believed that

assimilation was the only viable “final solution to the Jewish question”.¹⁷⁴¹

Boris Brasol wrote in 1921,

“When the Zionist claim was first established, and Theodore Hertzl, in 1897, came out with his specific program of a Jewish State, the world at large gave a sigh of relief as it was trusted that henceforth the Jews would have a country of their own where they would be able to develop freely and unhampered their racial peculiarities, their cultural traditions and their religious thought. Christian countries have been so accustomed to innumerable complaints made by the Jews of their oppression, of anti-Semitism breeding throughout the world, of pogroms ravaging the Jewish masses, that there was every reason to hope that the Jews would dash to Palestine, leaving those cruel Christians to their own destinies. What better scheme for a fair solution of the Jewish problem could be hoped for by both Gentiles and Jews?”¹⁷⁴²

The Zionists wrote in the official organ of the German Zionist Organization, *Jüdische Rundschau*, on 13 June 1933, shortly after Hitler assumed power,

“Zionism recognizes the existence of the Jewish question and wants to solve it in a generous and constructive manner. For this purpose, it wants to enlist the aid of all peoples; those who are friendly to the Jews as well as those who are hostile to them, since according to its conception, this is not a question of sentimentality, but one dealing with a real problem in whose solution all peoples are interested.”¹⁷⁴³

Jewish Zionist Joachim Prinz stated in 1937,

“Everyone in Germany knew that only the Zionists could responsibly represent the Jews in dealings with the Nazi government. We all felt sure that one day the government would arrange a round table conference with the Jews, at which—after the riots and atrocities of the revolution had passed—the new status of German Jewry could be considered. The government announced very solemnly that there was no country in the world which tried to solve the Jewish problem as seriously as did Germany. Solution of the Jewish question? It was our Zionist dream! We never denied the existence of the Jewish question! Dissimilation? It was our own appeal! . . . In a statement notable for its pride and dignity, we called for a conference.”¹⁷⁴⁴

In 1917, Jewish Zionist Elisha M. Friedman made several references to the “solution of the Jewish question”,

“Recent events have served to accentuate Zionism as an attempt at the solution of the Jewish question. [***] And only yesterday, as it were, Adolph

Lewinsohn, whose activities transcend creed, has likewise joined those that see in Zionism a solution to the Jewish question. [***] Insofar as it affords no relief to the assimilationist and intensifies the loyalty of the great mass of a dispersed people, the policy of partial assimilation defeats its own ends. It is purposeless. It has been tested out, as a solution of the Jewish question, and has proven an eloquent failure.”¹⁷⁴⁵

In 1914, Jewish Zionist Israel Zangwill made reference to the “solution of the Jewish Question”,

“But if the prospect of a territorial solution of the Jewish Question, whether in Palestine or in the New World appears remote, it must be admitted that the Jewish race, in abandoning before the legions of Rome the struggle for independent political existence, in favor of spiritual isolation and economic symbiosis, discovered the secret of immortality, if also of perpetual motion.”¹⁷⁴⁶

In 1898, an American Jewish Zionist, Richard Gottheil, proposed a Zionist “final solution of the Jewish question”. Gottheil feared the “extermination” of the Jewish race, not through violent genocide, but by “a final solution of the Jewish question” of “assimilation”. Gottheil proposed that Jews form a nation in Palestine in order to maintain the Jewish race. Note that Gottheil mentions “those Jews who are forced to go” to Palestine. Gottheil’s speech appeared in *The World’s Best Orations*, Volume 6, F. P. Kaiser, St. Louis, (1899), pp. 2294-2298:

“THE JEWS AS A RACE AND AS A NATION

(Peroration of the Address, «The Aims of Zionism,» Delivered in New York City, November 1st, 1898)

IKNOW that there are a great many of our people who look for a final solution of the Jewish question in what they call «assimilation.» The more the Jews assimilate themselves to their surroundings, they think, the more completely will the causes for anti-Jewish feeling cease to exist. But have you ever for a moment stopped to consider what assimilation means? It has very pertinently been pointed out that the use of the word is borrowed from the dictionary of physiology. But in physiology it is not the food which assimilates itself into the body. It is the body which assimilates the food. The Jew may wish to be assimilated; he may do all he will towards this end. But if the great mass in which he lives does not wish to assimilate him — what then? If demands are made upon the Jew which practically mean extermination, which practically mean his total effacement from among the nations of the globe and from among the religious forces of the world, — what answer will you give? And the demands made are practically of that nature.

I can imagine it possible for a people who are possessed of an active and aggressive charity which it expresses, not only in words, but also in deeds, to contain and live at peace with men of the most varied habits. But, unfortunately, such people do not exist; nations are swayed by feelings which are dictated solely by their own self-interests; and the Zionists in meeting this state of things, are the most practical as well as the most ideal of the Jews.

It is quite useless to tell the English workingman that his Jewish fellow-laborer from Russia has actually increased the riches of the United Kingdom; that he has created quite a new industry, — that of making ladies' cloaks, for which formerly England sent £2,000,000 to the continent every year. He sees in him some one who is different to himself, and unfortunately successful, though different. And until that difference entirely ceases, whether of habit, of way, or of religious observance, he will look upon him and treat him as an enemy.

For the Jew has this especial disadvantage. There is no place where that which is distinctively Jewish in his manner or in his way of life is *à la mode*. We may well laugh at the Irishman's brogue; but in Ireland, he knows, his brogue is at home. We may poke fun at the Frenchman as he shrugs his shoulders and speaks with every member of his body. The Frenchman feels that in France it is the proper thing so to do. Even the Turk will wear his fez, and feel little the worse for the occasional jibes with which the street boy may greet it. But this consciousness, this ennobling consciousness, is all denied to the Jew. What he does is nowhere *à la mode*; no, not even his features; and if he can disguise these by parting his hair in the middle or cutting his beard to a point, he feels he is on the road towards assimilation. He is even ready to use the term «Jewish» for what he considers uncouth and low.

For such as these amongst us, Zionism also has its message. It wishes to give back to the Jew that nobleness of spirit, that confidence in himself, that belief in his own powers which only perfect freedom can give. With a home of his own, he will no longer feel himself a pariah among the nations, he will nowhere hide his own peculiarities, — peculiarities to which he has a right as much as any one, — but will see that those peculiarities carry with them a message which will force for them the admiration of the world. He will feel that he belongs somewhere and not everywhere. He will try to be something and not everything. The great word which Zionism preaches is conciliation of conflicting aims, of conflicting lines of action; conciliation of Jew to Jew. It means conciliation of the non-Jewish world to the Jew as well. It wishes to heal old wounds; and by frankly confessing differences which do exist, however much we try to explain them away, to work out its own salvation upon its own ground, and from these to send forth its spiritual message to a conciliated world.

But, you will ask, if Zionism is able to find a permanent home in Palestine for those Jews who are forced to go there as well as those who wish to go, what is to become of us who have entered, to such a degree, into the

life around us, and who feel able to continue as we have begun? What is to be our relation to the new Jewish polity? I can only answer: Exactly the same as is the relation of people of other nationalities all the world over to their parent home. What becomes of the Englishman in every corner of the globe? What becomes of the German? Does the fact that the great mass of their people live in their own land prevent them from doing their whole duty towards the land in which they happen to live? Is the German-American considered less of an American because he cultivates the German language and is interested in the fate of his fellow-Germans at home? Is the Irish-American less of an American because he gathers money to help his struggling brethren in the Green Isle? Or are the Scandinavian-Americans less worthy of the title Americans, because they consider precious the bonds which bind them to the land of their birth, as well as those which bind them to the land of their adoption?

Nay! it would seem to me that just those who are so afraid that our action will be misinterpreted should be among the greatest helpers in the Zionist cause. For those who feel no racial and national communion with the life from which they have sprung should greet with joy the turning of Jewish immigration to some place other than the land in which they dwell. They must feel, for example, that a continual influx of Jews who are not Americans is a continual menace to the more or less complete absorption for which they are striving.

But I must not detain you much longer. Will you permit me to sum up for you the position which we Zionists take in the following statements: —

We believe that the Jews are something more than a purely religious body; that they are not only a race, but also a nation; though a nation without as yet two important requisites — a common home and a common language.

We believe that if an end is to be made to Jewish misery and to the exceptional position which the Jews occupy, — which is the primary cause of Jewish misery, — the Jewish nation must be placed once again in a home of its own.

We believe that such a national regeneration is the fulfillment of the hope which has been present to the Jew throughout his long and painful history.

We believe that only by means of such a national regeneration can the religious regeneration of the Jews take place, and they be put in a position to do that work in the religious world which Providence has appointed for them.

We believe that such a home can only naturally, and without violence to their whole past, be found in the land of their fathers — in Palestine.

We believe that such a return must have the guarantee of the great powers of the world in order to secure for the Jews a stable future.

And we hold that this does not mean that all Jews must return to Palestine.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is the Zionist program. Shall we be able to carry it through? I cannot believe that the Jewish people have been preserved throughout these centuries either for eternal misery or for total absorption at

this stage of the world's history. I cannot think that our people have so far misunderstood their own purpose in life, as now to give the lie to their own past and to every hope which has animated their suffering body.

Bear with me but a few moments longer while I read the words which a Christian writer puts into the mouth of a Jew. «The effect of our separateness will not be completed and have its highest transformation, unless our race takes on again the character of a nationality. That is the fulfillment of the religious trust that molded them into a people, whose life has made half the inspiration of the world. . . . Revive the organic centre; let the unity of Israel which has made the growth and form of its religion be an outward reality. Looking toward a land and a polity, our dispersed people in all the ends of the earth may share the dignity of a national life which has a voice among the peoples of the East and the West — which will plant the wisdom and skill of our race so that it may be, as of old, a medium of transmission and understanding. Let that come to pass, and the living warmth will spread to the weak extremities of Israel. Let the central fire be kindled again, and the light will reach afar. The degraded and scorned of the race will learn to think of their sacred land, not as a place for saintly beggary to await death in loathsome idleness, but as a republic, where the Jewish spirit manifests itself in a new order founded on the old, purified, enriched by the experiences which our greatest sons have gathered from the life of the ages. A new Judea, poised between East and West — a covenant of reconciliation. The sons of Judah have to choose, that God may again choose them. The Messianic time is the time when Israel shall will the planting of the national ensign. The divine principle of our race is action, choice, resolved memory. Let us help to will our own better future of the world — not renounce our higher gift and say: «Let us be as if we were not among the populations,» but choose our full heritage, claim the brotherhood of our nation, and carry into it a new brotherhood with the nations of the Gentiles. The vision is there; it will be fulfilled.»

These are the words of the non-Jewish Zionist, George Eliot. We take hope, for has not that Jewish Zionist said: «We belong to a race that can do everything but fail.»”

On 22 August 1897, on page 12, in an article entitled, “Jews Against Zionism”, *The New York Times* wrote,

“Many of them thought that a purely philanthropic movement would always be but a palliative, and would never lead to a solution of the Jewish question.”

Like countless other Jewish Zionists, Theodor Herzl spoke of Zionism as the “solution of the Jewish question”. In fact the very title of Herzl’s seminal book makes the reference, *Der Judenstaat; Versuch einer modernen Lösung der Judenfrage*, M. Breitenstein, Leipzig, Wien, (1896). English translation: *A Jewish*

State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904). Herzl stated in this book,

“This guard of honour would be the great symbol of the solution of the Jewish Question after eighteen centuries of Jewish suffering.”¹⁷⁴⁷

In an article entitled “Zionist Congress in Basel”, *The New York Times* quoted Theodor Herzl, on 31 August 1897, on page 7,

“I think we shall find Palestine at our disposal sooner than we expected. Last year I went to Constantinople and had two long conferences with the Grand Vizier, to whom I pointed out that the key to the preservation of Turkey lay in the solution of the Jewish question.”

In his opening address to the First Zionist Congress, Herzl stated,

“Wir Zionisten wünschen zur Lösung der Judenfrage nicht etwa einen internationalen Verein, sondern die internationale Diskussion.”¹⁷⁴⁸

Herzl’s statements were recorded in, “The Zionist Congress: Full Report of the Proceedings”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (3 September 1897), pp. 10-15, at 11, 12 and 15,

“We Zionists desire for the solution of the Jewish Question. [***] But it is not the solution of the Jewish Question, and cannot be so in its present form. [***] The financial help which the Jews are able to offer to Turkey is not small, and would serve to put an end to many an evil from which the country is suffering. If a part of the Oriental question can be solved, together with the Jewish question, this surely is in the interest of all nations. [***] In this way we understand, we expect the solution of the Jewish Question. [***] On the day when the Jews again held the plough in Palestine, on that day would the Jewish Question be solved.”

In examining the history of expressed threats of genocide, it should be mentioned that long before Kaufman’s genocidal book *Germany Must Perish!* advocated the extermination of Gentile Germans, anti-Semite Eugen Karl Dühring implicitly advocated the genocide of Jews in the 1901 edition of his *Die Judenfrage*, Chapter 5, Sections 4-9, which concludes with the statement:

“Precisely this situation must however urge the determined component of better humanity only so much more to act in order to create communities and communal life whose principles extend over the earth and thereby also, obviously, do not leave any room for Hebrew life.”¹⁷⁴⁹

Jörg Lanz-Liebenfels advocated the deportation and sterilization of “inferior

racess” in his book *Theozoologie, oder Die Kunde von den Sodomsäfflingen und dem Götter-Elektron eine Einführung in die älteste und neueste Weltanschauung und eine Rechtfertigung des Fürstentums und des Adels*. . ., Moderner Verlag, Wien, (1905).¹⁷⁵⁰ Hitler’s racial views came in part from Lanz-Liebenfels, who promoted the procreation of blond-haired people and the sterilization of the “ape-men” of the “inferior races”—he was also a Zionist who encouraged the formation of a Jewish State, and his mythologies may have been derived from the Jewish myth that angels bred with humans to produce a unique race. One example of the political Zionists’ equivalent of Liebenfels prescriptions for the ideal “Aryan”, was Elias Auerbach’s article “Rassenkunde” in Zionist Martin Buber’s journal *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 1, (1920-1921), pp. 49-57, which discusses eye and hair color, skeletal proportions, etc. of the average Jew. In 1909, Buber himself romanticized that a Jew awakening to his heritage undergoes many stages of racial self-awareness,

“He perceives then what commingling of individuals, what confluence of blood, has produced him, what round of begettings and births has called him forth. He senses in this immortality of the generations a community of blood, which he feels to be the antecedents of his I, its perseverance in the infinite past. To that is added the discovery, promoted by this awareness, that blood is a deep rooted nurturing force within individual man; that the deepest layers of our being are determined by blood ; that our innermost thinking and our will are colored by it. Now he finds that the world around him is the world of imprints and influences, whereas blood is the realm of a substance capable of being imprinted and influenced, a substance absorbing and assimilating all into its own form. And he therefore senses that he belongs no longer to the community of those whose constant elements of experience he shares, but to the deeper-reaching community of those whose substance he shares. [***] Whoever, faced with the choice between environment and substance, decides for substance will henceforth have to be a Jew truly from within, to live as a Jew with all the contradiction, all the tragedy, and all the future promise of his blood.”¹⁷⁵¹

Josef Ludwig Reimer published *Ein pangermanisches Deutschland. Versuch über die Konsequenzen der gegenwärtigen wissenschaftlichen Rassenbetrachtung für unsere politischen und religiösen Probleme*, F. Luckhardt, Berlin, Leipzig, (1905); which advocated dividing human beings into three categories with the rulers being blond-haired, blue-eyed supermen, who ruled the “mixed-race” and middle class, and the lowest grouping, the non-Germanics.¹⁷⁵² The non-Germanics would be sterilized or prevented by law from bearing children. Extremist and violent Social Darwinism appeared in Germany in the Nineteenth Century in the writings of Friedrich von Hellwald, and Ernst Haeckel advocated Eugenics.¹⁷⁵³

The “Eugenics” of Sir Fancis Galton¹⁷⁵⁴ has a long and complex history dating back to the Greeks and includes such famous persons as Charles Darwin and Alexander Graham Bell. Prior to the Nazi regime, Eugenics was most enthusiastically promoted in the United States, where there was active governmental

interest in the field, and where Eugenics influenced legislation. It was also welcomed in England. The colonial powers sought scientific justification for their un-Christian treatment of their fellow human beings, as if inferior. America sought to limit the immigration and political power of the so-called “inferior races”. The Nazis instituted their “T4” “*Euthanasie-Programme*” in 1939.

German Jews had endured increasingly hostile agitations since the end of the First World War, and the Hitler regime enacted discriminatory laws against the Jews long before Kaufman’s book found its way into print, which segregationist laws had an ancient history in Europe and were endorsed by Heinrich Class under the *nom de plume* Daniel Frymann, *Wenn ich der Kaiser wär’: politische Wahrheiten und Notwendigkeiten*, Dieterich, Leipzig, (1912); even before the First World War.

In naming the important historical incidents of genocidal propaganda and acts, it must also be mentioned that Biblical passages in the Old Testament and the New, as well as Talmudic writings, prophesied the genocide and enslavement of Gentiles and the ascent of a master race of Jews. Writing on Thomas Jefferson’s religious views, William D. Gould wrote,

“Jefferson praised the philosophers of antiquity for their insistence on the necessity of governing the passions, but found that they did not deal adequately with social duties. They taught well the obligation of being just in dealing with one’s neighbor or countryman, but felt under no constraint to cultivate a love for all mankind. Even the Jews in Jesus’ day, he believed, entertained many erroneous ideas concerning religion and morality. In addition to the fact that he felt that a number of their conceptions of God were incorrect, their ethics, in respect to other nations, were, he thought, decidedly antisocial.”¹⁷⁵⁵

Jefferson criticized ancient philosophers and the ancient Jews in his *Syllabus*. He wrote, *inter alia*, in a letter to Dr. Benjamin Rush of 21 April 1803 responding to rumors that he was not a Christian,

*“Syllabus of an Estimate of the Merit of the Doctrines
of Jesus, Compared with Those of Others.*

In a comparative view of the Ethics of the enlightened nations of antiquity, of the Jews and of Jesus, no notice should be taken of the corruptions of reason among the ancients, to wit, the idolatry and superstition of the vulgar, nor of the corruptions of Christianity by the learned among its professors.

Let a just view be taken of the moral principles inculcated by the most esteemed of the sects of ancient philosophy, or of their individuals; particularly Pythagoras, Socrates, Epicurus, Cicero, Epictetus, Seneca, Antoninus.

I. Philosophers. 1. Their precepts related chiefly to ourselves, and the government of those passions which, unrestrained, would disturb our tranquillity of mind.[Footnote: To explain, I will exhibit the heads of

Seneca's and Cicero's philosophical works, the most extensive of any we have received from the ancients. Of ten heads in Seneca, seven relate to ourselves, viz. *de ira, consolatio, de tranquillitate, de constantia sapientis, de otio sapientis, de vita beata, de brevitae vitae*; two relate to others, *de clementia, de beneficiis*; and one relates to the government of the world, *de providentia*. Of eleven tracts of Cicero, five respect ourselves, viz. *de finibus, Tusculana, academica, paradoxa, de Senectute*; one, *de officiis*, relates partly to ourselves, partly to others; one, *de amicitia*, relates to others; and four are on different subjects, to wit, *de natura deorum, de divinatione, de fato, and somnium Scipionis*.] In this branch of philosophy they were really great.

2. In developing our duties to others, they were short and defective. They embraced, indeed, the circles of kindred and friends, and inculcated patriotism, or the love of our country in the aggregate, as a primary obligation: towards our neighbors and countrymen they taught justice, but scarcely viewed them as within the circle of benevolence. Still less have they inculcated peace, charity and love to our fellow men, or embraced with benevolence the whole family of mankind.

II. Jews. 1. Their system was Deism; that is, the belief in one only God. But their ideas of him and of his attributes were degrading and injurious.

2. Their Ethics were not only imperfect, but often irreconcilable with the sound dictates of reason and morality, as they respect intercourse with those around us; and repulsive and anti-social, as respecting other nations. They needed reformation, therefore, in an eminent degree."¹⁷⁵⁶

Ancient Jewish myths enunciate a nationalistic and destructive racism by a master nation of Israel on a holy mission to mercilessly subjugate the other nations of the world, supposedly pursuant to God's will. For example, *Deuteronomy*, Chapter 7, states,

“When the LORD thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee, the Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than thou; 2 And when the LORD thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them, *and* utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them: 3 Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son. 4 For they will turn away thy son from following me, that they may serve other gods: so will the anger of the LORD be kindled against you, and destroy thee suddenly. 5 But thus shall ye deal with them; ye shall destroy their altars, and break down their images, and cut down their groves, and burn their graven images with fire. 6 For thou *art* an holy people unto the

LORD thy God: the LORD thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that *are* upon the face of the earth. 7 The LORD did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye *were* the fewest of all people: 8 But because the LORD loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the LORD brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt. 9 Know therefore that the LORD thy God, he *is* God, the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him and keep his commandments to a thousand generations; 10 And repayeth them that hate him to their face, to destroy them: he will not be slack to him that hateth him, he will repay him to his face. 11 Thou shalt therefore keep the commandments, and the statutes, and the judgments, which I command thee this day, to do them. 12 Wherefore it shall come to pass, if ye hearken to these judgments, and keep, and do them, that the LORD thy God shall keep unto thee the covenant and the mercy which he sware unto thy fathers: 13 And he will love thee, and bless thee, and multiply thee: he will also bless the fruit of thy womb, and the fruit of thy land, thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep, in the land which he sware unto thy fathers to give thee. 14 Thou shalt be blessed above all people: there shall not be male or female barren among you, or among your cattle. 15 And the LORD will take away from thee all sickness, and will put none of the evil diseases of Egypt, which thou knowest, upon thee; but will lay them upon all *them* that hate thee. 16 And thou shalt consume all the people which the LORD thy God shall deliver thee; thine eye shall have no pity upon them: neither shalt thou serve their gods; for that *will be* a snare unto thee. 17 If thou shalt say in thine heart, These nations *are* more than I; how can I dispossess them? 18 Thou shalt not be afraid of them: *but* shalt well remember what the LORD thy God did unto Pharaoh, and unto all Egypt; 19 The great temptations which thine eyes saw, and the signs, and the wonders, and the mighty hand, and the stretched out arm, whereby the LORD thy God brought thee out: so shall the LORD thy God do unto all the people of whom thou art afraid. 20 Moreover the LORD thy God will send the hornet among them, until they that are left, and hide themselves from thee, be destroyed. 21 Thou shalt not be affrighted at them: for the LORD thy God *is* among you, a mighty God and terrible. 22 And the LORD thy God will put out those nations before thee by little and little: thou mayest not consume them at once, lest the beasts of the field increase upon thee. 23 But the LORD thy God shall deliver them unto thee, and shall destroy them with a mighty destruction, until they be destroyed. 24 And he shall deliver their kings into thine hand, and thou shalt destroy their name from under heaven: there shall no man be able to stand before thee, until thou have destroyed them. 25 The graven images of their gods shall ye burn with fire: thou shalt not desire the silver or gold *that is* on them, nor take *it* unto thee, lest thou be snared therein: for it *is* an abomination to the LORD thy God. 26 Neither

shalt thou bring an abomination into thine house, lest thou be a cursed thing like it: *but* thou shalt utterly detest it, and thou shalt utterly abhor it; for it *is* a cursed thing.”

Deuteronomy, Chapter 28, proclaims the punishment to befall the assimilated,

“And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to observe *and* to do all his commandments which I command thee this day, that the LORD thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth: 2 And all these blessings shall come on thee, and overtake thee, if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the LORD thy God. 3 Blessed *shalt* thou *be* in the city, and blessed *shalt* thou *be* in the field. 4 Blessed *shall be* the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy ground, and the fruit of thy cattle, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep. 5 Blessed *shall be* thy basket and thy store. 6 Blessed *shalt* thou *be* when thou comest in, and blessed *shalt* thou *be* when thou goest out. 7 The LORD shall cause thine enemies that rise up against thee to be smitten before thy face: they shall come out against thee one way, and flee before thee seven ways. 8 The LORD shall command the blessing upon thee in thy storehouses, and in all that thou settest thine hand unto; and he shall bless thee in the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee. 9 The LORD shall establish thee an holy people unto himself, as he hath sworn unto thee, if thou shalt keep the commandments of the LORD thy God, and walk in his ways. 10 And all people of the earth shall see that thou art called by the name of the LORD; and they shall be afraid of thee. 11 And the LORD shall make thee plenteous in goods, in the fruit of thy body, and in the fruit of thy cattle, and in the fruit of thy ground, in the land which the LORD sware unto thy fathers to give thee. 12 The LORD shall open unto thee his good treasure, the heaven to give the rain unto thy land in his season, and to bless all the work of thine hand: and thou shalt lend unto many nations, and thou shalt not borrow. 13 And the LORD shall make thee the head, and not the tail; and thou shalt be above only, and thou shalt not be beneath; if that thou hearken unto the commandments of the LORD thy God, which I command thee this day, to observe and to do *them*: 14 And thou shalt not go aside from any of the words which I command thee this day, *to* the right hand, or *to* the left, to go after other gods to serve them. 15 But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee: 16 Cursed *shalt* thou *be* in the city, and cursed *shalt* thou *be* in the field. 17 Cursed *shall be* thy basket and thy store. 18 Cursed *shall be* the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy land, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep. 19 Cursed *shalt* thou *be* when thou comest in, and cursed *shalt* thou *be* when thou goest out. 20 The LORD shall send upon thee cursing, vexation, and rebuke, in all that thou settest thine hand unto for to do, until thou be destroyed, and until thou perish

quickly; because of the wickedness of thy doings, whereby thou hast forsaken me. 21 The LORD shall make the pestilence cleave unto thee, until he have consumed thee from off the land, whither thou goest to possess it. 22 The LORD shall smite thee with a consumption, and with a fever, and with an inflammation, and with an extreme burning, and with the sword, and with blasting, and with mildew; and they shall pursue thee until thou perish. 23 And thy heaven that *is* over thy head shall be brass, and the earth that is under thee *shall be* iron. 24 The LORD shall make the rain of thy land powder and dust: from heaven shall it come down upon thee, until thou be destroyed. 25 The LORD shall cause thee to be smitten before thine enemies: thou shalt go out one way against them, and flee seven ways before them: and shalt be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth. 26 And thy carcase shall be meat unto all fowls of the air, and unto the beasts of the earth, and no man shall fray *them* away. 27 The LORD will smite thee with the botch of Egypt, and with the emerods, and with the scab, and with the itch, whereof thou canst not be healed. 28 The LORD shall smite thee with madness, and blindness, and astonishment of heart: 29 And thou shalt grope at noonday, as the blind gropeth in darkness, and thou shalt not prosper in thy ways: and thou shalt be only oppressed and spoiled evermore, and no man shall save *thee*. 30 Thou shalt betroth a wife, and another man shall lie with her: thou shalt build an house, and thou shalt not dwell therein: thou shalt plant a vineyard, and shalt not gather the grapes thereof. 31 Thine ox *shall be* slain before thine eyes, and thou shalt not eat thereof: thine ass *shall be* violently taken away from before thy face, and shall not be restored to thee: thy sheep *shall be* given unto thine enemies, and thou shalt have none to rescue *them*. 32 Thy sons and thy daughters *shall be* given unto another people, and thine eyes shall look, and fail *with longing* for them all the day long: and *there shall be* no might in thine hand. 33 The fruit of thy land, and all thy labours, shall a nation which thou knowest not eat up; and thou shalt be only oppressed and crushed alway: 34 So that thou shalt be mad for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see. 35 The LORD shall smite thee in the knees, and in the legs, with a sore botch that cannot be healed, from the sole of thy foot unto the top of thy head. 36 The LORD shall bring thee, and thy king which thou shalt set over thee, unto a nation which neither thou nor thy fathers have known; and there shalt thou serve other gods, wood and stone. 37 And thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb, and a byword, among all nations whither the LORD shall lead thee. 38 Thou shalt carry much seed out into the field, and shalt gather *but* little in; for the locust shall consume it. 39 Thou shalt plant vineyards, and dress *them*, but shalt neither drink *of* the wine, nor gather *the grapes*; for the worms shall eat them. 40 Thou shalt have olive trees throughout all thy coasts, but thou shalt not anoint *thyself* with the oil; for thine olive shall cast *his fruit*. 41 Thou shalt beget sons and daughters, but thou shalt not enjoy them; for they shall go into captivity. 42 All thy trees and fruit of thy land shall the locust consume. 43 The stranger that *is* within thee shall get up above thee very high; and thou shalt come

down very low. 44 He shall lend to thee, and thou shalt not lend to him: he shall be the head, and thou shalt be the tail. 45 Moreover all these curses shall come upon thee, and shall pursue thee, and overtake thee, till thou be destroyed; because thou hearkenedst not unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes which he commanded thee: 46 And they shall be upon thee for a sign and for a wonder, and upon thy seed for ever. 47 Because thou servedst not the LORD thy God with joyfulness, and with gladness of heart, for the abundance of all *things*; 48 Therefore shalt thou serve thine enemies which the LORD shall send against thee, in hunger, and in thirst, and in nakedness, and in want of all *things*: and he shall put a yoke of iron upon thy neck, until he have destroyed thee. 49 The LORD shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, *as swift* as the eagle flieth; a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand; 50 A nation of fierce countenance, which shall not regard the person of the old, nor show favour to the young: 51 And he shall eat the fruit of thy cattle, and the fruit of thy land, until thou be destroyed: which *also* shall not leave thee *either* corn, wine, or oil, *or* the increase of thy kine, or flocks of thy sheep, until he have destroyed thee. 52 And he shall besiege thee in all thy gates, until thy high and fenced walls come down, wherein thou trustedst, throughout all thy land: and he shall besiege thee in all thy gates throughout all thy land, which the LORD thy God hath given thee. 53 And thou shalt eat the fruit of thine own body, the flesh of thy sons and of thy daughters, which the LORD thy God hath given thee, in the siege, and in the straitness, wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee: 54 *So that* the man *that is* tender among you, and very delicate, his eye shall be evil toward his brother, and toward the wife of his bosom, and toward the remnant of his children which he shall leave: 55 So that he will not give to any of them of the flesh of his children whom he shall eat: because he hath nothing left him in the siege, and in the straitness, wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee in all thy gates. 56 The tender and delicate woman among you, which would not adventure to set the sole of her foot upon the ground for delicateness and tenderness, her eye shall be evil toward the husband of her bosom, and toward her son, and toward her daughter, 57 And toward her young one that cometh out from between her feet, and toward her children which she shall bear: for she shall eat them for want of all *things* secretly in the siege and straitness, wherewith thine enemy shall distress thee in thy gates. 58 If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD; 59 Then the LORD will make thy plagues wonderful, and the plagues of thy seed, *even* great plagues, and of long continuance, and sore sicknesses, and of long continuance. 60 Moreover he will bring upon thee all the diseases of Egypt, which thou wast afraid of; and they shall cleave unto thee. 61 Also every sickness, and every plague, which *is* not written in the book of this law, them will the LORD bring upon thee, until thou be destroyed. 62 And ye shall be left few in number, whereas ye were as the stars of heaven for

multitude; because thou wouldest not obey the voice of the LORD thy God. 63 And it shall come to pass, *that* as the LORD rejoiced over you to do you good, and to multiply you; so the LORD will rejoice over you to destroy you, and to bring you to nought; and ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it. 64 And the LORD shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, *even* wood and stone. 65 And among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest: but the LORD shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind: 66 And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear day and night, and shalt have none assurance of thy life: 67 In the morning thou shalt say, Would God it were even! and at even thou shalt say, Would God it were morning! for the fear of thine heart wherewith thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see. 68 And the LORD shall bring thee into Egypt again with ships, by the way whereof I spake unto thee, Thou shalt see it no more again: and there ye shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy *you*.”

Isaiah, Chapter 34,

“Come near, ye nations, to hear; and hearken, ye people: let the earth hear, and all that is therein; the world, and all things that come forth of it. 2 For the indignation of the LORD *is* upon all nations, and *his* fury upon all their armies: he hath utterly destroyed them, he hath delivered them to the slaughter. 3 Their slain also shall be cast out, and their stink shall come up out of their carcasses, and the mountains shall be melted with their blood. 4 And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and as a falling *fig* from the fig tree. 5 For my sword shall be bathed in heaven: behold, it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse, to judgment. 6 The sword of the LORD is filled with blood, it is made fat with fatness, *and* with the blood of lambs and goats, with the fat of the kidneys of rams: for the LORD hath a sacrifice in Bozrah, and a great slaughter in the land of Idumea. 7 And the unicorns shall come down with them, and the bullocks with the bulls; and their land shall be soaked with blood, and their dust made fat with fatness. 8 For *it is* the day of the LORD’s vengeance, *and* the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion. 9 And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. 10 It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever: from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it for ever and ever. 11 But the cormorant and the bittern shall possess it; the owl also and the raven shall dwell in it: and he shall stretch out upon it the line of confusion, and the stones of emptiness. 12 They shall call the nobles

thereof to the kingdom, but none *shall be* there, and all her princes shall be nothing. 13 And thorns shall come up in her palaces, nettles and brambles in the fortresses thereof: and it shall be an habitation of dragons, *and* a court for owls. 14 The wild beasts of the desert shall also meet with the wild beasts of the island, and the satyr shall cry to his fellow; the screech owl also shall rest there, and find for herself a place of rest. 15 There shall the great owl make her nest, and lay, and hatch, and gather under her shadow: there shall the vultures also be gathered, every one with her mate. 16 Seek ye out of the book of the LORD, and read: no one of these shall fail, none shall want her mate: for my mouth it hath commanded, and his spirit it hath gathered them. 17 And he hath cast the lot for them, and his hand hath divided it unto them by line: they shall possess it for ever, from generation to generation shall they dwell therein.”

Isaiah, Chapter 60:12, 16,

“For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, *those* nations shall be utterly wasted. [***] Thou shalt also suck the milk of the Gentiles, and shalt suck the breast of kings: and thou shalt know that I the LORD *am* thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob.”

Isaiah, Chapter 61,

“The spirit of the Lord GOD *is* upon me; because the LORD hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to *them that are* bound; 2 To proclaim the acceptable year of the LORD, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn; 3 To appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness; that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the LORD, that he might be glorified. 4 And they shall build the old wastes, they shall raise up the former desolations, and they shall repair the waste cities, the desolations of many generations. 5 And strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and the sons of the alien *shall be* your plowmen and your vinedressers. 6 But ye shall be named the Priests of the LORD: *men* shall call you the Ministers of our God: ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory shall ye boast yourselves. 7 For your shame *ye shall have* double; and *for* confusion they shall rejoice in their portion: therefore in their land they shall possess the double: everlasting joy shall be unto them. 8 For I the LORD love judgment, I hate robbery for burnt offering; and I will direct their work in truth, and I will make an everlasting covenant with them. 9 And their seed shall be known among the Gentiles, and their offspring among the people: all that see them shall acknowledge them, that they *are* the seed *which* the LORD hath blessed. 10 I will greatly rejoice in the LORD, my soul

shall be joyful in my God; for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh *himself* with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth *herself* with her jewels. 11 For as the earth bringeth forth her bud, and as the garden causeth the things that are sown in it to spring forth; so the Lord GOD will cause righteousness and praise to spring forth before all the nations.”

The Nazis’ infamous *Lebensborn* program, the program to breed “Aryan” children for the Reich, was perhaps instead a means for racist Jews to interject Jewish blood into the German “race” so as to dilute the blood of Esau. This is pure speculation, but it is based upon the fact that the Jews viewed Germans as Esau, wanted to destroy or weaken Esau, had control over the Third Reich, and had numerous Jewish members in the SS who could have fathered these children.

After the war, many people began to notice that a large number of children in Israel were tall, blond and blue eyed. They could have passed for Swedes. The entire Holocaust may well have been a eugenics program for racist Jews to clean up their blood, which they believed had been damaged by the Ghetto system of Europe. Jewish prophecy and lore teaches that in the Messianic Era Jews will be tall, fair-skinned (radiant: *Isaiah* 60:5) and handsome.

The especially interesting thing about these tall, blond, blue-eyed children in Israel, is that many were allegedly orphans—orphans who believed that they were Gentiles and who were shocked when told that their parents had been Jewish. This has led some to conclude that Jews kidnaped Gentile children and brought them to Israel.¹⁷⁵⁷ This leads to speculation that after anointing their Messiah, racist Jews will use Gentile slaves to breed them children, so that they can populate the world with the children of breeding slaves and completely kill off Gentiles born and raised by Gentiles. They may plan to steal the children fathered and mothered by Gentiles, and they may plan to use Gentile woman as surrogate mothers to bear children of Jewish parents on a massive scale. This speculation is based on many Jewish writings, including, but not limited to, *Isaiah*, Chapter 49,

“Listen, O isles, unto me; and hearken, ye people, from far; The LORD hath called me from the womb; from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name. 2 And he hath made my mouth like a sharp sword; in the shadow of his hand hath he hid me, and made me a polished shaft; in his quiver hath he hid me; 3 And said unto me, Thou *art* my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified. 4 Then I said, I have laboured in vain, I have spent my strength for nought, and in vain: *yet* surely my judgment *is* with the LORD, and my work with my God. 5 And now, saith the LORD that formed me from the womb *to be* his servant, to bring Jacob again to him, Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the LORD, and my God shall be my strength. 6 And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that *thou* mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth. 7 Thus saith the LORD, the

Redeemer of Israel, *and* his Holy One, to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth, to a servant of rulers, Kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship, because of the LORD that *is* faithful, *and* the Holy One of Israel, and he shall choose thee. 8 Thus saith the LORD, In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee: and I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages; 9 That *thou* mayest say to the prisoners, Go forth; to *them* that *are* in darkness, Shew yourselves. They shall feed in the ways, and their pastures *shall be* in all high places. 10 They shall not hunger nor thirst; neither shall the heat nor sun smite them: for he that hath mercy on them shall lead them, even by the springs of water shall he guide them. 11 And I will make all my mountains a way, and my highways shall be exalted. 12 Behold, these shall come from far: and, lo, these from the north and from the west; and these from the land of Sinim. 13 Sing, O heavens; and be joyful, O earth; and break forth *into* singing, O mountains: for the LORD hath comforted his people, and will have mercy upon his afflicted. 14 But Zion said, The LORD hath forsaken me, and my Lord hath forgotten me. 15 Can a woman forget her sucking child, that *she* should not have compassion on the son of her womb? yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee. 16 Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of *my* hands; thy walls *are* continually before me. 17 Thy children shall make haste; thy destroyers and they that made thee waste shall go forth of thee. 18 Lift up thine eyes round about, and behold: all these gather themselves together, *and* come to thee. *As* I live, saith the LORD, thou shalt surely clothe thee with them all, as with an ornament, and bind them *on thee*, as a bride *doth*. 19 For thy waste and thy desolate places, and the land of thy destruction, shall even now be too narrow by reason of the inhabitants, and they that swallowed thee up shall be far away. 20 The children which thou shalt have, after thou hast lost the other, shall say again in thine ears, The place *is* too strait for me: give place to me that I may dwell. 21 Then shalt thou say in thine heart, Who hath begotten me these, seeing I have lost my children, and *am* desolate, a captive, and removing to and fro? and who hath brought up these? Behold, I was left alone; these, where *had* they *been*? 22 Thus saith the Lord GOD, Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people: and they shall bring thy sons in *their* arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon *their* shoulders. 23 And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee *with their face toward* the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet; and thou shalt know that I *am* the LORD: for they shall not be ashamed that wait for me. 24 Shall the prey be taken from the mighty, or the lawful captive delivered? 25 But thus saith the LORD, Even the captives of the mighty shall be taken away, and the prey of the terrible shall be delivered: for I will contend with him that contendeth with thee, and I will save thy children. 26 And I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh; and they shall be drunken with their own blood, as with sweet wine: and all flesh

shall know that I the LORD *am* thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob.”

Isaiah, Chapter 60:12, 16,

“For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, *those* nations shall be utterly wasted. [***] Thou shalt also suck the milk of the Gentiles, and shalt suck the breast of kings: and thou shalt know that I the LORD *am* thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob.”

There are many instances in the Old Testament of the use of slaves taken from other nations to bear the ancestors of the Jews young, for example Abraham and Hagar. *Isaiah* 66 states, note that the “Lord” who is speaking is the voice of genocidal Jewish racism and absolute Jewish religious intolerance,

“1 Thus saith the LORD, The heaven *is* my throne, and the earth *is* my footstool: where *is* the house that ye build unto me? and where *is* the place of my rest? 2 For all those *things* hath mine hand made, and all those *things* have been, saith the LORD: but to this *man* will I look, *even* to *him that is* poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word. 3 He that killeth an ox *is as if* he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, *as if* he cut off a dog’s neck; he that offereth an oblation, *as if he offered* swine’s blood; he that burneth incense, *as if* he blessed an idol. Yea, they have chosen their own ways, and their soul delighteth in their abominations. 4 I also will choose their delusions, and will bring their fears upon them; because when I called, none did answer; when I spake, they did not hear: but they did evil before mine eyes, and chose *that* in which I delighted not. 5¶ Hear the word of the LORD, ye that tremble at his word; Your brethren that hated you, that cast you out for my name’s sake, said, Let the LORD be glorified: but he *shall* appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed. 6 A voice of noise from the city, a voice from the temple, a voice of the LORD that rendereth recompence to his enemies. 7 Before she travailed, she brought forth; before her pain came, she was delivered of a man child. 8 Who hath heard such a *thing?* who hath seen such *things?* Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day? *or* shall a nation be born at once? for as soon as Zion travailed, she brought forth her children. 9 Shall I bring to the birth, and not cause to bring forth? saith the LORD: shall I cause to bring forth, and shut *the womb?* saith thy God. 10 Rejoice ye with Jerusalem, and be glad with her, all ye that love her: rejoice for joy with her, all ye that mourn for her: 11 That ye may suck, and be satisfied with the breasts of her consolations; that ye may milk out, and be delighted with the abundance of her glory. 12 For thus saith the LORD, Behold, I will extend peace to her like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowing stream: then shall ye suck, ye shall be borne upon *her* sides, and be dandled upon *her* knees. 13 As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you; and ye shall be comforted in Jerusalem.

14 And when ye see *this*, your heart shall rejoice, and your bones shall flourish like an herb: and the hand of the LORD shall be known toward his servants, and *his* indignation toward his enemies. 15 For, behold, the LORD will come with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire. 16 For by fire and by his sword will the LORD plead with all flesh: and the slain of the LORD shall be many. 17 They that sanctify themselves, and purify themselves in the gardens behind one *tree* in the midst, eating swine's flesh, and the abomination, and the mouse, shall be consumed together, saith the LORD. 18 For I *know* their works and their thoughts: it shall come, that I will gather all nations and tongues; and they shall come, and see my glory. 19 And I will set a sign among them, and I will send those that escape of them unto the nations, *to* Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, that draw the bow, *to* Tubal, and Javan, *to* the isles afar off, that have not heard my fame, neither have seen my glory; and they shall declare my glory among the Gentiles. 20 And they shall bring all your brethren *for* an offering unto the LORD out of all nations upon horses, and in chariots, and in litters, and upon mules, and upon swift beasts, to my holy mountain Jerusalem, saith the LORD, as the children of Israel bring an offering in a clean vessel *into* the house of the LORD. 21 And I will also take of them for priests *and* for Levites, saith the LORD. 22 For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I *will* make, *shall* remain before me, saith the LORD, so shall your seed and your name remain. 23 And it shall come to pass, *that* from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the LORD. 24 And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.”

[7.6 The Carrot and the Stick](#)

The violent Bolshevik revolution inspired great trepidation in the West. *The Morning Post* of London published numerous essays attacking Bolshevism and the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, and asserting that Bolshevism signified proof of the genuineness of the *Protocols* and of the alleged alliance of the Freemasons and a vast Jewish conspiracy to rule the world.¹⁷⁵⁸ In England, Lord Northcliffe drew attention to the *Protocols* in his newspaper *The London Times* and called for an investigation of the Zionists.¹⁷⁵⁹ Henry Ford's *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* did much the same thing in America and personally attacked many Jewish leaders in America.¹⁷⁶⁰ In Germany, Alfred Rosenberg and Adolf Hitler, among many others, focused public attention on the *Protocols*.

In *Genesis* 12:1-3 the Jews offer the world a carrot and a stick:

“Now the LORD had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee:
2 And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy

name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: 3 And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.”

“Mentor” intimated in *The Jewish Chronicle* on 4 April 1919 on page 7, that Bolshevism was revenge on the Gentile nations for not allowing the Jews their own nation and for not willfully succumbing to the Jewish Messianic prophecy of a world government run by Jews,

“PEACE, WAR—
AND BOLSHEVISM.
By *MENTOR*.

WHAT is written here is pendent to what appeared in this column last week. As I intimated, I propose to revert to the subject then referred to.

BOLSHEVISM is at once the most serious menace to, and the best hope of, Civilisation. Paradoxical as this may sound, but a little thought will show it to be abundantly true. The menace of Bolshevism is manifest. It pulls down what, until now, it has shown itself unable efficiently to replace. In the name of freedom, it imposes galling slavery. In the name of humanity, it inflicts the direst evil upon the men, women, and children who come under its sway. It protests against class domination and itself imposes the domination of class wherever it can obtain power. It knows no bounds either in justice or in liberty. It murders, imprisons and tortures with the ruthlessness of an autocracy drunk with new-found authority. It is ruthless, relentless, all-engulfing. It falls upon the country it infects like a dire pestilence which casts people prone. It is a political disease, an economic infliction, a social disaster.

YET, none the less, in Bolshevism there lies, to-day, the hope of Humanity. For in essence, it is the revolt of peoples against the social state, against the evil; the iniquities—and the inequalities—that were crowned by the cataclysm of the War under which the world groaned for upwards of four years. It is a revolution against a social state which suffered Tsarism to exist in Russia and militarism in Prussia and which still allows, alas, so many a crying wrong in countries that plume themselves on their freedom and boast of their liberty. Bolshevism is the signal to mankind to halt in its social, political, and economic ways of old; to stay and examine them in the light of the sacrifice of the millions of youth who have gone down to darkness eternal, of the millions of treasure which war has wasted, and to ponder them in the light of the incalculable, ineffable burden which the years of struggle have placed upon Society, and, heaviest of all, upon the poor—in light of the war which was proof in all surety that the old order was doomed if civilisation was to survive. That Bolshevism broke out first in the

country most oppressed is nothing for wonder; it is merely natural. For centuries Russia had been the forcing ground of every infamy imposed by power and every wickedness done in the name of Government. That the creed has spread to a country whose national aspirations were for generations crushed, and where autocracy ruled, is nothing for wonder. Nor is the protest of Bolshevism merely a matter for Russia and Hungary, or a menace only to bayonet-ridden Germany. It is a challenge to the world—not least to the nations of freedom and liberty. It is a challenge to all the nations including the peoples who nourish liberty and freedom as precious principles, but who have passively allowed a state of affairs to grow and putrefy into the infamies of Russian Tsarism, the iniquity of Hungary, and the wickedness of German militarism; to the world that has suffered Society to fester into these and to break out into the prurient, gaping, sloughing, agonising tumour of such a war as that which is not ended, though it is suspended. And the fact that this protest has been made is the world's best hope. It is a demand for another order of things, for a social state which will render humanity immune from the wickedness and such evil as resulted in the greatest war mankind has ever known. It asks for some guarantee against a system which dragged peoples innocent of any intention of killing, slaying, and slaughtering into the vortex of War—peacefully intentioned peoples who loathed and hated War (such as was England before that fateful day in August, 1914)—from which even the most innocent of belligerents, and even those who stood aside from the contest are suffering to-day; though none were wholly guiltless of it, because for generations all passively concurred in the system. If the world, as a result of the War, had received no such warning as Bolshevism, the evil would, in all probability have gone on, deepening in its wrong, becoming ever blacker. Bolshevism is a social fever which indicates a high blood temperature. It gives the warning of mischief that may be fatal. A wise doctor takes note of the fever and seeks to remove the cause. He does not call the fever ugly names or denounce it, nor is he so stupid as to confuse the patient's consequent delirium with his normal condition, as so many are confusing the delirium of Bolshevism with the normal state of the countries in which it is finding vogue.

ALL such indications on the part of the body politic that there is a disease that must be removed, else the patient must go under, are as unpleasant, as inimical, as is the delirium of the fever-stricken patient distressing. The French Revolution drowned Paris in blood. Its excesses were far greater than anything that even the most malicious has attributed to Bolshevism. It instituted a Reign of Terror. It massacred Royalty. It condemned men and women day by day to the tumbril; so commonly indeed, that the men and women walking in the streets of Paris hardly looked round when some victim of the Jacobins was being taken to the Guillotine. Nothing and nobody was safe from the raging, tearing fever of the Revolution. For years it inflicted upon France a series of infamies, of torture, of horror, of bloodshed almost unparalleled in history. Yet, at the end of it all, and notwithstanding its

reaction in Napoleonism, a great English writer declared that there had been nothing greater and more glorious in all history than the French Revolution. By common consent what liberty, equality, and fraternity—liberty, equality, and fraternity which the French Revolution never gained, and which in seeking after it demeaned and disgraced—the rest of the world possesses to-day, it draws in large measure from the days in which France was bathed in the anarchy of revolt. That is because the motive-spring which set the French Revolution into being was an ideal for the betterment of mankind, a protest against the social, political and economic infamies which will for ever be associated with the *régime* of the Bourbons, a striving for a social state that would not allow unbridled luxury, lascivious prodigality, selfish extravagance, inhuman carelessness, to thrive in the Court and to go on side by side with poverty, hunger, a life of groaning and moaning in the alleys hard by. And, even now, while the terror of Bolshevism is in full swing, a writer in an English Daily paper is brought to declare, as one did the other day, that at root Bolshevism in ideal has nothing comparable to it since the teachings which Jesus of Nazareth gave to the world. The writer had, there is little doubt, recollected the parable of the rich man, torn with suffering in Hell, pleading to Lazarus, the beggar whose sores the dogs licked, resting in the bosom of Abraham in Heaven. It is the parable of the ideals of Bolshevism.

IT is not difficult to see why a people which has managed to subsist through Tsardom, because of the religious ideals and ideas which it nourished throughout all its classes, and not least among its peasantry, has been attacked by the ideals of Bolshevism, and why, released from Tsardom, it has, pendulum-like, swung into the arms of Lenin, looking to the ideals of his creed, and not to its wickedness or its excesses. The same reason obtains for the number of Jews who are to be found in the Bolshevist ranks. The Jew is an idealist. He will give much for an ideal. He thirst for idealism as a goal of life. This may seem strange to those who associate the Jew with materialism. But the capacity of the Jew for idealism is such that he notoriously idealises even the material. The fact that there are so many of our people who have associated themselves with the ideals of Bolshevism, even although as Jews its excesses must be repugnant to them, has to be placed in conjunction with another fact. These men will be found for the most part unassociated with or dissociated from the Synagogue. In the ordinary way of speaking they are not observing Jews. Is it not patent that the Synagogue, having failed to attract them by its idealism, and no other ideal, not even a material ideal, having been provided for them—for they are not men of wealth and substance, such as are usually to be found among the *bourgeoisie*—they have ranged themselves on the side of Bolshevism, because here was no Jewish ideal to which these Jews could devote their sentiments and their energies? I cannot understand how people who for generations have, unprotesting, allowed the Jew, particularly in Eastern Europe, in Russia, to suffer pogroms, to be massacred and ill-treated, and tortured and murdered, and for two thousand

years have kept our people outside the ambit of the most potent source of idealism that can appeal to men—that associated with National being—now have the hypocrisy, the soulless impertinence, to complain that so many of our people are Bolsheviks! That Jews have been chosen to the extent they have to take a leading part in the movement in Russia and in Hungary, is merely because they are heavily endowed with intellectualism and capacity, as compared with the rest of the population. But the world must not be surprised that the Jew, who is an idealist or nothing, has turned to the idealism of Bolshevism, which a British writer has declared to be comparable to the idealism preached by the founder of Christianity. It were surprising, really, were it otherwise. You cannot keep a people out of their rightful place amid the nations of the world, and then complain because they take the leading part which their abilities entitle them to in the nations among whom you have scattered them. The fact that a timorous millionaire afraid, and doubtless with good cause, of Bolshevism, which he probably has never taken the trouble, or perhaps has not the capacity to appreciate in full measure, places a ban of religious excommunication upon those Jews who are Bolsheviks, is a thing for the gods to laugh at!

THERE is much in the fact of Bolshevism itself, in the fact that so many Jews are Bolsheviks, in the fact that the ideals of Bolshevism at many points are consonant with the finest ideals of Judaism, some of which went to form the basis of the best teachings of the founder of Christianity—these are things which the thoughtful Jew will examine carefully. It is the thoughtless one who looks upon Bolshevism only in the ugly repulsive aspects which all social revolutions assume and which make it so hateful to the freedom-loving Jew—when allowed to be free. It is the thoughtless one that thus partially examines the greatest problem the modern world has been set, and as his contribution to the solution dismisses it with some exclamation made in obedient deference to his own social position, and to what for the moment happens to be conventionally popular.”

Sir Winston Churchill offered the world a carrot and a stick on behalf of the Zionist Jews in a statement published in the *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, on 8 February 1920, on page 5. Churchill threatens God’s wrath, in the form of Bolshevism, on any nation that does not commit itself to the Zionist cause, and promises God’s gifts to any nation which sponsors Zionism. It was an ancient Zionist appeal to superstitious fear.

Churchill traveled to Palestine and was an outspoken champion of Zionism in the British Government. Some argue that Churchill was also crypto-Jew, who had a Jewish mother. Churchill aggressively spoke out on behalf of Zionism in June of 1921 before the House of Commons in an effort to justify the unfair appropriation of the nation by a minority population of Jews.¹⁷⁶¹

In 1948, when Israel became a nation-state, Churchill wrote to Chaim Weizmann, “[what a fine moment it was] for an old ‘Zionist’ like me!”¹⁷⁶² Christopher Sykes details much of Churchill’s Zionist activities in his book *Crossroads to Israel*, where

he states, “Mr Churchill had always been a Zionist, albeit of a very Gentile and unorthodox kind, since his days as Colonel Secretary.”¹⁷⁶³ Though Churchill’s newspaper article is today seen by many as anti-Semitic, it was written on behalf of the Zionists, who quickly seized upon the opportunity of its publication to point out that in their opinion the only option for all Jews is Zionism.¹⁷⁶⁴

Where Churchill paints Jews in a bad light, it is done as a threat to Gentiles, not as an attack on Jews, and his arguments were planted in his head by his Zionist cohorts, as evinced by Chaim Weizmann’s speech in Jerusalem in January of 1920, as captured in an article, “Eine große Rede Weizmanns in Jerusalem Vor der Abreise aus Palästina”, *Jüdische Rundschau*, Volume 25, Number 4, (16 January 1920), p. 4, which stated, *inter alia*,

“Professor Weizmann emphatically declared that the *beauty of the ideals of the Jewish renaissance* was critical for the English Declaration. It is a misconception, that England made the proposal to us only out of self-interest. *Lloyd George* once said: I know the Palestinian front far better than the French, because I am well acquainted with every borough and every brook from the Bible. For the English, Palestine is above all else a Biblical issue. The English still believe in the Bible more than many classes of Jewry. Therefore, the *idealistic reasons* came first, and afterwards the material reasons were added. It was we who made it clear to the English political leaders that it was in England’s interest to unite with us to spread the wings of the British eagle out over Palestine. We did not achieve the Declaration by way of miracles, but rather through persistent propaganda, through constant demonstration of the vigor of our people. We told the people in charge: We are taking over Palestine whether you like it, or not. You can accelerate or delay our arrival, but it is better for you to help us, because if you don’t our constructive power will turn destructive and overthrow the entire world.”

“Professor Weizmann betonte, daß die Schönheit des Ideals der jüdischen Renaissance das Entscheidende für die englische Deklaration war. Es sei eine irrtümliche Auffassung, daß England uns den Vorschlag nur aus eigenem Interesse heraus machte. *Lloyd George* sagte einmal: Ich kenne die Palästinafront viel genauer als die französische, denn jeder Flecken und jeder Bach ist mir aus der Bibel vertraut. Palästina ist für England vor allen Dingen ein Gegenstand der Bibel. Die Engländer glauben an die Bibel noch mehr als manche Schichten im Judentum. Zuerst kamen also die idealen Gründe, nachher kamen die materiellen hinzu. Wir sind es, die den englischen politischen Führern klagemacht haben, daß es im Interesse Englands ist, sich mit uns zu vermählen, die Fittiche des britischen Adlers über Palästina auszubreiten. Wir erreichten die Deklaration nicht durch Wundertaten, sondern durch beharrliche Propaganda, durch unaufhörliche Beweise von der Lebenskraft unseres Volkes. Wir sagten den maßgebenden Persönlichkeiten: Wir werden in Palästina sein, ob Ihr es wollt oder es nicht wollt. Ihr könnt unser Kommen beschleunigen oder verzögern,

es ist aber für Euch besser, uns mitzuhelfen, denn sonst wird sich unsere aufbauende Kraft in eine zerstörende verwandeln, die die ganze Welt in Gärung bringen wird.”

Though the Zionists dominated the proceedings of the Treaty of Versailles and later dominated the proceedings of the League of Nations and the Palestine Mandate, the masses of Jews did not want to go to Palestine. Since the Jewish masses failed to heed the Zionists’ threats, Weizmann and his fellow Zionists brought world-wide tumult upon the Gentiles, as well as the Jews, just as Chaim Weizmann had promised.

Weizmann took his cue from Theodor Herzl, who strongly believed that anti-Semitism was the best means to achieve a “Jewish State”. Herzl unwisely believed that he could threaten the governments of the world with absolute impunity,

“The governments will give us their friendly assistance because we relieve them of the danger of a revolution which would start with the Jews—and stop who knows where!”¹⁷⁶⁵

Herzl wrote in his book *The Jewish State*,

“When we sink, we become a revolutionary proletariat, the subordinate officers of the revolutionary party; when we rise, there rises also our terrible power of the purse. [***] Again, people will say that I am furnishing the Anti-Semites with weapons. Why so? Because I admit the truth? Because I do not maintain that there are none but excellent men amongst us? Again, people will say that I am showing our enemies the way to injure us. This I absolutely dispute. My proposal could only be carried out with the free consent of a majority of Jews. Individuals or even powerful bodies of Jews might be attacked, but Governments will take no action against the collective nation. The equal rights of Jews before the law cannot be withdrawn where they have once been conceded; for the first attempt at withdrawal would immediately drive all Jews rich and poor alike, into the ranks of the revolutionary party. The first official violation of Jewish liberties invariably brings about economic crisis. Therefore no weapons can be effectually used against us, because these cut the hands that wield them.”¹⁷⁶⁶

Churchill’s Weizmannesque and Herzlian article of 8 February 1920, originally published in the *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, on page 5, again issued the ancient threat of *Genesis* 12:3 and offered the Goyim the carrot and the stick:

“ZIONISM versus BOLSHEVISM.
A STRUGGLE FOR THE SOUL OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE.
By the Rt. Hon. WINSTON S. CHURCHILL

Some people like Jews and some do not; but no thoughtful man can doubt the fact that they are beyond all question the most formidable and the most remarkable race which has ever appeared in the world.

Disraeli, the Jew Prime Minister of England, and Leader of the Conservative Party, who was always true to his race and proud of his origin, said on a well-known occasion: 'The Lord deals with the nations as the nations deal with the Jews.' Certainly when we look at the miserable state of Russia, where of all countries in the world the Jews were the most cruelly treated, and contrast it with the fortunes of our own country, which seems to have been so providentially preserved amid the awful perils of these times, we must admit that nothing that has since happened in the history of the world has falsified the truth of Disraeli's confident assertion.

Good and Bad Jews.

The conflict between good and evil which proceeds unceasingly in the breast of man nowhere reaches such an intensity as in the Jewish race. The dual nature of mankind is nowhere more strongly or more terribly exemplified. We owe to the Jews in the Christian revelation a system of ethics which, even if it were entirely separated from the supernatural, would be incomparably the most precious possession of mankind, worth in fact the fruits of all other wisdom and learning put together. On that system and by that faith there has been built out of the wreck of the Roman Empire the whole of our existing civilisation.

And it may well be that this same astounding race may at the present time be in the actual process of producing another system of morals and philosophy, as malevolent as Christianity was benevolent, which, if not arrested, would shatter irretrievably all that Christianity has rendered possible. It would almost seem as if the gospel of Christ and the gospel of Antichrist were destined to originate among the same people; and that this mystic and mysterious race had been chosen for the supreme manifestations, both of the divine and the diabolical.

'National' Jews.

There can be no greater mistake than to attribute to each individual a recognisable share in the qualities which make up the national character. There are all sorts of men—good, bad and, for the most part, indifferent—in every country, and in every race. Nothing is more wrong than to deny to an individual, on account of race or origin, his right to be judged on his personal merits and conduct. In a people of peculiar genius like the Jews, contrasts are more vivid, the extremes are more widely separated, the resulting consequences are more decisive.

At the present fateful period there are three main lines of political conception among the Jews, two of which are helpful and hopeful in a very high degree to humanity, and the third absolutely destructive.

First there are the Jews who, dwelling in every country throughout the world, identify themselves with that country, enter into its national life, and, while adhering faithfully to their own religion, regard themselves as citizens

in the fullest sense of the State which has received them. Such a Jew living in England would say, 'I am an Englishman practising the Jewish faith.' This is a worthy conception, and useful in the highest degree. We in Great Britain well know that during the great struggle the influence of what may be called the 'National Jews' in many lands was cast preponderatingly on the side of the Allies; and in our own Army Jewish soldiers have played a most distinguished part, some rising to the command of armies, others winning the Victoria Cross for valour.

The National Russian Jews, in spite of the disabilities under which they have suffered, have managed to play an honourable and useful part in the national life even of Russia. As bankers and industrialists they have strenuously promoted the development of Russia's economic resources, and they were foremost in the creation of those remarkable organisations, the Russian Co-operative Societies. In politics their support has been given, for the most part, to liberal and progressive movements, and they have been among the staunchest upholders of friendship with France and Great Britain.

International Jews.

In violent opposition to all this sphere of Jewish effort rise the schemes of the International Jews. The adherents of this sinister confederacy are mostly men reared up among the unhappy populations of countries where Jews are persecuted on account of their race. Most, if not all, of them have forsaken the faith of their forefathers, and divorced from their minds all spiritual hopes of the next world. This movement among the Jews is not new. From the days of Spartacus-Weishaupt to those of Karl Marx, and down to Trotsky (Russia), Bela Kun (Hungary), Rosa Luxembourg (Germany), and Emma Goldman (United States), this world-wide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilization and for the reconstitution of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence, and impossible equality, has been steadily growing. It played, as a modern writer, Mrs. Webster, has so ably shown, a definitely recognizable part in the tragedy of the French Revolution. It has been the mainspring of every subversive movement during the Nineteenth Century; and now at last this band of extraordinary personalities from the underworld of the great cities of Europe and America have gripped the Russian people by the hair of their heads and have become practically the undisputed masters of that enormous empire.

Terrorist Jews.

There is no need to exaggerate the part played in the creation of Bolshevism and in the actual bringing about of the Russian Revolution by these international and for the most part atheistical Jews. It is certainly a very great one; it probably outweighs all others. With the notable exception of Lenin, the majority of the leading figures are Jews. Moreover, the principal inspiration and driving power comes from the Jewish leaders. Thus, Tchitcherin, a pure Russian, is eclipsed by his nominal subordinate Litvinoff, and the influence of Russians like Bukharin or Lunacharski cannot be compared with the power of Trotsky, or of Zinovieff, the Dictator of the Red

Citadel (Petrograd), or of Krassin or Radek—all Jews. In the Soviet institutions the predominance of Jews is even more astonishing. And the prominent, if not indeed the principal, part in the system of terrorism applied by the Extraordinary Commissions for Combating Counter-Revolution has been taken by Jews, and in some notable cases by Jewesses. The same evil prominence was obtained by Jews in the brief period of terror during which Bela Kun ruled in Hungary. The same phenomenon has been presented in Germany (especially in Bavaria), so far as this madness has been allowed to prey upon the temporary prostration of the German people. Although in all these countries there are many non-Jews every whit as bad as the worst of the Jewish revolutionaries, the part played by the latter in proportion to their numbers in the population is astonishing.

‘Protector of the Jews.’

Needless to say, the most intense passions of revenge have been excited in the breasts of the Russian people. Wherever General Denikin’s authority could reach, protection was always accorded to the Jewish population, and strenuous efforts were made by his officers to prevent reprisals and to punish those guilty of them. So much was this the case that the Petlurist propaganda against General Denikin denounced him as the Protector of the Jews. The Misses Healy, nieces of Mr. Tim Healy, in relating their personal experiences in Kieff, have declared that to their knowledge on more than one occasion officers who committed offences against Jews were reduced to the ranks and sent out of the city to the front. But the hordes of brigands by whom the whole vast expanse of the Russian Empire is becoming infested do not hesitate to gratify their lust for blood and for revenge at the expense of the innocent Jewish population whenever an opportunity occurs. The brigand Makhno, the hordes of Petlura and of Gregorieff, who signalised their every success by the most brutal massacres, everywhere found among the half-stupefied, half-infuriated population an eager response to anti-Semitism in its worst and foulest forms.

The fact that in many cases Jewish interests and Jewish places of worship are excepted by the Bolsheviks from their universal hostility has tended more and more to associate the Jewish race in Russia with the villainies which are now being perpetrated. This is an injustice on millions of helpless people, most of whom are themselves sufferers from the revolutionary regime. It becomes, therefore, specially important to foster and develop any strongly-marked Jewish movement which leads directly away from these fatal associations. And it is here that Zionism has such a deep significance for the whole world at the present time.

A Home for the Jews.

Zionism offers the third sphere to the political conceptions of the Jewish race. In violent contrast to international communism, it presents to the Jew a national idea of a commanding character. It has fallen to the British Government, as the result of the conquest of Palestine, to have the opportunity and the responsibility of securing for the Jewish race all over the

world a home and a centre of national life. The statesmanship and historic sense of Mr. Balfour were prompt to seize this opportunity. Declarations have been made which have irrevocably decided the policy of Great Britain. The fiery energies of Dr. Weissmann, the leader, for practical purposes, of the Zionist project, backed by many of the most prominent British Jews, and supported by the full authority of Lord Allenby, are all directed to achieving the success of this inspiring movement.

Of course, Palestine is far too small to accommodate more than a fraction of the Jewish race, nor do the majority of national Jews wish to go there. But if, as may well happen, there should be created in our own lifetime by the banks of the Jordan a Jewish State under the protection of the British Crown, which might comprise three or four millions of Jews, an event would have occurred in the history of the world which would, from every point of view, be beneficial, and would be especially in harmony with the truest interests of the British Empire.

Zionism has already become a factor in the political convulsions of Russia, as a powerful competing influence in Bolshevik circles with the international communistic system. Nothing could be more significant than the fury with which Trotsky has attacked the Zionists generally, and Dr. Weissmann in particular. The cruel penetration of his mind leaves him in no doubt that his schemes of a world-wide communistic State under Jewish domination are directly thwarted and hindered by this new ideal, which directs the energies and the hopes of Jews in every land towards a simpler, a truer, and a far more attainable goal. The struggle which is now beginning between the Zionist and Bolshevik Jews is little less than a struggle for the soul of the Jewish people.

Duty of Loyal Jews.

It is particularly important in these circumstances that the national Jews in every country who are loyal to the land of their adoption should come forward on every occasion, as many of them in England have already done, and take a prominent part in every measure for combating the Bolshevik conspiracy. In this way they will be able to vindicate the honour of the Jewish name and make it clear to all the world that the Bolshevik movement is not a Jewish movement, but is repudiated vehemently by the great mass of the Jewish race.

But a negative resistance to Bolshevism in any field is not enough. Positive alternatives are needed in the moral as well as in the social sphere; and in building up with the utmost possible rapidity a Jewish national centre in Palestine which may become not only a refuge to the oppressed from the unhappy lands of Central Europe, but which will also be a symbol of Jewish unity and the temple of Jewish glory, a task is presented on which many blessings rest.”

The Zionists were playing a very dangerous game with the lives of millions of innocent Jews. Israel Cohen saw the dangers of the false association of Bolsheviks

with all Jews and wrote, *inter alia*, in *The Jewish Chronicle* of London, on 12 December 1919, on page 17,

“THE ‘JEW-BOLSHEVIST’ LIE.

BY ISRAEL COHEN.

The systematic attempts that are now being made to identify the Jews of Russia with the Bolshevists, to represent Bolshevism as a Jewish movement, and thus to hold up the entire Jewish people to obloquy and attack, are based solely upon the fact that a certain number of prominent Bolshevist Commissaries are of Jewish birth. Upon this fact, which has never been denied, have been built up all sorts of fantastic accusations, such as that the Jews wish to wreak revenge upon Russia for the persecutions under Tsardom, and that they aim at sweeping away Christian civilization so as to enthrone Judaism as the dominant faith throughout the world. How utterly absurd these calumnies are, and how grotesquely exaggerated are most of the stories of Jewish participation in Bolshevism can be proved by an unimpassioned examination of the ascertainable facts and figures.”

See also: Fritz Rodeck, “Judentum und Bolschewismus”, *Jüdische Zeitung*, Volume 14, Number 25, (3 September 1920), pp. 5-6.

While it was true that most Jews were not Bolsheviks—even in Russia, it is also true that many Jews in lands “liberated” by Bolsheviks welcomed and embraced the mass murderers and aggressively participated in the destruction of their Gentile neighbors’ lives. It is further true that the rise and spread of Bolshevism primarily occurred through Jewish communities around the world. It is yet further true that Bolshevism fulfilled Jewish Messianic prophecy, which was no coincidence. However, this does not mean that a majority of Jews have ever been Bolshevists, or even that a majority of Bolshevists have ever been Jews, but there is no doubt that Bolshevism was a Jewish movement meant to accomplish Jewish Messianic prophecies.

While leading Jews in the West decried Bolshevism when the connection to Jews became obvious, they did little to undo the damage Jewish financiers had done through Bolshevism to Russia and other nations. In fact, Jewish leadership instead continued to covertly perpetuate Bolshevism. Had Jewish leaders genuinely opposed Bolshevism, they would have organized and funded massive campaigns to stamp it out and to repair the damage done, and given their wealth and influence, they would have succeeded.

[7.7 British Zionists, in Collaboration with Nazi Zionists, in Collaboration with Palestinian Zionists, Ensured that the Jews of Continental Europe Would Find No Sanctuary Before the War Ended](#)

After the First World War, the Zionists had their Peace Conference and their League of Nations and their Palestine Mandate, but they lacked the broad support of the

Jewish People. They decided to bring on a Second World War, which would result in another Peace Conference; and, the second time around, they would torture the Jewish People into embracing Zionism.

Lenni Brenner wrote in his exposé *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, “The Wartime Failure to Rescue”, Chapter 24, Lawrence Hill Books, Chicago, (1983), pp. 235-238 [Brenner cites in his notes: “22. Michael Dov-Ber Weissmandel, *Min HaMaitzer* (unpublished English translation). 23. Ibid. 24. Ibid. (Hebrew edn), p. 92. 25. Ibid., p. 93.”],

“For only with Blood Shall We Get the land’

The Nazis began taking the Jews of Slovakia captive in March 1942. Rabbi Michael Dov-Ber Weissmandel, an Agudist, thought to employ the traditional weapon against anti-Semitism: bribes. He contacted Dieter Wisliceny, Eichmann’s representative, and told him that he was in touch with the leaders of world Jewry. Would Wisliceny take their money for the lives of Slovakian Jewry? Wisliceny agreed for 50,000 in dollars so long as it came from outside the country. The money was paid, but it was actually raised locally, and the surviving 30,000 Jews were spared until 1944 when they were captured in the aftermath of the furious but unsuccessful Slovak partisan revolt.

Weissmandel, who was a philosophy student at Oxford University, had Volunteered on 1 September 1939 to return to Slovakia as the agent of the world Aguda. He became one of the outstanding Jewish figures during the Holocaust, for it was he who was the first to demand that the Allies bomb Auschwitz. Eventually he was captured, but he managed to saw his way out of a moving train with an emery wire; he jumped, broke his leg, survived and continued his work of rescuing Jews. Weissmandel’s powerful post-war book, *Min HaMaitzer* (From the Depths), written in Talmudic Hebrew, has unfortunately not been translated into English as yet. It is one of the most powerful indictments of Zionism and the Jewish establishment. It helps put Gruenbaum’s unwillingness to send money into occupied Europe into its proper perspective. Weissmandel realised: ‘the money is needed here – by us and not by them. For with money here, new ideas can be formulated.’²² Weissmandel was thinking beyond just bribery. He realised immediately that with money it was possible to mobilise the Slovak partisans. However, the key question for him was whether any of the senior ranks in the SS or the Nazi regime could be bribed. Only if they were willing to deal with either Western Jewry or the Allies, could bribery have any serious impact. He saw the balance of the war shifting, with some Nazis still thinking they could win and hoping to use the Jews to put pressure on the Allies, but others beginning to fear future Allied retribution. His concern was simply that the Nazis should start to appreciate that live Jews were more useful than dead ones. His thinking is not to be confused with that of the Judenrat collaborators. He was not trying to save some Jews. He thought strictly in terms of negotiations on

a Europe-wide basis for all the Jews. He warned Hungarian Jewry in its turn: do not let them ghettoise you! Rebel, hide, make them drag the survivors there in chains! You go peacefully into a ghetto and you will go to Auschwitz! Weissmandel was careful never to allow himself to be manoeuvred by the Germans into demanding concessions from the Allies. Money from world Jewry was the only bait he dangled before them.

In November 1942, Wisliceny was approached again. How much money would be needed for all the European Jews to be saved? He went to Berlin, and in early 1943 word came down to Bratislava. For \$2 million they could have all the Jews in Western Europe and the Balkans. Weissmandel sent a courier to Switzerland to try to get the money from the Jewish charities. Saly Mayer, a Zionist industrialist and the Joint Distribution Committee representative in Zurich, refused to give the Bratislavan ‘working group’ any money, even as an initial payment to test the proposition, because the ‘Joint’ would not break the American laws which prohibited sending money into enemy countries. Instead Mayer sent Weissmandel a calculated insult: ‘the letters that you have gathered from the Slovakian refugees in Poland are exaggerated tales for this is the way of the ‘*Ost-Juden*’ who are always demanding money’.²³

The courier who brought Mayer’s reply had another letter with him from Nathan Schwalb, the HeChalutz representative in Switzerland Weissmandel described the document:

There was another letter in the envelope, written in a strange foreign language and at first I could not decipher at all which language it was until I realised that this was Hebrew written in Roman letters, and written to Schwalb’s friends in Pressburg [Bratislava] . . . It is still before my eyes, as if I had reviewed it a hundred and one times. This was the content of the letter:

‘Since we have the opportunity of this courier, we are writing to the group that they must constantly have before them that in the end the Allies will win. After their victory they will divide the world again between the nations, as they did at the end of the first world war. Then they unveiled the plan for the first step and now, at the war’s end, we must do everything so that Eretz Yisroel will become the state of Israel, and important steps have already been taken in this direction. About the cries coming from your country, we should know that all the Allied nations are spilling much of their blood, and if we do not sacrifice any blood, by what right shall we merit coming before the bargaining table when they divide nations and lands at the war’s end? Therefore it is silly, even impudent, on our part to ask these nations who are spilling their blood to permit their money into enemy countries in order to protect our blood—for only with blood shall we get the land. But in respect to you, my friends, *atem taylu*, and for this purpose I am sending you money illegally with this

messenger.²⁴

Rabbi Weissmandel pondered over the startling letter:

After I had accustomed myself to this strange writing, I trembled, understanding the meaning of the first words which were ‘only with blood shall we attain land’. But days and weeks went by, and I did not know the meaning of the last two words. Until I saw from something that happened that the words ‘*atem taylu*’ were from ‘*tiyul*’ [to walk] which was their special term for ‘rescue’. In other words: you, my fellow members, my 19 or 20 close friends, get out of Slovakia and save your lives and with the blood of the remainder—the blood of all the men, women, old and young and the sucklings—the land will belong to us. Therefore, in order to save their lives it is a crime to allow money into enemy territory—but to save you beloved friends, here is money obtained illegally.

It is understood that I do not have these letters, for they remained there and were destroyed with everything else that was lost.²⁵

Weissmandel assures us that Gisi Fleischman and the other dedicated Zionist rescue workers inside the working group were appalled by Schwalb’s letter, but it expressed the morbid thoughts of the worst elements of the WZO leadership. Zionism had come full turn: instead of Zionism being the hope of the Jews, their blood was to be the political salvation of Zionism.”

Zionist Anglican Chaplain to the British Embassy in Vienna, William Henry Hechler,¹⁷⁶⁷ published *The Restoration of the Jews to Palestine According to the Prophets* in 1884. He contacted racist Zionist Theodor Herzl as soon as he learned of Herzl’s book *Der Judenstaat*, in 1896. Hechler knew the Jewish Zionist Leon Pinsker. Queen Victoria requested that Hechler transmit a letter from her to the Sultan of Turkey asking him to allow Russian Jews to take asylum in Palestine, but the British embassy would not transmit the message.¹⁷⁶⁸

Theodor Herzl changed paths from converting Jews to Christianity in order to end anti-Semitism, to converting anti-Semites to Zionism in order to end anti-Semitism. Herzl’s ungodly betrayal of the Jewish People ultimately led the Zionists to create and install the Nazi régime.

Like the prophet Isaiah, Hechler and Herzl envisioned Jerusalem as the new capital of the world. Herzl’s vision is revealed in his book *Altneustadt*.

Like many Zionists, Hechler relished the fact that anti-Semitism encouraged Jews to embrace Zionism out of fear for their lives. Isaiah Friedman wrote,

“On 26 March 1896, Hechler wrote to [Frederick the Grand Duke of Baden] about Herzl’s project, noting with satisfaction that the antisemitic movement had made the Jews see that they were ‘Jews first and [only] secondly Germans, Englishmen, etc.’ It reawakened in them a longing to return ‘as a

nation to the Land of Promise. . . Palestine belongs to them by right.’ Should Germany and England give their support and take the Jewish State, declared neutral, under their protection, the Return of the Jews would be a great blessing and would put an end to antisemitism, which was detrimental to the welfare of European nations. He also suggested that the issue be laid before the kaiser, the duke’s nephew.”¹⁷⁶⁹

Hechler knew beforehand that the First World War would occur. He also knew beforehand that the Holocaust would occur. He took comfort in his knowledge of these events. Elias Newman wrote,

“To the German-Jewish philosopher Martin Buber, Hechler said in 1913: ‘Your fatherland will soon be given back to you. For a serious crisis will occur, whose deep meaning is the liberation of your Messianic Jerusalem from the yoke of the — nations. . . We are moving towards a world war. . .’ Shortly before his death [in 1931], he said this to the family of the Zionist leader Nahum Sokolov: ‘Part of European Jewry is going to be sacrificed for the resurrection of your biblical fatherland.’”¹⁷⁷⁰

In the context Hechler’s foreknowledge of the Holocaust, Claude Duvernoy writes,

“Political, rational and ‘scientific’ anti-Semitism, born in Austria, spread all over Europe where the ground had been well prepared by centuries of bad Christian catechism. With Moscow opposing Zionism as a heretical movement and London already pursuing its policy of suffocation, one really could not see how this ferocious Nazi could fail in his plan for Jewish genocide. In closing Palestine to Jewish immigrants (which was done in 1939) London delivered up millions of European Jews to the ovens of the crematoriums soon to come—without wishing this, of course. [***] As there was need of a first world war, to force the liberation of Jerusalem from the pagan yoke of the Turk, undoubtedly a second world conflict was inevitable to form a Jewish homeland through much suffering and blood, but he did not dare to think of it.”¹⁷⁷¹

After Hechler came David Ben-Gurion, who stated,

“The First World War brought us the Balfour Declaration. The Second ought to bring us the Jewish State.”¹⁷⁷²

Before Hechler was Benjamin Disraeli. Soon after Queen Victoria ascended the throne in 1837, the campaign to “restore the Jews to Palestine” gained political support, which was driven by the Rothschild family in hopes that a Rothschild would ascend the throne in Jerusalem to become King of the Jews, a. k. a. the Messiah, and, therefore, King of the World. Victoria believed that she was descended from King

David and during her reign Rothschild and Disraeli were able to secure the Suez Canal for England as a means to expedite shipping to and from India, and as a means to tie England's fate to the goal of forming a Jewish State in Palestine.¹⁷⁷³ Disraeli wrote in 1852,

“We have shown that the theological prejudice against the Jews has no foundation, historical or doctrinal; we have shown that the social prejudice, originating in the theological but sustained by superficial observations irrespective of religious prejudice, is still more unjust, and that no existing race is so much entitled to the esteem and gratitude of society as the Hebrew. It remains for us to notice the injurious consequences to European society of the course pursued by the communities of this race, and this view of the subject leads us to considerations which it would become existing statesmen to ponder.

The world has by this time discovered that it is impossible to destroy the Jews. The attempt to extirpate them has been made under the most favourable auspices and on the largest scale; the most considerable means that man could command have been pertinaciously applied to this object for the longest period of recorded time. Egyptian pharaohs, Assyrian kings, Roman emperors, Scandinavian crusaders, Gothic princes, and holy inquisitors, have alike devoted their energies to the fulfilment of this common purpose. Expatriation, exile, captivity, confiscation, torture on the most ingenious and massacre on the most extensive scale, a curious system of degrading customs and debasing laws which would have broken the heart of any other people, have been tried, and in vain. The Jews, after all this havoc, are probably more numerous at this date than they were during the reign of Solomon the wise, are found in all lands, and unfortunately prospering in most. All which proves, that it is in vain for man to attempt to baffle the inexorable law of nature which has decreed that a superior race shall never be destroyed or absorbed by an inferior.

But the influence of a great race will be felt; its greatness does not depend upon its numbers, otherwise the English would not have vanquished the Chinese, nor would the Aztecs have been overthrown by Cortez and a handful of Goths. That greatness results from its organisation, the consequences of which are shown in its energy and enterprise, in the strength of its will and the fertility of its brain. Let us observe what should be the influence of the Jews, and then ascertain how it is exercised. The Jewish race connects the modern populations with the early ages of the world, when the relations of the Creator with the created were more intimate than in these days, when angels visited the earth, and God himself even spoke with man. The Jews represent the Semitic principle; all that is spiritual in our nature. They are the trustees of tradition, and the conservators of the religious element. They are a living and the most striking evidence of the falsity of that pernicious doctrine of modern times, the natural equality of man. The particular equality of a particular race is a matter of municipal arrangement,

and depends entirely on political considerations and circumstances; but the natural equality of man now in vogue, and taking the form of cosmopolitan fraternity, is a principle which, were it possible to act on it, would deteriorate the great races and destroy all the genius of the world. What would be the consequences on the great Anglo-Saxon republic, for example, were its citizens to secede from their sound principle of reserve, and mingle with their negro and coloured populations? In the course of time they would become so deteriorated that their states would probably be reconquered and regained by the aborigines whom they have expelled, and who would then be their superiors. But though nature will never ultimately permit this theory of natural equality to be practised, the preaching of this dogma has already caused much mischief, and may occasion much more. The native tendency of the Jewish race, who are justly proud of their blood, is against the doctrine of the equality of man. They have also another characteristic, the faculty of acquisition. Although the European laws have endeavoured to prevent their obtaining property, they have nevertheless become remarkable for their accumulated wealth. Thus it will be seen that all the tendencies of the Jewish race are conservative. Their bias is to religion, property, and natural aristocracy; and it should be the interest of statesmen that this bias of a great race should be encouraged, and their energies and creative powers enlisted in the cause of existing society.

But existing society has chosen to persecute this race which should furnish its choice allies, and what have been the consequences?

They may be traced in the last outbreak of the destructive principle in Europe. An insurrection takes place against tradition and aristocracy, against religion and property. Destruction of the Semitic principle, extirpation of the Jewish religion, whether in the Mosaic or in the Christian form, the natural equality of man and the abrogation of property, are proclaimed by the secret societies who form provisional governments, and men of Jewish race are found at the head of every one of them. The people of God co-operate with atheists; the most skilful accumulators of property ally themselves with communists; the peculiar and chosen race touch the hand of all the scum and low castes of Europe! And all this because they wish to destroy that ungrateful Christendom which owes to them even its name, and whose tyranny they can no longer endure.

When the secret societies, in February 1848, surprised Europe, they were themselves surprised by the unexpected opportunity, and so little capable were they of seizing the occasion, that had it not been for the Jews, who of late years unfortunately have been connecting themselves with these unhallowed associations, imbecile as were the governments the uncalled for outbreak would not have ravaged Europe. But the fiery energy and the teeming resources of the children of Israel maintained for a long time the unnecessary and useless struggle. If the reader throws his eye over the provisional governments of Germany, and Italy, and even of France, formed at that period, he will recognise everywhere the Jewish element. Even the

insurrection, and defence, and administration of Venice, which, from the resource of statesmanlike moderation displayed, commanded almost the respect and sympathy of Europe, were accomplished by a Jew—Manini, who by the bye is a Jew who professes the whole of the Jewish religion, and believes in Calvary as well as Sinai, ‘a converted Jew’, as the Lombards styled him, quite forgetting, in the confusion of their ideas, that it is the Lombards who are the converts—not Manini.

Thus it will be seen that the persecution of the Jewish race has deprived European society of an important conservative element and added to the destructive party an influential ally. Prince Metternich, the most enlightened of modern statesmen, not to say the most intellectual of men, was, though himself a victim of the secret societies, fully aware of these premises. It was always his custom, great as were the difficulties which in so doing he had to encounter, to employ as much as possible the Hebrew race in the public service. He could never forget that Napoleon in his noontide hour had been checked by the pen of the greatest of political writers; he had found that illustrious author as great in the cabinet as in the study; he knew that no one had more contributed to the deliverance of Europe. It was not as a patron, but as an appreciating and devoted friend, that the high chancellor of Austria appointed Frederick Gentz secretary of the congress of Vienna—and Frederick Gentz was a child of Israel.”¹⁷⁷⁴

In her autobiography *My Life*, Golda Meir, like Adolf Hitler,¹⁷⁷⁵ could not understand why the British refused to allow Jews to emigrate to Palestine during the Nazi régime—one should also note in this context that British and American Jews prevented the exodus of Jews from the Continent to England and the United States. Meir tries very hard to blame the Palestinians, the Germans and the British for all the horrors that befell the Jews of Europe, but her pangs of guilt for her own actions reveal themselves in her constant need to justify herself and to try to explain away the shared and greater guilt of the Zionists. She even justifies the Holocaust as the only means that would accomplish a “Jewish State”. However, the only real obstacle to the formation of a lasting “Jewish State” was the reality that the vast majority of Jews did not want to live in such a racist State. Many of those Jews under Nazi persecution who emigrated to Palestine returned to Europe in disgust.

Meir headed the Jewish Agency and missed an opportunity to save Jewish lives at the Evian Conference in July of 1938. Some believe that Zionists sabotaged this effort, because they believed there was no gain for them to be had from shuffling Jews who had been assimilating in Germany to a new destination like America or Britain, where they would again have the opportunity to assimilate. Many Zionists had no concern for Jewish lives or Jewish deaths unless they Jews were sent directly to Palestine, thereby furthering Zionist ambitions. Jewish tradition held that Jews who assimilated ought to be killed and if a Holocaust would restore Jewish fear in God, so much the better—in the view of many Zionists. Meir wrote,

“I suppose I must have tried a thousand times since 1939 to explain to

myself—let alone to others—just how and why it happened that during the very years that the British stood with so much courage and determination against the Nazis, they were also able (and willing) to find the time, energy and resources to fight so long and as bitter a war against the admittance of Jewish refugees from the Nazis to Palestine. But I have still not found any rational explanation—and perhaps there is none. All I know is that the State of Israel might not have come into being for many years if that British war within a war had not been waged so ferociously and with such insane persistence.

As a matter of fact, it was only when the British government decided—in the face of all reason or humanity—to place itself like an iron wall between us and whatever chance we had of rescuing Jews from the hands of the Nazis that we realized that political independence was not something that we could go on regarding as a distant aim: The need to control immigration because human lives depended on such control was the one thing that pushed us into making the sort of decision which might otherwise have waited for much better (if not ideal) conditions. But the 1939 White Paper—those rules and regulations laid down for us by strangers to whom the lives of Jews were obviously of secondary importance—turned the entire subject of the right of the *yishuv* to govern itself into the most pressing and immediate need that any of us had ever known. And it was out of the depth of this need, essentially, that the State of Israel was founded, only three years after the end of the war.”¹⁷⁷⁶

Zionists were by no means as innocent as Golda Meir would have us believe, nor were British Gentiles, as a group, responsible for what happened. British Jews sabotaged the efforts of German Jews to flee to safety in England, because the Zionists wanted the assimilationist Jews to suffer and die so that the Jewish remnant that eventually moved to Palestine would remain in the country out of fear. They also insisted that any Jewish exodus that took place must force the fleeing Jews to Palestine and nowhere else. The anti-Zionist Jews feared the emigration of large numbers of Jews to the West would provoke anti-Semitism in their home countries, and so the Jews obstructed the emigration of other Jews seeking sanctuary. British Jews, not a small number of them the former Sephardic Jews of Spain, had little love for Russian, or even German, Ashkenazi Jews.

Zionists had long been committing acts of terrorism against the British and the British had no legitimate reason to believe that a “Jewish State” in Palestine was in their, or anyone else’s, best interests. That said, many British Gentiles were duped, or bought, into embracing the Zionist cause. Most British Gentiles and British Jews, who tended to be anti-Zionists, believed that a Jewish nation in the Middle East would inflame Moslem passions against England and jeopardize British interests in the region and her trade route to her Asian colonies. The Zionists determined that both British and French interests in the region had to be destroyed by the Nazis and the Imperial Japanese, before the Jews could take Palestine (even Greater Israel) from the Palestinians—and the British—and the French.

The Second World War accomplished many things for the Zionists. It frightened Jews into accepting Zionism. It segregated Jews and taught them the skills needed to live in an agrarian country. It killed off weak Jews and anti-Zionist Jews. It largely destroyed British and French Imperial interests in Asia, thereby lessening their incentive to remain in Palestine and Greater Syria, which they had wanted to keep for themselves as an allegedly important trade route to their colonies.

It took the Second World War, the Holocaust, the independence of India from Great Britain and the creation of Pakistan, as well as pervasive corruption both clerical and profane to overcome the political and religious obstacles to Zionism which remained after the First World War. The Jews used the French under Napoleon, and then the British in the First World War, to chase the Turks out of Palestine and Greater Syria. The Jews lured the French and the British into the region by leading them to believe that a route to their East Asian colonies was vitally important to their national interests.

The Jews created the illusion that only Jews could be the Europeans' friends in the Middle East to secure this route, while Moslems could not. The opposite was true as both the French and the British soon learned after the First World War. When the Turks were finally forced out of Palestine and Greater Syria, the French and British almost went to war over who would control this region, into which they had been led by the Jews. The Jews then felt a need to destroy the French and the British Imperial interests in Asia. The Jews accomplished this goal in the Second World War with their Zionist National Socialists, with the Nazis; and with their old friends, the Imperial Japanese. Zionist Jews murdered one hundred million people in two world wars in order to create a racist "Jewish State" in Palestine, which would house one to five million Jews in a place where they did not want to live.

In 1921, Boris Brasol told of the Zionists' plan in 1920 to create a Socialist German army that would crush British Imperialism and secure Palestine for the Jews, and note that this army became the Nazi army, an army Walther Rathenau began to build in cooperation with the Bolsheviks in 1922 with the Rappallo Treaty (Poale-Zion were Russian Jewish Communist Zionists),

"Mr. Eberlin, a Jew himself, and one of the foremost leaders of the Poale-Zionist movement, in a book recently published in Berlin, entitled 'On the Eve of Regeneration,' stated:

'The foreign policy of England in Asia Minor is determined by its interests in India. There was a saying about Prussia that she represents the army with an admixture of the people. About England it could be said that she represents a colonial empire with a supplement of the metropolis. . . . It is obvious that England desires to use Palestine as a shield against India. This is the reason why she is feverishly engaged in the construction of strategic railroad lines, uniting Egypt to Palestine, Cairo to Haifa, where work is started for the construction of a huge port. In the near future Palestine will be in a position to compete with the Isthmus of Suez, which is the main artery of the great sea route from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean.' [Footnote: Translation from Russian, 'On the Eve of Regeneration,' by I. Eberlin, pp. 129, 130, Berlin, 1920.]

But this Poale-Zionist goes a step farther when he asserts that:

‘It is only Socialism attained in Europe which will prove capable of giving honestly and without hypocrisy Palestine to the Jews, thus assuring them unhampered development. . . . The Jewish people will have Palestine only when British Imperialism is broken.’¹⁷⁷⁷

The Second World War unhitched England from the East and largely destroyed British Imperialism. The Zionists deliberately caused those events and created those circumstances. The lost lives and misery were a deliberate human sacrifice the Zionists made to their Jewish God.

One group of Zionists openly fought against the British and called for an alliance of the Zionists with the Nazis. Francis R. Nicosia has demonstrated that the Nazis were not only anti-assimilationists, but were also very pro-Zionist.¹⁷⁷⁸ Michael Bar-Zohar wrote in his book *Ben-Gurion: The Armed Prophet*,

“The danger soon became a reality. Many were unable to distinguish between the British Government and the British people, and when war broke out, the extremists adopted radical methods. Supporters of Abraham Stern, who dreamed of a Kingdom of Israel extending from the Nile to the Euphrates, fired the first shots against the British. They even committed the unpardonable crime of recommending an alliance with Nazi Germany, against Britain. When the British shot Stern, his gang avenged him by bomb attacks. These men were few in number and represented a very small part of the *Yishuv*, but their terrorist activities began a new, violent phase in the struggle against the British, a phase which was to lead to open warfare between various factions and groups in Palestine, when Jew fought against Jew and disaster almost came to the Zionist cause.”¹⁷⁷⁹

David Ben-Gurion showed his utter disregard for the value of Jewish life,

“If I knew that it would be possible to save all the children in Germany by bringing them over to England, and only half of them by transporting them to *Eretz Yisrael*, then I would opt for the second alternative. For we must weigh not only the life of these children, but also the history of the People of Israel.”¹⁷⁸⁰

Zionists obstructed efforts to rescue Jews by not allowing them into countries like England and America. The Zionists wanted to ensure that the Jews felt that the only country that would receive them was Palestine and that the only community that would welcome them was the “Yishuv”—but only after the undesirable (in the minds of the Zionists) “7 million Jews” had been murdered with the approval, if not the active planning, of the Zionist Jews.¹⁷⁸¹

According to Johannes Buxtorf in 1603, Jewish authors had long ago planned the decimation of their own people and had planned that the rest of the world should turn

a blind eye to the injustice and murder. Buxtorf recounts that 14th Century Jewish author Machir of Toledo's (this is perhaps a pseudonym and the work may have been fabricated by Turkish Jews) *Avkat Rokhel*, Constantinople/Istanbul, (1516), states:

“The sixth miracle, God shall permit the kingdom of *Edom* (to wit that of the Romans) to bear rule over the whole world. One of whose Emperours shall reign over the whole earth nine moneths, who shall bring many great kingdoms to desolation, whose anger shall flame towards the people of Israel, exacting a great tribute from them, and so bringing them into much misery and calamity. Then shall Israel after a strange manner be brought low and perish, neither shall they have any helper: of this time *Esay* [Isaiah] prophesied, {Esa. 59.16.} *And he saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor: therefore his arm brought salvation unto him.* After the expiration of these nine moneths, God shall send the *Messias son of Joseph*, who shall come of the stock of *Joseph*, whose name shall be *Nehemiah*, the son of *Husiel*. He shall come with the stem of *Ephraim*, *Benjamin* and *Manasses*; and with one part of the sons of *Gad*. As soon as the Israelites shall hear of it, they shall gather unto him out of every City and nation, as it is written: {Jer. 3.14.} *Turn ye backsliding children saith the Lord, for I will reign over you, I will take you one of a City, and two of a tribe, and bring you to Sion.*

Then shall *Messias* the son of *Joseph*, make great war against the king of *Edom*, or the *Pope of Rome*, and being conqueror shall kill a great part of his army, and also cut the throat of the king of *Edom*, make desolate the Roman Monarchie, bring back some of the holy vessels to Jerusalem, which are treasured up in the house of *Ælianus*. Moreover the king of Egypt shall enter into league with Israel, and shall kill all the men inhabiting about Jerusalem, Damascus, and Ascalon: which thing once noised over the whole earth, a horrid dread and astonishment shall overwhelm the inhabitants thereof.”¹⁷⁸²

Nothing could put greater fear into apostate and anti-Zionist Orthodox Jews than the fact that almost no one interceded to rescue the assimilating Jews of Europe from the Nazi régime. The horrific indifference of the world to the mistreatment, degradation, humiliation and murder of Jews was a key factor in establishing the will of formerly non-Zionist, or anti-Zionist, Jews around the world to found the “Jewish State” in Palestine. Without the Nazis, and without the indifference of heads of state to the plight of Europe's Jews, there would have been no Israel. Christopher Sykes wrote,

“[. . .]Zionist leaders were determined at the very outset of the Nazi disaster to reap political advantage from the tragedy.”¹⁷⁸³

Zionist leaders were planning these events thousands of years before the Nazi disaster. After the Nazi disaster, Zionist Martin Buber wrote in 1958,

“Effects of Hitlerism

This organic phase of the settlement in Palestine went on till the days of Hitler. It was Hitler who brought Jewish masses to Palestine, not selected people who felt that here they must fulfill their lives and prepare the future. So, selective organic development was replaced by mass immigration and the indispensable necessity to find political force for its security. This was the hour when my great friend, the late Judah Leib Magnes, and I, and other friends felt that we must state clearly our own proposals. *But the majority of the Jewish people preferred to learn from Hitler rather than from us.* Hitler showed them that history does not go the way of the spirit but the way of power, and if a people is powerful enough, it can kill with impunity as many millions of another people as it wants to kill. This was the situation that we had to fight.”¹⁷⁸⁴

Hannah Arendt wrote in her book *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*,

“Of greater importance for Eichmann were the emissaries from Palestine, who would approach the Gestapo and the S.S. on their own initiative, without taking orders from either the German Zionists or the Jewish Agency for Palestine. They came in order to enlist help for the illegal immigration of Jews into British-ruled Palestine, and both the Gestapo and the S.S. were helpful. They negotiated with Eichmann in Vienna, and they reported that he was ‘polite,’ ‘not the shouting type,’ and that he even provided them with farms and facilities for setting up vocational training camps for prospective immigrants. (‘On one occasion, he expelled a group of nuns from a convent to provide a training farm for young Jews,’ and on another ‘a special train [was made available] and Nazi officials accompanied’ a group of emigrants, ostensibly headed for Zionist training farms in Yugoslavia, to see them safely across the border.) According to the story told by Jon and David Kimche, with ‘the full and generous cooperation of all the chief actors’ (*The Secret Roads: The ‘Illegal’ Migration of a People, 1938-1948*, London, 1954), these Jews from Palestine spoke a language not totally different from that of Eichmann. They had been sent to Europe by the communal settlements in Palestine, and they were not interested in rescue operations: ‘That was not their job.’ They wanted to select ‘suitable material,’ and their chief enemy, prior to the extermination program, was not those who made life impossible for Jews in the old countries, Germany or Austria, but those who barred access to the new homeland; that enemy was definitely Britain, not Germany. Indeed, they were in a position to deal with the Nazi authorities on a footing a mounting to equality, which native Jews were not, since they enjoyed the protection of the mandatory power; they were probably among the first Jews to talk openly about mutual interests and were certainly the first to be given permission ‘to pick young Jewish pioneers’ from among the Jews in the concentration camps. Of course, they were unaware of the sinister

implications of this deal, which still lay in the future; but they too somehow believed that if it was a question of selecting Jews for survival, the Jews should do the selecting themselves. It was this fundamental error in judgment that eventually led to a situation in which the non-selected majority of Jews inevitably found themselves confronted with two enemies—the Nazi authorities and the Jewish authorities. As far as the Viennese episode is concerned, Eichmann’s preposterous claim to have saved hundreds of thousands of Jewish lives, which was laughed out of court, finds strange support in the considered judgment of the Jewish historians, the Kimches: ‘Thus what must have been one of the most paradoxical episodes of the entire period of the Nazi regime began: the man who was to go down in history as one of the arch-murderers of the Jewish people entered the lists as an active worker in the rescue of Jews from Europe.’”¹⁷⁸⁵

7.8 Documented Collaboration Between the Palestinian Zionists and the Zionist Nazis

History records numerous well-documented instances where Zionist leaders, like Rudolf Kastner who assisted in the deportation of one-half-million Jews to concentration camps,¹⁷⁸⁶ collaborated with Zionist Nazi leaders, including Adolf Eichmann, to help them control mass Jewish populations allegedly destined for extermination, in order to save comparatively scant numbers of prominent Zionist Jews—an act which some allege was pardoned by the Israeli Government after the war so as to prevent an investigation into the broader collaboration between Zionists and Nazis in the persecution of Jews.¹⁷⁸⁷ Indeed, Adolf Eichmann—who was of Jewish descent—called himself a Zionist in 1939 in a conversation with Anny Stern,

“‘Are you a Zionist?’ Adolph Eichmann, Hitler’s specialist on Jewish affairs, asked her. ‘Jawohl,’ she replied. ‘Good,’ he said, ‘I am a Zionist, too. I want every Jew to leave for Palestine.’”¹⁷⁸⁸

There were many Zionists in Palestine who placed the acquisition of land from Palestinians above saving European Jewish lives during the Holocaust.¹⁷⁸⁹ Herzl actively conspired with the Sultan of Turkey to cover up the atrocities committed against Armenian Christians in Herzl’s efforts to acquire Palestine and force the expulsion of Jews from other nations of the world and drive them into Palestine. Many prominent and highly respected Jews have, over the course of many years, expressed concern and outrage over the alliance of Zionists and anti-Semites during the Hitler régime.

Though certainly not an endorsement of racism, anti-Semitism or Nazism, Samuel Landman’s statements in 1936 evince that some Zionists saw an opportunity to forward their agenda as Hitler’s persecution of Jews escalated. This disincentive to fight Hitler directly and with all available means, due to a wish to promote Zionism among reluctant, especially assimilationist, Jews before the Holocaust began, is highly troubling; especially so when it comes from English sources.

England did little to combat Nazism and prepare for war. It is also disturbing to note that Jews were among those who most strongly opposed the emigration of German Jews out of Germany. Landman, and every sensible person in the world, should have been calling for England to take immediate action against Nazism and to absorb Jews who wished to leave Germany or were forced out. Landman wrote,

“The rise of Hitler to power in Germany, with its ruthless forms of anti-Semitism, has driven home the Zionism of Herzl and given a tremendous impetus to Jewish national feeling all over the world. A few years ago, the view, adopted by Sir Herbert Samuel in 1921, that a smallish Jewish model settlement in Palestine living on healthy national lines would provide spiritual sustenance for the vast majority of Jewry outside Palestine still had a good few adherents, but to-day, German anti-Semitism and its repercussions in other lands, has all but given this doctrine its *coup de grâce*. Every Jew now sees clearly that without a physical and political as well as a spiritual centre, Jewry stands very little chance of survival. This conviction has spread much more rapidly than certain Zionist leaders, who have lost touch with the masses, realise. The Jewish land hunger has grown immeasurably and the Jewish masses feel that Palestine without Transjordan is far too small for the urgent and imperative need of Jewish emigration. Transjordan was originally part of the mandated territory of Palestine to which the Jewish National Home applied. Hence one of the other main points in the platform of the new Zionist Organisation is the opening of Transjordan to Jewish immigration. [***] The British Empire can afford to wait or hasten slowly; but it will be conceded that in their tragic plight the choice before Jewry is either speedily to rebuild Palestine or slowly to perish in the Diaspora. The words of the traditional Jewish toast—“Next year in Jerusalem” (Leshana Habaa Birushalayim)—are therefore no longer conventional words, but inspiriting and instinct with meaning and action and must assuredly appeal to the sense of humanity and fair play of the British Government and people.”¹⁷⁹⁰

Political Zionists wanted *Ostjuden* to emigrate to a “Jewish homeland”, not to England and America. Some assimilated American Jews had long opposed the immigration of more Jews to America for fear it would cause anti-Semitism. Richard Gottheil stated in 1898,

“They must feel, for example, that a continual influx of Jews who are not Americans is a continual menace to the more or less complete absorption for which they are striving.”¹⁷⁹¹

The New York Times reported on 20 September 1920 on page 16,

“F. Warburg Seeks to Check

Exodus Here of Jews in Europe

PARIS, Sept. 18.—Felix M. Warburg of New York, Chairman of the Joint Distribution Committee for American Jewish Relief Funds, who is here, is endeavoring to impress Jewish leaders in Europe with the necessity of discouraging European Jews from flocking to the United States, in order to keep Jewish emigration within reasonable limits.

In this connection Mr. Warburg has conferred with a number of leading Jews in Paris, including Nahum Sokolow, head of the Jewish Delegations Committee.”

Albert Einstein wrote to Max Born on 22 March 1934 that the same impediments Western European Jews had put in place against the emigration of Eastern European Jews during the Pogroms were now being instituted against German Jews by the Jews of America, France and England,

“It is particularly unfortunate that the satiated Jews of the countries which have hitherto been spared cling to the foolish hope that they can safeguard themselves by keeping quiet and making patriotic gestures, just as the German Jews used to do. For the same reason they sabotaged the granting of asylum to German Jews, just as the latter did to Jews from the East. This applies just as much in America as in France and England.”¹⁷⁹²

The Zionists obstructed the migration of Jews away from Hitler to any sanctuary other than Palestine, allegedly in the belief that this meant certain death and eventually in the knowledge that Jews could not emigrate to Palestine. They wanted the Jews to feel that no other country would allow Jews in their borders and that no other people would want them than Zionist Palestinian Jews. The Zionists used their strong and powerful influence to bring this fate upon the helpless Jews of Europe.¹⁷⁹³

The Nazis were eager to expel Jews and the only reason Jews could not escape Continental Europe was because other Jews stood in their way. Hitler was interviewed in the *Staatszeitung* of New York and stated,

“Why does the world shed crocodile’s tears over the richly merited fate of a small Jewish minority? But what happened to the conscience of the world when millions in Germany were suffering from hunger and misery? I ask Roosevelt, I ask the American people: Are you prepared to receive in your midst these well-poisoners [*Brunnenvergifter*] of the German people and the universal spirit of Christianity? We would willingly give everyone of them a free steamer-ticket and a thousand-mark note for travelling expenses, if we could get rid of them. Am I to allow thousands of pure-blooded Germans to perish so that all Jews may work, live, and be merry in security while a nation of millions is a prey to starvation, despair, and Bolshevism?”¹⁷⁹⁴

Hitler’s 7 April 1933 speech to the “Doctors’ Union” was paraphrased in *The Speeches of Adolf Hitler April 1922-August 1939*, Volume 1, Howard Fertig, New

York, (1969), page 728, as follows:

“*He said that* America of all countries had the least ground to object to these measures. America’s own Immigration Laws had excluded from admission those belonging to races of which America disapproved, while America was by no means prepared to open the gates to Jewish ‘fugitives’ from Germany. ‘As a matter of fact the Jews in Germany had not a hair of their heads rumped.’”

The New York Times published an interview with Hitler by Anne O’Hare McCormick on 10 July 1933 on the front page extending to page 6. Hitler disclosed his revolutionary and Marxist ideals—Hitler admired Henry Ford for removing class distinctions with his Model T and hinted at the *Volkswagen*. He also stated,

“‘As to the ‘persecuted’ Jews, whom you see peacefully walking in the streets and dining in all the best cafés in Berlin,’ he continued, ‘I would be only too glad if the nations which take such an enormous interest in Jews would open their gates to them.

‘It is true we have made discriminatory laws, but they are directed not so much against the Jews as for the German people, to give equal economic opportunity to the majority.

‘You say the Jews suffer, but so do millions of others. Why should not the Jews share the privations which burden the entire nation?

You must remember our fight is not primarily against the Jews as such but against the Communists and all elements that demoralize and destroy us. When I proceed against a Communist, I do not ask if he is a Saxon or a Prussian. What I mean is that I cannot spare a Communist because he is a Jew.’”

On 24 October 1933, Hitler delivered a speech in the *Sportpalast* in Berlin,

“In England people assert that their arms are open to welcome all the oppressed, especially the Jews who have left Germany. England can do this! England is big, England possesses vast territories. England is rich. We are small and overpopulated, we are poor and without any possibility for living. But it would be still finer if England did not make her great gesture dependent on the possession of £1,000—if England should say: Anyone can enter—as we unfortunately have done for thirty or forty years. If we too had declared that no one could enter Germany save under the condition of bringing with him £1,000 or paying more, then to-day we should have no Jewish question at all. So we wild folk have once more proved ourselves to be better humans—less perhaps in external protestations, but at least in our actions! And now we are still as generous and give to the Jewish people a far higher percentage as their share in possibility for living than we ourselves possess.”¹⁷⁹⁵

American Zionists, who sponsored the emigration of Eastern European Jews through the 1920's, had come to despise Russian (“red assimilationist”) Jews in the 1930's. At this time in Russia, the man behind Stalin’s genocide and anti-Semitism was an alleged “self-hating Jew”,¹⁷⁹⁶ Lazar Moiseyevich Kaganovich. American Communists, many, if not most, of whom were ethnic Jews, largely turned a blind eye to these atrocities, which cost tens of millions of Gentile lives. Kaganovich may well have been a Zionist who wanted to both punish assimilatory Jews (“red assimilationist”) and develop in them a keen interest in Palestine. Kaganovich, perhaps the bloodiest mass murderer in history, was the power behind the throne of the Stalinist Regime. Kaganovich directed the genocide of the Ukrainians, as well as “Stalin’s purges” and anti-Semitic campaigns.

Perhaps the most compelling evidence that Soviet anti-Semitism was a ploy meant to force reluctant, assimilating Jews into Zionism against their will, was the fact that the most virulent anti-Semitic purges began after the failed attempt to create a “Jewish State” in the far Eastern regions of the Soviet Union, the Jewish Autonomous Oblast in Khabarovsk Krai in the districts of Birobidzhansky, Leninsky, Obluchensky, Oktyabrsky and Smidovichsky.¹⁷⁹⁷ This plan failed, in part, due to the interference of some Zionist Socialists, who insisted that Palestine was the Jews’ national home. An even earlier attempt to found a “Jewish State” in Russia in the districts of Homel, Witebsk and Minsk,¹⁷⁹⁸ also failed, largely due to a lack of Jewish interest. The Zionists insisted that anti-Semitism alone could force the Jews to segregate. When the Zionists put Hitler in power, they had the needed impetus to force Jews to flee Europe and the Zionists attempted to steal Chinese territory for a “Jewish homeland” with the help of the Imperial Japanese under the “Fugu Plan”. Zionist Jews sought to establish a “Jewish State” in China, which had been taken over by the Imperial Japanese whom the Jews had been financing since the days when Jacob Schiff loaned them \$200,000,000.00 in the Russo-Japanese War. The Zionists used the Imperial Japanese to destroy the Chinese government in preparation for the formation of a Jewish nation in China under the “Fugu Plan” in Manchuria or Shanghai. The Jews even promoted the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* to the Japanese as evidence as to how powerful they were. The “Fugu Plan” failed to attract enough Jews, even under Nazi pressure, and the hard Zionists wanted Palestine. The Zionists then arranged for war between the United States and Japan. When America declared war on Japan, Hitler, seemingly inexplicably, declared war on the United States ensuring the ultimate defeat of Germany. Hitler also went to war with the Soviets, which gave him access to large numbers of Jews the Zionists could then segregate and ready for deportation to Palestine.

American Zionists took Hitler’s rise to power as an opportunity to promote Jewish nationalism, force Jewish ethnocentrism, and consolidate Zionist-Jewish power in the United States to the detriment of Europe’s Jews—those Jews the prominent and well read European Zionist Jakob Klatzkin had said had “seceded” from being Jews,

“A Jew who no longer wishes to belong to the Jewish people, who betrays the covenant and deserts his fellows in their collective battle for redemption,

has thereby abandoned his share in the heritage of the past and seceded from his people. [***] LET US ASSUME that the Galut can survive and that *total* assimilation will not inevitably follow the abandonment of religion. Nonetheless we must assert: The Judaism of the Galut is not worthy of survival. [***] Perhaps it is conceivable that, even after the disintegration of our national existence in foreign lands, there will yet remain for many generations some sort of oddity among the peoples going by the name—Jew. [***] We must increase self-restrictions and prohibitions, for the sake of protecting our identity and apartness, and we must define boundary after boundary between ourselves and the nations among whom we are assimilating. [***] The very culture that engulfs us so transforms our moral and aesthetic sense that we return to our own people, for we have learned to be sensitive to the crime of assimilation and its consequences.¹⁷⁹⁹

In 1933, prominent American Zionist Ludwig Lewisohn expressed his bitterness towards Jews who dared to disagree with him. Lewisohn issued an ominous warning to Jews who failed to convert to Zionism:

“[F]or Jews it has become a matter of life and death for each one and for our whole people. A matter of life and death. For the same sparks from which burst forth this year the foul and fatal German conflagration are smoldering, however hid in ashes, however swept out of sight by sincere gentile good will and by unacknowledged Jewish terror, in every land of the dispersion. [***] Hence millions of Jews must be converted, must achieve a *teshuvah* (repentance), each for himself, in order to consent to the saving of their people, in order to consent to the reconstruction of the Jewish communities of the world. Nothing less than a conversion, nothing less than a profound inner change, nothing less than a broken and a contrite Jewish heart, and yet a heart proud in its brokenness and its contrition, will avail. [***] And our books, instead of becoming instruments toward the auto-emancipation of Jewry and the warding off of a catastrophe, were patronized by a few high-brows whose ‘ifs’ and ‘buts’ were stamped out in the year 1933 in blood and dirt. [***] The Polish communities, though less catastrophically stricken, are so oppressed and burdened that leadership cannot be expected from them. The Russian Jews are lost to us in this generation by the device of Red assimilation, quite analogous to Prussian assimilation and mass baptism during certain decades of the nineteenth century, or to the processes of any polity which, in the period of consolidation, is willing temporarily to admit that assimilation can proceed to the point of paying. Hence the leadership of world-Jewry outside of Palestine devolves upon American Jewry, and American Jewry, the most populous and powerful in the world today, is also the most ignorant and the one in which the crippling sickness of preoccupation without knowledge is most prevalent. . . It is a necessity and a duty to be brutal today. It is necessary to be brutal even at the risk of being misunderstood. For, given the precise circumstances that confront us from

now on, the Jewish ignorance of American Jewry may prove a disaster of incalculable consequences to all Israel.”¹⁸⁰⁰

Ludwig Lewisohn lived with, and had a homosexual relationship with, poet George Sylvester Viereck.¹⁸⁰¹ Viereck was reputedly the grandson of Kaiser Wilhelm the First and Edwina Viereck, and was the son of the Marxist Louis Viereck. George Sylvester Viereck was one of the chief pro-German propagandists in America during World War I,¹⁸⁰² defended the Kaiser after World War I, was a devoted friend to Sigmund Freud and promoted Albert Einstein—as well as Adolf Hitler. Just as the poet Ezra Pound propagandized for the Fascists in Italy, Viereck propagandized for the Nazis from the 1920's through the 1940's and served time in prison in America for his pro-Nazi activities. Viereck and Lewisohn remained friends after the Second World War—and the Holocaust.¹⁸⁰³ Eustace Mullins stated that Viereck was flattered and pleased when Mullins told Viereck that Viereck had cost Germany victory in both world wars.¹⁸⁰⁴

Morris Raphael Cohen noted the kinship between the Nazis and Zionists like Lewisohn, in Cohen's critique of Lewisohn's *The Answer; the Jew and the World: Past, Present and Future*, Liveright Publishing Company, New York, (1939). Cohen stated in his review of Lewisohn's Zionist book of 1939,

“Yet the answer, which in accordance with the title this book offers us, is clear enough: remove the Arabs from Palestine and Transjordan, over a million of them, (p. 188), and put in their place a majority of the Jewish population of the world (p. 19). [***] Mr. Lewisohn is indeed aware of the fact that not only will a large part of the Jewish population of the world never go to Palestine but that it will take a long time before all those who wish to go can be transported and find room there. [***] Not only are Mr. Lewisohn's ideas hazy, confused, and disdainful of the facts, but his major premises are indistinguishable from the current anti-scientific racial dogmas which threaten to destroy liberal civilization. [***] [...]Mr. Lewisohn resort[s] to downright misrepresentation of Dr. Boas' position when he says (p. 310) that the latter 'hoped that Jewish babies would develop Indian skulls in America.' It is not necessary to refute this absurd and baseless charge; but it is well to call attention to the fact that neither Boas nor Fishberg ever denied the existence of Jews. What they did show by actual measurement is that there are no discoverable hereditary physical traits common to all Jews which distinguish them from other people. Mr. Lewisohn froths at this because it runs counter to the dogma which he shares with Hitler and Mussolini that cultural traits are inherited in the racial blood and cannot be changed (p. 46). [***] It seems cruel to link such an ardent Zionist as Mr. Lewisohn with Hitler and Mussolini, even ideologically. But the fact is that he does agree with them not only in their dogmatic racial fatalism but also in one of the conclusions that they and others draw from it, and that is that the democratic liberal regime of emancipation and toleration has not only failed but cannot and indeed ought not to succeed. From the way Mr.

Lewisohn writes, one would suppose that the emancipation of the Jews from the ghetto was a calamity second only to the destruction of the Jewish Commonwealth. By implication he is committed to the view that one born a Jew cannot enter completely into English, French or German culture, not only because he will not be allowed to, but because it is contrary to fate or God's will. [***] The implication that emancipation is responsible for the anti-Semitism in Poland and Rumania belongs to the same class [of misinformation].¹⁸⁰⁵

Zionists promised the Jews of the world that if Jews abandoned their calling to nationalism and refused to embrace Zionism, they would face annihilation in Europe. This had long been a common theme of Zionists and anti-Semites. The “Hamburg Resolutions of the German Social Reform Party” proclaimed in 1899,

“The strivings of Zionism are a fruit of the antisemitic movement. [***] Unfortunately [any hope that all Jews will emigrate to Palestine] appears to be infeasible. [***] As such, [the Jewish question] should be solved in common with other nations and result finally in full separation, and—if self-defense demands—in final annihilation [*Vernichtung*] of the Jewish race.”¹⁸⁰⁶

Adolf Hitler and Hans Frank later threatened the Jews of the world that if Jewish leadership “forced another world war”, then Jews would face annihilation in Europe. Hitler stated before the Reichstag on 30 January 1939,

“If international finance Jewry in and outside Europe succeeds in plunging the peoples into another world war, then the end result will not be the Bolshevization of the earth and the consequent victory of Jewry but the annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe.”¹⁸⁰⁷

“Wenn es dem internationalen Finanzjudentum in und außerhalb Europas gelingen sollte, die Völker noch einmal in einen Weltkrieg zu stürzen, dann wird das Ergebnis nicht der Sieg des Judentums sein, sondern die Vernichtung der jüdischen Rasse in Europa!”¹⁸⁰⁸

The Jewish Nazi tyrant of Poland, Dr. Hans Frank, stated at a Cabinet Session on 16 December 1941,

“As far as the Jews are concerned, I want to tell you quite frankly, that they must be done away with in one way or another. The Fuehrer said once: should united Jewry again succeed in provoking a world war, the blood of not only the nations which have been forced into the war by them, will be shed, but the Jew will have found his end in Europe”¹⁸⁰⁹

Did the crypto-Jewish Zionists Adolf Hitler and Hans Frank mean that they would exterminate the Jews of Europe in death camps, or did they mean that they would

deport the Jews of Europe to Palestine as a final solution to the Jewish question? Frank was a long-term Zionist who wanted to segregate the Jews in Polish concentration camps and then ship them to Palestine—not to say that he did not intend to kill off a large percentage of his brethren in the process. In the fall of 1933 in Nuremberg on *Reichsparteitag*, Frank stated that his goal was to secure a “Jewish State”,

“Unbeschadet unseres Willens, uns mit den Juden auseinanderzusetzen, ist die Sicherheit und das Leben der Juden in Deutschland staatlich, reichsamtlich und juristisch nicht gefährdet. Die Judenfrage ist rechtlich nur dadurch zu lösen, dass man an die Frage eines jüdischen Staates herangeht.”¹⁸¹⁰

World War II began soon after, and resulted in the Bolshevization of half of Germany, Eastern Europe, China, North Korea, and ultimately Indochina, with disastrous consequences for a large segment of humanity. Western Europe came very close to falling under the Bolshevists’ control and endured the Bolshevization of Nazism for many years. The war was also a victory for the Zionists—in their minds.

The Nazis and the Zionists iterated a common message. Even after Germany had initiated war and invaded Poland, where Jews had been forced to gather, the Jews of Europe did not embrace Zionism. They were then annihilated. Lest the Zionists be confused with visionaries who sought to rescue the Jews of Europe, one must bear in mind the Zionists’ all too common disdain for “surplus” and assimilationist Jews and the fact that instead of fighting the Nazis, they too often endorsed and encouraged the views of the Nazis—even offered a military alliance with the Nazis.

The unfortunate Jews of Eastern Europe and Germany were caught between Zionists, who hated their “red assimilation”, sponsoring racial and nationalistic mythologies in Germany, the Soviet Union, and elsewhere in collusion with the anti-Semites; and powerful and influential assimilated Jews in France, England and America who feared an increase in anti-Semitism should these Eastern Jews be permitted sanctuary in their lands. The Eastern Jews were chased from place to place and often murdered in cowardly cold blood, with the approval of the Zionists.¹⁸¹¹ Though many in positions of power around the world could have done much to help the Jews in danger, most did nothing. Immediately after the Second World War ended, the push for Israel became immensely strong among American Jews who had spent the war in relative safety—just as the political Zionists had always planned would happen. Israel Zangwill stated in 1914,

“But whether persecution extirpates or brotherhood melts, hate or love can never be simultaneous throughout the diaspora, and so there will probably always be a nucleus from which to restock this eternal type.”¹⁸¹²

The Zionists caused the Holocaust in the twisted belief that American and British Jews would “restock this eternal type” and that “Red assimilationists” and “rich assimilationists” were unworthy of life. Hitler’s threat to annihilate the European

Jews occurred shortly before England declared war on Germany and Frank's resolution came shortly after Germany declared war on America.

Before Hitler, there was Alfred Rosenberg. Rosenberg, perhaps a Bolshevik agent of what was to become "The Trust", under the tutelage of Houston Stewart Chamberlain,¹⁸¹³ List and Liebenfels, crafted what was to become the party ideology of the NSDAP. The Zionists created the ideology of the Nazi régime through these men. The Russian Jewess Helena Petrovna Blavatsky gave these men their mystic aryanistic dogmas and mythologies. In 1893, Blavatsky created the dogma behind the adoption of the "Aryan" Swastika they and the Nazis adopted—from her.¹⁸¹⁴

One of the architects of political Zionism, Max Nordau, wrote extensively¹⁸¹⁵ on the *Übermensch* and his role in history and politics (continuing the themes of Nietzsche's *Übermensch* in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* and Dostoevsky's dialectic and Hegelian *Übermensch* turned evil in the form of Raskolnikov in *Crime and Punishment*). Nordau, while formulating a biologically and physiologically based political psychology of the superior man—much in agreement with Hitler's later belief system, adopted the ideologies of Hegel, Schopenhauer and their progeny, while viciously criticizing them. He wrote of "Degeneration" in the arts and philosophy by Wagner and Nietzsche and throughout society—political elements which became fundamental in Nazi culture and science through a direct transference to Jews.

It was something more than common interest and circumstances which drove Rosenberg (in his many rôles as Nazi party leader, Nazi propagandist, and the creator of National Socialist policy) to attempt to fulfill Herzl's goals of a dramatic rise in international anti-Semitism, the distillation of Jews into segregated groups meant for deportation, and the destruction and punishment of upperclass Jews who had opposed Herzl and whom Herzl had repeatedly threatened, and the creation of a "Jewish State". There was common control of the Zionist, Nazi and Communist movements, with the common goals of wreaking havoc on Europe, destroying the genetic and cultural future of Europeans, and herding up the reluctant Jews of Europe for deportation to Palestine, and killing off weak Jews in order to "improve the bloodline" of Israeli Jews, since Palestine could not in any event house the majority of European Jews.

Zionist Jews had no compunctions about killing off a large percentage of assimilatory European Jewry. Bernard Lazare was one of many Zionist Jews who hated wealthy assimilating Jews and wrote in the late 1890's, "It is obvious that the so-called upper class among western Jews, and especially among French Jews, is in an advanced state of decay."¹⁸¹⁶ Jakob Stern published a rather famous critique of Herzl's *Der Judenstaat*, in which Stern saw Herzl's book as a Utopian Marxist vision. Stern also ridiculed wealthy "Jewish capitalists" who sought sanctuary in "civilized countries", and noted, in his view, "How little racial and tribal kinship and community of religion prevent Jewish capitalists from exploiting Jewish proletarians, could be witnessed again at the International Socialist Congress a short time ago."¹⁸¹⁷ We learn from Paul Ehrenfest's correspondence that Zionist Jacques Oppenheim believed that secular Jews were not Jews and that all the problems Jews faced were due to educated and influential Jews who had betrayed the "Jewish masses."¹⁸¹⁸

Einstein joined the chorus,

“The greatest enemies of the national consciousness and honour of the Jews are fatty degeneration—by which I mean the unconscionableness which comes from wealth and ease—and a kind of inner dependence on the surrounding Gentile world which comes from the loosening of the fabric of Jewish society.”¹⁸¹⁹

Anti-Semite Gyözö Istóczy issued an anti-Semitic Zionistic appeal to rich Jews. In 1878, Istóczy wrote,

“There is only one means of remedying this great international evil: the Jews must be expelled from Europe. [***] In Palestine the Jews will be in position to create a grand state. [***] The innermost, secret wish of most Jews can now become reality if they can overcome those powerful Jews who have acquired power in Europe and for whom it is so very congenial to rule the world from London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, and Budapest. I appeal to the oft-mentioned patriotism of the Jews; they can now create their own empire; they will surely become a mightier, more influential state. My sincerest and best wishes will accompany the Jews. May the Jews find this acceptable and cease their continuing efforts to exterminate the Christians.”¹⁸²⁰

Roman Dmowski iterated a Polish anti-Semite’s view of the struggle between wealthy Western Jews and Zionist Jews in his article *The Jews and the War* of 1924,

“Meanwhile there developed a stubborn battle between generally poor idealists, as the Zionists were, and those representing financial power. Englishmen, Americans, Germans, and Frenchmen of Jewish faith were not thinking of leaving the Parises, Londons, Berlins, and New Yorks, with everything they offered. [They] considered Zionism an absurd fantasy. [***] Palestine was never the fatherland of the Jews because they never had a fatherland, but they made Jerusalem their spiritual center; recovering this center along with controlling Palestine, with its non-Jewish population, is the necessary goal of this new current. Yet, at the same time, [this new current] bid them not to forget that they are supposed to ‘possess the earth,’ that therefore they must be everywhere, and everywhere gain positions and organize their influences.”¹⁸²¹

Alfred Rosenberg focused attention in Germany on *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, which Gottfried zur Beek, under the *nom de plume* Ludwig Müller von Hausen, had translated into German in 1919 and published in early 1920 as *Die Geheimnisse der Weisen von Zion*. Rosenberg published *Die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion und die jüdische Weltpolitik*, Deutsche Volksverlag, München, (1923), in an effort to generate, and promote extant, anti-Semitism.

Alfred Rosenberg, Hitler’s mentor, promoted Zionist programs as the state policy

of the Nazis, stating in his *Die Spur des Juden im Wandel der Zeiten* of 1920 that,

“The Jews are recognized as a nation living in Germany. [***] Zionism must be powerfully supported, in order to promote yearly a certain number of German Jews to Palestine or, in general, over the borders.”¹⁸²²

“Die Juden werden als eine in Deutschland lebende Nation anerkannt. [***] Der Zionismus muß tatkräftig unterstützt werden, um jährlich eine zu bestimmende Zahl deutscher Juden nach Palästina oder überhaupt über die Grenze zu befördern.”¹⁸²³

Though many authentic anti-Semites distrusted Zionism, both Adolf Hitler and Joseph Goebbels encouraged Zionism,¹⁸²⁴ as did SS officer Baron Leopold Itz von Mildenstein.¹⁸²⁵ Adolf Hitler’s ethnologist, Hans Günther, embraced and advocated Zionism in 1923, copying verbatim from the amended Zionist Program of 1897,¹⁸²⁶

“Research has shown time and again that the dispersion of the Jews among Gentile Peoples causes endless unrest, and again and again the racial antagonism of necessity escalates into hatred. Having exposed this is one of the most courageous realizations of Zionism. Zionism has clearly shown that the only dignified settlement of relations would be the removal of the Jews from living among the Gentile nations. The creation of a publically, legally secured homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine seems to now be politically attainable.”

“Immer wieder zeigt die Betrachtung, dass die Zerstreung der Juden unter nichtjüdischen Völkern eine endlose Unruhe bewirkt, und immer wieder die Artgegensätze bis zum Hass steigern muss. Dies eingesehen zu haben, ist eine der mutigsten Erkenntnisse des Zionismus. Der Zionismus hat es klar eingesehen, dass einzig die Herauslösung der Juden aus dem Zusammenwohnen mit nichtjüdischen Volkstümern eine würdevolle Klärung der Verhältnisse bedeutet. Die Schaffung einer öffentlich rechtlichen gesicherten Heimstätte für das jüdische Volk in Palästina scheint jetzt politisch erreichbar zu sein.”¹⁸²⁷

The infamous “Nuremberg Laws” of 1935 forbade Jews from raising the Reich’s flag, but Section 4 specifically granted them the right to display the “Jewish colors”, which encouraged Zionist nationalism. The Zionists embraced the Nuremberg Laws, which sponsored the racial segregation they desired and which forbade intermarriage or any sexual relations between “Jews” and “Aryans”. At least as early as 1914, Zionist racist Ignatz Zollschan iterated the Nazi goals of concentrating and segregating Russian Jews in order to prevent the assimilation of Jews after emancipation. Zollschan asserted that Jews must choose the ghetto or Zionism, if they wished to perpetuate the “Jewish race”. Since the vast majority of Jews did not want to segregate and congregate in Palestine, the Zionists and Nazis collaborated

to force Jews into ghettos. Since a very large percent of Jews in Germany were marrying Gentiles, the Zionists and Nazis collaborated to discourage and eventually outlaw such marriages. Political Zionist Zollschan stated at least as early as 1914,

“II.

The Significance of the Mixed Marriage

What can we say with certainty about the purity of the Jewish race? The answer to this question is of vital importance. For if intermarriage with alien races had in former years played a great role among Jews, it is self-evident that we are not justified in speaking of a Jewish race at all. Are the Jews of to-day really the pure descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob?

Nobody assumes to-day that all the Jews are the direct descendants of the three patriarchs; they are derived from the mingling of various stocks which were, however, essentially varieties of one and the same race.

When in the thirteenth century before the current era the Bedouin tribe of the Habiri, that is to say, the Hebrews, took possession of Palestine, they found there a vast native population, the Ganaanites, Hetites, Getites, Aniorites and Pihistines. During the period of the Judges and Kings, the Jewish tribes intermarried with all these nations. Their blood was mingled with that of the nations in whose midst they lived. This slow process of intermixture continued till after the first exile, till the time when the powerful word of Ezra severed all existing marriage connections with foreign nations, and henceforth the purity of the race became the dominating principle.

It is quite gratuitous to enter into a controversy about the exact definition and classification of such nations as the Hittites, Amorites, Philistines and others, to which, in a broader sense, the Egyptians, as well as the Babylonians, Assyrians, Phoenicians and Jews belong. Whether we speak of Semites and Hamites in accordance with the inadequate linguistic methods, or of Semites, Hittites, Amorites and Kushites, we regard these nations as related to one another in the racial sense. Ample anthropological evidence exists for this statement, though naturally it cannot be presented in this lecture.

Many historians are of the opinion that the appearance of Ezra did not put an end to the racial intermixture. They think that also in all subsequent centuries the Jews continued to mingle with the nations of the diaspora, just as in the time before the Babylonian exile. They advocate the theory that the Jews of to-day are the descendants of the heathen proselytes during the Hellenistic period, or the offspring of mixed marriages between the Jews and their surrounding nations during the Christian centuries.

We can to-day assert with certainty that the extent of proselytism has been greatly exaggerated. There can indeed be no doubt that Judaism found numerous adherents among the pagan nations during the Roman and Hellenistic and early Christian periods. We have, however, sufficient reason to assume that those proselytes were only the so-called ‘proselytes before the

gate,' that is to say, converts who practiced the worship of one God, but were never admitted to circumcision or marriage. They were proselytes who later on embraced Christianity.

And in the times that followed immediately, the policy of discriminating between Jew and Gentile was inaugurated. Hadrian's laws forbidding circumcision were, it is true, revoked by his successor, Antoninus Pius, but it was expressly prohibited to make converts to Judaism. In consequence of this, the formal embracing of Judaism became a punishable crime, and it remained such until quite recent times. Even during the periods when the Jews commanded respect to some extent, the Church took good care that the religious boundary-line should be kept intact. In times of persecution and oppression, no appreciable number of adherents of other religions could have gone over to outlawed Judaism. The bars of the Ghetto formed a reliable dividing wall.

But even if we grant that in some cases a few heathens became Jews in every respect prior to the Christian era, they could have been of no significance. As in the Hellenistic period there already existed millions of Jews, the admixture of foreign blood must have been infinitely small. And this foreign blood was, after all, derived from the kindred nations in 'Syria, Asia Minor and Egypt.

It may be regarded as certain that proselytism almost entirely ceased since the appearance of European Jewish history. Even the invasion of the Khazars in the eighth century does not alter the fact that during the Middle Ages not much of foreign blood was added to the Jews. For already in the tenth century the empire of the Khazars was confined to a small territory, something like Crimea of to-day, and in the eleventh century it was entirely wiped out. A small remnant of Khazarite Jews are still living in Crimea to-day, and belong to the Karaitic sect. But even if we assume that the entire nation of the Khazars embraced Judaism, and professed that religion for a long time, this admixture would still be a *quantite negligeeable* and would not alter the ethnical character of the Jewish race. Moreover, it is doubtful whether this conversion was not confined to the rulers and the ruling classes of the Khazars. We would be losing sight of historical proportion, if we were to infer from the conversion of the Khazars that the Jews have any remarkable admixture of foreign blood.

As far as legal mixed marriages are concerned we know that they actually existed in the times of high material culture, namely, in Egypt during the Hellenistic period and in Spain during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. But, as is the case now in Europe, where there is a strong leaning towards intermarriage, the offspring of those marriages preponderantly went over to Christianity. Besides this, those early periods quickly passed away owing to the changed political conditions, the reaction of orthodoxy and the decisions of the councils of the Christian Church. Moreover, this movement at that time, in contradistinction to the general spread of intermarriage of to-day, was only confined to one country. Intermarriage with northern nations never

took place in former years to any considerable extent.

The Jewish nation accordingly has propagated itself in an essentially pure manner from the time of Ezra until to-day, and for more than two thousand years represents an ethnically peculiar race, which was not diluted by foreign blood. It is self-evident that a few drops of foreign blood must have found their way among the Jews during the long time in the diaspora. But these admixtures were too insignificant to have any essential influence upon the ethnical character of the nation. Thus the Cohanim, who were absolutely excluded from mixed marriages, are typically the same as the other Jews. The state of affairs can best be described in one sentence: A great deal of blood was exported from Jewry, but little indeed was imported from outside. And, consequently, we can assume with certainty, that the blood which flows to-day in the veins of the Jews, is the same as that of two thousand years ago.

That Ezra's commandments, among which is also the one about purity of blood, have been kept for thousands of years, is due to the fact that they claimed to be religious ordinances coming from God. It is the case with all nations that social institutions which are interwoven with, and supported by religion are kept most tenaciously. In addition to this, Ezra's prescriptions owe their strength to the circumstance that they consisted in the practical laws of the cult, and not in theoretical doctrines; and that the Jews, after being scattered among other nations, were forced to social and economic isolation.

The true consideration of this circumstance, indicates the great significance of the solution of the problem of intermarriage in our own times. Economic and social isolation and the power of religious legislation, account for the fact that up till to-day this people did not fall a victim to intermarriage, despite its wanderings among strange nations for the last 2,000 years.

As long as ceremonial religion was a great power in the civilized life of all nations, this influence of religion was easily explained. But nowadays, for reasons which will presently become apparent, this influence upon the great masses is confined to the Ghetto environment. As soon as the Jew leaves this Ghetto environment, and participates in the national industry of his country as a factor of equal rights, and adapts himself to the speech and culture of his native land, he begins to free himself from the power of ceremonial religion. A century of free activity in the world of capital; combined with a secular education, entirely estranged the Jews, in all countries where the system of capital is developed, from their former mode of life. The pressure of changed economic conditions and the scientific materialistic conception of our age, sap the vitality of orthodox Judaism and undermine its foundation.

Now since ceremonial religion on the one hand and economic and social isolation on the other, together with the prohibition of Church and State, were the only reasons why intermarriage with foreign nations did not take place on a larger scale, it necessarily follows that affairs to-day have reached a critical stage. Free legislation in countries where the system of capital is

developed, has done away with the economic and political isolation; rationalism has shaken ceremonial religion, and no State nowadays prohibits mixed marriages.

In countries where one or another of these important conditions is not fulfilled, as, for instance, Galicia, Russia, and the Orient, Judaism is still kept alive, though the lot of the masses residing there is by no means to be envied. But in the Occident, and in all countries where the Jews are allowed to develop themselves freely, their lot is the same as that of other nations in a similar situation.

Without exception, all the nations who were compelled to leave their native soil and who never formed a compact majority in any part of the world, but were scattered in small communities, have vanished through intermarriage. And the Jews likewise would be swept away by the immense tide of the human race in the five continents, if all obstacles were removed. As can be easily shown, Jews have always married outside the fold whenever conditions were favorable. But never were conditions which make for the disintegration of Judaism as powerful as to-day. Nations who dwell together always mingle, unless intermarriage is made impossible by outside pressure of law or religion. The Jews nowadays come into contact with other nations, the civil law permits intermarriage, and the authority of religion is beginning to wane. The laws of love and material interests are mightier than all religious barriers, especially when the latter are weakened and enfeebled as they are to-day. The result of these considerations is, that to-day more than ever, Judaism is in danger of being dismembered.

The facts derived from statistics confirm this conclusion in all its details.

The first impulse to abrogate the laws forbidding marriage between Christians and Jews went forth from the French Revolution, and gradually spread from country to country—to Holland, Belgium, Denmark and Scandinavia; to England and the United States; to Germany, Italy and Hungary. It is even permitted in the Balkan States. On the other hand, it is still prohibited to-day in Austria, Russia, Spain and Portugal, and in Mohammedan countries. The most favorable places for mixed marriages are naturally those countries in which Jews have been domiciled for a considerable time and where they have attained prosperity. This is especially the case in the States of Western Europe.

The losses to Judaism in these western countries cannot be numerically ascertained, as there are no statistics in Italy, France and England relating to mixed marriages. Among the high-class Jewish families in Italy, for instance, it has almost become a rule to marry their children to Christians. All observers are unanimous in declaring that mixed marriages are extremely frequent in that country. As early as 1881, the mixed marriages in the province of Rovigo formed 34 per cent. of the pure Jewish marriages. Mixed marriages are also very common in Sweden, Denmark, Australia and France. In the last-named country, the highest aristocracy has often intermarried with Jewish heiresses. The Jews who had been domiciled in England for several

generations, have occasionally allied themselves to the aristocracy, during the nineteenth century. On the other hand, the Jewish population that immigrated to that country in the last few decades from Russia, Galicia and Roumania, is averse to intermarriage. The same holds good of France. In Sweden, the number of mixed marriages is actually greater than that of pure Jewish marriages.

Three-fourths of the Denmark Jews reside in Copenhagen. In that city, the average percentage of mixed marriages from 1880 to 1905, amounted to 69 per cent. of the pure Jewish marriages. The mixed marriages showed a tendency to increase, whereas pure Jewish marriages gradually decreased, as may be seen from the following table:

1880-1889	55.8%
1890-1899	68.7%
1900-1905	93.1%

According to the latest statements it is 96 per cent. It also appears that the Jewish population of Denmark did not increase from 1840 to 1901, but rather relatively decreased. In 1840, 0.30 per cent. of the general population were Jewish, while in 1901 there were only 0.14 per cent. The Jewish percentage, accordingly, was reduced to less than a half. The chief reason for this phenomenon is to be sought, along with the fact that fewer children were born to each family in the mixed marriages, through which the Christian population has gradually encroached upon the Jewish. In the other Scandinavian countries, as has already been remarked, the number of mixed marriages is actually greater than pure Jewish marriages.

In the United States, where no confessional statistics exist, conditions resemble those of England. The few Jews who had settled there for some time and who mostly belong to the wealthy classes, as, for instance, those of the Portuguese congregations now in process of disintegration, incline towards intermarriage, while the great masses of Jews who immigrated there since 1881, keep away from mixed marriages. But even here, at least in the congested districts of New York, marriages with the surrounding elements, such as the Irish and particularly the Italian, occur with growing frequency.

In Prussia, the number of couples who intermarried rose from 2,100 in the year 1885, to 5,100 in the year 1905. The marriage of a Jew to a Christian woman is, as a rule, more frequent than the opposite case. Along with the growth of mixed marriages, the number of children resulting from such marriages has naturally increased. Where the husband is Jewish about a fourth only of the offspring remained Jews; while where the woman is Jewish, only one-fifth—four-fifths falling to the lot of Christianity. In Germany, the mixed marriages in 1905 amounted to 21 per cent. and in 1910, to 26 per cent. of the pure Jewish marriages. This average was greatly exceeded in the large cities. Thus the number of mixed marriages amounted to 45 per cent. in Berlin, and to 60 per cent. in Hamburg. And even in

Frankfort on the Main, which has the reputation of being orthodox, there were about 30 per cent. of mixed marriages in the year 1908.

In Austria, intermarriage between Christians and Jews is forbidden, while intermarriage between Jews and nonconformists is permitted. Marriage is, accordingly, only possible when one of the parties embraces the religion of the other, or belongs to no denomination. It is obvious, for this reason, that the number of mixed marriages is much smaller in that country. The greater number of such marriages are contracted in Vienna. In the year 1906, they amounted to 13 per cent. While in Austria, as a rule, intermarriages between Jews and nonconformists are pretty rare, they are rather frequent in Triest. The following is a table of the average percentage of mixed marriages in the last few decades:

1877-1890	about	33%
1891-1895	“	38%
1896-1899	“	41%
1900-1903	“	62%

This is to be accounted for by the fact that Triest is on the border of Italy where, as is the case also in Denmark and Australia, the increasing frequency of mixed marriages actually threaten the existence of the Jewish population.

In Hungary, mixed marriages have been permitted since 1895, and they have become very numerous since that time. The capital towns of all countries offer the best opportunities for mixed marriages. In Hungary, the greater part of such marriages are contracted at Budapest. They amount in that town to 20 per cent.

The majority of Holland Jews reside in Amsterdam. Here also, mixed marriages between Jews and Christians show a constant increase. In 1903, they formed a fifth part of all the pure Jewish marriages.

Statistical figures recently obtained show a steady progress in the same direction. The language of these statistics is so eloquent and forceful, that it almost renders all discussion superfluous.

If we wish to draw up a summary of the above data, we can divide the countries, where mixed marriages are contracted, into four classes, according to Ruppin's scheme.

The first place must be accorded to the great mass of Jews whom modern culture has not reached as yet, and who remain in the same stage of civilization as they were during the Middle Ages. To this class belong the vast lower masses of the Jews in Russia, Roumania and Galicia, the native Jews of Morocco, Asia and European Turkey. They have their own vernaculars, the so-called Yiddish and Ladino, respectively. They dwell in their national exclusiveness, wear their peculiar garb and live for the greater part according to the old Jewish laws. The greater bulk are poor workmen or artisans and store keepers of precarious existence. It is in those countries that we still find the home of religious fervor and talmudic study. At the utmost,

two mixed marriages out of a hundred pure marriages are contracted there.

The second class has been somewhat influenced by European culture, and speak the language of the country either exclusively or along with their jargon. They have abandoned their peculiar garb, and are dressed like their Christian neighbors. They still practice Jewish observances, but the intolerance towards the non-Jewish is abated, and the imitation of Christian manners and the occupation with non-Jewish literature, are no longer regarded as reprehensible. The members of this class mostly live in conditions free from care, and some of them have even attained decided prosperity. To this class belong chiefly the Russian and Galician Jews who immigrated to America, the Jews of Hungary and of the small towns of Austria and Germany. Their number amounts to three millions. Mixed marriages occur there from two to ten per cent. The third class have renounced all Jewish ceremonial practices, especially the Sabbath, speak exclusively the language of the country and no longer occupy themselves with Jewish literature. The fact that the people of this class belong to Judaism is only proved by their contracting marriages with Jews, by circumcising their sons, and by attending synagogue during the High Festivals. To this class which, as a rule, lives in good material conditions, belongs the wealthy Jewish class of the large cities in Europe and America. Their number amounts to about two millions. In this class mixed marriages take place from ten to thirty per cent.

The fourth and last class has severed all connections with Judaism and religion. It still remains Jewish, because a sense of honor, family and social ties prevent it from going over to Christianity. To this class belong the Jews in the capital towns, and those who possess an academic education. Their number may be computed as something like a million. Mixed marriages are very frequent in this class—from thirty to fifty per cent.

These four classes, however, which I have attempted to portray with a few bold strokes, are not fixed groups, but cross-cuts at different positions, of a constantly flowing stream whose source to-day is in orthodox Judaism of eastern Europe, and which wends its way into the sea of Christianity. The process of infiltration of modern culture into Judaism goes on incessantly, and in the same manner, orthodox Judaism constantly yields to the members of the second tolerant class. The latter gradually yields to the class of reformers and freethinkers, and finally baptism, and especially intermarriage, leads the Jews to Christianity. These four classes can also be represented as four consecutive generations. Four or five generations intervene between our own age and the time of Mendelssohn. It is a melancholy reflection, that hardly one of the Jews who lived at that time in Berlin has any Jewish descendants.

This process would also assume equally large dimensions in Russia, if the Jews were granted equal rights and if the Pale of Settlement were removed. The amelioration of the material conditions would remove the Ghetto environment which is one of the factors in preserving orthodox Judaism. But

still more important would be the elimination of the second factor, namely, the keeping together of the Jews in one compact mass. If it were possible for the Russian Jews to spread themselves over the immense Russian Empire, the Jewish population in that country would not be denser than in western Europe. Thereby the progressive changes which exercise their destructive influences upon the western Jews would also apply to their Russian brethren. For the country that is more developed, serves as a picture of the future of the one that is less developed. Accordingly, eastern Jews will after some time apparently find themselves in the same position as the western Jews are to-day.

We may epitomise our conclusions from the processes described above, as follows: When the Jews in the diaspora became prosperous, assimilation which appears on the scene takes them away more or less from Judaism. It is mainly when they are oppressed, when they are in economically unfavorable conditions, that the Ghetto environment, in its old sense, is still retained. And although conditions to-day are not favorable in all countries, the beginning of this development can be recognized everywhere. Under favorable material conditions, and through the prevalence of secular education, Judaism, on account of its being scattered among nations of an alien race, is in danger of being disintegrated and destroyed, since the influence of ceremonial religion is waning.

It is not for the first time that we notice this process of disintegration. There were similar phases in all countries and throughout all ages. In accordance with the laws of historical evolution ever since the exile, this process has appeared in every country where a high culture brought about freedom from political pressure, from care for a livelihood, and from superstition. These phenomena appeared in those cases where Judaism actually imported foreign cultures, as for instance the Greek culture in the second century before the present era up till the first century of the common era, and afterwards the Arabian culture from the eighth till the twelfth century. Greek culture, from whose combination with Judaism, Christianity sprang, brought Judaism to the brink of ruin, and deprived it of a great part of its adherents. The million of Jews who, during the first century after Christ lived in Egypt, which was then the center of Hellenistic culture, appear to have gone over to Christianity. And the intimate and friendly intercourse which prevailed later on between Jews and Mohammedans in Babylon and Spain, caused the frequent recurrence of mixed marriages and conversions to Islam. The fact that in the empire of Castile, from the year 1290 till the year 1474, the number of Jews was reduced from 850,000 to 150,000, may serve as a proof for this assertion.

It is impossible to deny the resemblance of these two periods with the process of disintegration of our own times. Only, nowadays, the beginning of this process exists in all countries, and it has the tendency of becoming universal. Formerly, these processes were only partial, confined to certain domains of culture. Modern culture, however, has broken all boundaries, and

has become a world culture.

In China, the Jews who in former centuries were quite numerous, have almost entirely disappeared without leaving a trace, through intermarriage with the Chinese. And finally, we have to take into consideration the ten tribes who disappeared among the foreign nations, because at that time religion had not yet become ceremonial in the same sense as it existed after the Reformation of Ezra and Nehemiah. And also to-day it is possible, that wherever religion ceases to be ceremonial, the greater part of Jewry in the diaspora will, in the near future, become absorbed among the nations in whose midst it exists.

From all these considerations it becomes clearly manifest, how significant the problem of intermarriage is to-day. An inexorable process of disintegration is in progress. Although this process of breaking up Judaism is only gradual, from individual to individual, from family to family, it is of significance on account of the principle and inevitable result that it involves. The future of the Jews is seriously menaced by economic impoverishment in the East, and by baptism and mixed marriages in the west of Europe. In addition to this, there is a decrease in the birth-rate of the latter.

The Jewish people which existed almost from the time when the history of the world began, which flourished in antiquity, which defied fire and sword in the Middle Ages, which is the only one of the nations that survived from the earliest times until to-day, whose representatives even to-day have brilliant achievements to their credit—it is just to this people that culture and the development of civilization have brought nothing but misfortune; they have estranged many of its best sons, and through political and economic anti-Semitism have slowly but surely taken away the ground from under the feet of the great masses.

It is therefore not impossible that Judaism may be disbanded in the near future—to be more precise, when the amelioration of the lot of the Jews will enable them to spread themselves still more. Are we justified in hindering these historical processes, which may mean the termination of thousandfold tribulations? Can the continued existence of a nation which is externally persecuted by fate, be of any value to us? What our sentiment says is quite clear; but what answer do we get from positive Science? Would it not be perhaps of great benefit to the development of civilization if the Jews were to assimilate with other races of high standing?

These are questions and problems which cannot be solved from our subjective point of view, but we must seek for an answer in Sociology, History and Natural Science. Which is better when considered from the general point of view, race-mixture or race-purity? The point of view which modern Science adopts towards the important questions of race-mixture and in-breeding is totally different from that which prevailed up till the last quarter of the preceding century.

Whereas it was formerly believed that in the intermarriage of two different races, the qualities of both component parts would appear in the

offspring, we know now that the question of race-mixture is by no means so simple. It is possible, but not certain, that only kindred elements could improve through crossing. On the other hand, the interbreeding of totally different nations produces a bastard type whose character is far below the level of either parent.

The observations made in countries which have a population of half-breeds, have pointed to the unfavorable effect of crossing. In India, the progress of race-crossing caused civilization to retrograde. We also know very well the wretched conditions of Central and South America, which are inhabited by half-breeds, whose cultural stagnation stands in striking contrast to the rapid and ambitious development of the United States and Canada. It is certain that the conditions in Central and South America must, to some extent, be considered as the result of race-crossing. It is true that also in North America the population arose from a blending of various nationalities. But here it was chiefly Englishmen, Frenchmen, Spaniards, Dutchmen and Germans; that is to say, nations which were closely related to one another, who were amalgamated; whereas in South America it was Spaniards, Indians, Negroes and Mongolians who formed affinities.

Colonization in newly discovered countries has always succeeded in those places where, like in North America, the conquering nations have avoided crossing. In Brazil, on the other hand, there rules an indescribable mixed type whose bodily, intellectual and moral energy is exceedingly enfeebled. The natives of South Africa have a proverb: 'God created the white man, God created the black man, but the devil created the mulatto.'

According to the laws of Nature, the general instinctive abilities, from which depth of talent and character emanate, dwindle among half-breeds; while individual abilities often become more pronounced. Almost all observers are unanimous that through cross-breeding, bodily shapeliness, facility of talent could be gained, but resistibility of body and strength of character are impaired. Furthermore, the ability to achieve anything great and extraordinary, as well as nobility of mind are, as a rule, unknown to half-breeds. The latter characteristics form the constitutional ability, and the former the individual. The constitutional type becomes enfeebled through crossing, and the more distant the two races are, the more pronounced is this weakening.

Let us take a few examples. On the coast of Labrador there are a great number of half-breeds which are the offspring of Eskimos and Scotch immigrants. The old Scotch settlers were able to brave the adverse surroundings more easily than the new generation. At present, tuberculosis is raging there. Also the other polar nations, who have for thousands of years defied the most dreadful influences of their surroundings, are now retrogressing, after crossing found its way among them. The only exceptions are the Tunguses, who with their own culture, withstood the European settlers. The same recurrence is repeated elsewhere. Wherever the intermixture is limitless, as in Hawaii, that type which is numerically weaker,

gradually dies out without even increasing the number of half-breeds. The crossing of the Hawaiians chiefly takes place with the Chinese. Besides, those islands were exempt from war, pestilence and starvation, which are otherwise the causes of the destruction of uncivilized peoples. The Tasmanians and Australian negroes have vanished through crossing. The Eurasians at Java, who are the offspring of Europeans and Indian natives, are weaklings who are rapidly perishing. The Spanish mulattoes in the Philippines are a bastard race, doomed to destruction. The bushmen have for hundreds of years waged the battle for existence under the hardest conditions, for Hottentots and Bantus were their superior enemies. And yet it is only now, after general intermixture stepped in, that they are about to disappear.

These examples will suffice to prove that crossing is one of the principal causes of the destruction of nations, and that the interbreeding of widely different types leads to the reduction of fertility and vitality. The difference of race and character leads as also animal breeders assert, to the formation of discordant, irresolute characters. It is for this reason that all half-breeds who are the offspring of widely different races have a had reptttation in respect to character.

In history there are many examples of the impossibility for half-breeds, even when their parents did not belong to races very far from each other, to reach a state capable of developing a living culture. This impossibility is also observed in cases where each nationality in itself possessed very great ability. All investigations thus point to the ennobling influences of racial purity, and to the destructive effects of racial chaos.

One calls to mind the flourishing nations of the ancient Orient: the Indians, Persians, Egyptians and Greeks. One also compares their former creativeness and influence with those of the time when the tide of foreign nations began to overwhelm them. How brave were the old Rornans, and how capable did the Germanic race that mingled with them prove to be later on; and yet how wretched was the product of this crossing! After the barbarism of the Middle Ages, it took about a millenium before men of firmly rooted greatness arose once more, and before the national character strongly and harmoniously asserted itself! How changed were the inhabitants of Greece after they absorbed the Slavonic tribes! What became of the Indians after the Arabs and Mongolians broke into their country? Each of these racial components proved itself capable of high culture, and yet the result was always a change for the worse for both parent-races. That these results were not due to historical and social conditions alone, can be seen from the case of smaller nations like the Armenians and Jews who have retained their racial purity, and have consequently preserved and increased their cultural ability despite their unhappy lot. One calls to mind the high cultural ability of the Moors and the Goths, and one considers the result of the mixture in Spain, when the Gothic population absorbed the former after the destruction of the Moorish rule. One also thinks of the racial medley of Germans, Slays and Tartars in Russia. It becomes evident from these

examples, not speaking of the single individuals, but of the greater majority, what a bad effect the mixture of races has. The normal historical development does not tend towards the effacement of race, but rather towards making the racial features more pronounced, and is thus combatting political influences. The quintessence of race is the hero, the genius.

From experiments on and observations of our domestic animals, we also learn that thoroughbred animals which possess superior characteristics, become deteriorated with respect to these very characteristics, through intermixture. The same holds good of the human races. It is now regarded as certain, that virtues and superior qualities are mostly to be found among races which have kept themselves pure, while mixed breeds usually develop the defects and vices of their parents, but none of their good sides.

There is thus no doubt that the power of heredity is more powerful among pure races. Potential cultural energy will always predominate in pure untainted races. It is only among such races that ingenious creative power as well as artistic and moral genius find a favorable home.

These are, accordingly, the answers which Science gives to-day to the above questions. Even from the cosmopolitan point of view, therefore, it would be no advantage if Judaism were to disappear through assimilation with those Slavonic nations, in whose midst the bulk of the Jews reside to-day. Such an event would be detrimental to both sides. We have to strive after race-purity, not after racial chaos. Greatness of intellect, and character in the highest degree, and genius, can only emanate from the rich source of instincts which are to be found in pure races. In order to get an exact idea of the power of instincts and the effect of heredity, we ought to bear in mind that every man, in twenty generations, is the product of more than a million forefathers, and in thirty generations he is the product of a thousand million forefathers. If all these forefathers descend from one race, this enormous sum of similar instinctive talent, and with it the strength of constitutional capacity, becomes manifest. For it is this constitutional type, as above indicated, which produces bodily resistance, depth of intellect and strength of character. And this constitutional type becomes enfeebled through crossing. Accordingly, if a nation wishes to achieve something great and powerful for itself and mankind, its policy with reference to the future must have only one aim: to force its way from racial chaos to racial purity.

We have proved by our investigations that the Jews have racial purity and that an extraordinary high racial value falls to their share. Their disappearance would not only be a national loss, but also an irretrievable loss for the general culture. But unfortunately, even at this present moment, this race is in danger of being destroyed. The conservation and further development of the distinguished possibilities that are found in this ancient race owing to its long-standing purity, are just now being questioned. For there is not so much danger to the Jew from baptism, as is usually maintained, as there is from intermarriage. In the first place, because baptism only finds its way among Jews of ignoble character, while intermarriage is

found among all classes; and secondly, because intermarriage is practiced even in countries where baptism, for one reason or another, is of rare occurrence.

In conclusion, I wish to repeat the following sentence which contains the social law appertaining to mixed marriages, and for which we have previously cited statistical proofs: Tribes which live together always intermarry when such marriages are not forbidden by law or religion. Since they have been scattered all over the globe, the Jews have mingled with other nations. Civil law to-day permits mixed marriages, and religion has actually begun to lose its authority.

In order to preserve the Jews for Judaism two remedies are possible: to preserve the Ghetto with its external and social influences, or to abolish the diaspora. The first alternative can only mean a continued morbid existence.

This is the Jewish question in a quite different sense from that in which it is usually conceived, namely, the question about the future lot of the Jewish race, which, after thousands of years of splendid development and stubborn resistance, now presents the sad picture of the body of a people which is partly perishing in misery and partly in course of decomposition.”¹⁸²⁸

Both the Nuremberg Laws and Zollschan’s racist Zionist tracts are derivative of Theodor Fritsch’s *Antisemiten-Katechismus: eine Zusammenstellung des wichtigsten Materials zum Verständniss der Judenfrage*, H. Beyer, Leipzig, (1893), pp. 358ff., the first edition of which was published in 1887 under the *nom de plume* Thomas Frey. An English translation of Fritsch’s “Ten German Commandments of Lawful Self-Defense” is found in P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), pp. 306-307, which book also contains translations of other early political anti-Semitic works, as does R. S. Levy’s *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991). Fritsch went on to publish numerous anti-Jewish works in collaboration with Adolf Hitler, including a German translation of *The International Jew: The World’s Foremost Problem*. Earlier racist proscriptions against intermarriage are found throughout the Old Testament, including, among other places:

“26:34 And Esau was forty years old when he took to wife Judith the daughter of Beerli the Hittite, and Bashemath the daughter of Elon the Hittite: 26:35 Which were a grief of mind unto Isaac and to Rebekah. [***] 28:1 And Isaac called Jacob, and blessed him, and charged him, and said unto him, Thou shalt not take a wife of the daughters of Canaan. 28:2 Arise, go to Padan-aram, to the house of Bethuel thy mother’s father; and take thee a wife from thence of the daughters of Laban thy mother’s brother. 28:3 And God Almighty bless thee, and make thee fruitful, and multiply thee, that thou mayest be a multitude of people; 28:4 And give thee the blessing of Abraham, to thee, and to thy seed with thee; that thou mayest inherit the land

wherein thou art a stranger, which God gave unto Abraham. 28:5 And Isaac sent away Jacob: and he went to Padan-aram unto Laban, son of Bethuel the Syrian, the brother of Rebekah, Jacob's and Esau's mother. 28:6¶ When Esau saw that Isaac had blessed Jacob, and sent him away to Padan-aram, to take him a wife from thence; and that as he blessed him he gave him a charge, saying, Thou shalt not take a wife of the daughters of Canaan; 28:7 And that Jacob obeyed his father and his mother, and was gone to Padan-aram; 28:8 And Esau seeing that the daughters of Canaan pleased not Isaac his father; 28:9 Then went Esau unto Ishmael, and took unto the wives which he had Mahalath the daughter of Ishmael Abraham's son, the sister of Nebajoth, to be his wife."—*Genesis* 26:34-35; 28:1-9

"14 For thou shalt worship no other god: for the LORD, whose name *is* Jealous, *is* a jealous God: 15 Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and they go a whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods, and *one* call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice; 16 And thou take of their daughters unto thy sons, and their daughters go a whoring after their gods, and make thy sons go a whoring after their gods."—*Exodus* 34:14-16

"20:24 But I have said unto you, Ye shall inherit their land, and I will give it unto you to possess it, a land that floweth with milk and honey: *I am* the LORD your God, which have separated you from *other* people. [***] 20:26 And ye shall be holy unto me: for I the LORD *am* holy, and have severed you from *other* people, that ye should be mine. [***] 21:14 A widow, or a divorced *woman*, or profane, *or* an harlot, these shall he not take: but he shall take a virgin of his own people to wife."—*Leviticus* 20:24, 26; 21:14

"This *is* the thing which the LORD doth command concerning the daughters of Zelophehad, saying, Let them marry to whom they think best; only to the family of the tribe of their father shall they marry. So shall not the inheritance of the children of Israel remove from tribe to tribe: for every one of the children of Israel shall keep himself to the inheritance of the tribe of his fathers."—*Numbers* 36:6-7

"When the LORD thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee, the Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than thou; 2 And when the LORD thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them, *and* utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them: 3 Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son. 4 For they will turn away thy son from following me, that they may serve other gods: so will the anger of the LORD be kindled against you, and destroy thee suddenly."—*Deuteronomy* 7:1-4

“12 Else if ye do in any wise go back, and cleave unto the remnant of these nations, *even* these that remain among you, and shall make marriages with them, and go in unto them, and they to you: 13 Know for a certainty that the LORD your God will no more drive out *any* of these nations from before you; but they shall be snares and traps unto you, and scourges in your sides, and thorns in your eyes, until ye perish from off this good land which the LORD your God hath given you.”—*Joshua* 23:12-13

“3:5 And the children of Israel dwelt among the Canaanites, Hittites, and Amorites, and Perizzites, and Hivites, and Jebusites: 3:6 And they took their daughters to be their wives, and gave their daughters to their sons, and served their gods. 3:7 And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the LORD, and forgot the LORD their God, and served Baalim and the groves. 3:8 Therefore the anger of the LORD was hot against Israel, and he sold them into the hand of Chushan-rishathaim king of Mesopotamia: and the children of Israel served Chushan-rishathaim eight years. [***] 14:1 And Samson went down to Timnath, and saw a woman in Timnath of the daughters of the Philistines. 14:2 And he came up, and told his father and his mother, and said, I have seen a woman in Timnath of the daughters of the Philistines: now therefore get her for me to wife. 14:3 Then his father and his mother said unto him, *Is there* never a woman among the daughters of thy brethren, or among all my people, that thou goest to take a wife of the uncircumcised Philistines? And Samson said unto his father, Get her for me; for she pleaseth me well. 14:4 But his father and his mother knew not that it *was* of the LORD, that he sought an occasion against the Philistines: for at that time the Philistines had dominion over Israel.”—*Judges* 3:5-8; 14:1-4

“But king Solomon loved many strange women, together with the daughter of Pharaoh, women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Zidonians, *and* Hittites: 2 Of the nations *concerning* which the LORD said unto the children of Israel, Ye shall not go in to them, neither shall they come in unto you: *for* surely they will turn away your heart after their gods: Solomon clave unto these in love. 3 And he had seven hundred wives, princesses, and three hundred concubines: and his wives turned away his heart. 4 For it came to pass, when Solomon was old, *that* his wives turned away his heart after other gods: and his heart was not perfect with the LORD his God, as *was* the heart of David his father. 5 For Solomon went after Ashtoreth the goddess of the Zidonians, and after Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites. 6 And Solomon did evil in the sight of the LORD, and went not fully after the LORD, as *did* David his father. 7 Then did Solomon build an high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill that *is* before Jerusalem, and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon. 8 And likewise did he for all his strange wives, which burnt incense and sacrificed unto their gods.”—*I Kings* 11:1-8

“9:1 Now when these *things* were done, the princes came to me, saying, The people of Israel, and the priests, and the Levites, have not separated themselves from the people of the lands, *doing* according to their abominations, *even* of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Egyptians, and the Amorites. 9:2 For they have taken of their daughters for themselves, and for their sons: so that the holy seed have mingled themselves with the people of *those* lands: yea, the hand of the princes and rulers hath been chief in this trespass. 9:3 And when I heard this thing, I rent my garment and my mantle, and plucked off the hair of my head and of my beard, and sat down astonished. 9:4 Then were assembled unto me every one that trembled at the words of the God of Israel, because of the transgression of those that had been carried away; and I sat astonished until the evening sacrifice. 9:5 And at the evening sacrifice I arose up from my heaviness; and having rent my garment and my mantle, I fell upon my knees, and spread out my hands unto the LORD my God. 9:6 And said, O my God, I am ashamed and blush to lift up my face to thee, my God: for our iniquities are increased over *our* head, and our trespass is grown up unto the heavens. 9:7 Since the days of our fathers *have we been* in a great trespass unto this day; and for our iniquities have we, our kings, *and* our priests, been delivered into the hand of the kings of the lands, to the sword, to captivity, and to a spoil, and to confusion of face, as *it is* this day. 9:8 And now for a little space grace hath been *shewed* from the LORD our God, to leave us a remnant to escape, and to give us a nail in his holy place, that our God may lighten our eyes, and give us a little reviving in our bondage. 9:9 For we *were* bondmen; yet our God hath not forsaken us in our bondage, but hath extended mercy unto us in the sight of the kings of Persia, to give us a reviving, to set up the house of our God, and to repair the desolations thereof, and to give us a wall in Judah and in Jerusalem. 9:10 And now, O our God, what shall we say after this? for we have forsaken thy commandments, 9:11 Which thou hast commanded by thy servants the prophets, saying, The land, *unto* which ye go to possess it, *is* an unclean land with the filthiness of the people of the lands, with their abominations, which have filled it from one end to another with their uncleanness. 9:12 Now therefore give not your daughters unto their sons, neither take their daughters unto your sons, nor seek their peace or their wealth for ever: that ye may be strong, and eat the good of the land, and leave *it* for an inheritance to your children for ever. 9:13 And after all that is come upon us for our evil deeds, and for our great trespass, seeing that thou our God hast punished us less than our iniquities *deserve*, and hast given us *such* deliverance as this; 9:14 Should we again break thy commandments, and join in affinity with the people of these abominations? wouldest not thou be angry with us till *thou* hadst consumed us, so that *there should be* no remnant nor escaping? 9:15 O LORD God of Israel, thou *art* righteous: for we remain *yet* escaped, as *it is* this day: behold, *we are* before thee in our trespasses: for *we* cannot stand before thee because of this. [***] 10:17 And they made an end with all the men that had taken

strange wives by the first day of the first month. 10:18¶ And among the sons of the priests there were found that had taken strange wives: *namely*, of the sons of Jeshua the son of Jozadak, and his brethren; Maaseiah, and Eliezer, and Jarib, and Gedaliah. 10:19 And they gave their hands that they would put away their wives; and *being* guilty, *they offered* a ram of the flock for their trespass. [***] 10:44 All these had taken strange wives: and *some* of them had wives by whom they had children.”—*Ezra* 9; 10:17-19, 44

“9:2 And the seed of Israel separated themselves from all strangers, and stood and confessed their sins, and the iniquities of their fathers. [***] 13:3 Now it came to pass, when they had heard the law, that they separated from Israel all the mixed multitude. [***] 13:23¶ In those days also saw I Jews *that* had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, *and* of Moab: 13:24 And their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews’ language, but according to the language of each people. 13:25 And I contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair, and made them swear by God, *saying*, Ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons, nor take their daughters unto your sons, or for yourselves. 13:26 Did not Solomon king of Israel sin by these *things*? yet among many nations was there no king like him, who was beloved of his God, and God made him king over all Israel: *nevertheless* even him did outlandish women cause to sin. 13:27 Shall we then hearken unto you to do all this great evil, to transgress against our God in marrying strange wives? 13:28 And *one* of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib the high priest, *was* son in law to Sanballat the Horonite: therefore I chased him from me. 13:29 Remember them, O my God, because they have defiled the priesthood, and the covenant of the priesthood, and of the Levites. 13:30 Thus cleansed I them from all strangers, and appointed the wards of the priests and the Levites, every one in his business;”—*Nehemiah* 9:2; 13:3, 23-30

In September of 1935, the Nazis passed the anti-miscegenation Nuremberg Laws, which proscribed intermarriage and sexual contact between “Jews” and “Aryans”. Many Zionists were delighted. Despite the fact that these laws needlessly caused many Jews great pain and suffering, the Zionists, many of them hypocrites, rejoiced in the fact that the “race” of Jews had been saved from the death of assimilation. Their religion taught them to oppose “intermarriage” and to consider Jews who intermarried as traitors against God who must be killed.

The Old Testament is filled with proscriptions against “intermarriage”. Those who fabricated the Old Testament riddled it with racist messages to frighten anyone who would marry outside of the fold, and to provide the community with a justification to murder those who elected to “intermarry”. The ills of the Jews were often blamed on “intermarriage”, which allegedly brought down God’s wrath upon them. Even Solomon the wise is said to have been ruined by “intermarriage”. While tied to religion, the real motivation behind the myths is racism. The Biblical stories tell the Jews to keep the seed of Abraham pure so that there will be a pure race of

God's chosen to rule the world and subjugate the allegedly inferior Gentiles. In the Old Testament, God punished the Jews for "intermarriage" with death—God often instructed the Jews to murder their own people who "intermarried". [For example, *Malachi 2:12*—to "cut off" means to kill.]

On 26 April 1946, Nazi propagandist Julius Streicher affirmed at the Nuremberg Trials that the Nuremberg Laws of 1935 were patterned after Jewish Law,¹⁸²⁹

"Yes, I believe I had a part in it insofar as for years I have written that any further mixture of German blood with Jewish blood must be avoided. I have written such articles again and again; and in my articles I have repeatedly emphasized the fact that the Jews should serve as an example to every race, for they created a racial law for themselves—the law of Moses, which says, 'If you come into a foreign land you shall not take unto yourself foreign women.' And that, Gentlemen, is of tremendous importance in judging the Nuremberg Laws. These laws of the Jews were taken as a model for these laws. When, after centuries, the Jewish lawgiver Ezra discovered that notwithstanding many Jews had married non-Jewish women, these marriages were dissolved. That was the beginning of Jewry which, because it introduced these racial laws, has survived throughout the centuries, while all other races and civilizations have perished."¹⁸³⁰

Dr. Marx asked Julius Streicher, and note that the "1935 legislation" called for the segregation of Jews, not the extermination of the Jews, and was lauded by Zionists like Georg Kareski,¹⁸³¹

"Were you of the opinion that the 1935 legislation represented the final solution of the Jewish question by the State?"¹⁸³²

Streicher responded that Zionism was the final solution of the Jewish question,

"With reservations, yes. I was convinced that if the Party program was carried out, the Jewish question would be solved. The Jews became German citizens in 1848. Their rights as citizens were taken from them by these laws. Sexual intercourse was prohibited. For me, this represented the solution of the Jewish problem in Germany. But I believed that another international solution would still be found, and that some day discussions would take place between the various states with regard to the demands made by Zionism. These demands aimed at a Jewish state."¹⁸³³

Bernhard Lösener found common ground with the Zionists in the new Nuremberg Laws. He stated in November of 1935,

"If the Jews already had their own state in which the greater part of their people were settled, then the Jewish question could be considered completely resolved today, also for the Jews themselves. The least amount of opposition

to the underlying ideas of the Nürnberg Laws has been raised by Zionists, because they know at once that these laws represent the only correct solution for the Jewish people as well. For each nation must have its own state as the outward form of appearance of its particular nationhood.”¹⁸³⁴

The new laws did indeed meet with much applause from the political Zionists, who had for years been vocal advocates of such a policy.¹⁸³⁵ The political Zionists even went so far as to take credit for the Nuremberg Laws unto themselves, as if it were an honor. A. I. Berndt, an editor, published a statement of solidarity with the Nazi restrictions in the *Jüdische Rundschau* on 17 September 1935, stating, *inter alia*,

“Germany has merely drawn the practical consequences from this and is meeting the demands of the International Zionist Congress when it declares the Jews now living in Germany to be a national minority. *Once the Jews have been stamped a national minority* it is again possible to establish normal relations between the German Nation and Jewry. The new Laws give the Jewish minority in Germany their own cultural life, their own national life. In future they will be able to shape their own schools, their own theater, their own sports associations; in short, they can create their own future in all aspects of national life. On the other hand, it is evident that from now on and for the *future* there can be *no interference* in questions connected with the Government of the German people, that there can be no interference in the national affairs of the German Nation.”¹⁸³⁶

Georg Kareski, “the Jew who has accepted office under the Nazi Government as Reich Commissioner for Jewish Cultural Affairs”,¹⁸³⁷ whom Lenni Brenner called a “Hitler’s Zionist Quisling before Quisling”,¹⁸³⁸ stated in an interview in the Nazi Party’s *Der Angriff* in late 1935, as quoted in “Georg Kareski Approves of Ghetto Laws. Interview in Dr Goebbels’ ‘Angriff’ ”, *The Jewish Chronicle* on 3 January 1936 on page 16,

“I have for many years regarded a complete separation between the cultural activities of the two peoples as a condition for a peaceful collaboration and I have always been in favour of such a separation, provided it is founded on the respect for the alien nationality. [***] The Nuremberg Laws of September 15th, 1935, seem to me, apart from their legal provisions, entirely to conform with this desire for a separate life based on mutual respect.”¹⁸³⁹

The racist legacy of political Zionism, and of Judaism, lingers. Israeli Supreme Court Justice Haim Cohn was quoted in *The London Times* on 25 July 1963 on page 8:

“It is one of the bitterest ironies of fate that the same biological or racist approach which was propagated by the Nazis and characterized the infamous Nuremberg laws should, because of an allegedly sacrosanct Jewish tradition,

become the basis for the official determination or rejection of Jewishness in the state of Israel.”¹⁸⁴⁰

Years later, Zionist Meir Kahane sought to establish the Nuremberg-style laws in Israel.¹⁸⁴¹ Kahane wrote on 11 May 1979,

“We will also act to end the relationships between Arab men and Jewish women that is now growing and that so desecrates the Name of G-d.”¹⁸⁴²

After leading Jews announced that “Judea Declares War on Germany”¹⁸⁴³ in March of 1933, and instituted a boycott of German goods following Hitler’s election, there was a very short-lived boycott of Jewish businesses in Germany, on 1 April 1933. Nazis placed yellow and black emblems in the storefronts of Jewish owned shops, despite the fact that most German Jews were loyal to the Fatherland. Strangely, Robert Weltsch published an editorial in the *Jüdische Rundschau*, which was the official party organ of the Zionist Federation of Germany, in which he blamed assimilationist Jews for Nazism. He called on Jews to bear the medieval stigmata with pride. The resentment Weltsch expressed towards assimilationist Jews leads one to wonder if the Nazis were created in order to sponsor Zionism and eventually to punish those who would not embrace the cause after being warned of the consequences of a failure to do so—should the Jews of Europe continue to resist emigrating away from their homes after being warned. Weltsch wrote, *inter alia*,

“What should be recommended at this time is that the work which witnessed the infancy of Zionism, Theodor Herzl’s *The Jewish State*, be disseminated among Jews and non-Jews in hundreds of thousands of copies. If there is still left any feeling for greatness and nobility, gallantry and justice, then every National Socialist who looks into this book is bound to shudder at his own blind actions. Every Jew who reads it would also begin to understand and would be consoled and uplifted by it. Page after page of this booklet, which first appeared in 1896, would have to be copied to show that Theodor Herzl was the first Jew dispassionate enough to examine anti-Semitism in connection with the Jewish question. And he recognized that an improvement cannot be effected by ostrich-like behavior, but only by dealing with facts frankly and in full view of the world. . .

We Jews who have been raised in Theodor Herzl’s spirit want to ask ourselves what our own guilt is, what sins we have committed. At times of crisis throughout its history, the Jewish people has faced the question of its own guilt. Our most important prayer says, ‘We were expelled from our country because of our sins.’ Only if we are critical toward ourselves shall we be just toward others.

Jewry bears a great guilt because it failed to heed Theodor Herzl’s call and even mocked it in some instances. The Jews refused to acknowledge that ‘the Jewish question still exists.’ They thought the only important thing was not to be recognized as Jews. Today we are being reproached with having

betrayed the German people; the National Socialist press calls us the 'enemies of the nation,' and there is nothing we can do about it. It is not true that the Jews have betrayed Germany. If they have betrayed anything, they have betrayed themselves and Judaism.

Because the Jews did not display their Jewishness with pride, because they wanted to shirk the Jewish question, they must share the blame for the degradation of Jewry. . . ."¹⁸⁴⁴

Though many Jews and philo-Semites organized an international boycott of German goods in hopes of defeating the Hitler régime, there was one place where German products and services were not only welcomed, they were commissioned. In Palestine, Zionists worked in collusion with the Nazis to extort monies from Jews emigrating from Germany to Palestine and to use those funds to buy German products, thus annulling the effect of the boycotts and stimulating Hitler's economy with investment capital. This conspiracy to take the wealth of German Jews and use it to further persecute European Jews in the interest of forcing Jews into Palestine was called the "Ha'avara Agreement",¹⁸⁴⁵ which fulfilled Herzl's plan for both Zionists and anti-Semites to profiteer from the suffering and expulsion of assimilationist Jews. Hitler, the SS and the Gestapo, being staunch Zionists, supported Ha'avara over the objections of the more authentically anti-Semitic, pro-German, members of the Nazi Party.¹⁸⁴⁶ A good deal of evidence of the collaboration of Nazis and Zionists is presented in Roger Garaudy's book *Les Mythes Fondateurs de la Politique Israélienne*, Samizdat, Paris, (1996); English translations: *The Founding Myths of Israeli Politics*, and *The Mythical Foundations of Israeli Policy*, Studies Forum International, London, (1997) and *The Founding Myths of Modern Israel*, Institute for Historical Review, Newport Beach, California, (2000).

The Zionist Federation of Germany (*Zionistische Vereinigung für Deutschland*, or ZVfD) welcomed Hitler and the Nazi Party as their best hope for forcing Jews into Zionism.¹⁸⁴⁷ The Federation celebrated the emergence of governmental and nationalistic racism in Germany. On 21 June 1933, soon after Hitler was elected, they sent a memorandum to the Nazi Government embracing and encouraging Nazism. This memorandum iterated many prevalent Zionist myths, such as the belief that the emancipation of Jews by the French Revolution caused assimilation which was destructive to the "Jewish race" and to "Gentile races". The memorandum also anticipated the segregationist spirit of the Nuremberg Laws. The Zionist Federation of Germany's memoranda stated, among other things,

"The emancipation of the Jews, begun at the end of the 18th, beginning of the 19th century, was based on the idea that the Jewish question could be solved by having the nation-state absorb the Jews living in its midst. This view, deriving from the ideas of the French Revolution, discerned only the individual, the single human being freely suspended in space, without regarding the ties of blood and history or spiritual distinctiveness. Accordingly, the liberal state demanded of the Jews assimilation into the non-Jewish environment. Baptism and mixed marriage were encouraged in

political and economic life. Thus it happened that innumerable persons of Jewish origin had the chance to occupy important positions and to come forward as representatives of German culture and German life, without having their belonging to Jewry become visible. [***] On the foundation of the new state, which has established the principle of race, we wish so to fit our community into the total structure so that for us too, in the sphere assigned to us, fruitful activity for the Fatherland is possible. We believe it is precisely the new Germany that can, through bold resoluteness in the handling of the Jewish question, take a decisive step toward overcoming a problem which, in truth, will have to be dealt with by most European peoples—including those whose foreign-policy statements today deny the existence of any such problem in their own midst. [***] Thus, a self-conscious Jewry here described, in whose name we speak, can find a place in the structure of the German state, because it is inwardly unembarrassed, free from the resentment which assimilated Jews must feel at the determination that they belong to Jewry, to the Jewish race and past. We believe in the possibility of an honest relationship of loyalty between a group-conscious Jewry and the German state. [***] We are not blind to the fact that a Jewish question exists and will continue to exist. From the abnormal situation of the Jews severe disadvantages result for them, but also scarcely tolerable conditions for other peoples. Our observations, presented herewith, rest on the conviction that, in solving the Jewish problem according to its own lights, the German Government will have full understanding for a candid and clear Jewish posture that harmonizes with the interests of the state.”¹⁸⁴⁸

In 1937, evidently referring to the above cited memoranda of the Zionist Federation of Germany, Zionist Joachim Prinz recalled,

“Everyone in Germany knew that only the Zionists could responsibly represent the Jews in dealings with the Nazi government. We all felt sure that one day the government would arrange a round table conference with the Jews, at which—after the riots and atrocities of the revolution had passed—the new status of German Jewry could be considered. The government announced very solemnly that there was no country in the world which tried to solve the Jewish problem as seriously as did Germany. Solution of the Jewish question? It was our Zionist dream! We never denied the existence of the Jewish question! Dissimilation? It was our own appeal! . . . In a statement notable for its pride and dignity, we called for a conference.”¹⁸⁴⁹

On 4 August 1933, the *Jüdische Rundschau*, the official party organ of the Zionist Federation of Germany, published an article entitled “Rasse als Kulturfaktor” on page 392, which stated,

“We who live here as a ‘foreign race’ have to respect racial consciousness and the racial interest of the German people absolutely. This however does not preclude a peaceful living together of people of different racial membership. The smaller the possibility of an undesirable mixture, so much less is there need for ‘racial protection’. . . There are differentiations that in the last analysis have their root in ancestry. Only rationalist newspapers who have lost feeling for the deeper reasons and profundities of the soul, and for the origins of communal consciousness, could put aside ancestry as simply in the realm of ‘natural history’.”¹⁸⁵⁰

Heinz Höhne wrote,

“Alongside this majority [of patriotic German-Jews who did not wish to leave Germany], however, a small group of Zionist spokesmen was at work, and their object was to turn the minds of German Jewry away from their traditional German patriotism and direct them towards Palestine. Initially therefore they regarded the advent of National-Socialism as by no means a catastrophe; in their eyes it presented Zionism with a unique opportunity to fulfil its object, the return to a Jewish State and Jewish national consciousness. The rise of anti-Semitism in Germany exerted a curious fascination over the Zionists, for in it they saw the defeat of westernised Jewry which, they considered, was striving to identify itself with the non-Jewish industrialised peoples. After the Nazi seizure of power the Zionist newspaper *Jüdische Rundschau* proclaimed on a note of triumph: ‘An ideology has collapsed; we will not lament it but will think of the future.’³⁸

Many were tempted to regard 30 January 1933 as a favourable turning-point in Jewish history—‘Jewry for the Jews’ could become the watchword once more. This remark was to be found in an article entitled ‘We Jews’ written by a young Rabbi, Dr Joachim Prinz. (Hans Lamm, the historian of German Jewry under the Third Reich, described it as ‘a curious, almost apologetic, interpretation of the anti-Semitic phenomenon.’) Prinz considered that ‘there can be no further evasion of this Jewish problem; emancipation has forced the Jew to accept anonymity and deny his Jewish nationality.’ But this, he continued, had not profited the Jews at all. ‘Among those who nevertheless realised that a man was a Jew, this anonymity gave rise to the tensions generated by mistrust and the sense of contact with a foreigner.’ What solution could there be to the Jewish tragedy other than to take the road to Palestine? Prinz continued: ‘No subterfuge can save us now. In place of assimilation we desire to establish a new concept— recognition of the Jewish nation and Jewish race.’³⁹

For the Jewish nationalists the prospect was tempting; under the pressure of German racialism and with its assistance the Zionist ideal might win that victory denied it in the humanitarian and democratic atmosphere of the Weimar republic. If both the Zionists and National-Socialists regarded race and nationhood as universally valid criteria, some common ground must be

discoverable between the two. As early as 13 June 1933, the *Jüdische Rundschau* had come out into the open: ‘Zionism recognises the existence of a Jewish problem and desires a far-reaching and constructive solution. For this purpose Zionism wishes to obtain the assistance of all peoples, whether pro- or anti-Jewish, because in its view, we are dealing here with a concrete rather than a sentimental problem, in the solution of which all peoples are interested.’⁴⁰

At this point von Mildenstein stepped in. The task of the SD, he argued, was to turn the German-assimilated Jews back into ‘conscious Jews, to promote ‘dissimilation’ in order to awaken in the breasts of the largest possible number of Jews the urge to go to Palestine, the only country open at the time to large-scale Jewish immigration. Himmler seized on Mildenstein’s plan and set him to work. Within the SD Hauptamt Mildenstein set up a Jewish desk (entitled II 112); a period of SS Jewish policy began in which, according to Hans Lamm, ‘the adoption or affectation of a pro-Zionist attitude’ was in order.⁴¹

The new SS policy made its first appearance in the columns of the *Schwarze Korps*; in place of the paper’s anti-Jewish tirades references began to appear to the ‘sensible, totally unsentimental Jew’ of the Zionist movement. The paper forecast: ‘The time cannot be far distant when Palestine will again be able to accept its sons who have been lost to it for over a thousand years. Our good wishes together with our official goodwill go with them.’^{42, 1851}

An SS officer, Baron Leopold Itz von Mildenstein traveled to Palestine and reported on his impressions in the official Nazi Party organ *Der Angriff* in a series of twelve articles under the heading “Ein Nazi fährt nach Palästina” from 26 September 1934 to 9 October 1934. As director of the central office of the “Jewish desk” in the intelligence branch of the SS, Mildenstein promoted the Zionist cause in Nazi Germany. His primary goal was to convert reluctant Jews to Zionism. Jacob Boas wrote,

“The gist of that policy was to assist the expansion of Zionist influence among Germany’s Jews who, despite the oppressive conditions under which they lived, still showed no great desire to emigrate to Palestine. By making a distinction between race-minded, emigration-conscious Zionists and ‘assimilationists’ out to destroy National Socialism, the S. S. strove to strengthen the Zionist position in the Jewish community. Accordingly, S. S. officials were instructed to encourage the activities of Zionists and to discourage those of non-Zionists. Zionists were given privileges denied to other groups. A police decree of March, 1935, for example, ordered officers to favour Zionist youth groups over non-Zionist ones; the former were to be allowed to don uniforms but not the latter. The S. S. also looked with favour on the Zionist vocational and agricultural training centres which groomed young Jews for a life of toil in Palestine, and access to Nazi functionaries

generally proved easier for Zionists than for assimilationists. Even the Nuremberg Laws (September 15th, 1935), which deprived Jews of their German citizenship and condemned them to pariah status, contained a special ‘Zionist’ provision: forbidden to fly the German colours, Jews were given the right to hoist their own flag, i. e. the Zionist emblem, the blue Star of David between stripes, also blue, against a white background.”¹⁸⁵²

The SS issued a report in the summer of 1934 which recommended that Jewish youth be trained for the laborious task of improving Palestine for massive settlement. The report recommended that the German Government sponsor Zionism and persuade German-Jewish leadership to promote the Zionist cause. Should this fail, other measures would have to be taken.¹⁸⁵³ On 26 September 1935, *Das Schwarze Korps*, the official organ of the *Schutzstaffeln* (SS), reported,

“In the context of its *Weltanschauung*, National Socialism has no intention of attacking the Jewish people in any way. On the contrary, the recognition of Jewry as a racial community based on blood, and not as a religious one, leads the German government to guarantee the racial separateness of this community without any limitations. The government finds itself in complete agreement with the great spiritual movement within Jewry itself, the so-called Zionism, with its recognition of the solidarity of Jewry throughout the world and the rejection of all assimilationist ideas. On this basis, Germany undertakes measures that will surely play a significant role in the future in the handling of the Jewish problem around the world.”¹⁸⁵⁴

This statement relates to the fact that the Zionists had reacted negatively to Moses Mendelssohn’s reforms of Judaism to make it a universal spiritual religion, as opposed to the racist and nationalistic religion found in the Old Testament. Zionists like Moses Hess asserted in consort with anti-Semites, that Judaism is not a religion, but a race and a nation, and that Jews produced their religion as a product of their unique racial characteristics. In 1862, racist Zionist Moses Hess called the “new Jew” a traitor to the “Jewish race”,

“The most touching point about these Hebrew prayers is, that they are really an expression of the collective Jewish spirit; they do not plead for the individual, but for the entire Jewish race. The pious Jew is above all a Jewish patriot. The ‘new’ Jew, who denies the existence of the Jewish nationality, is not only a deserter in the religious sense, but is also a traitor to his people, his race and even to his family. If it were true that Jewish emancipation in exile is incompatible with Jewish nationality, then it were the duty of the Jews to sacrifice the former for the sake of the latter. This point, however, may need a more elaborate explanation, but that the Jew must be above all a Jewish patriot, needs no proof to those who have received a Jewish education. Jewish patriotism is not a cloudy Germanic abstraction, which dissolves itself in discussions about being and appearance, realism and

idealism, but a true, natural feeling, the tangibility and simplicity of which require no demonstration, nor can it be disposed of by a demonstration to the contrary.”¹⁸⁵⁵

In Hess’ view, better the Ghetto and persecution than emancipation, if emancipation meant assimilation. Hess asserted that a “race war” was needed to subjugate the German People to submit to Hess’ racist Zionist ideology,

“The democrats of 1848 undoubtedly fully demonstrated their superiority over the demagogues of the ‘War of Liberation,’ the Romantic lads of the Jahn and Arndt type, whom they left far behind on the road of progress. And yet, on the basis of my long experience, I feel inclined to assert that Germany as a whole, in spite of its collective intellectuality, is in its practical social life far behind the rest of the civilized nations of Europe. The race war must first be fought out and definitely settled before social and humane ideas become part and parcel of the German people, as was the case with the Romance peoples which, after a long historical process, finally defeated race antagonism.”¹⁸⁵⁶

Hess described Judaism as a national cult and argued that the essence of Judaism is national, and that pure Judaism, which balances spiritualism with materialism, would supplant the spiritual extremism of the Christian Judaic cult, which Hess alleged was out of balance and therefore unstable. Hess believed that things evolve in three stages and that the modern age is the Messianic Age, begun by Spinoza and the French Revolution. Hess adopted the racism of Judaism and of German Folkish mythology and expressed his beliefs that there are various races which each serve their function in the human organism led by Jews, allegedly the true People of God. He wanted to kill off the “German race”—eliminate Esau—with “Jewish love” in this third era of human history, so that the Jews can lead the world into a Utopia dominated by the “Jewish race”, as prophesied in the Hebrew Bible,

“The laws of universal history, I mean the history of the universe, namely, those of the cosmic, organic and social life, are as yet little known. We have particular sciences, but not a science of the universe; we still do not know the unity of all life. One thing, however, is certain, that a fusion of cults, an ideal to which so many aspire, and which was realized, at least in part, for thousands of years by Catholic Rome, will as little establish a lasting peace in human society as the philanthropic but unscientific belief in the absolute equality of men. In their attempt to base the granting of equal rights to all men on the primitive uniformity of all races and types, the humanitarians confound the organization of social life on the basis of solidarity, which is the result of a long and painful process of historical development, with a ready-made, inorganic equality and uniformity, which becomes rarer and rarer the farther back we go in history. The reconciliation of races follows its own natural laws, which we can neither arbitrarily create

nor change. As to the fusion of cults, it is really a past stage in the development of social life. It was the watchword of that religion which, owes its existence to the death of the nations of antiquity, i.e., Christianity. To-day the real problem is how free the various oppressed races and folk-types and allow them to develop in their own way. The dangerous possibility that the various nationalities will separate themselves entirely from each other or ignore each other is to be feared as little as the danger that they will fight among themselves and enslave one another.

The present-day national movement not only does not exclude humanitarianism, but strongly asserts it; for this movement is a wholesome reaction, not against humanism, but against the things that would encroach upon it and cause its degeneration, against the leveling tendencies of modern industry and civilization which threaten to deaden every original organic life-force, by introducing a uniform inorganic mechanism. As long as these tendencies were directed against the antiquated institutions of a long-passed historical period, their existence was justified. Nor can this nationalistic reaction object to them, insofar as they endeavor to establish closer relations between the various nations of the world. But, fortunately, people have gone so far in life, as well as in science, as to deny the typical and the creative; and as a result the vapor of idealism, on the one hand, and the dust of atomism on the other, rest like mildew on the red corn, and stifle the germinating life in the bud. It is against these encroachments on the most sacred principles of creative life that the national tendencies of our time react, and it is against these destructive forces that I appeal to the original national power of Judaism.

Like the general universal cosmic life which finds its termination in it, and the individual microcosmic life in which all the buds and fruits of the spirit finally ripen. Humanity is a living organism, of which races and peoples are the members. In every organism changes are continually going on. Some, quite prominent in the embryonic stage, disappear in the later development. There are organs, on the other hand, hardly noticeable in the earlier existence of the organism, which become important only when the organism reaches the end of its development.

To the latter class of members of organic humanity (which class is really the creative one) belongs the Jewish people. This people was hardly noticeable in the world, where it was greatly oppressed by its powerful, conquering neighbors. Twice it came near being destroyed; namely, in the Egyptian and Babylonian captivities; and twice it rose to new spiritual life and fought long and successfully against the mightiest as well as the most civilized peoples of antiquity—the Greeks and the Romans. Finally, in the last struggle of the ancient world, it was this people which fertilized the genius of humanity with its own spirit, so as to rejuvenate itself, along with the regeneration of humanity. To-day, when the process of rejuvenation of the historical peoples is ended and each nation has its special function in the organism of humanity, we are for the first time beginning to conceive the

special significance of the various organs of humanity.

England, with its industrial organization, represents the nerve-force of humanity which directs and regulates the alimentary system of mankind; France, that of general motion, namely, the social; Germany discharges the function of thinking; and America represents the general regenerating power by means of which all elements of the historical peoples will be assimilated into one. We observe that every modern people, every part of modern society, displays in its activity as an organ of humanity a special calling, then he must also determine the importance and function of the only ancient people which still exists to-day, as strong and vigorous as it was in days of old, namely, the people of Israel.

In the organism of humanity there are no two peoples which attract and repel each other more than the Germans and the Jews; just as there are no two mental attitudes which are simultaneously akin to each other and still diametrically opposed, as the scientific-philosophical and the religious-moral. Religion, in its higher form, is the spiritual tie which binds the creature to the Creator, the infinite thread, the end of which returns to its source, the bridge which leads from one creation to the other, from life to death, and from death back to life. It not only brings man to know the Absolute more intimately, but it inspires and sanctifies his whole life with the divine spirit. In religion, as in love, especially in a religion like Judaism, which is neither one-sidedly materialistic nor one-sidedly spiritualistic, body and spirit merge into one another. The greatest and most dangerous enemy of the Jewish religion in antiquity was the religion of gross sensualist, the material love of the Semites, namely, Baal worship. In mediæval ages, the enemy was represented by the embodiment of spiritualistic love—Christianity. The Jewish people which, thanks to its prophets of antiquity and rabbis of the Middle Ages, kept its religion from both extremes of degeneration, was, and is still to-day that organ of humanity which expresses the living, creative force in universal history, namely, the organ of unifying and sanctifying love. This organ is akin to the organ of thought, but is, at the same time, opposed to it. Both draw their force from the inexhaustible well of life. But, while the religious genius individualizes the infinite, philosophic, scientific thought abstracts from life all its individual, subjective forms and generalizes it. Objective philosophy and science have no direct connection with life; religious teaching is intimately united with it, for either religion is identical with the national, social and moral life, or it is mere hypocrisy.

I have wandered from my trend of thought. I merely wanted to explain to you why I do not ally myself with the humanitarian aspirations which endeavor to obliterate all differentiation in the organism of humanity and in the name of such catch words as 'Liberty' and 'Progress,' build altars to arbitrariness and ignorance, on which our light-minded youth offers its best energies and sacrifices.¹⁸⁵⁷

Die Geheime Staatspolizei (the Gestapo) also assisted the Zionists, as Zionist leader Hans Friedenthal noted,

“The Gestapo did everything in those days to promote emigration, particularly to Palestine. We often received their help when we required anything from other authorities regarding preparations for emigration. This position remained constant and uniform the entire time, until the year 1938.”¹⁸⁵⁸

In April of 1936, Zionist Meyer Steinglass quoted Zionist Emil Ludwig in the *American Jewish Times*,

“Hitler will be forgotten in a few years, but he will have a beautiful monument in Palestine. You know’, and here the biographer-historian seemed to assume the role of a patriarchal Jew—‘the coming of the Nazis was rather a welcome thing. So many of our German Jews were hovering between two coasts; so many of them were riding the treacherous current between the Scylla of assimilation and the Charybdis of a nodding acquaintance with Jewish things. Thousands who seemed to be completely lost to Judaism were brought back to the fold by Hitler, and for that I am personally very grateful to him.”¹⁸⁵⁹

In 1937, it was becoming increasingly clear to both the Nazis and the Zionists that the mere existence of the Nazi regime was not enough to drive Jews into Zionism, and that even if it were, Great Britain and other nations had placed too many obstacles in the way of a massive migration to Palestine for Zionism to succeed. The Ha’avara Agreement was a failure. The British had long wanted Palestine for a route to India and later to oil, ironically thoughts which were implanted into the British mind by opportunistic Jewish Zionists. Many of the German Jews who had fled to Palestine quickly became disenchanted with the desert and returned to Germany. The Nazis soon began to target Jews, especially healthy rich assimilated male Jews, for arrest and imprisonment in concentration camps. It was inexplicable act of self-destruction for the Germans headed by two Jews, Reinhard Heydrich and Adolf Eichmann.

Theodor Herzl had long ago warned rich assimilated Jews that if they did not follow the political Zionists, there would be dire consequences for them. Herzl wrote in his book *The Jewish State*,

“The Governments of all countries scourged by Anti-Semitism will serve their own interests in assisting us to obtain the sovereignty we want. [***] Great exertions will not be necessary to spur on the movement. Anti-Semites provide the requisite impetus. They need only do what they did before, and then they will create a love of emigration where it did not previously exist, and strengthen it where it existed before. [***] I imagine that Governments will, either voluntarily or under pressure from the Anti-Semites, pay certain

attention to this scheme; and they may perhaps actually receive it here and there with a sympathy which they will also show to the Society of Jews.”¹⁸⁶⁰

In the early 1940's, the Zionists had drawn the inhuman conclusion that since all other avenues had been tried and had failed, the only avenue for success for their tyrannical vision was the literal destruction of assimilatory Jewry. The Zionists had always exhibited an ungodly hubris and believed that they had the God given right to decide for all Jews and for all the world how each individual Jew must act and think. The Zionists' dogma was similar in this respect to the dogmatic insistence of the Marxists that they had a right to ruin the lives of the peoples the world over in order to promote the destruction of Capitalism and set the stage for their Communist world revolution. Marxists, too, believed that they knew better than each individual how that individual must think and how he or she must act. Many Zionists and Marxists believed that those who dared disagree with their “truths” must be rescued from themselves, by death if necessary—or even just convenient—to them life and liberty are cheap and comradeship means blind obedience—ultimately blind obedience to genocidal Jewish bankers seeking to create the “Jewish Utopia” of the “end times” of Jewish Messianic myth. Knowing what was soon to come, knowing the Zionist Nazis were about to turn up the heat on European Jews, some Zionists began to pull away from their public expressions of unity with the Nazis in the late 1930's, while working with Nazi authorities behind the scenes to annihilate the assimilatory and Orthodox anti-Zionist Jewry of Europe.

Zionist leader Feivel Polkes met with several high-ranking Nazi officials in Berlin in 1937, including Adolf Eichmann. The Zionists invited Adolf Eichmann and Herbert Hagen to Palestine to discuss how to purge Europe of Jews and ensure that they ended up in Palestine, so that the Jews could change the demographics of the region and take Palestine from the majority Moslem population. Eichmann and Hagen accepted the invitation and traveled to Palestine under the pretense that they were editors of the *Berliner Tageblatt*. After being refused permission to enter Palestine by the British authorities, they met with Polkes in Egypt, where Zionist Polkes commended the Zionist Nazis for persecuting the Jews. This was recorded in Eichmann and Hagen's reports on the meetings,

“Nationalist Jewish circles expressed their great joy over the radical German policy towards the Jews, as this policy would increase the Jewish population in Palestine, so that one can reckon with a Jewish majority in Palestine over the arabs in the foreseeable future.”¹⁸⁶¹

In 1938, Albert Einstein stated in his essay “Our Debt to Zionism”,

“Rarely since the conquest of Jerusalem by Titus has the Jewish community experienced a period of greater oppression than prevails at the present time. [***] Yet we shall survive this period too, no matter how much sorrow, no matter how heavy a loss in life it may bring. A community like ours, which is a community purely by reason of tradition, can only be strengthened by

pressure from without.”¹⁸⁶²

The Zionists proposed a military alliance with the Nazis. The Zionists asked to facilitate the Nazis’ “new order in Europe” with a fascistic totalitarian Zionist state in Palestine. Klaus Polkehn wrote,

“Thus what was on offer was no more and no less than the establishment of a fascist Jewish state in Palestine as an ally of German fascism!”¹⁸⁶³

8 HOW THE JEWS MADE THE BRITISH INTO ZIONISTS

The Biblical story of Esau and Jacob teaches the Jews that Gentiles will soldier and slave for the Jews. The Bible also prophesied that the Jews would be dispersed unto the ends of the Earth. Cabalistic Jewish racists believed that Jews must dwell in England in order for the Messianic Era to commence. The Jews gained great power in England and even managed to convince the British that they, the British, were of Jewish descent, and that British Royalty descended from the Messianic line of King David. Zionist Jews used Great Britain to ruin the Turkish Empire, which ruled over Palestine for many centuries. More than a million British have died while killing off millions more Germans, Italians, Turks, Japanese and Iraqis on behalf of the Zionist cause.

“Let their table become a snare before them: *and that which should have been for their welfare, let it become a trap.*”—*PSALM 69:22*

“¶7 And the children of Israel were fruitful, and increased abundantly, and multiplied, and waxed exceeding mighty; and the land was filled with them. 8 Now there arose a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph. 9 And he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel *are* more and mightier than we: 10 Come on, let us deal wisely with them; lest they multiply, and it come to pass, that, when there falleth out any war, they join also unto our enemies, and fight against us, and *so* get them up out of the land. 11 Therefore they did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses. 12 But the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew. And they were grieved because of the children of Israel.”—*EXODUS 1:7-12*

8.1 Introduction

The Old Testament’s solution to the Jewish question was two-fold. If the Jews obeyed God and remained segregated, God would give them the land from the Nile to the Euphrates. Note that the Jews were not the original inhabitants of the land and that they promised it to themselves. If the Jews did not obey God and assimilated into the Gentile world, they would be laid to waste in the lands in which they dwelt, and the righteous remnant—the most racist Jews—would steal the Promised Land from its original inhabitants. Note that racist Jews created this religious mythology and only racist Jews feel obliged to fulfill it.

8.2 The Rothschilds and Disraeli Lead the British Down the Garden Path to Palestine

Jewish British Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli illegally purchased shares in the Suez with a check written on the Bank of Rothschild. In 1875, Lionel Rothschild advanced Disraeli £4,000,000.¹⁸⁶⁴ The Rothschilds profited from the purchase with a commission on the huge sum and by its interest—as well as with speculation in the money, stock and commodities markets—Egyptian cotton was quite valuable.

The purchase accomplished little for England, but much for the Zionists. It tied England to the region and gave the Zionists an opportunity to persuade the British that they had an incentive to sponsor a “Jewish State” in Palestine in order to protect the illegal investment to which the Jewish racist Zionist Prime Minister of England Benjamin Disraeli had committed England in 1875. It also provoked hostility between England and Russia, and Zionists had long wished to destroy the Russian Empire. Not coincidentally, both the Egyptian Khedive and the Sultan of Turkey were on the verge of bankruptcy when approached by the Zionists for the purchases of the Suez Canal and Palestine—bankruptcy brought on by the Rothschilds, who wanted to secure their loans with Palestine. International finance coupled with bad advice given to a sovereign can easily drive a nation into bankruptcy. What is worse, many a corrupt sovereign were covertly agents of the Jewish financiers.

The Rothschilds profited from Disraeli’s purchase of shares in the Suez Canal and they were accused of it. Disraeli defended the Rothschilds by arguing that there had been “stock-jobbing” at Waterloo, but that the Rothschilds were honorable and would not do such a thing. In a rather obvious *non sequitur*, Disraeli argued that since the British victory at Waterloo was beneficial to the British Nation and was accompanied by stock-jobbing, stock-jobbing must be good for the British Nation, or at least a necessary consequence of positive events. Everyone knew that the Rothschilds had robbed the British People after the Battle of Waterloo. Disraeli’s argument obviously fails, because the British could have won the Battle of Waterloo without the Rothschilds having exploiting the event with lies to steal from their fellow countrymen. However, Disraeli was able to insult the intelligence of the Gentile members of the British Government with impunity, because the Rothschilds had the financial might to shut down the British Empire at any time.

Disraeli purchased the shares without lawful authority and had his friend Lionel Rothschild secure the check, earning the Rothschilds an enormous commission and enabling them to corruptly profit from the purchase on the stock markets with “inside information”, as they had earlier done by lying about the outcome of the Battle of Waterloo. Disraeli protested with sophistries, knowing that the Rothschilds could break the Bank of England, if it came to it,

‘Sir, although, according to the noble Lord, we are going to give a unanimous vote, it cannot be denied that the discussion of this evening at least has proved one result. It has shown, in a manner about which neither the House of Commons nor the country can make any mistake, that had the right honourable Gentleman the Member for Greenwich been the Prime Minister

of this country, the shares in the Suez Canal would not have been purchased. The right honourable Gentleman defies me to produce an instance of a Ministry negotiating with a private firm. The right honourable Gentleman found great fault with the amount of the commission which has been charged by the Messrs. Rothschild and admitted by the Government; and, indeed, both the right honourable Gentlemen opposite took the pains to calculate what was the amount of interest which it was proposed the Messrs. Rothschild should receive on account of their advance. It is, according to both right honourable Gentlemen, 15 per cent; but I must express my surprise that two right honourable Gentlemen, both of whom have filled the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, and one of whom has been at the head of the Treasury, should have shown by their observations such a lamentable want of acquaintance with the manner in which large amounts of capital are commanded when the Government of a country may desire to possess them under the circumstances under which we appealed to the House in question. I deny altogether that the commission charged by the Messrs. Rothschild has anything to do with the interest on the advance; nor can I suppose that two right honourable Gentlemen so well acquainted with finance as the Member for Greenwich and the Member for the University of London can really believe that there is in this country anyone who has £4,000,000 lying idle at his bankers. Yet one would suppose, from the argument of the right honourable Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, that such is the assumption on which he has formed his opinion in this matter. In the present instance, I may observe, not only the possibility, but the probability, of our having immediately to advance the whole £4,000,000 was anticipated. And how was this £4,000,000 to be obtained? Only by the rapid conversion of securities to the same amount. Well, I need not tell anyone who is at all acquainted with such affairs that the rapid conversion of securities to the amount of £4,000,000 can never be effected without loss, and sometimes considerable loss; and it is to guard against risk of that kind that a commission is asked for before advances are made to a Government. In this case, too, it was more than probable that, after paying the first £1,000,000 following the signature of the contract, £2,000,000 further might be demanded in gold the next day. Fortunately for the Messrs. Rothschild they were not; but, if they had, there would in all likelihood have been a great disturbance in the Money Market, which must have occasioned a great sacrifice, perhaps the whole of the commission. The Committee, therefore, must not be led away by the observations of the two right honourable Gentlemen, who, of all men in the House, ought to be the last to make them.

But the right honourable Gentleman the Member for Greenwich says we ought to have gone to our constitutional financiers and advisers, the Governor and Deputy Governor of the Bank of England, and, of course, the honourable Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry), who rose much later in the debate, and who spoke evidently under the influence of strong feeling, also says that we ought to have asked the Governor of the Bank of England

to advance the £4,000,000. But they forget that it is against the law of this country for the Bank to advance a sum of money to the Ministry.

But then it may be said—‘Though the Bank could not have advanced the £4,000,000, you might have asked them to purchase the shares.’ But how could they have purchased the shares? They must have first consulted their legal adviser, who probably would have told them that they had not power to do it; but, even if that doubtful question had been decided in the affirmative, they must have then called a public Court in order to see whether they could be authorized to purchase those shares to assist the Government. Now, I ask the Committee to consider for a moment what chance would we have had of effecting the purchase which we made under the circumstances, and with the competitors we had to encounter, and the objects we had to attain, if we had pursued the course which the right honourable Gentleman opposite has suggested? ‘But,’ says the Member for the University of London—and this also has been echoed by his late right honourable Colleague—‘you would have avoided all this, if you adopted the course which we indicate, and which I have just reminded the Committee is illegal, if you had only taken the illegal course we recommend, you would have got rid of this discreditable gambling, because although the Messrs. Rothschild, some of whom have been Members of this House, are men of honour, yet they have a great number of clerks who are all gambling on the Stock Exchange.’ Now, my belief is that the Messrs. Rothschild kept the secret as well as Her Majesty’s Government, for I do not think a single human being connected with them knew anything about it. And, indeed, it was quite unnecessary for the Messrs. Rothschild to have violated the confidence which we reposed in them, and quite unnecessary even for the Members of Her Majesty’s Government to hold their tongues, for no sooner was the proposal accepted than a telegram from Grand Cairo transmitted the news to the Stock Exchange, and it was that telegram which was the cause of all the speculation and gambling to which the right honourable Gentleman has referred. It is a fact that while the matter was a dead secret in England, the news was transmitted from Cairo. That was the intelligence on which the operations occurred. But I wish to say one word respecting the moral observations which have been made. As to gambling on the Stock Exchange, are we really to refrain from doing that which we think is proper and advantageous to the country because it may lead to speculation? Why, not a remark was made by the noble Lord, who has just addressed the House, the other night, or by me in reply, that would not affect the funds. On the one side people would say—‘The Government are in great difficulty, and probably a Vote of Censure will arise out of this Suez Canal speculation,’ while other persons would observe—‘There is evidently something coming about Egypt, and he is not going to let it all out.’ Ought we to refrain from doing what is necessary for the public welfare because it leads to stock-jobbing? Why, there is not an incident in the history of the world that led to so much stock-jobbing as the battle of Waterloo, and are we to regret that

that glorious battle was fought and won because it led to stock-jobbing? So much for the operations on the Stock Exchange. I think we have been listening all night to remarks on this transaction that have very little foundation. We have been admonished for conduct which has led to stock-jobbing and we have been admonished because we applied to a private firm when from the state of the law, I have shown that it was absolutely necessary from the character of the circumstances we had to deal with that a private firm should be appealed to.”¹⁸⁶⁵

Disraeli continues in his speech to attempt to justify the purchase of the Suez as if it were England’s only hope for securing trade with India and China. Disraeli’s hidden plan was to cajole England into the misguided and self-defeating belief that her destiny lay in the hands of the Jews, who Disraeli and his fellow Zionists planned would come to occupy Palestine and regulate trade between the continents. In the Zionists’ chimera, England was a helpless child without means, who required the Jews to rescue her. The disingenuous nature of this fallacy is revealed by the fact the Zionists had made precisely the same pitch to the French some ten years prior.

It was far wiser for England, for her own sake, to make alliances with Turkey, Egypt and Russia and improve their economies, than to drive Egypt, Turkey and Russia towards bankruptcy and war with England for the benefit of the Jews, as the Zionists were attempting to do. It was only by manipulating public opinion with lies, that the Zionists were able to vilify the Moslems and drive a wedge between Christians and Islam, despite the fact that Moslems and Jews had lived together for centuries in peace and prosperity. The British would have been far better off allying themselves with the Moslems and suppressing Jewish racism, than alienating and antagonizing the Moslems by creating a racist “Jewish State” in the heart of the Moslem world.

Many crypto-Jewish English Zionists sought to convert Christians to Judaism by asking the Jews to “convert” to Christianity in order to subvert it. They asked Jews to convert to Christianity in order to make the Christians common allies with the Jews against Islam. Zionists feared that if Jewish finance, or a common collection taken from the Jews, were to simply buy Palestine from the Turks, without the appearance of the Jewish Messiah to lead them into Palestine; then Christians would join forces with Islam to crush the Jews, as prophesied in the apocalyptic visions of both the Old and the New Testaments, and in the Koran. Many Gentiles in England realized these facts and sought alliances with Egypt, Turkey and Russia.

A quite similar situation exists today, where it would have been in the interests of England and America to have given Russia greatly more financial aid after the fall of the Soviet Union than they did, and to have joined forces with, and improved the lot of, Turkey, Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, Egypt, Iraq, Iran, etc. against Israel, in order to facilitate international trade through the Middle East and Russia. Instead, due in no small part to the corrupting influences of Zionism on public opinion, the Zionists have made Christianity and Judaism the unnatural common enemy of Islam, and Islam the unnatural enemy of an alliance of Judaism and Christianity—to the detriment of Christendom, Islam, Judaism, and the rest of humanity.

The Zionists have successfully blinded Americans and Jews around the world to their own best interests. If the Moslems had played the game by the same rules as the Zionists and sponsored the formation of a political party in America with the agenda of removing Zionists from the Middle East, allying America with the Moslem world to promote trade with India, China and Russia, and working with Russia to flood it with investment capital, while increasing trade with Pakistan, many of the world's problems would be lessened. Instead, the Zionists are leading America into alienation from Russia, China, Pakistan and the Moslem world; which increases world poverty, world-wide instability, and the likelihood of another—though even more disastrous—world war. Six and one half billion people face world war, death and absolute destruction for the sake of about five million obscenely selfish Zionists living in Israel, who stole the Palestinians' land on the racist premise that their religion is a nationalistic religion and that their Jewish God had promised the land to them thousands of years ago. (Note that Jews have long suffered from the superstition that they ought not to count their own, and it is sometimes difficult to know how many Jews have lived at any given time in any given place, *see: Exodus 30:12. II Samuel 24. I Chronicles 21. Hoshea 2:1. Yoma 22b. Rashi on Exodus 30:11-12.* In addition, there are many crypto-Jews throughout the world, who go uncounted as Jews.)

For centuries prior to forming a state, Jewish Zionists incited violence and world war. Subsequent to forming the State of Israel, they have endlessly incited violence and desire another world war.

If the Arabs had invested their oil-moneys in advanced education and American media outlets, instead of palaces, limousines and other unproductive ends, they could have helped to form public opinion in America with the facts and turned it against the inhuman Jewish Zionists, who have artificially created a religious war between Christians and Moslems. Jews took Palestine without a Messiah; which in Christianity means that these Jewish Zionists, who reject Christ, are in league with the "anti-Christ" and must be annihilated. Whereas it would be in the mutual best interests of both Christians and Moslems to join forces to defeat racist Jewish Zionism, racist warmongering Jews have turned Christianity against the Christians and made the Christians the artificial enemies of the Moslems. Instead of presenting the American public with a fair analysis of the facts, the media in America is led by tribal racist Jews who defame all Moslems in the American media as if genetically inferior terrorists, who are inherently prone to war, and in consort with the devil. Jews had done the same thing to the Catholics and Protestants, when they fomented the *Kulturkampf*.

The Zionists believed it was in their interests to destroy Catholicism (truly all of Christianity) and the Turkish Empire. They had initially hoped that the French Revolution would accomplish both these ends—as is revealed in the eleventh and twelfth "letters" in Hess' *Rome and Jerusalem* of 1862. Napoleon came close to achieving their ends. Since the Jewish People would not go to Palestine, the Zionists promoted the idea that the purchase of the Suez Canal would benefit France or England, in an attempt to draw the French, or the British, into the region as a means of creating a European commitment to the region that would provide security for the

establishment of Jewish colonies. The Jews sold this plan to the French and British public on the false premise that Jews in the region would provide security for French and English interests—the Zionists created a problem where one did not exist, in order to offer themselves as its solution, which they were not.

Only after the Zionist effort to coax the French into purchasing the Suez failed, did the Zionists turn to Disraeli, who deceived England in the 1870's with the same self-defeating mythologies that had been tried upon the French in the 1860's—and yet earlier with Napoleon Bonaparte.

In the 1840's Christian Zionist agents of the Rothschilds had already promoted the myth that a Jewish state in Palestine would benefit England and Christendom.¹⁸⁶⁶ The Zionists' plans eventually resulted the First and Second World Wars, where both England and France were pitted against Germany and Turkey. Racist Jewish Zionist Moses Hess published a book entitled *Rome and Jerusalem* in 1862, which was a direct precursor to Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. Note the tone of the *Kulturkampf* and the attacks on the Ottoman Turks from the racist Zionists. Note further that Hess discredits Christianity, the alleged divinity of Jesus and claims that Jesus hated Gentiles by quoting extensively from the Jewish historian Graetz in the Epilogue, Part 2, "Christ and Spinoza" [pages 186-211 in the 1943 edition of Hess' *Rome and Jerusalem*] though the later attacks in the *Kulturkampf* were more openly vitriolic, the goal was consistently to tear down Christianity and Islam in order to make way for the Jews in Palestine—a goal often iterated in the Talmudic and Cabalistic writings. Hess wrote,

“What we have to do at present for the regeneration of the Jewish nation is, first, to keep alive the hope of the political rebirth of our people, and next, to reawaken that hope where it slumbers. When political conditions in the Orient shape themselves so as to permit the organization of a beginning of the restoration of a Jewish State, this beginning will express itself in the founding of Jewish colonies in the land of their ancestors, to which enterprise France will undoubtedly lend a hand. You know how substantial was the share of the Jews in the subscriptions to the fund raised for the benefit of the Syrian war victims. It was Cremieux who took the initiative in the matter, the same Cremieux who twenty years ago traveled with Sir Moses Montefiore to Syria in order to seek protection for the Jews against the persecutions of the Christians. In the *Journal des Debats*, which very seldom accepts poems for publication, there appeared, at the time of the Syrian expedition, a poem by Leon Halevi, who at the time, perhaps, thought as little of the rebirth of Israel as Cremieux, yet his beautiful stanzas could not have been produced otherwise than in a spirit of foreseeing this regeneration. When the poet of the *Schwalben* mournfully complains:

Where tarries the hero? Where tarries the wise?
Who will, O my people, revive you anew;
Who will save you, and give you again
A place in the sun?

The French poet answers his query with enthusiastic confidence:

Ye shall be reborn, ye fearsome cities!
A breath of security will always hover
O'er your banks where our colors have fluttered!
Come again a call supreme!
Au revoir is not adieu—
France is all to those she loves,
The future belongs to God.

Alexander Weill sang about the same time:

There is a people stiff of neck,
Dispersed from the Euphrates to the Rhine,
Its whole life centered in a Book
Oft times bent, yet ever straightened;
Braving hatred and contempt,
It only dies to live again
In nobler form.

France, beloved friend, is the savior who will restore our people to its place in universal history.

Allow me to recall to your mind an old legend which you have probably heard in your younger days. It runs as follows:

'A knight [Esau] who went to the Holy Land to assist in the liberation of Jerusalem, left behind him a very dear friend. While the knight fought valiantly on the field of battle, his friend spent his time, as heretofore, in the study of the Talmud, for his friend was none other than a pious rabbi [Jacob].

'Months afterward, when the knight returned home, he appeared suddenly at midnight, in the study room of the rabbi, whom he found, as usual, absorbed in his Talmud. 'God's greetings to you, dear old friend,' he said. 'I have returned from the Holy Land and bring you from there a pledge of our friendship. What I gained by my sword, you are striving to obtain with your spirit our ways lead to the same goal.' While thus speaking, the knight handed the rabbi a rose of Jericho.

'The rabbi took the rose and moistened it with his tears, and immediately the withered rose began to bloom again in its full glory and splendor. And the rabbi said to the knight: 'Do not wonder, my friend that the withered rose bloomed again in my hands. The rose possesses the same characteristics as our people: it comes to life again at the touch of the warm breath of love, in spite of its having been torn from its own soil and left to wither in foreign lands. So will Israel bloom again in youthful splendor; and the spark, at present smoldering under the ashes, will burst once more into a bright flame.'

The routes of the rabbi and the knight dear friend, are meeting to-day. As

the rabbi in the story symbolizes our people, so does the knight of the legend signify the French people which in our days, as in the Middle Ages, sent its brave soldiers to Syria and 'prepared in the desert the way of the Lord.'

Have you never read the words of the Prophet Isaiah: 'Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to the heart of Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that the appointed time has come, that her iniquity is pardoned; for she hath received at the Lord's hand double for all her sins. The voice of one that crieth in the wilderness; prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall be made a straight place, and the rough places a plain. And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.' [Footnote: Isaiah xl, 1-5.]

Do you not believe that in these words, with which the second Isaiah opened his prophecies, as well as in words with which the Prophet Obadiah closed his prophecy, [Footnote: 'And saviors shall come up on Mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be the Lord's.'] the conditions of our own time are graphically pictured? Was not help given to Zion in order to defend and establish the wild mountaineers there? Are not things being prepared there and roads leveled, and is not the road of civilization being built in the desert in the form of the Suez Canal works and the railroad which will connect Asia and Europe? They are not thinking at present of the restoration of our people. But you know the proverb, 'Man proposes and God disposes.' Just as in the West they once searched for a road to India, and incidentally discovered a new world, so will our lost fatherland be rediscovered on the road to India and China that is now being built in the Orient. Do you still doubt that France will help the Jews to found colonies which may extend from Suez to Jerusalem, and from the banks of the Jordan to the Coast of the Mediterranean? Then pray read the work which appeared shortly after the massacres in Syria, by the famous publisher, Dentu, under the title *The New Oriental Problem*. The author hardly wrote it at the request of the French government, but acted in accordance with the spirit of the French nation when he urged our brethren, not on religious grounds, but from purely political and humanitarian motives, to restore their ancient state. [Footnote: I have heard that an American writer has discussed this question from a practical point of view, for a number of years. Also representative Englishmen have repeatedly declared themselves in favor of the restoration of the Jewish State.]

I may, therefore, recommend this work, written, not by a Jew, but by a French patriot, to the attention of our modern Jews, who plume themselves on borrowed French humanitarianism. I will quote here, in translation, a few pages of this work, *The New Eastern Question*, by Ernest Laharanne. [Footnote: See note IX at end of book.]

'In the discussion of these new Eastern complications, we reserved a special place for Palestine, in order to bring to the attention of the world the

important question, whether ancient Judæa can once more acquire its former place under the sun.

‘This question is not raised here for the first time. The redemption of Palestine, either by the efforts of international Jewish bankers, or the nobler method, of a general subscription in which all the Jews should participate, has been discussed many times. Why is it that this patriotic project has not as yet been realized? It is certainly not the fault of pious Jews that the plan was frustrated, for their hearts beat fast and their eyes fill with tears at the thought of a return to Jerusalem.[Footnote: My friend, Armond L., who traveled for several years through the Danube Principalities, told me that the Jews were moved to tears when he announced to them the end of their suffering, with the words ‘The time of the return approaches.’ The more fortunate Occidental Jews do not know with what longing the Jewish masses of the East await the final redemption from the two thousand year exile. They know not that the patriotic Jew cannot suppress his cry of anguish at the length of the exile, even in the midst of his festive songs, as, for instance, the patriotic poem which is read on Chanukah, closes with the mournful call:

‘For salvation is delayed for us and there is no end to the days of evil.’

‘They asked me,’ continued my friend, ‘what are the indications that the end of the exile is approaching?’ ‘These,’ I answered, ‘that the Turkish and the papal powers are on the point of collapse.’]

‘If the project is still unrealized, the cause is easily cognizable. The Jews dare not think of the possibility of possessing again the land of their fathers. Have we not opposed to their wish our Christian veto? Would we not continually molest the legal proprietor when he will have taken possession of his ancestral land, and in the name of piety make him feel that his ancestors forfeited the title to their land on the day of the Crucifixion?

‘Our stupid Ultramontanism has destroyed the possibility of a regeneration of Judæa, by making the present of the Jewish people barren and unproductive. Had the city of Jerusalem been rebuilt by means of Jewish capital, we would have heard preachers prophesying, even in our progressive nineteenth century, that the end of the world is at hand and predictions of the coming of the Anti-Christ. Yes, we have lived to see such a state of affairs, now that Ultramontanism has made its last stand in oratorical eloquence. In the sacred beehive of religion, we still hear a continuous buzzing of those insects who would rather see a mighty sword in the hands of the barbarians, than greet the resurrection of nations and hail the revival of a free and great thought inscribed on their banner. This is undoubtedly the reason why Israel did not make any attempt to become master of his own flocks, why the Jews, after wandering for two thousand years, are not in a position to shake the dust from their weary feet. The continuous, inexorable demands that would be made upon a Jewish settlement, the vexatious insults that would be heaped upon them and which would finally degenerate into persecutions, in which fanatic Christians and pious Mohammedans would unite in brotherly accord—these are the reasons, more potent than the rule of the Turks, that

have deterred the Jews from attempting to rebuild the Temple of Solomon, their ancient home, and their State.

‘But if this cause explains the lack of courage on the part of patriotic Jews, we cannot refrain from accusing the so-called progressive Jews of indifference to the fate of the Jewish people; for whenever a project for the restoration of the Jewish State is being considered, they display toward it a naïveté that neither does credit to their reasoning power nor to their heart. The explanations offered by them on such occasions are inadmissible both from a moral and from a political point of view. A declaration, composed by the representatives of the progressive Jews at their meeting in Frankfort, contains the following Article:

‘We acknowledge as our fatherland only the land where we are born and to which we are inseparably united by the bonds of citizenship.’

‘No member of the Jewish race can renounce the incontestable and fundamental right of his people, without at the same time denying the history of the Jews and his own ancestors. Such an act is especially unseemly, at a time when political conditions in Europe will not only not obstruct the restoration of a Jewish State, but will rather facilitate its realization. What European power to-day would oppose the plan that the Jews, united through a Congress, should buy back their ancient fatherland? Who would object if the Jews flung to decrepit old Turkey a few handfuls of gold, and said to her: ‘Give me back my home and use this money to consolidate the other parts of your tottering empire?’

‘No objections would be raised to the realization of such a plan, and Judæa would be permitted to extend its boundaries from Suez to the harbor of Smyrna, including the entire area of the western Lebanon range. For we will not be eternally engaged in war; the time must come when this wholesale massacre, usually accompanied by the booming of cannon, will be condemned by humanity, so that the nation which desires conquest in addition to commerce, will not dare to carry out its designs. We must therefore prepare and break new ground for the peaceful struggles of industry. European industry has daily to search for new markets as an outlet for its products. We have no time to lose. The time has arrived when it is imperative to call the ancient nations back to life, so as to open new highways and byways for European civilization.’

In another passage, the author speaks with so much enthusiasm, love and reverence for the Jews, that what he says overshadows all that has ever been said by a Jew in praise of his own people.

‘There is a mysterious power which rules the destiny of humanity. Once the hand of the Infinite Power has signed the decree of a nation to be banished forever from the face of the earth, the fate of that nation is irrevocable. But when we see a nation, torn from its cradle in its early childhood, and after having tasted all the bitterness of exile is brought back to its land, only to be tossed again into the wide world; and that nation, during the eighteen centuries of its wandering has displayed such remarkable

powers of endurance, suffering age-long martyrdom without extinguishing in its heart the fire of patriotism, then we just admit that we are standing before an infinite mystery, unparalleled in the history of humanity.’

In these few words there is concentrated the whole history of Israel.

What an example! What a race! You, Roman conquerors, led your legions in battle against the already ruined Zion and drove the children of Israel out of their ancestral land. Your European, Asiatic and African barbarians lent your ear to superstition and pronounced your curse upon them. You feudal kings branded the Jews with the mark of shame—the Jews, who, in spite of all your persecutions, supplied you with the necessary gold wherewith to arm your vassals and serfs and who provided your markets with goods. You, grand Inquisitors, searched among the children of the dispersed people of Israel for your richest victims, with whom to fill your prisons and coffers, and in order to feed your auto-da-fe’s—and you revoked the edict of Nantes and drove out of the land the remnant that had escaped the destruction of Apostolic fanaticism. And finally, you modern nations have denied these indefatigable workers and industrious merchants civil rights. What persecutions! What tears! What blood you children of Israel have shed in the last eighteen hundred years! But you sons of Judæa, in spite of all suffering are still here. You have overcome the innumerable obstacles which the hatred, contempt, fanaticism and barbarism of the centuries have placed in your way. The hand of the Eternal has surely guided you.

France finally freed you. On the eve of the great world epoch, France, while shattering its own chains, called all nations and also you, into freedom. You became citizens and now you are brothers. The year 1789 was the first step in the process of rehabilitation. Pursuing its mission, liberation, the eye of France searched after all persecuted races, and it found you in your ghetto and shattered its doors forever.[Footnote: The old Beneday, who was still alive in 1842, at the time of the publication of the first *Rhenische Zeitung* used to come, from time to time, to the office of that paper to converse with the members of the staff; and on one of these occasions he told us the story, which I had really heard before, how he, at the commission of the first French Republic had laid the ax at the gates of the Bonn Ghetto. Beneday could hardly conceive how his son Jacob could, at one and the same time, be a liberal and yet unfriendly toward the French. I comforted him by pointing to the progressive German Jews, who in reality have to thank the French for whatever political and civil rights they possess here or elsewhere in Germany, and yet rail, in company with the Germans, against the ‘hereditary enemy.’] France invited you to its Chambers. You participated in its triumphs; you shared its happiness and its reverses. You have raised your voice on the day of council, shouted for joy at our victories and wept at our defeats. You are good citizens and devoted brothers. France will perhaps be to you a lighthouse of salvation, a rock against your enemies, who are also the enemies of our modern institutions. It will defend you against the libelers of your nationality, your character and your religion.

You are an elemental force and we bow our heads before you. You were powerful in the early period of your history, strong even after the destruction of Jerusalem, and mighty during the Middle Ages, when there were only two dominant powers—the Inquisition and its Cross, and Piracy with its Crescent. You have escaped destruction in your long dispersion, in spite of the terrible tax you have paid during eighteen centuries of persecution. But what is left of your nation is mighty enough to rebuild the gates of Jerusalem. This is your mission.

Providence would not have prolonged your existence until to-day, had it not reserved for you the holiest of all missions. The hour has struck for the resettlement of the banks of the Jordan. The historical books of the royal prophets can, perhaps, be written again only by you.

A great calling is reserved for you: to be a living channel of communication between three continents. You should be the bearers of civilization to the primitive people of Asia, and the teachers of the European sciences to which your race has contributed so much. You should be the mediators between Europe and far Asia, open the roads that lead to India and China—those unknown regions which must ultimately be thrown open to civilization. You will come to the land of your fathers crowned with the crown of age-long martyrdom, and there, finally, you will be completely healed from all your ills! Your capital will again bring the wide stretches of barren land under cultivation; your labor and industry will once more turn the ancient soil into fruitful valleys, reclaim the flat lands from the encroaching sands of the desert, and the world will again pay its homage to the oldest of peoples.

The time has arrived for you to reclaim, either by way of compensation or by other means, your ancient fatherland from Turkey, which has devastated it for ages. You have contributed enough to the cause of civilization and have helped Europe on the path of progress, to make revolutions and carry them out successfully. You must henceforth think of yourselves, of the valleys of Lebanon and the plains of Gennesareth.

March forward! At the sight of your rejuvenation, our hearts will beat fast, and our armies will stand by you, ready to help.

March forward, Jews of all lands! The ancient fatherland of yours is calling you, and we will be proud to open its gates for you.

March forward, ye sons of the martyrs! The harvest of experience which you have accumulated in your long exile, will help to bring again to Israel the splendor of the Davidic days and rewrite that part of history of which the monoliths of Semiramis are the only witness.

March forward, ye noble hearts! The day on which the Jewish tribes return to their fatherland will be epoch-making in the history of humanity. Oh, how will the East tremble at your coming! How quickly, under the influence of labor and industry, will the enervation of the people vanish, in the land where voluptuousness, idleness and robbery have held sway for thousands of years.

You will become the moral stay of the East. You have written the Book of books. Become, then, the educators of the wild Arabian hordes and the African peoples. Let the ancient wisdom of the East, the revelations of the Zend, the Vedas, as well as the more modern Koran and the Gospels, group themselves around your Bible. They will all become purified from every superstition and all will proclaim alike the principles of freedom, humanity, peace and unity. You are the triumphal arch of the future historical epoch, under which the great covenant of humanity will be written and sealed in your presence as the witnesses of the past and future. The Biblical traditions which you will revive, will also sanctify anew our Occidental society and destroy the weed of materialism together with its roots.

And when you shall have made this wonderful progress, remember, ye sons of Israel, remember Modern France which, from the moment of its rebirth, has loved you continually and has never wearied of defending you.

[***]

If one appreciates fully the infinitely tragic rôle which the Jewish people has thus far played in history, he must also inevitably perceive the only way that will bring salvation to our misery. This solution is at present not as impractical as it may look at first sight. It is in accordance with the sympathies of the French people and with the interests of French politics, that after France's victorious armies shall have overthrown the modern Nebuchadnezzar, France will extend its work of redemption also to the Jewish nation. It is to the interest of France to see that the road leading to India and China should be settled by a people which will be loyal to the cause of France to the end, in order that it may fulfil the historical mission which has fallen to it as a legacy from the great Revolution. But is there any other nation more adapted to carry out this mission than Israel, which was appointed for the same mission from the beginning of its history?

'Frenchmen and Jews!' I hear you exclaim. 'If so, then the Christian German reactionaries were right in their denunciations of the Jews!' Yes, my dear friend, the animal instinct which scents the enemy in the distance is always infallible. Reaction has everywhere recognized its mortal enemy in those who stand midway between reaction and revolution and who act as the midwife of progress, the giant who is to smite reaction over its head. For it is a law of organic and social life history, that the mediate being whose existence is limited to the transition epoch, should pave the way from the imperfect to the more perfect and higher scales of life.

Frenchmen and Jews! It seems that in all things they were created for one another. They resemble one another in their humane and national aspirations, and differ only in such qualities as can only be complemented by another nation, but which are never united in one and the same people. The French people excel in alertness, in the humanistic and sympathetic quality to assimilate all elements; the Jews, on the other hand, possess more ethical seriousness than the French, and in meeting other types, the Jew will rather impress his stamp on his environment than be molded by it. The French can

rule the world because they absorbed the best of the entire human race. The Jews can only be masters of their own flock, and with the holy fire which they have kindled in their own midst, they will warm and enlighten a world composed of heterogeneous elements, and thus prevent this world from disintegrating into its elements and relapsing into the chaos out of which it was raised once before by Judaism.

The generous help which France has extended to civilized peoples toward the restoration of their nationality, will be remembered longer by our nation than by any other. How easily will we come to an understanding with this humane French people about our religion and its sacred places in Palestine. But matters have not gone so far yet. The Jewish people must first show itself worthy of the regeneration of its historical cult; it must first feel the necessity of a national restoration if it would reach that point. Until then we need not think about building the Temple; we must win the heart of our brethren for the great work which will finally bring eternal glory to the Jewish nation and salvation to humanity.

For Jewish colonization on the road to India and China, there is no lack, either of Jewish laborers or of Jewish talent and capital. Let only the germ be planted under the protection of the European powers, and the tree of a new life will spring forth by itself and bear excellent fruit.”¹⁸⁶⁷

Just as when the French were unwilling to buy the Suez Canal for the Jews, the Zionists looked to Disraeli in England to accomplish this end; when the English moved toward improving their relations with Russia, Egypt and Turkey, the Zionists looked to Germany as a sword with which to conquer the Turks and the Russians, and with which to manipulate the British and the French, resulting in the First and Second World Wars. When Germany failed them, they turned America against Germany and ruined it. In more modern times in America, when the French, who emancipated the Jews of Continental Europe, opposed war against Islam for Israel’s sake, the Zionists stirred up hatred of the French in America, though Hess had long ago tried lure the French into Palestine with the promise that the Jews would forever be loyal to France, the France which had liberated them,

“It is to the interest of France to see that the road leading to India and China should be settled by a people which will be loyal to the cause of France to the end, in order that it may fulfill the historical mission which has fallen to it as a legacy from the great Revolution. But is there any other nation more adapted to carry out this mission than Israel, which was appointed for the same mission from the beginning of its history?”

Zionists are loyal to none but themselves. When the French failed them, they became eternally loyal to England, and when that failed them, to Germany, and when that failed them, to America. Should America fail to perpetually slave for Israel, they will turn to China.

The Zionists repay the ancient gift (in Jewish myths) of the Persian King Cyrus

of the freedom of the Jews from the captivity of Babylon, as well as King Cyrus' restoration of the Jews to Judea and the rebuilding Jerusalem and the Temple, as well as the gift of Persian King Ahasuerus, who assisted Queen Esther and Mordecai to mass murder "the enemies of the Jews"—modern Jews repay these ancient gifts by perpetually destroying Iran and corrupting its leadership to the detriment of the Iranian People. Though the *Book of Esther* is a work of fiction, it provides a model that the Jews have often followed. The Rothschilds often followed the ancient Jewish model of Jacob and Esau, whereby Jacob exploited Esau's deathly hunger to steal Esau's freedom and Esau's land; and the ancient Jewish model of Joseph, whereby Joseph exploited the deathly hunger of the Egyptians to steal the Egyptians' freedom and the Egyptians' land—this in collusion with a corrupt Pharaoh, who helped the Jews destroy the currency—this after the Egyptians had given Jews land in Egypt. *Genesis 47* tells the Jews to ruin host nations and then leave them taking their wealth,

“1 Then Joseph came and told Pharaoh, and said, My father and my brethren, and their flocks, and their herds, and all that they have, are come out of the land of Canaan; and, behold, they *are* in the land of Goshen. 2 And he took some of his brethren, *even* five men, and presented them unto Pharaoh. 3 And Pharaoh said unto his brethren, What *is* your occupation? And they said unto Pharaoh, Thy servants *are* shepherds, both we, *and* also our fathers. 4 They said moreover unto Pharaoh, For to sojourn in the land *are* we come; for thy servants have no pasture for their flocks; for the famine *is* sore in the land of Canaan: now therefore, we pray thee, let thy servants dwell in the land of Goshen. 5 And Pharaoh spake unto Joseph, saying, Thy father and thy brethren are come unto thee: 6 The land of Egypt *is* before thee; in the best of the land make thy father and brethren to dwell; in the land of Goshen let them dwell: and if thou knowest *any* men of activity among them, then make them rulers over my cattle. 7 And Joseph brought in Jacob his father, and set him before Pharaoh: and Jacob blessed Pharaoh. 8 And Pharaoh said unto Jacob, How old *art* thou? 9 And Jacob said unto Pharaoh, The days of the years of my pilgrimage *are* an hundred and thirty years: few and evil have the days of the years of my life been, and have not attained unto the days of the years of the life of my fathers in the days of their pilgrimage. 10 And Jacob blessed Pharaoh, and went out from before Pharaoh. 11 And Joseph placed his father and his brethren, and gave them a possession in the land of Egypt, in the best of the land, in the land of Rameses, as Pharaoh had commanded. 12 And Joseph nourished his father, and his brethren, and all his father's household, *with* bread, according to *their* families. 13 ¶ And *there was* no bread in all the land; for the famine *was* very sore, so that the land of Egypt and *all* the land of Canaan fainted by reason of the famine. 14 And Joseph gathered up all the money that was found in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, for the corn which they bought: and Joseph brought the money into Pharaoh's house. 15 And when money failed in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, all the Egyptians came unto Joseph, and said, Give us bread: for why should we die in thy presence? for the money

faileth. 16 And Joseph said, Give your cattle; and I will give you for your cattle, if money fail. 17 And they brought their cattle unto Joseph: and Joseph gave them bread *in exchange* for horses, and for the flocks, and for the cattle of the herds, and for the asses: and he fed them with bread for all their cattle for that year. 18 When that year was ended, they came unto him the second year, and said unto him, We will not hide *it* from my lord, how that our money is spent; my lord also hath our herds of cattle; there is not ought left in the sight of my lord, but our bodies, and our lands: 19 Wherefore shall we die before thine eyes, both we and our land? buy us and our land for bread, and we and our land will be servants unto Pharaoh: and give *us* seed, that we may live, and not die, that the land be not desolate. 20 And Joseph bought all the land of Egypt for Pharaoh; for the Egyptians sold every man his field, because the famine prevailed over them: so the land became Pharaoh's. 21 And as for the people, he removed them to cities from *one* end of the borders of Egypt even to the *other* end thereof. 22 Only the land of the priests bought he not; for the priests had a portion assigned them of Pharaoh, and did eat their portion which Pharaoh gave them: wherefore they sold not their lands. 23 Then Joseph said unto the people, Behold, I have bought you *this* day and your land for Pharaoh: lo, *here is* seed for you, and ye shall sow the land. 24 And it shall come to pass in the increase, that ye shall give the fifth *part* unto Pharaoh, and four parts shall be your own, for seed of the field, and for your food, and for them of your households, and for food for your little ones. 25 And they said, Thou hast saved our lives: let us find grace in the sight of my lord, and we will be Pharaoh's servants. 26 And Joseph made it a law over the land of Egypt unto this day, *that* Pharaoh should have the fifth *part*; except the land of the priests only, which became not Pharaoh's. 27 ¶ And Israel dwelt in the land of Egypt, in the country of Goshen; and they had possessions therein, and grew, and multiplied exceedingly. 28 And Jacob lived in the land of Egypt seventeen years: so the whole age of Jacob was an hundred forty and seven years. 29 And the time drew nigh that Israel must die: and he called his son Joseph, and said unto him, If now I have found grace in thy sight, put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh, and deal kindly and truly with me; bury me not, I pray thee, in Egypt: 30 But I will lie with my fathers, and thou shalt carry me out of Egypt, and bury me in their buryingplace. And he said, I will do as thou hast said. 31 And he said, Swear unto me. And he sware unto him. And Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head."

This story taught the Jews that they could ruin any nation if they could control the nation's money supply. They controlled the money supply by melting down gold and silver and keeping the metals for themselves. Once they had ruined metallic currency, the Jews could then operate on a barter system with the subjugated Gentiles. They learned that with gold reserves, they could loan out more script money than they had gold and silver on reserve, and they could loan it out at interest. They could also buy up debts for foreign goods whether the securities for those

supposed goods actually existed, or not. In this manner, the Jews could increase the money supply and earn interest on monies which they never possessed.

Their profits came at the expense of inflation, which again taxed the people for their sake. In Socialist countries taxes gave them complete control over the flow of money. In Capitalist countries, they rigged the system so that the wealthiest paid little or no tax, while benefitting from the infrastructure of the nation and from the protection of their trade and property by the military and courts, which served their interests and their interests alone. Not only did they not pay the taxes, they reaped the profits of the bond markets which also effectively taxed the people. They not only kept the monies which they should have been paying in taxes, they earned interest on the monies which otherwise would have been lost to them in taxes—interest for which the people paid. All of these advantages quickly put virtually all of the wealth of the nation into their hands and prevented others from ever advancing to a point where they could effectively challenge them.

Jews could also contract the money supply by refusing loans, by calling in loans, by selectively issuing different rates for loans in different nations, and by melting down metallic currencies. This is an especially powerful means for garnering international control, because it provides empires with a means of securing protectionism and favoritism, by increasing the costs of production and other costs in colonial and competing nations. In this way, the Jews were able to accumulate much of the world's wealth into a given nation or empire which they effectively ran through corruption, and then take that wealth unto themselves, leaving the nation which otherwise would fight to take back the wealth the Jews had taken from them, in ruins. The Jews would then take the wealth they had stolen to another nation they could build up in order to knock down. The last ruined nation had not the funds with which to attack the new host nation, or host empire, and the Jews obtained security by means of bribery and blackmail. Those who were aware of what the Jews were doing and objected to it were often assassinated. Thomas Jefferson warned Americans, in anticipation of the Great Depression in the Twentieth Century, when he stated in an 1802 letter to Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury,

“I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. . . . If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency, first by inflation, then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around [the banks]. . . will deprive the people of all property until their children wake-up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered. . . . The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the people, to whom it properly belongs.”

Even if the issuing power of money is granted to the people, a group acting in collusion can melt down metallic currencies and syphon off the money supply. Fiat money is no guarantee of safety if the money is based on bonds, because the Jews can then tax the people into poverty by instigating wars or government projects which cannot be paid for immediately by direct taxes. Should this fail to give the Jews control over the money supply, as in the case of Russia, the Jews can then

instigate a revolution and deliberately cause chaos in a nation. They then spread word that banking reform and a dictatorship are the only means to restore order. Then the Jews install a dictator of their choosing, who funnels off the wealth of the subject nation into Jewish coffers, and who instigates wars of the Jews' choosing, which further profits them.

The Jews again ruined the Egyptians many times in the modern era. They deliberately bankrupted the nation and exploited its cotton markets and water ways. The purchase of the Suez, which was made to draw England into the region to sponsor Zionist ambitions, was then used as an excuse to secure alleged English interests in the region by means of Jewish colonialism. However, had it not been for the corrupt actions of Disraeli and Rothschild which brought England into the region, there would have been no English interests to secure, and placing a Jewish colony in Palestine would have worked against British interests in that it would have destabilized the region.

An article in the *Christian Reader*, Volume 3, Number 67, (19 November 1824), p. 366 evinces that the Jews were not needed by the British to secure British interests in the region, but rather that the British were needed by the Jews to secure Jewish Messianic interests in the region. Note that the Rothschilds and the Jews believed they had an incentive to ruin the Egyptians, in order to promote their own interest in the theft of the land of Palestine. Of course, any Egyptian who reacted to the Jewish attack on their civilization would be called a racist and religiously intolerant, which defamations Jewish racists would employ as an excuse to further ruin the Egyptians.

“CHRISTIAN REGISTER.

BOSTON, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1824.

THE JEWS. It is stated with much assurance in the *Gazette of Spire*, that the Sublime Porte has recently made proposals to the House of Rothschild for the loan of a considerable sum of money, and has offered as a security for payment, the entire country of Palestine. It is stated also that in consequence of this proposal a confidential agent had been dispatched by that House to Constantinople, ‘to examine into the validity of the pledge offered by the Turkish Cabinet.’

The editor of the *National Advocate* observes in relation to this report, that he at first supposed it was intended as a satire on the prevailing custom of raising loans for different nations; but on a nearer view of the subject, the proposition might be supposed probable. The *Advocate* proceeds with some interesting remarks on the subject, tending to show, that if such a proposition had been made it could not be accepted with any prospect, on the part of the Rothschilds, (who are Jews,) of the immediate restoration of their countrymen to Palestine, as it was probably not in the power even of the Turkish government, to guarantee to the Jews the quiet possession of the country against the prejudices and interests of the Egyptians, the Wechabites, the Wandering Arabs, and the Tartar Hordes.

It is also argued that the discrepancy of education, habits, views, and

manners, existing between the Jews of different countries, unfit them to amalgamate and become united under one government. They must be prepared for this by the same discipline which their fathers, who went out of Egypt were subjected to under Moses, for forty years in the wilderness, to prepare them for the promised land. 'Our country,' continues the Advocate, 'must be an asylum to the ancient people of God. Here they must reside; here, in calm retirement, study laws, governments, sciences; become familiarly known to their brethren of other religious denominations; cultivate the useful arts; acquire a knowledge of legislation, and become liberal and free. So, that appreciating the blessings of just and salutary laws, they may be prepared to possess permanently their ancient land, and govern righteously.'"

The pretext Disraeli and the racist Zionists used to justify the purchase of the Suez Canal was to persuade England that she had a vital interest in securing a route to India—the same pretext Hess and the racist Zionists had used in their earlier attempts to draw France into the region. The common denominator of this prolonged effort to take land from the Moslems was racist Zionism, not a genuine need for a European presence in the Middle East.

Disraeli flattered the Queen by dubbing her the "Empress of India". Disraeli is perhaps overrated as an intellect and politician. He probably only succeeded because of support from the Rothschilds, who had the ability to shut down the English economy. Disraeli did not create this scheme to draw England into Egypt. Rather, it arose in the mind of an American Ashkenazi Jew named Mordecai Manuel Noah¹⁸⁶⁸, who pretended to be a Sephardic Jew, and who published *Discourse on the Evidences of the American Indians Being the Descendants of the Lost Tribes of Israel: Delivered Before the Mercantile Library Association*, Clinton Hall: J. Van Norden, New York, (1837); so as to make it appear that the Jews had a greater right to America than the Gentiles. Noah published *Discourse on the Restoration of the Jews: Delivered at the Tabernacle, Oct. 28 and Dec. 2., 1844*, Harper, New York, (1845); in which he laid out the plan to draw England into the Mideast, which Disraeli and Rothschild fulfilled.

The New York Times reported on 31 December 1897 on page 5 that some Jews—especially those allied with the Puritans, a sect likely created by Cabalist Jews—had long sought America as a new Israel, and told of Judge Noah's plan to draw the British into the region and destroy the Turks:

"America and the Ten Tribes.

Dr. Alder, in reply to Dr. Kohler, contended that Anthony Montecinos originated the idea that America was the abode of the ten tribes.

Dr. Kohler said that the term Arsaveth was never used in Jewish writings. The term these was Eretz Aheret.

Dr. Leo Wiener gave some striking specimens of the folk-lore of the Russian Jews, which, he said, had thus far been virtually ignored in literature. He repeated an amusing story of a little Jewish tailor who set out to discover

the lost tribes. He found them at last beyond a great river, and they were giants. One of them put the little tailor in his pocket, and going into the synagogue, forgot all about him. The little tailor made answer of 'Amen,' however, to the prayer that was offered. Then he was taken out of the pocket, was recognized as a Jew, and was greatly honored.

Sarcastic comments upon several of the theories about the lost tribes that have been put forward were made by Dr. H. P. Mendes and others. The Rev. A. H. Neito reported upon some inscriptions upon ancient Jewish tombstones in New York which he had deciphered.

Early Zionist Projects.

A paper by Max J. Kohler on 'Some Early American Zionist Projects' was next read, and engaged the close attention of those present. The most curious part of it, and one which excited both laughter and applause, was an account of the three projects of Mordecai M. Noah, once a distinguished figure in New York, to re-establish the Jewish Kingdom. Mr. Kohler first reviewed the efforts to colonize Jews in this hemisphere, from the establishment of the settlement in Curacao, in 1652, and the scheme of Maurice de Saxe, about 1749, to create a kingdom for himself, peopled by the descendants of Abraham, and the projects of Dr. Kayurling and W. D. Robinson in this country, the former in 1783 and the latter in 1819. Judge Noah's first idea, announced in 1818, was that the Jews were to overthrow the Turkish domination in Northern Africa and Western Asia, and to regain possession of Palestine. In 1825 he devised the plan of founding the 'City of Ararat' on Grand Island in the Niagara River. He got some of his friends to constitute him 'Governor and Judge of Israel.' He issued proclamations and decrees, and made appointments which were laughed at and refused. In setting forth his third idea in 1845, in a pamphlet, 'The Restoration of the Jews,' Judge Noah made this remarkable forecast: 'England must possess Egypt, as affording the only secure route to her possessions in India, through the Red Sea.' This, he thought, would lead to the resettlement of the Jews in Palestine, with the consent of the Christian, and for the safety of the neighboring nations. This was to be accomplished by gradual means, the first step being to induce the Sultan to grant to the Jews permission to purchase and hold land in Palestine. Mr. Kohler drew attention to the parallelism of the arguments employed by Noah, from whom he quoted at length, in favor of this scheme, and those of the Zionites of to-day, as represented by the Congress at Basel.

A sketch of the Jewish pioneers of the Ohio Valley by the Rev. Dr. David Philipson of Cincinnati, a paper on 'Ezra Stiles (first President of Yale) and the Jews of Newport,' notes on New York wills by Dr. Herbert Friedenwald, 'A Statement Relative to Manuscripts Belonging to Hyam Solomon,' by Dr. J. H. Hollander of Johns Hopkins University, and a paper entitled 'A Brave Frontiersman,' by the Rev. Henry Cohen of Galveston, Texas, were among the other contributions. Dr. C. D. Spivak of Denver sent an argument in favor of the society making an index of periodical and pamphlet literature and data

on Jewish-American history. On motion a committee was appointed consisting of Prof. R. J. H. Gottheil, Dr. Friedenwald, and the Rev. Dr. Mendes, to take charge of the matter.

The selection of the place for holding the next annual meeting was left in the hands of the council. The meeting was then adjourned.”

Disraeli and Rothschild artificially created an animosity in England towards Russia. Zionist publications called the Turkish Sultans and the Russian Czars the anti-Christ. The Rothschilds curbed Pan-Slavic interests by regulating Russia's access to funds, in order to promote instead the interests of Pan-Judaism.¹⁸⁶⁹ The Rothschilds, who were already the Kings of the Gentile world, had long been seeking to have one of their own become the official King of the Jews and rule the world from Jerusalem as Messiah, as prophesied in *Isaiah*. On 14 July 1878, *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported on page 9 that the Rothschilds, and their agents around the world, organized an international Pan-Judaic union, which would rule the Jews and the world,

“PAN-JUDAISM.

WHAT IS LIKELY TO BE DONE AT THE PARIS CONFERENCE.

An International Jewish Conference will be held this month in Paris for the purpose of discussing measures to improve the political and social condition of the Jews in various parts of the world. Delegates will be sent from Jewish congregations in every quarter of the globe. The veteran Adolphe Crenneix [*sic*] is expected to preside, and among the delegates will probably be Chief Rabbi Astruc and M. Oppenheim from Belgium, Senator Artom from Italy, Chief Rabbi Cahn and Baron de Rothschild from France, Sir Julian Goldsmid and Baron de Worms from England, Baron de Rothschild and Dr. Jellinck from Austria, Mr. William Seligman from the United States, and a member of the Jewish clergy. Among the matters which occupy the attention of the conference are: The condition of the Jewish residents of the Danubian principalities and of Russia, Morocco, and Persia; the best means for securing industrial and educational advantages for the Jews of Jerusalem; the adoption of measures for the promotion of Hebrew education and for the advancement of Hebrew literature. The most important subject to be considered is a proposition to convene a synod for the purpose of inquiry into the condition of modern Judaism and the authoritative exposition of Jewish ecclesiastical law. Within the past few years two synods have been held, avowedly for this purpose, one at Leipzig, attended chiefly by European Jews, and the other at Philadelphia, attended exclusively by American Jews. The proposition to be considered at the coming conference is to call a synod which shall represent the Jews all over the world.

Since the destruction of the Temple and the dispersion of the Jews there has been no regular priesthood nor any recognized ecclesiastical authority, except such as was assumed by the chief rabbis of the various communities, who frequently differ among themselves. Such changes and modifications as

have been made in the Jewish ritual or the Jewish law have been introduced by the various communities on their own responsibility, and are not recognized by the Jews generally. Therefore, if such a synod as it is proposed to call could be convened, it would have a powerful effect upon the condition of the Jews everywhere, and it might result in the establishment of some central recognized ecclesiastical authority which would restore to the synagogue the discipline that it now lacks. Even the most orthodox Jews would pay respectful attention to the opinion of such a body, and, indeed, they are in favor of calling the synod. Mr. M. S. Isaacs, the President of the American Board of Jewish Delegates, says in a recent report:

There is a choice between an exposition by skillful, learned, competent, authoritative teachers, expounders, and judges of the ecclesiastical law, and the capricious, unreliable, ephemeral decisions of the mere officials in a particular territory, town, or congregation. The latter method is seen in its full extent in America. . . . Such a representative synod, aiming to strengthen Judaism by the recognition of current forces and agencies, by the education and guidance of the general body, without interfering with individual liberty or congregational independence within its sphere, would be an intense relief after that groping for a settlement of vexed questions, which has in despair turned in every direction for the counsel and example, and found no resource save in the untrained and deceptive public opinion of a congregation rarely fortunate in a minister at once educated and practical, versed in the law and able to calculate the effect of a novel interpretation, or a conscious departure from an existing ordinance.”

When the Czars responded with suspicion towards the Jews of Russia (whom the English Zionists had asked to sponsor attacks on Persia and Turkey and later the Czars, at least since the days of David Alroy, in order to secure Palestine for the Jews), Rothschild feigned indignation and published his “Memorial of the Jews in England to the Czar of Russia” in 1882. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported on 19 February 1882 on page 5,

“THE JUDENHETZE.

Text of the Memorial of the Jews in England to the Czar of Russia.

The following is the full text of the memorial of the Jews of England which was handed to Prince Lobanoff for transmission to the Emperor of Russia, but which the Prince declined to transmit, in accordance with instructions from his Government:

‘To his Imperial Majesty Alexander III., Emperor of All the Russias: The humble memorial of the Jews of England on behalf of the Jews of Russia. May it please your Imperial Majesty, a grievous cry of suffering has reached us from our brethren in faith in many parts of your Majesty’s great empire. For the past nine months large numbers of your Majesty’s Jewish subjects, especially those residing in the southern provinces of your Majesty’s dominions, have been the victims of serious civil outbreaks. The security of

life and property, so many years enjoyed by them, has vanished. Murder, rapine, and pillage have taken its place. The most terrible deed of violence have been perpetrated on helpless women and children. Unarmed and unoffending men have become a prey to the fury of a brutal mob. The survivors, scarcely more fortunate than the slain, live only to find their homes devastated or burned, their fortunes wrecked, and their means of subsistence gone.

‘Great, indeed, is our horror at these atrocities, but greater still, we feel certain, must be your gracious Majesty’s pain and indignation at the sufferings thus inflicted on thousands of your subjects.

‘Until last year Jews and Christians throughout your Majesty’s empire lived on terms of amity rarely, if ever, disturbed. No act of the Jews has been committed to warrant the interruption of the friendly attitude of their neighbors or the goodwill of their rulers. Your Jewish subjects love and honor your Majesty, and in their homes and synagogs pray for your welfare. They respect the laws and pay the State its just dues. They serve your Majesty in peace and war, even without hope or chance of promotion, and willingly lay down their lives for the country that has given them birth, and that has hitherto protected them. In truth, they are commanded by our sacred books to promote the welfare of the land which shelters them, to obey its laws, to honor its rulers, and to love as themselves their neighbors, though differing in faith; and the Israelites, acting in conformity with those precepts, are innocent of cause for the oppression that has befallen them.

‘We have reason to believe that in most cases it has not been the honest, law-abiding neighbors of the Jews who have originated or perpetrated these lamentable excesses, but professional agitation from a distance, acting upon the turbulent and revolutionary spirits, the enemies of law, loyalty, and order. No better proof of this can be afforded than the fact that the ringleaders have in many localities, with an audacity and shamelessness unparalleled in history, traitorously used the august name of your Majesty as a warrant for their infamous projects, and have published a forged ukase purporting to authorize the general spoliation of the Jews.

‘But we fear the cup of affliction of our brethren is not yet full, for the future appears even blacker than the past. For now the enemies of our brethren seek to palliate the atrocities that have been perpetrated, falsely declaring the Jews to have merited their persecution by their own misconduct, by their odious mode of trading, and by their having overreached their neighbors; and these enemies endeavor to induce the Government of your Majesty to impose upon all Israelites such new restrictions as to residence, occupation, and education as will not only prevent their fairly competing with their Christian fellow-subjects, but will practically prevent their becoming useful citizens and servants of the State, and will even debar them from earning their subsistence.

‘We have heard with alarm and grief that commissions have been issued with instructions couched in terms of opprobrium and hostility, teeming with

charges, assumed, but not true, which would render impossible any result favorable to the Jews. The worst effects are, therefore, apprehended. Even in Poland, where the Israelites have ever dwelt on terms of good fellowship with their neighbors, and where, until the lamentable event of last month, they have always enjoyed immunity from outrage of any kind, like commissions have been issued with similar instructions, so that everywhere throughout your Majesty's dominions the populace seems to imagine that it has the Imperial sanction for its ill-treatment of our brethren, an idea which we are convinced could never have been, however faintly, conceived by the benignant and humane spirit of your Majesty.

'Already deplorable results have ensued from the terms in which these commissions have been issued. For many local authorities, in anticipation of the reports of the commission, have put in force certain ancient laws of domicile, which had fallen into desuetude, and have forcibly driven the Jews, still smarting from their recent calamities, away from the towns and villages which they have so long been permitted to inhabit; while others, perhaps a little less inhuman, have allowed them to remain only on condition of their being pent up within the limits of their ancient ghettos.

'With regard to the imputations that have been made upon your Majesty's Jewish subjects, we humbly submit to your Majesty that whatever exceptional social position they may occupy, or whatever failings may be charged to some of them, these are due mainly to the exceptional laws to which they have been so long subjected.

'If, in some places, undue activity has characterized their conduct in certain trades and occupations, we believe it to be because other means of earning a subsistence have been denied them, because they have been too crowded in particular localities, and have, therefore, experienced the greatest difficulty in gaining a livelihood.

'We feel certain that if the special laws affecting the Jews were abolished their exceptional status, social and civil, would come to an end. Complaint would no longer be heard of their undue commercial and economic activity operating to the detriment of others if the Jews were suffered to disperse themselves at will so as to become merged amid their fellow-subjects instead of being concentrated, to the injury of themselves and others, in overcrowded hives of industry.

'Here in England, where perfect civil and religious equality has been granted us, we English Jews can bear testimony to the happy results effected by such complete emancipation. Here all those restrictions—civil, commercial, and educational—which formerly oppressed us have happily been removed, and, as a result, Jew and Christian here live and work side by side on terms of mutual respect and good fellowship, engaged in friendly rivalry, which stimulates public industry and adds to the common weal.

'And so, sire, may it be in the mighty Empire whose destinies you wield with wisdom and enlightenment. For, as the late Emperor, your father, of sainted memory, rendered his name immortal as emancipator of millions of

serfs, even so it may be your Majesty's high destiny to give life and protection to those now trembling on the verge of destruction, to give equal rights to the millions of your loyal Jewish subjects, who in their dread emergency look up to you, sire, Emperor and father of your people, only for leave to live with home and hearth secure from violence.

'Humbly do we present this memorial to your Majesty on behalf of our brethren in the name of humanity—the foundation of all religion; in the name of justice—the heritage of all; in the name of mercy—the prerogative of Imperial power.

'And we shall ever pray that the Supreme King or Kings may bless the efforts of your Majesty for the glory of your mighty Empire and the well-being of your subjects, and that He may grant your Majesty a long, and prosperous, and happy reign.

'Signed, on behalf of the Jews of England, this 19th day of January.

'N. M. DE ROTHSCHILD.'

British Jews organized for centuries to destroy Russia and Turkey. They set forth their plans in countless books and articles, which concomitantly called for the "restoration of the Jews to Palestine" and the annihilation of the Russian and/or Turkish "anti-Christ". Jews were behind the revolts in those lands in the Twentieth Century which decimated their empires, cultures and their futures. Jews in general considered Gentiles to be animals, and not their Hebrew "neighbors", and thus Russians were not protected by Jewish law in the sense which Rothschild alleged. In addition, many Jews considered Slavs to be lower than Aryans, and thus beneath the contempt many Jews had for Gentiles in general. Contrary to Rothschild's assertions, Jewish tribalism, racism and corruption did indeed continue after emancipation and became most manifest when Jews were accorded the greatest freedom after the Bolshevik Revolution and took advantage of their liberty as an opportunity to slaughter Gentiles. Most tellingly, when Russian Jews sought to emigrate to England and America, it was English and American Jews who most strongly opposed their emigration, realizing better than anyone else how tribal, racist and corrupt Russian and Galician Jews could be.

The Zionist financiers were so successful in making it appear that Great Britain was acting out of its own best interests by inserting itself into the Turkish Empire, and not acting pursuant to the instigation of the Zionists; that many came to conclude that the Balfour Declaration materialized out of British interests. Ironically, this backfired on the Zionists, and some sectors of the British Government were reluctant to give up Palestine to the Jews, while others were reluctant to incite the French to war by interfering with French interests in the region—all of which frustrated the Zionists' efforts to steal the land from the Palestinians after the First World War. *The London Times* reported on 29 June 1920 on page 15,

"THE POPE AND ZIONISM.
ACRIMONIOUS ITALIAN COMMENT.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

ROME, JUNE 27.

Sir Herbert Samuel, High Commissioner to Palestine, who left Rome last night, visited both the King and the Pope. His visit to the Pope has attracted a certain amount of attention, as it was bound to do.

The *Tempo* comments acrimoniously on British policy in Palestine, saying that England merely supported Zionism in order to find an excuse for establishing herself there, where she had no other excuse to be. But the *Tempo* has never been anything but anti-British. The article finishes by asking whether Sir Herbert Samuel attempted to assure the Pope that fears inspired by Zionism were unfounded, and whether he is likely to have succeeded.

Certainly the Vatican has been nervous about Zionism, and certain utterances have given it cause to be. But there is every reason to believe that Sir Herbert should be able to still these fears by proving them to be unjustified.”

This was, however, a minor obstacle for the Rothschilds when compared with the fact that most Jews did not wish to live in Palestine and did not have the racist mindset of the Zionists. *The London Times* reported on 17 June 1918 on page 5,

“FUTURE OF PALESTINE.

OPPOSITION TO ZIONISM.

The ideals of the League of British Jews in regard to the future of Palestine as distinct from those of the Zionists were expounded by Dr. Israel Abrahams, of Cambridge, at Wigmore Hall yesterday.

What divided the League from the Zionists, he said, was that the former could not assent to the setting up in Palestine of a State composed exclusively of Jews. They maintained that, whatever the government, the State should be absolutely free from any racial or religious test. Citizenship and nationality had nothing to do with religion. As to the Jews outside, the League could not assent to the statement that they constituted a nation. They belonged to many nations, and could neither control Palestinian politics nor be controlled by them. The Jews of the world were not united, but divided by nationality, and now were actually fighting each other. The Palestine of the future was for the Jews who desired to live there, and for those who wished to escape from countries where they had no home.

In a discussion which followed, some opposition to the lecturer’s point of view was shown, and one speaker asserted that the League had hindered the colonization of Palestine.”

The tribalism of Rothschild is apparent not only his covert designs to destroy Russia and to use English treasure and lives to achieve his ends, not only in the fact that he felt a tribal kinship with the Jews of Russia and rushed to defend them, but

in his statement that even after the Jews had been emancipated in England they were at perpetual war with the Christians,

“Here all those restrictions—civil, commercial, and educational—which formerly oppressed us have happily been removed, and, as a result, Jew and Christian here live and work side by side on terms of mutual respect and good fellowship, engaged in friendly rivalry, which stimulates public industry and adds to the common weel.”

How did the Rothschilds gain the wealth which fed their arrogance? In part by stealing from the English, who had granted the Jews freedom. This Jewish theft of British treasure took place at a time when England was at war. That was how the Rothschilds repaid English generosity. It was the Rothschilds’ method of “friendly rivalry” with the Christians. If the Christians had responded in unkind, the Jews would have been wiped out in a very short while. Perhaps the English example gave the Czar pause.

Concerned that the Rothschilds were moving into America during the Civil War, after having largely ruined the markets of Europe by plundering Europe’s wealth, on 2 June 1867 on page 3, *The Chicago Tribune* told part of the story of the Jewish war profiteers and cheats, the Rothschilds of their day. It was one of many stories the *Tribune* ran, which exposed the Rothschilds:

“THE HOUSE OF ROTHSCHILD.

Its Origin and History—The ‘Red Shield’—The Power and Wealth of the Rothschilds—Their Operations with American Bonds—The Rothschilds and the Pope.

(Frankfort Correspondence of the Boston Journal.)

THE RED SHIELD.

Come with me to the eastern part of the city—the old town—where you will discover scarcely a sign of modern architecture. The streets are narrow; the houses lean toward each other from opposite sides of the way, as if they were friends about to fall into each other’s arms. It is the Jews’ quarter. The door-ways are crowded with women and children—all bearing the unmistakable features which, the world over, characterize this historic people—rejected of God, despised of men, scattered everywhere, yet retaining their nationality, endowed with a vitality which has no parallel in the human race.

We turn down the Judengasse, the Jew’s alley, from the chief thoroughfare of the modern town. In this street, 124 years ago, lived a dealer in old clothes who had a red shield for a sign, which in German reads *Roth Schild*. It was in 1743 that a child was born to this Israelite. The name given to the boy was Anselm Meyer, who also became a clothes dealer and a pawn broker, succeeding to the business of his father. By degrees he extended his business, lending money at high rates of interest during the wars of the last century, managing his affairs with such skill that Prince William the

Landgrave made him his banker. When Napoleon came across the Rhine, in 1806, this clothes dealer was directed to take care of the treasures of the Prince, amounting to twelve million dollars, which he invested so judiciously that it brought large increase to the owner, and especially to the manager.

This banker died in 1812, leaving an estate estimated at \$5,000,000—not a very large sum these days—but he left an injunction upon his five sons, which was made binding by an oath given by sons around his death-bed, which has had and still has a powerful influence upon the world. The sons bound themselves by an oath to follow their father's business together, holding his property in partnership, extending the business, that the world might know of but one house of the *red shield!* (Rothschild.)

The sons were true to their oath. Nathan went to Manchester, England, as early as 1797, but afterward moved to London. Anselm remained at Frankfort, James went to Paris, Solomon to Vienna, and Charles to Naples, the five brothers thus occupying great financial centres. Nathan, in London, amassed money with great rapidity, and the same may be said of all the others, the wars of Napoleon being favorable to the business of the house. Nathan went to the Continent to witness the operations of Wellington in his last campaign against Napoleon, prepared to act with the utmost energy, let the result be as it might. He witnessed the battle of Waterloo, and, when assured of Napoleon's defeat, rode all night, with relays of horses, to Ostend; went across the channel in a fishing smack—for it was before the days of steam—reached London in advance of all other messengers, and spread the rumor that Wellington and Blucher were defeated. The 20th of June in that memorable year was a dismal day in London. The battle was fought on the 18th. Nathan Meyer, of the house of Red Shield, by hard riding, reached London at midnight on the 19th. On the morning of the 20th, the news was over town that the cause of the allies was lost, that Napoleon had swept all before him. England had been the leading spirit in the struggle against Napoleon. The treasury of Great Britain had supplied funds to nearly all of the allied Powers. If their cause was lost what hope was there for the future? Bankers flew from door to door in eager haste to sell their stocks. Funds of every description went down. Anselm Meyer was besieged by men who had funds for sale. He too had stocks for sale. What would they give? But meanwhile he had scores of agents purchasing. Twenty four hours later Wellington's messenger arrived in London; the truth was known. The nation gave vent to its joy; up went the funds, pouring, it is said, five million dollars into the coffers of this one branch of the house of the Red Shield!

Though Frankfort is comparatively a small city, though it has no imperial court, it is still a great money centre, solely because that here is the central house of the Rothschild and other bankers.

The House of the Red Shield is the greatest banking house of the world—the mightiest of all time. Its power is felt the world over—in the Tuileries of Paris, in the ministerial chamber of Berlin, in the imperial palace at St. Petersburg, in the Vatican at Rome, in the Bank of England, in Wall

street, State street, and by every New England fireside. The house of the Red Shield, by the exercise of its financial power, can make a difference in the yearly account of every man who reads these words of mine! Though Anselm Meyer has been half a century dead; though several of his sons have gone down to the grave—the house is the same. The grand-children have the spirit of the children. The children of the brothers have intermarried, and it is one family, animated by a common purpose, that the world shall know only one *red shield*.

AMERICAN BONDS.

The house, at an early stage of the American war, took hold of the United States bonds. Germany had confidence in America. England strove for our ruin, but the people of the Rhine believed in the star of American liberty. Fifty years of peace had been long enough to bring wealth to this land, and so with every steamer orders were sent across the Atlantic for investment in American securities. It is supposed that Germany holds, at the present time, about three hundred and fifty millions of United States bonds, and it is said that there have been no less than fifty million dollars profit to the bankers of Frankfort on American securities since 1863!

The great banking houses here make little show. The transactions of the Rothschilds amount to millions a day, and yet the operations are conducted as quietly as the business of a small counting house. You can purchase any stock here. Passing along the street I noticed bonds of the State of California—of several American States—of the United States—bonds in Dutch, Russian, Turkish, Arabic, Spanish, Italian, French—bonds of all lands—of States, cities, towns and companies. The reports of the Frankfort exchange are looked at by European bankers with as much interest as that of London or Paris.

Erlanger, the banker who negotiated the rebel cotton loan, and who fleeced English sympathizers with the South out of fifteen million dollars, has a house here. he has just now taken hold of the new Tunisian loan, but his management of the rebel loan has brought discredit upon his house.

The power of the Red Shield was felt by Prussia last summer. The Prussian Government demanded an indemnity of great amount, twenty-five million dollars, I believe, from the city of Frankfort. The head of the house of the Red Shield informed the Count Bismark that if the attempt was made to enforce that levy he would break every bank in Berlin; that he had the power to do it, and that he should exercise the power. Prussia had won a victory at Konnigratz; but here, in the person of one man, she had met an adversary who had the power to humble her, and she declined the contest. A much lower sum was agreed upon, which was paid by the city.

THE ROTHSCHILDS AND THE POPE.

For fifteen centuries the Jews have been cursed by the Pope, and persecuted by the Roman Church. There is no more revolting chapter of horrors in history than that of the treatment of the Jews at the hands of the Pontiffs. In all lands where the Roman religion is dominant the children of

Israel have been treated with barbaric rigor—allowed few privileges, denied all rights, looked upon as a people accursed of God, and set apart by divine ordination to be trampled upon by the church. In Rome, at the present day, the Jews are confined to the Ghetto; they are not allowed to set up a shop in any other part of the city; they cannot leave the city without a permit; they can engage only in certain trades; they are compelled to pay enormous taxes into the Papal treasury; they are subject to a stringent code of laws established by the Pope for their special government; they are imprisoned and fined for the most trivial of offences. They cannot own any real estate in the city; cannot build or tear down or remodel any dwelling or change their place of business, without Papal permission. They are in abject slavery, with no right whatever, and entitled to no privileges, and receive none, except upon the gracious condescension of the Pope. In former times they were unmercifully whipped and compelled to listen once a week to the *Christian* doctrine of the priests. But time is bringing changes. The Pope is in want of money; and the house of the red shield has money to lend on good security. The house is always ready to accommodate Governments. Italy wants money, so she sells her fine system of railroads to the Rothschilds. The Pope wants money, and he sends his Nuncio to the wealthy house of the despised race, offers them security on the property of the church, the Compagna, and receives ten million dollars to maintain his army and Imperial State. That was in 1865. A year passes, and the Pontifical expenditures are five million more than the income, and the deficit is made up by the Rothschilds, who take a second security at a higher rate of interest. Another year has passed and there is a third great annual vacuum in the Papal treasury of six million, which quite likely will be filled by the same house. The firm can do it with as much ease as your readers can pay their yearly subscription to the weekly *Journal*. When will the Pope redeem his loan at the rate he is going? Never. Manifestly the day is not far distant when these representatives of the persecuted race will have all the available property of the Church in their possession. Surely time works wonders.”

Russians had many reasons to suspect Russian Jews, who were pledged to retaliate against Russian Gentiles for the persecutions they had faced. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* wrote on 21 July 1878 on page 13,

“BEACONSFIELD’S LUCK.

Bismarck’s Hand Disclosed in the
Workings of the Congress
at Berlin.

How the Jew Bankers Revenged
Themselves for Insults to Their
Race.

Correspondence New York Graphic.

LONDON, July 6.—All hail, Beaconsfield!

He is the hero of the hour. He is looked upon by all loyal Englishmen as the pivot on which has turned all the deliberations of the Berlin Congress. But is this the correct view?

Not at all. England's triumphs at Berlin are simply incidents in the 'streak of luck' which has marked the career of this great political adventurer.

I am enabled to furnish the *Graphic* with the first true account of the recent moves on the chess-board of European politics.

The result of the Congress may be briefly stated as the complete humiliation of Russia. True, she receives Batoum, with conditions that render the concession practically valueless. True, she regains her little strip of Bessarabia that had been given to Roumania, and she is permitted to retain Kars. But it is her rivals who have secured the material advantages at the Congress, and, worse than all, it is England, her special rival, who has been made the chief recipient of the fruits of Russia's expenditure of blood and treasure.

It is now certain—it will be published in the journals and confirmed in Parliament ere this letter is 1,000 miles on its way to you—that England is to have Cyprus as her own, and is to acquire a protectorate of the whole of Asiatic Turkey, with practically illimitable possibilities of the extension of trade in the Levant and down the Valley of the Euphrates. Egypt is virtually hers; the Suez Canal is absolutely in her control.

Russia has acquired neither facilities for the extension of her trade nor territory; and she has lost all the prestige acquired by the war.

What does this mean?

The answer to this question involves three names—Rothschild, Bismarck, Andrassy.

First, as to Rothschild. The sympathy of the Hebrews all over the world has been with Turkey and against Russia. Russia, in the nineteenth century, has oppressed and persecuted the Jews with the most bitter and malignant cruelty. The hatred of the Greek Church for the Jews to-day is as intense as was that of some of the bigoted Catholics in the Middle Ages for that long suffering and persecuted race. The success of the Russian arms against Turkey filled the Jews with indignation and alarm. The Turks in their rule in Europe and in Asia have been tolerant alike to Christian and to Jew; it may be said they have been forced to award this tolerance; but it was not in violation of their faith nor of the will of their great Prophet, for to this day there exists the authenticated manuscript of the famous decree of Mohammed, in which he commands the faithful to abstain from persecuting and to treat charity and kindness the Jews and Christians dwelling under their rule. But, against the personal wishes of the Czar, the blind and bitter hatred of the Russians for the Jews continually manifests itself, and their persecution of the chosen people has never ceased.

Russia was forced to make great pecuniary sacrifices to keep her armies in the field; she taxed her monetary resources to the utmost; and when the San Stefano treaty had been negotiated and the question of war or peace hung trembling in the balance, she found to her dismay that if she ventured upon a war with England she must reckon with a potent foe, of whose existence she had hitherto been disdainful, if not ignorant.

This foe was the most powerful element in Continental Europe.

All bankers are not Jews. But the Hebrew element among the money-lenders and money-masters of Europe is so widespread and so powerful that it was easy for it to effect combinations by which Russia was shut out from the privilege of borrowing money to continue to renew her march of conquest.

She tried to borrow in England—no money! She sought to effect a loan in Paris—no money! She intrigued through her most skillful agents in all the minor Bourses of Europe—not a rouble could she obtain. And now, as you will probably learn in a few days, she is in such desperate financial straits that, as a last resort, she is about to call upon her patriotic subjects—if she has any—to put their hands in their pockets and lend her their own money,—if they have any, which is doubtful.

Yes! In the very hour of Russia's military triumph, when, flushed with her dearly-bought victories, and with the Sultan willing to prostrate himself as a vassal at her feet, the despised and persecuted Israelite was able to say to the Czar: 'Thus far and no farther!'

It was not England who forced Russia to appear before the Berlin Congress, and submit to a revision of her extorted treaty with Turkey.

Russia was forced into this humiliation by the Jew bankers of the world.

Once in the Congress, Gortschakoff and Schouvaloff found to their dismay and horror that they were contending single-handed against all Europe.

Bismarck proved to be the arch enemy of Russia in the Congress, the master-spirit who formed the combination to humiliate her by the Treaty of Berlin after her victories more than she had been humiliated by the Treaty of Paris after her defeats.

Now for a State secret, hinted at in various ways, but which has never come to light in any official form, and the details of which cannot be fully known until after Kaiser William and Prince Bismarck are dead.

Bismarck, with true statesmanlike prescience, detests Russia. Russia is a military power of incalculable possibilities, capable, perhaps, in time, of overrunning and conquering all Europe. A war that would increase the military prestige or augment the territorial domain of Russia, Bismarck regarded with alarm and indignation.

Why, then, did he not put an end to the Russian and Turkish war?

The answer is—Kaiser William.

The German Emperor is swayed by his personal affections and his dynastic prejudices. The old gentleman never had much political sense. He

supposed his personal honor was pledged to Russia. The Czar had not interfered with Prussia in her wars with Austria and France. He, then, should not interfere in Russia's contest with Turkey. Bismarck had been quite willing to have an amicable understanding with Russia as regarded Austria and France; but he had no intention of permitting Russia to gain a military and territorial predominance that might overshadow Germany.

Thus it was Bismarck who formed the combination that robbed Russia of the fruits of her great victories.

How did he effect this? Here comes in the third name—Andrassy.

The Prime Minister of Hungary, be it remembered, is a Hungarian statesman. Blood with him, also, is thicker than water. He remembers that, when Hungary had German-Austria at her feet in 1848, Russia sent 60,000 troops to the aid of Austria, turned the tide of victory, and crushed out forever the hopes of Hungary for independent neutrality. The hated Slav was thus used to overcome the legitimate and patriotic aspirations of Hungary.

I state upon the best authority that, in the conferences held in the beginning of the late war by Bismarck and Andrassy, the scheme was concocted which culminated in the yet unsigned Treaty of Berlin. It was in these conferences determined that Russia should be despoiled of the fruits of her victories. One of the results is seen in the virtual annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria, and the great strengthening of that Power thereby.

Here, then, is the key to the mysteries of the Congress of Berlin. Rothschild, the representative of the Jews, closing the Bourses Europe against Russia; Bismarck, intent on the purpose of curbing and manacled the giant of the North in the interests of Western civilization; Andrassy paving off Russia for the injuries inflicted on Hungary in 1848, and turning her victories into Dead Sea fruit,—pleasant to the sight, but turning to ashes upon the lips.

But how about Disraeli—Beaconsfield? Is he not the real hero of this great drama? Not at all.

True, again, blood with him is thicker than water; and undoubtedly he placed himself in relation with the Jewish money-kings to effect the humiliation of Russia. True, he withdrew the timid and hesitating Lord Derby at the right moment, and put the courageous Marquis of Salisbury in his place. But the cession of Cyprus to England, and investing her with protectorate of Asiatic Turkey, was really the work of Bismarck.

Cyprus should have been given to France. The trade of the Levant properly belongs to her and to Italy more than to England. But Bismarck, in view of the prejudices of his own people,—not that he shares these prejudices, for he is a true statesman, but merely out of deference to these narrow hatreds and dislikes,—was compelled to permit England to take what really belongs to France, and by doing this he has crowned with a new chaplet the brow of that strange personage, the novelist and the political adventurer who is now Premier of England, who will certainly become a

Duke, and who is possibly destined—as gossip will have it—to still further honor, to wear the Royal robes of Prince Consort and to occupy the long vacant bed of ‘Albert the Good.’”

Bismarck followed the advice of, and was at the mercy of, Jewish bankers. As part of the Bolsheviks controlled opposition, Hitler also argued that Pan-Germany could save Western Civilization from Pan-Slavism and Bolshevism. He expected England’s support in this posture. Again and again, from Napoleon onward, Russia was attacked by Western Europe and the central issue was Jews. Whether the pretext was to rescue them or to attack them, the results were to gain control of the Holy Land from Turkey and to use the Jews of Russia to take and to occupy it—then to use the Russian Jews as a slave labor force to construct palatial estates for wealthy Western Jews.

G & C Merriam believed that Bismarck was a Jew, and they expressed this belief, perhaps not coincidentally, in the context of Disraeli and Rothschild. *The Chicago Tribune* published the following article on 13 March 1872 on page 3:

“THE DICTIONARY QUESTION.

To Jew, a Verb—Jesuitical—Card from the Merriams.

To the Editor of the Springfield (Mass.) Republican:

Some few days since you commented upon the course of the dictionaries in regard to ‘jew’ and jesuitical.’

In a recently issued circular of ours, which we hand you herewith, replying to certain strictures upon Webster’s definitions of political terms, you will notice the ground the dictionary professes to take in regard to opprobrious and offensive appellations, that of strict impartiality. It is an error of judgment, and not of intention, if that position is not maintained in regard to two words in question. Some few weeks since a respected business acquaintance, Mr. Solomons, of Washington, a Jew, wrote us complaining, in substance, that the use of ‘jew, verb, active, to cheat or defraud; to swindle,’ in Webster, was unjust and unauthorized;—that is, that it wronged his people, and was unsanctioned by good usage. An examination by us disclosed the fact, after a careful collation, that the word as a verb, in any sense, does not appear in any dictionary ever published in England, so far as we have the means at hand of ascertaining. It is not found in Bailey, Johnson, Richardson, Walker, Reid, Smart, Ogilvie, Knowles, etc. The inference seems fair that the word has no recognized use out of this country. It is found in none of the earlier editions of Webster, and first appears in the present. Our attention is now originally called to it, and how it found its way with us, we know not. We fear it must have been drawn from Worcester, where we first find it. Then, as to popular or recognized usage; we do not recall ever seeing it employed in literary composition,—rarely, if ever, to have heard it used colloquially. In these circumstances it seemed due to truth, to our correspondent, and to literary impartiality, to adopt the course pursued.

You allude to it as a 'Shakspearean word.' Whilst we think the masterly delineation of Shylock the Jew, in the Merchant of Venice, by Shakspeare, thus attaching this offensive characteristic, as a national trait, to the Jewish race, (and a writer of fiction, in a strongly-drawn character, is usually understood as justified in a very considerable exaggeration), if not first, yet most strongly, fastened this feature of a sharp bargainer upon the poor Hebrew, yet we believe you will nowhere find 'jew,' as a verb, employed by him. We speak only from memory, but such is our strong conviction. Sir Walter Scott, in Ivanhoe, more justly and more naturally, because giving a mixed character, presents, in Rebecca the Jewess, one of his loveliest female portraits, and Isaac her father has noble as well as mercenary traits.

Injustice, perhaps, is done to the Jewish race, by not sufficiently considering the past and current conditions of their national, or rather race existence; while the noble traits which characterized them whilst the chosen people of the Lord, and which still exist, are forgotten or overlooked. Who ever heard of one depending upon public charity, or uncared for by his race? Two circumstances seem to have combined to make them a trading people. The severest civil disabilities, until quite recently enforced against them in nearly all lands, frequent banishments, and the bitterest persecutions, have prevented permanent settlements, and agricultural or mechanical pursuits. They must stand ready to depart at a moment's notice, and a life of traffic seemed their only resource. Men, with beautiful, if misplaced faith (yet eminent Christian scholars, in the light of prophecy, look to their final restoration to Palestine, with something of its pristine glory), they believe they are but strangers and pilgrims in all other lands, and are to find rest only in their own.

The founder of Christianity was himself a Jew, and the race are 'Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory and the covenants, and the giving of the law and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever.' Should we not hesitate, on this ground alone, about applying an epithet to the race of somewhat doubtful propriety? So far as our personal observations goes, the Jews are much like other men, neither essentially better, nor worse. Certainly, we have known excellent people among them. One of the most prominent booksellers of Philadelphia a few years since was a Jew, and liberal and equitable in his dealings. Although with Christian partners, the store was invariably and closely closed on Saturdays, (on Sunday's likewise), thus involving much business sacrifice and negating, certainly, inordinate mercenary views, and so presented a marked aspect on the thronged thoroughfare of Chestnut street. Rothschild, the banker, Disraeli, the statesman (we have the impression Bismarck, the Prussian Premier), all Jews, certainly give evidence of extraordinary intellectual powers, not coupled with unennobling traits. The isolated distinctive existence of the Jewish race, thus secured by Providential causes, as well as by their own religious faith and rites, while yet they mingle without

commixing with all people, assures, wonderfully, the fulfillment of prophecies uttered more than twenty centuries ago, and it thus a marked proof of the truth of revelation.

We have but a few words in regard to ‘jesuitical.’ In preparing for the revision of the dictionary, we applied, through a Roman Catholic friend, to the late Archbishop Hughes of New York, then at the head of the Catholic prelacy in this country, as to the person of highest scholarship in that Church to whom we could intrust the revision and preparation of Roman Catholic terms. He introduced us to Dr. O’Callghan of Albany, by whom that revision was made. These, of course, were subsequently submitted to President Porter, the editor-in-chief, and as left by him now appear in the dictionary. Jesuitical, as now defined, meets the approval of the scholars and dignitaries of the Catholic Church, who accord to it, as employed in popular use, the signification given in the dictionary, which is also accepted by Protestants. This use in neither colloquial nor local, like ‘jew,’ but is employed by the best writers and speakers, and so has long been. Intelligent men, of whatever faith do not take umbrage at this, and if others do, it is from want of a proper understanding of the province of the lexicographer. Loyola, the founder of the order, as have, presumably, those since connected with it, probably claimed that a ‘higher law’ in divine and religious obligation, was paramount and superior to civil rule and rulers: and hence justified to themselves measures to thwart the latter, unjustifiable on any other supposition. Hence their practices, and the word growing out of them. As with Jews, there might be some sacred associations with the word Jesus, Jesu-itical, to make undesirable the use of the term in an offensive sense, yet the usage seems too well established to be changed. Do we meet your difficulty?

G. & C. MERRIAM.”

How did Disraeli and Rothschild, both of whom were Zionists, skirt the laws of England and purchase the Suez with Rothschild’s credit? Legend had it that the Rothschilds had demonstrated that they could break the Bank of England at any time. *The Chicago Daily Tribune* published the following article on 21 February 1877 on page 2,

“NATHAN ROTHSCHILD.

His Little Scrimmage with the Bank of England.

Somewhere near a score of years ago, I think, I read the story, then fresh. It has been recalled to my mind by its telling in my presence to an English gentleman, who assured us that he could personally vouch for its truth, he having had business with the old lady of Threadneedle street while the transaction was in progress; and, from this assurance of an eye-witness, I deem the thing worth repeating. I think I remember it as it was told to me.

A bill of exchange, for a large amount, was drawn by Anselm Rothschild, of London. When the gentleman who held it arrived in London, Nathan was away, and he took the bit of paper to the Bank of England, and asked them

there to discount it. The managers were very stiff. With haughty assurance they informed the holder that they discounted only their own bills; they wanted nothing to do with the bills of 'private persons.' They did not stop to reflect with whom they had to deal. Those shrewd old fellows in charge of the change of the realm should have known and remembered that that bit of paper bore the sign manual of a man more powerful than they,—more powerful because independent of the thousand-and-one hampers that rested upon them.

'Umph!' exclaimed Nathan Rothschild, when the answer of the bank was repeated to him. 'Private persons! I will give those important gentlemen to know with what sort of private persons they have to deal!'

And then Nathan Rothschild went at work. He had an object in view,—to humble the Bank of England,—and he meant to do it. He sent agents upon the Continent, and through the United Kingdom, and three weeks were spent in gathering up notes of the smaller denominations of the bank's own issue. One morning, bright and early, Nathan Rothschild presented himself at the bank at the opening of the teller's department, and drew from his pocketbook a five pound note, which he desired to have cashed. Five sovereigns were counted out to him, the officers looking with astonishment upon seeing the Baron Rothschild troubling himself personally about so trivial a matter. The Baron examined the coins one by one, and, having satisfied himself of their honesty in quality and weight, he slipped them into a canvas bag, and drew out and presented another five pound note. The same operation was gone through with again, save that this time the Baron took the trouble to take a small pair of scales from his pocket and weigh one of the pieces, for the law gave him that right. Two—three—ten—twenty—a hundred—five hundred pound notes were presented and cashed. When one pocketbook had been emptied another was brought forth; and when a canvas bag had been filled with gold it was passed to a servant who was in waiting. And so he went on until the hour arrived for closing the bank; and at the same time he had nine of the employes of the house engaged in the same work. So it resulted that ten men of the house of Rothschild had kept every teller of the bank busy seven hours, and had exchanged somewhere about £22,000. Not another customer had been able to get his wants attended to.

The English like oddity. Let a man do something original and piquant, and they will applaud even though their own flesh is pricked. So the people contrived to smile at the eccentricity of Baron Rothschild, and when the time came for closing the bank, they were not a tenth part so much annoyed as were the customers from abroad, whose business had not been attended to. The bank officials smiled that evening but—

On the following morning, when the bank opened, Nathan Rothschild appeared again, accompanied by his nine faithful helpers, this time bringing with him as far as the street entrance four heavy two-horse drays, for the purpose of carting away the gold, for to-day the Baron had bills of a larger denomination. Ah, the officers of the bank smiled no more, and a trembling

seized them when the banker monarch said, with stern simplicity and directness:

‘Ah, these gentlemen refuse to take my bills. Be it so. I am resolved that I will keep not one of theirs. It is the house of Rothschild against the Bank of England!’

The Bank of England opened its eyes very wide. Within a week the house of Rothschild could be demanding gold it did not possess. The gentlemen at the head of affairs saw very plainly that in a determined tilt the bank must go to the wall. There was but way out of the scrape, and they took it. Notice was at once publicly given that thenceforth the Bank of England would cash the bills of Rothschild as well as its own!—*Exchange*.”

Under the heading “Foreign Articles”, the following statement appeared in *Niles’ Weekly Register*, Volume 17, Number 427, (13 November 1819), p. 169,

“Mr. Rothschild, the great London banker, indignant at the persecution of his Jewish brethren in Germany, has refused to take bills upon any of the cities in which they are persecuted; and great embarrassments to trade have been experienced in consequence of his determination. ☞It is intimated that the persecution of the Jews is in part owing to the fact, that Mr. Rothschild and his brethren were among the chief of those who furnished the ‘legitimates,’ with money to forge chains for the people of Europe.”

Not only could no nation claim to be a democracy while the Rothschilds held so much sway in politics, no nation could claim national sovereignty. Michael Shapiro wrote of the Rothschilds, in Shapiro’s book *The Jewish 100: A Ranking of the Most Influential Jews of All Time*,

“Although their political power would wane after the First World War as more banking houses rose to prominence and competition set in, the Rothschilds helped shape the political fortunes of many of the great figures of the age, including, but certainly not limited to, Napoleon, the Duke of Wellington, Talleyrand, Metternich, Queen Victoria, Disraeli, and Bismarck (and the futures of their countries).”¹⁸⁷⁰

and of Disraeli,

“With his sister’s fiancé, William Meredith, Disraeli left Britain in 1830 for a ‘Grand Tour’ of the Mediterranean. The sixteen-month trip made a permanent impression on him. Disraeli was particularly taken with Jerusalem. He began to understand the relationship between his Jewish heritage and Christian assimilation. Indeed, this Middle Eastern journey inspired creation of the protagonist of his novel *Alroy* (1833). Set in an exotic twelfth-century milieu, the character, David Alroy, fails in his attempt to restore the Holy Land to Jewish dominion. Later, in his novel *Tancred*,

Disraeli's early Zionism would result in the often quoted line that 'a race that persists in celebrating their vintage although they have no fruits to gather, will regain their vineyards.'"¹⁸⁷¹

Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch was quoted in *The Chicago Tribune* on 5 November 1889 on page 10, and capsulized the disparate views of wealthy "assimilated" Jews many of whom were under Rothschild's influence, reformed Jews, and Orthodox Jews,

"Many orthodox Jews go to Jerusalem to die. They believe that when the resurrection takes place those who are not buried there will have to go there from their graves. In order to avoid the journey after death they go before. The restoration of the City of Jerusalem was a dream of Disraeli and of 'Daniel Deronda.' The reformed Jews are entirely indifferent to this question, though the orthodox expect the restoration and rebuilding to take place in some miraculous way."

Disraeli admitted that the purchase of the Suez was not made as an investment for England, but a was a purely political maneuver to draw England into Egypt for the benefit of Zionists and to take Palestine from the Turkish Empire and its native population,

"The noble Lord himself has expressed great dissatisfaction, because I have not told him what the conduct of the Government would be with regard to the Canal in a time of war. I must say that on this subject I wish to retain my reserve. I cannot conceive anything more imprudent than a discussion in this House at the present time as to the conduct of England with regard to the Suez Canal in time of war, and I shall therefore decline to enter upon any discussion on the subject. . . . What we have to do tonight is to agree to the Vote for the purchase of these shares. I have never recommended, and I do not now recommend this purchase as a financial investment. If it gave us 10 per cent of interest and a security as good as the Consols I do not think an English Minister would be justified in making such an investment; still less if he is obliged to borrow the money for the occasion. I do not recommend it either as a commercial speculation although I believe that many of those who have looked upon it with little favour will probably be surprised with the pecuniary results of the purchase. I have always, and do now recommend it to the country as a political transaction, and one which I believe is calculated to strengthen the Empire. That is the spirit in which it has been accepted by the country, which understands it though the two right honourable critics may not. They are really seasick of the 'Silver Streak.' They want the Empire to be maintained, to be strengthened; they will not be alarmed even it be increased. Because they think we are obtaining a great hold and interest in this important portion of Africa—because they believe that it secures to us a highway to our Indian Empire and our other dependencies, the people of England have from the first recognized the propriety and the wisdom of the

step which we shall sanction tonight.”¹⁸⁷²

In an allusion to Shakespeare’s character Shylock in the play *A Merchant of Venice*, *The Chicago Daily Tribune* reported on 4 July 1881 on page 7,

“ROTHSCHILD’S POUND OF FLESH

It appears from the report, too, that the foreign bondholders, mostly French and English, still have possession of the country, and are like the leeches of that valley in the days of Moses. There have been some changes in the physical conditions, and the boundaries of the domain of the security lands have been changed; still, the Government sees to it that the foreign usurers are paid their pound of flesh. Mr. Farman says:

When the decree appeared abolishing the law of the moukabalah, the Rothschilds refused to pay over the balance of the proceeds of the loan then in their hands until other securities were given them. The result was, that, while they consented to the increase of their taxes in an amount of about \$500,000, this was not to be paid until their coupons were provided for, and they had also pledged to them, as a further guarantee, the revenues of the Province of Kenah, which contains 283,842 acres of cultivable land, on which the annual tax is \$1,478,805. The whole revenues of the province are in excess of this sum.

It will be seen that the interest is amply secured; and that the increase of the taxes caused by the repeal of the law of the moukabalah, so far as relates to lands mortgaged to secure this loan, is only nominal, and cannot injuriously effect the bondholders. In case of a low Nile or bad crops from any other cause, full provision has been made for their coupons. On the occurrence of any such event, it will be the people of Egypt who are to suffer, and not the Parisian or London bankers.”

8.3 Jews Provoke Perpetual War

The power and duplicity of Jewish finance again revealed itself in the First World War. In 1920, the Zionist Organization of America, New York, published *A Guide to Zionism*, edited by Jessie E. Sampter, which contained a time-line, which states on pages 238-239, *inter alia*,

“[1914] *Sept.* Whole press in England begins active agitation for Jewish rights in Russia. [***] [1915] *June.* Zionist Organization (in Germany) refuses request of Government that it issue appeal to all Zionists asking for sympathy with Germany, replying that it could not involve the Zionist movement in world politics.”

The New York Times reported on 30 December 1917 on page 5,

“JEWS IN GERMANY FIRM.

Won't Support War Loan Until
Palestine Independence Is
Sanctioned.

Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

THE HAGUE, Dec. 29.—It is reported here that the leading Jewish financiers of Germany refused to support the German war loan unless the German Government undertook to refrain from all opposition to the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine, independent of any Turkish suzerainty or control.

By Associated Press.

THE HAGUE, Dec. 29.—The Jewish Correspondence Bureau here has received a telegram from Berlin stating that at a Zionist conference in Germany a resolution was adopted in which satisfaction was expressed that Great Britain had recognized the right of the Jewish people to a national existence in Palestine.”

Eduard Bernstein wrote after the war,

“To many Social Democrats the war really seemed to be one for national existence; and to many passionate natures the opposition of so many Jews to the war credits might have seemed to betray un-German or anti-German thinking. How little such feeling had to do with anti-Semitism can be seen from the fact that those Jews who voted for the war loans were more highly esteemed and sought after than ever.”¹⁸⁷³

After the war, Kaiser Wilhelm II lived in exile in the Netherlands at Doorn. Many in the Jewish controlled press tried to place the blame for the war on him. Baron Clemens von Radowitz-Nei alleged that he had discussed politics with the former Emperor on May 20th, 21st and 22nd of 1922. The Baron reported on his alleged conversations with the former Kaiser in *The Chicago Daily Tribune* on 3 July 1922 on the front page in an article which continued onto page 4, where the Baron alleged, among other things,

“The former emperor had a very great respect for Dr. Rathenau's ability, but considered him a great danger to Germany. In the first place, Rathenau was a Jew, and the Kaiser has come apparently to the firm conviction that the Jews are at the bottom of most of the troubles in Germany and Europe.

‘The much talked of Wiesbaden agreement,’ said the former emperor, ‘was not an international agreement. It was an understanding between two groups of capitalists, two great trusts—between Rathenau and the interests represented by Loucheur and Giraud.’

And curiously enough, when I saw Dr. Rathenau a few weeks later, he asked me if many people did not think that—in France.

[***]

The Kaiser is convinced that all the evils of the modern world originate with the Jews.

‘A Jew cannot be a true patriot,’ he exclaimed. ‘He is something different—like a bad insect. He must be kept apart, out of a place where he can do mischief—even if by pogroms, if necessary.’

‘The Jews are responsible for bolshevism in Russia, and Germany, too. I was far too indulgent with them during my reign, and I bitterly regret the favors I showed to prominent Jewish bankers and business men.’

I notice that one of the generals in attendance on him at the time wore the swastika, symbol of an anti-Semitic organization in Germany.

[***]

[The former emperor] was much disturbed by the strong Jewish-Masonic influence in France, and thought that this was at the bottom of much that went wrong.

[***]

The Jewish influence among the Young Turks worries him, and he fears that bolshevist elements are becoming too powerful among them; but he thinks that Turkey and Egypt will form the nucleus, sooner or later, of a Moslem bloc.”

The Baron’s allegations also appeared in *The New York Times* on 3 July 1922 on the front page continuing onto page 3. However, the following statements, which appeared in *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, were absent in *The New York Times*:

“[. . .]to the firm conviction that the Jews are at the bottom of most of the troubles in Germany and Europe.”

“The Kaiser is convinced that all the evils of the modern world originate with the Jews. ‘A Jew cannot be a true patriot,’ he exclaimed. ‘He is something different—like a bad insect. He must be kept apart, out of a place where he can do mischief—even if by pogroms, if necessary. ‘The Jews are responsible for bolshevism in Russia, and Germany, too. I was far too indulgent with them during my reign, and I bitterly regret the favors I showed to prominent Jewish bankers and business men.’ I notice that one of the generals in attendance on him at the time wore the swastika, symbol of an anti-Semitic organization in Germany.”

“The Jewish influence among the Young Turks worries him, and[. . .]”

The following statement, which appeared in *The New York Times*, was absent in *The Chicago Daily Tribune*:

“Yet, while the former Emperor disliked Rathenau, on the matter of the treaty with the Russian Bolsheviki signed at Rapallo, he was even more indignant

at Baron von Maltzahn, head of the Russian Division of the Foreign Office. That Rathenau should have signed a treaty with the Bolsheviki he thought more or less intelligible, but that a professional diplomat should have thrown in his lot with them was a different and to him far more serious matter.”

Kaiser Wilhelm II denied that he had had a political discussion with the Baron, though he admitted that the Baron had visited him. The Kaiser alleged that the visits were limited to non-political small talk about family, and to photo sessions. The Baron reaffirmed that the political discussions took place and *The New York Times* supported the Baron’s contention that he had visited the Kaiser over the course of three days.¹⁸⁷⁴

The publication of these articles soon after Rathenau’s assassination tended to place the blame for his murder on the Monarchy and on anti-Semitism. The Kaiser had long ago been under the influence of men like Adolf Stoecker and Heinrich von Treitschke, who, like Rathenau, wanted the Jews to assimilate and give up nationalistic ambitions and disloyalties. They quoted Jewish authors like Heinrich Graetz, who, like Moses Hess, stated that Judaism is more than a mere religion, but represents a racial perspective and national culture.

Nevertheless, this was strange talk coming from Kaiser Wilhelm II, who was the grandson of Queen Victoria, a woman who believed that she was directly descended from King David, making Wilhelm his supposed heir as well. The Messiah was to come from the seed of King David (II *Samuel* 7; 22:44-51; 23:1-5. *Isaiah* 9:6-7. *Jeremiah* 23:5; 33:15, 17). Wilhelm II was the proud owner of the “Spear of Destiny”,¹⁸⁷⁵ which had supposedly pierced the side of Jesus and rendered its holder invincible in battle.

General von Ludendorff believed that the Kaiser had betrayed Germany. Ludendorff iterated the common belief that Jews were an enemy of the German People and intimated that they sought to make Germany a Communist state—which in fact did occur in part, in Bavaria, and the Soviets again took over a large part of Germany after the Second World War, creating East Germany out of the Soviet Sector. Ludendorff was quoted in the *Chicago Daily Tribune* on 1 March 1924 on page 3 in article with the header “‘I Fought Rule by Red or Jew’—Ludendorff”, and his statements were in full agreement with those of Jewish Zionists—it almost appears as if he were scripted by Zionists, like Moses Pinkeles, who discussed such things in his autobiography. *The Tribune* wrote,

“[. . .]With this introduction Gen. von Ludendorff launched into a long explanation of the reasons for attempting a coup d’état against the republican government, which he sees undermined by the socialist principles of Marxism and pan-Judaism.

‘There cannot be the slightest doubt of my attitude towards the communists,’ he continued. ‘Before the war this Marxist world turned against every military power. Philip Scheidemann said to France, ‘You are not our enemies, but our friends and allies.’

‘In connection with this is the Jewish question. I made its acquaintance

during the war. For me it is a question of race. Little as the Englishmen or Frenchmen can be permitted to obtain domination over us, so little can the Jew be permitted. Freedom of the nation cannot be expected from him. Therefore I was against him.

‘We want a Germany free of Marxism, semitism, and papal influences.’”

THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT published an article alleging that the Zionists knew that the First World War was coming long before it came. The article was titled, “Did the Jews Foresee the World War?”, and it appeared on 21 August 1920:

“Fortunately the clue to the answer is supplied to us by unquestionable Jewish sources. The *American Jewish News* of September 19, 1919, had an advertisement on its front page which read thus:

‘WHEN PROPHETS SPEAK

By Litman Rosenthal

Many years ago Nordau prophesied the Balfour Declaration. Litman Rosenthal, his intimate friend, relates this incident in a fascinating memoir.’

The article, on page 464, begins: ‘It was on Saturday, the day after the closing of the Sixth Congress, when I received a telephone message from Dr. Herzl asking me to call on him.’

This fixes the time. The Sixth Zionist Congress was held at Basle in August, 1903.

The memoir continues: ‘On entering the lobby of the hotel I met Herzl’s mother who welcomed me with her usual gracious friendliness and asked me whether the feelings of the Russian Zionists were now calmer.

‘‘Why just the Russian Zionists, Frau Herzl?’ I asked. ‘Why do you only inquire about these?’

‘‘Because my son,’ she explained, ‘is mostly interested in the Russian Zionists. He considers them the quintessence, the most vital part of the Jewish people.’”

At this Sixth Congress the British Government (‘Herzl and his agents had kept in contact with the English Government’—*Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. 12, page 678) had offered the Jews a colony in Uganda, East Africa. Herzl was in favor of taking it, not as a substitute for Palestine, but as a step toward it. It was this which formed the chief topic of conversation between Herzl and Litman Rosenthal in that Basle hotel. Herzl said to Rosenthal, as reported in this article: ‘There is a difference between the final aim and the ways we have to go to achieve this aim.’

Suddenly Max Nordau, who seems at the conference held last month in London to have become Herzl’s successor, entered the room, and the Rosenthal interview was ended.

Let the reader now follow attentively the important part of this Rosenthal story:—(the italics are ours)

‘About a month later I went on a business trip to France. On my way to Lyons I stopped in Paris, and there I visited, as usual, our Zionist friends. One of them told me that this very same evening Dr. Nordau was scheduled to speak about the Sixth Congress, and I, naturally, interrupted my journey to be present at this meeting and to hear Dr. Nordau’s report. When we reached the hall in the evening we found it filled to overflowing and all were waiting impatiently for *the great master*, Nordau, who, on entering, received a tremendous ovation. But Nordau, without paying heed to the applause showered upon him, began his speech immediately, and said:

“You all came here with a question burning in your hearts and trembling on your lips, and the question is, indeed, a great one, and of vital importance. I am willing to answer it. What you want to ask is: How could I—I who was one of those who formulated the Basle program—how could I dare to speak in favor of the English proposition concerning Uganda, how could Herzl as well as I betray our ideal of Palestine, because you surely think that we have betrayed it and forgotten it. Yet listen to what I have to say to you. I spoke in favor of Uganda after long and careful consideration; deliberately I advised the Congress to consider and to accept the proposal of the English Government, a proposal made to the Jewish nation through the Zionist Congress, and my reasons—but instead of my reasons let me tell you a political story as a kind of allegory.

“I want to speak of a time which is now almost forgotten, a time when the European powers had decided to send a fleet against the fortress of Sebastopol. At this time Italy, the United Kingdom of Italy, did not exist. Italy was in reality only a little principality of Sardinia, and the great, free and united Italy was but a dream, a fervent wish, a far ideal of all Italian patriots. The leaders of Sardinia, who were fighting for and planning this free and united Italy, were the three great popular heroes: Garibaldi, Mazzini, and Cavour.

“The European powers invited Sardinia to join in the demonstration at Sebastopol and to send also a fleet to help in the siege of this fortress, and this proposal gave rise to a dissension among the leaders of Sardinia. Garibaldi and Mazzini did not want to send a fleet to the help of England and France and they said: ‘Our program, the work to which we are pledged, is a free and united Italy. What have we to do with Sebastopol? Sebastopol is nothing to us, and we should concentrate all our energies on our original program so that we may realize our ideal as soon as possible.’

“But Cavour, who even at this time was the most prominent, the most able, and the most far-sighted statesman of Sardinia, insisted that his country should send a fleet and beleaguer with the other powers Sebastopol, and, at last, he carried his point. *Perhaps it will interest you to know that the right hand of Cavour, his friend and adviser, was his secretary, Hartum, a Jew,* and in those circles, which were in opposition to the government, one spoke fulminantly of Jewish treason. And once at an assembly of Italian patriots one called wildly for Cavour’s secretary, Hartum, and demanded of him to

defend his dangerous and treasonable political actions. And this is what he said: ‘Our dream, our fight, our ideal, an ideal for which we have paid already in blood and tears, in sorrow and despair, with the life of our sons and the anguish of our mothers, our one wish and one aim is a free and united Italy. *All means are sacred if they lead to this great and glorious goal.* Cavour knows full well that after the fight before Sebastopol *sooner or later a peace conference will have to be held, and at this peace conference those powers will participate who have joined in the fight.* True, Sardinia has no immediate concern, no direct interest in Sebastopol, but if we will help now with our fleet, *we will sit at the future peace conference, enjoying equal rights with the other powers,* and at this peace conference Cavour, as the representative of Sardinia, will proclaim the free and independent, united Italy. Thus our dream for which we have suffered and died, will become, at last, a wonderful and happy reality. And if you now ask me again, what has Sardinia to do at Sebastopol, then let me tell you the following words, *like the steps of a ladder:* Cavour, Sardinia, the siege of Sebastopol, the future European peace conference, the proclamation of a free and united Italy.’

‘The whole assembly was under the spell of Nordau’s beautiful, truly poetic and exalted diction, and his exquisite, musical French delighted the hearers with an almost sensual pleasure. For a few seconds the speaker paused, and the public, absolutely intoxicated by his splendid oratory, applauded frantically. But soon Nordau asked for silence and continued:

“Now this great progressive world power, England, has after the pogroms of Kishineff, in token of her sympathy with our poor people, offered through the Zionist Congress the autonomous colony of Uganda to the Jewish nation. Of course, Uganda is in Africa, and Africa is not Zion and never will be Zion, to quote Herzl’s own words. But Herzl knows full well that *nothing is so valuable to the cause of Zionism as amicable political relations* with such a power as England is, and so much more valuable as England’s main interest is concentrated in the Orient. Nowhere else is precedent as powerful as in England, and so it is most important to accept a colony out of the hands of England and create thus a precedent in our favor. Sooner or later the Oriental question will have to be solved, and the Oriental question means, naturally, also the question of Palestine. England, who had addressed a formal, political note to the Zionist Congress—the Zionist Congress which is pledged to the Basle program, England will have the deciding voice in the final solution of the Oriental question, and Herzl has considered it his duty to maintain valuable relations with this great and progressive power. *Herzl knows that we stand before a tremendous upheaval of the whole world. Soon, perhaps, some kind of a world-congress will have to be called,* and England, the great, free and powerful England, will then continue the work it has begun with its generous offer to the Sixth Congress. And if you ask me now what has Israel to do in Uganda, then let me tell you as the answer the words of the statesmen of Sardinia, only applied to our case and given in our version; let me tell you the following words as if I were

showing you *the rungs of a ladder leading upward and upward: Herzl, The Zionist Congress, the English Uganda proposition, the future world war, the peace conference* where with the help of England a free and Jewish Palestine will be created.’

‘Like a mighty thunder these last words came to us, and we all were trembling and awestruck as if we had seen a vision of old. And in my ears were sounding the words of our great brother Achad Haam, who said of Nordau’s address at the First Congress:

‘I felt that one of the great old prophets was speaking to us, that his voice came down from the free hills of Judea, and our hearts were burning in us when we heard his words, filled with wonder, wisdom and vision.’

The amazing thing is that this article by Litman Rosenthal should ever have been permitted to see print. But it did not see print until the Balfour Declaration about Palestine, and it never would have seen print had not the Jews believed that one part of their program had been accomplished.

The Jew never betrays himself until he believes that what he seeks has been won, then he lets himself go. It was only to Jews that the 1903 ‘program of the Ladder’—*the future world war—the peace conference—the Jewish program*—was communicated. When the ascent of that ladder seemed to be complete, then came the public talk.”

In the English translation of Max Nordau’s *The Interpretation of History*, Willey, New York, (1910), p. 293; Nordau employs the image of the ladder,

“The politician uses the parliamentary system as a ladder up which he may climb from being a secretary to a member, parliamentary reporter, or honorary secretary to some political club, to member of a parliamentary committee, member of Parliament itself, party leader, and finally minister.”

The London Times reported on 15 August 1914, on page 3,

“JEW AND GERMAN.

A PROTEST AGAINST UNFAIR SUSPICION.

The Editor of the *Jewish Chronicle* and *Jewish World* writes:—

‘Instance after instance has come to my knowledge of the ignorant assumption up and down the country that every Jew is necessarily a German and is hence being made an object of hatred as an enemy of this country. In Germany I learn that our Jews are in a somewhat similar case. But there they are not called ‘German’ Jews, but ‘Russian’ Jews. The fact is, of course, that Jews are by their tradition and, indeed, by absolute Jewish law, bound in loyalty to the country of which they are citizens. The Jew in Germany is no

more German than the German, and the Jew in England is no less English than the English. Even in Russia the Russian Jew, at this hour of Russia's trial, is as Russian as the Russian.

'From end to end of the Empire Jews of all classes have shoulder to shoulder with their fellow-citizens manifested their unswerving loyalty in a hundred directions to this country in the righteous cause for which it has drawn the sword. This attitude of our people is perhaps only natural, seeing what the Jews of all the world owe to England for the example she has set in relation to Jews. But I do think it unwise at this juncture in the nation's affairs that anything should be done or said which it is possible may encourage in the ignorant some doubt about the loyalty of a section of the country's citizens.'

Karl Lamprecht published an article in the *Berliner Tageblatt*, on 23 August 1914, arguing that the First World War was a racial war. Some Germans were concerned by the success of Serbia against the Young Turks in the Balkan Wars and feared that it would provide Russia, which allegedly sought to unify all Slavs in a Pan-Slavic Russian Empire and to take Constantinople, in order to establish a port and route into the Adriatic and Mediterranean Seas through Albania and Constantinople. This area of the world had long been a source of international conflict throughout the period of the "Eastern Question" with the wars between Turkey, Russia, England, France, etc. These conflicts were fomented by Zionist Jews.

The political Zionists Theodor Herzl and Max Nordau were both products of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, where the Pan-Germanic and Pan-Slavic forces directly confronted one another.¹⁸⁷⁶ They must have known that this antagonism could provoke a massive conflict. Friedrich August Hayek stated,

"I think the decisive influence was really World War I, particularly the experience of serving in a multinational army, the Austro-Hungarian army. That's when I saw, more or less, the great empire collapse over the nationalist problem. I served in a baffle in which eleven different languages were spoken. It's bound to draw your attention to the problems of political organization."¹⁸⁷⁷

At the end of the First World War, the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire into small ethnically segregated nations would provide the precedent and the climate for the Zionists' artificial creation of the nonexistent "small nation" of Israel in Palestine, as if the Jews dispersed among all the nations of the Earth were one small nation among many small nations deserving of recognition and protection by the major powers of Western Europe. Not only would the First World War break up the Austro-Hungarian Empire, it would dissolve Turkish Empire, which owned Palestine. Under the influence of "Colonel" House, the recognition of the rights of minor nations became one of Zionist President Woodrow Wilson's favorite themes. The Zionists knew that a Peace Conference would be held at war's end at which they

could petition for the creation of a “Jewish State” in Palestine. The entire war served the interests of the Zionists. They had been planning it and fomenting it for centuries.

Some have argued that the “racial” tribalism of the Pan-Germanic and Pan-Slavic forces was modeled after ancient Judaic tribalism and “racial” nationalism.¹⁸⁷⁸ The political Zionists, many of whom were positivists, were one of many interested parties fanning the fires of “racial”, nationalistic and religious discord in Vienna. Some Zionists believed that these Empires harmed Jews by insisting upon assimilation—the case of Czar’s proclamation against Zionism being a primary example. Horace Mayer Kallen stated, “Pan-Germanism, Pan-Slavism, and all the other panic movements are assimilationist.”¹⁸⁷⁹ The Turkish Empire prevented the formation of a sovereign “Jewish State” in Palestine and encouraged assimilation. Political Zionism preferred smaller democracies where ethnicities were encouraged to segregate. They had plans to eventually wipe out all of these small nations with the force of Communism and replace all nations with a Jewish world government, after they had formed their “Jewish State” in Palestine. But first they had to break up the Gentile Empires.

8.4 Jewish World Government—A Prophetic Desire

Political Zionist Moses Hess forecast a “race war” and “last catastrophe” in 1862. From the 1870's onward in England, the fabulously wealthy businessman Cecil John Rhodes, who was an agent for the Rothschild family,¹⁸⁸⁰ planned for a world government to be led by the British and Americans; because, so he asserted, the English were a master race which had the moral authority to exploit the inferior races. Rhodes was a “pacifist”, who used the liberal sentiment of pacifism to justify tyranny, colonialism and slavery. He was very close to the Rothschild family¹⁸⁸¹ and Alfred Beit. Rhodes formed a “secret society”—to use his term—of the world’s wealthiest persons, which had as its goal the accumulation of the world’s wealth for the purpose of world domination.¹⁸⁸² Rhodes advocated the reunification of the “English-speaking race”. Rhodes enslaved the blacks he sent to South Africa to work the gold and diamond mines and the British introduced the use of concentration camps to destroy the Boers. Rhodes openly called for a “secret society” patterned after the Jesuits, which he planned would rule the world. *The New York Times* wrote on 9 April 1902,

“MR. RHODES’S IDEAL OF
ANGLO-SAXON GREATNESS

Statement of His Aims, Written
for W. T. Stead In 1890,
He Believed a Wealthy Secret Society
Should Work to Secure the World’s
Peace and a British-American
Federation.

LONDON, April 9.—An article on the Right Hon. Cecil J. Rhodes, by

William T. Stead, will appear in the forthcoming number of *The American Review of Reviews*. The article, excerpts from which follow, consists of a frank, powerful explanation of Mr. Rhodes's views on America and Great Britain, and for the first time sets forth his own inmost aims. It was written mainly by himself for Mr. Stead in 1890. For originality and breadth of thought it eclipses even his now famous will, yet it is merely a collection of disoriented ideas, hurriedly put together by 'The Colossus,' as a summary of a long conversation between himself and Mr. Stead. In those days Mr. Stead was not only one of Mr. Rhodes's most intimate friends, as indeed he was till the last, but also his executor. Mr. Stead's name was only removed from the list of the trustees of Mr. Rhodes's will on account of the Boer war, which forced the two men into such vehement political opposition. Of this, episode Mr. Stead says:

'Mr. Rhodes's action was only natural, and, from an administrative point of view, desirable, and it in no way affected my attitude as political confidant in all that related to Mr. Rhodes's world-wide policy.'

In its three columns of complex sentences the whole of Mr. Rhodes's international and individual philosophy is embraced. Perhaps it can best be summarized as an argument in favor of the organization of a secret society, on the lines of the Jesuit order, for the promotion of the peace and welfare of the world, and the establishment of an American-British federation, with absolute home rule for the component parts.

'I am a bad writer,' says Mr. Rhodes in one part of what might be called his confession, 'but through my ill-connected sentences you can trace the lay of my ideas, and you can give my idea the literary clothing that is necessary.'

RHODES'S ROUGH NOTES UNEDITED.

But Mr. Stead wisely refused to edit or dress it up, saying:

'I think the public will prefer to have these rough, hurried, and sometimes ungrammatical notes exactly as Mr. Rhodes scrawled them off, rather than have them supplied with literary clothing by any one else.'

Mr. Rhodes began by declaring that the 'key' to his idea for the development of the English-speaking race was the foundation of 'a society copied, as to organization, from the Jesuits.' Combined with 'a differential rate and a copy of the United States Constitution,' wrote Mr. Rhodes, 'should be home rule or federation.' An organization formed on these lines in the House of Commons, constantly working for decentralization and not wasting time on trivial questions raised by 'Dr. Tanner, or the important matter of O'Brien's breeches,' would, Mr. Rhodes believed, soon settle the all-important question of the markets for the products of the empire.

'The labor' question,' Mr. Rhodes wrote, 'is important, but that is deeper than labor.'

THE MENACE TO BRITISH TRADE.

America, both in its possibilities of alliance and its attitude of commercial rivalry, was apparently ever present in Mr. Rhodes's mind. 'The world, with America in the forefront,' he wrote, 'is devising tariffs to boycott

your manufactures. This is the supreme question. I believe that England, with fair play, should manufacture for the world, and, being a free trader, I believe that, until the world comes to its senses, you should declare war, I mean a commercial war, with those trying to boycott your manufactures. That is my programme. You might finish the war by a union with America and universal peace after a hundred years.' But toward securing this millenium Mr. Rhodes believed the most powerful factor would be 'a secret society, organized like Loyola's, supported by the accumulated wealth of those whose aspiration is a desire to do something,' and who would be spared the 'hideous annoyance' daily created by the thought to which 'of their incompetent relations' they should leave their fortunes. These wealthy people, Mr. Rhodes thought, would thus be greatly relieved and be able to turn 'their ill-gotten or Inherited gains to some advantage.'

Reverting to himself. Mr. Rhodes said:

'It is a fearful thought' to feel you possess a patent, and to doubt whether your life will last you through the circumlocution of the Patent Office. I have that inner conviction that if I can live I have thought out something that is worthy of being registered in the Patent Office. The fear is shall I have time and opportunity? And I believe, with all the enthusiasm bred in the soul of an inventor, that it is not self-glorification that I desire, but the wish to live and register my patent for the benefit of those who I think are the greatest people the world has ever seen, but whose fault is that they do not know their strength, their greatness, or their destiny, but who are wasting their time in minor or local matters; but, being asleep, do not know that through the invention of steam and electricity, and, in view of their own enormous increase, they must now be trained to view the world as a whole, and not only to consider the social questions of the British Isles. Even a Labouchere who possesses no sentiment should be taught that the labor of England is dependent on the outside world, and that, as far as I can see, the outside world, if he does not look, out, will boycott the result of English labor.'

Once again the personal feelings of the man crop out. 'They are calling the new country Rhodesia,' he wrote. 'I find I am human, and should like to be living after my death. Still, perhaps, if that name is coupled with the object of England everywhere it may convey the discovery of an idea which will ultimately lead to the cessation of all wars, and on language throughout the world, the patent being the gradual absorption of wealth and human minds of the higher order to the object.'

Here Mr. Rhodes used the sentence cabled to America, in Mr. Stead's article of April 4:

'What an awful thought it is that if, even now, we could arrange with the present members of the United States Assembly and our House of Commons the peace of the world would be secured for all eternity! We could hold a Federal Parliament, five years in Washington and five in London.'

Mr. Rhodes added: 'The only thing feasible to carry out this idea is a secret society gradually absorbing the wealth of the world, to be devoted to

such an object.’

‘There is Baron Hirsch,’ interpolated Mr. Rhodes, ‘with twenty millions, very soon to cross the unknown border and struggling in the dark to know what to do with his money, and so one might go on ad infinitum.’

‘Fancy,’ Mr. Rhodes goes on to say, the charm to Young America, just coming on, and dissatisfied, for they have filled up their own country and do not know what to tackle next, to share in a scheme to take the government of the whole world. Their present President [Mr. Harrison] is dimly seeing it; but his horizon is limited to the New World, north and south, and so he would intrigue in Canada, Argentina, and Brazil, to the exclusion of England. Such a brain wants but little to see the true solution. He is still groping in the dark, but very near the discovery, for the American has been taught the lesson of home rule and of the success of leaving the management of the local pump to the parish beadle. He does not burden his House of Commons with the responsibility of cleansing the parish drains. The present position of the English House is ridiculous. You might as well expect Napoleon to have found time to have personally counted his dirty linen before he sent it to the wash and to have recounted it upon its return.

‘It would have been better for Europe if Napoleon had carried out his idea of a universal monarchy. He might have succeeded if he had hit upon the idea of granting self-government to the component parts.’

COUNTRIES ‘FOUND WANTING.’

Dealing with the ‘sacred duty of the English-speaking world of taking the responsibility for the still uncivilized world,’ and commenting upon the necessary departure from the map of such countries as Portugal, Persia, and Spain, ‘who are found wanting,’ Mr. Rhodes said:

‘What scope! What a horizon of work for the next two centuries for the best energies of the best people in the world!’

In regard to tariffs, Mr. Rhodes was characteristically positive.

‘I note,’ he wrote, ‘with satisfaction that the committee appointed to inquire into the McKinley tariff, reports that in certain articles our trades have fallen off 50 per cent. Yet the fools do not see that if they do not look out they will have England shut out and isolated, with 90,000,000 to feed and capable of internally supporting about 6,000,000. If they had a statesman they would at the present moment be commercially at war with the United States, and would have boycotted the raw products of the United States until she came to her senses; and I say this because I am a free trader. Your people have not known their greatness. They possess one-fifth of the world and do not know it is slipping away from them. They spend their time in discussing Mr. Parnell and Dr. Tanner, the character of Sir Charles Duke, compensation for beer houses, and omne hoc genus. Your supreme question at present is the seizure of the labor vote for the next election. Read the Australian bulletins and see where undue pandering to the labor vote may lead you. But, at any rate, the eight-hour question is not possible without a union of the English-speaking world; otherwise you drive your manufactures to Belgium,

Holland, and Germany, just as you have placed a great deal of cheap shipping trade the hands of Italy by your stringent shipping regulations.'

Here this 'political will and testament,' as Mr. Stead calls it, abruptly breaks off. Mr. Stead, commenting on this, says:

'It is rough and inchoate and almost as uncouth as one of Cromwell's speeches. but the central idea glows luminous throughout. Its ideal is the promotion of racial unity on the basis of the principles embodied in the American Constitution.'"

Rhodes' statement, sans the literary clothing *The New York Times* supplied, appeared in *The American Monthly Review of Reviews*, Volume 25, Number 5, (May, 1902), pp. 548-560, at 556-557. Stead had founded this journal in order to promote Rhodes' millenniumistic vision. Rhodes' wrote,

"Please remember the key of my idea discussed with you is a Society, copied from the Jesuits as to organization, the practical solution a differential rate and a copy of the United States Constitution, for that is Home Rule or Federation, and an organization to work this out, working in the House of Commons for decentralization, remembering that an Assembly that is responsible for a fifth of the world has no time to discuss the questions raised by Dr. Tanner or the important matter of Mr. O'Brien's breeches, and that the labor question is an important matter, but that deeper than the labor question is the question of the market for the products of labor, and that, as the local consumption (production) of England can only support about six million, the balance depends on the trade of the world.

That the world with America in the forefront is devising tariffs to boycott your manufactures, and that this is the supreme question, for I believe that England with fair play should manufacture for the world, and, being a Free Trader, I believe until the world comes to its senses you should declare war—I mean a commercial war with those who are trying to boycott your manufactures—that is my programme. You might finish the war by union with America and universal peace, I mean after one hundred years, and a secret society organized like Loyola's, supported by the accumulated wealth of those whose aspiration is a desire to do something, and a hideous annoyance created by the difficult question daily placed before their minds as to which of their incompetent relations they should leave their wealth to. You would furnish them with the solution, greatly relieving their minds, and turning their ill-gotten or inherited gains to some advantage.

I am a bad writer, but through my ill-connected sentences you can trace the lay of my ideas, and you can give my idea the literary clothing that is necessary. I write so fully because I am off to Masbonaland, and I can trust you to respect my confidence. It is a fearful thought to feel that you possess a patent, and to doubt whether your life will last you through the circumlocution of the forms of the Patent Office. I have that inner conviction that if I can live I have thought out something that is worthy of being

registered at the Patent Office; the fear is, shall I have the time and the opportunity? And I believe with all the enthusiasm bred in the soul of an inventor it is not self-glorification I desire, but the wish to live to register my patent for the benefit of those who, I think, are the greatest people the world has ever seen, but whose fault is that they do not know their strength, their greatness, and their destiny, and who are wasting their time on their minor local matters, but being asleep do not know that through the invention of steam and electricity, and in view of their enormous increase, they must now be trained to view the world as a whole, and not only consider the social questions of the British Isles. Even a Labouchere, who possesses no sentiment, should be taught that the labor of England is dependent on the outside world, and that as far as I can see, the outside world, if it does not look out, will boycott the results of English labor. They are calling the new country Rhodesia, that is from the Transvaal to the southern end of Tanganyika; the other name is Zambesia. I find I am human and should like to be living after my death; still, perhaps, if that name is coupled with the object of England everywhere, and united, the name may convey the discovery of an idea which ultimately led to the cessation of all wars and one language throughout the world [*see: Zephaniah 3:9—CJB*], the patent being the gradual absorption of wealth and human minds of the higher order to the object.

What an awful thought it is that if we had not lost America, or if even now we could arrange with the present members of the United States Assembly and our House of Commons, the peace of the world is secured for all eternity. We could hold your federal parliament five years at Washington and five at London. The only thing feasible to carry this idea out is a secret one (society) gradually absorbing the wealth of the world to be devoted to such an object. There is Hirsch with twenty millions, very soon to cross the unknown border, and struggling in the dark to know what to do with his money; and so one might go on *ad infinitum*.

Fancy the charm to young America, just coming on and dissatisfied—for they have filled tip their own country and do not know what to tackle next—to share in a scheme to take the government of the whole world! Their present President is dimly seeing it, but his horizon is limited to the New World north and south, and so he would intrigue in Canada, Argentina, and Brazil, to the exclusion of England. Such a brain wants but little to see the true solution; he is still groping in the dark, but is very near the discovery. For the American has been taught the lesson of Home Rule and the success of leaving the management of the local pump to the parish beadle. He does not burden his House of Commons with the responsibility of cleansing the parish drains. The present position in the English House is ridiculous. You might as well expect Napoleon to have found time to have personally counted his dirty linen before he sent it to the wash, and recounted it upon its return. It would have been better for Europe if he had carried out his idea of Universal Monarchy; he might have succeeded if he had hit on the idea of

granting self-government to the component parts. Still, I will own tradition, race, and diverse languages acted against his dream all these do not exist as to the present English-speaking world, and apart from this union is the sacred duty of taking the responsibility of the still uncivilized parts of the world. The trial of these countries who have been found wanting—such as Portugal, Persia, even Spain—and the judgment that they must depart, and, of course, the whole of the South American republics. What a scope and what a horizon of work, at any rate, for the next two centuries, the best energies of the best people in the world; perfectly feasible, but needing an organization, for it is impossible for one human atom to complete anything, much less such an idea as this requiring the devotion of the best souls of the next 200 years. There are three essentials (1) The plan duly weighed and agreed to. (2) The first organization. (3) The seizure of the wealth necessary.

I note with satisfaction that the committee appointed to inquire into the McKinley Tariff report that in certain articles our trade has fallen off 50 per cent., and yet the fools do not see that if they do not look out they will have England shut out and isolated with ninety millions to feed and capable internally of supporting about six millions. If they had had statesmen they would at the present moment be commercially at war with the United States, and they would have boycotted the raw products of the United States until she came to her senses. And I say this because I am a Free Trader. But why go on writing? Your people do not know their greatness; they possess a fifth of the world and do not know that it is slipping from them, and they spend their time on discussing Parnell and Dr. Tanner, the character of Sir C. Dilke, the question of compensation for beer-houses, the *omne hoc genus*. Your supreme question at the present moment is the seizure of the labor vote at the next election. Read the *Australian Bulletin* (New South Wales), and see where undue pandering to the labor vote may lead you, but at any rate the eight-hour question is not possible without a union of the English-speaking world, otherwise you drive your manufactures to Belgium, Holland, and Germany, just as you have placed a great deal of cheap shipping trade in the hands of Italy by your stringent shipping regulations which they do not possess, and so carry goods at lower rates.”

William Winwood Reade described the origins of the millennium concept, with its one language, nihilistic “last catastrophe” destruction to renew, world government and lasting peace,

“Those Jews of Judea, those Hebrews of the Hebrews, regarded all the Gentiles as enemies of God; they considered it a sin to live abroad, or to speak a foreign language, or to rub their limbs with foreign oil. Of all the trees, the Lord had chosen but one vine; and of all the flowers but one lily; and of all the birds but one dove; and of all the cattle but one lamb; and of all the builded cities only Sion; and among all the multitude of peoples he had elected the Jews as a peculiar treasure, and had made them a nation of priests

and holy men. For their sake God had made the world. On their account alone empires rose and fell. Babylon had triumphed because God was angry with his people; Babylon had fallen because he had forgiven them. It may be imagined that it was not easy to govern such a race. They acknowledged no king but Jehovah, no laws but the precepts of their holy books. In paying tribute they yielded to absolute necessity, but the tax-gatherers were looked upon as unclean creatures; no respectable men would eat with them or pray with them; their evidence was not accepted in the courts of justice.

Their own government consisted of a Sanhedrin or Council of Elders, presided over by the High Priest. They had power to administer their own laws, but could not inflict the punishment of death without the permission of the procurator. All persons of consideration devoted themselves to the study of the law. Hebrew had become a dead language, and some learning was therefore requisite for the exercise of this profession, which was not the prerogative of a single class. It was a rabbinical axiom that the crown of the kingdom was deposited in Judah, and the crown of the priesthood in the seed of Aaron, but that the crown of the law was common to all Israel. Those who gained distinction as expounders of the sacred books were saluted with the title of rabbi, and were called scribes and doctors of the law. The people were ruled by the scribes, but the scribes were recruited from the people. It was not an idle caste—an established Church—but an order which was filled and refilled with the pious, the earnest, and the ambitious members of the nation.

There were two great religious sects which were also political parties, as must always be the case where law and religion are combined. The Sadducees were the rich, the indolent, and the passive aristocrats; they were the descendants of those who had belonged to the Greek party in the reign of Antiochus, and it was said that they themselves were tainted with the Greek philosophy. They professed, however, to belong to the conservative Scripture and original Mosaic school. As the Protestants reject the traditions of the ancient Church, some of which have doubtless descended *viva voce* from apostolic times, so all traditions, good and bad, were rejected by the Sadducees. As Protestants always inquire respecting a custom or doctrine, 'Is it in the Bible?' so the Sadducees would accept nothing that could not be shown them in the law. They did not believe in heaven and hell because there was nothing about heaven and hell in the books of Moses. The morality which their doctors preached was cold and pure, and adapted only for enlightened minds. They taught that men should be virtuous without the fear of punishment and without the hope of reward, and that such virtue alone is of any worth.

The Pharisees were mostly persons of low birth. They were the prominent representatives of the popular belief, zealots in patriotism as well as in religion—the teaching, the preaching, and the proselytising party. Among them were to be found two kinds of men. Those Puritans of the Commonwealth with lank hair and sour visage and upturned eyes, who wore sombre garments, sniffled through their noses, and garnished their discourse

with Scripture texts, were an exact reproduction, so far as the difference of place and period would allow, of certain Jerusalem Pharisees who veiled their faces when they went abroad lest they should behold a woman or some unclean thing; who strained the water which they drank for fear they should swallow the forbidden gnat; who gave alms to the sound of trumpet, and uttered long prayers in a loud voice; who wore texts embroidered on their robes and bound upon their brows; who followed minutely the observances of the ceremonial law; who added to it with their traditions; who lengthened the hours and deepened the gloom of the Sabbath day, and increased the taxes which it had been ordered should be paid upon the altar.

On the other hand, there had been among the Puritans many men of pure and gentle lives, and a similar class existed among the Pharisees. The good Pharisee, says the Talmud, is he who obeys the law because he loves the Lord. They addressed their god by the name of 'Father' when they prayed. 'Do unto others as you would be done by' was an adage often on their lips. That is the law, they said; all the rest is mere commentary. To the Pharisees belonged all that was best and all that was worst in the Hebrew religious life.

The traditions of the Pharisees related partly to ceremonial matters which in the written law were already diffuse and intricate enough. But it must also be remembered that without traditions the Hebrew theology was barbarous and incomplete. Before the captivity the doctrine of rewards and punishments in a future state had not been known. The Sheol of the Jews was a land of shades in which there was neither joy nor sorrow, in which all ghosts or souls dwelt promiscuously together. When the Jews came in contact with the Persian priests they were made acquainted with the heaven and hell of the Zend-Avesta. It is probable, indeed, that without foreign assistance they would in time have developed a similar doctrine for themselves. Already in the Psalms and Book of Job are signs that the Hebrew mind was in a transition state. When Ezekiel declared that the son should not be responsible for the iniquity of the father nor the father for the iniquity of the son, that the righteousness of the righteous should be upon him, and that the wickedness of the wicked should be upon him, he was preparing the way for a new system of ideas in regard to retribution. But as it was, the Jews were indebted to the Zend-Avesta for their traditional theory of a future life, and they also adopted the Persian ideas of the resurrection of the body, the rivalry of the evil spirit, and the approaching destruction and renovation of the world.

The Satan of Job is not a rebellious angel, still less a contending god: he is merely a mischievous and malignant sprite. But the Satan of the restored Jews was a powerful prince who went about like a roaring lion, and to whom this world belonged. He was copied from Ahriman, the God of Darkness, who was ever contending with Ormuzd, the God of Light. The Persians believed that Ormuzd would finally triumph, and that a prophet would be sent to announce the gospel or good tidings of his approaching victory. Terrible calamities would then take place; the stars would fall down from heaven; the earth itself would be destroyed. After which it would come forth

new from the hands of the Creator; a kind of Millennium would be established; there would be one law, one language, and one government for men, and universal peace would reign.

This theory became blended in the Jewish minds with certain expectations of their own. In the days of captivity their prophets had predicted that a Messiah or anointed king would be sent, that the kingdom of David would be restored, and that Jerusalem would become the headquarters of God on earth. All the nations would come to Jerusalem to keep the feast of tabernacles and to worship God. Those who did not come should have no rain; and as the Egyptians could do without rain, if they did not come they should have the plague. The Jewish people would become one vast priest-hood, and all nations would pay them tithe. Their seed would inherit the Gentiles. They would suck the milk of the Gentiles. They would eat the riches of the Gentiles. These same unfortunate Gentiles would be their ploughmen and their vine-dressers. Bowing down would come those that afflicted Jerusalem, and would lick the dust off her feet. Strangers would build up her walls, and kings would minister unto her. Many people and strong nations would come to see the Lord of Hosts in Jerusalem. Ten men in that day would lay hold of the skirt of a Jew saying, 'We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you.' It was an idea worthy of the Jews that they should keep the Creator to themselves in Jerusalem, and make their fortunes out of the monopoly.

In the meantime these prophecies had not been fulfilled, and the Jews were in daily expectation of the Messiah—as they are still, and as they are likely to be for some time to come. It was the belief of the vulgar that this Messiah would be a man belonging to the family of David, who would liberate them from the Romans and become their king; so they were always on the watch, and whenever a remarkable man appeared they concluded that he was the son of David, the Holy One of Israel, and were ready at once to proclaim him king and to burst into rebellion. This illusion gave rise to repeated riots or revolts, and at last brought about the destruction of the city.

But among the higher class of minds the expectation of the Messiah, though not less ardent, was of a more spiritual kind. They believed that the Messiah was that prophet, often called the Son of Man who would be sent by God to proclaim the defeat of Satan and the renovation of the world. They interpreted the prophets after a manner of their own: the kingdom foretold was the kingdom of heaven, and the new Jerusalem was not a Jerusalem on earth but a celestial city built of precious stones and watered by the Stream of Life.

Such were the hopes of the Jews. The whole nation trembled with excitement and suspense; the mob of Judea awaiting the Messiah or king who should lead them to the conquest of the world; the more noble-minded Jews of Palestine, and especially the foreign Jews, awaiting the Messiah or Son of Man who should proclaim the approach of the most terrible of all events. There were many pious men and women who withdrew entirely from the

cares of ordinary life, and passed their days in watching and in prayer.

The Neo-Jewish or Persian-Hebrew religion, with its sublime theory of a single god, with its clearly defined doctrine of rewards and punishments, with its one grand duty of faith or allegiance to a divine king, was so attractive to the mind on account of its simplicity that it could not fail to conquer the discordant and jarring creeds of the pagan world as soon as it should be propagated in the right manner. There is a kind of natural selection in religion; the creed which is best adapted to the mental world will invariably prevail, and the mental world is being gradually prepared for the reception of higher and higher forms of religious life. At this period Europe was ready for the reception of the one-god species of belief, but it existed only in the Jewish area, and was there confined by artificial checks. The Jews held the doctrine that none but Jews could be saved, and most of them looked forward to the eternal torture of Greek and Roman souls with equanimity, if not with satisfaction. They were not in the least desirous to redeem them; they hoarded up their religion as they did their money, and considered it a heritage, a patrimony, a kind of entailed estate. There were some Jews in foreign parts who esteemed it a work of piety to bring the Gentiles to a knowledge of the true God, and as it was one of the popular amusements of the Romans to attend the service at the synagogue a convert was occasionally made. But such cases were very rare, for in order to embrace the Jewish religion it was necessary to undergo a dangerous operation and to abstain from eating with the pagans—in short, to become a Jew. It was therefore indispensable for the success of the Hebrew religion that it should be divested of its local customs. But however much the Pharisees and Sadducees might differ on matters of tradition, they were perfectly agreed on this point, that the ceremonial laws were necessary for salvation. These laws could never be given up by Jews unless they first became heretics, and this was what eventually occurred. A schism arose among the Jews: the sectarians were defeated and expelled. Foiled in their first object, they cast aside the law of Moses and offered the Hebrew religion without the Hebrew ceremonies to the Greek and Roman world. We shall now sketch the character of the man who prepared the way for this remarkable event.

It was a custom in Israel for the members of each family to meet together once a year that they might celebrate a sacred feast. A lamb roasted whole was placed upon the table, and a cup of wine was filled. Then the eldest son said, ‘Father, what is the meaning of this feast?’ And the father replied that it was held in memory of the sufferings of their ancestors, and of the mercy of the Lord their God. For while they were weeping and bleeding in the land of Egypt there came his voice unto Moses and said that each father of a family should select a lamb without blemish from his flock, and should kill it on the tenth day of the month Abib, at the time of the setting of the sun; and should put the blood in a basin, and should take a sprig of hyssop and sprinkle the door-posts and lintel with the blood; and should then roast the lamb and eat it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. They should eat it as

if in haste, each one standing with his loins girt, his sandals on his feet, and his staff in his hand. That night the angel of the Lord slew the first born of the Egyptians, and that night Israel was delivered from her bonds.

When the father had thus spoken the lamb was eaten, and four cups of wine were drunk, and the family sang a hymn. At this beautiful and solemn festival all persons of the same kin endeavoured to meet together, and Hebrew pilgrims from all parts of the world journeyed to Jerusalem. When they came within sight of the Holy City and saw the Temple shining in the distance like a mountain of snow, some clamoured with cries of joy, some uttered low and painful sobs. Drawing closer together, they advanced towards the gates singing the Psalms of David, and offering up prayers for the restoration of Israel.

At this time the subscriptions from the various churches abroad were brought to Jerusalem, and were carried to the Temple treasury in solemn state; and at this time also the citizens of Jerusalem witnessed a procession which they did not like so well. A company of Roman soldiers escorted the lieutenant-governor, who came up from Caesarea for the festival that he might give out the vestments of the High Priest, which, being the insignia of government, the Romans kept under lock and key.

It was the nineteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar. Pontius Pilate had taken up his quarters in the city, and the time of the Passover was at hand. Not only Jerusalem, but also the neighbouring villages, were filled with pilgrims, and many were obliged to encamp in tents outside the walls.

It happened one day that a sound of shouting was heard; the men ran up to the roofs of their houses, and the maidens peeped through their latticed windows. A young man mounted on a donkey was riding towards the city. A crowd streamed out to meet him, and a crowd followed him behind. The people cast their mantles on the road before him, and also covered it with green boughs. He rode through the city gates straight to the Temple, dismounted, and entered the holy building. In the outer courts there was a kind of bazaar in connection with the Temple worship. Pure white lambs, pigeons, and other animals of the requisite age and appearance were there sold, and money merchants, sitting at their tables, changed the foreign coin with which the pilgrims were provided. The young man at once proceeded to upset the tables and to drive their astonished owners from the Temple, while the crowd shouted and the little gamins, who were not the least active in the riot, cried out, 'Hurrah for the son of David!' Then people suffering from diseases were brought to him, and he laid his hands upon them and told them to have faith and they would be healed. When strangers inquired the meaning of this disturbance they were told that it was Joshua—or—as the Greek Jews called him, Jesus—the Prophet of Nazareth. It was believed by the common people that he was the Messiah. But the Pharisees did not acknowledge his mission. For Jesus belonged to Galilee, and the natives of that country spoke a vile patois, and their orthodoxy was in bad repute. 'Out of Galilee,' said the Pharisees with scorn, 'out of Galilee there cometh no

prophet.’

All persons of imaginative minds know what it is to be startled by a thought; they know how ideas flash into the mind as if from without, and what physical excitement they can at times produce. They also know what it is to be possessed by a presentiment, a deep, overpowering conviction of things to come. They know how often such presentiments are true, and also how often they are false.”

Like the firstborn of Egypt, the story of Jesus (the lamb of God) is the story of bloody human sacrifice for the sake of Jewish “restoration to Palestine”—in this instance God sacrifices his firstborn child, just as the Jews had so often sacrificed their own children to Baal.

In Austria, Georg Schönerer, or Georg Ritter von Schönerer, agitated for Pan-Germanism, or an *Alldeutscher Verband*, in which all members of the “German race” or “Aryan Race” would unite to form a unified state with broad borders across Middle Europe. Schönerer advocated the segregation of Jewish children from Christian schools, a goal of the Zionists. He also founded a worker’s party, which eventually morphed into the NSDAP. Schönerer was staunchly anti-Catholic and founded the *Los von Rom Bewegung*. In 1892, a thirty page pamphlet appeared entitled *Ein deutsches Weltreich?*, Sammlung deutscher Schriften, Volume 7, Lüstenöder, Berlin. This brochure called for the “German races” to unite and form an empire to rule the world.¹⁸⁸³ Between the British Imperialist racists and the German Imperialist racists, between the remnants of the Holy Roman Empire (the Catholics of France and Italy) and the Ottoman Turks, Moses Hess’ Pan-Judaic Zionists had the makings of their Biblical race war to end all wars, and they did what they could to provoke it. They planned to eventually replace all the other empires they had pitted against one another with a universal Jewish Empire.

8.5 Puritans and Protestants Serve Jewish Interests

Racist Zionist Moses Hess was one of the founders of the Jewish Communist factions. The Jewish Communists, with their blind and brutal cult following, looked forward to a devastated Europe, which weakened world would enable them to take over the Earth through violent revolt. The Communists’ world of universal “equality”, would give every Gentile an equal opportunity to slave for Jewish leadership—as prophesied in *Isaiah*. The Communists justified their dark visions of ultimate destruction with the same false premise as the Jews and Christians, that a new millennium would occur after the devastation, and the Earth would become a Utopia. All their terrible attacks on humanity and their Socialist dictatorships were merely transitional phases working toward the Utopia of Communism, the Jewish “End Times”.

It is interesting to note that the Communists in Russia prevented wealth accumulation and the pooling of investment capital for decades, which left Russia, after having shaken off the yoke of Communism, vulnerable to another Jewish takeover led by Jewish financiers. From the beginning, the Communists drew off the

wealth of Russia and fed it to the Jewish financiers who had funded and organized the Russian Revolution. Communism always served the interests of Jewish Capitalists.

Like the Communism the Jews gave the Christians, Christianity itself also taught Gentiles that wealth accumulation was immoral. This worked against the interests of the Gentiles, while providing more opportunities for Jews to accumulate the Christians' wealth. Jewish sponsored Christianity led the Romans and Europe into the Dark Ages. It was the more Judaically minded Protestants, with their Judaic concept of the "elect" (*Isaiah 65. Enoch*) that justified wealth accumulation, who materialistically prospered under a new form Judaized Christianity—at the expense of the colonial peoples—and resulting in the second destruction of a Roman Empire, the slow decline of the Roman Catholic Church. The Protestants became the parasites of the "Third World" colonies.

One suspects that Cabalists and other Jews may have been the instigators of the Christian Reformation; for they, more than anyone else, were opposed to Catholicism, that second Roman Empire which according to them: worshiped idols, treated the Pope as they would treat a Jewish Messiah, gave the Pope the authority to interpret God's word while taking away that right from Rabbis and individuals, and stood in the way of Jewish desires on Jerusalem. There was also the issue of faith versus works.

Jewish mythology holds that nations which worship idols must be exterminated (*Exodus 34:11-17. Isaiah 65; 66. Ezekiel*), and that when this divine obligation is accomplished, the Jews will rule the world. The Talmud teaches in one opinion that "heathens" can annul idols and that Jews can use force to make heathens annul their idols (*Abodah Zarah 43a*). The annulment of Catholic idol worship was one of the main goals of the Reformation. Frankist Jews became Catholics in order to undermine the religion, in order annul the worship of idols and ruin the authority of the Pope. The Illuminati and Free Masonry sought to destroy "superstitious" religion. The Communists use force to make other religions annul their idols.

Catholicism became the focal point of Jewish genocidal hatred and mythology. They had a model for the Reformation in the lives, writings and practices of Jon Wycliffe and Jan Hus. All they lacked were spokesmen in the Christian community, whom they recruited in the form of their friend Martin Luther, as well as John Calvin (some claim "Calvin" is a corruption via "Cauin" of "Cohen"¹⁸⁸⁴—the man had a classical Jewish appearance) and the new Enoch—Melchior Hofmann, Ignatius Loyola, the father of the Jesuits, etc.

There are many allegations of a long term plan carried out by Prussian Protestants, French free thinkers, the Illuminati and Freemasonry to convert Catholics to Judaism and eventually atheism. This charge was strongly brought forth after the French Revolution by John Robison¹⁸⁸⁵ and Abbé Barruel.¹⁸⁸⁶ The alleged plan to subjugate the world to a tyranny of hypocrites preaching disingenuous Liberalism took on its ultimate protagonist in Marx's Communism, which failed in its promise of a liberal Utopia, but succeeded quite well in its nihilistic ambitions. More recent accusations include, among many others: George Pitt-Rivers', *World Significance of the Russian Revolution*, B. Blackwell, Oxford, (1920); Nesta Helen

Webster's, *Germany and England*, Boswell, London, (1938); and Captain Archibald Henry Maule Ramsay's, *The Nameless War*, Britons Publishing Company, London, (1952).

Martin Luther had direct and indirect connection to Cabalistic Jews, influential Jews and anti-Semitic Jews, who claimed to have converted to Christianity, including: Konrad Mutian (a. k. a. Conradus Mutianus Rufus), Johann Reuchlin, Pico della Mirandola, Jakob Questenberg, Jakob ben Jehiel Loans, Obadja Sforno of Cesena, Johann Pfefferkorn, etc. Note that in the Dualistic and dialectical terms of the Cabalah, both anti-Semites, and the defenders of Judaism as a "racial" and nationalistic sect, serve the same purpose—the beloved hateful segregation of the Jews from the Gentiles, after which the Jews sought.¹⁸⁸⁷

For Cabalistic Jews, both evil and good are functions of, and serve, God. Contemporary Jews believed that Martin Luther was preparing the way for the arrival of the Jewish Messiah. The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* writes in its article "Messianic Movements":

"About the same time many Jews pinned their hopes on Martin *Luther as a man who had come to pave the way for the Messiah through gradually educating the Christians away from their idolatrous customs and beliefs."¹⁸⁸⁸

Luther caused the slaughter of countless Christians, then caused Christian enmity towards Jews—which were Zionist aspirations.

Malachi 3:1 and 4:5 speak of a forerunner of the Messiah who will prepare the way, like John the Baptist (*Matthew* 11:10). Cabalist Jews considered Martin Luther (1483-1546) to have been this forerunner,

"Behold, I *will* send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the LORD, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he *shall* come, saith the LORD of hosts. [***] Behold, I *will* send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the LORD:"

Some Cabalist Jews believed that Isaac ben Solomon Luria (1534-1572) was "the Messiah, son of Joseph" (as opposed to: "the Messiah, son of David").¹⁸⁸⁹ Luria formulated a new Cabalistic dogma, which preached Metempsychosis and emphasized the Messianic prophecies in a way that was forbidden in the Talmud (*Kethuboth* 111a). The Lurian Cabalah inspired Shabbatai Zevi and Jacob Frank, both of whom claimed to be the Davidic Messiah—Frank claiming to have received the soul of the Messiah of Shabbatai Zevi through Cabalistic Metempsychosis—the transmigration of souls.

The Messiahship was believed to have been a dynasty of Jewish Kings descended from Joseph and David—in fact many myths alleged that their were two Messiahs, one a sacrificial warrior, and the other a genocidal tyrant to rule over the entire Earth. Many believe that the Lurian Cabalah became the basis for the Hasadic dynasty of the Lubavitchers, whose descendants today claim that the Jewish Messiah is among

us. They are eagerly waiting to anoint him King of the Jews.

The followers of this Hasidic dynasty were said to number 3,000,000 strong in 1930,¹⁸⁹⁰ and are, so some claim, the descendants of the Frankists of Poland and Russia. Jacob Frank taught that both good and evil are necessary functions of God, and that Jews should cause rampant evil in the world in order to hasten the coming of the Messianic Era.

Frank taught that since God is hidden in all things and yet controls them, and since Jews are to humanity what God is to the Universe, Jews should act as a hidden force controlling humanity. He taught his followers to feign conversion to other religions, as Shabbatai Zevi had, so as to infiltrate other religions and governments and, once in power, destroy them. Frank taught his followers to engage in sexual orgies and practice other forms of depravity—practices allegedly common among some groups of Hasidic Jews as evidenced in their frequent fits of frantic dancing. Many of the descendants of Jacob Frank have come to America and live as crypto-Jews. Hasidic Jews tend to be very secretive.

The Lubavitchers were initially outspoken anti-Zionists. It shocked many when the last of the Lubavitch Dynasty, the Rebbe whose life was to herald the coming of the Messiah, the seventh Rebbe in the line, Rebbe Menachem Mendel Schneerson, declared that he was a Zionist and that the Messiah is here alive among us. One wonders if this influential dynasty had been secretly planning the rise of Israel for centuries—if they had employed Frankist followers to destroy governments and religions and create bloody wars. The Lubavitchers were notoriously racist and considered Gentiles to be something less than human.¹⁸⁹¹ The Talmud states that Gentiles are subhuman at *Baba Mezia* 108b and 114b.

The Zionist racists who believe that they are the divine leaders of the world, will, if successful, destroy all nations and replace them with a world government led from Jerusalem by the King of the Jews. They will proscribe all religions other than Judaism and will force Gentiles into atheism. Then they will systematically exterminate all Gentiles.

Zionism is based on the Judaic myth of a new Utopian millennium following world-wide nihilistic devastation—which is to say Utopian for “righteous Jews”, hellish for non-racist Jews and Gentiles.¹⁸⁹² Judaism and Christianity make the Christians vulnerable to an absolute genocidal Zionist tyranny, in that Judaism asked Gentiles to slave and fight for Jews, and Christianity promotes a slavish mentality and a self-defeating fatalism which sponsors the suicidal belief that the worse one’s conditions are, the better off one is in God’s eyes.

8.6 The Planned Apocalypse

Since God had not yet brought about the horrific wars prophesied in the end times, some Jews began to intervene on God’s behalf. In the 1800’s, Baron Edward Bulwer-Lytton wrote of an extraordinary “occult” force called “Vril”, which was so destructive that it resulted in peace among those who could control it, because it assured mutual destruction between combatants. His book was titled *The Coming Race: Or the New Utopia*.¹⁸⁹³ Lord Lytton wrote of a race of giants descended from

Aryans which lived below the surface of the Earth, flew about on artificial wings, and which would one day again surface to exterminate all who lived on the surface of the Earth.

Lytton's tale recalls the Jewish myth of the race of giants bred from women and angels told in the Old Testament and the book of *Enoch*.¹⁸⁹⁴ It is also derivative of the Hindu myths of the Nagas, a serpent-human cross which lives underground. Lytton had his angelic characters instruct us that humans evolved from tadpoles in a Lamarckian manner and in a process of natural and sexual selection (this before Spencer, Wallace and Darwin, though much after Empedocles), that souls undergo reincarnation pursuant to the principles of Metempsychosis, that the name of God must not be written, that all forces are unified, that form should follow function, that the principle of logical economy made dictatorships more reasonable than democracies, that we should practice vegetarianism, that enemy races must be unemotionally and mercilessly exterminated, etc. Many of these ideas, which stem from various sects of Judaism and Hinduism, found their way into Nazi mythology. In the Bible, the angels, like Lytton's children of the underworld, committed genocide and other atrocities against human beings. In Lytton's book, six children could—like the Lord's angels—destroy thirty million of us, by harnessing the force of "Vril", an æthereal fluid as destructive as nuclear bombs.

This fantasy of alien races and super forces later became a facet of *Thule-Gesellschaft* mythology, which influenced Adolf Hitler and several other prominent Nazis. They taught that Aryans descended from aliens from outer space, which had interbred with humans. Other Earthly sub-human races were akin to the apes.

This mythology has roots in Jewish mythologies centered around the Biblical people called Nefilim, and more broadly around the Gentiles. Jewish myth has it that this people called Nefilim is descended from a mixture of fair humans and angels who fell from heaven to fall in love with the beautiful human women whose beauty had seduced them, much like Adam was tempted to sin by a woman—much like the Sirens who seduced sailors into suicide. For their sin, God banished the angels from the future world as He had banished Adam from the Garden—yet another instance of misogyny in Jewish mythology. Another Jewish myth also holds that the Gentiles are descended from a race begun by the fornication of Eve with the serpent who tempted her—an attack transferred to Jews themselves by the Apostate crypto-Jews who founded the Christian Identity movement in America.¹⁸⁹⁵

There is also a Jewish myth which holds that angels dubbed "Watchers" fell from heaven to Earth, became men, and bred with the fair daughters of the Earth to produce a race of giants, who were evil and destructive. This myth holds that the angels taught humans the secrets of nature and that this is how evil came to the world.¹⁸⁹⁶ After fornicating with women, the angels lost their immortality. This mythology, which again mirrors the story of Adam and Eve, is one of the major themes of the book of *Enoch*, which is probably in large part a plagiarism of the story of Gilgamesh.¹⁸⁹⁷ The apocalyptic book of *Enoch* contains much that later appeared in the Reformation of the Protestants and in the "second Reformation" of the Puritans, with their emphasis on the mythology of the "elect", the destruction of the Earth, damnation, and their hatred and reluctance to look to redeem those who

have sinned against them (*Isaiah* 65; 66. *Enoch*); which tends to indicate that Jews, especially Cabalistic Jews, were the driving force behind the Reformation and Puritanism, which had as their main goal the destruction of Roman Catholicism.

The apocalyptic works derive from the flood story told in the legends of Gilgamesh, and the flood is a genocide meant to cleanse the Earth of the unclean mixture of the blood of angels which had commingled with humans and other animals through angelic miscegenation with women and animals. The character Enoch parallels Enmeduranna and Noah replicates Utnapishtim. In Jewish mythology, the angels brought evil to the world and taught humans to do wrong.

The ultimate source of the giant myths, as told in Gilgamesh, *Enoch*, the book of *Giants*, and in the legends of the Greeks, is probably to be found in dinosaur, elephant, mastodon and mammoth bones; which Adrienne Mayor has shown were kept in ancient temples and which were believed to be the bones of the legendary giant beasts and men.¹⁸⁹⁸ Christian Messianic and apocalyptic mythology certainly derives not only from the prophecies found in the Old Testament, but also from the genocidal book of *Enoch*, with its “Elect” and “Elect One”, and the book of *Giants*, which were valued by the Essenians who created, or at least contributed to, the Christian myth. These dangerous mythologies each teach their blind adherents to welcome genocide, and they provide a religious basis for the mass murder of our fellow human beings and the destruction of our natural environment.

In another instance of Jewish genocidal hatred, the book of *Enoch* calls for the extermination of the “seed of Cain”,¹⁸⁹⁹ which “race” descended from the evil mixture of the “angels” with women. This gives Jews religious license to mercilessly mass murder any group which they oppose. It is interesting that the genocidal Nazis, as a philosophical movement, sprang forth from, and adopted, the ancient Jewish myths expressed in the book of *Enoch*. One also sees the book of *Enoch* in the legend of Faust, and the story of Mohammed and his flight with Gabriel.

William Winwood Reade published an influential book which applied Darwinist principles to history, *The Martyrdom of Man*, Trübner & Co., London, (1872). This work influenced Cecil John Rhodes, among many others. Reade discussed various revolutionary movements and concluded that they would next destroy religion—he very much wanted to destroy Christianity—a goal he had in common with Talmudic writers,

“The anti-slavery movement, which we shall now briefly sketch, is merely an episode in that great rebellion against authority which began in the night of the Middle Ages; which sometimes assumed the form of religious heresy, sometimes of serf revolt; which gradually established the municipal cities, and raised the slave to the position of the tenant; which gained great victories in the Protestant Reformation, the two English Revolutions, the American Revolution, and the French Revolution; which has destroyed the tyranny of governments in Europe, and which will in time destroy the tyranny of religious creeds.”

Reade saw that Communism was patterned after the Christian faith, with its

homogenous and obedient followers; and the damnation of the wealthy, which led Christians to accept their own misery with joy,

“A young man named Joshua or Jesus, a carpenter by trade, believed that the world belonged to the devil, and that God would shortly take it from him, and that he the Christ or Anointed would be appointed by God to judge the souls of men, and to reign over them on earth. In politics he was a leveller and communist, in morals he was a monk; he believed that only the poor and the despised would inherit the kingdom of God. All men who had riches or reputations would follow their dethroned master into everlasting pain. He attacked the churchgoing, sabbatarian ever-praying Pharisees; he declared that piety was worthless if it were praised on earth. It was his belief that earthly happiness was a gift from Satan, and should therefore be refused. If a man was poor in this world, that was good; he would be rich in the world to come. If he were miserable and despised, he had reason to rejoice; he was out of favour with the ruler of this world, namely Satan, and therefore he would be favoured by the new dynasty. On the other hand, if a man were happy, rich, esteemed, and applauded, he was for ever lost. He might have acquired his riches by industry; he might have acquired his reputation by benevolence, honesty, and devotion; but that did not matter; he had received his reward. So Christ taught that men should sell all that they had and give to the poor; that they should renounce all family ties; that they should let tomorrow take care of itself; that they should not trouble about clothes: did, not God adorn the flowers of the fields? He would take care of them also if they would fold their hands together and have faith, and abstain from the impiety of providing for the future. The principles of Jesus were not conducive to the welfare of society; he was put to death by the authorities; his disciples established a commune; Greek Jews were converted by them, and carried the new doctrines over all the world. The Christians in Rome were at first a class of men resembling the Quakers. They called one another brother and sister; they adopted a peculiar garb, and peculiar forms of speech; the Church was at first composed of women, slaves, and illiterate artisans but it soon became the religion of the people in the towns. All were converted excepting the rustics (pagani) and the intellectual freethinkers, who formed the aristocracy. Christianity was at first a republican religion; it proclaimed the equality of souls; the bishops were the representatives of God, and the bishops were chosen by the people. But when the emperor adopted Christianity and made it a religion of the state, it became a part of imperial government, and the parable of Dives was forgotten. The religion of the Christians was transformed; its founder was worshipped as a god; there was a doctrine of the incarnation; they had their own holy books, which they declared to have been revealed; they established convents, and nunneries, and splendid temples, adorned with images, and served by priests with shaven heads, who repeated prayers upon rosaries, and who taught that happiness in a future state could best be obtained by long prayers and by liberal presents

to the Church. In the Eastern or Greek world, Christianity in no way assisted civilisation, but in the Latin world it softened the fury of the conquerors, it aided the amalgamation of the races. The Christian priests were revered by the barbarians, and these priests belonged to the conquered people.”

The Communists replaced the slavish dogma of Christianity with the slavish dogma of Marx, making their leaders the new gods and breaking the power of the emerging democracies of Europe, which had led to the assimilation of the Jews. Reade believed that war had many beneficial effects for humanity, though he predicted that weapons of mass destruction would eventually make war unthinkable,

“Thus war will, for long years yet to come, be required to prepare the way for freedom and progress in the East; and in Europe itself, it is not probable that war will ever absolutely cease until science discovers some destroying force, so simple in its administration, so horrible in its effects, that all art, all gallantry, will be at an end, and battles will be massacres which the feelings of mankind will be unable to endure.”

The same principle of assured mutual destruction, with which we are all familiar in this age of nuclear weapons, had already appeared in the writings of Edward Bulwer-Lytton. In *The Coming Race*, Lord Lytton wrote, at least as early as 1848,

“But the effects of the alleged discovery of the means to direct the more terrible force of vril were chiefly remarkable in their influence upon social polity. As these effects became familiarly known and skillfully administered, war between the Vril-discoverers ceased, for they brought the art of destruction to such perfection as to annul all superiority in numbers, discipline, or military skill. The fire lodged in the hollow of a rod directed by the hand of a child could shatter the strongest fortress, or cleave its burning way from the van to the rear of an embattled host. If army met army, and both had command of this agency, it could be but to the annihilation of each. The age of war was therefore gone, but with the cessation of war other effects bearing upon the social state soon became apparent. Man was so completely at the mercy of man, each whom he encountered being able, if so willing, to slay him on the instant, that all notions of government by force gradually vanished from political systems and forms of law. It is only by force that vast communities, dispersed through great distances of space, can be kept together; but now there was no longer either the necessity of self-preservation or the pride of aggrandizement to make one State desire to preponderate in population over another.”¹⁹⁰⁰

Henri de Saint-Simon¹⁹⁰¹ predicted the end of war due to the destructive force of modern technologies, in the early 1800's. He also argued for a United Nations, a world government, and a socialistic world in which science liberated mankind. His concepts were derivative of Francis Bacon's Seventeenth Century work, *New*

Atlantis, which in turn is derivative of Campanella's *Civitas Solis* and Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*—all these Utopian works deriving from Plato's description of Atlantis in his *Timæus*. It is interesting to note that Saint Simon of Trent was a young Christian boy who was murdered on 21 March 1475. It was alleged that a group of Rabbis had ritually murdered the boy in order to ridicule Christ and use the boy's blood in the matzoh for Passover. He was made a Saint and became one of the most popular Saints in history.

In 1913, H. G. Wells crafted a novel which envisioned many of the events which later took place in the First World War and in the Second World War. This novel was titled, *The World Set Free: A Story of Mankind*, Macmillan, London, (1914); also published in Leipzig, Germany, by B. Tauchnitz. Wells' story tells of a "world war" which ends when "atomic bombs" fall and a "world government" is formed. Wells later published *The Open Conspiracy; Blue Prints for a World Revolution*, V. Gollancz Ltd., London, (1928); and several other related works.¹⁹⁰² Wells' book inspired Michael Higger to publish a depiction of the rabbinical "Utopia" Zionists had planned for their domination of the Earth entitled: *The Jewish Utopia*, Lord Baltimore Press, Baltimore, (1932). Racist Zionist Albert Einstein used his fame to promote world government, an ideal which in the Old Testament, as well as Cabalistic and Talmudic writings, takes the form of universal Jewish rule and the subjugation and eventual extermination of the Gentiles.

Many believed and believe that the events of the Twentieth Century fulfilled many of the Bible's prophecies. Many of these persons do not recognize the willful intervention of groups who organized themselves for the expressed purpose of bringing these events about in order to "fulfill prophecy". When the "race war", the First World War, finally broke out, it was not easy to define just what "race" was fighting which other "race", and "races" came to be defined by religious affiliation and language, as well as historical groupings and phenotypes.¹⁹⁰³

The Frankists, their cabalistic predecessors and their nihilistic descendants were successful in breaking apart Western Christendom under the Roman Catholics of the Holy Roman Empire. They worked to destroy the hegemony of Christianity and replace it with Judaic hegemony in fulfillment of ancient Judaic prophecies. This struggle played out in part Vienna during the *Kulturkampf*.

A common theme of many politicians was the notion that war must not result in changed borders—beyond the dissolution of empires. Both World Wars did little to change the map of Europe from its traditional complexion, other than to enhance segregation, and promote Bolshevism. Though many Zionists allegedly sponsored "Internationalism", they sought to segregate out the "Nationalities" which were disappearing under the empires and thereby causing Jews to assimilate in a spirit of true internationalism and integration. The Zionists, who were forbidden to practice their racism in the empires, sought to promote instead the rabid and racist Nationalism which led to the near destruction of Europe, without much changing its ethnic map. This was their short term goal, because it enabled the Zionists to justify their racism and to take the opportunity of peace talks which would follow a world war—at which talks small nations would appeal for independence—to ask for Palestine as an independent nation for the formation of a "Jewish State".

The *Kulturkampf* further complicated matters, because some Catholics desired to take Constantinople and Jerusalem from the Turks, who were Germany's allies, and make them Christian centers. The Zionists sought sympathy for their cause by promising Christians easy access to the Holy Land and by promoting Biblical prophecies, and more recent pseudo-Christian inventions like the "rapture", which they themselves did not believe. Many Catholics, as well as British and American Protestants, desired that Rome, Athens, Jerusalem and Constantinople forever be in Jewish and Christian hands. Greece had obtained its independence from the Turks with help of England, France and Russia and had long desired to reconquer all of the Byzantine Empire for Christendom. Greek Christians (doubtless many were crypto-Jews or the agents of Jews) managed the accounts of the Sultan and despite the prosperity the rise in cotton prices (which resulted from the American Civil War¹⁹⁰⁴) and other factors should have brought to the region, the Sultan was led towards bankruptcy.

Before political Zionism and Theodor Herzl, many "Christian" writers (doubtless many were crypto-Jews or the agents of Jews) and movements sought to reestablish a Jewish nation in Palestine allegedly in order to fulfill Biblical prophecy and hasten the second coming of Christ. Napoleon sought to destroy the Turkish Empire and take Palestine and give it to the Jews, believing himself to be the Messiah. Napoleon invaded Poland and Russia in order to emancipate the Jews—at the expense of his French soldiers and the Russian people, as well as many peoples in between the Russians and the French.

There were many Christian Zionists in the Nineteenth Century many of whom hoped to bring on the Apocalypse (whose loyalty had been bought with Rothschild money). These included Queen Victoria, Louis Way, the Christadelphians, William Blackstone, Charles Henry Churchill, Lord Anthony Ashley Cooper, the Earl of Shaftesbury, Lord Manchester, Lord Lindsay, Lord Palmerston, F. Laurence Oliphant, Holman Hunt, Sir Charles Warren, George Eliot, Hall Caine, George Gawler, Orson Hyde, John Nelson Darby, Jean Henri Dunant, and William Henry Hechler—who inspired and encouraged Theodor Herzl when he was feeling defeated, and who contacted Frederick the Grand Duke of Baden, Kaiser Wilhelm II, the Sultan of Turkey and Arthur Balfour on behalf of the Zionist cause.¹⁹⁰⁵ David Lloyd George's Christianity made him favorable to Zionism.

Then, as now, England and America were the staunchest supporters of Zionism. English Protestants had been promoting the "restoration of the Jews" for centuries. Many English believed that the ancient Britons were of Jewish descent and that the Royal Family were direct descendants of King David—David who took Jerusalem and whose seed was prophesied to bear the Messiah. The Germans had hoped in both World Wars that the British and Americans would side with them against the Slavs, or remain neutral.

8.7 Cabalistic Jews Calling Themselves Christian Condition the British to Assist in Their Own Demise—Rothschild Makes an Open Bid to Become the Messiah

It is interesting to note that the Damascus Affair, which united Jews around the

world, happened shortly after a broad based and well-publicized Zionist movement got underway in England in the 1830's. Both this movement to "restore Jews to Palestine" and the Damascus Affair received a great deal of press coverage in England. Was the Damascus Affair and the murder of Father Thomas the work of *agents provocateur* of the Lavon Affair¹⁹⁰⁶ type today celebrated in Israel?¹⁹⁰⁷

In an article entitled "The Jews", *The Knickerbocker; or New York Monthly Magazine*, Volume 53, Number 1, (January, 1859), pp. 41-51, at 50-51, wrote,

"Of all Mussulmans the Egyptians doubtless regard the Jews with most aversion. In the year 1844 a young man belonging to a respectable family in Cairo, suddenly disappeared. Several of the resident Consuls, moved by the solicitations of the wretched mother, requested of the Viceroy a searching investigation into the circumstances of the case. It could only be discovered that the young man had gone to the Jews' quarter, from which no one had seen him return. He had been missed a few days before the feast of the Passover, and the terrible accusation was laid upon the Jews of having offered the blood of a human victim as a holocaust, instead of the blood of the paschal lamb.

Had the Israelites not been protected by the Austrian Consul, it is probable that the infuriated and bigoted populace would have razed their quarter of the city level with the ground. Four years previous a similar event had occurred at Damascus. The Père Thomas, a Christian priest, greatly beloved by the people, was treacherously murdered in the house of an opulent Jew named Daout-Arari. The affair created much excitement even in Europe. Two celebrated French advocates were sent to Egypt to plead the cause of the accused before Mohammed Ali, then master of Syria. The intrigues of the Austrian Consul and other secret influences brought to bear, procured an acquittal of the accused. But during the judicial investigation, several important revelations were obtained. Seven Israelites confessed the crime, and turned Mussulmans in order to claim the clemency of the Cadis. From them it was learned that a Jewish barber had murdered the Père Thomas in the house of Daout-Arari, and that the blood of the priest had been mixed with the unleavened bread. The same year the Jews of Rhodes were charged with a like offence. Similar accusations have been brought against the Israelites living in Germany and Hungary.

The Greeks of Constantinople affirm that heretofore the Jews have been in the habit of purloining children, in order to sacrifice them as paschal lambs. This sacrilege was universally talked of and generally believed a few years ago in Pera and the Fanar, when the traditional enmity of the Jews and Greeks was at its height. During the Greek Revolution the Israelites assisted the Turks against the Hellenes; and when the venerable Greek Patriarch was hanged by the Moslems, the Jews volunteered to drag his corpse through the streets to the sea."

Sandwiched between the memorandum to the Protestant monarchs of Europe and

the leader of the United States on the “Restoration of the Jews” which was published together with attendant correspondence,¹⁹⁰⁸ and a story about the murder of Father Thomas which “occupies in a marked manner the whole journalism of Europe”, were the following two Letters to the Editor of *The London Times* published on 26 August 1840 on page 6 (note the expression of tensions which led to WW I and WW II),

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—Every right-minded person must feel gratified at the general expression of interest in the Jewish nation which has been elicited by the recent sufferings of their brethren at Damascus. It is to be hoped that the public feeling will not be allowed to evaporate in the mere expression of sympathy, but that some effectual measures may be adopted to prevent a recurrence of these atrocities, not merely in our own times, but in generations yet to come. We must not forget, when giving utterance to our indignation at the late transactions in the east, that but a few centuries have passed since our own country was the scene of similar enormities on a far larger scale. What reader of English history does not recall with shame and sorrow the wholesale tortures, executions, and massacres of the Jews who had sought shelter here, or who can estimate the amount of property seized and confiscated, or the number of hearts wrung by the endless repetition of cruelty and injustice? If in England they have till lately been thus treated, how can they look for more security elsewhere? Instead of wondering that they should become sordid and debased, the only cause for surprise is that any should rise to intelligence and respectability. Subject to the caprice and cruelty of any nation among whom they may dwell, fleeing from the persecutions of one only to meet with like treatment from another, having no city of refuge where they can be in safeguard, no single spot to call their own, they are in a more pitiable condition than the Indian of the forest, or the Arab of the desert.

‘The wild bird hath her nest, the fox his cave,
‘Mankind their country, Israel but the grave.’

Is this state of things always to continue? They think not. Though many hundreds of years of hope deferred might have been enough to quench the anticipations of the most sanguine, they still hope on, and turn with constant and earnest longing to the land of their forefathers. Their little children are taught to expect that they shall one day see Jerusalem. They purchase no landed property, and hold themselves in readiness at a few hours’ notice to revisit what they and we tacitly agree to call ‘their own land.’ It is theirs by a right which no other nation can boast, for God gave it to them, and though dispossessed of it for so many ages, it is still but partially peopled, and held with a loose hand and a disputed title by a hostile power, as if in readiness for their return.

There are political reasons arising from the present aspect of affairs in Russia, Turkey, and Egypt, which would make it to the interest not only of England but of other European nations, either by purchase or by treaty, to

procure the restoration of Judea to its rightful claimants. About a year since, I heard it said by a German Jew, that a proposal had some time before been made by our (then) Government to the late Baron Rothschild, that he should enter into a negotiation for this purpose, and that he declined, assigning as a reason, 'Judea is our own; we will not buy it, we wait till God shall restore it to us.' The desirableness as well as the possibility of such a step seems daily to become more evident, but England has lately proved that she needs no selfish motives to induce her to discharge a debt of national honour and justice, or to perform an act of pure benevolence. The one now suggested would not, judging from appearances, cost 20,000,000*l.* of money, or be unaccomplished after 50 years of exertion, or be so vast and so laborious an undertaking as the extinction of slavery throughout the world. It would be a noble thing for a Christian nation to restore these wanderers to their homes again. It would be a crowning point in the glory of England to bring about such an event. The special blessings promised in the Scriptures to those who befriend the Jews would rest upon her, and her sons and daughters would sit down with purer enjoyment to their domestic comforts when they thought that the persecuted outcasts of so many ages had, through their agency, been replaced in homes as happy and secure as theirs.

Hoping that some master mind may be led to take up this subject in all its bearings, and to form some tangible plan for its accomplishment, and that some Wilberforce may be raised up to plead for it by all the powerful and heart-stirring arguments of which it is capable,

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

AN ENGLISH CHRISTIAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—The extraordinary crisis of Oriental politics has stimulated an almost universal interest and investigation, and the fate of the Jews seems to be deeply involved with the settlement of the Syrian dilemma now agitating every Court of Christendom.

You have well and wisely recommended that a system of peaceful umpirage and arbitration should be adopted as the proper *role* of Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, and you have exposed the extreme absurdity which these Powers would commit if in their zeal for accommodating the quarrels of the Ottomans they should stir up bloody wars among themselves.

The peace of Europe and the just balance of its powers being therefore assumed as the grand desideratum, as the consummation most devoutly to be wished, I peruse with particular interest a brief article in your journal of this day relative to the restriction of the Jews in Jerusalem, because I imagine that this event has become practicable through an unprecedented concatenation of circumstances, and that moreover it has become especially desirable, as the exact expedient to which it is the interest of all the belligerent parties to consent.

The actual feasibility of the return of the Jews is no longer a paradox; the

time gives it proof. That theory of the restoration of the Jewish kingdom, which a few years ago was laughed at as the phantasy of insane enthusiasm, is now calculated on as a most practical achievement of diplomacy.

Let us view the question more nearly. It is granted that the Jews were the ancient proprietors of Syria; that Syria was the proper heart and centre of their kingdom. It is granted that they have a strong conviction that Providence will restore them to this Syrian supremacy. It is granted that they have entertained for ages a hearty desire to return thither, and are willing to make great sacrifices of a pecuniary kind to the different parties interested, provided they can be put in peaceful and secure possession.

It is likewise notorious, that since the Jews have been thrust out of Syria, that land has been a mere arena of strife to neighbouring Powers, all conscious that they had no legitimate right there, and all jealous of each other's intrusion.

Such having been the case, why, it may be asked, have not the Jews long ago endeavoured to regain possession of Syria by commercial arrangements? In reply it may be said, that though they have evidently wished to do so, and have made overtures of the kind, hitherto circumstances have mainly opposed their desires. For instance, they could not expect to purchase a secure possession of Syria from Turkey, while that empire, in the pride of insolent despotism, could have suddenly revoked its stipulations, and have seized on Jewish treasures, none venturing to call it to account. Nor could the Jews have ventured to purchase Syria while the right to that country was vehemently disputed between Turkey and Egypt, without any powerful arbitrators to arrange the right at issue, and lend sanction and binding authority to diplomatic documents.

Now, however, these obstacles and hindrances are in a great measure removed; all the strongest Powers in Europe have come forward as arbitrators and umpires to arrange the settlement of Syria.

Under such potent arbitrators, pledged to the performance of any conditions finally agreed on, I have reason to believe that the Jews would readily enter into such financial arrangements as would secure them the absolute possession of Jerusalem and Syria.

If such an arrangement were formed, one great cause of dissension between France and England would be at once removed; for both the Porte and Egypt are decidedly in want of money, and will gladly sell their respective rights in the Syrian territory. They themselves begin to see the folly of enacting the part of the dog in the manger; they will drop the apple of discord if they can get fair compensation for their trouble.

I know no reason, under such powerful umpires, why the Hebrews should not restore an independent monarchy in Syria, as well as the Egyptians in Egypt, or the Grecians in Greece.

As a practical expedient of politics, I believe it will be easier to secure the peace of Europe and Asia by this effort to restore the Jews, than by any allotment of Syrian territories to the Turks or Egyptians, which will be sure

to occasion fresh jealousies and discords.

In offering these remarks, I have viewed the question merely as a lawyer and a politician, and proposed the restoration of the Jews as a sort of *tertium quid*, calculated to win the votes of several of the parties at issue. But, Sir, there is a higher point of view from which many of the readers of *The Times* may wish to regard this topic of investigation. Whichever way the restoration of the Jews may finally be brought about, there is no doubt that it is a subject frequently illustrated by Biblical prophecies.

I will, therefore, if I may do so without the vain and presumptuous curiosity which some of the neologists have manifested, endeavour to detail the opinion of the church on this subject in the words of some of her most respectable writers.

It is generally supposed by Newton, Hales, Faber, and others, that the great prophetic period of 1,260 years is not very far from its termination. If they are right in this supposition, the period of the restoration of the Jews cannot be very remote.

These two contingencies are evidently connected by the prophet Daniel, who distinctly states that at the time of the end of this period there shall be great contests among the Eastern nations in Syria. And at that time (continues Daniel) shall Michael stand up, even the great Prince who standeth up for the children of the Jews, and there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, and at that time the Jews shall be delivered. (Daniel xii.)

Whatever this mysterious passage may imply, all the most learned expositors agree that it refers to the same crisis indicated by the author of the Apocalypse (Chapter xvi., verses 12, 16.) Most of these expositors seem to think that by the phrase 'drying up the great river Euphrates, that the way of the Kings of the East might be prepared,' we are to understand the diminution of the Turkish empire, that the Jews may regain their long lost kingdom of Syria.

I will not detain you by quoting a host of learned authorities in confirmation of this interpretation; but it may be important to hint, that the moral and intellectual position of the Jews in the present day, as well as their commercial connexions, has enabled them to assume a political sphere of activity at once lofty and extensive.

As to religion, they have of late years realized many of the predictions of Mendelssohn and D'Israeli. They have thrown off the absurd bigotry which once rendered them contemptible, and begin to give the New Testament and the writings of Christian divines that attention to which they are every way entitled among truth-searching and philosophic men. Though, perhaps, fewer positive conversions to Christianity have taken place than were expected by the clergy, still the Hebrew intellect has made within a few years past a wonderful approximation to that temper of impartial inquiry in which such books as *Grotius de Veritate* produce an indelible impression.

I believe that the cause of the restoration of the Jews is one essentially

generous and noble, and that all individuals and nations that assist this world-renounced people to recover the empire of their ancestors will be rewarded by Heaven's blessing. [It was and is commonplace for Zionists to appeal to the superstitions of Christians and others with the myth that Jews have supernatural connections which will bless those who help Jews and punish those who do not. The real forces at work are generally control over public opinion through media, planted rumor and gossip; sophisticated intelligence networks; and the might of higher education and investment capital, or lack thereof, which can raise a nation above others, or destroy it. Whoever controls news outlets and financial institutions is the first to learn of events and investments, and to profit from them, or prevent them.—CJB] Everything that is patriotic and philanthropic should urge Great Britain forward as the agent of prophetic revelations so full of auspicious consequence.

I dare not allow my mind to run into the enthusiasm on this subject which I find predominant among religious authors. I will, therefore, conclude with one quotation from *Hale's Analysis of Chronology*:—

'The situation of the new Jerusalem,' says this profound mathematician, 'as the centre of Christ's millenary kingdom in the Holy Land, considered in a geographical point of view, is well described by Mr. King in a note to his *Hymns to the Supreme Being*. How capable Syria is of a more universal intercourse than any other country with all parts of the world is most remarkable, and deserves to be well considered, when we read the numerous prophecies which speak of its future grandeur, when its people shall at length be gathered from all nations among whom they have wandered, and Sion shall be the joy of the whole earth.'

Your very obedient servant,

Aug. 17.

F. B."

The "Memorandum" was advertised in *The London Times* on 9 March 1840, on page 3,

"RESTORATION OF THE JEWS.—A memorandum has been addressed to the Protestant monarchs of Europe on the subject of the restoration of the Jewish people to the land of Palestine. The document in question, dictated by the peculiar conjuncture of affairs in the East, and the other striking 'signs of the times,' reverts to the original covenant which secures that land to the descendants of Abraham, and urges upon the consideration of the powers addressed what may be the possible line of duty on the part of Protestant Christendom to the Jewish people in the present controversy in the East. The memorandum and correspondence which has passed upon the subject have been published."

The "Memorandum to the Protestant Powers of the North of Europe and America" was published in *Memorials concerning God's Ancient People of Israel*.

It was later republished together with attendant correspondence in *The London Times* on 26 August 1840 on pages 5-6. It is an attempt to persuade Protestant leaders to bring to fruition Biblical apocalyptic prophecy by forcing it to “come true” through less than divine willful human intervention. This was a tradition for the Christians which dates from the *Gospels*. For example, *Matthew* 21:1-11 states, referring to *Zachariah* 9:9,

“And when they drew nigh unto Jerusalem, and were come to Bethphage, unto the mount of Olives, then sent Jesus two disciples. Saying unto them, Go into the village over against you, and straightway ye shall find an ass tied, and a colt with her: loose *them*, and bring *them* unto me, And if any *man* say ought unto you, ye shall say, The Lord hath need of them; and straightway he will send them. All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass. And the disciples went, and did as Jesus commanded them, And brought the ass, and the colt, and put on them their clothes, and they set *him* thereon. And a very great multitude spread their garments in the way; others cut down the branches from the trees, and strawed *them* in the way. And the multitudes that went before, and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the son of David: Blessed *is* he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest. And when he was come into Jerusalem, all the city was moved, saying, Who is this? And the multitude said, This is Jesus the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee.”

Rothschild saw himself as the Messiah, but could not convince any large number of Jews of the fact. He could buy Palestine, but could not buy enough Jews to populate it. Rothschild could even buy the support of the governments of Europe, but there was only one means to persuade Jews to move to the desert—by mass murdering and otherwise terrorizing European assimilatory Jews. Both the Old Testament (*Leviticus* 26. *Deuteronomy* 4:24-27; 28:15-68; 30:1-3. II *Chronicles* 7:19-22. *Jeremiah* 29:1-7) and the Babylonian Talmud, *Tractate Kethuboth* (also: “Ketubot”), 111a, make it clear that the Jews must not hasten the coming of the Messiah and must wait for the Messiah to establish a Jewish state, before emigrating to Palestine in large numbers. Israel Shahak and Norton Mezvinsky wrote in their book *Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel*,

“The Haredi objection to Zionism is based upon the contradiction between classical Judaism, of which the Haredim are the continuators, and Zionism. Numerous Zionist historians have unfortunately obfuscated the issues here. Some detailed explanation is therefore necessary. In a famous talmudic passage in *Tractate Ketubot*, page 111, which is echoed in other parts of the Talmud, God is said to have imposed three oaths on the Jews. Two of these oaths that clearly contradict Zionist tenets are: 1) Jews should not rebel against non-Jews, and 2) as a group should not massively emigrate to

Palestine before the coming of the Messiah. (The third oath, not discussed here, enjoins the Jews not to pray too strongly for the coming of the Messiah, so as not to bring him before his appointed time.) During the course of post-talmudic Jewish history, rabbis extensively discussed the three oaths. Of major concern in this discussion was the question of whether or not specific Jewish emigration to Palestine was part of the forbidden massive emigration. During the past 1,500 years, the great majority of traditional Judaism's most important rabbis interpreted the three oaths and the continued existence of the Jews in exile as religious obligations intended to expiate the Jewish sins that caused God to exile them."¹⁹⁰⁹

Christians believe that the Jews had broken the Covenant and that a new Covenant had been made between God and the Christians, thereby voiding the Covenant with the Jews (*Matthew* 12:30; 21:43-45. *Romans* 9; 11:7-8. *Galatians* 3:16. *Hebrews* 8:6-10).

The New-Yorker, Volume 9, Number 13, Whole Number 221, (13 June 1840), pp. 196-197; wrote of Rothschild's desires to be King of the Jews, and by the implications of Jewish prophecy, King of the World—and by the implications of Christian prophecy, the anti-Christ:

“RESTORATION OF THE JEWS.—On more than one occasion we have called attention to the signs, of one kind or another, by which the exiles of Israel are beginning to express their impatience for the accomplishment of the prophecies that point to their restoration; and the changes, physical and moral, which are gradually breaking down the barriers to the final fulfilment of the promise. These are curious and worth attention; and more significant in their aggregation, and with reference to the character of the people in question, than those of our readers who have looked at them hastily and separately, may have been prepared to suspect. The Malta letters brings accounts from Syria, in which some curious particulars are given of Sir Moses Montefiore's proceedings, during his late visit to the Holy Land. We remember rumors, which had currency some years ago, of the Jewish capitalist's (Rothschild's) design to employ his wealth in the purchase of Jerusalem, as the seat of a kingdom, and bring back the tribes under his own guidance and sovereignty. If the scheme, amid its sublimity, savored sufficiently of the romantic to make the rumor suspicious, the positive acts of Sir Moses, at least, exhibit an anxiety to gather together the wanderers in the neighborhood of their ancient home and future hopes; that they may await events on the ground where they can best be made available to the fulfilment of the promise. During his pilgrimage he sought his way to the hearts of his countrymen, by giving a *talaris* (we believe about fifteen piastres) to every Israelite; and having instituted strict inquiries respecting the various biblical antiquities on his way, and ascertained the amount of duty which the sacred places and villages paid to the Egyptian Government to be about 64,000 purses (a purse being equal to fifteen talaris,) he proposed to the Viceroy of

Egypt, that he (Sir Moses) should pay this revenue out of his own pocket, as the price of that prince's permission to him to colonize all those places with the Children of Israel. The offer has been, it is said, accepted, subject to the condition that the colony shall be considered national, and not under European protection. Athenæum."

Though the majority of Jews opposed political Zionism from its inception for the very reason that it was an artificial effort to do God's will in the absence of a Messiah, some modern Jewish and Christian Zionist groups are planning to artificially create the horrors of the Apocalypse, in order to artificially begin the Messianic Era—in their twisted dreams. Jessica Stern writes, referring to Judaism, Christianity and Islam; and citing the Bible at *Zechariah* 14:2-12, *Daniel* 12:1-2, *Revelation* 16:14-16, 20:1-6, and the Koran at Sura 14:48 and Sura 18:8:

"Millenarian Jews believe that at the End of Days, there will be a time of great troubles. Jerusalem will be taken in battle, but God will smite the enemies of the Jews. The wicked will act wickedly and not understand, while the knowledgeable will grow refined and radiant. The righteous among the dead will rise to eternal life, while others will be left to everlasting abhorrence. All three monotheistic traditions have a conception of an apocalypse, but each believes that its own group will prevail in the catastrophic events of the final days.¹⁴ Some millenarians hope to bring on that very catastrophe, which they see as a necessary stage in the process of redemption. Evangelical Christians and Messianic Jews have developed a cooperative relationship, based on their common belief that rebuilding the Temple will facilitate the process of redemption, even though each believes its own group will ultimately triumph."¹⁹¹⁰

The "Memorandum to the Protestant Powers of the North of Europe and America" was soon followed by the memorandum of Lord Ashley (Shaftesbury) to British Foreign Secretary Lord Palmerston of 25 September 1840 and the memorandum to Palmerston of 2 March 1841.

Almost a century before the "Memorandum to the Protestant Powers of the North of Europe and America", another English "Christian", David Hartley, published his *Observations on Man* in 1749.¹⁹¹¹ Hartley evinces the desire of a (recently reemerging) sect of philo-Semitic Christian Zionists for the destruction of Catholicism (in anticipation of the French Revolution and the *Kulturkampf*), the "restoration of the Jews to Palestine"; then Jewish world rule followed by the utter destruction of human kind, in anticipation of the First and Second (and Third?) World Wars. He tried to persuade his Christian readers to welcome despair, death and destruction in the hopes that it "may fit us for *the new Heavens, and new Earth.*" (*Isaiah* 65:16-17; 66:22-24). Hartley asked Christians to accept that this life must be miserable, while promising them a better afterlife—a promise he knew he would never be asked to honor.

In the Jewish dominated media of today we find many Jews preaching to the

public that the end times are coming and that Christians ought to view their own destruction in a positive light as if it were the divine fulfillment of Jewish and Christian prophecy. Many Christians have been duped by these charlatans, be they psychics, pseudo-Christians preachers, UFO and ghost investigators, etc. These dupes must awaken to fact that the destruction of the world and its nations is occurring as a result of the deliberate intervention of immensely wealthy Jews, and not as the result of God's will. These Jewish leaders view the Hebrew Bible as a plan which they are deliberately fulfilling without their God's help and in violation of Christian principles and prophecy, unless it be Christian prophecy of the "anti-Christ" against whom Christians are duty bound to fight. Christianity, like Communism has always been used by Jews as a trap to destroy Europeans. It promises a Utopia if only the Europeans surrender their power to State authority and surrender their wealth to the Jews. In the meantime, Jews are taught that they need only obey God's laws and that they are duty bound to accumulate wealth, most especially gold and jewels. Under such a system, Christians cannot compete and the Jews have provided them with belief systems meant to destroy them. Whereas Christians are taught to surrender their struggle for individual survival to fatalism under the promise of a perfect afterlife, Jews are taught that immortality rests in the segregation and survival of their "race" and that the individual must struggle for the survival and segregation of the "Jewish race", and must also encourage all other "races" to destroy themselves, because they view the mere existence of other "races" as a threat to the survival of the "Jewish race", both because they sense the ever present danger that assimilation will dissolve them, and because they sense that Esau will someday take revenge on Jacob for its deliberate deceit, theft and genocide of non-Jews.

David Hartley was a Cabalistic Jew who wanted to bring ruin upon the Gentiles by deceiving them with Christian mythology into mass murdering themselves for the benefit of the Jews. He was next in a long line of traitors who had come under the influence of wealthy Cabalistic Jewish mystics, a lineage which can be traced through Sir Isaac Newton to Henry More and beyond.

The genocidal Zionists attempted to justify their inhuman actions and plans as if divine manifestations of the Messianic myth of "hevlei Mashiah", or "the birth pangs of the Messiah".¹⁹¹² This madness of self-destruction imposed on Christians by Jewish Zionists and their Cabalistic agents—including Henry More, Isaac Newton, Samuel Clarke and David Hartley—has culminated today, after two horrific world wars which they and their progeny planned and brought about—has culminated today in the apocalyptic desires of Dispensationalist Christians, who slavishly promote the evils of Israel and eagerly await a nuclear holocaust they intend to deliberately bring about, which will destroy human life on Earth.¹⁹¹³ These insane dupes of the racist Jewish Zionists have been taught that they will be raptured up into Heaven and that God will create a new heaven and Earth just for them. The racist Jewish Zionists use their media control and wealth to promote these pseudo-Christians in America in order to subvert the American political process and to lead America into World War Three with a dim-witted smile on its face.

David Hartley was influenced by Isaac Newton's student and defender, the quasi-

Anglican Arian philosopher (cabalistic Jew) Samuel Clarke. Clarke's Arianism was in fact Judaic—he, Newton, and later Hartley, would not sign the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, which would have required them to affirm a belief in the Trinity. Clarke compiled a series of Bible quotations concerning the “restoration of the Jews”.¹⁹¹⁴ Hartley apparently copied much from Clarke's *A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God And Other Writings*, without any attribution, including Clarke's space-time theory of 1705,¹⁹¹⁵ which anticipated the special theory of relativity by two-hundred years, and which had its origins in the Cabalistic space-time theories of Giordano Bruno,¹⁹¹⁶ Henry More,¹⁹¹⁷ John Locke,¹⁹¹⁸ and Isaac Newton—and the *Kabbala Denudata* which inspired all of these pseudo-Christians to destroy Christian society.¹⁹¹⁹ These men were Cabalists who denied the divinity of Jesus, and who were greatly influenced by prominent and wealthy Jewish mystics, and who also wrote about the “restoration of the Jews” and the conversion of Jews to Christianity which they argued would bring about the millennium, the destruction of the old world and the creation of a new world.¹⁹²⁰ Again, it is important to stress, that we have as their legacy two world wars and a coming third.

Some Jews were spreading the message that in order for Christianity to succeed, Jews would have to convert Christianity. This gave them privilege and the power to amend Christianity so as to make it more palatable to Jews. It also prevented a backlash against Jews who would emigrate to Palestine and who would be seen by Christians as the minions of the anti-Christ were they not to feign Christian conversion.

Isaac Newton, like Clarke after him, disbelieved in the Trinity, wanted to see the Gentile nations laid to waste, and hoped that the Jews would rule the world from Jerusalem. Newton wrote, among other things,

“For they understand not that ye final return of ye Jews captivity & their conquering the nations <of ye four Monarchies> & setting up a peaceable righteous & flourishing Kingdom at ye day of judgment is this mystery. Did they understand this they would end it in all ye old Prophets who write of ye last times as in ye last chapters of Isaiah where the Prophet conjoyns the new heaven & new earth wth ye ruin of ye wicked nations, the end of all troubles weeping & of all troubles, the return of ye Jews captivity & their setting up a flourishing & everlasting Kingdom.”¹⁹²¹

and,

“’Tis in ye last days yt this is to be fulfilled & then ye captivity shall return & become a strong nation & reign over strong nations afar off, & ye Lord shal reign in mount Zion from thenceforth for ever, & many nations shal receive ye law of righteousness from Jerusalem, & they shall beat their swords into plow-shares & their spears into pruning hooks & nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shal they learn war any more; all wch never yet came to pass.”¹⁹²²

Stephen Snobelen wrote of Newton,

“Newton had a profound interest in things Jewish. His library alone supplies ample evidence of this.¹⁵ Newton owned five of the works of Maimonides,¹⁶ and makes numerous references to them in his manuscripts. He also possessed Christian Knorr von Rosenroth’s *Kabbala denudata* (1677-84), which shows extensive signs of dog-eating,¹⁷ along with an edition of the first-century Jewish philosopher Philo.¹⁸ His writings reveal that he used the Talmud, the learning of which he accessed through Maimonides and other sources in his library.¹⁹ Although he never acquired a competency in the language, Newton picked up a smattering of Hebrew and armed himself with an array of Hebrew lexicons and grammars.²⁰ He also owned and used a Hebrew Bible.²¹ Much attention is given in Newton’s writings to studies of the Jewish Temple and its rituals.²² His fascination with these things was motivated in large part by the importance of understanding both the complexities of Jewish ritual and the design of the Temple for the interpretation of prophecy.²³ Newton owned a number of works on these subjects as well.²⁴ A further testimony to his research on the Temple exists in the physical evidence of his octavo Bible, the pages of which are heavily soiled in the section detailing the Temple of Ezekiel’s prophecy.²⁵ This study also bore its fruit. Several scholars have pointed to Newton’s appropriation of elements of Jewish theology. John Maynard Keynes famously characterized Newton as a ‘Judaic monotheist of the school of Maimonides.’²⁶,¹⁹²³

The first known records of Christianity appeared after the destruction of the Temple and the dispersion of the Jews from Jerusalem. Religious Jews were fanatically concerned that the nation of the Jews be preserved. Christianity itself was probably nothing but a means to convert the Romans to Judaism so that the Romans would then restore the Jews to Palestine and force the Jews back to Judaism, which the Jews had largely abandoned. After, or as, the Jews were being restored to Judaism, Jews would then restore the Christians to Paganism. This appears to be the plan of treacherous Paul, who was born a Jew named Saul, and who set down this plan in *Romans* 9-11. The fulfilment of this plan occurred in the Twentieth Century, when Communism and Nazism largely destroyed the religion of European Christians and forced Jews to move to Palestine out of fear. The anti-religious doctrines of Communism are well known. The anti-religious doctrines of Nazism are discussed in Uriel Tal’s introduction to J. M. Snoek’s *The Grey Book*, Humanities Press, New York, (1970), pp. I-XXVI. Tal writes, *inter alia*,

“[T]he Nazis appropriated the messianic structure of religion which they exploited to their own ideological and political ends[. . .] but which is designed to de-Christianize the German people[.] Anti-Semitism is not only called to combat religion and Christianity; its chief aim is to save the German nation and the whole world from Jewish domination and from the moral

depredation of the Jewish race. [*i. e.* to segregate and persecute Jews as the Zionists desired and to force them to Palestine, while destroying the Judaism of Gentiles—while destroying Christianity.] [***] The general tendency of this movement was directed against Christianity as an ecclesiastical institution, sometimes chiefly against the Catholic Church which was suspected of ‘ultramontanist’ sympathies for a foreign ecclesiastical power.”

After making it appear that he was a neutral arbiter in Chapters 9 and 10, Paul, born Saul, warns Gentiles and apostate Jews of their ultimate fate when he writes in Chapter 11 of *Romans*,

“1 I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, *of* the tribe of Benjamin. 2 God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot ye not what the scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, 3 Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. 4 But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to *the image of* Baal. 5 Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace. 6 And if by grace, then *is it* no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if *it be* of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work. 7 What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded 8 (According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto this day. 9 And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumblingblock, and a recompence unto them: 10 Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their back alway. 11 I say then, Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but rather through their fall salvation *is come* unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy. 12 Now if the fall of them *be* the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness? 13 For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office: 14 If by any means I may provoke to emulation *them which are* my flesh, and might save some of them. 15 For if the casting away of them *be* the reconciling of the world, what *shall* the receiving *of them* be, but life from the dead? 16 For if the firstfruit *be* holy, the lump *is* also *holy*: and if the root be holy, so are the branches. 17 And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; 18 Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. 19 Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. 20 Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear: 21 For if God spared not the natural branches, *take heed* lest he also spare not thee. 22 Behold therefore

the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in *his* goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. 23 And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graff them in again. 24 For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree: how much more shall these, which be the natural *branches*, be grafted into their own olive tree? 25 For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. 26 And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: 27 For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins. 28 As concerning the gospel, *they are* enemies for your sakes: but as touching the election, *they are* beloved for the fathers' sakes. 29 For the gifts and calling of God *are* without repentance. 30 For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief: 31 Even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy. 32 For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all. 33 O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable *are* his judgments, and his ways past finding out! 34 For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor? 35 Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? 36 For of him, and through him, and to him, *are* all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen.”

Paul, born Saul, also warned his fellow Jews in I *Thessalonians* 2:15-16, where Paul stated,

“For ye, brethren, became followers of the churches of God which in Judaea are in Christ Jesus: for ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they *have* of the Jews. Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men: Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost.”

We see that “Jesus” is an allegory for Judaism, which the Romans had attacked, and which many Jews had abandoned. The name “Jesus” in the original means “Jew”. The “life” of Jesus was concurrent with the life of Philo the Jew, who Hellenized Judaism—an act which made Judaism palatable to Romans; and who obliged the conversion of the Temple to the worship of the Roman Emperors after the Jews had exhibited religious intolerance against Rome. The parallels between the story of “Jesus” and the history of Judaism are many. The sale of Judaism by “Judas”, which name is the same word as “Jesus” in the original and which means “Jew” as in *Philo Judæus*—the doubting of Thomas and the denial of Peter as Jews

became more secular or pagan—the promise of everlasting life to a religion that was dying out¹⁹²⁴—the destruction of the Temple—twelve Apostles of “the Jew” judging the Twelve Tribes of Israel (*Matthew* 19:28. *Luke* 22:28-30)—forgiveness of the whore which had slept with Judah (*Genesis* 38), etc. What better act of vengeance could there have been for Caligula’s desecration of the Temple and Titus’ destruction of it, than to convert Romans to a Romanized and Hellenized branch of Judaism, which had the Romans worshiping “the Jew” and joyfully looking forward to their ultimate destruction?

In 1925, Bialik gave a speech at the inauguration of the “Hebrew University” and arrogantly spoke of the salvation of the pagan and the rôle Jesus played in conditioning Gentiles to accept the Jewish world view, that ultimately led to the Balfour Declaration.¹⁹²⁵ The closing book of the Old Testament states (*Malachi* 1:11-14), in the context of the continual ruin of Edom—the continual ruin of the world of the Gentiles:

“11 For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name *shall* be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense *shall* be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name *shall* be great among the heathen, saith the LORD of hosts. 12 But ye have profaned it, in that ye say, The table of the LORD *is* polluted; and the fruit thereof, *even* his meat, *is* contemptible. 13 Ye said also, Behold, what a weariness *is it!* and ye have snuffed at it, saith the LORD of hosts; and ye brought *that which was* torn, and the lame, and the sick; thus ye brought an offering: should I accept this of your hand? saith the LORD. 14 But cursed *be* the deceiver, which hath in his flock a male, and voweth, and sacrificeth unto the LORD a corrupt thing: for I *am* a great King, saith the LORD of hosts, and my name *is* dreadful among the heathen.”

The stumblingblocks we face even today are many. Christianity, Islam and Judaism pose a great danger to our modern existence, with their suicidal hopes and apocalyptic dreams which are used to justify inhumanity and war and the selfishness and self-destructiveness of the “elect” (*Isaiah* 65; 66. *Enoch*). In the Twentieth Century, Marxism, Einsteinism and Freudism became dark dogmas rooted in ancient mythologies, which monopolized discourse, while far more enlightened views were suppressed. The Christian religion of obedience to the Jewish God of war and destruction has been one of the worst stumblingblocks Europe (“Rome”) has faced—as those who fabricated the mythology probably intended (note that Jesus was effectively the Messiah of the Gentiles, not the Jews).¹⁹²⁶ *Psalms* 69:22, may have inspired some Jews to trap the Romans with Christianity:

“Let their table become a snare before them: *and that which should have been for their welfare, let it become a trap.*”

The Jews, whose religion taught them to mercilessly destroy other peoples, had long seen religious conversion as a means to trap a people. *Deuteronomy* 7:2, 16-18

states:

“7:2 And when the LORD thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them, *and* utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor shew mercy unto them: [***] 16 And thou shalt consume all the people which the LORD thy God shall deliver thee; thine eye shall have no pity upon them: neither shalt thou serve their gods; for that *will be* a snare unto thee. 17 If thou shalt say in thine heart, These nations *are* more than I; how can I dispossess them? 18 Thou shalt not be afraid of them: *but* shalt well remember what the LORD thy God did unto Pharaoh, and unto all Egypt;”

Where Christianity has been forcibly replaced by Communism, still worse mythologies have been imposed. Benjamin Disraeli, who was to become Britain’s Prime Minister, wrote in 1852,

“Nor is it indeed historically true that the small section of the Jewish race which dwelt in Palestine rejected Christ. The reverse is the truth. Had it not been for the Jews of Palestine the good tidings of our Lord would have been unknown for ever to the northern and western races. The first preachers of the gospel were Jews, and none else; the historians of the gospel were Jews, and none else. No one has ever been permitted to write under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit except a Jew. For nearly a century no one believed in the good tidings except Jews. They nursed the sacred flame of which they were the consecrated and hereditary depositories. And when the time was right to diffuse the truth among the ethnicks, it was not a senator of Rome or a philosopher of Athens who was personally appointed by our Lord for that office, but a Jew of Tarsus, who founded the seven churches of Asia. And that greater church, great even amid its terrible corruptions, that has avenged the victory of Titus by subjugating the capital of the Cæsars and has changed every one of the Olympian temples into altars of the God of Sinai and of Calvary, was founded by another Jew, a Jew of Galilee.

[***]

They may be traced in the last outbreak of the destructive principle in Europe. An insurrection takes place against tradition and aristocracy, against religion and property. Destruction of the Semitic principle, extirpation of the Jewish religion, whether in the Mosaic or in the Christian form, the natural equality of man and the abrogation of property, are proclaimed by the secret societies who form provisional governments, and men of Jewish race are found at the head of every one of them. The people of God co-operate with atheists; the most skilful accumulators of property ally themselves with communists; the peculiar and chosen race touch the hand of all the scum and low castes of Europe! And all this because they wish to destroy that ungrateful Christendom which owes to them even its name, and whose tyranny they can no longer endure.

When the secret societies, in February 1848, surprised Europe, they were themselves surprised by the unexpected opportunity, and so little capable were they of seizing the occasion, that had it not been for the Jews, who of late years unfortunately have been connecting themselves with these unhallowed associations, imbecile as were the governments the uncalled for outbreak would not have ravaged Europe. But the fiery energy and the teeming resources of the children of Israel maintained for a long time the unnecessary and useless struggle. If the reader throws his eye over the provisional governments of Germany, and Italy, and even of France, formed at that period, he will recognise everywhere the Jewish element. Even the insurrection, and defence, and administration of Venice, which, from the resource of statesmanlike moderation displayed, commanded almost the respect and sympathy of Europe, were accomplished by a Jew—Manini, who by the bye is a Jew who professes the whole of the Jewish religion, and believes in Calvary as well as Sinai, ‘a converted Jew’, as the Lombards styled him, quite forgetting, in the confusion of their ideas, that it is the Lombards who are the converts—not Manini.

[***]

Is it therefore wonderful, that a great portion of the Jewish race should not believe in the most important portion of the Jewish religion? As however the converted races become more humane in their behaviour to the Jews, and the latter have opportunity fully to comprehend and deeply to ponder over true Christianity, it is difficult to suppose that the result will not be very different. Whether presented by a Roman or Anglo-Catholic, or Geneveve, divine, by pope, bishop, or presbyter, there is nothing one would suppose very repugnant to the feelings of a Jew when he learns that the redemption of the human race has been effected by the mediatorial agency of a child of Israel; if the ineffable mystery of the Incarnation be developed to him, he will remember that the blood of Jacob is a chosen and peculiar blood, and if so transcendent a consummation is to occur he will scarcely deny that only one race could be deemed worthy of accomplishing it. There may be points of doctrine on which the northern and western races may perhaps never agree. The Jew, like them, may follow that path in those respects which reason and feeling alike dictate; but nevertheless it can hardly be maintained that there is anything revolting to a Jew to learn that a Jewess is the queen of heaven, or that the flower of the Jewish race are even now sitting on the right hand of the Lord God of Sabaoth.

Perhaps too in this enlightened age as his mind expands and he takes a comprehensive view of this period of progress, the pupil of Moses may ask himself, whether all the princes of the house of David have done so much for the Jews as that prince who was crucified on Calvary? Had it not been for Him, the Jews would have been comparatively unknown, or known only as a high oriental caste which had lost its country. Has not He made their history the most famous in the world? Has not He hung up their laws in every temple? Has not He vindicated all their wrongs? Has not He avenged the

victory of Titus and conquered the Cæsars? What successes did they anticipate from their Messiah? The wildest dreams of their rabbis have been far exceeded. Has not Jesus conquered Europe and changed its name into Christendom? All countries that refuse the cross wither while the whole of the new world is devoted to the Semitic principle and its most glorious offspring the Jewish faith, and the time will come when the vast communities and countless myriads of America and Australia, looking upon Europe as Europe now looks upon Greece and wondering how so small a space could have achieved such great deeds, will still find music in the songs of Sion and solace in the parables of Galilee.

These may be dreams, but there is one fact which none can contest. Christians may continue to persecute Jews and Jews still persist in disbelieving Christians, but who can deny that Jesus of Nazareth, the Incarnate Son of the Most High God, is the eternal glory of the Jewish race?"¹⁹²⁷

The ancient Judeans prevailed in one sense against the Romans, whom they identified as their mortal enemy "Esau", they themselves being "Jacob". Jewish proselytes made Rome the new capital of the Jewish religion, where Roman gods were spat upon, where a Jewish son was worshiped as God, and where a Jewish woman, who the Jews claimed was a prostitute, was worshiped as the mother of God.

The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* writes in its article "Messianic Movements":

"One trend of Jewish messianism which left the national fold was destined 'to conquer the conquerers'—by the gradual Christianization of the masses throughout the Roman Empire. Through Christianity, Jewish messianism became an institution and an article of faith of many nations. Within the Jewish fold, the memory of glorious resistance, of the fight for freedom, of martyred messiahs, prophets, and miracle workers remained to nourish future messianic movements."¹⁹²⁸

The story of Jesus appeared at a time when many Jews believed that God was punishing the Jews for a long list of transgressions including Solomon's marriage to the Pharaoh's daughter and subsequent idolatry (*Sabbath 56b*. I *Kings* 11. II *Chronicles* 7:19-23), as well as the transgressions of Aaron's worship of the Golden Calf, and the increase in "intermarriage" with the "daughter of a strange god" and apostasy (*Malachi* 2:10-12). The ten northern tribes were allegedly sent into captivity for impiety (II *Kings* 17), and the southern tribes, who remained unrepentant, soon followed into their own captivity (II *Kings* 18:13; 24:3-16; 25), Solomon's Temple was destroyed, thus beginning the age of Gentile domination and the yoke on Israel. II *Chronicles* 36:18-21, attributes the destruction of the First Temple, at least in part, to the failure of the Israelites and Judeans to maintain the Shemmitah (*Exodus* 23:10-11. *Leviticus* 25. *Deuteronomy* 15; 23:20; 31:10-13),

"18 And all the vessels of the house of God, great and small, and the

treasures of the house of the LORD, and the treasures of the king, and of his princes; all *these* he brought to Babylon. 19 And they burnt the house of God, and brake down the wall of Jerusalem, and burnt all the palaces thereof with fire, and destroyed all the goodly vessels thereof. 20 And them that had escaped from the sword carried he away to Babylon; where they were servants to him and his sons until the reign of the kingdom of Persia: 21 To fulfil the word of the LORD by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had enjoyed her sabbaths: *for* as long as *she* lay desolate she kept sabbath, to fulfil threescore and ten years.”

Solomon was a magician and is said to have built the Temple with the assistance of *demons* and angels. Due to his evil, Solomon lost his Kingdom and ruled only his staff at the end of his life (*Sanhedrin 20b*). Some Jews believed that God would not permit the existence of the Temple, or send the Messiah, until the Jews had atoned for Solomon’s sins and for the sins of Israel—some even viewed the Holocaust as atonement for the sins of Israel and justify their conclusion by pointing to the existence of Israel—others believe that Zionists instigated the Holocaust as an artificial atonement for the sin of worshiping the Golden Calf, which the Talmud asserted caused the Jews eternal suffering (*Sanhedrin 102a*). The very gift of the Covenant is tainted by Jacob’s sins against Esau.¹⁹²⁹ Moses iterated many curses which would befall the Jews if they were disobedient to God (*Leviticus 26. Deuteronomy 4:24-27; 28:15-68; 30:1-3. II Chronicles 7:19-22. Jeremiah 29:1-7*). Many Jews view the Diaspora, and their supposed eternal suffering, as God’s retribution against them for the Jews’ disobedience to God.

The Zionists put Hitler into power in order to bring about an unprecedented human sacrifice, which would finally atone for the Jews’ sins against God, through their own treachery to the Jewish People. Dualist, or Satanist, Jews see Jacob’s treachery against his brother as his greatest strength. They argue that evil deeds are rewarded many times in the Old Testament. The Satanic Cabalistic cults believe that evil triumphs over good. Jewish Dualist cults seek the combined power of both good and evil, but tend to fear the Devil more than God, and so are eager to do the Devil’s bidding. These genocidal Jews found divine authority for their actions throughout the Hebrew Bible, which calls for the mass murder of assimilatory Jewry.

Christians called for Jews to atone for the death of Jesus Christ, and some will not be satisfied unless Israel evaporates beneath a storm of mushroom clouds and rains human ash upon the desert. Jews, especially assimilated Jews, have not only Christian mythology to fear, but Judaic mythology, as well. The Jews killed off many of their fellow Jews in the Holocaust in the belief that they were fulfilling Old Testament prophecies. Their campaign is not over and will not end until all assimilated Jews and all Gentiles are dead.

Some Jews, the same type of racist tribal Jews who caused the Holocaust, want to kill off all Christians and all assimilated Jews. They believe that all anti-Semitism stems from Esau’s pledge to destroy the seed of Jacob, and that God insisted that the Jews exterminate the seed of Amalek, grandson of Esau—and all assimilated Jews. Rather than fault Jacob for his vile treachery, racist Jews excuse their immoral hatred

of Esau, by faulting Esau for being angry at Jacob for stealing the Covenant. Note that Esau was Jacob's brother and that the genocidal Jews believe in pruning off whole branches from their own family tree and exterminating whole lines of Jewish ancestral blood. Note further that Jews believe in treachery against their own blood as a means of maintaining the Covenant, for after all they are told again and again that only a remnant of Jews will survive in the end times, and racist Jews are convinced that that means them and that they have right to kill off assimilated Jews and Gentiles. This was one of the ways in which the racist Zionist Jews justified their mass murder of fellow Jews to themselves during the Holocaust.

The success of the story of Jesus led the Jews into another dilemma, in that Christians asserted that Jews must convert to Christianity as stated in *Romans* 9-11, though Saul, a. k. a. Paul, was probably only asking Jews to remain Jews at a time when many Jews were becoming secular. After more than a thousand years of antagonism, something had to give, and some Jews sought to undermine Christianity by converting it to Judaism, while pretending to convert Jews to Christianity. In many waves, over many centuries, swarms of Talmudists, Cabalists and false Messiahs have swept across Europe literally peddling social, spiritual and medical panaceas. Zionist anti-Catholic ministers preached the conversion and restoration of the Jews to Palestine and readied their gullible Christian brethren for their own demise.

The Jews had another reason to feign Christian conversion before colonizing Palestine. They knew that the Christians would see the Biblical implications of Jewish financiers using their corruptly gotten gains to take Jerusalem from its rightful ancient inhabitants as the manifestation of the "anti-Christ". The Jews feared that the Christians would join forces with Islam to crush the "anti-Christ" Jewish King and with him the Jews. Moses Hess quoted Ernest Laharanne, *La nouvelle question d'Orient: Empires d'Egypte et d'Arabie. Reconstitution de la nationalité juive*, E. Dentu, Paris, (1860):

"I may, therefore, recommend this work, written, not by a Jew, but by a French patriot, to the attention of our modern Jews, who plume themselves on borrowed French humanitarianism. I will quote here, in translation, a few pages of this work, *The New Eastern Question*, by Ernest Laharanne.[Footnote: See note IX at end of book.]

'In the discussion of these new Eastern complications, we reserved a special place for Palestine, in order to bring to the attention of the world the important question, whether ancient Judæa can once more acquire its former place under the sun.

'This question is not raised here for the first time. The redemption of Palestine, either by the efforts of international Jewish bankers, or the nobler method, of a general subscription in which all the Jews should participate, has been discussed many times. Why is it that this patriotic project has not as yet been realized? It is certainly not the fault of pious Jews that the plan was frustrated, for their hearts beat fast and their eyes fill with tears at the thought of a return to Jerusalem.[Footnote: My friend, Armond L., who

traveled for several years through the Danube Principalities, told me that the Jews were moved to tears when he announced to them the end of their suffering, with the words ‘The time of the return approaches.’ The more fortunate Occidental Jews do not know with what longing the Jewish masses of the East await the final redemption from the two thousand year exile. They know not that the patriotic Jew cannot suppress his cry of anguish at the length of the exile, even in the midst of his festive songs, as, for instance, the patriotic poem which is read on Chanukah, closes with the mournful call:

‘For salvation is delayed for us and there is no end to the days of evil.’

‘They asked me,’ continued my friend, ‘what are the indications that the end of the exile is approaching?’ ‘These,’ I answered, ‘that the Turkish and the papal powers are on the point of collapse.’]

‘If the project is still unrealized, the cause is easily cognizable. The Jews dare not think of the possibility of possessing again the land of their fathers. Have we not opposed to their wish our Christian veto? Would we not continually molest the legal proprietor when he will have taken possession of his ancestral land, and in the name of piety make him feel that his ancestors forfeited the title to their land on the day of the Crucifixion?’

‘Our stupid Ultramontanism has destroyed the possibility of a regeneration of Judæa, by making the present of the Jewish people barren and unproductive. Had the city of Jerusalem been rebuilt by means of Jewish capital, we would have heard preachers prophesying, even in our progressive nineteenth century, that the end of the world is at hand and predictions of the coming of the Anti-Christ. Yes, we have lived to see such a state of affairs, now that Ultramontanism has made its last stand in oratorical eloquence. In the sacred beehive of religion, we still hear a continuous buzzing of those insects who would rather see a mighty sword in the hands of the barbarians, than greet the resurrection of nations and hail the revival of a free and great thought inscribed on their banner. This is undoubtedly the reason why Israel did not make any attempt to become master of his own flocks, why the Jews, after wandering for two thousand years, are not in a position to shake the dust from their weary feet. The continuous, inexorable demands that would be made upon a Jewish settlement, the vexatious insults that would be heaped upon them and which would finally degenerate into persecutions, in which fanatic Christians and pious Mohammedans would unite in brotherly accord—these are the reasons, more potent than the rule of the Turks, that have deterred the Jews from attempting to rebuild the Temple of Solomon, their ancient home, and their State.’¹⁹³⁰

The Christians believed that the Jews had only one way to save themselves from ultimate annihilation—to convert to Christianity. Christians believe that only a small remnant of the Jews will convert and survive. They plan to slaughter the others. Even those Gentiles who were willing to help the Jews to take Palestine from the Turks believed that the Jews would be attacked by Christians unless they pretended to convert to Christianity. The Jews also believed that the Moslems would attack them

and many toyed with the idea of massive feigned Christian conversion so that the Jews in Palestine would have Christendom as an artificial ally against Islam. Hence the countless books that were published by “Christians” calling for the “restoration of the Jews to Palestine” concurrently called for the conversion of the Jews, so as to protect the Jews from the Christians and grant them Christian protection from Islam.

The Holocaust had the effect of making the Jews appear impotent and vulnerable—non-threatening. Centuries of Jewish intrigues and propaganda eventually had the effect of weakening Christianity and subverting its beliefs such that the threat of a negative Christian response to massive Jewish emigration to Palestine has greatly diminished, though the possibility that the Jews will find themselves in a trap of their own making persists.

The numbing pain inspired by the shocking images of the victimization of the Jews in the Holocaust has been abused by racist Jews to shield themselves from criticism, such that their arrogance makes them an open menace which tarnishes the image of all Jews. As has always happened in the past when leading Jews grow insufferably arrogant and hypocritical, it might some day come about that true Christians will feel that they have been betrayed by “evil Jewish leadership” and will retaliate against the “anti-Christ” and the Zionists—pseudo-Christian and Jew, who have misled them. Real Christians may join forces with Islam and crush a foe which has been attacking them from the beginning, and which views the Hebrew Bible as a plan they intend to fulfill with their own deliberate actions. It is possible that the Christians and Moslems will learn from Jewish racists and adopt Jewish inhumanity and religious intolerance.

Very early on, Cyprian stated in his Twelfth Treatise, “Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews”, First Book, Testimony 24, that the Jews had but one option to atone for the death of Christ,

“24. That by this alone the Jews can receive pardon of their sins, if they wash away the blood of Christ slain, in His baptism, and, passing over into His Church, obey His precepts.

In Isaiah the Lord says: ‘Now I will not release your sins. When ye stretch forth your hands, I will turn away my face from you; and if ye multiply prayers, I will not hear you: for your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean; take away the wickedness from your souls from the sight of mine eyes; cease from your wickedness; learn to do good; seek judgement; keep him who suffers wrong; judge for the orphan, and justify the widow. And come, let us reason together, saith the Lord: and although your sins be as scarlet, I will whiten [*Footnote*: ‘Exalbabo.’] them as snow; and although they were as crimson, I will whiten [*Footnote*: ‘Inalbabo.’] them as wool. And if ye be willing and listen to me, ye shall eat of the good of the land; but if ye be unwilling, and will not hear me, the sword [Esau] shall consume you; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken these things. [*Footnote*: Isa. i. 15-20.]”¹⁹³¹

The Zionists who wanted to remain openly practicing Jews had to carefully

nurture an antagonism over the course of many centuries in Europe against the Pope, and depict him as the anti-Christ, and against Catholicism as the evil ecumenical Church of the Apocalypse, and against Islam and the Turks as heathens; so that “reformed” Christians would not see the Jews and Judaism as the evil ecumenical Church of the Apocalypse headed by the anti-Christ; and so that the English Esau, or some other European force, would take Palestine from the Turks and give it to the Jews, who could then regulate the trade of the world. The best means to accomplish this feat was to create anti-Catholic “reformations” and “second reformations” creating the Protestant and Puritan Churches which mirrored the Jewish faith, and for the Jews to pretend to convert to these Judaized Churches and form an alliance with Gentile Christians against Islam, while destroying Catholic Christianity.

Cabalist Giordano Bruno influenced Queen Elizabeth, and a short time later an interest in the *Kabbala Denudata*, edited by Christian Knorr von Rosenroth and Francis Mercury van Helmont, appeared in England.¹⁹³² Franciscus Mercurius van Helmont¹⁹³³ promoted cabalistic reformist dogma in England. Van Helmont taught an ecumenical religion which converted Christianity into Judaism. The Inquisition accused him of Judaizing Europe. He was a good friend of Leibnitz.

Van Helmont disseminated his message in England through Anne Conway¹⁹³⁴ to Henry More, Robert Boyle, John Locke, Isaac Newton, etc. Van Helmont also published on medicine and chemistry, subjects which would later interest David Hartley. The ecumenical Protestants, Puritans, and Arians like Isaac Newton, Samuel Clarke and David Hartley, converted Christians to Judaism under the guise of converting Jews to Christianity.

Frankist Jews converted to Christianity in order to destroy it. Some Jews used the institution of Freemasonry as a means to bring about the conversion of Christians to Judaism. As predicted in Biblical prophecy, they sought to make Jerusalem the capital of the ecumenical church of Judaism, which would replace the supposedly “Universal” or “Catholic” Church seated in Rome. Zionist Moses Hess wrote in his treatise published in 1862, *Rome and Jerusalem*,

“You have certainly heard of Joseph Salvador, the author of the work entitled *History of the Mosaic Institutions and of the Hebrew People*. This same author recently published a work entitled *Paris, Rome and Jerusalem*, in which he clearly shows that even among our enlightened brethren, there are dreamers who wish for a rebuilding of the Temple of Jerusalem. But he attaches to this rebuilding conditions that are acceptable neither to pious nor to progressive Christians and Jews. If I understand the author correctly, he expects his New Jerusalem to become the world capital of the fusionists. Salvador, furthermore, seems to cherish the curious idea that the Jews ought first to turn Christians, so that they may be the better able to convert the Christians afterward to Judaism. This work is, in reality, not as new as Salvador thinks; it began eighteen hundred years ago. It seems, however, that the Judaism of which Salvador is thinking is as new as his Christianity.

More reasonable are the attempts of those fusionists who, like my friend Hirsch, of Luxemburg, are utilizing freemasonry as a means to amalgamate

all the historical cults into one. The Luxemburg Rabbi, the antipode of his namesake, the Frankfort Rabbi Hirsch, developed the idea of fusion so thoroughly in the excellent lectures which he delivered at the Luxemburg Lodge, and later published under the title *Humanity as a Religion*, that, according to him, the matter may be considered closed. All that remains for the rabbis to do is to close up their reform temples and send the school children to the masonic temples. In truth, the logical consequences of reform have long since led those who took the sermons of the reform rabbis seriously, toward making such a step; as you, being a resident of Frankfort, well know. In vain did they afterward ornament their fusionist sermons with Talmudic quotations. It was too late and they had to be satisfied to preach to empty pews.

Jewish rationalists, who have as little reason to remain within the fold of Judaism as have Christian rationalists for clinging to Christianity are, like their Christian friends, very energetic in discovering new grounds for the existence of a religion which, according to them, has no longer any reason to exist. According to them, the dispersion of the Jews was merely a preliminary step to their entering upon their great mission. What great things are the Jews in exile to accomplish in their opinion? First of all, they are to represent 'pure' theism, in contradistinction to Christianity. In the next place, tolerant Judaism is to teach intolerant Christianity the principles of humanitarianism. Furthermore, it is the function of exilic Judaism to take care that morality and life, which in the Christian world are severed from each other, should become one. And lastly, the Jews must also act as industrial and commercial promoters—be the leaven of such activities among the civilized nations in whose midst they live. I have even heard it remarked quite seriously, that the Indo-Germanic race must improve its quality by mingling with the Jewish race!

But, mark you, from all these real or imaginary benefits which the Jews in dispersion confer upon the world, none will be diminished even after the restoration of the Jewish State. For just as at the time of the return from the Babylonian exile not all the Jews settled in Palestine, but the majority remained in the lands of exile, where there had been Jewish settlements since the dispersion of Israel and Judah, so need we not look forward to a larger concentration of Jews at the future restoration. Besides, it seems to me that those benefits which the Jews in exile confer upon the world are exaggerated, 'for the sake of the cause.' I consider it an anachronism to assign to the Jews those missions which they certainly performed in antiquity, and to some extent also in mediaeval times, but which, at present, no longer belong peculiarly to them. As to affecting the unity of life and theory, it is only possible with a nation which is politically organized; such a nation alone is able to realize it practically by embodying it in its institutions.

Again, what section of world-Jewry is to teach the Christians tolerance and humanity? You will surely say the enlightened Jews. But is not the enlightened Christian entitled to repeat to the enlightened Jew the words

which Lessing, in his *Nathan the Wise*, puts into the mouth of the liberal Christian in his answer to the liberal Jew: ‘What makes me a Christian in your eyes, makes you a Jew in mine.’

Or, on the other hand, should the enlightened Jew say to the orthodox Christian, ‘Your beliefs are mere superstitions, your religion only fanaticism,’ may the enlightened Christian not turn to the orthodox Jew and make similar remarks in defense of his own religion? Our cultured Jews who accuse Christians of possessing a persecution mania, reason as fallaciously as does Bethmann Hollweg when he charges the Jews with the same trait. History can neither be explained nor changed in its course by such explanations.

From the viewpoint of enlightenment, I see as little reason for the continuation of the existence of Judaism as for Christianity. It is better for the Jew who does not believe in the national regeneration of his people, to labor, like the enlightened Christian, for the dissolution of his religion. I understand how one can hold such an opinion. But what I do not understand is, how it is possible to believe simultaneously in ‘enlightenment’ and in a Jewish Mission in exile; in other words, in the ultimate dissolution and in the continued existence of Judaism at the same time.”¹⁹³⁵

Christianity itself was a movement to convert Gentiles to Judaism in the guise of Liberalism, and to take the hatred and menacing nature of the creator God of the Old Testament out of Judaism so as to make it more palatable for Gentile consumption. A new call for “fusion” reappeared in the Zionism of Protestants, who often wrote of converting Jews to “Christianity”—while calling for the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, so as to make Jerusalem (as opposed to Rome) the seat of a new international despotism that was based on Judaism, which treachery against Christians signified the terror and devastation of the prophecies, the mysticism of the gnostics who were influenced by the East, and the despotism and deceit of the worst of the Talmud. Protestantism itself takes a large step towards converting Christianity back into original Judaism, with all its horrors and inhumanity.

8.7.1 The “British-Israel” Deceit

Biblical prophecies require that in order for the millennium to begin all of the Tribes of Israel must return to Palestine (*Isaiah* 11:11-12. *Jeremiah* 23:8; 30:3. *Ezekiel* 37:21. *Hosea* 3:4-5). The ten northern tribes were missing (never existed), though some were believed to have been found in the mid-1800's. Some in England had long believed that the English descended from one of the ten lost tribes of Israel which had allegedly traveled to England on Phoenician ships in ancient times.

The belief that the British were a lost tribe of Israel was promoted in Russia as evidence that England might be a place of respite for the anti-Christ—especially since British Royals claimed to be descended from King David and the Zionists published countless books in England and America calling for the “restoration of the Jews to Palestine” and concurrently seeking to foment a war with Rome, Russia and

Turkey by calling the Pope, the Czar and the Sultan the “anti-Christ”. There is little doubt but that it was Jews in England who inspired the belief that the Pope in Rome, the Russian Czar and the Turkish Sultan were the anti-Christ, because the propaganda which popularized these beliefs served the perceived self-interests of the Jews. It was also likely the Jews in Russia who inspired a belief there that the English King was the anti-Christ. It was not mere coincidence that this antagonistic propaganda calling for wars on all sides amongst the empires uniformly called for the “restoration of the Jews to Palestine” and uniformly stigmatized an artificial enemy as the “anti-Christ”. The Jews had been trying to provoke a world war through their hateful and intolerant propaganda for centuries.

A vast movement existed in England and the Commonwealth Nations during and after Queen Victoria’s reign, which called itself “Anglo-Israel” or “British-Israel”. They claimed that the English descended from Israel, that Queen Victoria descended from the House of King David, and that the Jews should be restored to Palestine.¹⁹³⁶ It is likely that all movements which call for the “restoration of the Jews to Palestine” are begun by Jews.

The prophecies require that the Messiah be descended from David (II *Samuel* 7; 22:44-51; 23:1-5. *Isaiah* 9:6-7. *Jeremiah* 23:5; 33:15, 17). In an attempt to avoid Christian suspicion and persecution, many Jewish groups spread the myth that their ancestors had left Israel before the crucifixion of Christ, or had opposed it.¹⁹³⁷ The question naturally arises, was the entire British-Israel movement, which began more than one thousand years ago, initiated by Jews who sought to distance themselves from the crucifixion of Christ? Some Jews asserted that America was the new Israel and that Jews were important members and sponsors of Christopher Columbus’ voyage to America—even that Christopher Columbus was himself a Jew searching for a new homeland for the Jews.¹⁹³⁸ In America, Judge Noah, a Jewish Zionist, argued that the American Indians were descended from the Israelites, and Noah sought to privilege Jews in America on this basis.

John Spargo was quoted in *The New York Times* on 22 February 1921 on page 10, referring to the publication of the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* in English translation, in an article entitled “Spargo Condemns Racial Antagonism”

“In 1895 a book was published in France which attempted to prove the existence of a world-wide conspiracy against Christian civilization. In that book the theory was advanced that the English people are all of the Jewish race, and that the British Government is the central force of this worldwide Jewish conspiracy. In his book Nilus reproduced this fantastic theory but, recognizing that it would cause the protocols to be laughed out of court, *The Dearborn Independent*, *The London Morning Post* and all the other publishers of the protocols in England and America have carefully deleted this part of the book by Nilus. The reason for the deletion is as obvious as the dishonor of it.”

Spargo was mistaken if he would assert that there was no belief among the British themselves that they had descended from the “Israelites” and that this belief

was instead concocted in Russia in 1895 in order to discredit the Jews and the British. The belief that the British descended from the “Israelites” was very old and enduring, as was the belief that they descended from Noah.¹⁹³⁹ William Camden in his *Britannia* of 1586,¹⁹⁴⁰ and Theophilus Evans in his *Drych y prif oesoedd* of 1716,¹⁹⁴¹ told of the Welsh legend that the Ancient Britons, the Welsh, had descended from Noah’s grandson Gomer. Camden’s view even found its way onto the 1606 English edition of the map *ANGLIÆ, SCOTIÆ ET HIBERNIÆ, SIVE BRITANNICAR: INSVLARVM DESCRIPTIO*:

“The first Inhabitants which settled here not long after the universal Flood and the Confusion of Babel came here from France, considering its Proximity, Similarity of language, Manners, Government, Customs and Name, as is stated by the learned Clarencieux Camden, the only light shining on our histories, as demonstrated in his treatise called Britannia. For to this day the ancient Britans, the Welshmen, call themselves CUMRI, (not Cambri), derived from Gomer, the son of Iaphet (called by the Romans Cimber) from whom the Celtæ or Gauls are descended.”¹⁹⁴²

Circa 800AD, Nennius wrote that the British descended from Noah in his *Historia Britonum*.¹⁹⁴³ Aylett Sammes published *Britannia Antiqua Illustrata*¹⁹⁴⁴ in 1676, in which he argued that the British descended from the Phoenicians. Henry Rowlands¹⁹⁴⁵ argued in 1723 that the ancient Druids were the descendants of Noah. In the 1740's, William Stukeley held that the British were the children of Abraham.¹⁹⁴⁶ Queen Victoria believed that she was descended from King David, which also meant that Victoria’s grandson Kaiser Wilhelm II was also believed by the family to be descended from David. In 1924, Laurence Austine Waddell published *The Phoenician Origin of Britons, Scots & Anglo-Saxons Discovered by Phoenician & Sumerian Inscription in Britain, by Pre-Roman Briton Coins & a Mass of New History*.¹⁹⁴⁷

[8.7.2 For Centuries, England is Flooded with Warmongering Zionist Propaganda](#)

Zionism appeared early and often in England and America.¹⁹⁴⁸ For example, in addition to the works cited above, Thomas Brightman published his *Apocalypsis Apocalypseos* in 1585.¹⁹⁴⁹ In 1585, Francis Kett, like Martin Luther, declared that the Pope was the “Beast” prophesied in *Revelation* and the man foretold to pretend to be God in the Temple.¹⁹⁵⁰ In 1585, Kett envisioned Jerusalem as the heavenly seat of the new Kingdom of Christ.¹⁹⁵¹ Kett was burned at the stake in 1589 for declaring that the Bible prophesied that the Jews would be restored to Palestine. The “Eastern Question” arose again and again in apocalyptic literature and the authors frequently discussed scenarios that eventually played out—Russia’s wars against Turkey, Napoleon and the East, Greek independence, the Crimean War, the Congress of Berlin, World War I and World War II, etc. It is no coincidence that the works which called for the “restoration of the Jews to Palestine” correctly foretold the wars the

Jews deliberately caused to further their goal of creating a “Jewish State”.

“Lord Protector” Oliver Cromwell, Queen Victoria, Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli, Prime Minister Arthur Balfour, Prime Minister David Lloyd George and Prime Minister Winston Churchill were each outspoken and long-term Zionists.¹⁹⁵² This remarkably high percentage of Zionist leaders in England is especially odd given that only a very small percentage of Jews were Zionists and there was never a large Jewish population in England. This oddity is explained by the grossly disproportionate influence of Cabalistic Jews and Jewish bankers in England over the course of many centuries.

Puritans, like Oliver Cromwell, were ardent Zionists and carried out a “second reformation” in order to attack the Catholics—whom the Jews hated. Many Puritans migrated to America. Though American schools teach that they came for religious freedom, the truth of the matter is that they migrated to America so that they would have the freedom to practice extreme intolerance.

Puritans sought to forcefully convert Christians to Judaism while pretending to seek to convert Jews to Christianity. Like many of the Protestants of Germany, they generally named their children with names taken from the Old Testament, not the New. In Amsterdam, English Puritan Zionists Joanna and Ebenezer Cartwright issued a Zionist petition in 1649 calling on the English and the Dutch to lead the Jews back to Palestine. Zionist Cabalist Franciscus Mercurius van Helmont traveled from Amsterdam to England to spread Cabalistic Judaism and Zionism among the intellectual elite of England—and he was quite successful. Rabbi Manassah ben Israel, of Amsterdam, persuaded Oliver Cromwell to readmit Jews into England on the premise that the Biblical pronouncement that the Jews shall be scattered to the ends of the Earth meant that they shall enter England, which would trigger the “ingathering” of the Jews to Palestine.¹⁹⁵³ The Old Testament instructed the Jews to enter every nation and the affluent Jews of Amsterdam no doubt recognized the benefits of gaining inroads into the affairs of England and of profiting from its wealth. Jews were famous for gathering political and economic intelligence from around the world.¹⁹⁵⁴

Regina Sharif wrote in her article “Christians for Zion, 1600-1919”,

“Nowhere in Europe has support for Zionism been as widespread and popular over the ages as in England. It was there that the idea of Jewish restoration in Palestine became prominent and developed into a doctrine that lasted well over three centuries.¹ Nahum Sokolow, the well-known Jewish historian of the Zionist movement, commented on this permanent connection between England and Zionism: ‘English Christians taught the underlying principles of Jewish nationality.’² He expressed his gratitude to the many ‘English thinkers, men of letters and poets throughout the ages,’ who championed the Zionist cause through many generations. ‘For nearly three centuries Zionism was a religious as well as a political idea which great Christians and Jews, chiefly in England, handed down to posterity.’³ [***] Weizmann’s skills in international diplomacy and persuasion, however great they might have been, would have remained fruitless had not English culture been conditioned to

Zionism long before the time of Herzl or Weizmann and had not the seeds of Zionism been sown and cultivated in England by non-Jewish Zionists long before the appearance of Herzl's *Judenstaat*.¹⁹⁵⁵

See also: Eliyahu Tal, *You Don't Have to be Jewish to be a Zionist: A Review of 400 Years of Christian Zionism*, International Forum for a United Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, (2000).

In the 1500's and continuing through the 1800's and beyond, a great many books were published in Great Britain and in America advocating: (1) the overthrow of the Pope, who was called "the Beast", and the destruction of the Catholic Church; (2) the destruction of the Turkish Empire, and of Mohammedanism; (3) the destruction of the French and German Empires; (4) world war; (5) the "restoration of the Jews to Palestine", the rebuilding of the Temple and turning Jerusalem into the capital of a new world government—many of which objectives Jewish leaders accomplished through the Russian Revolution and the First World War.

There were many advocates of these beliefs, including Thomas Drake, who published *The Calling of the Jews* in 1608. Henry Finch published *The Worlds Great Restauration. Or the Calling of the Ievves and (With Them) of All the Nations and Kingdomes of the Earth, to the Faith of Christ* in 1621.¹⁹⁵⁶ Manasseh ben Israel's work was translated into English as: *The Hope of Israel*, Printed by R.I. for Hannah Allen, London, (1650); and *The Great Deliverance of the Whole House of Israel: What it Truly Is, by Whom it Shall Be Performed, and in What Year. . . in Answer to a Book Called the Hope of Israel, Written by a Learned Jew of Amsterdam Named Menasseh ben Israel*, Printed by M.S., London, (1652). John Milton published *Paradise Regained* in 1671.¹⁹⁵⁷ In 1747, John Collet published *A Treatise of the Future Restoration of the Jews and Israelites to Their Land: with Some Account of the Goodness of the Country, and Their Happy Condition There, till They Shall Be Invaded by the Turks : with Their Deliverance from All Their Enemies, When the Messiah Will Establish His Kingdom at Jerusalem, and Bring in the Last Glorious Ages*.¹⁹⁵⁸ Joseph Eyre published *Observations upon the Prophecies Relating to the Restoration of the Jews: with an Appendix in Answer to the Objections of Some Late Writers* in 1771.¹⁹⁵⁹ After winning an award for his work on Zionism in 1795 while a divinity student at Cambridge, Charles Jerram published *An Essay Tending to Shew the Grounds Contained in Scripture for Expecting a Future Restoration of the Jews* in 1796.¹⁹⁶⁰

Scores of such works appeared in Britain, America, and elsewhere advocating world war, the "restoration of the Jews to Palestine" and the destruction of heaven and Earth; including: G. Fletcher, *The Policy of the Turkish Empire. The First Booke*, Printed by Iohn Windet for W[illiam] S[tansby] and are to be soulede at Powles Wharfe at the signe of the Crosse Keyes, London, (1597); **and** *Of the Rvsse Common Wealth, Or, Maner of Gouvernment by the Russe Emperour, (Commonly Called the Emperour of Moskouia): With the Manners, and Fashions of the People of That Country*, Thomas Charde, London, (1591); **and** *De literis antiquae Britanniae, regibus praesertim qui doctrinâ claruerunt, quique Collegia Cantabrigiae fundârunt, Ex Academiae celeberrimae typographeo, Cantabrigiae*, (1633); **and** *Israel Redux*:

Or the Restauration of Israel, Exhibited in Two Short Treatises. The First Contains an Essay upon Some Probable Grounds, That the Present Tartars Near the Caspian Sea, Are the Posterity of the Ten Tribes of Israel. The Second, a Dissertation Concerning Their Ancient and Successive State, with some Scripture Evidences of Their Future Conversion, and Establishment in Their Own Land, Printed by S. Streater for John Hancock, London, (1677); **and** *The English Works of Giles Fletcher, the Elder*, University of Wisconsin Press, Amsterdam, (1964). **See also:** T. Draxe, *The VVorldes Resurrection, or the Generall Calling of the Iewes a Familiar Commentary Vpon the Eleuenth Chapter of Saint Paul to the Romaines, According to the Sence of Scripture, and the Consent of the Most Iudicious Interpreters, Wherein Aboue Fiftie Notable Questions Are Soundly Answered, and the Particular Doctrines, Reasons and Vses of Euery Verse, Are Profitable and Plainly Deliuered*, Iohn Wright, London, (1608); **and** *The Earnest of Our Inheritance Together with a Description of the New Heauen and the New Earth, and a Demonstration of the Glorious Resurrection of the Bodie in the Same Substance*, George Norton, London, (1613); **and** *An Alarum to the Last Iudgement. Or an Exact Discourse of the Second Comming of Christ and of the Generall and Remarkeable Signes and Fore-Runners of It Past, Present, and to Come; Soundly and Soberly Handled, and Wholesomely Applied. Wherein Diuers Deep Mysteries Are Plainly Expounded, and Sundry Curiosities Are Duely Examined, Answered and Confuted*, Matthew Law, London, (1615). **See also:** J. Mede, *Clauis apocalyptica ex innatis et insitis visionum characteribus eruta et demonstrata. Ad eorum usum quibus deus amorem studiúm[ue] indiderit prophetiam illam admirandam cognoscendi scrutandique*, T. and J. Buck, Cantabrigiæ, (1627); English translation by R. B. Cooper, *A Translation of Mede's Clavis Apocalyptica*, Rivington, London, (1833). **See also:** J. Archer, *The Personall Reigne of Christ upon Earth: In a Treatise Wherein Is Fully and Largely Laid Open and Proved, That Jesus Christ, Together with the Saints Shall Visibly Possesse a Monarchicall State and Kingdome in this World*, Benjamin Allen, London, (1643). **See also:** T. Brightman, *The Revelation of Saint John: Illustrated with Analysis and Scholions, Wherein the Fence Is Opened by the Scripture, and the Events of Things Foretold Showed by Histories, Together with a Most Comfortable Exposition of the Last and Most Difficult Part of the Prophecy of Daniel, Wherein the Restoring of the Jews, and Their Calling to the Faith of Christ, after the Utter Overthrow of Their Three Last Enemies, Is Set Forth in Lively Colours*, Printed by Thomas Stafford, Amsterdam, (1644); **and** *The Workes of That Famous, Reverend, and Learned Divine, Mr. Tho. Brightman viz., a Revelation of the Apocalyps, Containing an Exposition of the Whole Book of the Revelation of Saint John, Illustrated with Analysis and Scholions : Wherein the Sense Is Opened by the Scripture, and the Event of Things Foretold, Shewed by History : Whereunto Is Added, a Most Comfortable Exposition of the Last and Most Difficult Part of the Propesie of Daniel : Wherein the Restoring of the Jews, and Their Calling to the Faith of Christ, after the Utter Overthrow of Their Three Last Enemies, Is Set Forth in Lively Colours : Together with a Commentary on the Whole Book of Canticles, or Song of Salomon*, Printed by John Field for Samuel Cartwright, London, (1644). **See also:** R. J., *Compunction or Pricking of Heart with the Time*,

Meanes, Nature, Necessity, and Order of It, and of Conversion; with Motives, Directions, Signes, and Means of Cure of the Wounded in Heart, with Other Consequent or Concomitant Duties, Especially Self-Deniall, All of Them Gathered from the Text, Acts 2.37. And Fitted, Preached, and Applied to His Hearers at Dantzick in Pruse-land, in Ann. 1641. And Partly 1642. Being the Sum of 80. Sermons. With a Post-Script Concerning These Times, and the Sutableness of this Text and Argument to the Same, and to the Calling of the Jews. By R. J. Doctor of Divinity, Printed by Ruth Raworth for Thomas Whitaker, and are to be sold at his shop, at the Kings Armes in Pauls Church-Yard, London, (1648). **See also:** S. Gott, *Nova solymæ libri sex: sive Institutio Christiani 1. De pueritia. 2. De creatione mundi. 3. De juventute. 4. De peccato. 5. De virili ætate. 6. De redemptione hominis,* Johannis Legati, Londini, (1649); English translation: *Nova Solyma, the Ideal City; Or, Jerusalem Regained,* London, J. Murray, (1902). **See also:** T. Thorowgood, J. Dury, Manasseh ben Israel, *Digitus dei: Nevv Discoveryes with Sure Arguments to Prove That the Jews (A Nation) or People Lost in the World for the Space of near 200 Years, Inhabite Now in America; How They Came Thither; Their Manners, Customs, Rites and Ceremonies; the Unparallel'd Cruelty of the Spaniard to Them; and That the Americans Are of That Race. Manifested by Reason and Scripture, Which Foretell the Calling of the Jewes; and the Restitution of Them into Their Own Land, and the Bringing Back of the Ten Tribes from All the Ends and Corners of the Earth, and That Great Battell to Be Fought. With the Removall of Some Contrary Reasonings, and an Earnest Desire for Effectuall Endeavours to Make Them Christians. Whereunto Is Added an Epistolicall Discourse of Mr John Dury, with the History of Ant: Monterinos, Attested by Manasseh Ben Israell, a Chief Rabby.* By Tho: Thorowgood, B:D, : Printed for Thomas Slater, and are to be sold at his shop at the signe of the Angell in Duck-Lane, London, (1652). **See also:** E. Hall, *He apostasia, ho antichristos, Or, a Scriptural Discourse of the Apostasie and the Antichrist, by Way of Comment, upon the Twelve First Verses of 2 Thess. 2 under Which Are Opened Many of the Dark Prophecies of the Old Testament, Which Relate to the Calling of the Jews, and the Glorious Things to Be Affected at the Seventh Trumpet Through the World : Together with a Discourse of Slaying the Witnesses, and the Immediate Effects Thereof : Written for the Consolation of the Catholike Church, Especially the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland,* London, (1653). **See also:** E. Lane, *Look unto Jesus, Or, An Ascent to the Holy Mount to See Jesus Christ in His Glory Whereby the Active and Contemplative Believer May Have the Eyes of His Understanding More Inlightned to Behold in Some Measure the Eternity and Immutability of the Lord Jesus Christ: At the End of the Book Is an Appendix, Shewing the Certainty of the Calling of the Jews,* Printed by Thomas Roycroft for the Authour, and are to be sold by Humphrey Tuckey, and by William Taylor, London, (1663). **See also:** R. R., *The Restauration of the Jevves: Or, a True Relation of Their Progress and Proceedings in Order to the Regaining of Their Ancient Kingdom. Being the Substance of Several Letters viz. from Antwerp, Legorn, Florence, &c.,* A. Maxwell, London, (1665). **See also:** J. A. Comenius, *The Way of Light,* Hodder & Stoughton, Ltd., London, (1668/1938). **See also:** G. Ben Syrach, *Nevvs from the Jews, or a True Relation of a Great Prophet in the Southern Parts of Tartaria;*

Pretending Himself to Be Sent to Gather Together the Jews from All Parts: as Well the Ten Tribes That Have So Long Absconded Themselves from the World; as the Known Tribes of Judah and Benjamin: Promising to Them the Restoration of the Land of Canaan, and All That They Formerly Enjoyed in the Time of King Solomon. As it Was Communicated to Rabbi Josuah Ben Eleazar, Merchant in Amsterdam, by a Letter from Adrianople. Faithfully Translated into English, by Josephus Philo-Judæus, Gent. With Allowance, Printed for A.G., London, (1671). See also: W. Alleine, The Mystery of the Temple and City Described in the Nine Last Chapters of Ezekiel, Unfolded Also These Following Particulars Are Briefly Handled, 1. The Calling of the Jews, 2. The Restitution of All Things, 3. The Description of the Two Beasts, Rev. 13, 4. The Day of Judgment, and the World Perishing by Fire, 5. Some Signs of the Times When the Fall of Babylon Is Near, 6. Some Advantages Which the Knowledge of These Truths Will Afford, 7. The Conclusion of All in Some Counsels and Directions, Printed for E. Harris: And are to be sold by T. Wall, London, (1677). See also: "Lover of His Country's Peace", The Mystery of Ambras Merlins, Standardbearer Wolf, and Last Boar of Cornwall With Sundry Other Mysterious Prophecys, Both Ancient and Modern, Plainly Unfolded in the Following Treatise, on the Signification and Portent of That Prodigious Comet, Seen by Most Part of the World, Anno 1680, with the Blazing Star Anno 1682, and the Conjunctions of Saturn and Jupiter in October Following and since : All Which Do Purport Many Sad Calamitys to Befall Most Parts of the European Continent in General Before the Year 1699, ... the Ruin of the House of Austria, Vienna, and the Empire of Germany : with Rome, Italy, and the Pope and Papicy, the King and Kingdom of France, with Several Other Countrys in Europe, and the Danger of an Invation in England by the Turks, and Then the Conversion of the Said Nation to the Christian Faith, Before this Present Expedition of the Turks into Hungary and Germany Be Over, Which Will Be Followed, (1) with the Calling of the Jews, (2) the Reducing of All Wayes of Religious Worship into One by Which an Universal Peace Will Ensue to All the Earth, Printed for Benj. Billingsley, London, (1683). See also: R. Baxter, The Glorious Kingdom of Christ, Described and Clearly Vindicated, Against the Bold Asserters of a Future Calling and Reign of the Jews, and 1000 Years Before the Conflagration. And the Asserters of the 1000 Years Kingdom after the Conflagration. Opening the Promise of the New Heaven and Earth, and the Everlastingness of Christ's Kingdom, Against Their Debasing It, Who Confined it to 1000 Years, Which with the Lord Is but as One Day, Printed by T. Snowden, for Thomas Parkhurst at the Bible and Three Crowns, the lower end of Cheapside, London, (1691). See also: "Lay Hand", The Great Signs of the Times Giving a True Account of the Universal Change That Is Now Expected: With a Preface Concerning Prophecies, and an Introduction Wherein the Right Notion of the Calling of the Jews and the Kingdome of Christ, So Much Obscur'd, Is True and Faithfully Declar'd, Printed for the author, and are to be sold by J. Nutt, London, (1699). See also: S. Willard, The Fountain Opened, Or, the Great Gospel Priviledge of Having Christ Exhibited to Sinfull Men: Wherein Also Is Proved That There Shall Be a National Calling of the Jews from Zech. XIII, 1, Printed by B. Green and J. Allen for Samuel Sewall, Junior, Boston in New-England, (1700). See also: R. Fleming, Apocalyptical Key: an Extraordinary

Discourse on the Rise and Fall of Papacy, Or, the Pouring out of the Vials, in the Revelation of St. John, Chap. XVI: Containing Predictions Respecting the Revolutions of France, the Fate of It's Monarch, the Decline of Papal Power, Together with the Fate of the Surrounding Nations, the Destruction of Mahometanism, the Calling in of the Jews, the Restoration and Consummation of All Things, &c. &c., Printed for G. Terry, London, (1701/1793). **See also:** S. Clarke, "The Conversion and Restoration of the Jews", *A Collection of the Promises of Scripture: or, The Christian's Inheritance*, Part 3, Section 10, American Tract Society, New York, and J. Buckland, London, (1750); **and** *A Discourse Concerning the Connexion of the Prophecies in the Old Testament, and the Application of Them to Christ. Being an Extract from the Sixth Edition of a Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God, &c. . . .*, J. Knapton, London, (1725). **See also:** W. Whiston, *An Essay on the Revelation of Saint John, So Far as Concerns the past and Present Times: To Which Are Added Two Dissertations, the One upon Mark II. 25, 26. The Other upon Matthew XXIV. And the Parallel Chapters: With a Collection of Scripture-Prophecies Relating to the Times after the Coming of the Messiah*, Cambridge: Printed at the University-Press; for B. Tooke, London, (1706); **and** *The Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies: Being Eight Sermons Preach'd at the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, in the Year MDCCVII, at the Lecture Founded by the Honourable Robert Boyle Esq.: With an Appendix, to Which Is Subjoin'd a Dissertation, to Prove That Our Savior Ascended into Heaven on the Evening after His Resurrection*, Cambridge: Printed at the University-Press for B. Tooke, London, (1708); **and** *Historical Memoirs of the Life of Dr. Samuel Clarke Being a Supplement to Dr. Sykes's and Bishop Hoadley's Accounts. Including Certain Memoirs of Several of Dr. Clarke's Friends*, London, Fletcher Gyles, (1730); **and** *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Mr. William Whiston: Containing, Memoirs of Several of His Friends Also. Written by Himself, J. Whiston and B. White*, London, (1753). **See also:** T. Burnet, *De statu mortuorum et resurgentium tractatus: adjicitur: Appendix de futurâ Judaeorum restauratione*, J. Hooke, Londini, (1727). **See also:** I. Newton, *Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel, and the Apocalypse of St. John*, Printed by J. Darby and T. Browne and sold by J. Roberts etc., London, (1733). **See also:** T. Newton, *Dissertations on the Prophecies; Which Have Remarkably Been Fulfilled, and at this Time Are Fulfilling in the World*, William Butler, Northhampton, Massachusetts, (1746). **See also:** T. Newans, *A Key to the Prophecies of the Old and New Testaments: Shewing the Approaching Invasion of England, the Desolation of Germany ..., the Destruction of Rome, the Expulsion of the Mahometans, the Extirpation of Popery ..., the Restoration of the Jews to Their Own Land, the Rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem, the Fulness of the Gentiles, and the Glorious and Triumphant Estate of Christ's Church upon Earth*, London, (1747). **See also:** J. Collet, *A Treatise of the Future Restoration of the Jews and Israelites to Their Land: With Some Account of the Goodness of the Country, and Their Happy Condition There, till They Shall Be Invaded by the Turks: with Their Deliverance from All Their Enemies, When the Messiah Will Establish His Kingdom at Jerusalem, and Bring in the Last Glorious Ages*, J. Highmore, M. Cooper and G. Freer, London, (1747). **See also:** R. Clayton, *An Enquiry into the*

Time of the Coming of the Messiah, and the Restoration of the Jews, Printed for J. Brindley, London, 1751); **and** *An Impartial Enquiry into the Time of the Coming of the Messiah, Together with an Abstract of the Evidence on Which the Belief of the Christian Religion Is Founded: In Two Letters from Robert, Lord Bishop of Clogher, to an Eminent Jew*, J. Brindley, London, (1751). **See also:** Archaicus, *The Rejection and Restoration of the Jews, According to Scripture Declar'd: With Indications of the Means by Which, And, Nearly, of the Time When, the Latter of These Great Events Is to Be Brought to Pass. To Which Are Added, Some Intimations That Neither Is this Time Yet Nigh at Hand, Nor Will Any Extraordinary Civil Privileges Indulg'd to That People Conduce to Accelerate, but Rather to Retard It, and for What Reasons*, R. Baldwin, London, (1753). **See also:** Presbyterian of the Church of England, *An Explanation of Some Prophecies Contained in the Book of Daniel, Wherein the Particular Times of the Destruction of the Mahometans, and of the Restoration of the Jews, Are Pointed Out*, Printed by E. Say and sold by R. Baldwin, London, (1753). **See also:** W. Torrey, *A Brief Discourse Concerning Futurities or Things to Come Viz. The Next, of Second Coming of Christ. Of the Thousand Years of Chrst's Kingdom. Of the First Resurrection. Of the New Heavens and New Earth; and of the Burning of the Old. Of the New Jerusalem. Of Gog and Magog. Of the Calling of the Jews. Of the Pouring out of the Spirit on All Flesh. Of the Greatest Battle That Ever Was, or Shall Be Fought in the World. And Many Other Things Coincident with These Things. Together with Some Useful Consideration upon the Whole Discourse*, Prince, Thomas, Publication, Printed and sold by Edes and Gill, at their printing-office, next to the prison, in Queen-Street, Boston, (1757). **See also:** J. Inglis, *By the Way of a Scripture Interpretation. Theism: a Prophecy: Or, Prophetical Dissertation. Predicting and Declaring the Coming of the Expected Messiah, in the Character of Lord and King; the Setting up of a National Theocracy, in the Calling of the Jews, and Redemption of the Gentile Church. Part I. Consisting of an Astro-theological Unfolding of Certain Formerly Obscure, but Highly-interesting and Capital Points of Doctrine. Adapted to the Present Crisis of Affairs*, Printed for the author by William Dunlap, Philadelphia, (1763). **See also:** J. Inglis and W. Dunlap, *et al.*, *The Little Book Open [Double Dagger]: A Prophecy, Or, Prophitical Dissertation. Predicting and Declaring the Coming of the Expected Redeemer, in the Character of Lord and King; the Setting up of a National Theocracy, in the Calling of the Jews, and Redemption of the Gentile Church. Part I. Consisting of an Astro-Theological Unfolding of Certain Formerly Obscure, but Highly-Interesting and Capital Points of Doctrine. Adapted to the Present Crisis of Affairs*, William Dunlap, Philadelphia, (1763). **See also:** J. Eyre, *Observations upon the Prophecies Relating to the Restoration of the Jews: with an Appendix in Answer to the Objections of Some Late Writers*, T. Cadell, London, (1771). **See also:** R. Hurd, *An Introduction to the Study of the Prophecies Concerning the Christian Church: And in Particular Concerning the Church of Papal Rome: in Twelve Sermons, Preached in Lincoln's-Inn-Chapel, at the Lecture of the Right Reverend William Warburton*, Thomas Ewing, Dublin, (1772). **See also:** C. Love, *The History of the Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments, by Question and Answer, Giving, I., an Account of the Remarkable Events and Transactions of the*

*Antideluvian and Patriarchal Ages Before and after the Flood: as Also, Several Very Curious Critical Remarks and Practical Observations upon the Lives of the Patriarchs ; II., a Minute Description of the Jews, from the Calling of Abraham to Their Settlement in the Promised Land: with Suitable Remarks upon the Messages of the Prophets Sent to That People; III., and Lastly, the History of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and His Apostles, from the Birth of John the Baptist, to the Conclusion of the Canon of Scripture; for the Benefit of Every Real Christian, Printed and sold by Patrick Mair, Falkirk, (1783). **See also:** E. W. Whitaker, *A Dissertation on the Prophecies Relating to the Final Restoration of the Jews*, J. Rivington and Sons, London, (1784). **See also:** J. Priestley, *Letters to the Jews: Inviting Them to an Amicable Discussion of the Evidences of Christianity*, Pearson and Rollason, Birmingham, (1787); **and** *Letters to the Jews; Part II: Occasioned by Mr. David Levi's Reply to the Former Letters*, Pearson and Rollason, Birmingham, (1787); **and** *The Evidence of the Resurrection of Jesus Considered: In a Discourse First Delivered in the Assembly-room, at Buxton, on Sunday, September 19, 1790. To Which Is Added, an Address to the Jews*, J. Thompson, Birmingham, (1791); **and** *An address to the Jews*, Birmingham, (1791); **and** *A Comparison of the Institutions of Moses with Those of the Hindoos and Other Ancient Nations With Remarks on Mr. Dupuis's Origin of All Religions, the Laws and Institutions of Moses Methodized, and an Address to the Jews on the Present State of the World and the Prophecies Relating to It*, A. Kennedy, Northumberland, Pennsylvania, (1799). **See also:** J. Bicheno, *A Friendly Address to the Jews: Stating the Motives to Serious Inquiry into the Cause of Their Dispersion. . . : To Which Is Added, a Letter to Mr. D. Levi, Containing Remarks on His Answer to Dr. Priestley's Letters to the Jews*, Buckland, London, (1787); **and** *The Signs of the Times, Or, the Overthrow of the Papal Tyranny in France, the Prelude of Destruction to Popery and Despotism, but of Peace to Mankind*, Carter and Wilkinson, Providence, Rhode Island, (1794); **and** *The Restoration of the Jews, the Crisis of All Nations, Or, an Arrangement of the Scripture Prophecies Which Relate to the Restoration of the Jews. . . : Drawn from the Present Situation and Apparent Tendencies of Things, Both in Christian and Mahomedan Countries*, Printed by Bye and Law, London, (1800); **and** *The Restoration of the Jews. The Crisis of All Nations; to Which Is Now Prefixed, a Brief History of the Jews, from Their First Dispersion, to the Calling of Their Grand Sanhedrim at Paris, October 6th, 1806, and an Address on the Present State of Affairs, in Europe in General, and in this Country in Particular*, J. Barfield, London, (1807). **See also:** D. Levi and J. Priestley, *Letters to Dr. Priestley, in Answer to His Letters to the Jews, Part. II. Occasioned by Mr. David Levi's Reply to the Former Part. Also Letters 1. To Dr. Cooper, in Answer to His "One Great Argument in Favour of Christianity from "A Single Prophecy." 2. To Mr. Bicheno, 3. To Dr. Krauter. . . Occasioned by Their Remarks on Mr. David Levi's Answer to Dr. Priestley's First Letters to the Jews*, London, (1789). **See also:** R. Beere, *An Epistle to the Chief Priests and Elders of the Jews: Containing an Answer to Mr. David Levis Challenge to Christians of Every Denomination ... Predictive of the Time of the First Coming and Crucifixion of the Messiah. To Which Is Added an Investigation and Computation of the Exact Time of Their Final Restoration. . . Together with an**

Accurate Chronology of the World. . . Confirmed by Astronomical Observations, D. Brewman, London, (1789). **See also:** “Watchman”, *A Divine Call to That Highly Favoured People the Jews: Justice and Mercy Opening Now the Way for Their Restoration*, Frederick Green, Anapolis, Maryland, (1790). **See also:** J. A. Comenius, *The Lives, Prophecies, Visions and Revelations, of Christopher Kotterus, and Christian Poniatonia: Two Eminent Prophets in Germany ; Containing Predictions Concerning the Pope, the King of France, and the Roman Emmpire, with the Sudden Destruction of the Papal Power, the Miraculous Conversion of the Turks, the Calling in of the Jews, and the Uniting All Religions into One Universal Visible Church ; Many of Which Prophecies Being Desired by the Then King of Bohemia, Were by the Learned Comenius Presented to Him*, Printed for G. Terry, London, (1794). **See also:** W. Ashburnham, *Restoration of the Jews: A Poem*, London, (1794). **See also:** F. Wrangham, *The Restoration of the Jews: A Poem*, R. Edwards, London, (1795). **See also:** R. Brothers, *A Revealed Knowledge of the Prophecies and Times Book the First. Wrote under the Direction of the Lord God, and Published by His Sacred Command; it Being the First Sign of Warning for the Benefit of All Nations. Containing, with Other Great and Remarkable Things, Not Revealed to Any Other Person on Earth, the Restoration of the Hebrews to Jerusalem, by the Year 1798; under Their Revealed Prince and Prophet Richard Brothers*, Robert Campbell, Philadelphia, (1795); **and** *A Revealed Knowledge of the Prophecies and Times Particularly of the Present Time, the Present War, and the Prophecy Now Fulfilling. The Year of the World 5913. Book the Second. Containing, with Other Great and Remarkable Things, Not Revealed to Any Other Person on Earth, the Sudden and Perpetual Fall of the Turkish, German, and Russian Empires*, Robert Campbell, Philadelphia, (1795). **See also:** N. B. Halhed, *A Revealed Knowledge of the Prophecies and Times. Wrote under the Direction of the Lord God, and Published by His Sacred Command; it Being the First Sign of Warning for the Benefit of All Nations. Containing, with Other Great and Remarkable Things, Not Revealed to Any Other Person on Earth, the Restoration of the Hebrews to Jerusalem, by the Year of 1798, under Their Revealed Prince and Prophet. To Which Is Added, the Testimony of the Authenticity of the Prophecies of Richard Brothers, and of His Mission to Recall the Jews / Book the First*, Dublin, (1795); **and** *Testimony of the Authenticity of the Prophecies of Richard Brothers, and of His Mission to Recall the Jews*, London : Printed for H.D. Symonds, (1795). **See also:** C. Jerram, *An Essay Tending to Shew the Grounds Contained in Scripture for Expecting a Future Restoration of the Jews*, J. Burges, Cambridge, (1796). **See also:** D. Levi, *Dissertations on the Prophecies of the Old Testament: Part I Contains All Such Prophecies as Are Applicable to the Coming of the Messiah: the Restoration of the Jews, and the Resurrection of the Dead: Whether So Applied by Jews or Christians. Part Ii Contains All Such Prophecies as Are Applied to the Messiah by Christians Only, but Which Are Shewn Not to Be Applicable to the Messiah*, D. Levi, London, (1796-1800). **See also:** C. J. Ligne, *Mémoire sur les Juifs*, (1797); reprinted *Oeuvres du Prince de Ligne*, Volume 1, F. van Meenen, Bruxelles, L. Van Bakkenes, Amsterdam, (1860). **See also:** E. King, *Remarks on the Signs of the Times*, George Nicol, London, (1798); **and** *A Supplement to the Remarks on the Signs of the Times:*

With Many Additional Remarks, George Nicol, London, (1799). **See also:** H. Kett, *History the Interpreter of Prophecy, Or, a View of Scriptural Prophecies and Their Accomplishment in the past and Present Occurrences of the World; with Conjectures Respecting Their Future Completion*, Hanwell and Parker, and J. Cooke, Oxford, (1799). **See also:** T. Witherby, *Observations on Mr. Bicheno's Book, Entitled the Restoration of the Jews, the Crisis of All Nations: Wherein the Revolutionary Tendency of That Publication Is Shown to Be Most Inimical to the Real Interest of the Jews. . . Together with an Inquiry Concerning Things to Come*, S. Couchman, London, (1800); **and** *An Attempt to Remove Prejudices Concerning the Jewish Nation: By Way of Dialogue*, Stephen Couchman, London, (1804); **and** *A Vindication of the Jews: By Way of Reply to the Letters Addressed to Perseverans to the English Israelite ; Humbly Submitted to the Consideration of the Missionary Society, and the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews*, Stephen Couchman, London, (1809). **See also:** D. Lewis, *An Address to the Jews; Shewing the Time of Their Obtaining the Knowledge of the Messiah, and Their Restoration to the Land of God's Promise to Abraham. . . to Which Is Added, an Address to the Nations, Shewing the Origin of Apostacy; Their Continuance Therein; and the Time of Their Delivery Therefrom. Also, a Few Observations on the Plan of a Modern Utopia*, H. D. Symonds, London, (1800). **See also:** L. Mayer, *Restoration of the Jews: Being an Extract from an Entire New Work, Intended to Be Published by Subscription Entitled "Truth Dispelling the Clouds of Error, by the Fulfilment of the Prophecies": Addressed to the Jews*, London, (1803); **and** *Bonaparte the Emperor of the Gauls, Considered as the Lucifer and Gog of Isaiah and Ezekiel: And the Issue of the Present Contest Between Great Britain and France Represented According to Divine Revelation, with an Appeal to Reason on the Errors of Commentators*, C. Stower, London, (1804); **and** *Restoration of the Jews: Containing an Explanation of the Prophecies in the Books of Daniel and the Revelations, That Relate to the Period When Their Restoration Will Be Accomplished. With an Illustration, Applicable to the Jews, of the Two Olive Trees, and the Two Candlesticks, That Are Said to Stand Before the God of the Earth, and the Two Witnesses, Who Were to Prophecy, Clothed in Sackcloth, 1260 days. Addressed to the Jews*, London, (1806); **and** *Peace with France, and Catholic Emancipation: Repugnant to the Command of God*, London, (1806); **and** *The Important Period, and Long Wished for Revolution, Shewn to Be at Hand, When God Will Cleanse the Earth by His Judgments*, Williams & Smith, London, (1806); **and** *The Prophetic Mirror; Or, a Hint to England: Containing an Explanation of Prophecy That Relates to the French Nation, and the Threatened Invasion; Proving Bonaparte to Be the Beast That Arose out of the Earth, with Two Horns like a Lamb, and Spake as a Dragon, Whose Number is 666. Rev. XIII, London*, (1806); **and** *Bonaparte the Emporor of the French, Considered as the Lucifer and Gog of Isaiah and Ezekiel: And the Issues of the Present Contest Between Great Britain and France, Represented According to Divine Revelation with an Appeal to Reason, on Prophecy, and the Errors of Commentators. . . Also an Hieroglyphic Published in 1804, of the Destiny of Europe, the Fate of the German Empire, and the Fall of Russia. And a New Explanation of Daniel's Seventy Weeks*, London, (1806); **and** *Truth Dispelling the Clouds of Error:*

Containing a New Explanation of Nebuchadnezzar's Great Image and the Prophecies of Balaam, Which Relate to the Total Destruction of the Antichristian Powers, and the Annihilation of the Turkish and Persian Empires. Part I, W. Nicholson for Williams & Smith, London, (1807); **and** *Death of Bonaparte, and Universal Peace: A New Explanation of Nebuchadnezzar's Great Image, and Daniel's Four Beasts*, W. Nicholson, London, (1809). **See also:** J. Rathbun, *A Sign, with a Looking-glass, Or, a Late Vision Opened and Explained, in the Light of the Prophecies and Revelations: In Which Is Shown, the Sudden Destruction of the Draggon, and Beast, and False-church, and the Sudden Gathering in of the Jews, into Their Own Land, and Their Final Restoration to Christ ; and the Curse Taken off from the Earth, and the Glory of the Millennium ; Also, the Sudden Second Coming of Christ, Which Will Be like the Opening of the Eyelids of the Morning to All Nations, When Every Man May Sit down under His Own Vine and Fig Tree, and None Shall Hurt Them*, Phinehas Allen, Pittsfield, (1804). **See also:** G. White and H. Witsius, *The Restoration of the Jews: An Extract from Herman Witsius*, Printed for Williams & Smith, by W. Heney, London, (1806). **See also:** Hunter, *The Rise, Fall, and Future Restoration of the Jews: To Which Are Annexed, Six Sermons, Addressed to the Seed of Abraham by Several Evangelical Ministers : Concluding with an Elaborate Discourse, by the Late Dr. Hunter, Entitled, 'The Fullness of the Gentiles Coeval with the Salvation of the Jews'*, W. Button, London, (1806). **See also:** G. S. Faber, *A Dissertation on the Prophecies, That Have Been Fulfilled, Are Now Fulfilling, or Will Hereafter Be Fulfilled, Relative to the Great Period of 1260 Years; the Papal and Mohammedan Apostasies: the Tyrannical Reign of Antichrist, or the Infidel Power; and the Restoration of the Jews*, Printed for F.C. and J. Rivington, London, (1806). **See also:** *Sanhedrin Hadashah, and, Causes and Consequences of the French Emperor's Conduct Towards the Jews: Including Official Documents and the Final Decisions of the Grand Sanhedrin : a Sketch of the Jewish History since Their Dispersion, Their Recent Improvements in the Sciences and the Polite Literature upon the Continent : and the Sentiments of Their Principal Rabbins, Fairly Stated and Compared with Some Eminent Christian Writers, upon the Restoration, the Rebuilding of the Temple, the Millennium, &C. ; with Considerations on the Question: "Whether There Is Any Thing in the Prophetic Records That Seems to Point Particularly to England?"*, Printed by Day & co., for M. Jones, London, (1807). **See also:** W. Ettrick, *The Second Exodus; Or, Reflections on the Prophecies, Relating to the Rise, —Fall, —and Perdition of the Great Roman Beast of the 1260 Years and His Last Head, and Their Connection with the Long Captivity and Approaching Restoration of the Jews*, J. Graham, Sunderland, England, (1814). **See also:** J. M'Donald, *Isaiah's Message to the American Nation: A New Translation of Isaiah, Chapter XVIII, with Notes Critical and Explanatory: A Remarkable Prophecy, Respecting the Restoration of the Jews, Aided by the American Nation, with a Universal Summons to the Battle of Armageddon, and a Description of That Solemn Scene*, Printed by E. & E. Hosford, Albany, New York, (1814). **See also:** C. Maitland, *A Brief and Connected View of Prophecy: Being an Exposition of the Second, Seventh, and Eighth Chapters of the Prophecy of Daniel Together with the Sixteenth Chapter of Revelation : to Which Are Added, Some*

Observations Respecting the Period and Manner of the Restoration of the Jews, J. Hatchard, London, (1814). **See also:** M. M. Noah, *Call to America to Build Zion*, Arno Press, New York, (1814/1977); **and** *Discourse Delivered at the Consecration of the Synagogue of [K. K. She`erit Yisra`el] in the City of New-York on Friday, the 10th of Nisan, 5578, Corresponding with the 17th of April, 1818*, Printed by C.S. Van Winkle, New-York, (1818); **and** *Discourse on the Evidences of the American Indians Being the Descendants of the Lost Tribes of Israel: Delivered Before the Mercantile Library Association*, Clinton Hall, J. Van Norden, New York, (1837); **and** *Discourse on the Restoration of the Jews: Delivered at the Tabernacle, Oct. 28 and Dec. 2., 1844*, Harper, New York, (1845); **and** *The Jews, Judea, and Christianity: A Discourse on the Restoration of the Jews*, Hugh Hughes, London, (1849). **See also:** W. Ettrick, *The Season and Time, Or, an Exposition of the Prophecies Which Relate to the Two Periods of Daniel Subsequent to the 1260 Years Now Recenter Expired: Being the Time of the Seventh Trumpet. . . Together with Remarks upon the Revolutionary Anti-Christ Proposed by Bishop Horsley and the Rev. G. S. Faber*, Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orne, and Brown, London, (1816). **See also:** N. L. Moore, *The Restoration of Sodom, Samaria and Judah, Or, the Return of the Jews to Their Former Estate: A Sermon*, Printed by John B. Johnson, Hamilton, New York, (1817). See also: "Citizen of Baltimore", *The Return of the Jews, and the Second Advent of Our Lord, Proved to Be a Scripture Doctrine*, Printed by Richard J. Matchett, Baltimore, (1817). **See also:** W. Witherby and J. Eyre, *A Review of Scripture in Testimony of the Truth of the Second Advent, the First Resurrection and the Millennium*, W. Marchant for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, London, (1818). **See also:** H. McNeile, *The Church of Rome the Apostasy, and the Pope the Man of Sin and Son of Perdition. With an Appendix*, Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia, (1818/1841); **and** *Popular Lectures on the Prophecies Relative to the Jewish Nation*, J. Hatchard, London, (1830); **and** *The Relative Position Occupied by the Jewish Nation in the Revealed Purposes of Jehovah, Towards Our World: A Sermon Preached on Behalf of the Philo-Judaeon Society at the Church of St. Clement Danes, on Tuesday Evening, April 27th, 1830*, Hatchard & Son, London, (1830); **and** *Nationalism in Religion: A Speech Delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Protestant Association, Held in Exeter Hall, on Wednesday, May 8, 1839*, (1839); **and** *Jezebel: A Type of Popery: A Speech*, New Irish Pulpit Office, Dublin, (1840); **and** *The Papal Antichrist. Church of Rome Proved to Have the Marks of Antichrist: A Speech, March 7, 1843*, Hatchards, London, (1843); **and** *A Sermon Preached at the Parish Church of the United Parishes of Christ Church, Newgate-Street, at St. Leonard, Foster-Lane, on Thursday, May 7, 1846 Before the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*, London Society, London, (1846); **and** *The Covenants Distinguished: A Sermon, on the Restoration of the Jews, Preached in the Parish Church of St. George's, Bloomsbury, on Thursday, the 22d of November, 1849, and Published by Request*, J. Hatchard and Son, London, Arthur Newling, Liverpool, (1849); **and** *The Rev. Dr. M'Neile's Speech on the Papal Aggression: Delivered at Exeter Hall, on Tuesday, December 17th, 1850*, C. Westerton, London, (1850); **and** *The Jews and Judaism. A Lecture by the Rev. Hugh M'Neile, D.d., St. Paul's,*

Liverpool, Delivered Before the Young Men's Christian Association, in Exeter Hall, February 14, 1854, James Nisbet, London, (1854); **and** *The English Reformation, a Re-Assertion of Primitive Christianity. A Sermon, Preached in Christ Church, Newgate Street, on the 17th of November, 1858, the Tercentenary Commemoration of the Accession of Queen Elizabeth*, A. Holden, Liverpool, (1858). **See also:** P. Fisk, L. Parsons, et al., *Holy Land Missions and Missionaries*, Arno Press, New York, (1819-1977). **See also:** P. Fisk and L. Parsons, *Sermons of Rev. Messrs. Fisk & Parsons, Just Before Their Departure on the Palestine Mission*, Samuel T. Armstrong, Boston, (1819). **See also:** L. Parsons, *The Dereliction and Restoration of the Jews: A Sermon Preached in Park Street Church, Boston, Sabbath, Oct. 31, 1819, Just Before the Departure of the Palestine Mission*, S. T. Armstrong, Boston, (1819). **See also:** A. Power, *An Appeal to the Jewish Nation in Particular, and the Infidel in General: With an Endeavour to Prove the Pyramid to Be the Ensign or Beacon of Isaiah, for the Call and Restoration of all Jews, &c.*, G. & W.B. Whittaker, London, (1822). **See also:** "Jerusalem", *An Account of the Siege and Destruction of Jerusalem; with Some Observations on the Present State of the Jews, and on Their Future Restoration to Former Privileges*, Edmond Barber, Cork, Brown-Street, (1822). **See also:** J. P. Haven, *Israel's Advocate, Or, the Restoration of the Jews Contemplated and Urged*, Serial Publication Published for the American Society for Meliorating the Condition of the Jews by John P. Haven, New York, (1823-1827). **See also:** J. Wilson, *A Dissertation on the Future Restoration of the Jews, the Overthrow of the Papal Civil Authority, and on Other Interesting Events of Prophecy, in Two Sections*, H. H. Brown, Providence, Rhode Island, (1828). **See also:** J. Burridge, *The Budget of Truth: Relative to the Present Aspect of Affairs in the Religious and the Political World, Especially to the Existing State of Christendom: To Which Are Added, Observations on the Restoration of the Jews, and "The Holy Alliance," Being a Development of the Prophecies of Daniel & John, with an Appendix Containing Curious Official Correspondence, &c.*, London, (1830). **See also:** J. Tyso, *An Inquiry after Prophetic Truth Relative to the Restoration of the Jews and the Millenium: Containing a Map of the Countries to Be Possessed by the Restored Tribes, and Ground Plans of the New City and Temple to Be Built, According to the Patterns Showed to Ezekiel in the Mount: Addressed to the Jews and Gentiles*, Holdsworth and Ball, London, (1831). **See also:** G. H. Wood, *The Believer's Guide to the Study of Unfulfilled Prophecy. Containing the Scripture Testimony Respecting the Gentile Apostacy, the Second Advent of Christ in Judgment, His Personal Reign on Earth with All His Saints, the Restoration of the Jews, the Restitution of All Things, Hades, or the Intermediate State of Departed Spirits, and Other Important Subjects, with an Appendix, Containing the Testimony of the Fathers, Reformers, &c. To the Truth of the above Doctrines*, J. Nisbet, London, (1831). **See also:** B. Disraeli, *The Wondrous Tale of Alroy. The Rise of Iskander*, Saunders and Otley, London, (1833); **and** *Tancred, or, The New Crusade*, Henry Colburn, London, (1847); **and** *Die jüdische Frage in der orientalischen Frage*, Wien, (1877); reproduced in: N. M. Gelber, *Tokhnit ha-medinah ha-Yehudit le-Lord Bikonsfild (Binyamin Deyizra'eli)*, Ts. Lainman, Tel-Aviv, (1946), pp. 61-91; also attributed to Disraeli in: N. H. Frankel and T. H. Gaster, *Unknown*

Documents on the Jewish Question: Disraeli's Plan for a Jewish State (1877), The Schlesinger Pub. Co., Baltimore, (1947); on attribution to Disraeli see: C. Roth, *Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1952). **See also:** J. Gregg, *Elisama; or, The Captivity and Restoration of the Jews: Including the Period of Their History from the Year 606 to 408, B.C.*, American Sunday-School Union, Philadelphia, (1835). **See also:** *Remarks on the Expatriation of the Jews from Judea: and the Probability of Their Restoration to That Country*, B. Fellowes, London, (1836). **See also:** P. Colby, *The Conversion and Restoration of the Jews: A Sermon Delivered at Randolph, Mass., Before the Palestine Missionary Society, June 17, 1835*, (1836). **See also:** J. S. C. F. Frey, *Judah and Israel, or, The Restoration and Conversion of the Jews and Ten Tribes: To Which Is Added Essays on the Passover*, T. Ward & Co., London, (1837). **See also:** E. Bickersteth, *The Way of Christ Prepared: An Address Both to Christians and Jews, on the Duty and Blessedness of Removing Their Mutual Stumbling-Blocks: Being the Substance of a Sermon Preached to the Jews in the Episcopal Jews' Chapel, in London, March 12, and at St. Augustines, in Liverpool, Sept. 27, 1837*, Seeley & Co., London, (1837); **and** *The Time to Favour Zion, Or, an Appeal to the Gentile Churches in Behalf of the Jews: Being the Substance of Four Sermons Preached in the Episcopal Churches of St. James, Trinity, and St. John, in Edinburgh, on Whit-Sunday, May 19, 1839, and the Following Wednesday; with the Proceedings on the Formation of the Edinburgh Auxiliary to the London Society for Promoting Christianity Among the Jews*, John Lindsay, Edinburgh, (1839); **and** *The Future Destiny of Israel*, O. Rogers, Philadelphia, (1840); **and** *The Restoration of the Jews to Their Own Land: In Connection with Their Future Conversion and the Final Blessedness of Our Earth*, R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, London, (1841); **and** *Scriptural Studies Relating to the Conversion and Restoration of the Jews*, London Society's Office, London, (1843); **and** *The Way of the Jewish People to Be Prepared: A Sermon, Preached at the Parish Church of St. Clement Danes, Strand, on Tuesday Evening, May 8, 1834, Before the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*, Sold at the London Society's House, London (1844); **and** *The Mind of Christ Respecting the Jews*, H. B. Pratt, Boston, (1845); **and** *Israel's Sins, and Israel's Hopes: Being Lectures Delivered During Lent, 1846, at St. George's, Bloombury*, James Nisbet and Co., London, (1846); **and** *The Forty-Eight Report of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews: With an Appendix Containing a List of Subscribers and Benefactors, and a Statement of Accounts to March 31, 1856; to Which Is Prefixed the Annual Sermon Preached Before the Society on May 8, 1856, at the Church of St. Dunstan-in-the-West, Fleet Street*, London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, London, (1856). **See also:** A. McCaul, *The Conversion and Restoration of the Jews: Two Sermons, Preached Before the University of Dublin*, B. Wertheim, London, (1837); **and** *Equality of Jew and Gentile in the New Testament Dispensation: A Sermon Preached at the Parish Church of St. Clement Danes, Strand, on Thursday Evening May 2, 1833, Before the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*, B. Wertheim, London, (1838); **and** *The Conversion and Restoration of the Jews: A Lecture Delivered on Tuesday Evening October 28 1845*, J. Nisbet London,

(1845); **and** *New Testament Evidence to Prove That the Jews Are to Be Restored to the Land of Israel*, Sold at the London Society's House, London, (1850). **See also:** A. C. L. Crawford, a. k. a. Lord Lindsay, "Letters on Egypt, Edom, and the Holy Land", *The Quarterly Review*, Volume 125, (December, 1838), pp. 166-192. **See also:** W. Aldis, *The Holy Prophecies, Visions and Life of the Prophet Enoch: Quoted by Saint Jude's Epistle on Christ's Millennium Reign. Introduced by an Epistle on Church Union, for the Jews' Conversion, and Restoration of the Twelve Tribes of Israel. Preached to Vast Multitudes in England and Scotland*, R. Menzies, Edinburgh, (1839). **See also:** "Restoration of the Jews", *The New-Yorker: A Weekly Journal of Literature, Politics and General Intelligence* (H. Greeley & Co., New York), Volume 9, Number 13 (13 June 1840), pp. 196-197. **See also:** J. Litch, *An Address to the Clergy on the near Approach of the Glorious, Everlasting Kingdom of God on Earth: As Indicated by the Word of God, the History of the World, Signs of the Present Times, the Restoration of the Jews, &c.*, Dow & Jackson, Boston, (1840). **See also:** J. W. Brooks, *The Testimony of Prophecy Concerning the Conversion of the Gentiles and the Restoration of the Jews: An Address Delivered to the Clergy of Bath and its Vicinity, and the Members of the Bath and East Somerset Auxiliary Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, Assembled at Breakfast at Bath, Preparatory to the Anniversary Meeting, April 12, 1842*, Printed for the Society, by George Wood & Sons, Bath, (1842). **See also:** C. Elizabeth, *Judah's Lion*, M. W. Dodd, New York, (1843). **See also:** R. H. Herschell, *The National Restoration of the Jews to Their Fatherland, and Consequent Fulfilment of the Promise to the Patriarchs. A Sermon*, London, (1843). **See also:** O. Bachelier, *Restoration and Conversion of the Jews*, Potter, Pawtucket, (1843). **See also:** A. Keith, *The Land of Israel, According to the Covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob*, William Whyte, Edinburgh, (1843); **and** *Isaiah as It Is: Or, Judah and Jerusalem the Subjects of Isaiah's Prophesying*, William Whyte and Co., Edinburgh, (1850). **See also:** G. Bush, *The Valley of Vision, Or, the Dry Bones of Israel Revived: An Attempted Proof from Ezekiel, Chap. XXXVII. 1-14 of the Restoration and Conversion of the Jews*, Saxton & Miles, New York, (1844). **See also:** Abram-François Pétavel, *La fille de Sion, ou, le rétablissement d'Israel: Poème en sept chants, avec notes et éclaircissemens Bibliques*, Chez Gerster, Neuchatel, (1844); **and** *Israël peuple de l'Avenir: Discours prononc'e a l'assembl'ee g'en'erale des Chr'etiens 'evang'eliques de tout pays, à Paris, Librairie de Grassart, Paris, (1861)*. **See also:** L. Gaussen, *Geneva and Jerusalem. The Gospel at Length Preached to the Jews, and Their Restoration at Hand. A Discourse Delivered at a Missionary Meeting at Geneva, March 12, 1843*, W. H. Dalton, London, (1844). **See also:** J. L. Rhees, *A Scriptural View of the Restoration of the Jews, the Second Advent of the Lord Jesus and Some of the Leading Circumstances of That Glorious Event*, King & Baird, Philadelphia, (1844). **See also:** L. Gaussen, *Geneva and Jerusalem. The Gospel at Length Preached to the Jews, and Their Restoration at Hand. A Discourse Delivered at a Missionary Meeting at Geneva, March 12, 1843*, W. H. Dalton, London, (1844). **See also:** E. Winchester, H. Ballou, *et al.*, *Select Theological Library: Containing Valuable Publications Principally Treating of the Doctrine of Universal Salvation*, Gihon, Fairchild, Philadelphia, (1844). **See also:**

S. A. Bradshaw, *A Tract for the Times, Being a Plea for the Jews*, (1844); **and** *Modus Operandi in Political, Social, and Moral Forecast Concerning the East*, (1884). **See also:** G. Gawler, *Tranquillization of Syria and the East: Observations and Practical Suggestions, in Furtherance of the Establishment of Jewish Colonies in Palestine, the Most Sober and Sensible Remedy for the Miseries of Asiatic Turkey*, T. & W. Boone, London, (1845); **and** *The Emancipation of the Jews Indispensable for the Maintenance of the Protestant Profession of the Empire; and, in Other Respects, Most Entitled to the Support of the British Nation*, Boone, London, (1847); **and** *Syria and Its near Prospects: The Substance of an Address Delivered in the Young Men's Christian Association Lecture Room, Derby, on Tuesday, 25th January, 1853. With an Appendix*, Hamilton, Adams, London, (1853). **See also:** R. W. Johnson, *The World Enlightened by the Restoration of Judah's Palace: A Sermon Preached on the 9th of March, 1845, at St. Anne's Chapel, Wandsworth, Surrey, in Behalf of the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews*, Simpkin and Marshall, London, (1845). **See also:** P. Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture; Or, the Doctrine of Types Investigated in its Principles, and Applied to the Explanation of the Earlier Revelations of God, Considered as Preparatory Exhibitions of the Leading Truths of the Gospel. With an Appendix on the Restoration of the Jews*, T. Clark, Edinburgh, (1845). **See also:** S. Hawley, *The Fulness of the Jews: The Restoration of the Jews and Subsequent Probation to the Gentiles Demonstrated from Romans Eleventh*, H. B. Pratt, Boston, (1845). **See also:** L. M. Auerbach, *Claims of the Jews in Two Parts: I. Claims of the Jews on Christians and Their Obligations to the Jews, a Discourse Delivered on 25th, Dec. 1845 in the City Hall, Glasgow at the Request of Christians Who Seek the Good of God's Ancient People; Ii. The True Nature and Character of the Returning Exiles the House of Israel from the Land of Strangers to Their Fatherland and Second Advent, Reign, and Personal Ministry of the Lord Jesus Christ on Earth over the House of Israel in Their Fatherland with a Few Hebrew Anthems Translated into English, as Relating to the Restoration of Israel*, Glasgow, (1846). **See also:** J. Thomas, *Elpis Israel: A Book for the Times: Being an Exposition of the Kingdom of God; with Reference to the Time of the End, and the Age to Come*, London, (1849); **and** *The Coming Struggle among the Nations of the Earth, Or, the Political Events of the Next Fifteen Years, Described in Accordance with Prophecies in Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Apocalypse: Showing Also the Important Position Britain Will Occupy During, and at the End of, the Awful Conflict*, T. Maclear, Toronto, (1853); **and** *Anatolia: Or Russia Triumphant and Europe Chained: Being an Exposition of Prophecy: Showing the Inevitable Fall of the French and Ottoman Empires: The Occupation of Egypt and the Holy Land by the British. . . : And Consequent Establishment of the Kingdom of Israel*, Mott Haven, New York, (1854); **and** *Phanerosis: An Exposition of the Doctrine of the Old and New Testaments, Concerning the Manifestation of the Invisible Eternal God in Human Nature : Being Alike Subversive of Jewish Rabbinical Tradition and the Theology of Romish and Protestant Sectarianism*, R. Roberts, Birmingham, (1869); **and** *Destiny of the British Empire, as Revealed in the Scriptures*, G. J. Stevenson, London, (1871). **See also:** A. G. H. Hollingsworth, *The Holy Land Restored; Or, an Examination of the Prophetic Evidence for the*

Restitution of Palestine to the Jews, in Twelve Dissertations, Seeleys, London, (1849); **and** *Remarks upon the Present Condition and Future Prospects on the Jews in Palestine and the Duty of England to That Nation*, Seeleys, London, (1853). **See also:** W. Ashburnham, *The Restoration of the Jews, and Other Poems*, R. Bentley, London, (1849). **See also:** W. W. Ewbank, *The National Restoration of the Jews to Palestine Repugnant to the Word of God: A Speech, Delivered. . . in Liverpool at the Anniversary Meeting of the Auxiliary Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, Oct. 21, 1849*, Deighton and Laughton, Liverpool, (1849). **See also:** W. W. Ewbank and H. M. Villiers, *A Distinction Without a Difference: a Letter to the Hon. & Rev. H. Montagu Villiers, M.a., Rector of St. George's Bloomsbury, on a Sermon Lately Preached in His Church, in Favour of the Restoration of the Jews, and Entitled, "The Covenants Distinguished."*, Deighton and Laughton, Liverpool, F. and J. Rivington, London, (1850). **See also:** W. H. Johnstone, *Israel After the Flesh: The Judaism of the Bible, Separated from its Spiritual Religion*, John W. Parker, London, (1850); **and** *Israel in the World: Or, the Mission of the Hebrews to the Great Military Monarchies*, J. F. Shaw, London, J. Menzies, Edinburgh, J. Robertson, Dublin, (1854). **See also:** B. Musolino, *Gerusalemme ed il popolo ebreo*, La Rassegna mensile d'Israel, Roma, (1851/1951). **See also:** E. Avery, *A Few Thoughts Taken from the Word of God, In Favor of Christ's Body Being of a Divine Nature, He Being the Son of God and Not the Eternal Father. The End of Idolatry and the Restoration of the Jews*, (1851). **See also:** S. Lewis, *The Restoration of the Jews, with the Political Destiny of the Nations of the Earth, as Foretold in the Prophecies of Scripture*, J.S. Redfield, New York, (1851). **See also:** J. Wright, *Christianity and Commerce the Natural Results of the Geographical Progression of Railways; Or, a Treatise on the Advantage of the Universal Extension of Railways in Our Colonies and Other Countries, and the Probability of Increased National Intercommunication Leading to the Early Restoration of the Land of Promise to the Jews*, Dolman, London, (ca. 1850). **See also:** S. M. M., *Remarks on the Prophecies Relating to the Restoration of the Jews*, W.E. Painter, London, (1852). **See also:** D. D. Buck, *An Original Harmony and Exposition of the Twenty-fourth Chapter of Matthew: and the Parallel Passages in Mark and Luke, Comprising a Review of the Common Figurative Theories of Interpretation, with a Particular Examination of the Principal Passages Relating to the Second Coming of Christ, the End of the World, the New Creation, the Millennium, the Resurrection, the Judgment, the Conversion and Restoration of the Jews, the Final Gathering of the Elect, etc., etc.*, Henry W. Derby, Cincinnati, (1853); **and** *Our Lord's Great Prophecy, and its Parallels Throughout the Bible, Harmonized and Expounded: Comprising a Review of the Common Figurative Theories of Interpretation. With a Particular Examination of the Principal Passages Relating to the Second Coming of Christ, the End of the World, the New Creation, the Millennium, the Resurrection, the Judgment, the Conversion and Restoration of the Jews, and a Synopsis of Josephus' History of the Jewish War*, Miller, Orton & Mulligan, New York and Auburn, (1856). **See also:** R. Browning, *Holy-Cross Day: on Which the Jews Were Forced to Attend an Annual Christian Sermon in Rome*, Poem of 1855 reproduced in many of Browning's works. **See also:** *Expected Restoration of the Jews; and the Millennium: Being the Seventh Lecture*

of a View of the Scripture Revelations Concerning a Future State, J.W.Parker, London, (1859). **See also:** E. Hanes, *The Observer of the Signs of the Times, Including the Final Restoration of the Jews and the Messiah's Reign*, Pierce, Armstrong Co., Pennsylvania, (1860). See also: E. Laharanne, *La nouvelle question d'Orient: Empires d'Egypte et d'Arabie. Reconstitution de la nationalité juive*, E. Dentu, Paris, (1860). **See also:** J. C. M'Causland, *The Hope of Israel; Or, the Testimony of Scripture to the National Restoration and Conversion of the Jews*, Hodges, Smith & Co., Dublin, (1860). **See also:** R. Raine, *The Restoration of the Jews: And the Duties of English Churchmen in That Respect*, London, (1860). **See also:** D. Brown, *The Restoration of the Jews: The History, Principles, and Bearings of the Question*, A. Strahan & Co., Edinburgh, (1861). **See also:** E. B. Eaton, *The Signs of the Times, or What Things Are Coming on the Earth: The Downfall of Monarchy in Europe, the Restoration of the Jews, Second Advent of Christ-Jesus the Messiah, the Millenium, the Whole World a Republican Comm-Union of Continental and Adjacent Insular Unions of States*, R.J. Trumbull, San Francisco, (1868). **See also:** S. Henn, *The Return of the Jews: Or, The restoration of Israel*, Worcestershire, (ca. 1870). **See also:** E. R. Talbot, *The Mystery of the Jew, as Revealed by St. Paul in Romans XI.; Being an Expository Paraphrase of the Scope and Argument of the Chapter, with Four Lectures on the Leading Features of the Revelation as to the Future National Restoration and Conversion of the Jews. To Which Is Added, a Refutation of the Theory as to the Identity of the English Nation with the Lost House of Israel*, W. Macintosh, London, (1872). **See also:** C. Warren, *The Land of Promise: Or, Turkeys Guarantee*, George Bell & Sons, London, (1875). **See also:** G. Eliot (Mary Ann Evans), *Daniel Deronda*, William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh, London, (1876). **See also:** L. Glueckstein, *The Eastern Question and the Jews*, P. Vallentine, London, (1876). **See also:** C. H. Spurgeon, *The Restoration and Conversion of the Jews, Sovereign Grace Advent Testimony*, Chelmsford, Essex. **See also:** Philadelphos, *The Coming Trouble: Certain Fate of Turkey ; the World's Tribulation; and Time of the End, Or, the Eastern Question and the Turkish Revolution Viewed in the Light of Prophecy, Showing the Certain Fate of the Turkish Empire, the Return of the Jews, the Destruction of the Papacy*, J.G. Berger, London. **See also:** H. Folbigg, *Millennial Glory, Or, the Doom of Turkey and the Battle of the Nations: The Restoration of the Jews, &c.*, London, (1877). **See also:** J. Neil, *Palestine Re-Peopled: Or, Scattered Israel's Gathering, a Sign of the Times*, J. Nisbet, London, (1877). **See also:** R. Roberts, *Prophecy and the Eastern Question: Being an Exhibition of the Light Shed by the Scriptures of Truth on the Matters Involved in the Crisis That Has Arrived in Eastern Affairs, Showing the Approaching Fall of the Ottoman Empire, War Between England and Russia; the Settlement of the Jews in Syria under British Protectorate*, F. Pitman, London, (1877). **See also:** E. Cazalet, *The Eastern Question: An Address to Working Men*, Edward Stanford, London, (1878); **and** *The Berlin Congress and the Anglo-Turkish Convention*, Edward Stanford, London, (1878); **and** *England's Policy in the East: Our Relations with Russia and the Future of Syria*, Edward Stanford, London, (1879). **See also:** J. P. Henderson, *The Destiny of Russia as Foretold by God's Prophets: Together with an Outline of the Future Movements and Destiny of England, Germany, Persia,*

Africa, and the Jews, Thomas Wilson, Chicago, (1878). **See also:** L. Oliphant, *The Land of Gilead, with Excursions in the Lebanon*, W. Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh, London, (1880). **See also:** A. Cairns, *The Jews: Their Fall and Restoration: Two Discourses, Preached in Chalmer's Church, on September the 3rd, 1854, in Behalf of the Suffering Jews of Palestine*, Hutchinson, Melbourne, (1881). **See also:** T. H. Dawson, *The Restoration of the Jews at the Second Coming of Christ: A Lecture*, Bosqui Engraving & Print. Co., San Francisco, (1885). **See also:** C. W. Meiter, *The Restoration of the Jews, and the Re-Building of King Solomon's Temple*, London, (1887). **See also:** A. W. Miller, *The Restoration of the Jews*, Constitution Pub. Co., Atlanta, (1887). **See also:** W. E. Blackstone, *Palestine for the Jews*, W. Blackstone, Oak Park, Illinois, (1891); **and** *Christian Protagonists for Jewish Restoration*, Arno Press, New York, (1891/ 1977). **See also:** A. C. Tris, *The Restoration of Israel, the Jews in Canaan, Jehovah Jesus, Their King: A Word to All*, Iowa Print. Co., Des Moines, (1895). **See also:** B. H. Charles, *Lectures on Prophecy: An Exposition of Certain Scriptures with Reference to the History and End of the Papacy; the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine, Their Repentance and Enlargement under the Reign of the Son of David; and the New State in the Millennium*, Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, (1897). **See also:** Cheiro, a. k. a. Count Louis Hamon, *Cheiro's World Predictions: the Fate of Europe, the Future of the U.S.A., the Coming War of Nations, the Restoration of the Jews*, The London Pub. Co., London, (1928).

Jewish forces in England who wanted to destroy Catholicism and attack the Pope and the Turks in order to “restore the Jews to Palestine” fabricated prophecies meant to win converts to their cause. In 1641, a pamphlet appeared in England purporting to be the prophecies of one Ursula Shipton, a. k. a. Mother Shipton, a. k. a. Agatha Shipton, a. k. a. Ursula Sontheil (ca. 1488-1561). This six page pamphlet entitled *The Prophesie of Mother Shipton in the Raigne of King Henry the Eighth Foretelling the Death of Cardinall Wolsey, the Lord Percy and Others, as Also What Should Happen in Insuing Times*¹⁹⁶¹ printed several statements of fact in 1641, which purported to be predictions of events yet to occur in Shipton's lifetime, but which had already occurred by 1641. There were no extant records proving that any such woman as “Mother Shipton” ever existed.

The pamphlet was political propaganda issued by those who wished to rid England of Catholicism and justify revolution and murder. It was so successful, that new prophecies allegedly written by “Mother Shipton” began to appear referring to the Pope, the Turks and the “calling of the Jews”.¹⁹⁶² “Mother Shipton” predicted terrible wars, which had not yet occurred when these new prophecies appeared, but which had been in the plans of the Protestants who would overthrow the Pope and take Palestine from the Turks in order to give it to the Jews. Numerous later and expanded editions appeared. In 1862, Charles Hindley¹⁹⁶³ lent greater credibility to the hoax by adding passages about machines, which did not exist in the period of 1488-1561, but which had since been invented. He also infamously added the prediction that the world would end in 1881, but later admitted that these additions were the products of his own imagination.¹⁹⁶⁴

8.7.3 As a Good Cabalist Jew, David Hartley Conditions Christians to Welcome Martyrdom for the Sake of the Jews

Though he came from humble beginnings, David Hartley was well-connected and had married into the immensely wealthy family of his second wife Elizabeth Packer in 1735. His plea for the destruction of the Christian Temple of Europe—principally *Roman* Catholicism, and the diaspora of Christendom—smack of revenge for the Jewish Diaspora brought on by the Romans. It is amazing that some Christians, to this day, are gullible enough to destroy themselves and humanity for the sake of ancient Jewish prophecies, for the sake of modern Jews. Their leaders are well paid.

In an odd twist on the Crusader culture of the English, Hartley tried to make one feel un-Christian if one did not support world revolution, Zionism and Jewish world rule after the intentional destruction of Christendom. Anti-Semitic Christian Zionists worked the other end of the political spectrum, but issued the same ultimate message, *i. e.* they promoted world revolution, Zionism and the destruction of Christendom.¹⁹⁶⁵ It is interesting to note that the founder of Protestantism—the founder of the Gentile movement to destroy Catholicism and label the Pope the “Beast of the Apocalypse”—was an expressed philo-Semite, Martin Luther, a “Reformer” who appeared to seek the cooperation of the Jews to end the religious hegemony of Catholicism—Luther who had published *That Jesus Christ was Born a Jew* in 1523.¹⁹⁶⁶ Long after creating a divide in European Christians, Martin Luther forwarded the Zionist agenda by taking an anti-Semitic stand. He published *On the Jews and Their Lies* in 1543.¹⁹⁶⁷ Luther, with his close contacts with the Jewish community, may well have been an agent for Zionists and Protestantism was a device to divide and destroy Christendom. It might also be that near the end of his life Luther eventually sickened of killing Christians and was sincerely revolted by the Jews’ plans to exterminate all Gentile races. The ultimate motives behind the Crusades and the persecution of Jews during the Crusades are also open to question.

Some have taken the view that Protestantism created Zionism in its quest for an ally against the Catholic Church—and in England with the purpose of securing trade routes to India and China (and later oil).¹⁹⁶⁸ Though these forces were no doubt in play during the movement—at the instigation of Jews, it would appear far more likely that Zionists created Protestantism as a means to destroy the Roman Catholic Church they so hated, than that the Protestants created Zionism—given the fact that Zionism pervades the Old Testament. The Rothschilds had no small amount of influence in England and in France—they helped to put Disraeli and the Napoleons in power—and the alleged trade advantages of securing Palestine for the Jews would profit Jewish financiers, as well as the British or French. It was always the Jews who were whispering of these alleged advantages into the ears of the Christians. It was the Jews who went from one country to another preaching this same message. It was the Jews who alleged that only Jews could secure European interests in the region, which was not only a patently false message, it was absurd and the exact opposite of the truth.

Abbé Barruel alleged that the Jacobins, who instigated the French Revolution, were a current manifestation of a very old revolutionary conspiracy of the

Freemasons to establish a world government through world revolution. In 1806, Barruel produced a letter he received from A. J. B. Simonini, which he alleged proved a Jewish conspiracy to destroy Christendom and rule the world.¹⁹⁶⁹ At about the same time, George Stanley Faber¹⁹⁷⁰ alleged that the Pope and Islam were an evil conspiracy, which stood in the way of the “restoration of the Jews” and the fulfilment of prophecy. Faber proposed the destruction of the Turkish Empire, and the destruction of Catholicism, in preparation for the “restoration of the Jews”. In this period we find such fanatical titles as: W. Ettrick, *The Season and Time, Or, an Exposition of the Prophecies Which Relate to the Two Periods of Daniel Subsequent to the 1260 Years Now Recenter Expired: Being the Time of the Seventh Trumpet. . . Together with Remarks upon the Revolutionary Anti-Christ Proposed by Bishop Horsley and the Rev. G. S. Faber*, Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orne, and Brown, London, (1816). There was a large and long-lived religious movement in Protestant England and America to bring about World War in order to “restore the Jews to Palestine”. This had no benefits for Christians.

The Bolsheviks under Trotsky sought the destruction of religion and a world government. These were expressed Jewish objectives. The Bolsheviks mass murdered tens of millions of Christians and plunged many millions more into misery. The British and Americans eventually succeeded in destroying the Turkish Empire, “restoring the Jews to Palestine” and securing their access to the Orient and to oil. The Jews had their way, at a horrible cost to humanity, which we continue to pay.

One hundred years before Marx published his *Manifesto*, Hartley called for world revolution and the destruction of the Christian Churches and of European civil institutions so as to cause suffering Christians to disperse throughout the world and evangelize—just as the Roman dispersion of the Jews into Diaspora caused Jews to roam and proselytize. In Hartley’s day, many governments had both “evangelical and civil” power—the Church and the State were often one institution with two faces.

At that time, the Roman Catholic Church was one of the most powerful institutions in the world and stood in the way of the Old Testament prophecy that the “Jewish Nation” should attain political and religious hegemony, and rule the world after the other nations had been obliterated. The Catholics pretended to the Jewish throne as the elect, as the chosen of God. The Catholics asserted the doctrine that the Catholic Church is the “Mystical Body of Christ”, which has divine dominion over the nations. The Jews believed that their Messianic prophecies gave them this divine right.

Herzl believed that he would not receive the support of the Pope and the Catholic Church and he was correct. Jews also had many other reasons to hate Catholics. Romans destroyed the Jewish Nation and Rome was the seat of Catholicism. Catholics had committed numerous atrocities against Jews, including the Ghetto system and the Inquisition—the Ghetto of Rome was an especially degrading system.

In Europe, absolute hegemony had always been the goal of empires and churches—and the cause of numerous wars. Jews were by no means alone in their quest for hegemony. In addition, the Catholic Popes had sought to take Palestine in the Crusades, supposedly not in hopes of the “restoration of the Jews to Palestine”, but in the hopes of taking the Holy Land for the Christians. This made Catholicism

an obstacle to Zionism. Catholicism had long been the chief obstacle to Jewish religious hegemony. It also sought hegemony over the Christian faith, for example, in the case of the Council of Trent.

The Old Testament, the Talmud¹⁹⁷¹ and the Cabalistic writings led Jews like the Frankists to believe that they had a right and an obligation to enslave the rest of mankind to serve them, that evil was good, and that the only means to bring about the reign of God was to destroy all competitive religions and governments and bring about absolute suffering throughout the world. These Cabalistic Dualistic sects among Jews even promoted anti-Semitism—even Blood Libel accusations—in order to promote their political agendas in an unbroken chain of revolutionaries from the Frankists to the Marxists to the Zionists. They preached reincarnation and taught that their leaders were incarnations of the Messiah. It is no coincidence that Newton, Clarke, Hartley and the other British “Christians” who rejected the divinity of Christ preached the message that Christians must destroy themselves with a world revolution and “restore the Jews to Palestine”. These treacherous men were obviously serving the interests of the Cabalistic Jews who led them.

8.7.3.1 Jewish Revolutionaries and Napoleon the Messiah Emancipate the Jews

Pragmatically, in order for the Jews to obtain emancipation throughout the world, the governments which held them as chattel would have to be overthrown. In order for the governments to be overthrown, the basic structures of society had to be destroyed so as to promote misery, gross dissatisfaction and revolution. Satisfied people tend to preserve the *status quo*. The last vestiges of the Holy Roman Empire and the Turkish Empire had to be eliminated in order for the Jews to obtain Palestine.

Jewish revolutionaries seek to tear down society so that the common people will have no option but to revolt. Though they pretend to work for the interests of the common people, the Jewish revolutionaries covertly do everything in their power to make the people suffer. When the revolution occurs, Jewish revolutionaries deliberately throw the nation into chaos and economic disaster. Jewish revolutionaries then use their power over the press to spread the myth that only a dictator can restore order, the order the Jews covertly and deliberately subverted. After the Jewish revolutionaries have their puppet dictator in place, they attack religion and mass murder Christians and especially attack the intellectual elite so as to ruin the genetic heritage of the Gentile peoples and prevent counter-revolution—prevent Gentile self-determination. This “revolutionary” process is the fulfillment of Judaism.

The Jacobins used pro-democracy propaganda to install the dictator Robespierre in the French Revolution. After Robespierre failed, the Jews put Napoleon, a dictator who considered himself to have been the Messiah, into power. Napoleon almost achieved the Jews goals. However, when Napoleon’s success in emancipating the Jews led to assimilation, Jewish leaders turned against him for having helped the Jews. Jewish leaders preferred oppressive segregation to assimilation.

Liberal apostate Jews began to treat Napoleon as if something of a god. On 4 April 1806, Napoleon mandated a single catechism for the entire Empire, which

included the statements that Napoleon was “the image of God on Earth” and the “the Lord’s anointed”, *i. e.* the “Messiah”.¹⁹⁷² Napoleon instituted the Feast of St. Napoleon on 15 August 1806 in honor of Neopolas and mixed the cipher of Napoleon and Josephine with the unutterable name of Jehovah and placed the imperial eagle higher than the Ark of the Covenant on his official crest. Before Napoleon, the French Revolution had largely lost favor with Catholics and religious Jews when Robespierre attacked Judaic and Christian beliefs and instituted the Cult of the Supreme Being and pretended that he was himself a god. Napoleon, the Messiah, emancipated Jews wherever he could, tried to take Palestine for the Jews, re-instituted the Sanhedrin, laid much of the foundation for reform Judaism, etc.¹⁹⁷³ *The North American Review* wrote in 1845,

“The performance of Racine’s tragedy of ‘Esther’ is said to have excited Napoleon’s sympathy for the Jews; and he intended at once to improve their condition, and win them to his own interests. In 1806, their usurious practices led to complaint, and serious question, whether their rights, under the decree of 1791, should not be withdrawn. Whereupon, the emperor convened at Paris an assembly of the principal French Jews, to whom he proposed questions respecting their opinions and practices, with measures for establishing their brethren throughout the kingdom in honest and useful professions. The questions were answered, for the most part, to the satisfaction of the emperor; and he called a grand sanhedrim of seventy-one members, to convert the doctrinal explanations of the first assembly into authoritative decrees; hoping that the Jews out of the kingdom, also, would send representatives, and thus Paris would be made the centre of a powerful influence to unite and control the Jews throughout the world. The sanhedrim assembled at Paris in 1807,—a truly venerable body. A few foreign deputies attended; but its authority has never been recognized out of France, nor by all in that country; where, however, it seems to have been productive of benefit, in turning many Jews from dishonest and sordid to respectable and useful employments. Indeed, the decrees of this assembly contained a submissive renunciation of many firm Judaic principles. They declared, that France was the only ‘fatherland’ of the French Jews, that intermarriage with Christians was lawful, and that no trades were prohibited.”¹⁹⁷⁴

When Napoleon sought the “restoration of the Jews to Palestine”, Czar Alexander, under the influence of religious Jewish leadership, called Napoleon the anti-Christ and declared that he was out to destroy Christendom. Jewish leaders used their influence around the world to prevent the complete emancipation of the Jews, which they believed would lead to assimilation and the loss of their power over the Jewish People. The Holy Synod of Moscow proclaimed,

“In order to bring about a debasement of the Church he [Napoleon] has convened to Paris the Jewish synagogues, restored the dignity of the rabbis and founded a new Hebrew Sanhedrin, the same infamous tribunal which

once dared to condemn our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to the cross. And now he has the impudence to contemplate the unification of the Jews whom God in His wrath has dispersed over the surface of the earth and to organize all of them for the destruction of the Church of Christ to the purpose — oh, unspeakable audacity surpassing all the misdeeds! — that they may proclaim the Messiah in the person of Napoleon.”¹⁹⁷⁵

The Jews exerted their influence in England as well as in Russia. Lewis Mayer, who desired the “restoration of the Jews” and who sought the annihilation of Catholicism, and the German, Turkish and Russian Empires, also declared that Napoleon was the anti-Christ in 1806.¹⁹⁷⁶ During Napoleon’s reign, some Jews betrayed him and encouraged all Jews to side against Napoleon and with an “anti-Semitic” Czar, because they feared that Napoleon’s emancipation of the Jews was leading to assimilation, and one must wonder if Russian anti-Semitism was the work of such Jews and if the anti-Semitism of the Czars came at the request of Jewish leaders. A powerful Jewish leader of the time, Shneur Zalman, who hated Gentiles, reasoned that,

“If Bonaparte wins, the wealth of the Jews will increase and their positions will be raised. But their hearts will be estranged from their Father in Heaven. However, if Czar Alexander wins, then although the poverty of the Jews will increase and their position will be lower, their hearts will cleave to and be bonded with their Father in Heaven.”¹⁹⁷⁷

Napoleon III was also seen by some as the anti-Christ, who would reign over America and England and persecute and destroy Christendom.¹⁹⁷⁸ When Napoleon Bonaparte’s attempt to capture Palestine for the Jews failed, he sought to bring Jews from around the world to France—only five hundred Jews lived in Paris in 1789,¹⁹⁷⁹ and there were only 40,000 Jews in all of France.¹⁹⁸⁰ If Napoleon had defeated the British, it would have meant the hegemony of the Jews over Christendom as Hartley had desired.

Napoleon Bonaparte told Barry Edward O’Meara,

“I wanted to make them leave off usury, and become like other men. There were a great many Jews in the countries I reigned over; by removing their disabilities, and by putting them upon an equality with Catholics, Protestants, and others, I hoped to make them to become good citizens, and conduct themselves like the rest of the community. I believe that I should have succeeded in the end. My reasoning with them was, that as their rabbis explained to them that they ought not practise usury against their own tribes, but were allowed to practise it with Christians and others, that, therefore, as I had restored them to all their privileges, and made them equal to my other subjects, they must consider me like Solomon or Herod, to be the head of their nation, and my subjects as brethren of a tribe similar to theirs. Consequently, they were not permitted to deal usuriously with them or me,

but to treat us as if we were of the tribe of Judah. Enjoying similar privileges to my subjects, they were, in like manner, to pay taxes, and submit to the laws of conscription, and to other laws. By this I gained many soldiers. Besides, I should have drawn great wealth to France, as the Jews were very numerous and would have flocked to a country where they enjoyed such privileges. Moreover, I wanted to establish a universal liberty of conscience and thought to make all men equal, whether Protestants, Catholics, Mohammedans, Deists, or others; so that their religion should have no influence in getting them employment under government. In fact, that it should neither be the means of serving, nor of injuring them: and that no objection should be made to a man's getting a situation on the score of religion, provided he were fit for it in other respects. I made everything independent of religion."¹⁹⁸¹

In August of 1806, the Venetian representative of the Viennese Court stated that the assembly of the Notables of France and Italy "aimed at the realization of far-reaching plans and 'even to the gathering of the Jews in a particular Kingdom'."¹⁹⁸² On 24 September 1806, Metternich wrote to Standion of Napoleon, the Messiah,

"The impulse has been given: the Israelites of all the lands have their eyes turned to the Messiah who seems to free them from the yoke under which they find themselves; the aim of so many sentences (as it is only that much) is not at all to give full licence to the citizens professing this religion in the lands submitted to French rule, but the desire to prove to the whole nation that its real fatherland is France."¹⁹⁸³

If France were to become the Jewish homeland, as Napoleon desired after his failure to take Palestine for the Jews, that would have made Napoleon the King of the Jews, the Jewish Messiah—the "anti-Christ". Napoleon's uncle, Cardinal Joseph Fesch, purportedly said to him,

"Do you want indeed to bring about the end of the world? Do you not know that the Holy Scriptures predict the end of the world for the moment when the Jews will be recognized as a corporate nation?"¹⁹⁸⁴

Israel Jacobson published *Les premiers pas de la nation juive vers le bonheur sous des auspices du Grand Monarque Napoléon*, Paris, (1806); which treated of Napoleon as if he were the Messiah.

8.7.3.2 Hitler Accomplishes for the Zionists What Napoleon Could Not

Later, the Nazis, with their dictator, and the Bolsheviks, with their many dictators, sought to destroy all religions in Europe—sought to destroy Europe, itself. Hitler called for a millennium of Nazism. Much of this revolutionary and nihilistic fervor in Europe stemmed from the Reformation as a revolution against Catholic corruption

and in this period revolutions were commonly justified based upon scripture.¹⁹⁸⁵ The Illuminati sought revolution, the elimination of private property and religion. Even more revolutionary and nihilistic was the Jewish reformatory movement of Frankism.¹⁹⁸⁶ This Jewish sect encouraged its members to join other religions in order to destroy them—to become leaders in government in order to subvert society—to practice the mafia creed of *Omerta* silence and to lie and deceive.

Hitler, whose political career in many ways reflects Napoleon's and in many ways was the polar opposite of Napoleon's though meant to fulfill the same ends Napoleon failed to achieve—Hitler tells us of his apocalyptic visions that Nature might have chosen the Jews. The pledge of a thousand year empire, *ein tausendjähriges Reich*, is reminiscent of the prophesy of the millennium of Christ (*Revelation 20:1-7*). Hitler, the Bolshevik who did what he could do to destroy Europe—Hitler, who ultimately called on the German People to admit their defeat and kill themselves at the close of the war in Europe, who wrote in *Mein Kampf*, after complaining of the francophilia of the Viennese press and stating that Zionism had convinced him to finally accept anti-Semitism, Hitler stated,

“Just once more — and this was the last time — fearful, oppressive thoughts came to me in profound anguish.

When over long periods of human history I scrutinized the activity of the Jewish people, suddenly there rose up in me the fearful question whether inscrutable Destiny, perhaps for reasons unknown to us poor mortals, did not with eternal and immutable resolve, desire the final victory of this little nation.

Was it possible that the earth had been promised as a reward to this people which lives only for this earth?

Have we an objective right to struggle for our self-preservation, or is this justified only subjectively within ourselves?

As I delved more deeply into the teachings of Marxism and thus in tranquil clarity submitted the deeds of the Jewish people to contemplation, Fate itself gave me its answer.

The Jewish doctrine of Marxism rejects the aristocratic principle of Nature and replaces the eternal privilege of power and strength by the mass of numbers and their dead weight. Thus it denies the value of personality in man, contests the significance of nationality and race, and thereby withdraws from humanity the premise of its existence and its culture. As a foundation of the universe, this doctrine would bring about the end of any order intellectually conceivable to man. And as, in this greatest of all recognizable organisms, the result of an application of such a law could only be chaos, on earth it could only be destruction for the inhabitants of this planet.

If, with the help of his Marxist creed, the Jew is victorious over the other peoples of the world, his crown will be the funeral wreath of humanity and this planet will, as it did millions' of years ago, move through the ether devoid of men.

Eternal Nature inexorably avenges the infringement of her commands.

Hence today I believe that I am acting in accordance with the will of the Almighty Creator: *by defending myself against the Jew, I am fighting for the work of the Lord.*"¹⁹⁸⁷

Jewish Dualists believed that the millenium could be brought about by committing monumental acts of evil. They believed that by betraying the Jewish People, as Judas betrayed Jesus—Jew betrayed Jew, anti-Semitic Jews could fulfill the Jewish prophecies. They believed in Hitler.

English Protestant Zionists, vile traitors under the direction and influence of Jewish Zionist financiers, planned the destruction of European society, which they planned would result in the “restoration of the Jews to Palestine” and the downfall of Christianity—ultimately the destruction of Heaven and Earth by fire. The Socialist ideology that almost brought this about was promoted by the anti-Semite Karl Marx and his good friend, the eager assimilationist—turned anti-Semite—turned racist Zionist, Moses Hess—who, together with Ghillany, Bauer, and others, provided the anti-Semitic Socialistic dogma that gave rise to Dühring and eventually to Adolf Hitler. Such Socialists had always used anti-Semitism to bring themselves into power and their goal was always to destroy the social institutions of Europe to make it ripe for revolution, which revolution would emancipate the Jews, then expel them to Palestine.

In 1749, with the English Revolution of 1688 against Catholicism in fairly recent memory, Hartley had iterated these goals in three corollaries to his 83rd Proposition in the second volume of his *Observations on Man*:

“C O R . 1. May not the two Captivities of the *Jews*, and their two Restorations, be Types of the first and second Death, and of the first and second Resurrections?

C O R . 2. Does it not appear agreeable to the whole Analogy both of the Word and Works of God, that the *Jews* are Types both of each Individual in particular, on one hand, and of the whole World in general, on the other? May we not therefore hope, that, at least after the second Death, there will be a Resurrection to Life eternal to every Man, and to the whole Creation, which groans, and travails in Pain together, waiting for the Adoption, and glorious Liberty, of the Children of God?

C O R . 3. As the Downfal of the *Jewish* State under *Titus* was the Occasion of the Publication of the Gospel to us Gentiles, so our Downfal may contribute to the Restoration of the *Jews*, and both together bring on the final Publication and Prevalence of the true Religion; of which I shall treat in the next Proposition. Thus the Type, and the Thing typified, will coincide; the First-fruits, and the Lump, be made holy together.”

Hartley called for the destruction of the Christian Temple—principally *Roman* Catholicism. Jews hated Romans and that hatred carried over to the Pope and Catholicism. Gustaf Dalman wrote of the Talmud, which is riddled with hateful comments,

“In the Talmud no people have a name so hated as the Romans, who destroyed the Jews’ holy city and took from them the last remnant of independence.”¹⁹⁸⁸

In Proposition 84, Hartley calls for a Christian diaspora to serve the interests of the Jews by spreading Jewish monotheism to all the peoples of the Earth and by making it easy for the Jews to monopolize trade and take all the wealth of the Gentiles, which objectives fulfill Jewish Messianic prophecy,

“Fifthly, The Downfal of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Powers, mentioned in the 81st and 82d Propositions, must both be attended with such public Calamities, as will make Men serious, and also drive them from the Countries of *Christendom* into the remote Parts of the World, particularly into the *East* and *West-Indies*; whither consequently they will carry their Religion now purified from Errors and Superstitions.

Sixthly, The Restoration of the *Jews*, mentioned in the last Proposition, may be expected to have the greatest Effect in alarming Mankind, and opening their Eyes. This will be such an Accomplishment of the Prophecies, as will vindicate them from all Cavils. Besides which, the careful Survey of *Palæstine*, and the neighboring Countries, the Study of the *Eastern* Languages, of the Histories of the present and antient Inhabitants, &c. (which must follow this Event) when compared together, will cast the greatest Light upon the Scriptures, and at once prove their Genuineness, their Truth, and their Divine Authority.”

Hartley concludes his many fallacies by asserting that Christendom should rejoice in its own deliberate self-destruction and the annihilation of the Earth, because destroying itself proves its faith in, and the truth of, the Jews’ prophecies, by artificially and willfully bringing them about,

“One ought also to add, with St. *Peter*, as the practical Consequence of this Proposition, that the Dissolution of this World by Fire is the strongest Motive to an Indifference to it, and to that holy Conversation and Godliness, which may fit us for *the new Heavens, and new Earth*.”

The Dispensationalist “Christians” are the modern version of the Hartleys and the Newtons. They have nuclear bombs at their disposal and intend to bring about the destruction of life on Earth in the vain and suicidal hope that Jesus will fabricate them a new heaven and Earth. These religious fanatics are a menace to mankind and are under the direct control of modern Jewish leadership, who have fabricated their mythologies and promoted them. They are slaves to Israel who intend to deliberately destroy humankind. They are psychopathic and have no sympathy for others, nor respect for the self-determination of others, nor any regard for human life. They are the ideal slaves of Israel.

It is interesting that the New Testament contains in its creed the seeds of the self-

destruction of the enemies of the Jews prophesied in the Old Testament, and converts the enemies of the Jews to a mythology that results in their own demise (*see, for example: Romans 11*). The apocalyptic book of *Enoch* contains many of the mythologies found in the apocalyptic aims of “Christian” Zionists, who seem to wish to stamp out the “seed of Cain”¹⁹⁸⁹—the seed of the fair—the seed of the European Gentiles. Hartley and countless others readied Christians to joyfully accept war and their own extermination.

History’s most highly regarded theological expert on Judaism, Johannes Buxtorf alleged that Jews were readying to destroy Christianity and to take the Christians remaining after the devastation as slaves—as is prophesied in the Old Testament, in the apocalyptic books of Qumran, and in the Talmud and Cabalistic writings. Buxtorf reiterated the intentions of some Jews as told in the 14th Century Jewish author Machir of Toledo’s (this is perhaps a false name and the work may have been fabricated by Turkish Jews) *Avkat Rokhel*, Constantinople/Istanbul, (1516). Machir’s *Avkat Rokhel* was and is a very influential work, which was translated from Hebrew to Yiddish, and which has been republished many times in both Hebrew and Yiddish. The Jews wrote of Hitler and the persecutions of the Third Reich centuries before they came about. The Zionists put Adolf Hitler into power to fulfil these plans. The Jews also wrote of world government and of the league of nations following world war, centuries before they came about. The Zionists have agitated for both World Wars in order to fulfil these plans, and are today agitating for a Third World War.

The book of I *Enoch* taught Jews many apocalyptic lessons. It is interesting to note that being victims of oppressive laws, Jews had experience with “excessive laws, tyrannical rulers,” etc. and one is struck by how these methods were applied by Bolsheviks and Nazis under Zionist control, and are today used against the Palestinians in the illegally occupied territories. Some Jewish writers knew that such oppression could make peoples lackadaisical, defeatist and lose their will to fight back, or be involved in politics, which they would degrade into vicious combat—especially vulnerable were peoples who had been conditioned by Jewish mythology to welcome their own demise, like Christians were conditioned to exterminate themselves by vile traitors like David Hartley. Jewish writers told that chemical and biological weapons, as well as environmental degradation and psychological warfare, would decimate Gentiles and apostate Jews, while antidotes spared pious Jews, who prospered from the destruction of their neighbors. Jewish writers predicted dictators like Napoleon and Hitler who would ask their people to worship them as gods—there being no better means to defeat Roman Catholicism in Europe. Jewish writers often spoke of the extermination of assimilatory Jews, like those of Europe in the mid-Twentieth Century.

Buxtorf, a renowned expert on Judaism and the life of the Jews who were his contemporaries, and with whom he had an extensive correspondence (his son corresponded with Manasseh ben Israel), wrote in his *Synagoga Judaica: Das ist Jüden Schul ; Darinnen der gantz Jüdische Glaub und Glaubensubung. . . grundlich erkläret*, Basel, (1603), as translated in the 1657 English edition, *The Jewish Synagogue: Or An Historical Narration of the State of the Jewes, At this Day Dispersed over the Face of the Whole Earth*, Printed by T. Roycroft for H. R. and

Thomas Young at the Three Pidgeons in Pauls Church-Yard, London, (1657),
(margin notes appear here in {braces}):

“CHAP. XXXVI.

Touching the Jews Messias who is yet for to come.

THat a Messias was promised unto the Jews, they all with one mouth acknowledge; hereupon petitioning in their daily prayers that he would come quickly; before the houreglass of their life be run out. The only scruple is of the time when, and the state in which he shall appear.

They generally beleeve, that this their future Messias shall be a simple man, yet nevertheless far exceeding the whole generation of mortals in all kinde of vertues: who shall marry a wife and beget children, to sit upon the throne of his kingdom after him. When therefore the Scripture mentioneth a twofold Messias, the one plain, poor, and meek, subject to the stroke of death: the other illustrious, powerful, highly advanced and exalted: the Jews forge unto themselves two of the same sort, one which they call by the name of Messias the son of *Joseph* that poor and simple one, yet an experienced and valiant leader for the warrs; Another whom they entitle Messias the son of *David* that true Messias who is to be king of Israel, and to rule over them in their own land. About whose coming they are among themselves altogether disagreeing.

Those ancient Jews who lived before Christs incarnation, did not much miss the marke, when *Elias* said that the world should continue six thousand years, whereof two thousand were to be void and without force, that is, without the law of God, the other two thousand under the law: and the last under the Messias.

Their hope was therefore this, that foure thousand years after the worlds creation fully expired, their Messias should come in the flesh: in which their errour was small or none at all; for according to the vulgar account of us Christians, Christ the true Messias was borne in the 3963. year of the world, but according to the Jews computation in the year 3761, we and they differing 202 years. And now because Christ came not unto them in great power, a king of glorious state (such as were *David* and *Solomon*) to deliver them from the tyranny of that usurping *Herod*, and Roman cruelty, neither with a rod of iron to break in pieces and destroy their enemies: but only began his kingdom over them with the spiritual scepter of his doctrine, even for this very cause they would not receive him for the true Messias, though some few did acknowledge and embrace him, and at that time the most ancient and approved men amongst them did expect his coming: {Luk. 2.25.} thus we finde a *Simeon* waiting for the consolation of Israel, {Ib. v. 38.} and *Anna* that old Prophetess speaking of him to all that hoped for deliverance in Jerusalem. The very same that the Apostle *Paul* witnesseth in his Epistle to

the *Romans*, {Rom. 11.5.} that though the Jews were most ingrateful, *yet is there a remnant of them according to the election of grace*. Yea, when all kingly power, sacerdotal honour and dignity was taken from them, the city Jerusalem made a ruinous heap, and their beauty the temple turned into ashes, every one now begins to suspect the time of the coming of the Messiah to be past. Hence it was that in the 52. years after the destruction of the Temple, a certain proud and haughty Jew boasting that he was the true Messiah, feared not to affirme himself the same of whom *Balaam* prophesied in these words: {Num. 24.17, 18.} *I shall see him, but not now, I shall behold him, but not nigh: there shall come a star out of Jacob, and a Scepter shall rise out of Israel, and he shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth. And Edom shall be a possession, Seir also shall be a possession for his enemies, and Israel shall do valiantly*. Others understood this prophesie of the then newly begun kingdom of the Christians. But the Jews even at this day determine their Messiah as yet to come, and to fulfil those things which *Balaam* foretold, according to their substance. That the said Jew should proclaim himself the Messiah, was most grateful unto them: who presently in their own conceits can nourish hopes, that they should become the conquerours of the Romans, who a little before had destroyed their City and Temple. This Seducer following the letter of the prophesie, names himself, *Ben Chocab*, which is by interpretation, the son of a Star. His chief follower, who at the very first clave unto him, was *Rabbi Akibha*, a man of great learning, who had under his tuition twenty four thousand Scholars, proclaiming him to be *Malka Meschiccha*, Christ the King. By this means much people went after him; insomuch, that he chused unto himself the City *Bittera* for the seat of his kingdom. But when that *Adrian* the Roman Emperour, had after a siege of three years and an half taken and killed this their Messiah, and together with this beautiful Star had miserably slaughtered more then four hundred thousand Jews, then the remnant of so great a massacre perceiving themselves led astray by this their Star, turn Anabaptists, and call him from that day to this *Barcozabh*, that is, the son of a lye, a lying and bastardly Messiah. Yet neverthelesse, many since have lived who would be reputed for the Messiah, as you may read in a book called *Schebhet Jehudah**. {*Schebet Jehudah*, the tribe of Judah. A historical book of the many afflictions, martyrdoms of the Iews, as also of their disputes with the Christians in *Spain*, and *Italy*. It was printed at *Crncovia* in Germany. An. d.1591.}

The issue of all is this; that the Jews convicted in their own consciences, will they, nill they, [willy nilly] are forced to confesse that the time in which the Messiah was to come, is already past.

When therefore they had despised and rejected Christ the true Messiah, and no other appeared, they falsified the above mentioned tradition of *Elias* (which was that the Messiah should come about the four thousandth year of the world) by annexing unto it this Comment; that the time was prolonged for their offences. But when at length no reason could be pretended of this long

delay, neither could they define the time of his coming: their onely evasion is, to smite with this curse the head of him that should determine a certain season for his coming, *Tippach ruchan atzman schel mechasschebbe Kitzin**, {Sanhedrin c.ii.p.97.} *Which is, Let their soul and body burst with a swelling Rupture, who peremptorily set down the time; that time (I say) in which the Messiah is expressly for to come. Yet this not at all pondered, and nothing set by, many of them moved by the prophesies of the men of God concerning the coming of the Messiah, have in their souls and consciences confessed, that the time of his coming was already past; and therefore in their writings they acknowledge that he is born indeed; but for their sins and impenitent life, not as yet revealed. And at this instant all the Jews dwelling amongst us are of the same opinion. Hereupon Rabbi Solomon Jarchi saith, that according to their ancestors, the Messiah was born in that day in which Ierusalem was last of all destroyed, but where he hath so long been hid, to be uncertain. Some of them think that he lies in Paradise, bound to the womans hair, grounding upon these words in the Song of Solomon: {Cant. 7.5.} Thy head upon thee is like Carmel, and the hair of thy head like purple, the King is bound in the Galleries. By King understanding the Messiah, and by Galleries, paradise. Rabbi Solomon follows this exposition of these ancient Rabbines. The Talmudists write, {Sanhedrin c.ii. p. 98.} that he lies in Rome under a gate among sick folks and Lepers, perswaded by the words of Esay [Isaiah], who saith, {Esay 53.3.} that he is one despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief. Others forge other lies and tales.*

Well, let all these things fall out according to their own desire; yet they still believe he is to come. {The miracles before Christs coming.} First then before his coming shall happen ten notable miracles, by which every one shall be admonished and incited to an accurate preparation for his coming, and also be warned to conceive that he shall not come so poor and privately as Christ came. These ten miracles I mean here to present in the same words that the Rabbines have commended them to posterity, in a little book called *Abkas Rochel*. {*Abkas rochel pulvis aromatarius*, the author *Rimchar* a little book in *octavo* it hath 3 parts, the first of the miracles, before the coming of the *Messias*, two of the soule, and the state of it after this life. The third of *Moses* his tradition about Mount Sinai, mans creation, &c. It was printed at *Venice anno Dom. 1597.*}

The first miracle, God shall stirr up and produce three kings, who proving traitors to their own faith, shall also turn Apostates: so living before men as though they served the true God: yet in very deed practising nothing less; seducing silly souls, and after such a manner tormenting their consciences, that they may abjure God and their own faith, even so that many of the sinners of Israel shall utterly despair of redemption, being ready to deny God, and forsake his fear. Concerning these things *Isaiah* speaketh, c. 59. 14,15. *Judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off; for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter, yea truth faileth. What? All they why shall love the truth shall flee in troops, and flying hide themselves*

in the caves and holes of the earth, and shall be massacred by the great, and mighty, and tyrannical persecutors. At that time shall be no king in Israel, as it is written. {Hos. 3.4.} *The children of Israel shall abide many dayes without a King, and without a Prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an Image, and without an Ephod, and without a Teraphin:* There shall not be any more *Rosch Ieschibhah (b) {Jascbhah. [***] a Synagogue from [***] to sit or rest.}* that is head of the Synagogue, no faithful teachers who may feed the people with the word of God, no merciful and holy, no famous and eminent persons shall remain. The heaven shall be shut up and food shall fail; these three kings shall enact laws so many, so burdensome, and so tyrannical, pronounce such heavie judgments upon men, that but a very few shall be left, because they had rather die, then living deny their maker. Yet these three kings by Gods ordinance and disposition shall only reign three moneths.

In the time of their reign, they shall double the ordinary tribute, so that who formerly paid only eight pieces only eight pieces, shall then pay eighty, he who formerly paid ten, shall then be forced to give an hundred. He that hath nothing at all to give, shall be punished with the loss of his head: yea also, the longer they shall reign, the greater and heavier will the burdens be which they shall impose upon the children of Israel. There shall also come certain men from the ends of the earth, so black and abominable, that if any man look upon them he will die through fear. Every one of them shall have two heads, and eight eyes, shining like a flame of fire. They shall run as nimbly and swiftly as an hart. Then shall Israel cry out, woe unto us, woe unto us, the frighted little ones cry alas alas, dear father what shall we doe? then shall the father answer, the deliverance of Israel is now at hand, and even at the door.

{The second miracle.} The second miracle, God shall make the sun to exceed in heat, that many burning feavers, plagues, and other diseases shall be scattered abroad upon the earth, by reason of which, a thousand thousand of the Gentiles and people of the world shall die daily. Hereupon, the Gentiles at length weeping, shall bitterly cry out, woe and alas whither shall we turn our selves? where shall we hide us? Thus with expedition they shall goe and dig their own graves, wish for death, and oppressed with thirst and grief, hide themselves in the Caves and Dens of the Earth. But this great heat shall be as physick and a refreshing to them that are just and good in Israel, as it is written, {Mal. 4.2.} *unto you that fear my name shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings, and ye shall go forth and grow up as calves of the stall;* by this sun of righteousness understanding that in the heavens. {Num. 24.23.} *Balaam (say they) also prophesied of this; saying, alas who shall live when the Lord hath brought it to pass.*

{The third miracle.} The third miracle, God shall make a dew of blood to fall upon the earth: which all Christians and people of the earth thinking to be watery and most delightful, shall take and drink, and drinking die. The Reprobate also in Israel who despaired of redemption, shall also die by drinking of it, but it shall not be hurtful to them who are just among the Jews,

who in true faith firmly cleaving unto God, do persevere in the same, as it is written. {Dan. 12.3.} *They that be just shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turne many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever:* again, the whole world for three dayes space shall be full of blood; according to that which is written: {Joel 2.30.} *I will give signes in heaven and in earth, blood and fire and pillars of smoke.*

{The fourth miracle.} The fourth miracle, God shall send a wholesome dew upon the earth. They shall drink of this who are indifferent honest: It shall serve as a salve to them who were made sick by drinking of the former, as it is written. {Hos. 14.5.} *I will be as a dew to Israel, he shall grow as the lillie, and cast forth his root as Lebanon.*

{The fifth miracle.} The fifth miracle. God shall turn the sune into so thick a darkness, that it shall not shine for the space of thirty dayes, as it is written, *The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come.* At the end of thirty dayes God shall restore its light; as it is written, {Es. 24.22.} *They shall be gathered as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in prison, and after many dayes they shall be visited.* The Christians being sore afraid to see these things, they shall be confounded with shame, and acknowledg that all these things come to pass for Israels sake: yea, many of them shall embrace the Jewish religion: as it is written, {Jon. 2.8.} *They that observe lying vanities forsake their own mercy.*

{The sixth miracle.} The sixth miracle, God shall permit the kingdom of *Edom* (to whit that of the Romans) to bear rule over the whole world. One of whose Emperours shall reign over the whole earth nine moneths, who shall bring many great kingdoms to desolation, whose anger shall flame towards the people of Israel, exacting a great tribute from them, and so bringing them into much misery and calamity. Then shall Israel after a strange manner be brought low and perish, neither shall they have any helper: of this time *Esay* prophesied, {Esa. 59.16.} *And he saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor: therefore his arm brought salvation unto him.* After the expiration of these nine moneths, God shall send the *Messias son of Joseph*, who shall come of the stock of *Joseph*, whose name shall be *Nehemiah*, the son of *Husiel*. He shall come with the stem of *Ephraim*, *Benjamin* and *Manasses*; and with one part of the sons of *Gad*. As soon as the Israelites shall hear of it, they shall gather unto him out of every City and nation, as it is written: {Jer. 3.14.} *Turn ye backsliding children saith the Lord, for I will reign over you, I will take you one of a City, and two of a tribe, and bring you to Sion.*

Then shall *Messias* the son of *Joseph*, make great war against the king of *Edom*, or the *Pope of Rome*, and being conqueror shall kill a great part of his army, and also cut the throat of the king of *Edom*, make desolate the Roman Monarchie, bring back some of the holy vessels to Jerusalem, which are treasured up in the house of *Ælianus*. Moreover the king of Egypt shall enter into league with Israel, and shall kill all the men inhabiting about Jerusalem,

Damascus, and Ascalon: which thing once noised over the whole earth, a horrid dread and astonishment shall overwhelm the inhabitants thereof.

{The Seventh miracle.} The seventh miracle. They say that at *Rome* there is a certain piece of marble, in shape resembling a Virgin, so framed and fashioned, not by mans workmanship, but by the Lords hand. To this Image shall all the wicked livers in the world gather themselves, and burning in lust towards it, shall commit incest with it. Hereupon, in the same marble will the Lord forme an infant, which by a certain rupture shall issue out of it. This infant shall be called *Armillus Harascha*, *Armillus* the wicked, and shall be the same which the Christians call Antichrist. His length and bredth shall be tenn els, the space betwixt his eyes and the palm cross wise. His hollow eyes red, his hair yellow like gold, the soles of his feet green; and to make his deformity compleat, he shall have two heads. He coming to the wicked king of Rome, shall affirm himself to be the *Messias* and god of the Romans, to whom they easily give credit: and make him king over them. All the sons of *Esau* shall love and stick fast unto him. He shall bring under his yোক the whole Roman Monarchie, and to all *Esaus* ofspring glorying in the name of Christian, he shall say, bring me the law which I gave unto you. Which they shall presently deliver, together with their book of Common-prayer, which he shall receive as true and legitimate, acknowledging that he gave that law and book unto them, desiring that they will beleve in him.

These things once finished, he shall send his Embassadors to Jerusalem to *Nehemiah* the son of *Husiel*, and to all the Congregation of Israel; with this mandate to bring their law unto him: and confess him to be God: At the report of this, fear and wonder assault their souls: and *Nehemias* accompanied with three hundred thousand voluntiers of the tribe of *Ephraim*, carrying also the book of the law with him, shall come unto *Armillus*, and out of it read him this sentence, {Exod. 20.} *I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have none other Gods before me.* To whom *Armillus* making answer, shall deny any such sentence to be extant in their law, and that therefore they ought to acknowledg him for a God, following the example of the Christians, and other people of the earth. Then shall *Nehemiah* the son of *Husiel* in that instant command his followers to binde *Armillus*, and entering the field with thirty thousand armed Nobles, shall put to the sword two hundred thousand of his assistants. For this cause *Armillus* greatly enraged, shall gather together all his forces in a deep valley to fight against Israel, and to destroy no small number of *Jacobs* posterity. There shall *Messias* the son of *Joseph* breath his last, whom the holy Angels shall take, hide, and casket up with other Patriarks of the world. The Israelites shall be struck with such astonishment, their hearts shall fleet like water; but *Armillus* himself shall not know of the death of their *Messias*, who otherwise would not leave one of them alive.

Then shall all the Nations of earth banish the Jews out of their dominions, no way permitting them any longer to be their co-inhabitants. Moreover, such trouble and distresse shall at that time perplex the Jews, as hath not been

from the beginning of the world.

{The coming of Michael.} Then shall *Michael* come and fan away the wicked in *Israel*, as it is written; {Dan. 12.1.} *At that time shall Michael stand up, the great Prince, which standeth for the children of thy people, and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time.* Then the remnant shall flee into the wilderness, where God shall try and purge them after the same manner that silver and gold is tried in the Furnace. For the Lord saith, {Exek. 20.38.} *I will purge out from among you the Rebels, and them that transgresse against me.* And again, {Dan. 12.10.} *Many shall be purified, made white, and tryed; but the wicked shall do wickedly, and none of the wicked shall understand: but the wise shall understand.* Then shall the whole remainder of *Israel* be in the wilderness for forty five days, the chief of their fare being grasse, leaves, and herbs; and that Scripture shall be fulfilled in their ears, {Hos. 2.14.} *I will allure her, and bring her into the wilderness, and speak comfortably unto her.* The truth of this appears out of that of the Prophet, *From the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate, set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety dayes. Blessed is he that cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty dayes. But goe thee thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in the lot at the end of the dayes.*

Conceive that forty five being added to the precedent number of ninty, the last number of 1335 daies doth arise. In that time all the wicked in *Israel* shall perish; who are unworthy to be copartners in such a deliverance. Finally, *Armillus* invading *Egypt* with great power shall subdue it, as it is written: {Dan. 11.42.} *The land of Egypt shall not escape.* From *Egypt* he shall muster his forces for *Jerusalem*, striving with might and main once more to make it a desolate heap. {Dan. 11.45.} *And he shall plant the tabernacle of his palace, between the Seas, in the glorious holy mountain, yet he shall come to his end, and shall help him.*

{The eighth miracle.} The eighth miracle. The Archangel *Michael* shall arise, and shall thrice winde a mighty trumpet, as it is written; {Jsa. 27.13.} *It shall come to pass in that day, that the great trumpets shall be blowen, and they shall come that were ready to perish in the land of Assyria, and the outcasts in the land of Egypt, and shall worship the Lord in the holy mount at Jerusalem.* Again, {Zech. 9.14.} *The Lord God shall blow the trumpet, and shall goe with the whirlwinds of the South.* At the sound of this trumpet the true *Messias the son of David*, and the Prophet, *Elias* shall appear and manifest themselves to the devout *Israelites* inhabiting the wilderness of *Judea*. Then shall they receive encouragement, the weary hands shall be lifted up, and strength shall visit the feeble knees. All the *Jews* also wheresoever dispersed over the whole earth shall hear the sound of the trumpet, and at last confess, that God in mercy hath visited his people, and by a plenary deliverance hath been gracious to his inheritance, and all the captives of *Ashur* shall be gathered together. But the sound of this trumpet shall blast the

Christians and people of the world with fear and astonishment, casting them into horrid maladies, Then shall the Jews gird up their loins, and with many a weary journey seek to revisit their Jerusalem. *Messias* also the son of *David*, together with his harbinger *Elias*, and all the faithful his followers in Israel with great joy shall come into Jerusalem. So soon as this pierceth the ears of wicked *Armillus*: he will babble out, how long will this abject and base people thus behave themselves? and shall once more with a great army of Christians hasten to Jerusalem to give battle to their newly inaugurated sovereign. But God shall not permit that the Israelites should fall out of the fire into the pit, but speaking unto the *Messias* shall say unto him, Come thou and sit at my right hand, and to the children of Israel, sit you still, hold your peace, and quietly expect that great deliverance which the Lord this day will impart unto you. Then shall the Lord rain from heaven fire and brimstone, as it is recorded, {Ezech. 38.22.} *I will plead against him with pestilence, and with blood, and I will rain upon him, and upon his bands, and upon the many people that are with him, an overflowing rain, and great hailstones, fire and brimstone.* Then shall *Armillus* with his whole army die, and the Atheistical Edomites (the Christians they mean) who laid waste the house of our God, and led us captive into a strange land, shall miserably perish; then shall the Jews be revenged upon them, as it is written, {Obad. 18} *The house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau (that is, we Christians, as the Jews interpret, whom they Christen Edomites) shall be for stubble.* This stubble the Jews shall set in fire, that nothing be left to us Edomites which shall not be burnt and turned into ashes.

{The ninth miracle.} The ninth miracle. At the second blast of *Michael* his trumpet being long and loud, all the graves in Jerusalem shall open, and the dead arise, *Messias* also the son of *David* together with *Elias* the Prophet shall restore to life *Messias* that good son of *Joseph* reserved under a certain gate.

At the same time shall all the Congregation of Israel send *Messias* the son of *David* as an Ambassador to the remnant of the Jews superviving the last slaughter, dispersed here and there among the Christians and other people of the earth, to summon them to Jerusalem. Then shall the kings of the nations without delay, carry the Jews inhabiting their quarters, upon their shoulders, and in Chariots unto Sion. I think this will come to pass much about the Greek Calends. {I. never.}

{The tenth miracle.} The tenth miracle. At what time the Angel *Michael* shall blow the trumpet the third time, then shall God bring them forth who border upon the rivers *Gosane Lachlacke*, *Chabore*, and also inhabited the cities of Juda, and they in number infinite and immesurable, together with their infants shall enter into *Moses* Paradise; the earth before and behinde them shall be nothing but a flame of fire, which shall consume all which is needful for the preservation of life among the Christians and other people.

When the ten tribes of Israel shall return out of the land of their captivity, then the pillar of the cloud of the divine glory and majesty shall

encompass them, as it is written: {Micah 2.13.} the breaker up is to come before them: *they have broken up, and have passed through the gate, and are gone out by it, and their king shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them.* Moreover God shall open unto them fountains flowing out of the tree of life, wherewith he shall refresh them in their journey, lest at any time thirst should annoy them. For the Lord saith, {Jsa. 41.18.} *I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of the vallies: I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and dry land springs of water.* Again, {Jsa. 49.10.} *They shall not hunger nor thirst, neither shall the heat nor sun smite them, for he that hath mercy on them, shall lead them, even by the springs of water shall he guide them.* {The Jews ten fould comfort against the foresaid signes.} To comfort them against these ten signes foregoing the coming of the *Messias*, the most of which pretend great calamity and affliction to the Jews, they have a tenfold consolation. {Consol. 1.} The first is, that the *Messias* is certainly yet for to come: according to that of the Prophet, {Zach. 9.9.} *Behold thy king cometh &c.*

{The 2. Cons.} The second that he shall again gather them together being dispersed over the face of the whole earth, as it is written: *I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the coasts of the earth, and with them the blinde and the lame, the women with childe, and her that travelleth with childe together, a great company shall return thither:* From which place we may learn thus much, that if any went unto his grave blind or lame, the same shall God raise up cloathed with the same imperfections: that one may more easily know another, yet the Lord shall so perfectly cure the lame, that they shall skip like Roes, as the Scripture witnesseth, {Esa. 35.6} *Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumbe sing; for in the wilderness shall the waters break out, and streams in the desert.*

{The 3. Cons.} The third is; that God shall raise up the dead: as it is written; *Many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall arise: these to life eternal, they to shame and everlasting contempt.*

{The 4. Cons.} The fourth is, that God shall build them up a third temple, according to that plat-form and fashion which *Ezekiel* hath described *cap. 41. ver. 1, 2, 3.*

{The 5. Cons.} The fift is, that the people of Israel shall be the sole Monarchs of the whole world, their dominion stretching from one end of the earth unto the other, according to that of *Esay* 60.12. *The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish: yea, these nations shall be utterly wasted.* Yea, the whole world being turned unto the Lord shall be subject to his law, as it is recorded, {Zeph. 3.9.} *For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent.*

{The 6. Cons.} The sixth is, that God at that time shall defeat and destroy all the enemies of his people (that is, the Christians) and mightily to revenge himselfe upon them: as it is written, {Ezek. 25.14.} *I will lay vengeance upon*

Edom by the hand of my people Israel, and they shall do in Edom according to mine anger.

{The 7. Cons.} The seventh is, that God shall take away all diseases and maladies from among the people of Israel, according to that; {Jsa. 33.24.} *The inhabitants shall not say I am sick: the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquitie.*

{The 8. Cons.} The eight is, God shall prolong the dayes and yeares of the life of the Israelites. So that they shall live as long as the oake or other of that kinde: {Jsa. 65.22.} *for saith the lord, as the dayes of a tree are the dayes of my people, and my elect shalt long enjoy the works of their hands, and againe, there shall be no more thence an infant of dayes, nor an old man that hath not filled his dayes: for the child shall die an hundred yeares old, but the Sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed,* which is as much as to say, {See *Reschaim* in the Talmud c. 6. p. 68.} if any die at an hundred years of age, it shall be said of him, that he died as a little infant, or in his infancy: for at that time the years of life of the Israelites shall be equal to them of the fathers from *Adam* to *Noah*, as *Abenezra* comments upon the place.

{Ninth Cons.} The ninth is, that God shall so clearly manifest himself to the Israelites, that they shall see him face to face. As it is recorded: {Isa. 40.5.} *The glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see together: because the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.* Yea, all the Lords people shall be Prophets, as it is written: *It shall come to pass afterward that I will powr out my spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesie: your old men shall dream dreams, your yong men shall see visions.*

{Tenth Cons.} The last degree of comfort is, that God shall quite root out of them all imbred lusts, and inclinations unto evil, as it is written: {Ezek. 36.26.} *A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh.* Hitherto we have delivered what we promised out of the book called *Abhkas rochel*, in which though it be summarily set down what the Jews beleve concerning their *Messias*, as also the manner how he is to bring them back to Jerusalem: yet I think not impertinent in this place a litle more largely to declare with what solemnities their *Messias* shal give them intertainment in their own land, and with what happiness and felicitie they shall lead their lives under him.

{The feast which the *Messias* shall make unto the Jews at his coming.} When then the *Messias* hath gathered all the Jews together out of all the nations under heaven and from the foure winds of the earth, and hath brought them unto the land of Canaan flowing with milk and hony; then shall he cause to be prepared a sumptuous and delicate banquet, inviting and friendly welcoming unto it all the Jews with great pomp and joy inexpressible.

At this banquet shall be dished up and served in, the greatest beasts, fishes and fowls that ever God created. The worst wine that they shall drink

shall be whose grape had its growth in paradise, and hath been barrel'd up and reserved in *Adams* Cellar unto that time.

{The first dish. *Behemoth*. Job. 4.10.} The first dish in this feast shall be that huge ox described in the book of *Job*, to be of such great strength and magnitude, named *Behemoth*. This is the Rabbines affirme to be the same ox whereof *David* makes mention in his 50 *Psalms* and 10 verse. *All the beasts of the forrest are mine, and the cattel (Behemoth) feeding on a thousand hills*, that is to say, which every day eateth up the grass of a thousand hills. But a man will aske what at length would have become of this ox, if he had lived so long, seeing he had long since eaten up all his fodder. The Rabbines (a) {(a) *Rabbi Sal: Jarchi, & Rabhuenski.*} learnedly answer that this ox is stall-fed, and remains always in the same place, and that whatsoever he eateth on the day grows again upon the night in the same length and forme.

{The 2. dish. *Leviathan*.} The second dish adorning the table shall be that vast whale, *Leviathan*, (according to the Jewish tone Pronounced Lipiasan) who is also described in the book of *Job*, and mentioned in other places of holy writ.

Concerning these two beasts there hath bin handsomly compiled this tradition by the wit and ingenuity of the solid pated Rabbins in their Talmud, {*Babha Basra*. c. 5. p. 74.} it runs thus, Rabbi Jehudah saith that what thing soever God created in the world he created it male and female, and that without all doubt; for he created the *Leviathan* yet least the he and she *Leviathan*: by engendring should augment the number, and at length by there monstrous magnitude and multitude destroy the whole world, God gelded the male, and killed the female, reserving her in pickle to be meat for them that are just in Judah and feared him, in the dayes of the *Messias*, as it is written: {*Jsa.* 27.1} *In that day will the lord with a sore and great and strong sword punish Leviathan the piercing serpent, even Leviathan that crooked serpent, and he shall slay the dragon that is in the sea.* In the same manner he created that great ox called *Behemoth* feeding on a thousand hills male and female: yet lest by multiplying they might fill and destroy the earth, he gelded the male and killed the female, reserving it for the Jewes diet in time to come, as it is written: {*Job* 40.16.19} *Loe now his strength is in his loynes, and his force in the navell of his belly, he that made him can make his sword to approach unto him.*

{The third dish. *Barinchue*.} The third dish in this banquet as *Elias Levita* in his dictionarie named *Tesbi* out of the Rabbins reports, shall be that horrible huge bird called *Barinchue* which killed and unbowed shall then be roasted. Concerning this bird it is written in the Talmud {*Bechoros* c. ult. p. 57} she cast an Egge out of her nest by whose fall three hundred tall Cedars were broken down, and the Egge breaking in the full drowned three score villages. By this relation it is easie to conceive this bird to have been little inferiour in greatnes to the forementioned ox and fish; whence we may also collect how glorious a dish the *Messias* is to make of it for his guests, and

when there are many such birds (Guls I think) found in the land of Judah, none ought to think that which is reported of this to be fabulous.

{The Crow. *Babha basra*. c. 5. p. 72.} In the forementioned book of the Talmud, we read of a certain great crow which was seen of a Rabbine, worthy to be credited. The relation runs thus. *Rabbi barchannah* saith, At a certain time I saw a frog, which is as great as the village *Akra* in *Hagronia*, well how big was the village? It consisted of no fewer then threescore houses. Then came a mighty serpent and swallowed up this frog. Instantly upon this, a great crow flying that way picked up as a small morsel both the frog and the serpent; and taking him to flight sat upon a Tree, now think with your selves how great and strong this tree must be. To which *Rabbi papa* the son of *Samuel* making answer, unless I had been in the place, and with these mine eyes seen the very tree, I would not have beleaved it. Thus much the Talmudist. Who dare give the lie to this *Rabbine*? When that good man *Kimchi* commenting on the fifty Psalm, {The great bird. *ziz*.} and explaining the word *Ziz* hath there witnessed that *Rabbi Judah* the son of *Simeon* did avouch *Ziz* to be a bird of that bigness, that when he spreads abroad his wings he hides the body of the sun, and wraps the world in darkness. Furthermore, on a certain time, a certain *Rabbine* was upon the sea in a little ship, in the middle of which he saw a bird standing of such an height, that water came only to her knees: {Talmud in the same place.} which the *Rabbine* observing, bespeaks his companions that there they might wash themselves seeing the water was not deep. But a voice from heaven hindred the attempt, saying unto the *Rabbine*, see that thou do it not: for now seven whole years are gone and past, since a certain man let a hatchet fall in this very place, which hath been ever since a falling, and is not as yet come to the bottome. By which a man may easily gather how long legs this bird had, and how great her body ought to be in proportion to her feet. Without doubt these birds keep their residence in the wood *Ela*, in which, a Lion is reported to live of such an unheard of portraicture, that only to relate would strike a man with astonishment. {The great Lion *Chohn*. cap. 3. p. 59.} Of this Lion the Talmud thus fables. When upon a certain time the Emperor of *Rome* asked *Rabbi Joshua* the son of *Hananiah*, what the reason was why their God compared himself unto a Lion; and whether he was of so great strength that he could kill a Lion? the *Rabbine* made answer, that God did not compare himself unto an ordinary Lion, but unto such an one as lived in the wood *Ela*: to whom the Prince replied, shew me that Lion. Then the *Rabbine* by prayer obtained of God that the lion should leave the wood, and come, when hs was yet foure hundred miles distant from the Emperour, he roared so terribly, that all the women with child in *Rome* became abortive, and the walls of the City fell flat unto the ground. When he had come an hundred miles nearer, he the second time roared so fearefully that all the teeth of the Romanes fell out of their heads, & the Emperour falling from his throne, lay prostrate upon the earth half dead; who with vehement entreaties begs of the Rabbin to send back the Lion; which was likewise put in execution. But these fables draw us

too far from the smell of that feast which the Messias hath provided for the Jews in the land of promise.

The flesh of the foresaid Behemoth and Leviathan will not digest well without a Cup of older wine; therefore the Messias shall broach that wine and give it unto his guests, {The wine for the feast.} which was made in Paradise, and was kept from the beginning of the world to that time in *Adams Cellar*, as it is written: {Esa. 27.2.3.} *In that day sing you unto her a vineyard of red wine. I the Lord do keep it, I do water it every moment: lest any hurt it, I will keep it night and day:* again, {Psal. 75.9.} *There is a cup in the hand of the Lord, and the wine thereof is red: it is full mixt; he shall poure it out, and the dregs thereof all the ungodly of the earth shall drink and suck them up.*

{The sports where with the Messias will delight the Jews.} Before the supper be served in, the *Messias* after the manner of Kings, and Princes, and others celebrating Festivals and Marriages, shall present the Jews with pleasant sports and plaies to make them merry. He will cause *Behemoth* and *Leviathan* to meet in some spacious place, and there they shall play before the *Messias* to pass away the time, and for his minds refreshing, as it is written: {Job 40.20.} *Surely the Mountains bring him forth food, where all the beasts of the field play.* And again, {Psal. 104.26.} *There go the ships, there is that Leviathan whom thou hast made to play therein.* Then the ox running hither and thither shall bend his hornes against the *Leviathan*; which will greatly affect the *Messias*, according to that, {Psal. 69.32.} *It will be more grateful to the Lord then a bullock that hath horns and hoofs.* The *Leviathan* also shall come to encounter the ox, armed with his fins as an helmet, not easie to be seen, as it is written: {Job 40.14.15.} *Who can open the doors of his face, his teeth are terrible round about. His scales are his pride, shut up together as with a close seal.* Here shall be the summons to the battle, and the first encounter begin most hot and furious, but to small purpose, for they being of equall strength neither can overcome the other, but at last wearied out both shall fall upon the ground. Then the *Messias* drawing out his sword shall slay them both, as it is written: {Jsa. 27.1.} *At that day will the Lord with a sore, great and strong sword punish Leviathan.*

Now comes the Cooks part, nothing but boyling and roasting: and great provision for this sumptuous supper, as it is recorded: {Esa. 25.6} *The Lord of hosts shall make unto all people in this mountain a feast of fat things, of fat things full of marrow.* The fish shall be served up in parcels to the guests, which done, every one shall greatly rejoyce, as it is written: {Job 41.6} *shall thy companions make a banquet of him? shall they part him among the merchants.*

{The marriage of the Messias} This donative supper being ended, the *Messias* shall marry a wife: the Scripture being witness: {Ps. 45.10.} *Kings daughters were among thy honourable women: upon thy right hand stood the Queen in a vesture of gold.* So the Jews themselves interpret: {*Schegal* [***]} properly signifieth the wife of a King from [***] *Shagal* which is to exercise the very act of ventry.} and the meaning is this, as *Kimchi* professeth in his

great gloss: Among the honourable women which the *Messias* shall have, shall be the daughters of Kings. For every King of the earth shall esteem himself highly graced, so that he may give his daughter in marriage unto the *Messias*. But the genuine and rightly so named wife of the *Messias* (properly signified by the word *Schegal*) shall be one of the most eminent beauties among the daughters of Israel; she shall sit at his right hand, without intermission abide in the Kings closet: whereas the other shall stay in the supping room, or house of the women: not approaching the King, unless it be his pleasure to send for them. In this bond of Wedlock the *Messias* shall beget children; after he shall die as other mortals, and his children shall sit upon his throne after him, as it is written: {Isa. 53.10.} *He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his dayes, and the will of the Lord shall prosper in his hands*, that is, as a *Rabbine* expounds it, The *Messias* shall live to a good old age, and at last shall be brought to his grave with great solemnity: and his son shall reign after him, and after his death his posterity shall possess his seat.

{The manner of life the Jews shall have under their *Messias*.} For the manner of life which the Jews shall have under their *Messias*. First of all the remnant of the Christians and other people which fell not by the hand of the Jews shall make hast and build the Jews houses and Cities, not for hire, but of free accord, till their ground, plant them vineyards, yea, bestow their very goods upon them; moreover Kings and Princes shall be their servants whom they have subdued. They themselves shall be cloathed in costly aray: all their Priests anointed shall be holiness to the Lord; as it is written: {Jsa. 60.10,11,12.} *The sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and their Kings shall minister unto thee: for in my wrath I smote thee, but in mercy have I had favour on thee, therefore thy gates shall be open continually, they shall not be shut day nor night, that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their Kings may be brought, for the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish, yea those nations shall be utterly wasted, and again* {Jsa. 61.5.6.} *strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and all the sons of the alien shall be your plow-men, and your vine-dressers. But you shall be named the Priests of the Lord, men shall call you the Ministers of our God: you shall eat the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory shall you boast your selves.* (Oh here with hunger and thirst how are the Jews opprest? Although some of them satisfie and appease both, without the sweat of their own brows gaining many a million: for which many a poor Christian suffers toile and vexation.)

{The 2 benefit.} 2. They shall have a new and wholesome aire, as it is written: {Jsa. 65.17.} *Behold I create a new heaven and a new earth, the former shall not be thought upon*, by the benefit of this aire they shall enjoy their health and prolong their life, even as the men before the flood. In their hoary old age their strength and agility shall not forsake them, but remain in the same temper as in their youth, as it is written, {Psal. 92.14,15.} *They who are planted in the house of our God, shall flourish in the courts of the Lord, they shall bring forth more fruit in their age, they shall be fat and well liking.*

{The 3 Benefit} 3. The seed once sown shall for ever grow up, increase, and ripen of its own accord: after the manner of Vines which require but one plantation, as it is written, {Hos. 14.8.} *They shall revive as wheat, flourish like a vine, his smell is like Lebanon.*

Whensoever any one shall desire rain for the watering of any particular Field, Garden, or the smallest herb therein, the Lord will pour out upon that place, and on that onely, without delay: for saith the Prophet, *Ask you rain of the Lord, and he shall create lightnings, and give you showres of rain.* Then shall they gather their fruits and wine with great quietnesse and security, and shall not be molested by any enemy: as it is written, The Lord hath sworn by his right hand, and by the arm of his strength, {Isay 62.8,9.} *I will no more give thy corn to be meat for thine enemies, and the sons of strangers shall not drink thy wine for the which thou hast laboured, but they that have gathered it shall eat it.*

{The 4 Benefit} 4. No war nor rumour of war shall any more be heard in the land: and there shall be a firm and secure peace established, not only between man and man, but also between man and beast; as it is written, *I will make a covenant for them in that day with the beasts of the field, with the fowls of heaven, and creeping things of the earth: I will put away the bow and the sword and war from the earth, and make them to sleep secure. And I will espouse thee unto me for ever and ever: I will marry thee in justice and judgement, in mercy and commiseration.* Again, {Esay 11.17.} *The Cow and the Bear shall feed: their young ones shall lie down together, and the Lion shall eat straw with the Ox. The Wolf shall lie down with the Lamb, and the Leopard with the Kid: and the Calf and the young Lion and the fatling together, and a little childe shall lead them.*

{The 5 Benefit} 5. When any war or discord ariseth among the Gentiles, then the Messias shall reconcile them, and renew the league amongst them: so that there shall be no more mutiny; as it is written, {Isay 2.4} *He shall judge among the nations, and rebuke many people; he shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, nor learn war any more.* Then shall the Iews live in everlasting joyes, make new marriages, sing praise and glory to God without ceasing: shall be full of the wisdom and knowledge of the Lord: as it is written, *In this place of which you say that it is forsaken, shall again be heard the voice of joy, the voice of exultation, the voice of the Bride and the Bridegroom, the voice of them that say, Give thanks to the Lord of hosts.* And again, *the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the sea is full of water.*

Briefly, the happiness of this holy people shall at that time be so immeasurable, that neither can the heart of man conceive it, or the tongue yeeld the least expression thereof. Which things thus ordered and declared, leaving the Iewes in this their prosperous estate, I will put a period to my labours, and hide the secret of their faith from the Christians; seeing I have attempted more then they themselves, if they could have ruled the matter,

would have permitted. What I have done already will not be pleasing unto them, in which I have exposed to every mans eye the full anatomy of their life and belief.

The Christian Reader may easily perceive by that which hath been said, that the faith of the Jews and their whole religion, is not grounded upon *Moses*, but upon meer lies, false and forged constitutions, fables of the Rabbines, and inventions of seduced Pharisees. And that therefore it ought no more to issue out of the mouth of a Christian, that the Jewes stand for the Law of *Moses*, but rather with *Jeremy*, {Jer. 8.} that they are strong defendants of the false worship of the true God, not suffering themselves any way to be drawn from it. And with our Saviour to affirm, that {Matth. 15.5} *they make the Commandments of God of none effect by their traditions*; in vain they worship him, when they teach nothing but the mandates of men: honouring him with their lips, but in their hearts are far from him. In their words they professe to know God, but in their works they deny him: {Titus 1.} these are the men whom the Lord abhors, who being disobedient unto his word are unto every good work reprobate, as the Apostle *Paul* hath recorded. By which it is more manifest then the light of the Sun at noontide, that the punishment is now fallen heavie upon them wherewith *Moses* threatened them: that {Deut. 28.} *the Lord should smite them with madnesse, blindnesse, and astonishment of heart, that they should grope at noon day as the blinde gropeth in darknesse*. And this appears most clearly, and is more then evident from this, that they miserably pervert, and contrary to all reason with an impudent front invested with a dull ignorance expound and interpret the word of God.

O merciful God, who hast vouchsafed to impart this gracious favour unto us Christians, that we being warned by such an horrible example of the divine wrath, should with awe and reverence embrace his holy word, lest the same things should befall us, and so our Candlestick should be removed for our ingratitude, God of his mercy grant, that the Sun of his justice may alwayes shine in our hearts until perfect day, and by the illumination of his good Spirit conduct us unto all truth. Amen.”

Interestingly, Charles Taze Russell determined in 1876 that the reign of the Gentile governments would end in 1914—which is the year World War I began—and that the Jews would then take over the world. Russell supposedly made his prediction based on Scripture, and his followers spread his message widely. In an article, “Gentile Times: When Do They End?”, *The Bible Examiner*, Volume 21, Number 1, Whole Number 313, (October, 1876), pp. 27-28; Charles Taze Russell wrote,

“‘Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled.’—Luke 21:24.

Doubtless our Lord intended to communicate to His disciples some

knowledge, and possibly it was addressed more to the disciples in our day, than to the early church.

Let us then search what times the prophecy, which was in Christ, did signify. Of course, if it be one of the secret things of God, we cannot find out; but if a secret, why should Jesus mention it? If, on the contrary, it is revealed it *belongs* to us. Shall we guess and suppose? No: let us go to God's treasure-house; let us search the Scriptures for the key.

Jesus does not *foretell* its treading under foot of the Gentiles, as Rome had her foot upon them at that time. He does tell us, however, how long it will continue so, even the disciples thought 'that it was he which should have DELIVERED Israel.'

We believe that God has given the key. We believe He doeth nothing but he revealeth it unto His servants. Do we not find part of the key in Lev. 26:28, 33 'I, even I will chastise you seven times for your sins: . . . and I will bring your land into desolation . . . and will scatter you among the heathen.' Israel did not hearken unto the Lord, but disobeyed him, and this prophecy is now being fulfilled, and has been since the days of Zedekiah, when God said, 'Remove the diadem, take off the crown, . . . I will overturn, overturn, overturn it, . . . until He comes whose right it is, and I will give it unto Him.' Comparing these Scriptures, we learn, that God has scattered Israel for a period of seven times, or until 'he comes whose right' the Government is, and puts an end to Gentile rule or government. This gives us a clue at least, as to how long until the Jews are delivered. Further, Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, the head of gold, is recognized by God as the representative of the beast, or Gentile Governments. 'A king of kings and wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the air, hath God given into his hand.' Dan. 2:38. God had taken the crown off Zedekiah and declared the Image, of which Nebuchadnezzar is the head, ruler of the world until the kingdom of God takes its place (smiting it on its feet); and, as this is the same time at which Israel is to be delivered, (for 'Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled'), we here get our second clue, viz.: these two events, noted of the Scriptures of truth—'Times of Gentiles,' and 'Treading of Jerusalem,' are parallel periods, commencing at the same time and ending at the same time; and, as in the case of Israel, their degradation was to be for seven times, so with the dominion of the Image; it lasts seven times; for, when in his pride the 'Head of Gold' ignored 'The God of heaven,' the glory of that kingdom (which God gave him, as a representative of the Image,) departed, and it took on its beastly character, which lasts seven times. Dan 4:23—and, (prefigured by the personal degradation for seven years, of Nebuchadnezzar, the representative) until the time comes when they shall acknowledge, and 'give honor to the Most High, whose Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom.' Dan 4:34: for all the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto the Lord when He is the Governor among the nations.

Our next question naturally, is, How long are seven times? Does God in

his word, furnish us any clue from which to determine the length of that period? Yes, in Revelations we learn that three and one-half times, 42 months, and 1260 prophetic days, literal years, are the same (it has for years been so accepted by the church,) and it was so fulfilled: if three and one-half times are 1260 years, seven times would be twice as much, i.e., 2520 years. At the commencement of our Christian era, 606 years of this time had passed, (70 years captivity, and 536 from Cyrus to Christ) which deducted from 2520, would show that the seven times will end in A.D. 1914; when Jerusalem shall be delivered forever, and the Jew say of the Deliverer, 'Lo, this is our God, we have waited for Him and He will save us.' When Gentile Governments shall have been dashed to pieces; when God shall have poured out of his fury upon the nation, and they acknowledge, him King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

But, some one will say, 'If the Lord intended that we should know, He would have told us plainly and distinctly how long.' But, no, brethren, He never does so. The Bible is to be a *light* to God's children;—to the world, foolishness. Many of its writings are solely for *our* edification upon whom the ends of the world are come. As well say that God should have put the gold on top instead of in the bowels of the earth it would be too common; it would lose much of its value. So with truth; but, 'to you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom.

We will ask, but not now answer, another question: If the Gentile Times end in 1914, (and there are many other and clearer evidences pointing to the same time) and we are told that it shall be with fury poured out; at time of trouble such as never was before, nor ever shall be; a day of wrath, etc., how long before does the church escape? as Jesus says, 'watch, that *ye* may be accounted worthy to *escape* those things coming upon the world.'

Brethren, the taking by Christ of His Bride, is evidently, one of the first acts in the Judgment; for judgment must begin at the house of God.

W. Philadelphia."

The World, of New York, wrote on 30 August 1914,

"The terrific war outbreak in Europe has fulfilled an extraordinary prophecy. For a quarter of a century past, through preachers and through press, the 'International Bible Students,' best known as 'Millennial Dawners,' have been proclaiming to the world that the Day of Wrath prophesied in the Bible would dawn in 1914. 'Look out for 1914!' has been the cry of the hundreds of traveling evangelists."¹⁹⁹⁰

Were Cabalistic Jews working with Russell and conditioning Gentiles to surrender their rights to Jews? Did Cabalistic Jews simply time the war based on the same premises as Russell used to arrive at his predictions, or was it the other way around? Cabalistic Jews have long practiced numerology.

Ben Justin Martyr alleged that Jews murdered and defamed Christians from the

very beginning of the Christian movement—as did other sources, including Biblical sources. Gustaf Dalman wrote,

“SINCE everyone has not the writings of Justin at hand, we venture to offer some important extracts from them bearing on this subject. We quote in accordance with the edition of J. C. Th. Otto, Jena, 1843:—‘The Jews regard us as foes and opponents, and kill, and torture us, if they have the power. In the lately-ended Jewish war Bar Kokh’ba, the instigator of the Jewish revolt, caused Christians alone to be dragged to terrible tortures, whenever they would not deny and revile Jesus Christ [*Footnote: Apology*, i. chap. 31.]’ ‘The Jews hate us, because we say that Christ is already come, and because we point out that He, as had been prophesied, was crucified by them [*Footnote: Ibid.* chap. 36.]’—‘Therefore we pray both for you Jews and for all other men who hate us, that you place yourselves in company with us, and against those, whom His works, and the miracles now still wrought through the invoking of His Name, and His teaching, as well as the prophecies concerning Him as wholly undefiled and blameless, all unite to admonish that they should vomit forth no revilings against Jesus Christ, but believe on Him [*Footnote: Dialogue with Trypho*, chap. 35.]’ ‘The high-priests of your nation and your teachers have caused that the name of Jesus should be profaned and reviled through the whole world [*Footnote: Ibid.* chap. 117.]’—‘Ye have killed the Just and His prophets before Him. And now ye despise those, who hope in Him and in God, the King over all and Creator of all things, who has sent Jesus; ye despise and dishonour them, as much as in you lies, in that in your synagogues ye curse those who believe in Christ. Ye only lack the power, on account of those who hold the reins of government, to treat us with violence. But as often as ye have had this power, ye have also done this [*Footnote: Ibid.* chap. 16.]’ ‘In your synagogues ye curse all who have become Christians, and the same is done by the other nations, who give a practical turn to the curse, in that when any one merely acknowledges himself a Christian, they put him to death [*Footnote: Dialogue with Trypho*, chap. 96.]’ ‘Nay, ye have added thereto, that Christ taught those impious, unlawful, horrible actions, which ye disseminate as charges above all, against those who acknowledge Christ as Teacher and as the Son of God [*Footnote: Ibid.* chap. 108.]’ ‘Yet revile not the Son of God, and hearken not to the Pharisees as teachers, that after prayer ye should ill-treat the King of Israel with scoffs, as they have been taught you by the rulers of the synagogue [*Footnote: Ibid.* chap. 137.]’—‘As far as depends on you and the rest of mankind, each Christian is driven not only from his possession, but completely out of the world: ye permit no Christian to live [*Footnote: Ibid.* chap. 110.]’—‘Your hand is stretched out for ill-doing. For instead of experiencing repentance for having put Christ to death, ye hate us who through Him believe on God and the Father of all things, and ye put us to death as often as ye have the power, and ye continually curse Christ and His adherents, whereas we all pray for you as in general for all men’ (after the

wording of Matt. v. 44; Luke vi. 27 f.) [*Footnote: Ibid.* chap. 133.],—‘Your teachers exhort you to permit yourselves no conversation whatever with us [*Footnote: Ibid.* chap. 112.].’—‘There does not press upon other nations so heavy an offence against us and Christ as upon you, who are the originators of the preconceived evil opinion, which the nations cherish concerning Christ and us, His disciples. For since ye have attached Him the only blameless and righteous One to the Cross, ye have not only made no amends for your atrocious action, but at that time ye sent forth chosen men from Jerusalem, to proclaim throughout the world, that there is a new sect, namely, the Christians, arisen, which reverence no God, and to spread abroad what all who know us not maintain concerning us. It was your most earnest endeavour that bitter, dark, unjust charges should be put into circulation throughout the whole world against that sole spotless and righteous Light, which was sent from God to men [*Footnote: Ibid.* chap. 17.].’—‘The Jews make war against the Christians as against a foreign nation, and the Greeks (*i.e.* the Gentiles) persecute them; but their enemies can allege no ground of hostility [*Footnote: Letter to Diognetus*, chap. 5.].’¹⁹⁹¹

One can expect that when the Jews anoint their Messiah, he will be especially vicious to Christians, because he will resent their belief that Jesus was the Messiah and not him.

In 1802, in the context of Hartley’s and Napoleon’s Zionism, Johann Gottfried Herder believed that Hartley and his ilk were trying to “restore the Jews to Palestine” in order to make the world safe for a Jewish monopolization of trade among the Continents, because Palestine itself could not provide the Jews with the great wealth they needed to fund the dominance Hartley had planned for them. If the Christians were ruined and dispersed, as Hartley planned, Judaized “Christian” settlements could provide the Jews with infrastructure around the world, and Christian armies could “civilize” and dominate lands the Jews could not, and Christian navies could secure Jewish trade. It was obvious that Hartley had called for a Christian diaspora, based on the model of the Jewish Diaspora, in order to forward the interests of the Jews, not the interests of the Christians. He wanted Christians to become Jews and then spread Judaism around the globe. Hartley, who was an agent of the Cabalistic Jews, would accomplish these ends by teaching the Christians to welcome their demise at the hands of Jewish revolutionaries.

The Jewish revolutionaries accomplished their goals in France and Poland. In 1899, Edouard Drumont wrote, *inter alia*,

“During the Revolution, [Jewish money power] was with us; then it supported Bonaparte; in 1815, it was clearly against him, and, at Waterloo, with Rothschild it fought as energetically as Wellington. [***] After having been, at its birth, the apotheosis of Power, France culminates in the apotheosis of Money. It had two masters; Napoleon, in the beginning; Rothschild, personification of the Jewish Conquest, at its decline. [***] Already in 1875 a Jew who is mostly forgotten today but who was then

almost famous and who was, in any case, a most interesting and very curious spirit, Alexandre Weill,¹¹ explained to me that France was obliged to undergo the same fate as Poland and that it would be good, in the best interests of Humanity, that the French, dispersed and countryless like the Poles, would go and spread throughout the world the general truths of civilization and progress”¹⁹⁹²

Drumont recounted in 1899, that Alexandre Weill, an elderly and supposedly prophetic man of Jewish descent, had told him that France would end up in a diaspora like Poland, which had been devastated, divided and dispersed by Frankist Jews. In fact, both Poland and France, two predominantly Catholic nations which at one time had led European culture, were battlegrounds in both World Wars—in the case of France, just as Weill and Drumont had predicted. In the early 1790's, Poland suffered under Russian tyranny after the Frankist Jews had undermined the Polish Government. Many Polish intellectuals, philosophers, poets, artists, political theorists, etc. fled to places like France,¹⁹⁹³ which was embroiled in a revolution, and carried with them their sophisticated knowledge and ways. Weill looked forward to another destruction of France which he hoped would result in a similar migration of talent and wisdom—all of which recalls David Hartley's desires that Christianity be destroyed and dispersed so as to spread Judaism around the world—which reminds one of *Exodus* 1:7-12,

“¶7 And the children of Israel were fruitful, and increased abundantly, and multiplied, and waxed exceeding mighty; and the land was filled with them. 8 Now there arose a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph. 9 And he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel *are* more and mightier than we: 10 Come on, let us deal wisely with them; lest they multiply, and it come to pass, that, when there falleth out any war, they join also unto our enemies, and fight against us, and *so* get them up out of the land. 11 Therefore they did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses. 12 But the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew. And they were grieved because of the children of Israel.”

Racist Jews and Reformed Jews believed that the Diaspora of the Jews had benefitted the world by dispersing the Jews, who then spread knowledge of Judaism around the world. The Jews shattered French and Polish society, in part, so that the intellectuals of these highly advanced and sophisticated nations would travel the world spreading modernity and Jewish monotheism, which would make the way easier for Jewish infiltration of the rest of the world, which would fulfill the forecasts of the Jewish prophets who predicted the demise of the Gentiles and the rise of the Jews.

Jewish and Christian investors and merchants had long profited from trade with the colonial new world, in slaves,¹⁹⁹⁴ furs, sugar, etc. Many great fortunes that were made, were made with inside information and manipulation in the money,

commodity and stock markets—especially during wars. Rothschild made a fortune from Napoleon’s adventures.¹⁹⁹⁵ As Smedley D. Butler said, “war is a racket.”¹⁹⁹⁶

Herder wrote, in 1802, shortly after Napoleon commenced his Zionist campaigns,

“Good luck to [World Jewry], if a Messiah-Bonaparte may victoriously lead them there, good luck to them in Palestine! But it will be difficult for this richly competitive nation to live in a narrow Palestine if they cannot there take over the general middle trade of both the old and the new world. For the old world would be convenient to their land. Fine sharp-witted race, wonder of the ages! One of the brilliant glosses of their rabbis yokes together a complaining Esau and Israel [Jacob]. Both suffer from the kiss, but they cannot separate themselves.”¹⁹⁹⁷

In the 1830's, Godfrey Higgins suspected that Napoleon viewed himself as the Messiah of the Jews,

“To what I have said in Vol. I. p. 688, respecting Napoleon, I think it expedient to add a well-known anecdote of him. When his uncle, Cardinal Fesch, once expostulated with him, and expressed his belief that he must one day sink beneath that universal hatred with which his actions were surrounding his throne, he led his uncle to the window, and, pointing upwards, said, “*Do you see yonder star?*” “*No sire,*” was the reply. “*But I see it,*” answered Napoleon, and abruptly dismissed him. [Footnote: J. T. Baker, of Deptford, to Ed. of Morn. Chron., Oct. 12, 1832.] What are we to make of this? Here we have the star of Jacob, of Abraham, of Cæsar. Here we have a star, probably from the East. The whole of Napoleon’s actions in the latter part of his life bespeak mental alienation. I believe that he continued to retain expectations and hopes of restoration to the empire of the world, till the day of his death. Many circumstances unite to persuade me that he was latterly the victim of monomania. I cannot help suspecting that Napoleon was tainted with a belief that he was *the promised one*. [***] Victor Cousin says, “You will remark, that all great men have, in a greater or less degree, been fatalists: *the error is in the form, not at the foundation of the thought*. They feel that, in fact, they do not exist on their own account: they possess the consciousness of an immense power, and being unable to ascribe the honour of it to themselves, they refer it to a higher power which uses them as its instruments, in accordance with its own ends.” [Footnote: For. Quar. Review, No. XXIII. July 1833, p.202.] With the exception of the words in Italics, which I do not understand, I quite agree with M. Cousin. But how completely it bears me out in the assertion I have made, that the belief in each person that *he was the great one that was for to come* has led either to his success or to his destruction! It led Julian into the desert—Napoleon to Moscow.”¹⁹⁹⁸

Hartley and later Shaftesbury iterated themes repeated again and again by English Christian Zionists through to the time of Winston Churchill, and beyond.

The same themes reappear today in the beliefs of evangelical Dispensationalist Christian Zionists and neo-conservative Zionists in the United States. On the other end of the Protestant political spectrum, the anti-Semites followed Martin Luther's call for the expulsion of the Jews and the destruction of Catholicism, all of which forwards the Jewish Zionist agenda.

Hartley wrote in 1749, and his work is but one of thousands of such examples of Jewish Zionist propaganda published by pseudo-Christian traitors,

“P R O P . 41.

The Divine Authority of the Scriptures may be inferred from the superior Wisdom of the Jewish Laws, considered in a political Light; and from the exquisite Workmanship shewn in the Tabernacle and Temple.

ALL these were Originals amongst the *Jews*, and some of them were copied partially and imperfectly by ancient Heathen Nations. They seem also to imply a Knowledge superior to the respective Times. And I believe, that profane History gives sufficient Attestation to these Positions. However, it is certain from Scripture, that *Moses* received the whole Body of his Laws, also the Pattern of the Tabernacle, and *David* the Pattern of the Temple, from God; and that *Bezaleel* was inspired by God for the Workmanship of the Tabernacle. Which Things, being laid down as a sure Foundation, may encourage learned Men to inquire into the Evidences from profane History, that the Knowledge and Skill to be found amongst the *Jews* were superior to those of other Nations at the same Period of Time, *i. e.* were supernatural.

[***]

S E C T . II.

Of the Expectation of Bodies Politic, the Jews in particular, and the World in general, during the present State of the Earth.

P R O P . 81.

It is probable, that all the present Civil Governments will be overturned.
THIS may appear from the Scripture Prophecies, both in a direct way, *i. e.* from express Passages, such as those concerning the Destruction of the Image, and Four Beasts, in *Daniel*; of Christ's *breaking all Nations with a Rod of Iron, and dashing them in Pieces like a Potter's Vessel, &c.* and from the Supremacy and universal Extent of the Fifth Monarchy, or Kingdom of the Saints, which is to be set up.

We may conclude the same Thing also from the final Restoration of the *Jews*, and the great Glory and Dominion promised to them, of which I shall speak below.

And it adds some Light and Evidence to this, that all the known Governments of the World have the evident Principles of Corruption in themselves. They are composed of jarring Elements, and subsist only by the alternate Prevalence of these over each other. The Splendor, Luxury, Self interest, Martial Glory, &c. which pass for Essentials in Christian Governments, are totally opposite to the meek, humble, self-denying Spirit

of Christianity; and whichsoever of these finally prevails over the other, the present Form of the Government must be dissolved. Did true Christianity prevail throughout any Kingdom intirely, the Riches, Strength, Glory, &c. of that Kingdom would no longer be an Object of Attention to the Governors or Governed; they would become a Nation of Priests and Apostles, and totally disregard the Things of this World. But this is not to be expected: I only mention it to set before the Reader the natural Consequence of it. If, on the contrary, worldly Wisdom and Infidelity prevail over Christianity, which seems to be the Prediction of the Scriptures, this worldly Wisdom will be found utter Foolishness at last, even in respect of this World; the Governments, which have thus lost their Cement, the Sense of Duty, and the Hopes and Fears of a future Life, will fall into Anarchy and Confusion, and be intirely dissolved. And all this may be applied, with a little Change, to the *Mahometan* and *Heathen* Governments. When Christianity comes to be propagated in the Countries where these subsist, it will make so great a Change in the Face of Affairs, as must shake the Civil Powers, which are here both externally and internally opposite to it; and the Increase of Wickedness, which is the natural and necessary Consequence of their Opposition, will farther accelerate their Ruin.

The Dissolution of antient Empires and Republics may also prepare us for the Expectation of a Dissolution of the present Governments. But we must not carry the Parallel too far here, and suppose that as new Governments have arisen out of the old ones, resembling them in great measure, subsisting for a certain time, and then giving place to other new ones, so it will be with the present Governments. The Prophecies do not admit of this; and it may be easily seen, that the Situation of Things in the Great World is very different from what it has ever been before. Christianity must now either be proved true, to the intire Conviction of Unbelievers; or, if it be an Imposture, it will soon be detected. And whichsoever of these turns up, must make the greatest Change in the Face of Affairs. I ought rather to have said, that the final Prevalence and Establishment of Christianity, which, being true, cannot but finally prevail, and be established, will do this. But it may perhaps be of some Use just to put false Suppositions.

How near the Dissolution of the present Governments, generally or particularly, may be, would be great Rashness to affirm. Christ will come in this Sense also *as a Thief in the Night*. Our Duty is therefore to watch, and to pray; to be faithful Stewards; to give Meat, and all other Requisites, in due Season, to those under our Care; and to endeavour by these, and all other lawful Means, to preserve the Government, under whose Protection we live, from Dissolution, seeking the Peace of it, and submitting to every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's sake. No Prayers, no Endeavours of this Kind, can fail of having some good Effect, public or private, for the Preservation of ourselves or others. The great Dispensations of Providence are conducted by Means that are either secret, or, if they appear, that are judged feeble and inefficacious. No man can tell, however private his Station may be, but his

fervent Prayer may avail to the Salvation of much People. But it is more peculiarly the Duty of Magistrates thus to watch over their Subjects, to pray for them, and set about the Reformation of all Matters Civil and Ecclesiastical, to the utmost of their Power. Good Governors may promote the Welfare and Continuance of a State, and wicked ones must accelerate its Ruin. The sacred History affords us Instances of both Kinds, and they are recorded there for the Admonition of Kings and Princes in all future Times.

It may not be amiss here to note a few Instances of the Analogy between the Body Natural, with the Happiness of the Individual to which it belongs, and the Body Politic, composed of many Individuals, with its Happiness, or its flourishing State in respect of Arts, Power, Riches, &c. Thus all Bodies Politic seem, like the Body Natural, to tend to Destruction and Dissolution, as is here affirmed, through Vices public and private, and to be respited for certain Intervals, by partial, imperfect Reformations. There is no complete or continued Series of public Happiness on one hand, no utter Misery on the other; for the Dissolution of the Body Politic is to be considered as its Death. It seems as romantic therefore for any one to project the Scheme of a perfect Government in this imperfect State, as to be in Pursuit of an universal Remedy, a Remedy which should cure all Distempers, and prolong human Life beyond Limit. And yet as Temperance, Labour, and Medicines, in some Cases, are of great Use in preserving and restoring Health, and prolonging Life; so Industry, Justice, and all other Virtues, public and private, have an analogous Effect in respect of the Body Politic. As all the Evils, which Individuals suffer through the Infirmity of the mortal Body, and the Disorders of the external World, may, in general, contribute to increase their Happiness even in this Life, and also are of great Use to others; and as, upon the Supposition of a future State, Death itself appears to have the same beneficial Tendency in a more eminent Degree than any other Event in Life, now considered as indefinitely prolonged; so the Distresses of each Body Politic are of great Use to this Body itself, and also of great Use to all neighbouring States; and the Dissolution of Governments have much promoted the Knowledge of true Religion, and of useful Arts and Sciences, all which seem, in due time and manner, intended to be intirely subservient to true Religion at last. And this affords great Comfort to benevolent and religious Persons, when they consider the Histories of Former Times, or contemplate the probable Consequences of Things in future Generations.

PROP. 82

*It is probable, that the present Forms of Church-Government
will be dissolved.*

THIS Proposition follows from the forgoing. The Civil and Ecclesiastical Powers are so interwoven and cemented together, in all the Countries of *Christendom*, that if the first fall, the last must fall also.

But there are many Prophecies, which declare the Fall of the Ecclesiastical Powers of the Christian World. And through each Church seems to flatter itself with the Hopes of being exempted; yet it is very plain,

that the prophetic Characters belong to all. They have all left the true, pure, simple Religion; and teach for Doctrines the Commandments of Men. They are all Merchants of the Earth, and have set up a Kingdom of this World, abounding in Riches, temporal Power, and external Pomp. They have all a dogmatizing Spirit, and persecute such as do not receive their own Mark, and worship the Image which they have set up. They all neglect Christ's Command of preaching the Gospel to all Nations, and even of going to *the lost Sheep of the House of Israel*, there being innumerable Multitudes in all Christian Countries, who have never been taught to read, and who are, in other respects also, destitute of the Means of saving Knowledge. It is very true, that the Church of *Rome* is *Babylon the Great, and the Mother of Harlots, and of the Abominations of the Earth*. But all the rest have copied her Example, more or less. They have all received Money, like *Gehazi*; and therefore the Leprosy of *Naaman* will cleave to them, and to their Seed for ever. And this Impurity may be considered not only as justifying the Application of the Prophecies to all the Christian Churches, but as a natural Cause for their Downfall. The corrupt Governors of the several Churches will ever oppose the true Gospel, and in so doing will bring Ruin upon themselves.

The Destruction of the Temple at *Jerusalem*, and of the Hierarchy of the *Jews*, may likewise be considered as a Type and Presage of the Destruction of that *Judaical* Form of Rites, Ceremonies, and human Ordinances, which takes place, more or less, in all Christian Countries.

We ought, however, to remark here,

First, That though the Church of Christ has been corrupted thus in all Ages and Nations, yet there have been, and will be, in all, many who receive the Seal of God, and worship him *in Spirit, and in Truth*. And of these as many have filled high Stations, as low ones. Such Persons, though they have concurred in the Support of what is contrary to the pure Religion, have, however, done it innocently, with respect to themselves, being led thereto by invincible Prejudices.

Secondly, Nevertheless, when it so happens, that Persons in high Stations in the Church have their Eyes enlightened, and see the Corruptions and Deficiencies of it, they must incur the prophetic Censures in the highest Degree, if they still concur, nay, if they do not endeavour to reform and purge out these Defilements. And though they cannot, according to this Proposition, expect intire Success; yet they may be blessed with such a Degree, as will abundantly compensate their utmost Endeavours, and rank them with the Prophets and Apostles.

Thirdly, As this Corruption and Degeneracy of the Christian Church has proceeded from the fallen State of Mankind, and particularly of those Nations to whom the Gospel was first preached, and amongst whom it has been since received; so it has, all things being supposed to remain the same, suited our Circumstances, in the best Manner possible, and will continue to do so, as long as it subsists. God brings Good out of Evil, and draws Men to himself

in such manner as their Natures will admit of, by external Pomp and Power, by things not good in themselves, and by some that are profane and unholy. He makes use of some of their Corruptions as Means of purging away the rest. The Impurity of Mankind is too gross to unite at once with the strict Purity of the Gospel. The *Roman* Empire first, and the *Goths* and *Vandals* afterwards, required, as one may say, some Superstitions and Idolatries to be mixed with the Christian Religion; else they could not have been converted at all.

Fourthly, It follows from these Considerations, that good Men ought to submit to the Ecclesiastical *Powers that be*, for Conscience-sake, as well as to the Civil ones. They are both from God, as far as respects Inferiors. Christ and his Apostles observed the Law, and walked orderly, though they declared the Destruction of the Temple, and the Change of the Customs established by *Moses*. Both the *Babylonians*, who destroyed *Jerusalem* the first time, and the *Romans*, who did it the second, were afterwards destroyed themselves in the most exemplary Manner. And it is probable, that those who shall hereafter procure the Downfall of the Forms of Church-Government, will not do this from pure Love, and Christian Charity, but from the most corrupt Motives, and by Consequence bring upon themselves, in the End, the severest Chastisements. It is therefore the Duty of all good Christians to obey both the Civil and Ecclesiastical Powers under which they were born, *i. e.* provided Disobedience to God be not enjoined, which is seldom the Case; to promote Subjection and Obedience in others; gently to reform and rectify, and to pray for the Peace and Prosperity of, their own *Jerusalem*.

P R O P . 83.

It is probable, that the Jews will be restored to Palæstine.

THIS appears from the Prophecies, which relate to the Restoration of the *Jews* and *Israelites* to their own Land. For,

First, These have never yet been fulfilled in any Sense agreeable to the Greatness and Gloriousness of them. The Peace, Power, and Abundance of Blessings, temporal and spiritual, promised to the *Jews* upon their Return from Captivity, were not bestowed upon them in the Interval between the Reign of *Cyrus*, and the Destruction of *Jerusalem* by *Titus*; and ever since this Destruction they have remained in a desolate State.

Secondly, The Promises of Restoration relate to the Ten Tribes, as well as the Two of *Judah* and *Benjamin*. But the Ten Tribes, or *Israelites*, which were captivated by *Salmaneser*, have never been restored at all. There remains therefore a Restoration yet future for them.

Our Ignorance of the Place where they now lie hid, or Fears that they are so mixed with other Nations, as not to be distinguished and separated, ought not to be admitted as Objections here. Like Objections might be made to the Resurrection of the Body; and the Objections both to the one, and the other, are probably intended to be obviated by *Ezekiel's* Prophecy concerning the dry Bones. It was one of the great Sins of the *Jews* to call God's Promises in Question, on account of apparent Difficulties and Impossibilities; and the

Sadduces, in particular, erred concerning the Resurrection, because *they knew not the Scriptures, nor the Power of God*. However, it is our Duty to inquire, whether the Ten Tribes may not remain in the Countries where they were first settled by *Salmaneser*, or in some others.

Thirdly, A double Return seems to be predicted in several Prophecies.

Fourthly, The Prophets who lived since the Return from *Babylon*, have predicted a Return in similar Terms with those who went before. It follows therefore, that the Predictions of both must relate to some Restoration yet future.

Fifthly, The Restoration fo the *Jews* to their own Land seems to be predicted in the New Testament.

To the Arguments, drawn from Prophecy, we may add some concurring Evidences, which the present Circumstances of the *Jews* suggest.

First, then, The *Jews* are yet a distinct People from all the Nations amongst which they reside. They seem therefore reserved by Providence for some such signal Favour, after they have suffered the due Chastisement.

Secondly, They are to be found in all the Countries of the known World. And this agrees with many remarkable Passages of the Scriptures, which treat both of their Dispersion, and of their Return.

Thirdly, They have no Inheritance of Land in any Country. Their Possessions are chiefly Money and Jewels. They may therefore transfer themselves with the greater Facility to *Palæstine*.

Fourthly, They are treated with Contempt and Harshness, and sometimes with great Cruelty, by the Nations amongst whom they sojourn. They must therefore be the more ready to return to their own Land.

Fifthly, They carry on a Correspondence with each other throughout the whole World; and consequently must both know when Circumstances begin to favour their Return, and be able to concert Measures with one another concerning it.

Sixthly, A great Part of them speak and write the *Rabbinical Hebrew*, as well as the Language of the Country where they reside. They are therefore, as far as relates to themselves, actually possessed of an universal Language and Character; which is a Circumstance that may facilitate their Return, beyond what can well be imagined.

Seventhly, The *Jews* themselves still retain a Hope and Expectation, that God will once more restore them to their own Land.

C O R . 1. May not the two Captivities of the *Jews*, and their two Restorations, be Types of the first and second Death, and of the first and second Resurrections?

C O R . 2. Does it not appear agreeable to the whole Analogy both of the Word and Works of God, that the *Jews* are Types both of each Individual in particular, on one hand, and of the whole World in general, on the other? May we not therefore hope, that, at least after the second Death, there will be a Resurrection to Life eternal to every Man, and to the whole Creation, which groans, and travails in Pain together, waiting for the Adoption, and glorious

Liberty, of the Children of God?

C O R . 3. As the Downfal of the *Jewish* State under *Titus* was the Occasion of the Publication of the Gospel to us Gentiles, so our Downfal may contribute to the Restoration of the *Jews*, and both together bring on the final Publication and Prevalence of the true Religion; of which I shall treat in the next Proposition. Thus the Type, and the Thing typified, will coincide; the First-fruits, and the Lump, be made holy together.

P R O P . 84.

The Christian Religion will be preached to, and received by, all Nations.

THIS appears from the express Declarations of Christ, and from many of his Parables, also from the Declarations and Predictions of the Apostles, and particularly from the *Revelation*. There are likewise numberless Prophecies in the Old Testament, which admit of no other Sense, when interpreted by the Events which have since happened, the Coming of Christ, and the Propagation of his Religion.

The Truth of the Christian Religion is an Earnest and Presage of the same Thing, to all who receive it. For every Truth of great Importance must be discussed and prevail at last. The Persons who believe can see no Reasons for their own Belief, but what must extend to all Mankind by degrees, as the Diffusion of Knowledge to all Ranks and Orders of Men, to all Nations, Kindred, Tongues, and People, cannot now be stopped, but proceeds ever with an accelerated Velocity. And, agreeably to this, it appears that the Number of those who are able to give a Reason for their Faith increases every Day.

But it may not be amiss to set before the Reader in one View some probable Presumptions for the universal Publication and Prevalence of the Christian Religion, even in the way of natural Causes.

First, then, The great Increase of Knowledge, literary and philosophical, which has been made in this and the Two last Centuries, and continues to be made, must contribute to promote every great Truth, and particularly those of Revealed Religion, as just now mentioned. The Coincidence of the Three remarkable Events, of the Reformation, the Invention of Printing, and the Restoration of Letters, with each other, in Time, deserves particular Notice here.

Secondly, The Commerce between the several Nations of the World is enlarged perpetually more and more. And thus the Children of this World are opening new Ways of Communication for future Apostles to spread the glad Tidings of Salvation to the uttermost Parts of the Earth.

Thirdly, The Apostasy of nominal Christians, and Objections of Infidels, which are so remarkable in these Days, not only give Occasion to search out and publish new Evidences for the Truth of Revealed Religion, but also oblige those who receive it, to purify it from Errors and Superstitions; by which means its Progress amongst the yet Heathen Nations will be much forwarded. Were we to propagate Religion, as it is now held by the several Churches, each Person would propagate his own Orthodoxy, lay needless

Impediments and Stumbling-blocks before his Hearers, and occasion endless Feuds and Dissensions amongst the new Converts. And it seems as if God did not intend, that the general Preaching of the Gospel should be begun, till Religion be discharged of its Incumbrances and Superstitions.

Fourthly, The various Sects, which have arisen amongst Christians in late Times, contribute both to purify Religion, and also to set all the great Truths of it in a full Light, and to shew their practical Importance.

Fifthly, The Downfall of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Powers, mentioned in the 81st and 82d Propositions, must both be attended with such public Calamities, as will make Men serious, and also drive them from the Countries of *Christendom* into the remote Parts of the World, particularly into the *East* and *West-Indies*; whither consequently they will carry their Religion now purified from Errors and Superstitions.

Sixthly, The Restoration of the *Jews*, mentioned in the last Proposition, may be expected to have the greatest Effect in alarming Mankind, and opening their Eyes. This will be such an Accomplishment of the Prophecies, as will vindicate them from all Cavils. Besides which, the careful Survey of *Palæstine*, and the neighboring Countries, the Study of the *Eastern* Languages, of the Histories of the present and antient Inhabitants, &c. (which must follow this Event) when compared together, will cast the greatest Light upon the Scriptures, and at once prove their Genuineness, their Truth, and their Divine Authority.

Seventhly, Mankind seem to have it in their Power to obtain such Qualifications in a natural way, as, by being conferred upon the Apostles in a supernatural one, were a principal Means of their Success in the first Propagation of the Gospel.

Thus, as the Apostles had the Power of Healing miraculously, future Missionaries may in a short time accomplish themselves with the Knowledge of all the chief practical Rules of the Art of Medicine. This Art is wonderfully simplified of late Years, has received great Additions, and is improving every Day, both in Simplicity and Efficacy. And it may be hoped, that a few theoretical Positions, well ascertained, with a moderate Experience, may enable the young Practitioner to proceed to a considerable Variety of Cases with Safety and Success.

Thus also, as the Apostles had the Power of speaking various Languages miraculously, it seems possible from the late Improvements in Grammar, Logic, and the History of the human Mind, for young Persons, by learning the Names of visible Objects and Actions in any unknown barbarous Language, to improve and extend it immediately, and to preach to the Natives in it.

The great Extensiveness of the *Rabbinical Hebrew*, and of *Arabic*, of *Greek* and *Latin*, of *Sclavonic* and *French*, and of many other Languages, in their respective ways, also of the *Chinese* Character, ought to be taken into Consideration here.

And though we have not the Gift of Prophecy, yet that of the

Interpretation of Prophecy seems to increase every Day, by comparing the Scriptures with themselves, the Prophecies with the Events, and, in general, the Word of God with his Works.

To this we may add, that when Preachers of the Gospel carry with them the useful manual Arts, by which human Life is rendered secure and comfortable, such as the Arts of Building, tilling the Ground, defending the Body by suitable Cloathing, &c. it cannot but make them extremely acceptable to the barbarous Nations; as the more refined Arts and Sciences, Mathematics, natural and experimental Philosophy, &c. will to the more civilized ones.

And it is in an additional Weight in favour of all this Reasoning, that the Qualifications here considered may all be acquired in a natural way. For thus they admit of unlimited Communication, Improvement, and Increase; whereas, when miraculous Powers cease, there is not only one of the Evidences withdrawn, but a Recommendation and Means of Admittance also.

However, far be it from us to determine by Anticipation, what God may or may not do! The natural Powers, which favour the Execution of this great Command of our Saviour's, to preach the Gospel to all Nations, ought to be perpetual Monitors to us to do so; and as we now live in a more adult Age of the World, more will now be expected from our natural Powers. The *Jews* had some previous Notices of Christ's First Coming, and good Persons were thereby prepared to receive him; however, his Appearance, and intire Conduct, were very different from what they expected; so that they stood in need of the greatest Docility and Humility, in order to become Disciples and Apostles. And it is probable, that something analogous to this will happen at Christ's Second Coming. We may perhaps say, that some Glimmerings of the Day begin already to shine in the Hearts of all those, who study and delight in the Word and Works of God.

PROP . 85

It is not probable, that there will be any pure or complete Happiness, before the Destruction of this World by Fire.

THAT the Restoration of the *Jews*, and the universal Establishment of the true Religion, will be the Causes of great Happiness, and change the Face of the World much for the better, may be inferred both from the Prophecies, and from the Nature of the Thing. But still, that the great Crown of Glory promised to Christians must be in a State ulterior to this Establishment, appears for the following Reasons.

First, From the express Declarations of the Scriptures. Thus St. *Peter* says, that the Earth must be burnt up, before we are to expect *a new Heaven, and new Earth, wherein dwelleth Righteousness*; and St. *Paul*, that *Flesh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God*; the celestial, glorious Body, made like unto that of Christ, at the Resurrection of the Dead, being requisite for this Purpose.

Secondly, The present disorderly State of the natural World does not

permit of unmixed Happiness; and it does not seem, that this can be rectified in any great Degree, till the Earth have received the Baptism by Fire.

But I presume to affirm nothing particular in relation to future Events. One may just ask, whether Christ's Reign of a Thousand Years upon Earth does not commence with the universal Establishment of Christianity; and whether the Second Resurrection, the new Heavens, and new Earth, &c. do not coincide with the Conflagration.

One ought also to add, with St. *Peter*, as the practical Consequence of this Proposition, that the Dissolution of this World by Fire is the strongest Motive to an Indifference to it, and to that holy Conversation and Godliness, which may fit us for *the new Heavens, and new Earth*.”¹⁹⁹⁹

Note Hartley's statement,

“First, then, The *Jews* are yet a distinct People from all the Nations amongst which they reside. They seem therefore reserved by Providence for some such signal Favour, after they have suffered the due Chastisement.”

Many Christian Zionists and many Jewish Zionists tried to justify the Holocaust as “due Chastisement”. Politically powerful Dispensationalist Christians and their Jewish handlers are today actively promoting nuclear war and an apocalyptic holocaust which will kill us all, because they believe that God will create a new Earth after they have destroyed the old Earth. It is a new heaven and a new Earth which will only sustain the “elect”, the “chosen”, the Jews. *Isaiah 65* states (*see also: Enoch*),

“1 I am sought of *them that* asked not *for me*; I am found of *them that* sought me not: I said, Behold me, behold me, unto a nation *that* was not called by my name. 2 I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, which walketh *in* a way *that* was not good, after their own thoughts; 3 A people that provoketh me to anger continually to my face; that sacrificeth in gardens, and burneth incense upon altars of brick; 4 Which remain among the graves, and lodge in the monuments, which eat swine's flesh, and broth of abominable *things is in* their vessels; 5 Which say, Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou. These *are* a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day. 6 Behold, *it is* written before me: I will not keep silence, but will recompense, even recompense into their bosom, 7 Your iniquities, and the iniquities of your fathers together, saith the LORD, which have burned incense upon the mountains, and blasphemed me upon the hills: therefore will I measure their former work into their bosom. 8 Thus saith the LORD, As the new wine is found in the cluster, and *one* saith, Destroy it not; for a blessing *is* in it: so will I do for my servants' sakes, that *I* may not destroy them all. 9 And I will bring forth a seed out of Jacob, and out of Judah an inheritor of my mountains: and mine elect shall inherit it, and my servants shall dwell there. 10 And Sharon shall be a fold of flocks, and the

valley of Achor a place for the herds to lie down in, for my people that have sought me. 11¶ But ye *are* they that forsake the LORD, that forget my holy mountain, that prepare a table for *that* troop, and that furnish the drink offering unto *that* number. 12 Therefore will I number you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter: because when I called, ye did not answer; when I spake, ye did not hear; but did evil before mine eyes, and did choose *that* wherein I delighted not. 13 Therefore thus saith the Lord GOD, Behold, my servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry: behold, my servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty: behold, my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed: 14 Behold, my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit. 15 And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord GOD shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name: 16 That he who blesseth himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth; and he that sweareth in the earth shall swear by the God of truth; because the former troubles are forgotten, and because they are hid from mine eyes. 17¶ For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. 18 But be ye glad and rejoice for ever *in that* which I create: for, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy. 19 And I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people: and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying. 20 There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days: for the child shall die an hundred years old; but the sinner *being* an hundred years old shall be accursed. 21 And they shall build houses, and inhabit *them*; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. 22 They shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not plant, and another eat: for as the days of a tree *are* the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands. 23 They shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth for trouble; for they *are* the seed of the blessed of the LORD, and their offspring with them. 24 And it shall come to pass, that before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear. 25 The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock: and dust *shall be* the serpent's meat. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the LORD.”

Isaiah 66:22-24 states,

“22 For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I *will* make, *shall* remain before me, saith the LORD, so shall your seed and your name remain. 23 And it shall come to pass, *that* from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the LORD. 24 And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh.”

Note Hartley's pronouncement, which became a policy of inhumanity for the Zionists, both Christian and Jewish, who allied themselves with the anti-Semites and funded the anti-Semites' rise to political power in hopes that the persecution of assimilated Jews would force them to Zionism,

“Fourthly, They are treated with Contempt and Harshness, and sometimes with great Cruelty, by the Nations amongst whom they sojourn. They must therefore be the more ready to return to their own Land.”

Further note Hartley's statement,

“Fifthly, The Downfal of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Powers, mentioned in the 81st and 82d Propositions, must both be attended with such public Calamities, as will make Men serious, and also drive them from the Countries of *Christendom* into the remote Parts of the World, particularly into the *East* and *West-Indies*; whither consequently they will carry their Religion now purified from Errors and Superstitions.”

In 1899, anti-Semite Edouard Drumont alleged that Protestants and Jews had united to corrupt and destroy the predominantly Catholic nation of France. Drumont also predicted that Jewish financiers would unite with the German Government to destroy Russia, years before Jacob Schiff boasted of his success in destroying the Russian People. Drumont also alleged that “Jews” would build up the economy of a nation only to then use corrupt influence in its thriving markets, artificially enhanced by an influx of Jewish investment capital, to deplete the nation of its wealth. He argued that Jews made money the controlling factor in society, and then corruptly obtained control over the fortunes of nations. Drumont believed that Napoleon had been put in power to serve the interests of Jewish wealth accumulation; and that when there was little left to take, the Jews turned against Napoleon, in particular, Rothschild turned against Napoleon.

Many have alleged that Jewish Liberalism was a farce that led to tyranny and absolute Jewish dominance. They further asserted that wealthy Jewish materialistic Capitalists deliberately destroyed all virtue in Gentile society, so as to turn God against the Gentile world and back towards the Jews. Anti-Semitic political movements often concluded that they, not liberal or capitalistic Jews, represented the genuine interests of the working class; which the Jews only desired to deceive and exploit.²⁰⁰⁰ It was a pattern of general vilification of all Jews that suited the Zionists well, in that it segregated the wealthier Jews from the societies into which they were otherwise comfortably and wilfully assimilating.

[8.7.3.3 Zionists Develop a Strategy Which Culminates in the Nazis and the Holocaust as Means to Attain the “Jewish State”](#)

In the 1640's, Orthodox Ukrainian Bohdan Chmielnicki alleged that Jews and Polish Catholics had enslaved the peoples who were under Polish control. In retaliation,

Chmielnicki allegedly slaughtered large numbers of Jews. Some Jews saw this holocaust as the punishment which signaled the coming of the Messiah. Some Jews believed that God would not allow the existence of the Temple, or send the Messiah, until the Jews had atoned for Solomon's marriage to the Pharaoh's daughter and subsequent idolatry (*Sabbath 56b*. I *Kings 11*); which became associated with the "sin" of assimilation. There was also a perceived need to finally atone for Aaron's worship of the Golden Calf (*Sanhedrin 102a*) and the impiety of the ten Northern Tribes, and the impiety of southern tribes of Judah and Benjamin. Note that the Jews correlated a Jewish Holocaust with the redemption of Israel through the arrival of the Messiah, whose primary task was to "restore the Jews to Palestine".

Many had predicted that the year 1666 would mark the arrival of the Messiah. For the Christians, this meant the second coming of Christ, for the Jews, the arrival of the Jewish King. After the Chmielnicki holocaust, which some saw as the sacrifice of masses of Jewish lives as an act of atonement, Shabbatai Zevi declared himself to be the Jewish Messiah and a large Messianic sect followed him. He traveled to Palestine, as a good Messiah would, and attracted a large Jewish following. While traveling through Turkey, Shabbatai Zevi was taken prisoner and was forced to feign conversion to Islam in order to save his life.

A branch of the Shabbataian sect of crypto-Jews, called the *Dönme*, formed in Turkey. They pretended to convert to Islam, but practiced Judaism in secret. For centuries this sect of crypto-Jewish Turks have bred subversive crypto-Jewish agents who have been sent around the world to prepare the way for Jewish world domination. They created a secret society in Paris and eventually led a revolt from Salonika. They were the hidden masters of the "Young Turks" and flooded Turkey with revolutionary propaganda defaming the Sultan. Their reach extended across the globe.

The Shabbataians believed that Shabbatai Zevi's Messianic spirit passed from one Jewish King to the next in a process of Metempsychosis. They argued that the line of David was a dynasty, which would not end when any given King of the Jews died, but rather the spirit of the Messiah would leave one body of the Jewish King and enter the next, sort of like a kosher Dalai Lama. In the form of the "Young Turks", the *Dönme* eventually succeed in overthrowing the Sultan whose ancestors had shamed Shabbatai Zevi. They also destroyed Turkish culture and committed genocide against the Armenian Christians. Shabbatai Zevi was a bizarre individual, a bit of a "flake". He wore a bride's dress and wedded himself to the Torah.

Jacob Frank—a Polish Jew who was born Jacob Leibowitz, or Jacob Ben Judah Leib, whose father belonged to the Messianic sect of Shabbatai Zevi—joined the *Dönme* in Turkey. Frank declared himself to be the successor of Shabbatai Zevi and the then present Messiah. Frank opposed the Talmud and convinced prominent Catholic leaders that his sect would convert Jews to Christianity. The Frankist reformation, as well as Moses Mendelssohn's and Napoleon's reforms, set the stage for reformed Judaism, which, it was alleged, would lead to better relations between Christians and Jews, and which would afford revolutionary Jews with a means by which they could subvert Gentile society.²⁰⁰¹ The Talmud, with its anti-Christian passages, had long been a source of anti-Christian and anti-Semitic tensions. Though

Ashkenazi Jews had lain greater emphasis on the Talmud than even the Pentateuch, Sephardic Jews had a greater respect for the original books of Judaism and viewed the Talmud as the mere commentary it is. The Sephardic Jews developed Cabalism as an outgrowth of original Judaism with less emphasis on the Rabbinical authority of Talmudism—unless it happened to be convenient at any given time to quote a Talmudic authority.

Just as the Rabbis used the Talmud to justify their power and authority over Jewry, the Cabalists used the anti-Gentile and anti-Christian passages of the Talmud as a weapon against the Rabbis, to usurp their authority, and to bring them into conflict with Christians. Cabalistic writings are also severally anti-Christian and anti-Gentile, and the attacks were hypocritical, but the Cabalists survived their hypocrisy by becoming crypto-Jews who pretended to Christian and Moslem conversion. The Talmud, in *Tractate Kethuboth* 111a, prevents the Jews from forcing the Messianic Era and from emigrating to Palestine in large numbers before the coming of the Messiah. The Cabalists opposed this stance and had a powerful Messianic message and model, by which they used politics and wealth accumulation to carry out the Messianic prophecies, and anointed their own false messiahs at will.

The Jewish descendants of the Frankists became leading figures in Poland. Granted special privileges by the elite of Europe, they pretended to convert to Catholicism, but the Frankist conversions to Catholicism and Islam were instead efforts to subvert both religions and the Jews secretly carried on as Jews. The Frankists had many reasons for attacking Rabbinical culture. The Rabbis opposed any “artificial” establishment of a Jewish State, and the Catholic Church would likely have ended its opposition to “the restoration of the Jews to Palestine” if the Jews professed to be Christians and accepted the “new Covenant of Christ”. The New Testament calls for a “remnant of Jews” to convert and live in Palestine.

The Frankists advocated many of the same beliefs as the Illuminati—and Communism and Bolshevism. The leadership elements of each of these groups are notable both for their disproportionate Jewish influence and for their highly perverse sexual deviancy. The Frankists believed that if they could destroy all Gentile religions, the Gentiles would be left without gods to protect them and their Jewish God would reign supreme. The Frankists also believed that evil is good and found many passages in the Old Testament to support their view that the Messiah would only be successful when evil ruled the Earth. They did everything they could to infiltrate and overthrow governments and sought world revolution. They wormed their way into the leadership of governments through pretended conversions and through intermarriage and did what they could to cause calamities, starvation and war.

Shabbatai Zevi, Jacob Frank and the Frankists had a long relationship with Turkey, as did Adolf Hitler’s Hungarian Jewish patron Moses Pinkeles, a. k. a. Ignatius Trebitsch-Lincoln, and Adam Alfred Rudolf Glauer, a. k. a. Rudolf Glandeck Freiherr von Sebottendorf, both of whom helped to put Adolf Hitler into power—there were also the genocidal Young Turks of Jewish descent,²⁰⁰² of *Dönme* descent, and there have been many Israeli leaders with intimate involvements in Turkey, including David Ben-Gurion.²⁰⁰³

The belief that the God of the Old Testament sponsored evil was not new. The Talmud contains passages indicating that evil must reign before the Messiah will appear.²⁰⁰⁴ Some of the earliest Christians saw the creator God of the Old Testament as an evil force, who was supplanted by the supreme God who was the Father of Jesus. Marcion²⁰⁰⁵ believed that Jesus was not the Messiah of the Old Testament God, who was in Marcion's view the evil creator God who would restore the Jews, but was instead the Messiah of a good God, a supreme God who reigned over the *many* gods referred to in the Old Testament—for example in *Genesis* 3:5, 22,

“For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil [***] And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever:”

and *Psalms* 82:1,

“God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; he judgeth among the gods.”

and *Jeremiah* 10:10-11,

“10 But the LORD *is* the true God, he *is* the living God, and an everlasting king: at his wrath the earth shall tremble, and the nations shall not be able to abide his indignation. 11 Thus shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, *even* they shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens.”

Marcion believed that the Jew's Messiah was yet to appear and Marcion shunned the Old Testament creator God as an evil force and sought to keep the Christian faith from falling into the belief that Jesus was the Messiah of the Jews. *The Catholic Encyclopedia* wrote of Marcion, among other things,

“II. DOCTRINE AND DISCIPLINE.—We must distinguish between the doctrine of Marcion himself and that of his followers. Marcion was no Gnostic dreamer. He wanted a Christianity untrammelled and undefiled by association with Judaism. Christianity was the New Covenant pure and simple. Abstract questions on the origin of evil or on the essence of the Godhead interested him little, but the Old Testament was a scandal to the faithful and a stumbling-block to the refined and intellectual gentiles by its crudity and cruelty, and the Old Testament had to be set aside. The two great obstacles in his way he removed by drastic measures. He had to account for the existence of the Old Testament and he accounted for it by postulating a secondary deity, a demiurgus, who was god in a sense, but not the supreme God; he was just, rigidly just, he had his good qualities, but he was not the

good god, who was Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ. The metaphysical relation between these two gods troubled Marcion little; of divine emanation, æons, syzygies, eternally opposed principles of good and evil, he knows nothing. He may be almost a Manichee in practice, but in theory he has not reached absolute consistency as Mani did a hundred years later. Marcion had secondly to account for those passages in the New Testament which countenanced the Old. He resolutely cut out all texts that were contrary to his dogma; in fact, he created his own New Testament, admitting but one gospel, a mutilation of St. Luke, and an Apostolicon containing ten epistles of St. Paul. The mantle of St. Paul had fallen on the shoulders of Marcion in his struggle with the Judaisers. The Catholics of his day were nothing but the Judaisers of the previous century. The pure Pauline Gospel had become corrupted and Marcion not obscurely hinted that even the pillar Apostles, Peter, James and John, had betrayed their trust. He loves to speak of 'false apostles', and lets his hearers infer who they were. Once the Old Testament has been completely got rid of, Marcion has no further desire for change. He makes his purely New Testament Church as like the Catholic Church as possible, consistent with his deep-seated Puritanism. The first description of Marcion's doctrine dates from St. Justin: 'With the help of the devil Marcion has in every country contributed to blasphemy and the refusal to acknowledge the Creator of all the world as God. He recognizes another god, who, because he is essentially greater (than the World-maker or Demiurge) has done greater deeds than he (ὡς ὄντα μείζονα τὰ μείζονα παρὰ τοῦτον πεποιηκέναι). The supreme God is ἀγαθός, good, kind; the inferior god is merely δίκαιος, just and righteous. The good God is all love, the inferior god gives way to fierce anger. Though less than the good God, yet the just god, as world-creator, has his independent sphere of activity. They are not opposed as Ormuzd and Ahriman, though the good God interferes in favour of men, for He alone is all-wise and all-powerful and loves mercy more than punishment. All men are indeed created by the Demiurge, but by special choice he elected the Jewish people as his own and thus became the god of the Jews.

His theological outlook is limited to the Bible, his struggle with the Catholic Church seems a battle with texts and nothing more. The Old Testament is true enough, Moses and the Prophets are messengers of the Demiurge, the Jewish Messiah is sure to come and found a millennial kingdom for the Jews on earth, but the Jewish Messiah has nothing whatever to do with the Christ of God. The Invisible, Indescribable, Good God (ἀόρατος, ἀκατάνομαστος, ἀγαθὸς θεός), formerly unknown to the creator as well as to his creatures, has revealed Himself in Christ. How far Marcion admitted a Trinity of persons in the Supreme Godhead is not known; Christ is indeed the Son of God, but he is also simply 'God' without further qualification; in fact, Marcion's Gospel began with the words; 'In the fifteenth year of the Emperor Tiberius God descended in Capharnaum and taught on the Sabbaths'. However daring and capricious this manipulation of

the Gospel text, it is at least a splendid testimony that in Christian circles of the first half of the second century the Divinity of Christ was a central dogma. To Marcion however Christ was God Manifest, not God Incarnate. His Christology is that of the Docetæ (q.v.) rejecting the inspired history of the Infancy, in fact any childhood of Christ at all; Marcion's Savior is a 'deus ex machina' of which Tertullian mockingly says: 'Suddenly a Son, suddenly Sent, suddenly Christ!' Marcion admitted no prophecy of the Coming of Christ whatever; the Jewish prophets foretold a Jewish Messiah only, and this Messiah had not yet appeared. Marcion used the story of the three angels, who ate, walked and conversed with Abraham and yet had no real human body, as an illustration of the life of Christ (Adv. Marc., III, ix). Tertullian says (*ibid.*) that when Apelles and seceders from Marcion began to believe that Christ had a real body indeed, not by birth but rather collected from the elements, Marcion would prefer to accept even a putative birth rather than a real body. Whether this is Tertullian's mockery or a real change in Marcion's sentiments we do not know. To Marcion matter and flesh are not indeed essentially evil, but are contemptible things, a mere production of the Demiurge, and it was inconceivable that God should really have made them His own. Christ's life on earth was a continual contrast to the conduct of the Demiurge. Some of the contrasts are cleverly staged: the Demiurge sent bears to devour children for puerile merriment (Kings)—Christ bade children come to Him and He fondled and blessed them; the Demiurge in his law declared lepers unclean and banished them—but Christ touched and healed them. Christ's putative passion and death was the work of the Demiurge, who in revenge for Christ's abolition of the Jewish law delivered Him up to hell. But even in hell Christ overcame the Demiurge by preaching to the spirits in Limbo, and by His Resurrection He founded the true Kingdom of the good God. Epiphanius (Haer., xlii, 4) says that Marcionites believed that in Limbo Christ brought salvation to Cain, Core, Dathan and Abiron, Esau and the Gentiles, but left in damnation all Old Testament saints. This may have been held by some Marcionites in the fourth century, but it was not the teaching of Marcion himself, who had no Antinomian tendencies. Marcion denied the resurrection of the body, 'for flesh and blood shall not inherit the Kingdom of God', and denied the second coming of Christ to judge the living and the dead, for the good God, being all goodness, does not punish those who reject Him; He simply leaves them to the Demiurge, who will cast them into everlasting fire.

With regard to discipline, the main point of difference consists in his rejection of marriage, i.e. he baptized only those who were not living in matrimony: virgins, widows, celibates, and eunuchs (Tert., 'Adv. Marc.', I, xxix); all others remained catechumens. On the other hand the absence of division between catechumens and baptized persons in Marcionite worship, shocked orthodox Christians, but it was emphatically defended by Marcion's appeal to Gal., vi, 6. According to Tertullian (Adv. Marc., I, xiv) he used water in baptism, anointed his faithful with oil and gave milk and honey to

the catechumens and in so far retained the orthodox practices, although, says Tertullian, all these things are ‘beggarly elements of the Creator.’ Marcionites must have been excessive fasters to provoke the ridicule of Tertullian in his Montanist days. Epiphanius says they fasted on Saturday out of a spirit of opposition to the Jewish God, who made the Sabbath a day of rejoicing. This however may have been merely a western custom adopted by them.”²⁰⁰⁶

The Frankists wanted to be the Messiahs not of the creator God of the Old Testament whom they also called evil, but of Marcion’s good God, whom they recast into the ultimate and supreme God of Israel. The Frankist Jews believed that they could accomplish this end by being apostates, nihilists and deceivers, who achieved God’s will by doing evil, and who did evil by hiding their true intentions. The Messiah himself would have to be crypto-Jew who would torment other Jews—like Adolf Hitler. The Frankist Jews tried to force God to restore them to Israel as he promised to do after punishing them for their evil acts. They believed that they had to first perform said divine evil on an unprecedented scale and thereby hasten the punishment of the Jews in a horrific holocaust, which would also hasten the arrival of the Messianic Era. The Frankist sophists thereby converted the action of doing evil into a divine act of obedience to God. They set about to destroy the world as an invitation to God to punish them and begin the Messianic Age. Adolf Hitler was their apostate Messiah, who restored the Jews to Palestine by punishing the Jews and committing gross acts of deliberate evil.

These Frankist Jews quickly became the guiding force behind world leadership. Gershom Scholem encapsulated their beliefs as follows:

“1) The belief in the necessary apostasy of the Messiah and in the sacramental nature of the descent into the realm of the *kelipot*. 2) The belief that the ‘believer’ must not appear to be as he really is. 3) The belief that the Torah of *atzilut* must be observed through the violation of the Torah of *beriah*. 4) The belief that the First Cause and the God of Israel are not the same, the former being the God of rational philosophy, the latter the God of Religion. 5) The belief in three hypostates of the God-head, all of which have been or will be incarnated in human form.”²⁰⁰⁷

Scholem wrote,

“According to Frank, the ‘cosmos’ (*tevel*) or ‘earthly world’ (*tevel ha-gashmi*) as it was called by the sectarians in Salonika, is not the creation of the Good or Living God, for if it were it would be external and man would be immortal, whereas as we see from the presence of death in the world this is not at all the case.”²⁰⁰⁸

Scholem quotes Frankist doctrine:

“This much I tell you: Christ, as you know, said that he had come to redeem the world from the hands of the devil, but I have come to redeem it from all the laws and customs that have ever existed. It is my task to annihilate all this so that the Good God can reveal Himself. [***] Wherever Adam trod a city was built but wherever I set foot all will be destroyed, for I came into this world only to destroy and to annihilate. But what I build will last forever. [***] I did not come into this world to lift you up but rather to cast you down to the bottom of the abyss. further than this it is impossible to descend, nor can one ascend again by virtue of one’s own strength, for only the Lord can raise one up from the depths by the power of His hand.”²⁰⁰⁹

Jacob Frank gave out his wife and daughter for sexual favors in order to gain converts and influence the influential. He accused his fellow Jews of ritual sacrifice for personal political gain, and otherwise tried to appeal to the mythologies and aspirations of Moslem and Christian leaders. Frank’s agents and their descendants have corrupted the Gentile world with Communist, Masonic and Illuminati-style leaders, who bought into the mythologies he promulgated, and who have done his bidding. The Hasidic Jews seem very earnest in carrying out his objectives and some practice his perversions. Frank’s ultimate goal was to destroy life on Earth, and the means to accomplish that end today exist. The Nazis and Communists, under crypto-Jewish leadership, inflicted terrible harm on humanity. For the Frankist Jews, there is still worse evil yet to be done.

It is interesting to note that Baal worshipers practiced the prostitution of women and homosexual men in their temples to gain converts and as an expression of their fertility religion, and some Jewish temples were used for Baal worship by Jews. The Gnostics also used communal women and homosexual sex to lure in converts. The dissemination of insincere Liberalism was another tactic some Zionists have used to undermine the structure of Gentile societies.

What the Italian mafia called *Omerta*, the code of silence, Frank called *massa dumah*. The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* writes in its article, “FRANK, JACOB, AND THE FRANKISTS,”

“The motto which Frank adopted here was *massa dumah* (from Isa. 21:11), taken to mean ‘the burden of silence’; that is, it was necessary to bear the heavy burden of the hidden faith in the abolition of all law in utter silence, and it was forbidden to reveal anything to those outside the fold. Jesus of Nazareth was no more than the husk preceding and concealing the fruit, who was Frank himself. Although it was necessary to ensure an outward demonstration of Christian allegiance, it was forbidden to mix with Christians or to intermarry with them, for in the final analysis Frank’s vision was of a Jewish future, albeit in a rebellious and revolutionary form, presented here as a messianic dream. [***] Frank went with his daughter to Vienna in March of 1775 and was received in audience by the empress and her son, later Joseph II. Some maintain that Frank promised the empress the assistance of his followers in a campaign to conquer parts of Turkey, and in

fact over a period of time several Frankist emissaries were sent to Turkey, working hand in glove with the Doenmeh, and perhaps as political agents or spies in the service of the Austrian government. During this period Frank spoke a great deal about general revolution which would overthrow kingdoms, and the Catholic Church in particular, and he also dreamed of the conquest of some territory in the wars at the end of time which would be the Frankist dominion.”²⁰¹⁰

It is difficult to believe that it is merely a coincidence that this religion of revolution and Nihilism was heavily promoted in England at the same time in the writings of David Hartley—and can be traced back to the Cabalist Van Helmont. It was their intention to destroy and corrupt; and the Frankists relied upon passages in the Old Testament and the Lurian Cabalah to justify deceit, lying, world revolution, destruction, evil and atheism among Gentiles—passages such as *Isaiah* 45:7; and 59:15-16:

“I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the LORD do all these *things*. [***] Yea, truth faileth; and he *that* departeth from evil maketh himself a prey. And the LORD saw *it*, and it displeased him that *there was* no judgment. And he saw that *there was* no man, and wondered that *there was* no intercessor: therefore his arm brought salvation unto him; and his righteousness, it sustained him.”

and *Job* Chapter 12,

“And Job answered and said, 2 No doubt but ye *are* the people, and wisdom shall die with you. 3 But I have understanding as well as you; I *am* not inferior to you: yea, who knoweth not such things as these? 4 I am *as* one mocked of his neighbor, who calleth upon God, and he answereth him: the just upright *man is* laughed to scorn. 5 He that is ready to slip with *his* feet *is as* a lamp despised in the thought of him that is at ease. 6 The tabernacles of robbers prosper, and they that provoke God are secure; into whose hand God bringeth *abundantly*. 7 But ask now the beasts, and they shall teach thee; and the fowls of the air, and they shall tell thee: 8 or speak to the earth, and it shall teach thee; and the fishes of the sea shall declare unto thee. 9 Who knoweth not in all these that the hand of the LORD hath wrought this? 10 In whose hand *is* the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind. 11 Doth not the ear try words? and the mouth taste his meat? 12 With the ancient *is* wisdom; and in length of days understanding. 13 With him *is* wisdom and strength, he hath counsel and understanding. 14 Behold, he breaketh down, and it cannot be built again: he shutteth up a man, and there can be no opening. 15 Behold, he withholdeth the waters, and they dry up: also he sendeth them out, and they overturn the earth. 16 With him *is* strength and wisdom: the deceived and the deceiver *are* his. 17 He leadeth counselors away spoiled, and maketh the judges fools. 18 He looseth the bond of kings,

and girdeth their loins with a girdle. 19 He leadeth princes away spoiled, and overthroweth the mighty. 20 He removeth away the speech of the trusty, and taketh away the understanding of the aged. 21 He poureth contempt upon princes, and weakeneth the strength of the mighty. 22 He discovereth deep things out of darkness, and bringeth out to light the shadow of death. 23 He increaseth the nations, and destroyeth them: he enlargeth the nations, and straiteneth them *again*. 24 He taketh away the heart of the chief of the people of the earth, and causeth them to wander in a wilderness *where there is no way*. 25 They grope in the dark without light, and he maketh them to stagger like a drunken man.”

It was a long road for the Frankist Nihilists to the end of time, which came during, and shortly after, the Second World War. The Frankists chose Jacob Frank’s nephew, Moses Dobrushka a. k. a. Junius Frey, a. k. a. Franz Thomas von Schoenfeld, as Jacob Frank’s successor—it was a Frankist-Shabbataian tradition to change names, and give the appearance of changing religions, in order to gain the confidence of Gentiles so as to enable the Frankists to more easily destroy them and subvert their societies. Moses Dobrushka became a Jacobin, a leader of Freemasonry and a powerful influence in the French Revolution. It is interesting that Robespierre and Napoleon saw themselves as Messiahs, as had Shabbatai Zevi and Jacob Frank, and as Adolf Hitler later would. Frankist mythologies asserted that Messiahdom was a generational passage—a matter of reincarnation. Frankism primarily took root in Poland, which has been at the epicenter of the destruction of Catholic Europe.

According to Edouard Drumont, Alexandre Weill found good in the destruction and dismemberment of Poland and the planned destruction of France and diaspora of the French—recall that David Hartley had wished for the fall of Christendom and the diaspora of Christians. Drumont wrote that Weill had told him in 1875 that,

“[. . .]France was obliged to undergo the same fate as Poland and that it would be good, in the best interests of Humanity, that the French, dispersed and countryless like the Poles, would go and spread throughout the world the general truths of civilization and progress.”²⁰¹¹

Roman Dmowski iterated a Polish Gentile’s view of the First World War in his article *The Jews and the War* of 1924.²⁰¹² He noted that many of the Jews who had supported the Central Powers in the beginning of the war changed sides to the Allies in early 1917. Dmowski believed in 1924 that Jews intended to make Poland a new Palestine. Great masses of Jews were deported to Poland in both world wars by both sides of the conflict. Poland was the epicenter of the Jewish Holocaust.

The initial plan was evidently to concentrate them for deportation to Palestine, which neither a majority of the Jews, nor many of the world’s nations, desired. It is interesting to note that Hitler was allegedly surprised by the reaction of the British when Germany invaded Poland in a quest for *Lebensraum* for Germans and for a place in which to segregate the Jews to the East and prevent their assimilation while preparing them for forced deportation to Palestine. The English had obstructed the

Nazis' attempts to deport Jews to Palestine and then declared war on Germany when the Nazis invaded Poland—the ultimate destination for millions of Jews, many of whom perished under the crypto-Jewish Zionist Nazi leaders Adolf Eichmann and Hans Frank. After World War II, the Allies allowed the Soviet Union to take over Poland. The Soviets tried for another forty years to destroy religion in Poland—primarily Catholicism. The Jews were forced to suffer through the war in Poland so that enough Jewish blood would be spilled to justify the theft of Palestine and frighten the Jews into moving there and staying.

David Hartley's work followed the works of Thomas Brightman, who published his *Apocalypsis Apocalypseos* in 1585;²⁰¹³ and Henry Finch, who published *The Worlds Great Restauration. Or the Calling of the Ievves and (With Them) of All the Nations and Kingdomes of the Earth, to the Faith of Christ* in 1621.²⁰¹⁴

The Zionists had the vocal support of prominent Protestant Christians who hoped to bring about the Apocalypse through active political intervention—as opposed to waiting for God to do what He promised to do. More modern Jewish Zionists repeated much of the rhetoric and tactics the Christian Zionists used, which was originally covertly crafted by Cabalistic Jews. It was a strange cycle, whereby Jews learned their Zionism from the Christians who had secretly learned it from Jews.

All that the modern Jewish Zionists lacked was the widespread support of Jews, which they only received after the end of the Second World War—after the Frankist Jews had done their dirty deeds. It took the Zionists two world wars and Adolf Hitler to change the Jews' collective mind to embrace secular Zionism, which led many to realize that Zionists and their Protestant supporters had agitated for both world wars and had created and continually sponsored Adolf Hitler's rise to power.

In 1933, Zionist Horace Mayer Kallen blamed the First World War on the Germans, and stated,

“The formation of the League of Nations on the initiative and insistence of a great American President, Woodrow Wilson, was fruit of this War, and an explicit, if weak, acknowledgment of this interdependence. Mr. Wilson's successor of today just as frankly acknowledges it stresses it.”²⁰¹⁵

Kallen goes on to quote Zionist Franklin Delano Roosevelt's message to the World Economic Conference and the Disarmament Conference of 16 May 1933.²⁰¹⁶

Like Wilson, Roosevelt later lied to the American public in order to be elected and told them that he was against American involvement in the war in Europe. Tyler Gatewood Kent²⁰¹⁷ documented President Roosevelt's secret communications to Zionist Winston Churchill beginning in October of 1939, in which Roosevelt assured Churchill that America would not be truly neutral and would rescue the British. This emboldened the British in their declaration of war on Germany, and revealed Roosevelt's duplicity.

When this correspondence began, Neville Chamberlain was Prime Minister of England and Churchill was head of the British Navy. Roosevelt went behind Chamberlain's back and apparently knew ahead of time that Churchill would succeed Chamberlain. Just when Kent had accumulated all the evidence needed to

prove Roosevelt a liar, and a criminal, and as Kent was preparing to send this evidence to the American Congress; British authorities arrested him, seized his records and in violation of his American diplomatic immunity, which they conspired to have waived, imprisoned him for the duration of the war. Just as the American Wilson Administration passed several laws which enabled them to imprison dissenters, and the Roosevelt Administration used the Sedition Act to persecute its critics; the British had in place Regulation 18B, which enabled authorities to arrest and detain anyone they wanted to keep quiet, including Captain Archibald Henry Maule Ramsay.

Like Zionist President Wilson, Zionist President Roosevelt betrayed the American blacks who initially helped to put him in office; and, unlike his wife Eleanor, Franklin Delano Roosevelt opposed the anti-lynching bill. While it is obviously a good thing that the Russians, Americans and British defeated the Nazis, it obviously would have been a better thing if the Zionists had not caused both of the world wars.

Zionists and their supporters often spoke of Wilson's "New World Order" following the "war to end all wars." The concept of the "war to end all wars" is a prophetic and apocalyptic one foretold in *Isaiah 2:1-4*:

"1 The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem. 2 And it shall come to pass in the last days, *that* the mountain of the LORD's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. 3 And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem. 4 And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

In 1943, Zionist Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver saw this new world order of "justice" as the allegedly just action of taking Palestine from its majority population and giving it to the Zionists. Referring to Americans of Jewish descent, the Rabbi asked them in 1943 to give their approval to Zionism and to pressure American politicians,

"with the same sympathy and the same understanding as the Presidents of the United States from Wilson down, and the Congress of the United States, helped [the Yishuv] in the earlier years."²⁰¹⁸

In 1944, while the Nazis were massacring innocent and helpless Slavs, Jews, Gypsies, etc., Zionist David Ben-Gurion stated,

"One Degania [resident of the first communal settlement of Zionists in Palestine] is worth more than all the 'Yevsektzias' [Jewish Bolsheviks who

sought to secularize Jews] and assimilationists in the world.”²⁰¹⁹

Ben-Gurion boasted,

“This people was the first to prophesy about ‘the end of days,’ the first to see the vision of a new human society. [***] Our small and land-poor Jewish people, therefore, lived in constant tension between the power and influence of the neighboring great empires and its own seemingly insignificant culture—a culture poor in material wealth and tangible monuments, but rich and great in its human and moral concepts and in its vision of a universal ‘end of days.’”²⁰²⁰

Christopher Sykes wrote, “[. . .]Zionist leaders were determined at the very outset of the Nazi disaster to reap political advantage from the tragedy.”²⁰²¹ David Ben-Gurion stated in 1932,

“What Zionist propaganda for years and years could not do, disaster has done overnight. Palestine is today the fiery question for the Jews of East and West, and the New World as well.”²⁰²²

Ben-Gurion also stated,

“The disaster facing European Jewry is not directly my business.”²⁰²³

and,

“The First World War brought us the Balfour Declaration. The Second ought to bring us the Jewish State.”²⁰²⁴

and,

“It is the job of Zionism not to save the remnant of Israel in Europe but rather to save the land of Israel for the Jewish people and the yishuv.”²⁰²⁵

The majority of Jews did not want the desert the Zionists wanted for them, until the Nazis had mass murdered European Jews. Racist Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann stated in 1914, before the First World War began,

“We cannot take Palestine yet, even if it were given to us. Even if the great miracle had happened and we had obtained the Charter, we should have to wait for the greater miracle—for the Jews to know how to make use of this Charter.”²⁰²⁶

Weizmann admitted in 1927 that,

“We Jews got the Balfour Declaration quite unexpectedly; or, in other words, we are the greatest war profiteers. [***] The Jews, they knew, were against us; we stood alone on a little island, a tiny group of Jews with a foreign past.”²⁰²⁷

David Ben-Gurion stated,

“The First World War brought us the Balfour Declaration. The Second ought to bring us the Jewish State.”²⁰²⁸

Countless millions died as the Zionists depended on both world wars to bring them Palestine.

The London Times had published on the Protestant Zionist movement on 24 January 1839 on page 3, quoting extensively from *The Quarterly Review*²⁰²⁹ of January, 1839,

“THE STATE AND PROSPECT OF THE JEWS.

(From a Correspondent.)

‘What is to become of the Jews?’ is a question that must as often occur to the reflecting statesman as to the reader of the ancient prophecies. Wherever he turns his eye he beholds a people exiled and scattered, persecuted and despised, as a body ground almost to powder by the iron hand of poverty; and yet, everywhere intelligent, learned, and possessed of unbounded influence, and, however paradoxical it may sound, of immense wealth; inhabitants of all countries, but at home in none; apparently a mass of disjointed fragments, but in reality knit together in the most intimate religious and national union, and in continual and rapid communication with their brethren in all parts of the world. What, then, is to become of them? Some of the continental statesmen solve the enigma by an attempt at amalgamation, and think that the ties of religion and nationality, which have stood the wear and tear of 18 centuries, are to be rent asunder by the simple process of naturalization. Very similar is the expectation of the church of Rome and of most sectarians. Looking upon their own little communion as the church and people of God, they appropriate to themselves the promises of future glory which Hebrew prophets have announced to the Hebrew people, and think that by the process of conversion the Jews will gradually melt down and be lost in the Christian church. The great writers of the Anglican church, adopting an interpretation more worthy of their faith and their scholarship, trace out for the children of Abraham a destiny more congenial to their hitherto marvellous history, the main features of which are ably delineated in an article on Lord Lindsay’s travels in the last number of the *Quarterly Review*.

The writer, treading in the steps of Bishops Lowth, Butler, Horsley, and Van Mildert, has turned the public attention to the claims which the Jewish people still have upon the land of Israel as their rightful inheritance, and their

consequent political importance in the progress of that great struggle which has already commenced in the East, and which threatens soon to absorb the regards and energies of the old world, possibly of the new also. The subject may be new to many of our readers, but it is one deserving the solemn consideration of a people possessing an oriental empire of such vast extent. The article breathes also a spirit of kindness towards a deeply injured people, and a freedom from prejudice which does honour to the author. No people on the face of the earth has been so little understood and so grossly misrepresented as the Jewish, but no wonder, for no people ever did so much to misrepresent and caricature themselves as the Jews have done in the maxims and legends of the Talmud. A new era is, however, commencing. The Jews themselves, in London as elsewhere, are taking steps to abdicate the follies and intolerance of Rabbinism, and Christians at the same moment begin to renounce their most unchristian prejudice.

The following extracts from a journal so highly respectable as the *Quarterly Review* must tend to prove to the Jews that the feelings of those whose opinions are worth having are those of kindness and good will.

After a notice of Lord Lindsay's work, the author thus proceeds:—

'We have alluded, in the commencement of this article, to the growing interest manifested in behalf of the Holy Land. This interest is not confined to the Christians—it is shared and avowed by the whole body of the Jews, who no longer conceal their hope and their belief that the time is not far distant when 'the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea; and shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and shall gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.' Isaiah xi., 11.

'Doubtless, this is no new settlement among the children of the dispersion. The novelty of the present day does not lie in the indulgence of such a hope by that most venerable people; but in their fearless confession of the hope, and in the approximation of spirit between Christians and Hebrews, to entertain the same belief of the future glories of Israel, to offer up the same prayer, and look forward to the same consummation. To most former periods a development of religious feeling has been followed by a persecution of the ancient people of God; from the days of Constantine to Leo XII, the disciples of Christ have been stimulated to the oppression of the children of Israel; and Heaven alone can know what myriads of that suffering race fell beneath the *piety* of the Crusaders, as they marched to recover the sepulchre of their Saviour from the hands of the infidels. But a mighty change has come over the hearts of the Gentiles; they seek now the temporal and eternal peace of the Hebrew people; societies are established in England and Germany to diffuse among them the light of the gospel; and the increasing accessions to the parent institution in London attest the public estimation of its principles and services. * * * *

'But a more important undertaking has already been begun by the zeal and piety of those who entertain an interest for the Jewish nation. They have designed the establishment of a church at Jerusalem, if possible on Mount Zion itself, where the

order of our service and the prayers of our liturgy shall daily be set before the faithful in the Hebrew language. A considerable sum has been collected for this purpose; the missionaries are already resident on the spot; and nothing is wanting but to complete the purchase of the ground on which to erect the sacred edifice. Mr. Nicolayson, having received ordination at the hands of the Bishop of London, has been appointed to the charge; and Mr. Pieritz, a Hebrew convert, is associated in the duty. The service meanwhile proceeds, though 'the ark of God is under curtains;' and a small but faithful congregation of proselytes hear daily the Evangelical verities of our church on the mount of the Holy City itself, in the language of the prophets, and in the spirit of the apostles. To anyone who reflects on this event it must appear one of the most striking that have occurred in modern days, perhaps in any days since the corruptions began in the church of Christ. It is well known that for centuries the Greek, the Romanist, the Armenian, and the Turk, have had their places of worship in the city of Jerusalem, and the latitudinarianism of Ibrahim Pasha had lately accorded that privilege to the Jews. The pure doctrines of the Reformation, as embodied and professed in the church of England, have alone been unrepresented amidst all these corruptions; and Christianity has been contemplated both by Mussulman and Jew as a system most hateful to the creed of each, a compound of mummery and image-worship.

'It is surely of vital importance to the cause of our religion that we should exhibit it in its pure and apostolical form to the children of Israel. We have already mentioned that they are returning in crowds to their ancient land; we must provide for the converts an orthodox and spiritual service, and set before the rest, whether residents or pilgrims, a worship as enjoined by our Saviour himself, 'a worship in spirit and in truth,'—its faith will then be spoken of through the whole world. A great benefit of this nature has resulted from the Hebrew services of the London Episcopal Chapel; it has not only afforded instruction and opportunity of worship to the converted Israelite, but has formed a point of attraction to foreign Jews on a visit to this country, and has been largely and eagerly commented on in many of the Hebrew journals published in Germany. In the purity of our worship they confess our freedom from idolatry; and in the sound of the language of Moses and the prophets, they forget that we are Gentiles. But if this be so in London, what will it be in the Holy City? They will hear the Psalms of David, in the very words that fell from his inspired lips, once more chanted on the holy hill of Zion; they will see the whole book of the law and the prophets laid before them, and hear it read at the morning and evening oblation; they will admire the church of England, with all its comprehensive fulness of doctrine, truth, and love, like a pious and humble daughter, doing final homage to that church first planted at Jerusalem, which is the mother of us all. Our soul-stirring and soul-satisfying liturgy—in Hebrew—its deep and tender devotion—the evangelical simplicity of its ritual—will form, in the mind of the Jew, an inviting contrast to the idolatry and superstition of the Latin and eastern churches; its enlarged charity will affect his heart, and its scriptural character demand his homage. It is surely a high privilege reserved to our church and nation to plant the true cross on the holy hill of Zion; to carry back the faith we thence received by the apostles; and uniting, as it were, the history, the labours, and the blood of the primitive and Protestant martyrs, 'light such a candle in Jerusalem as by God's blessing shall never be put out.'

'But this privilege will not be unaccompanied by practical benefits to the character and position of our own establishment. Whatever promotes the study and

reverence of the Hebrew Scriptures promotes, in a similar degree, the honour and stability of the church of England. Her appointed orders, her liturgical services, her decent splendour, her national endowments, are 'according to the pattern that God showed us in the Mount.' The principle of an establishment then received the august sanction of the divine wisdom; and whether we look back to the earliest periods of the Jewish history, or forwards to the day of their future glory, as displayed in the concluding chapters of Ezekiel, we shall find that a national and established church is ever a main portion of the polity of the people of God. The arch-assailants of our Zion are well aware of this truth, and seek, therefore, to disparage the Old Testament by a contemptuously exclusive preference of the New!—irreverently excluding from their 'Christian' catalogue the 'Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms,' they ascribe to the Gospels and Epistles *alone* the title of the *Christian Scriptures!* And they are wise in their generation,—perceiving, as they do, that the co-ordinate authority and mutual dependence of all parts of the written word would manifest that the Saviour of Mankind, no less in the temporal than in the spiritual necessities of his church, 'came not destroy, but to fulfil.'

'The growing interest manifested for those regions, the larger investment of British capital, and the confluence of British travellers and strangers from all parts of the world, have recently induced the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to station there a representative of our Sovereign, in the person of a vice-consul. This gentleman set sail for Alexandria at the end of last September—his residence will be fixed at Jerusalem, but his jurisdiction will extend to the whole country within the ancient limits of the Holy Land; he is thus accredited, as it were, to the former kingdom of David and the twelve tribes. The soil and climate of Palestine are singularly adapted to the growth of produce required for the exigencies of Great Britain; the finest cotton may be obtained in almost unlimited abundance; silk and madder are the staple of the country, and olive-oil is now, as it ever was, the very fatness of the land. Capital and skill are alone required: the presence of a British officer, and the increased security of property which his presence will confer, may invite them from these islands to the cultivation of Palestine; and the Jews, who will betake themselves to agriculture in no other land,* having found in the English Consul a mediator between their people and the Pasha, will probably return in greater numbers, and become once more the husbandmen of Judea and Galilee.

'This appointment has been conceived and executed in the spirit of true wisdom. Though we cannot often commend the noble Lord's official proceedings, we must not withhold our meed of gratitude for the act, nor of praise for the zeal with which he applied himself to great preliminary difficulties, and the ability with which he overcame them. It is truly a national service: at all times it would have been expedient, but now it is necessary. To pass over commercial advantages—which the country will best perceive in the experience of them—we may discern a manifest benefit to our political position. We have done a deed which the Jews will regard as an honour to their nation, and have thereby conciliated a body of well-wishers in every people under heaven. Throughout the East they nearly monopolize the concerns of traffic and finance, and maintain a secret but uninterrupted intercourse with their brethren in the West. Thousands visit Jerusalem in every year from all parts of the globe, and carry back to their respective bodies that intelligence which guides their conduct and influences their sympathies. So rapid and accurate is their mutual communication, that Frederick the Great confessed the earlier and superior intelligence obtained through the Jews of all affairs of moment. Napoleon knew well

the value of an Hebrew alliance, and endeavoured to reproduce in the capital of France the spectacle of the ancient Sanhedrim, which, basking in the sunshine of imperial favour, might give laws to the whole body of the Jews throughout the habitable world, and aid him, no doubt, in his audacious plans against Poland and the East. His scheme, it is true, proved abortive, for the mass of the Israelites were by no means inclined to merge their hopes in the destinies of the empire—exchange Zion for Montmartre, and Jerusalem for Paris. The few liberal unbelievers whom he attracted to his view ruined his projects with the people by their impious flattery, and averted the whole body of the nation by blending, on the 15th of August, the cipher of Napoleon and Josephine with the unutterable name of Jehovah, and elevating the imperial eagle above the representation of the ark of the covenant. A misconception, in fact, of the character of the people has vitiated all the attempts of various sovereigns to better their condition; they have sought to amalgamate them with the body of their subjects, not knowing or not regarding the temper of the Hebrews, and the plain language of Scripture, that ‘the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations.’

‘That which Napoleon designed in his violence and ambition, thinking ‘to destroy nations not a few,’ we may wisely and legitimately undertake for the maintenance of our empire. The affairs of the East are lowering on Great Britain, but it is singular and providential that we should at this moment have executed a measure which will almost assure us the co-operation of the eastern Jews, and kindle in our behalf the sympathies of nearly 2,000,000 in the heart of the Russian dominions. These hopes rest on no airy foundation; but, pleasing as they are, we cannot disguise our far greater satisfaction that, in the step just taken, in the appointment just made, England has attained the praise of being the first of the Gentile nations that has ceased to ‘*to tread down Jerusalem!*’ This is, indeed, no more than justice, since she was the first to set the evil and cruel example of banishing the whole people in a body from her inhospitable bosom. France next, and then Spain, aped our unchristian and foolish precedent. Spain may have exceeded us in barbarity; but we invented the oppression, and preceded her in the infliction of it.’

*Dr. Henderson says of the Polish Jews—‘Comparatively few of the Jews learn any trade, and most of those attempts which have been made to accustom them to agricultural habits have proved abortive. **[Later political Zionists were anxious to persuade Jews to take up farming so as to cease to be, in their minds, “parasites”. They did not want foreign workers to live in Israel and, in their minds, pollute their gene pool and corrupt their culture. Jacob worked the field. Esau wielded the sword. Cain was a farmer who slew Abel. “Abel was a keeper of sheep.” (Genesis 4:2) The Talmud taught Jews that agricultural was the lowest form of work (Yebamoth 63a).—CJB]** Some of those who are in circumstances of affluence possess houses and other immoveable property; but the great mass of the people seem destined to sit loose from every local tie, and are waiting, with anxious expectation, for the arrival of the period when, in pursuance of the Divine promise, they shall be restored to what they still consider *their own land*. Their attachment indeed to Palestine is unconquerable.’—*Biblical Researches and Travels in Russia*, 1826.”

The Zionists often attempted to draw the might of the British Empire into the Middle East, so that the British citizens could sacrifice their lives for the sake of

Israel, just as the French had done under Napoleon. The Zionists flattered and tempted the British, just as they had done to the French, with promises of Messiahdom, the Messianic Age, wealth and millions of Jewish allies against the Russians in the heart of the Russian Empire. Disraeli would later draw the British into the swamp of the Suez and Queen Victoria, the Queen of the House of David, became “Empress of India”, in an effort to defend British interests from an imagined Russian and Turkish threat through the trade routes of the Middle East. While pretending to solve these “problems”, the Jews created and agitated them. Zionists persuaded the British to die to take Palestine in order to curry favor with Russian Jews, and Zionists brought America into the war in exchange for the Balfour Declaration—to this day Americans are killing Moslems in pursuit of the Zionists’ perceived self-interests. As they had done to the British and French, Jews covertly and artificially create disasters for America, and then offer up greater destruction as a solution, a solution which benefits them and destroys all others.

In 1839, *The Quarterly Review* pitched Zionism to the British by appealing to their sympathies, and to their greed,

“That which Napoleon designed in his violence and ambition, thinking ‘to destroy nations not a few,’ we may wisely and legitimately undertake for the maintenance of our Empire. The affairs of the East are lowering on Great Britain—but it is singular and providential that we should, at this moment, have executed a measure, which will almost assure us the co-operation of the Eastern Jews, and kindle, in our behalf, the sympathies of nearly two millions in the heart of the Russian dominions. [*Footnote*: ‘Look to their present state of suffering in Poland and Russia, where they are driven from place to place, and not permitted to live in the same street where the so-called Christians reside! It not unfrequently happens, that when one or more wealthy Jews have built commodious houses in any part of a town, not hitherto prohibited, this affords a reason for proscribing them; it is immediately enacted that no Jew must live in that part of the city, and they are forthwith driven from their houses, without any compensation for their loss being given them’. ‘they are oppressed on every side, yet dare not complain; robbed and defrauded, yet obtain no redress’. ‘in the walk of social life, insult, and contempt, meet them at every turning.’—*Herschel’s Sketch*, p. 7.] These hopes rest on no airy foundation; but pleasing as they are, we cannot disguise our far greater satisfaction that, in the step just taken, in the appointment just made, England has attained the praise of being the first of the Gentile nations that has ceased ‘to tread down Jerusalem!’ This is, indeed, no more than justice, since she was the first to set the evil and cruel example of banishing the whole people in a body from her inhospitable bosom. France next, and then Spain, aped our unchristian and foolish precedent. Spain may have proceeded us in barbarity; but we invented the oppression, and preceded her in the infliction of it.”²⁰³⁰

The majority of Jews wanted nothing of the Protestant movement to banish them to the deserts of Palestine in the hopes that Jesus might return in the form of a Rothschild. *The London Times* published the following set of queries on 17 August

1840 on page 3,

“SYRIA.—RESTORATION OF THE JEWS.

(From a Correspondent.)

The proposition to plant the Jewish people in the land of their fathers, under the protection of the five Powers, is no longer a mere matter of speculation, but of serious political consideration. In a Ministerial paper of the 31st of July an article appears bearing all the characteristics of a feeler on this deeply interesting subject. However, it has been reserved for a noble lord opposed to Her Majesty’s Ministers to take up the subject in a practical and statesmanlike manner, and he is instituting inquiries, of which the following is a copy:—

QUERIES.

‘1. What are the feelings of the Jews you meet with respect to their return to the Holy Land?

‘2. Would the Jews of station and property be inclined to return to Palestine, carry with them their capital, and invest it in the cultivation of the land, if by the operation of law and justice life and property were rendered secure?

‘3. How soon would they be inclined and ready to go back?

‘4. Would they go back entirely at their own expense, requiring nothing further than the assurance of safety to person and estate?

5. Would they be content to live under the Government of the country as they should find it, their rights and privileges being secured to them under the protection of the European powers?

‘Let the answers you procure be as distinct and decided and detailed as possible: in respect as to the inquiries as to property, it will of course be sufficient that you should obtain fair proof of the fact from general report.’

The noble Lord who is instituting these inquiries has given deep attention to the matter, and is well known as the writer of an able article in the *Quarterly* on the subject, in December, 1838.

In connexion with this, a deeply interesting discovery has been made on the south-west shores of the Caspian, enclosed in a chain of mountains, of the remnant of the Ten Tribes, living in the exercise of their religious customs in a primitive manner, distinct from the customs of modern Judaism. The facts which distinguish them as the remnant of that branch of the Jewish family are striking and incontrovertible, and are about to be given to the world. An intrepid missionary, the Rev. Mr. Samuel, of Bombay, has made the discovery, and resided amongst this people several months, under permission from the Russian Government, who directed him to institute inquiry concerning them.”

9 THE PRIORITY MYTH

It is well known in the Physics community that Albert Einstein was a career plagiarist. Immediately after the Annalen der Physik published the Einsteins' 1905 paper on the theory of relativity, which wanted for a single reference to the published work of the Einsteins' predecessors, Walter Kaufmann dubbed the special theory of relativity the "Lorentz-Einstein" theory. Kaufmann was overly generous to Einstein at the expense of the Frenchman Henri Poincaré.

“The secret to creativity is knowing how to hide your sources.”—ALBERT EINSTEIN

“All this was maintained by Poincaré and others long before the time of Einstein, and one does injustice to truth in ascribing the discovery to him.”—CHARLES NORDMANN

9.1 Introduction

It is easily proven that Albert Einstein did not originate the special theory of relativity in its entirety, or even in its majority.²⁰³¹ The historic record is readily available. Ludwig Gustav Lange,²⁰³² Woldemar Voigt,²⁰³³ Oliver Heaviside,²⁰³⁴ Heinrich Rudolf Hertz,²⁰³⁵ George Francis FitzGerald,²⁰³⁶ Joseph Larmor,²⁰³⁷ Hendrik Antoon Lorentz,²⁰³⁸ Jules Henri Poincaré,²⁰³⁹ Paul Drude,²⁰⁴⁰ Paul Langevin,²⁰⁴¹ and many others, slowly developed the theory, step by step, and based it on thousands of years of recorded thought and research. Einstein may have made a few contributions to the theory, such as the relativistic equations for aberration and the Doppler-Fizeau Effect;²⁰⁴² though he also rendered an incorrect equation for the transverse mass of an electron, which, when corrected, becomes Lorentz' equation.²⁰⁴³

Albert Einstein's first work on the theory of relativity did not appear until 1905. There is substantial evidence that Albert Einstein did not write this 1905 paper²⁰⁴⁴ on the “principle of relativity” alone. His wife, Mileva Einstein-Marity, may have been co-author, or the sole author, of the work.²⁰⁴⁵

9.2 Opinions of Einstein and “His” Work

If Albert Einstein did not originate the major concepts of the special theory of relativity, how could such a historically significant fact have escaped the attention of the world for nearly a century? The simple answer is that it did not.

Some called Einstein's priority into question almost immediately. As early as the years 1905-1907, Max Planck,²⁰⁴⁶ Walter Kaufmann,²⁰⁴⁷ Paul Ehrenfest,²⁰⁴⁸ Jakob Laub,²⁰⁴⁹ Max von Laue,²⁰⁵⁰ Hermann Minkowski, and Albert Einstein,²⁰⁵¹ himself, referred to the Einsteins' theory as being a mere interpretation and generalization of

Hendrik Antoon Lorentz' principle of relativity, which interpretation and generalization was first accomplished by Henri Poincaré,²⁰⁵² and later became known as the "Special Theory of Relativity".

In 1905, immediately after the appearance of the Einsteins' first paper on the principle of relativity, which did not contain any references to previous works, Walter Kaufmann coined the term "Lorentz-Einstein" for the theory, in recognition of Lorentz' priority,

"Finally, there is a recently published theory of electrodynamics by Mr. A. Einstein, which leads to consequences which are formally identical to those of Lorentz' theory, and for which, therefore, the second equation applies, as well. [***] (Lorentz-Einstein) [***] The above results speak decidedly against the correctness of the Lorentzian, and, therefore, also the Einsteinian, fundamental assumption. If one considers this basic assumption as thereby disproved, then the attempt to base the whole of Physics including electrodynamics and optics on the principle of relative motion must be considered a failure."

"Endlich ist noch eine von Hrn. A. Einstein² kürzlich publizierte Theorie der Elektrodynamik zu erwähnen, die zu Folgerungen führt, die mit denen LORENTZschen Theorie formell identisch sind, und für die deshalb auch die zweite Gleichung in Anwendung kommt. [***] (LORENTZ-EINSTEIN) [***] Die vorstehenden Ergebnisse sprechen entschieden gegen die Richtigkeit der Lorentzschen und somit auch der Einsteinschen Grundannahme. Erachtet man diese Grundannahme als hierdurch widerlegt, so würde der Versuch, die ganze Physik, einschließlich der Elektrodynamik und der Optik auf das Prinzip der Relativbewegung zu gründen, einstweilen als mißglückt zu bezeichnen sein."²⁰⁵³

Kaufmann again used the phrase "Lorentz-Einstein" in 1906, and reiterated the formal identity of the two authors' works,

"Einstein's theory leads to the same formula as Lorentz' [.]"

"Die Einsteinsche Theorie führt zu derselben Formel wie die Lorentzsche[.]"²⁰⁵⁴

Max Planck stated in the early spring of 1906,

"The 'principle of relativity' recently introduced by H. A. Lorentz¹) and more generally worded by A. Einstein²)[.]"

"Das vor kurzem von H. A. Lorentz¹) und in noch allgemeinerer Fassung von A. Einstein²) eingeführte „Prinzip der Relativität“ [.]"²⁰⁵⁵

In 1906, Planck referred to the theory of relativity as the Lorentz-Einstein theory and referenced Poincaré,

“I have only done the calculations for those two theories, which are the most developed at this point: Abraham’s [*Footnote*: M. Abraham, *Ann. d. Phys.* (4) 10, 105, 1903.], according to which the electron has the form of a rigid sphere, and Lorentz-Einstein’s [*Footnote*: H. A. Lorentz, *Versl. Kon. Akad. v. Wet. Amsterdam* 1904, S. 809. A. Einstein, *Ann. d. Phys.* (4) 17, 891, 1905. Also confer with H. Poincaré, *C. R.* 140, 1504, 1905.], according to which the ‘principle of relativity’ is rigorously valid. In order to be concise, I will dub the first theory ‘theory of the sphere’, and the second ‘theory of relativity’. [***] The Lorentz-Einstein theory is based upon the postulate that no absolute translation is provable.”

“Ich habe die Rechnungen nur für diejenigen beiden Theorien durchgeführt, welche bis jetzt die meiste Ausbildung erfahren haben: die Abrahamsche [*Footnote*: M. Abraham, *Ann. d. Phys.* (4) 10, 105, 1903.], wonach das Elektron die Form einer starren Kugel hat, und die Lorentz-Einsteinsche [*Footnote*: H. A. Lorentz, *Versl. Kon. Akad. V. Wet. Amsterdam* 1904, S. 809. A. Einstein, *Ann. d. Phys.* (4) 17, 891, 1905. Vgl. auch H. Poincaré, *C. R.* 140, 1504, 1905.], wonach das „Prinzip der Relativität“ genaue Gültigkeit besitzt. Zur Abkürzung werde ich im folgenden die erste Theorie als Kugeltheorie, die zweite als „Relativtheorie“ bezeichnen. [***] Der Lorentz-Einsteinschen Theorie liegt auch ein Postulat zugrunde, nämlich, daß keine absolute Translation nachzuweisen ist.”²⁰⁵⁶

Relativistic theories were commonplace at the time. Friedrich Kottler wrote an article entitled “Gravitation and the Theory of Relativity” in 1903.²⁰⁵⁷

Albert Einstein believed he had a right to plagiarize these ideas of Lorentz, and others, if he could put a new spin on them. He asserted this “privilege” in 1907, and note that in order for Einstein to assert that his viewpoint is “new” he must have known what the “old” viewpoint was,

“It appears to me that it is the nature of the business that what follows has already been partly solved by other authors. Despite that fact, since the issues of concern are here addressed from a new point of view, I believe I am entitled to leave out what would be for me a thoroughly pedantic survey of the literature, all the more so because it is hoped that these gaps will yet be filled by other authors, as has already happened with my first work on the principle of relativity through the kind efforts of Mr. *Planck* and Mr. *Kaufmann*.”

“Es scheint mir in der Natur der Sache zu liegen, daß das Nachfolgende zum Teil bereits von anderen Autoren klargestellt sein dürfte. Mit Rücksicht darauf jedoch, daß hier die betreffenden Fragen von einem neuen

Gesichtspunkt aus behandelt sind, glaubte ich, von einer für mich sehr umständlichen Durchmusterung der Literatur absehen zu dürfen, zumal zu hoffen ist, daß diese Lücke von anderen Autoren noch ausgefüllt werden wird, wie dies in dankenswerter Weise bei meiner ersten Arbeit über das Relativitätsprinzip durch Hrn. P l a n c k und Hrn. K a u f m a n n bereits geschehen ist.”²⁰⁵⁸

Rather than claim independence from Lorentz’ work, in 1907, Einstein endorsed Kaufmann’s and Planck’s declarations that his work was merely an extension of Lorentz’ prior work. In 1907, Einstein wrote a review article on the principle of relativity for the *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, and again declared that his work was an interpretation of Lorentz’ 1904 paper on electromagnetic phenomena in moving systems—though Einstein would later lie about this point.

In 1907, Einstein wrote to Johannes Stark, who edited the *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, that the only work by Lorentz related to the special theory of relativity which he knew of was Lorentz’ 1904 paper (which contains the “Lorentz transformation”).²⁰⁵⁹ This alone would indicate that when the Einsteins spoke of “Lorentzian electrodynamics” in their 1905 paper, they were speaking of Lorentz’ work of 1904—a position held by Prof. G. H. Keswani. However, Einstein’s statement is contradicted by a letter from Albert Einstein to Mileva Marić, written in 1901 in which Albert pledges to delve into the work of Lorentz.²⁰⁶⁰

Einstein stated on 19 December 1952,

“I learned of [the Michelson-Morley experiment] through H. A. Lorentz’ decisive investigation of the electrodynamics of moving bodies, with which I was acquainted before developing the special theory of relativity.”²⁰⁶¹

However, Albert Einstein lied to R. S. Shankland on 4 February 1950 and stated,

“[I] had become aware of [the Michelson-Morley experiment] through the writings of H. A. Lorentz, but only after 1905 had it come to [my] attention.”²⁰⁶²

In Einstein’s famous lecture of 1922 in Kyoto, Japan, he recounts that he derived inspiration from “Michelson’s experiment”:

“While I was thinking of this problem in my student years, I came to know the strange result of Michelson’s experiment. Soon I came to the conclusion that our idea about the motion of the earth with respect to the ether is incorrect, if we admit Michelson’s null result as a fact. This was the first path which led me to the special theory of relativity.”²⁰⁶³

On 21 September 1909, Einstein stated the “principle of relativity” is the generalization of the empirical result of the Michelson experiment,

“Michelson’s experiment suggested the assumption that, relative to a coordinate system moving along with the earth, and, more generally, relative to any system in nonaccelerated motion, all phenomena proceed according to exactly identical laws. Henceforth, we will call this assumption in brief ‘the principle of relativity.’”²⁰⁶⁴

R. S. Shankland recorded a letter Einstein had sent him in 1952, in which Einstein stated,

“I learned of [the Michelson-Morley experiment] through H. A. Lorentz’ decisive investigation of the electrodynamics of moving bodies, with which I was acquainted before developing the special theory of relativity.”²⁰⁶⁵

Assuming Einstein did not intend to lie to Stark, one must further assume that when Einstein stated in the 1905 paper that,

“[T]he electrodynamic foundation of Lorentz’s theory of the electrodynamics of moving bodies is in agreement with the principle of relativity.”²⁰⁶⁶

Einstein must have been alluding to Lorentz’ 1904 paper, which paper he did not cite in 1905, but which paper he correctly found the most relevant of Lorentz’ writings at the time. Prof. G. H. Keswani has arrived at this same conclusion on other grounds.²⁰⁶⁷ Keswani avers that the Einsteins’ 1905 paper’s assertion of conformity between the relativity principle and Lorentzian electrodynamics could only have referred to Lorentz’ paper of 1904, and that Lorentz’ earlier efforts were not in conformity with the principle of relativity, according to Keswani, and Max Born would seemingly have agreed,

“In the new theory of Lorentz the principle of relativity holds, in conformity with the results of experiment, for all electrodynamic events.”²⁰⁶⁸

Albert Einstein clearly lied when he told Carl Seelig,

“There is no doubt, that the special theory of relativity, if we regard its development in retrospect, was ripe for discovery in 1905. LORENTZ had already observed that for the analysis of MAXWELL’S equations the transformations which later were known by his name are essential, and POINCARÉ had even penetrated deeper into these connections. Concerning myself, I knew only LORENTZ’ important work of 1895—‘La théorie électromagnétique de Maxwell’ [*sic* (1892)] and ‘Versuch einer Theorie der electrischen und optischen Erscheinungen bewegten Körpern’—but not LORENTZ’ later work, nor the consecutive investigations by POINCARÉ. In this sense my work of 1905 was independent.”²⁰⁶⁹

It is obvious that Einstein not only contradicted himself, but lied to both Johannes

Stark and Carl Seelig regarding Lorentz' work. Einstein probably lied to Stark in 1907 in order emphasize the freshness of Lorentz' 1904 work in 1905, thereby emphasizing the novelty of the work, and likely lied to Seelig many years later in order emphasize the distinction of Lorentz' earlier works from Lorentz' 1904 paper, and hence the Einsteins' 1905 paper, which contained the perfected form of the Lorentz Transformation the Einsteins had plagiarized from Lorentz and Poincaré. When Albert Einstein published the article Stark had requested in 1907 for the *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Einstein emphasized the fact that his work of 1905 was an extension of Lorentz' 1904 paper, and that his 1907 article would heal any wounds which existed between Lorentz' 1904 paper and the Einsteins' 1905 paper. When the Einsteins' 1905 paper was reproduced in the book *Das Relativitätsprinzip* in 1913 together with Lorentz' prior work of 1895 and 1904, Arnold Sommerfeld annotated the Einsteins' paper, which so obviously parroted Lorentz' prior work, with the following footnote—which we know, based on the above facts, to be untrue,

“Die im Vorhergehenden abgedruckte Arbeit von H. A. Lorentz war dem Verfasser noch nicht bekannt.”²⁰⁷⁰

We know from Maurice Solovine that Einstein had studiously read Poincaré's books *Science and Hypothesis* of 1902 and *The Value of Science* of 1904, which reprinted Poincaré's famous St. Louis lecture of 1904 and his 1898 work on relative simultaneity. We know from Einstein's citations that he was familiar with Poincaré's 1900 paper on the theory of Lorentz, which contained the clock synchronization procedure Einstein parroted, and which implicitly contained the formula $E = mc^2$, which Einstein also plagiarized from Poincaré. Therefore, Albert Einstein's statement to Carl Seelig that in 1905 he was unfamiliar with Poincaré's works, which followed from Lorentz' work of 1892 and 1895, was a deliberate lie.

Einstein stated in a lecture in Kyoto, Japan, on 14 December 1922, that,

“At that time I firmly believed that the electrodynamic equations of Maxwell and Lorentz were correct. Furthermore, the assumption that these equations should hold in the reference frame of the moving body leads to the concept of the invariance of the velocity of light, which, however, contradicts the addition rule of velocities used in mechanics. Why do these concepts contradict each other? I realized that this difficulty was really hard to resolve. I spent almost a year in vain trying to modify the idea of Lorentz in the hope of resolving this problem.”²⁰⁷¹

Said “year in vain” was the year from Lorentz' work of 1904 to the Einsteins' 1905 paper, and the missing link required to “modify the idea of Lorentz” was supplied by Poincaré months before Mileva and Albert's 1905 paper appeared in print. Poincaré corrected the defects in Lorentz' theory, before the Einsteins, and thus rendered simultaneity fully relative from the additions of velocity perspective, perfecting the Lorentz group, and attaining full reciprocity for all inertial systems

and the covariance of the laws of physics, without a preferred reference frame.²⁰⁷² Poincaré also went far beyond this, and asserted that gravity propagates at light speed, and introduced the four-dimensional interpretation of the Lorentz group, before Minkowski or Einstein.

This new spin on the principle of relativity for which Einstein claimed sole credit, had already been spun in the papers of Henri Poincaré, and Einstein failed to acknowledge this fact in his 1907 review article, which was the perfect opportunity for Einstein to have made amends for the sins of his wife's and his 1905 paper, which lacked any references to, or even mention of, the work of Henri Poincaré. It appears that Einstein never gave Poincaré due credit for the extension of the principle of relativity to electrodynamics; or for the light postulate; or for the concept of, and the exposition on, relative simultaneity; or for the first covariant relativistic theory of gravity based on the presupposition that gravitational effects propagate at light speed; or for the introduction of four-dimensional space-time into the theory of relativity. Einstein was deeply indebted to Poincaré for these ideas, and failed to specifically credit him for them, though Einstein knew that they were Poincaré's ideas, not his.

In 1908, Alfred Heinrich Bucherer published a paper titled, "The Experimental Verification of the Lorentz-Einstein Theory".²⁰⁷³ In 1909, Philipp Frank wrote of the "principle of relativity according to Lorentz" and "The Lorentzian theorem of relativity" and also employed the designation "Lorentz-Einstein".²⁰⁷⁴ Walther Ritz, who once coauthored a paper with Albert Einstein,²⁰⁷⁵ spoke of the "Lorentz-Einstein Theory of Relativity".²⁰⁷⁶ Erich Hupka wrote of the "Lorentz-Einstein theory" and W. Heil wrote of the "Lorentz-Einstein relativity theory" in 1910.²⁰⁷⁷ Max Born wrote in 1910 and 1911 of the "Lorentz-Einstein principle of relativity".²⁰⁷⁸ Richard Hiecke wrote of the "Lorentz-Einstein Theory of Relativity" in 1914.²⁰⁷⁹ George Braxton Pegram spoke of the "Lorentz-Einstein relativity theory in 1917".²⁰⁸⁰ The designation "Lorentz-Einstein" was quite common at least through the 1920's, and was found in the writings of Emil Cohn, Ferdinand Lindemann, Arvid Reuterdahl, Erwin Freundlich and Hans Reichenbach, among many others.²⁰⁸¹ Hermann Weyl wrote of "Lorentz's Theorem of Relativity" and of the "Lorentz-Einstein Theorem of Relativity", in 1921.²⁰⁸²

While the theory was known most commonly as the "Lorentz-Einstein theory of relativity", it was really Hermann Minkowski who gave the theory its sex appeal based on Poincaré's innovations; and probably Minkowski, more than Larmor, Lorentz, Einstein and even Poincaré, created a stir for the special theory of relativity outside the small circle of theoretical physicists of the day—that is, before the media circus surrounding the eclipse observations of 1919 made Einstein internationally famous. Minkowski, in dramatic style, elevated the theory from an absurd proposition to an intriguing possibility in the eyes of many of his contemporary mathematicians, physicists and philosophers.

Minkowski acknowledged Woldemar Voigt's priority for the "Lorentz Transformation", the mathematical backbone of the special theory of relativity,

"In the interest of history, I want yet to add, that the transformations which

play the main rôle in the principle of relativity were first mathematically formulated by Voigt, in the year 1887.”

“Historisch will ich noch hinzufügen, daß die Transformationen, die bei dem Relativitätsprinzip die Hauptrolle spielen, zuerst mathematisch von Voigt im Jahre 1887 behandelt sind.”²⁰⁸³

Minkowski named Lorentz, Planck and Poincaré, together with Einstein,²⁰⁸⁴ as the developers of the principle of relativity,

“H. A. Lorentz has found out the ‘Relativity theorem’ and has created the Relativity-postulate as a hypothesis that electrons and matter suffer contractions in consequence of their motion according to a certain law.”²⁰⁸⁵

and,

“The credit for the development of the general principle [of relativity] belongs to Einstein, Poincaré and Planck, upon whose works I shall presently expound.”

“Verdienste um die Ausarbeitung des allgemeinen Prinzips haben Einstein, Poincaré und Planck, über deren Arbeiten ich alsbald Näheres sagen werde.”²⁰⁸⁶

Planck²⁰⁸⁷ and Poincaré attributed the principle of relativity to H. A. Lorentz,

“Will not the principle of relativity, as conceived by Lorentz, impose upon us an entirely new conception of space and time and thus force us to abandon some conclusions which might have seemed established? [***] What, then, is the revolution which is due to the recent progress of physics? The principle of relativity, in its former aspect, has had to be abandoned; it is replaced by the principle of relativity according to Lorentz. It is the transformations of ‘the group of Lorentz’ which do not falsify the differential equations of dynamics. [***] No, it was the mechanics of Lorentz, the one dealing with the principle of relativity; the one which, hardly five years ago, seemed to be the height of boldness. [***] In all instances in which it differs from that of Newton, the mechanics of Lorentz endures. We continue to believe that no body in motion will ever be able to exceed the speed of light; that the mass of a body is not a constant, but depends on its speed and the angle formed by this speed with the force which acts upon the body; that no experiment will ever be able to determine whether a body is at rest or in absolute motion either in relation to absolute space or even in relation to the ether. [***] This is easy; we have only to apply Lorentz’ principle of relativity.”²⁰⁸⁸

In 1911, Max von Laue wrote of, “the principle of relativity of classical

mechanics,” and of, “the principle of relativity of the Lorentz Transformation.”²⁰⁸⁹ Lorentz, himself, attributed the principle of relativity to Poincaré,

“For certain of the physical magnitudes which enter in the formulas I have not indicated the transformation which suits best. This has been done by Poincaré, and later by Einstein and Minkowski. [***] I have not established the principle of relativity as rigorously and universally true. Poincaré on the contrary, has obtained a perfect invariance of the electromagnetic equations, and he has formulated the ‘postulate of relativity,’ terms which he was the first to employ.”²⁰⁹⁰

Albert Einstein stated,

“The term relativity refers to time and space. [***] This led the Dutch professor, Lorentz, and myself to develop the special theory of relativity.”²⁰⁹¹

Einstein, who knew that Lorentz had the power to end Einstein’s masquerade at any time, wrote to Lorentz,

“My feeling of intellectual inferiority with regard to you cannot spoil the great delight of [our] conversation, especially because the fatherly kindness you show to all people does not allow any feeling of despondency to arise.”²⁰⁹²

Einstein was grateful to Lorentz, for his theory and for his tact,

“Lorentz is a marvel of intelligence and exquisite tact. A living work of art! In my opinion he was the most intelligent of the theorists present”.²⁰⁹³

At the 1953 centennial celebration of Lorentz’ birthday, Einstein stated,

“At the turn of the century, H. A. Lorentz was regarded by theoretical physicists of all nations as the leading spirit; and this with the fullest justification. No longer, however, do physicists of the younger generation fully realise, as a rule, the determinant part which H. A. Lorentz played in the formation of the basic principles of theoretical physics.”²⁰⁹⁴

Robert Shankland records that,

“[Einstein] repeatedly praised H. A. Lorentz and at our last meeting he told me: ‘People do not realize how great was the influence of Lorentz on the development of physics. We cannot imagine how it would have gone had not Lorentz made so many great contributions.’”²⁰⁹⁵

Abraham Pais recounts that,

“As [Einstein] told me more than once, without Lorentz he would never have been able to make the discovery of special relativity.”²⁰⁹⁶

Adriaan D. Fokker wrote,

“This transposition received the name of the Lorentz transformation of coordinates and time. After Einstein the same theory came to be known as the theory of relativity. [***] The invariance of the laws of nature had already been postulated by [Lorentz] in 1892.”²⁰⁹⁷

Einstein stated in 1912,

“To fill this gap, I introduced the principle of the constancy of the velocity of light, which I borrowed from H. A. Lorentz’s theory of the stationary luminiferous ether, and which, like the principle of relativity, contains a physical assumption that seemed to be justified only by the relevant experiments (experiments by Fizeau, Rowland, etc.).”²⁰⁹⁸

Einstein professed in 1935, that it is the Lorentz Transformations which are fundamental in deducing the “two postulates” of special relativity, not the other way around, which means that the “postulates” are in fact corollaries, and that those who first induced the Lorentz transformation ought to be considered the founders of the special theory of relativity,

“The special theory of relativity grew out of Maxwell electromagnetic equations. So it came about that even in the derivation of the mechanical concepts and their relations the consideration of those of the electromagnetic field has played an essential role. The question as to the independence of those relations is a natural one because the Lorentz transformation, the real basis of the special relativity theory, in itself has nothing to do with the Maxwell theory”²⁰⁹⁹.

Einstein also stated,

“This rigid four-dimensional space of the special theory of relativity is to some extent a four-dimensional analogue of H. A. Lorentz’s rigid three-dimensional æther.”²¹⁰⁰

and,

“I think, that the ether of the general theory of relativity is the outcome of the Lorentzian ether, through relativation.”²¹⁰¹

and,

“The four men who laid the foundations of physics on which I have been able to construct my theory are Galileo, Newton, Maxwell, and Lorentz.”²¹⁰²

Einstein’s sycophantic behavior towards Lorentz may well explain why Lorentz did not take a stronger stance against Einstein’s plagiarism. Another factor in Lorentz’ reluctance to discuss Einstein’s plagiarism may have been that Lorentz, together with Einstein, stood much to lose in a priorities dispute, and Lorentz owed much of his fame to Einstein’s promotion. Lorentz owed a great debt of acknowledgment (which he most often paid prior to Einstein’s sycophantic adoration) to Weber, Mossotti, Zöllner, Gerber, Mewes, Tisserand, Voigt, Heaviside, Hertz, FitzGerald, Poincaré and Larmor, among others—many others. That no articles from these men appeared in the 1913 book *Das Relativitätsprinzip* is a moral crime, one in which Hendrik Antoon Lorentz fully participated.

Lorentz, like Einstein, was a pacifist, even before World War I,²¹⁰³ and found an ally in Einstein against war and against Germany. In a letter to Einstein dated 28 October 1920, Max Born charged Lorentz with plagiarism, and with committing a gross injustice against Max Planck in order to curry favor with Lorentz’ “well-fed friends amongst the Allies”—this at a time when Germans were starving.²¹⁰⁴ Max Born called Lorentz dishonest and ignoble.

Beyond all of this, Lorentz shared another character flaw with Einstein—supreme arrogance. At a conference in California, Lorentz stated, near the end of his life,

“As to the second-order effect, the situation was much more difficult. The experimental results could be accounted for by transforming the co-ordinates in a certain manner from one system of co-ordinates to another. A transformation of the time was also necessary. So I introduced the conception of a local time which is different for different systems of reference which are in motion relative to each other. But I never thought that this had anything to do with the real time. This real time for me was still represented by the old classical notion of an absolute time, which is independent of any reference to special frames of co-ordinates. There existed for me only this one true time. I considered my time transformation only as a heuristic working hypothesis. So the theory of relativity is really solely Einstein’s work. And there can be no doubt that he would have conceived it even if the work of all his predecessors in the theory of this field had not been done at all. His work is in this respect independent of the previous theories.”²¹⁰⁵

If he in fact uttered these words, Lorentz’ statement is not only supremely arrogant—he took it upon himself to deny the legacies of many scientists, philosophers and mathematicians (most notably Voigt who introduced “local time” before Lorentz and Lorentz knew it), knowing that his legacy was secure—Lorentz’ statement is also irrational. One usually gives the credit and honor of priority to she or he who originated the subject idea, and one does not give credit for the evolution of a theory to someone who later summarizes it.

Furthermore, Lorentz was under the gun when he made this statement, in that the special theory of relativity had been discredited by Miller, who also spoke at the gathering at which Lorentz made his statement. Lorentz was careful to distance himself from “Einstein’s theory”, while cautiously promoting himself, knowing he was widely considered the forefather of this theory, such that whether the special theory of relativity won or lost the day, Lorentz’ legacy would remain intact. It is shameful that Lorentz took credit for Voigt’s “Ortszeit” and gave Einstein credit for Poincaré’s renouncement of the concept of absolute time and the assertion of relative simultaneity, and gave Einstein undue credit for Michelson’s experimental results, if Lorentz in fact made the last of the above comments, which were published almost two years after the conference, and after Lorentz’ death. Perhaps Lorentz’ lecture notes have survived and will show that he did make the statements. Lorentz also must have known that Poincaré’s work was vastly superior to the Einsteins’.

Lorentz also had political interests in promoting Einstein. Both were pacifists and Lorentz was interested in the success of the eclipse expeditions in 1919 because he hoped it would promote the interests of *rapprochement*. Lorentz delighted in Einstein’s celebrity for many reasons. Lorentz wanted Einstein to come to Leyden, but Einstein knew that Lorentz would discover that Einstein had no talent. Lorentz must have known that Einstein was very well connected and had numerous important contacts in the press and in the publishing business.

Though the press claimed that Einstein was the greatest and most original thinker the world had ever seen. Einstein wrote to Lorentz on 19 January 1920,

“Nevertheless, unlike you, nature has not bestowed me with the ability to deliver lectures and dispense original ideas virtually effortlessly as meets your refined and versatile mind. [***] This awareness of my limitations pervades me all the more keenly in recent times since I see that my faculties are being quite particularly overrated after a few consequences of the general theory stood the test.”²¹⁰⁶

Paul Ehrenfest, who was close to Lorentz and Einstein, already knew this about Einstein and wrote to Einstein on 2 September 1919,

“No one here expects any accomplishments, all simply want you nearby.”²¹⁰⁷

In 1905 and 1906, Paul Ehrenfest considered Lorentz’ 1904 paper on special relativity and Poincaré’s Rendiconti paper on space-time as the most significant work (both historically and scientifically) on the subject of the principle of relativity. Paul Ehrenfest and his wife Tatiana attended David Hilbert’s 1905 Göttingen seminars on electron theory, which described Lorentz’ and Poincaré’s work on special relativity. They knew that Einstein did not create the theory of relativity. Paul Ehrenfest wrote to Albert Einstein on 9 December 1919,

“I hear, for ex., that your accomplishments are being used to make propaganda, with the ‘Jewish Newton, who is simultaneously an ardent

Zionist' (I personally haven't *read* this yet, but only *heard* it mentioned). [***] But I cannot go along with the propagandistic fuss with its *inevitable* untruths, precisely *because* Judaism is at stake and *because* I feel myself so thoroughly a Jew."²¹⁰⁸

As for the alleged inevitability of Einstein's hypothetical genesis of the theory of relativity sans all predecessors, Einstein wrote in late 1907,

"That the supposition made here, which we want to call the 'principle of the constancy of the velocity of light', is actually met in Nature, is by no means self-evident, nevertheless, it is—at least for a system of coordinates in a definite state of motion—rendered probable through its verification, which Lorentz' theory based upon an absolutely resting æther has ascertained through experiment."

"Daß die hier gemachte Annahme, welche wir „Prinzip von der Konstanz der Lichtgeschwindigkeit“ nennen wollen, in der Natur wirklich erfüllt sei, ist keineswegs selbstverständlich, doch wird dies — wenigstens für ein Koordinatensystem von bestimmtem Bewegungszustande — wahrscheinlich gemacht durch die Bestätigungen, welche die, auf die Voraussetzung eines absolut ruhenden Äthers gegründete Lorentzsche Theorie durch das Experiment erfahren hat."²¹⁰⁹

The "supposition" was, in Einstein's eyes, not a self-evident truth, but an empirical observation—not *a priori*, but *a posteriori*. In fact, Einstein depended upon the Michelson-Morley result, which he later cited in this 1907 paper as compelling a change in Lorentz' theory of 1895 and 1904, which change Einstein argues was the result of the merger of Lorentz' theory with the principle of relativity, a merger made by Poincaré before the Einsteins. Einstein makes clear in this 1907 article that his 1905 work on the principle of relativity was an evolution of Lorentz' 1904 paper, and Einstein told Shankland that he learned of Michelson's experiments in Lorentz' work, before 1905.

The so-called "Lorentz Transformation" which is contained in Lorentz' 1904 paper, first appeared Joseph Larmor's work before Lorentz adopted it. The theory of relativity was not a popular theory among scientists in the early part of the twentieth century, and Lorentz was likely glad to have Einstein on the team to help popularize the unpopular theory. Making much of Einstein's plagiarism would have entailed the risk that Lorentz' theoretical work would itself have been blackened by the scandal. Planck and Kaufmann forced Einstein to acknowledge Lorentz early on, and Lorentz' legacy was thus secured.

Poincaré died in 1912. He is not known to have mentioned Einstein in the context of the theory of relativity in any positive sense. Of course, it would have been ludicrous for Poincaré to have referenced Einstein when describing his own work, which Einstein plagiarized. It is disappointing that Lorentz did not do more to restore Poincaré's legacy, though he did credit Poincaré with perfecting his theory, before

Einstein and Minkowski.

While Einstein was demonstrably a sycophant, he had another side to his personality, as sycophants often do. Einstein would not hesitate to arrogantly express ruthless disdain for those who had nothing to offer him and those whom he wished to smear in order to avoid scandal and criticism. This is abundantly clear in Einstein's letters and statements. Einstein's smear tactics and his infamous cowardly avoidance of criticism, as well as his reticence in response to accusations of his plagiarism have already been addressed.

In 1912 Johannes Stark accused Einstein of plagiarism. Einstein did not deny the charge, but arrogantly held,

“J. Stark has written a comment on a recently published paper of mine¹ for the purpose of defending his intellectual property.² I will not go into the question of priority that he has raised, because this would hardly interest anyone, all the more so because the law of photochemical equivalence is a self-evident consequence of the quantum hypothesis.”^{3,2110}

The “self-evident” ploy was one of Einstein and his coterie's favorite tactics to manipulate credit for the ideas of others through fallacy of *Petitio Principii*. Knowing the published results others had derived, Einstein and his friends would assert the results, *later*, as “natural consequences” of “their” subsequent theory, which conclusions they had also irrationally presumed in their premises, as if this gave them priority for the thoughts others had published before them, because they would falsely claim that they had derived what others were forced to hypothesize.²¹¹¹ Einstein would turn the deductive synthetic scientific theories of his predecessors on their heads and argue the same theories inductively, as if that gave him the right to take credit for them. He would do this without making reference to the works of his predecessors and then would later lie and claim that he had had no knowledge of the prior works.

Einstein had a very different attitude when it came to his alleged priority. Contrary to the impression some would have us believe, that Einstein was oblivious to the issue of priority, Einstein had written to Stark on 17 February 1908,

“I find it somewhat strange that you do not recognize my priority regarding the connection between inertial mass and energy.”²¹¹²

Einstein and his followers often promoted the theory of relativity as if revolutionary, a supposedly unprecedented departure from all that came before it. The issue of priority was very important to Einstein and to his supporters. Had it not been, Einstein would have been more honest and forthcoming when he wrote his papers and when he described the history of the theory of relativity.

But others had not forgotten Poincaré. In 1912, shortly after Poincaré's untimely death, Vito Volterra wrote in a tribute to Poincaré,

“But a celebrated experiment was performed by Michelson and Morley

which kept account of the terms depending on the square of the aberration, and even this experiment, as is well known, gave a negative result.

In a famous paper of 1904 Lorentz showed that this result could be explained by introducing the hypothesis that all bodies are subjected to a contraction in the direction of the motion of the earth.

This paper was the point of departure for the later investigations. The results of Poincaré, Einstein and Minkowski followed closely that of Lorentz. In 1905 Poincaré published a summary of his ideas in the ‘Comptes Rendus’ of the French Academy of Sciences. An extended memoir on the same subject appeared shortly afterwards in the ‘Rendiconti’ of Palermo.

The basic idea in this set of investigations is founded upon the principle that no experiment could show any absolute motion of the earth. That is what is called the *Postulate of Relativity*. Lorentz showed that certain transformations, called now by his name, do not change the equations that hold for an electromagnetic medium; two systems, one at rest, the other in motion, are thus the exact images each of the other, in such a way that we can give every system a motion of translation without affecting any of the apparent phenomena.”²¹¹³

In 1913, Arthur Gordon Webster wrote in his memorial to Poincaré,

“The development of Maxwell’s electromagnetic theory that has taken place in the last twenty-five years has led to a theory that has attracted the greatest interest among mathematical physicists and has, in fact, become in certain parts of the world no less than a mania. I refer to the so-called principle of relativity, a name which was given to it first, if I am not mistaken, by Poincaré. This principle is no less than a fundamental relation between time and space, intended to explain the impossibility of determining experimentally whether a system, say the earth, is in motion or not. In an elaborate paper published in 1905 in the *Palermo Rendiconti* entitled, ‘Sur la dynamique de l’électron,’ he defines the principle of relativity by means of what he calls the Lorentz transformation. If the coordinates and the time receive the following linear transformation

$$x' = kl(x + \epsilon t), \quad t' = kl(t + \epsilon x), \quad y' = ly, \\ z' = lz, \quad k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \epsilon^2}}$$

the function $x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - t_1^2$ and the equations of electric propagation will remain invariant. From this follows the impossibility of determining absolute motion. Poincaré then submits the Lorentz transformation, which he shows belongs to a group, to an examination with regard to the principle of least action, which he shows holds for the principle of relativity. He further shows that by aid of certain hypotheses gravitation can be accounted for and shown

to be propagated with the velocity of light.”²¹¹⁴

In 1913, Ernst Gehrcke wrote,

“The theory of relativity is nothing but a completely novel interpretation of the theory of the electrodynamics and optics of bodies in motion, which Lorentz had already developed. The theory of relativity is *not* distinguished by the creation of substantially new equations, but by a substantially new *interpretation* of the known transformation equations of Lorentz. The arguments made against this *interpretation* condemn it, not the equations themselves, which, as was stated, are not Einstein’s, but rather Lorentz’ equations, and still stand intact today.”

“Die Relativitätstheorie ist nichts anderes, als eine völlig neuartige Interpretation einer schon von LORENTZ entwickelten Theorie der Elektrodynamik und Optik bewegter Körper. Das Charakteristikum der Relativitätstheorie besteht *nicht* in der Aufstellung wesentlich neuer Gleichungen, sondern in der Aufstellung einer wesentlich neuen *Interpretation* der bekannten Transformationsgleichungen von LORENTZ. Gegen diese *Interpretation* richten sich die gemachten Einwände, nicht gegen die Gleichungen selbst, die, wie gesagt, keine EINSTEINschen, sondern LORENTZsche Gleichungen sind und die bis heute unangegriffen dastehen.”²¹¹⁵

Alfred Arthur Robb spoke to the issue in 1914,

“Although generally associated with the names of Einstein and Minkowski, the really essential physical considerations underlying the theories are due to Larmor and Lorentz.”²¹¹⁶

Einstein had already conceded this fact in early 1911,

“In fact, there are no fundamental differences between Minkowski’s and Lorentz’s theory.”²¹¹⁷

Einstein saw the only difference between the two as being a “top down” versus “bottom up” approach to the *same* problem with the *same* results, as in inductive versus deductive reasoning of the same problem with the same solution.

Harry Bateman asserted his priority over Albert Einstein, in 1918,

“The appearance of Dr. Silberstein’s recent article on ‘General Relativity without the Equivalence Hypothesis’²¹¹⁸ encourages me to restate my own views on the subject. I am perhaps entitled to do this as my work on the subject of General Relativity was published before that of Einstein and Kottler,²¹¹⁹ and appears to have been overlooked by recent writers.”²¹²⁰

In 1920, Johannes Riem stated,

“Auf Wunsch der Schriftleitung soll hier der Versuch gemacht werden, zu zeigen, worum es sich eigentlich bei dem jetzt so viel genannten und mit so großer Reklame verbreiten Prinzip handelt, das an sich so merkwürdig und allen Erfahrungssätzen so sehr widersprechend ist, daß Einstein selber erzählt, er habe erst Monate lang darüber nachgedacht, ehe er dahinter gekommen sei, daß es kein Unsinn sei. Dabei ist zu betonen, daß es nicht etwa fertig aus Einsteins Kopfe entsprungen ist. Zunächst ist der berühmte Mathematiker Riemann zu nennen, dessen Habilitationsschrift von 1854 die Gedanken gibt, die weiter geführt, zu Einstein führen, indem Riemann zeigte, daß Physik und Geometrie zusammengehören. Erheblich später hat dann Lorentz 1895 und Minkowski 1907 die Lehre weiter ausgebaut, letzterer führte schon die Verbindung von Raum und Zeit als Weltpostulat ein und benutzte es dazu, die elektrodynamischen Grundgleichungen für bewegte Materie abzuleiten. Endlich hat dann Einstein alle diese Gedankengänge in mathematischer Weise vertieft und einen die ganze Mechanik, Physik und Astronomie umfassenden Bau daraus gemacht, freilich in einer Weise, die der elementaren Darstellung durchaus spottet. Gleichzeitig mit dieser Entwicklung ist dann eine zweite gegangen, die, von gleichen Gedanken ausgehend, zu anderen Folgerungen kommt und sich daher Einstein gegenüber kritisch verhält, seine Schlüsse zum Teil ablehnt. Das sind die Entwicklungen von Rudolf Mewes in Berlin, der schon 1889 in einem Aufsatz über das Wesen der Materie und des Naturerkennens die Relativität der Materie und der von einander untrennbaren Begriffe Raum und Zeit nachweist. Fußend auf dem Weberschen Grundgesetz und dem Dopplerschen Prinzip, hat er schon drei Jahre vor Lorentz eine Relativitätstheorie aufgestellt, welche außer der relativen Bewegung der Körper zueinander auch noch deren Drehbewegung berücksichtigt, ein Umstand, der bei Einstein nicht vorhanden ist.

Wir kommen so zu einem nach Einsteins Meinung ganz allgemeinen Grundgesetz der Natur, dessen Aufstellung ihn nach der Behauptung der Tagespresse mit Newton auf eine Stufe stelle oder noch darüber. Dem gegenüber ist nicht scharf genug zu betonen, daß erstens sein Prinzip nicht von ihm aufgefunden ist, sondern nur erweitert, und daß ferner der Streit für und wider noch weit davon entfernt ist, ein Ende zu haben. See hat in den „Astronomischen Nachrichten“ soeben mehrere Aufsätze erscheinen lassen, die sich scharf gegen Einstein wenden, seine Leugnung des Äthers als unsinnig bezeichnen, dagegen betonen, wie die amerikanischen Physiker und Astronomen Einstein ablehnen, und Michelson selber sich dagegen verwahrt, seinen Versuch so zu deuten, wie es Einstein tut.”²¹²¹

Charles Nordmann averred, in 1921,

“The only time of which we have any idea apart from all objects is the

psychological time so luminously studied by M. Bergson: a time which has nothing except the name in common with the time of physicists, of science.

It is really to Henri Poincaré, the great Frenchman whose death has left a void that will never be filled, that we must accord the merit of having first proved, with the greatest lucidity and the most prudent audacity, that time and space, as we know them, can only be relative. A few quotations from his works will not be out of place. They will show that the credit for most of the things which are currently attributed to Einstein is, in reality, due to Poincaré. [***] I venture to sum up all this in a sentence which will at first sight seem a paradox: in the opinion of the Relativists it is the measuring rods which create space, the clocks which create time. All this was maintained by Poincaré and others long before the time of Einstein, and one does injustice to truth in ascribing the discovery to him.”²¹²²

On 28 March 1921, *The New York Times* reported that Edmund Noble claimed to have anticipated the deductions Einstein made from the theory of relativity. Noble published a relativistic article in the journal *The Monist* in 1905,²¹²³ which set forth a research program for a unified field theory, a relational theory of a finite (of necessity) universe in which space and time exist only as the universe itself, etc. Though Noble does not note the fact, it is interesting that the article which follows his in *The Monist* was written by David Hilbert,²¹²⁴ from whom Einstein plagiarized the generally covariant field equations of gravitation of the general theory of relativity, and from whom Einstein plagiarized the unified field theory concept.

This volume of *The Monist* of 1905 also contains an English translation of Poincaré’s famous St. Louis lecture of 1904,²¹²⁵ which iterated so many of the essential elements of the special theory of relativity, before Einstein, and which lecture Einstein must have read when reading Poincaré’s book *The Value of Science*. Poincaré and Hilbert were frequent contributors to *The Monist*, an Open Court publication—a publishing house under the direction of Paul Carus, which helped bring Ernst Mach’s works to the English speaking audience. Monistic²¹²⁶ and Anti-Kantian philosophy defined the research program of the general theory of relativity in the Nineteenth Century. Einstein considered himself an “Anti-Kantian”, and certainly pursued the reasoning of Bolliger, who iterated “Mach’s principle” in terms of a Boscovichian dynamistic unified field theory.²¹²⁷

On 3 April 1921, *The New York Times* quoted Chaim Weizmann,

“When [Einstein] was called ‘a poet in science’ the definition was a good one. He seems more an intuitive physicist, however. He is not an experimental physicist, and although he is able to detect fallacies in the conceptions of physical science, he must turn his general outlines of theory over to some one else to work out.”²¹²⁸

Einstein told Leopold Infeld, “I am really more of a philosopher than a physicist.”²¹²⁹

On 27 April 1921, Gertrude Besse King wrote in *The Freeman* of New York,

“ALADDIN EINSTEIN. THE popular interest in America in Professor Einstein’s theories has astonished the professor. The public who does not know whether the theory of relativity has accounted for the alteration of mercury or of Mercury, waylays his steps, and delights, with the exception of a mere alderman or two, to do him honour. Gifted newspaper-reporters herald him as the originator of the theory of relativity, which, by the way he is not, and question him as to the ultimate nature of space, though only a mathematical physicist who is also a philosopher could understand the professor’s answers.

This general interest in an extremely difficult science is not quite what it seems. Probably Professor Einstein does not realize how sensationally and cunningly he has been advertised. From the point of view of awakening popular curiosity, his press-notices could hardly have been improved. The newspapers first announced his discovery as revolutionizing science. This sounds well, but its meaning, after all, is rather vague. Then they printed a series of entertaining oddities, supposedly deducible from his hypothesis, although most of them could have been equally well deduced from the conclusions of Lorentz or Poincaré: for example, moving objects are shortened in the direction of their motion. This is a gay novelty until one learns the proportion of the reduction, which is calculated to divest the statement of interest to any but scientists. Further, our newspapers told us that if we were to travel from the earth with the speed of light, and could see the clock we left behind, it would always remain at the same moment, permanently pausing, unable to reach the next tick. But we should be unable to travel at the rate of light for a number of reasons, the most interesting and perhaps the most decisive being that such a speed would cause our mass to be infinite! Finally, our informants assert that no point in space, no moment of time can serve as a permanent base for measurement; we can measure only the relations of space, the relations of time, never absolute space or time; and even to measure space-relations, we have to take into account time! What a fascinating dervish-dance of what we used to regard as immutable fixities! Is it possible that these delicious contradictions are serious and accredited doctrines among those who know? Yet so they appear, for though Professor Einstein is always careful in stating that his hypothesis enjoys as yet only a tentative security, his methods are vouched for by the experts, his procedure is according to Hoyle, and the crowd is at liberty to gorge its appetite for marvels untroubled by the ogres of scientific orthodoxy.

Aside from the fact that Professor Einstein comes as a distinguished and somewhat mysterious foreigner to partake of our insatiable hospitality, his popular welcome is to be accounted for by the spell of wizardry that the press has cast upon his interpretations. For it is the necromancy of these strange theories, not their science, that catches the gaping crowd. Reporters are often good, practical psychologists. Instinctively they have divined the public eagerness for miracles, without grasping the factors that feed this taste. They know that most of us are essentially children still clamouring for fairy tales.

Man is congenitally restless with the prison-house of this too, too solid world. He is always looking for short-cuts to power. Since he can not find them to his mental satisfaction as once he could through the miracles and divine dispensations of the Church, or through the magic and occultism that were his legitimate resources in the Middle Ages, he now turns to the wonders of science and philosophy. Here, even in theories that he does not understand, he can find release for his cramped position, here he can taste the intoxicating freedom of a boundless universe, and renew his sense of personal potency. [. . .]”²¹³⁰

Arvid Reuterdaahl wrote in *The Bi-Monthly Journal of the College of St. Thomas*, Volume 9, Number 3, (July, 1921):

“Einstein and the New Science.

BY

ARVID REUTERDAHL

HISTORICAL NOTE ON THE NEW SCIENCE.

A New Science has been born, a science in which metaphysics and philosophy find a prominent place. This statement conjures before your vision the internationally celebrated figure of Professor Dr. Albert Einstein, who was born in 1879 in the town of Ulm, Wurtemberg, Germany. Although Dr. Einstein, through his colossal and unprecedented advertising campaign, has done more than any other man to bring this New Science before the world, nevertheless, the year of birth of this new departure in scientific thought cannot be considered as coincident with the appearance, in 1905, of Dr. Einstein’s first contribution to the subject of Relativity.

On the contrary, we must look back to the year 1887 as the proper birth year of the New Science, which bids fair to inaugurate a new era in intellectual thought. In that year the famous Michelson-Morley experiment was performed at Cleveland, Ohio. At the time Dr. Albert A. Michelson was Professor of Physics at the Case School of Applied Science. Dr. Edward W. Morley was Professor of Chemistry at the same institution. The writer, because of the far reaching significance of this experiment, considers the year 1887 as marking the birth of the New Science.

THE PIONEERS OF THE NEW SCIENCE.

The New Science was, in part, foreshadowed by the work of Baron Karl von Reichenbach in the years 1844 and 1856. Reichenbach, in his various works, laid the foundation to the theory of radiation. He also held that physiological organisms exhibited characteristics of a decidedly electrical nature.

In the years 1870 and 1871, Aurel Anderssohn of Breslau, Germany, announced the theory that there is no force of attraction extant in the

universe. He maintained that gravitation, that is, universal attraction of material systems, is not due to a force but is a mutual effect produced by radiation from bodies.

Dr. Johannes Zacharias expanded the limited principle of Anderssohn into practically universal proportions. The results of the earliest work of Zacharias were presented in a lecture before the Physical Society of Breslau in the year 1882. In the hands of a capable and a prodigious worker as Zacharias the elementary suggestion of Anderssohn grew into The Mass-Pressure Theory of Electricity and Magnetism. The essential principle of this theory was publicly demonstrated in Berlin (November, 1908) by means of a colossal rotating electromagnet. The careful and exhaustive experimental work of Zacharias confirmed the vision of Anderssohn that the force of gravitation is merely fictitious.

'Kinertia,' during the period of time from 1877 to 1881, convinced himself that the so-called attractive force of gravitation was an illogical inference not warranted by facts. (For more complete details refer to the author's article, 'Kinertia Versus Einstein' which appeared in The Dearborn Independent, April 30, 1921.) On the 27th day of June 1903, 'Kinertia' filed with the 'Kgl. Preussische Akademie Der Wissenschaften' a description of a mechanical device and an account of an experiment by which 'gravity' could be produced experimentally. (The writer is in possession of the original acknowledgment of the receipt of this deposition.) The 'gravity machine' of 'Kinertia', when water only is used, generates a spiral vortex in space similar to the vortex of a spiral nebulae. When lead balls are projected from the machine by means of either water or compressed air, then the balls describe elliptical orbits, like the planets, while advancing along the neutral axis of rotation. The resultant path, in the latter case, is therefore an elliptical spiral. Many years later (1911-1915 inclusive) Dr. Einstein presented this same theory to a then receptive scientific world with the result that he was subsequently proclaimed a 'greater than Newton.'

'Kinertia' concludes that the effects formerly attributed to the action of a 'force' called gravitation are due to acceleration. He includes a dynamic principle in his concept.

It is an incontrovertible fact, therefore, that 'Kinertia' announced the now famous, 'Principle Of Equivalence,' many years before the alleged discoverer Einstein won the excessive plaudits of the over-enthusiastic scientific world. The work of 'Kinertia,' however, is free from the erroneous sophisticated solipsism of Einstein.

Dr. J. Henry Ziegler, of Zurich, Switzerland, in the year 1902, laid the foundation of a cosmic theory in a lecture entitled, 'Die Universelle Weltformel und ihre Bedeutung fur die wahre Erkenntnis aller Dinge.' This theory is of basic and far reaching significance to the New Science. Ziegler's cosmology is based upon the fundamental conception that the world is a unitary structure generated from the universal trinity of space, time and force. Ziegler does not commit the solipsistic error of Einstein by omitting the

inclusion of a genuine Absolute Principle in his system. Any cosmological theory which endeavors to construct the universe upon purely relative fundamentals leads to the ultimate verdict 'ignorabimus'. Absolute truth becomes impossible and knowledge is merely a matter of individual opinion. Einstein's system is of this latter type and the name "solipsism" is therefore a proper and fitting designation for the Einsteinian Theory of Relativity. The significant and universal relationship of light to the physical and chemical manifestations of matter led Ziegler to regard light as an absolute essential in physical phenomena. In Ziegler's theory we find, therefore, the root of the only absolute in Einstein's entire system. The fact that Dr. Einstein lived in Bern, Switzerland, at the time when Ziegler's theory of light was a topic of general discussion, leads one to justly question the extraordinary claims to originality of the founder of the Theory of Relativity.

In the same year (1902) that Dr. Ziegler first announced his theory to the world, the writer presented a brief outline of his Space-Time Potential and Theory of Interdependence. At the Inaugural Meeting of the American Electrochemical Society, held at Philadelphia, April 5, 1902, the writer presented his conclusions in a lecture entitled 'The Atom of Electrochemistry.'

In this lecture the writer showed that the physical universe is ultimately reducible to centers of activity (action point-instants) which undergo compensating changes and displacements in conformity with the requirements of the whole cosmos regarded as a unitary, interacting, and interdependent system of multiplicity. This unitary multiplicity system is its own continuum. Action-at-a-distance between its ultimates is not only postulated as inevitably necessary between the primordial centers regarded as discrete (which is an incontrovertible fact of experience), but is also inherent in the fundamental concept of a unitary continuum whose principal constituents are space, time and interdependent interaction.

The writer, consequently, found it possible at that time (1902), to dispense with the old inconsistent ether hypothesis. Moreover, he took occasion, in this lecture, to protest against the attempts of the pangeometers to mathematically manufacture reality by conceptual extensions of actuality. The mythical edifice erected by Minkowski and Einstein, based upon the merely speculative mathematical contributions of the non-Euclidean, has not caused him to feel any necessity whatsoever to modify his views of 1902. This lecture has been fully developed in a work published by the Devin-Adair Company of New York City, bearing the title, 'Scientific Theism Versus Materialism, The Space-Time Potential.'

The great contribution of Ziegler has afforded the writer profound pleasure. Ziegler, working independently in Switzerland, evolved the theory of the unitary triune, Space, Time, and Force. The present author developed his Space-Time Potential in the United States without being aware of the conclusions of Ziegler. The word 'Potential' was used merely to emphasize the fact that the Space-Time Chart is potentially receptive to the play of

energy or substance. Ziegler and the present writer are at one in their emphasis upon the dynamic element in the universe which has been so blatantly omitted in the system of Einstein.

It is with utmost pleasure that I here call particular attention to the fact that Ziegler was the first to advance a complete theory of light from the standpoint of the New Science. Einstein has nowhere in his works referred to the work of Ziegler, despite the fact that the much heralded Doctor, undoubtedly, owes a great debt to the illustrious Swiss savant.

Dr. H. Fricke completed his investigations concerning the nature of gravitation and space in the year 1914. The war delayed the publication of this work which finally appeared in 1919 under the title 'Eine neue und einfache Deutung der Schwerkraft'. For Fricke the old ether disappears, but he replaces it with a field of force. The static or stationary ether of Lorentz gives way before the energetic and mobile medium of Fricke which, however, like space, with which it is identified, retains abiding properties. Gravitation (Schwerkraft) is regarded, in the theory of Fricke, as a continuous stream of energy which acts as a *concurrent* system in the equilibration of the *excitant* systems in the universe. Cosmic bodies exhibit outgoing radiational and ingoing gravitational fields of force and all fields of activity are, in their last analysis, moving fields of force. Dr. Einstein, who, it seems, is not in the habit of extending recognition to the deserving, has nevertheless, reluctantly admitted that this theory of Fricke is both highly significant and original. Fricke has announced a New Cosmic Law of far reaching consequences. This epoch-making law may be briefly stated as follows: In vacuous space, if we disregard all other disturbing influences, a definite temperature pertains to every gravitational field. It follows that the temperature of cosmic space does not correspond to the absolute zero, but it is proportional to the gravitational field present in each particular location. Fricke, moreover, concludes that the work done by gravitation is not only changed into heat, but, in part, appears as a directed motion of cosmic bodies.

The homogeneity of inertial resistance and gravitation is a basic principle with Fricke. In cases of inertia the medium of Fricke has a decelerating action toward ponderable masses in conformity with the same laws which govern the accelerative force in the case of gravitation. This conception plays an important role in the theory of Einstein which, however, lacks even the semblance of an explanation. The Pressure Theory of Fricke not only affords an explanation of this cosmic phenomenon but also obviates the difficulties, ably pointed out by Maxwell, in a mechanical theory of gravitation.

In the United States we find Dr. Robert T. Browne in the front rank of the new scientific movement. In his great work 'The Mystery of Space', Dr. Browne emphasizes the actuality of a genuine dynamic element in space. He fully appreciates the weakness and danger of the Relativistic position. For him the universe is inexplicable without an Absolute Principle.

Dr. Charles F. Brush, the world famous electrical engineer and scientist of Cleveland, Ohio; with a series of carefully conducted experiments has

challenged the investigation of the Hungarian Baron, Eötvös, performed with a torsion-balance in the year 1890. The issue involved in both investigations is the equivalence or non-equivalence of the inertial and the gravitational mass of a body. Eötvös concludes that the two are equivalent. The General Theory of Relativity of Einstein relies upon the correctness of the conclusions of Eötvös. (See, *Relativity*, by A. Einstein, pages 80 to 83 inclusive.) The conclusions of Eötvös may be stated in another manner: The magnitude of the effect of gravitation does not depend upon the kind of the material. According to Eötvös, one unit of mass of bismuth should be affected in precisely the same manner as one mass unit of zinc by the gravitational influence. Dr. Brush, on the contrary, asserts that his experiments indicate that the gravitational field exerts a greater influence upon the same mass of bismuth than it does upon precisely the same mass of zinc. The inference from Dr. Brush's experiments is that gravitation takes cognizance, as it were of those subtle differences in matter which we ordinarily group under the term 'qualities'.

The significance of the issue here involved is almost staggering when one reflects upon its far reaching import to the New Science. The old school of science built its stupendous edifice upon the assumption of 'sameness' in its ultimates. Diversity is the result of differences in the number of identical ultimates. For many years the writer has been of the opinion that the physical universe cannot be constructed from mere number. On the contrary, it is my firm conviction, grounded in reason and experience, that observable diversity owes its being to genuine and individually different characteristics in the ultimate particles out of which material aggregates are formed (See author's 'Scientific Theism Versus Materialism, The Space-Time Potential,' paragraph 82, page 44).

Einstein's elaborate speculative edifice falls to the ground, if the momentous experimental results of Dr. Brush are completely substantiated. Practically all the foundation stones of Einstein's structure are composed of unproven, volatile material.

J. G. A. Goedhart, Officer of the Royal Netherlands Navy, Retired, in his work 'L'Orbite En Spirale Dans La Mecanique Celeste' (The Spiral Orbit In Celestial Mechanics, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 1921) presents Six Principal Laws pertaining to the movements of celestial bodies. At this time Goedhart's Second Law is of particular interest because of its relation to the work of 'Kinertia' and the alleged originality of Einstein's conclusions. Goedhart's Second Law is: 'Secondary celestial bodies revolve around the centers of gravitation of planetary systems in eccentric logarithmic spiral orbits, the asymptotes of which are ellipses'.

The work of Goedhart is of unique significance to the scientific world at the present time because it proves conclusively that the spiral orbit, in the case of a planet, can be derived without recourse to the Minkowski-Einstein, four-dimensional, Space-Time speculative product.

Dr. Sten Lothigius of Stockholm, Sweden, in a brochure entitled

‘Esquisse D’Une Theorie Nouvelle De La Lumiere’ (Sketch Of a New Theory Of Light; Stockholm, 1920) presents a ‘Thread-Theory’ of light. In his theory of light Lothigius gives a more tangible significance to the usual term ‘ray of light’. For him a light-ray is a continuous and coherent structure. Along the axis of transmission undulatory crests may therefore appear without the auxiliary assistance of an ether. Referring to the hypothetical ether, Lothigius states: ‘Here lies someone who lived long although he never existed’. It would be difficult to condense a criticism of so vast a subject into fewer words.

Professor P. Lenard, the illustrious physicist, whose brilliant investigations concerning the behavior and properties of certain types of radiations or rays, formed, in part, the basis of the award of a Nobel Prize, has rendered the New Science a service of immeasurable value in stabilizing its formative tendencies during the disruptive attack of Einsteinism.

Lenard’s fearless attack on the theory of the ‘Zauberkünstler’ (Z. K.) (Einstein) has had an exceptionally wholesome influence in preserving the dignity and sanity of the scientific world.

In this connection the forceful exposures of ‘Z. K.’ by Paul Weyland, E. Gehrcke, H. Fricke, E. Guillaume, and A. Patscke, deserve particular mention.

Dr. Lenard’s work, ‘Uber Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation,’ is of such profound import that it cannot be lightly set aside by the mere flippant gesture of Einstein.

Professor Lenard is now preparing a work, exposing the errors of Einsteinism.

Dr. Rudolf Mewes, the distinguished physicist and engineer, with his contribution, ‘Raumzeitlehre oder Relativitätstheorie in Geistes—und Naturwissenschaft und Werkkunst’, has rendered a lasting service to the New Science. His first work on Space, Time, and Relativity appeared in 1884, thus antedating Einstein by twenty one years.

Camille Flammarion, the eminent French astronomer, writing in the ‘Revue Mondiale’, calls attention to the fact that Denis Diderot was undoubtedly the first to present an outline of a theory of relativity. Flammarion repudiates the Space-Time Combination of Minkowski and Einstein.

Professor Henri Poincaré, the famous French physicist and mathematician, advisedly ignores the name of Einstein in his lectures on ‘Relativity’.

In this short resume it has been impossible to do justice to the momentous issues brought before the intellectual world by the Pioneers of the New Science. Many names have, undoubtedly, been omitted, not intentionally, however, but because of lack of first hand information.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THE THEORY OF RELATIVITY

(In Einstein’s works passing references are found to the influential contributions of Cristoffel, Riemann, Ricci, Levi-Civita, Gauss, and

Hamilton in mathematics; and to Galilei, Newton, Minkowski, and Lorentz in physics.)

In the year 1869, E. B. Christoffel laid the basis for a new type of calculus which was later used by Einstein in his speculative development of the Theory of Relativity. (See Crelle's Journal fur die Math., Vol. LXX, 1869). Riemann developed the work of Christoffel. In the hands of Ricci and Levi-Civita these contributions took the form of the Absolute Differential Calculus, used by Einstein in his mathematical treatment of Relativity.

Certain functions developed by Sir William R. Hamilton, and known as the Hamiltonian Functions, were also used by Einstein. It would, indeed, have been difficult for Einstein to avoid the references to these men which are found in 'Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie', Annalen der Physik, Band 49, No. 7, 1916, (see pages 782, 799, and 804) It so happens that their names have been permanently associated with particular mathematical devices.

Professor Einstein mentions the work of Newton and Galilei, merely in passing, and by way of contrast with his own system which, by means of this delicate stratagem, is thereby made to assume far greater significance than the work of Galilei and Newton, because of its alleged inclusive universality. Einstein seems to be reasonably certain that no serious competition can arise from the graves of the great.

The great German mathematician Karl Friedrich Gauss, receives post-mortem glorification by having his name associated with the four-dimensional system of coordinates which has proved a useful instrument for Einstein.

Without the 'Space Time' contribution of Hermann Minkowski, the electrodynamics of Maxwell-Lorentz, and the H. A. Lorentz Transformation, the Einsteinian tower would reduce to a mere excavation. Consequently, conservative references are made, always in passing, however, to the work of these men.

ADDITIONAL BASIC CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE THEORY OF RELATIVITY.

(Einstein either advisedly ignores or is unaware of the contributions of Anderssohn, Zacharias, 'Kinertia', Larmor, Gerber, Palagyi, Ziegler, Reuterdahl, Mewes, Fricke, and Varicak).

Anderssohn paved the way to a new conception of gravitation (1870-1871).

Zacharias extended the principle of Anderssohn to include electrical and magnetic phenomena (1882).

'Kinertia' developed the Principle Of Equivalence (1877-1881) many years before its announcement by Einstein (1911-1915).

Larmor's work, 'Aether And Matter', was published in the year 1900. Einstein's dissociation of the name of Larmor from Lorentz is incomprehensible.

Paul Gerber, in the year 1898, developed a formula descriptive of the

perturbed motion of the Planet Mercury. (See, *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik*, 1898). Professor Dr. E. Gehrcke fully realizing the great importance of this work of Gerber, arranged for its reprinting in *Annalen der Physik* (1917, Vol. 52, page 415). Einstein made his calculations for the motion of the perihelion of Mercury in the year 1915.

Melchior Palagyi published, in the year 1901, a contribution entitled 'Neue Theorie des Raumes und der Zeit' (Engelmanns Verlag in Leipzig) which contained the essentials of the Minkowski-Einstein Space-Time conception. Minkowski's first paper appeared in 'Der Göttinger Mathematischen Gesellschaft,' Nov. 5, 1907. In the following year his Cölner lecture, entitled 'Raum und Zeit', was delivered. This was reprinted in *Annalen Der Physik*, Vol. 47, No. 15, page 927; June 15, 1915.

Zeigler, in the year 1902 announced his new cosmic theory involving the unitary triune, Space, Time, and Force, together with Light as the universal, physical absolute.

Einstein's first paper bears the date September 1905. It was written in Bern, Switzerland where Ziegler's theory was much discussed.

The present writer's first paper was published in the year 1902. This paper briefly outlined the basic elements of his complete work 'Scientific Theism Versus Materialism, The Space-Time Potential', which appeared in 1920.

The present author's direct and simple method of calculating the deflection of light, due to the Sun, is a closer approximation to the observed 'bending' than the result obtained by the more indirect and involved method of Einstein. (See work cited, pages 271 and 272).

Rudolf Mewes' contributions, when they appear in a collected form, will exert exceptional influence upon the position of Lorentz. In fact, the older works of both Mewes and Gerber will then attain unique significance.

H. Fricke, in his work (1914-1919), presented a physical basis for the Principle Of Equivalence which was arbitrarily announced by Einstein from purely speculative reasons. Fricke's researches on the relation of heat to gravitation are certain to open fruitful fields of investigation for the New Science.

Varicak, the mathematician, was the first (1915) to point out that the Principle of Relativity leads directly to the formulae of non-Euclidean geometry. (See, *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie* 1915, page 847). Einstein's fabric is woven from the fibers supplied by the metageometers.

A retrospective view of the above facts can result in but one question: What original contribution has Einstein made which warrants the, now common, verdict that he is 'a greater than Newton'?

The *Scientific American* (May 14, 1921), in an unwarranted, sarcastic editorial attack on the present writer, answers this question as follows: 'He (Einstein) has formulated mathematically and as a concrete whole ideas which have had a rather nebulous existence before him, cementing the structure with ideas to which he has himself given birth. His crowning

achievement is the precise mathematical formulation; this has never been approached or approximated in any way.' This is surely an extraordinary claim, especially in view of the fact, that the editorial itself was called forth because the writer demanded, in the name of justice, that credit be given to the originators of those 'nebulous' ideas, without which the Theory of Relativity would have been an impossibility.

The case is analogous to that of the builder who appropriated sufficient bricks to build a house, and when payment was demanded, replied: 'I have furnished the cement, which binds the bricks into a structure, therefore I owe you nothing for the bricks.'

THE 'MAIN MEMBERS' OF EINSTEIN'S STRUCTURE.

The relations of the 'main members' in Einstein's structure may, most readily, be illustrated by a reinforced concrete arch bridge composed of two ribs or segments, hinged at the crown (center of span) and at the abutments. A reinforced concrete floor, laid in the bed of the stream, connects the two thrust-resisting abutments. The left abutment in Einstein's arch is the Lorentz Transformation. Non-Euclidean Space-Time (Minkowski) constitutes the right abutment, and the Michelson-Morley Experiment is the connecting floor between the abutments.

The left arch rib is The Absolute Velocity of Light, while the Principle Of Equivalence constitutes the right arch rib. The three alleged experimental verifications of Einstein's theory form the three hinges. From left to right we may think of these hinges as being, 1st, The Perturbations of the Planet Mercury; 2nd, Displacement of the Spectral Lines towards the Red; and 3rd, The Deflection of Light in a Gravitational Field.

TESTS OF THE MEMBERS.

The limited scope of this article prevents a full discussion of the structural value of the members. 'The Fallacies Of Einstein,' now in preparation by the writer, will consider these and other matters in detail.

RIGHT ABUTMENT.-NON-EUCLIDEAN SPACE-TIME.

It can be shown that the Minkowski-Einstein Space-Time is a mathematically camouflaged type of four-dimensional space. In the invariant form of the General Quadratic Differential, which is basic to Relativity, the last term is formed by multiplying the velocity of light by time. Velocity is reducible to length divided by time. Therefore time is eliminated from this term, leaving it as a pure spatial expression. Consequently we have here

nothing but a new version of four-dimensional space which is not a physical reality. The writer challenges the relativists and the metageometers to construct a model of the four co-ordinate axes required by this conceptual space. This demand can be satisfied in the case of three dimensional space, which is our only real space.

Conclusion.

The right abutment of Einstein's arch bridge is merely mythical and not a physical reality. From the standpoint of engineering this verdict is sufficient to condemn the entire structure. Certainly pure science ought not to be less exacting in its demands than the applied science of engineering.

THE FLOOR. - MICHELSON - MORLEY - MILLER EXPERIMENT.

This experiment involves the ether, and the possibility of relative motion between the earth and the ether. The constancy of the velocity of light was assumed in the experiment.

Known Facts.

The motion and velocity of the earth.

The constant velocity of light.

Unknown Facts.

(The experiment assumed the existence of the ether. This assumption takes too much for granted.)

Does the medium called 'The Ether' exist?

Assuming the existence of the ether, then in regard to its possible motion, only two assumptions can be made: viz.,

1st. The ether is stationary,

2nd. The ether is in motion.

Michelson and Morley, using an interferometer, failed to detect any relative motion between the earth and the ether. Miller and Morley, with a much larger interferometer, were unable to detect any relative motion.

Sir Oliver Lodge, assuming that the ether was carried along with moving bodies, experimented with rapidly rotating discs only to obtain negative results. Both of the above possibilities proved futile in the attempt to determine the earth's motion in respect to the ether.

At the time when these experiments were performed science was not prepared to abandon the ether because of its *conceptual* usefulness in explaining the phenomena of light and electro-magnetics.

In the New Science the old inconsistent ether is being replaced by interactional vehicles and interdependent activities.

Classical mechanics and the theory of relativity as held by Newton took cognizance of relative velocities computed by reference to arbitrary systems of co-ordinates. If the Michelson-Morley experiment had yielded a positive result, indicating that the earth's velocity could be calculated in reference to a stationary ether, then the measurement of so-called 'absolute motion' would have been possible. The ether would then have constituted a universal and fixed reference system.

Because of the negative results of these experiments, Einstein expanded

the older notions of relativity to include these later results. He concludes therefore, that an *absolute* determination of *uniform* motion is impossible, and he holds that the ether cannot be used as a reference system by which relative uniform motion may be detected.

It should be recalled that Archimedes failed to find a fixed point in the universe. Michelson, Morley, Miller, and Lodge also failed in the more modern case of the ether. Then the voice of the Prophet of Relativity was heard crying from the house-tops, 'There is no Absolute! Everything is conditioned and relative! Truth itself is variable!' We listen but we are not convinced. We conclude that the relativists have sought the philosopher's stone in vain, for they have searched for a static point in the dynamic world. They have tried to achieve the impossible. We become content then and decide to continue making observational references from 'fixed' points that move.

The negative result of the Michelson-Morley experiment may, with confidence, be regarded as a conclusive proof that there is no ether. If this position is entertained, then interactional vehicles, acting in conjunction with Space-Time (properly interpreted), must be introduced in order to function in the cases of light and electro-magnetic phenomena. Einstein, however, has not allowed this phase of the problem to disturb his equanimity. On the contrary, he has seized upon the Larmor-Lorentz Transformation as the only way out of the difficulty.

Conclusion.

At the present time the results of the Michelson-Morley-Miller experiments must be accepted as experimental facts. The abuse of these results by Larmor, Lorentz, and Einstein, in no way influences the previous statement. Notwithstanding its Eisteinian misapplication and abuse, the floor must certainly be pronounced as structurally safe.

The experiment actually proves that the time required for light to travel from an initial to a final observation point, in a closed vectorial configuration is independent of the path.

The result of the Michelson-Morley trial, therefore, substantiates the writer's theory of light. (See discussion in this article under caption, 'A New Theory Of Light.')

LEFT ABUTMENT. THE FITZGERALD-LARMOR-LORENTZ TRANSFORMATION.

Assuming that the ether exists, Fitzgerald conceived the idea that if the material composing a body contracted along lines and planes parallel to the direction of motion through the ether, then the negative results of the Michelson-Miller experiment could be explained. According to the modern view matter is composed of electrons which are identical in size and deterministic characteristics. This is merely an arbitrary assumption which is not warranted by the great diversity manifest in the physical universe. However, the assumption, it appeared, would obviate such difficulties as would arise from the differences in the structural material of the

interferometer. Moreover, it would serve to generalize this entire class of phenomena—a generalization purchased with a sacrifice of truth.

Larmor and Lorentz, adopting the suggestion of Fitzgerald, conceived its mathematical form. The amount of the contraction in the direction of motion must be something definite. Moreover, it must agree with that space and time coefficient for moving bodies which now constitutes an important element in the left and right abutments of Einstein's structure. The 'plot' was a master stroke of ingenious imagination. Since we have bound ourselves to refrain from mathematical developments in this article we are forced merely to label this Space-Time Motion expression for purposes of discussion. We shall designate it as the 'Space-Time Coefficient.' The writer, in his work, has referred to this expression as the Fundamental Scalar of Einstein's Relativity. It is used in both Scalar and Vector Analysis.

With this expression known, (derived by *Euclidean* geometry from Space and Time considerations and not from experimental evidence) Larmor and Lorentz could readily *speculatively determine* the amount of the contraction in the direction of motion. If then the diameter of an electron at 'rest' is known, its contracted diameter could be calculated by multiplying the 'rest-diameter' by the Space-Time Coefficient. This is a pathetic illustration of the fact that the Relativists, whilst disclaiming any knowledge of 'fixed' points, persistently employ moving points (electron in this case) as 'fixed'. They are continually cutting the eternally moving infinite chain of relativities in order to 'fix' a point. As a speculation their theory is interesting. Practically it cannot be consistently applied.

Knowing the mass of the electron at 'rest' its so-called 'transverse mass' can be *speculatively determined* by introducing this known mass into the Space-Time Coefficient. The 'transverse mass' is therefore based upon that diameter of the electron which is *parallel* or *coincident* with its direction of motion.

If we align one arm of the Michelson interferometer in the direction of the earth's motion, then the time required by light (according to Lorentz, a type of motion in the stationary ether) to travel from a point to a mirror and back again *ought to be* greater than if light travels an *equivalent* distance (twice the sum of the distance from the point to the mirror) in a *continuous and unreversed* path. This statement assumes the constancy of the velocity of light. The Michelson-Morley-Miller experiment showed *no difference* in time. In fact the other arm of the interferometer, constructed at right angles to the first, gave the same time interval. The two arms were identical in all essential details. Moreover, *no difference* in the time period could be detected by swinging the interferometer on its axis into any position whatsoever.

If that interferometer arm which was parallel to the direction of the earth's motion would only be sufficiently accommodating to always contract in length that precise amount which would compensate the theoretical excess in the time period, then all would be well, because light would then travel over a shorter path and the time-excess would disappear. The science of

mathematics is a boon to the modern school of scientific speculators. By its manipulations we can produce the most gratifying compensations and accommodations. It does not seem to be particularly important if the alleged compensations are actual physical facts. The principal issue is, the derivation of a satisfactory *mathematical* result.

In any event, if physical experiment should fail to cope with the situation, it must be determined mathematically and then imposed upon our long-suffering physical universe. Fortunately for Relativity, Larmor and Lorentz, in their Space-Time Coefficient, had the *mathematically, built-to-order*, instrument of precision which unerringly could *speculatively* annihilate the alleged difficulty.

Hence, if the length of that arm of the interferometer which moved in the earth's direction of motion, was multiplied by the Space-Time Coefficient (a reduction expression) then this length would be sufficiently decreased to compensate for the supposed time-excess.

This contraction theory of Larmor and Lorentz, in the hands of Einstein, became a means of producing a confusing pyrotechnic display designed to intellectually impress the masses. Serious calculations were made concerning the diminution of a human being due to motion. The poor victim, we are told, is totally unaware of the change in his dimensions because his associates are all *suffering* diminution in the same relative proportion. Everything in motion contracts in the same relative ratio. One cannot even physically *determine* the actual amount of the alleged contraction. It always eludes you. This fact is an extraordinarily ingenious protective element inserted, inadvertently perhaps, into the Theory of Relativity. Nothing can be verified experimentally. Reality has been dethroned and mathematics has become the final creator, director, judge, jury, and arbiter of the type and destiny of a physical universe which, no longer, is permitted a voice in these matters.

By way of summarizing the results of this discussion of the contraction theory, the writer desires merely to restate that which is now self-evident.

The Larmor-Lorentz contraction theory is purely a mathematical device designed to meet an emergency. It has not been shown by physical experiment that an electron contracts in the manner claimed by the theory. The relativists themselves take great delight, it seems, in pointing out that, from the standpoint of their own theory the affair is beyond proof or disproof. One must conform, without murmur, to the precepts laid down in the Relativistic Koran. If this work, however, is regarded as the product of a fallible mind, then we may venture into that real world which lies beyond the confines of Relativity and there discover facts which serve, like dynamite, to cause the collapse of this speculative structure.

The experiments of Kaufmann and others have shown that the mass of an electron increases as its velocity increases. (Below a certain limiting velocity the mass remains practically constant.) As this velocity approaches the velocity of light, the mass increases towards an infinite amount. Lorentz and Einstein employed the same expression to mathematically describe this

experimentally observed increase that was used in the calculation of the contraction of the electronic diameter in the direction of its motion. The writer desires to call particular attention to the dangerous dilemma which arises from this maneuver.

Left Horn.

If the mass of the electron at rest is divided by the Space-Time Coefficient, in which the velocity of the electron equals that of light, then the expression indicates a resulting infinite mass for the moving electron.

It should be noted that the Kaufmann Effect is an observed fact and that the mathematical expression is merely an attempt to describe an actuality. Therefore, a true scientist, in contradistinction to a mathematical speculator, will abide by the result of an experiment whenever mathematical speculation and actual observation disagree.

Right Horn.

If the diameter of the electron at rest is multiplied by the Space-Time Coefficient, in which the velocity of the electron equals that of light, the expression indicates a zero value for the diameter. In other words, the electron will have no diameter at all. In the absence of any statement to the contrary on the part of the Relativists we are at liberty to assume that a similar fate befalls all lines of the electron which are parallel to the direction of motion. It follows that, if the Larmor-Lorentz contraction hypothesis is true, the mass of the electron reduces, in this case, to zero.

The two horns of this dilemma have been presented with complete recognition of a somewhat similar expression for the so-called 'longitudinal mass.'

Between these two horns, the proper choice is apparent at once, if facts and not speculation shall be our guide. Therefore, we discard the right horn as untenable because it is incompatible with the left horn which is based upon facts. Moreover, we demand that the advocates of the contraction theory, if they desire serious consideration for their claims, prove their contentions by an experiment. We cannot accept the subterfuge that this is not possible. Whatever we accept as truthfully descriptive of the physical world must be verifiable by experimental observation. Any theory which cannot meet this requirement is not worthy of serious consideration.

The Space-Time Coefficient owes its origin in Relativity to mathematical speculations concerning Space, Time, and Motion, depicted in the terms of Euclidean geometry. Nowhere do we find even a trace, in Relativity, of its source in an actual dynamic world. It is not surprising that it is continually misapplied by the Relativists. If the Relativists had first probed for its supporting source in the physical universe, then this very origin would have served as an unerring guide in its future application. In his investigations concerning Interdependent and Independent Motion the writer has shown that its origin is grounded in the facts of dynamic action which exhibit interdependent motion. (See Scientific Theism etc., pages 273-280).

The contraction hypothesis is a flagrant case of the misapplication of a

mathematical product to physical reality. The Larmor-Lorentz contribution to the Theory of Relativity must be discarded because it is not only contrary to known facts, but it is also incapable of experimental verification.

Conclusion. The Left Abutment of Einstein's arch is not only inadequate to withstand the thrust, but also non-existent as a genuine physical fact.

LEFT ARCH RIB. THE CONSTANCY OF THE VELOCITY OF LIGHT.

Without entering into refined particulars we may state that, 'The Second Postulate of Einstein's Theory' maintains that the velocity of light, in a vacuum, is the same for all observers and is independent of the relative motion existing between the observer and the source of light.

Einstein regards this constancy of light as a necessary assumption in his theory. In this he has shown unusual caution. The reason for his prudence is that he cannot suggest even a semblance of an explanation of this glaring exception to his world-scheme of Relativity. This situation is not devoid of humor. That member in his arch which is indisputably sound he regards as a postulate. The Michelson-Morley Experiment, of course, is exempt from the previous implied criticism for the reason that the result of this experiment must be regarded, at the present time, as an *experimental fact*. The interpretation, however of this result, is an entirely different matter. The Relativistic version is palpably fallacious. Another test has been proposed. It is evident from the nature of the Einsteinian arch that the outcome of this proposed test can have no beneficial bearing upon the stability of Einstein's structure.

We have already shown that the Arch fails for a negative result. It is self-evident that a positive result, being fatally inimical to the Larmor-Lorentz Contraction, is of less value, and therefore cannot prevent the collapse of the structure.

Although Einstein has failed utterly to find even a clew to that greatest of all world mysteries, The Constancy of Light, nevertheless, the New Science stands ready with a solution.

A NEW THEORY OF LIGHT.

The New Science has found it necessary to abandon the ether hypothesis in its inconsistent and antiquated form. The only physically known is differential matter in motion in the sympathetic presence of the compensating integrator Space-Time. This conception is the root of the author's Space-Time Potential in which Space and Time are regarded as the Intermutational Matrices of Reality. The writer has failed to find the word which will adequately express the thought which he desires to convey by the word 'Intermutational.' The idea cannot be expressed by the word 'Interactional' because action, in the physical universe, is always associated with matter. Space and Time are not material essences, therefore the word 'action, in any form whatsoever, cannot properly be associated with these basic matrices of reality. The 'inter-play' of Space and Time, although not genuine action, nevertheless *suggests* action, foreshadows it from its very essence as a hope

which can be realized in the presence of dynamic substance. This is the thought which the writer has, so inadequately, attempted to express by the word 'Intermutational.' If there exists one characteristic in either Space or Time (real not conceptual) which is totally different and not found in the other, then Space and Time are not mere phases of a single entity Space-Time. That such distinct features exist becomes apparent upon reflection. Real Time is irreversible. Space is reversible. The limited scope of this article prohibits a detailed discussion of this phase of the subject. The mere hint, here given, is sufficient to prove that the Einsteinian single entity Space-Time is not grounded in experience. That actually existing, though shadowy phase of the 'inter-play' of Space and Time, which we have here termed 'intermutation' is impossible in a single entity Space-Time.

The writer has sought for an explanation of that greatest of all cosmic mysteries, the constancy of the velocity of light, at the very fountain-head of reality, the 'Intermutation of Space and Time.' An explanation cannot be found anterior to the fountain-head. The solution is therefore startling in its directness and simplicity. Only a brief exposition of the author's theory is possible in this article.

In order to make the content of this theory clear, let us erect a straight line, in any desirable direction, in Space. We will call this line the 'Space-Directrix.' It is evident that we can erect an infinite number of such directrices. Erect a plane perpendicular to the Space-Directrix. Regard this plane of sufficiently great dimensions to include all elements under investigation. Consider matter as the 'Now of Substance.' No other conception of matter conforms with observed reality. There is a 'Now' and a 'Future' for every kern (mass-acceleration unit) of reality. The 'Now' can be depicted in our plane, provided that we identify our consciousness with it. When this is done we will designate our plane as the 'Now Plane'. The 'Future' (substance) of every kern can be depicted as a *kern-extension filament* reaching beyond the Now Plane into Space. We give the name 'Cosmic Filaments' to all such extension filaments. This picture of the Cosmos is merely pictorially symbolic of a reality which defies the most profound attempts of finite representation. In our picture, Time is represented by the Now Plane. In the Intermutative background of the Cosmos, Time corresponds to the 'dynamic urge' of substance and may therefore be regarded as an *Underlying Principle of Motion*, which in conjunction with Space, Substance, and all the Categorical and Empirical Determinations manifest as cosmic phenomena.

With Time regarded as an Underlying Principle of Motion, the question immediately arises: 'Have we any precise experiential knowledge of the 'Motion' of Time?' The answer is close at hand. So close, indeed that it has completely escaped the notice of both science and philosophy. The writer has found the answer at the very fountain-head of existence in the matrices of Time and Space whose intermutational motion is the underlying basis of the known constancy of the velocity of light. There is, of course, a material side

to this primordial relation, but this material phase of the problem must ultimately be grounded in the intermutational matrices which form the responsive equilibrating background of all physical reality. If we refer again to the Cosmic Model, presented above, the thought here outlined becomes clear. Let the Now Plane moves in such a manner that it is continuously perpendicular to a Space-Directrix. In cosmic phenomena, such as light and gravitation, the Now Plane moves, in reference to any initial point of reference in the Space-Directrix, with a velocity of 300,000 kilometers per second. In my Space-Time Potential I have given the name 'Kosmometer' to this cosmic unit of length. (Scientific Theism, page 173.) The cosmic unit of time is therefore that time period (one second) which is required for the Now Plane to travel a distance of one Kosmometer along a Space-Directrix. It is understood that the Now Plane in all its positions is perpendicular to the arbitrarily selected Space-Directrix. The velocity which arises in this manner is an Absolute Cosmic Velocity because it is the *constant cosmic ratio* of intermutation of the matrices of Time and Space. The converse is also true. The generation of this *constant cosmic ratio* is possible because Time and Space are distinct, though intermutational matrices. Einstein erroneously considers Space and Time as merely subjective precipitates from the single entity Space-Time.

As the Now Plane moves with this constant velocity, it continuously intersects the Cosmic Filaments whose 'Now Sections' responsively adjust themselves in such relative positions and configurations which conform with their inmost interactional nature and also with the co-responsive Cosmic Mold, Space-Time. Thus it is seen that intermutational Space-Time constitutes a cosmic chart capable of (the '*becoming-kinetic*' of substance) exhibiting deterministic future action. Herein lies the essence of the author's use of the word Potential in his 'Space-Time Potential.' The entire system is thus both interacting and unitary, and individually distinct forces, regarded as entities separate from matter, have no meaning. (Thus the 'force of gravitation', regarded as a separate and distinct entity is meaningless.) In such a unitary system the objections usually entertained against 'action-at-a distance,' completely disappear.

The material side of the phenomenon of light is in perfect harmony with its intermutational aspect in Space-Time. (See Scientific Theism, pages 172, 274, 275, and 276.) Here we deal with transverse and longitudinal displacements arising during the interaction of the *excitant* and *concurrent material systems*. The *ratio* of the velocities of the excitant and concurrent material system is that constant velocity which is known as the velocity of light. The concurrent system is composed of gyratory groups of monons which are interactionally responsive to the presence of the constituent units of the excitant system. The latter travels in straight lines, unless subjected to the deflective interactional influence of other material systems. Normally to the direction of motion of the excitant units, the gyrational groups, constituting the concurrent system, undergo a cyclical augmentation in their

orbital radii. The result is a genuine physical light-wave which cannot be even conceived in a continuum like the ether which contains no real discrete parts.

The writer desires to point out a few of the results which follow from his theory.

1st. Cosmic Space and Time become genuine primordial realities. The Cosmic Now Plane moves with an Absolute, and known, velocity in reference to Space. The velocity of Cosmic Phenomena (light, gravitation etc.,) becomes known as a universal Cosmic Constant (that of Light).

2nd.

The discrepancy between the sum of the component vectors and the resultant vector in the ordinary velocity and force triangle is completely accounted for by this theory. The truth of this assertion follows from the fact that a displacement in this Now Plane is inseparably associated with, and actually impossible without, a coordinated displacement of the Now Plane itself along a Space-Directrix. Thus for every vector which is not perpendicular to the Now Plane two components are inevitable. Here then we have the ultimate source of the vector triangle and also the root of the above mentioned discrepancy.

3rd.

It follows, that in a closed vectorial configuration the time period between an initial and final point is independent of the path. Since the paths are unequal in length, it follows that the velocities also will be unequal.

In the case of the interferometer experiment, if we regard the Space-Directrix as parallel or coincident with the direction of the earth's motion, it follows that the observed time period, referred to the Now Plane, is independent of the path of the light-ray. The time period required for a net displacement of the ray *along the Space-Directrix*, is the same whether the path be a curve, a continuous broken line, two adjoining hypotenuses of right triangles, or the net resultant of a simple forward and backward motion. The governing element is the initial and final position of the Now Plane in reference to the Space-Directrix.

The interpreters of the Michelson-Morley experiment have not given due consideration to the fact that light is a *continuously generated* phenomenon. It is a generated (dynamic) vector *subject to interdependent interaction*.

The writer's theory permits variability in the velocity of both the *excitant* and the *concurrent* systems. It is only the *ratio* of these variable velocities which *remains constant*. The excitant system is actively responsive to interactional intensities. The concurrent system is continuously equilibrated and therefore exists in a neutral action phase. The excitant system is subject to acceleration in the presence of interacting fields. This obviates the dilemmas (like that arising out of the Doppler effect), difficulties, and omissions which are constitutionally inherent in Einstein's system.

The excitant system, when passing near the Sun, will be subject to its direct interactional influence, and also to the refractive effect due to its

corona. The combined result will be a retardation of the velocity of the excitant system.

The difficulties and possibilities of observational errors involved in this class of physico-astronomical investigations are both numerous and large. Such allowances for the combined influences which can be made are consequently, rather in the nature of assumptions than precise determinations. These effects, however, cannot be ignored. It would seem that Einstein, in his calculations, has taken no cognizance whatever of these combined influences. In the writer's calculations an attempt was made to make allowance for these disturbing effects by a reduction in the velocity of the excitant system. In the near future, comparatively accurate information may make it possible to substitute precise data for enforced assumption.

At the present time, therefore, the main significance of the writer's calculation lies in the directness and simplicity of the method employed, together with the additional important feature that whenever reliable information is available concerning the retardational influences mentioned above, a precise determination can be made without recourse to the unnecessarily complicated, and basically erroneous, hypothesis of a curved space.

It is important to note that Cosmic phenomena involve the Cosmic Now Plane whose movement in reference to any Space-Directrix is describable in terms of the velocity of light.

The motion, however, of a discrete material system is describable in terms of a particular Now Plane which may be regarded as associated with the system.

4th.

The perfect harmonious agreement between the dynamical behavior of substance and the cooperative responsiveness of Space-Time is evident from the fact that the same vectorial relations also arise from a study of the basic dynamic laws of the universe. These dynamic relations were first developed by the writer in the year 1904. They are treated in his work under the caption, 'Fundamental Physico-mathematical Relations of the Space-Time Potential' (pages 261-268 inclusive). The relations which pertain to Interdependent and Independent Motion follow directly from these basic dynamic relations. (See Scientific Theism, pages 278-279 inclusive). The Interaction Coefficient for Light was developed by the writer from these dynamic relations, which were based directly upon experimental facts. The author's Interaction Coefficient is identical in form with the Space-Time Coefficient of Larmor, Lorentz and Einstein. Not comprehending the nature of its interdependent source in both Space-Time and real dynamic action (not mathematically speculative) the Relativists misinterpreted its significance and grossly abused its use. The unsound Larmor-Lorentz Contraction hypothesis is only one of their many misapplications.

RIGHT ARCH RIB. THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUIVALENCE.

Stated briefly, the Principle Of Equivalence asserts the equivalence of

acceleration and gravitation. Einstein was not the first one to announce this Principle, even if he was the first to misinterpret it in order to link the mutilated product into his system.

Everyone grants that acceleration can be produced by *mechanical* means. Energy must then be expended in its production. The effects produced by acceleration mechanically-generated are precisely the same as the effects which result from its *cosmic generation*, generally described by the term 'gravitation.' The 'dynamic urge' in the case of gravitational acceleration is hidden in its cosmic generation. It is, however, just as much a reality as the energy which must be supplied to generate acceleration mechanically. The 'pure acceleration' of Einstein can therefore never be the equivalent of an actual and physically real 'dynamic urge.' 'Mere motion' is purely theoretical. The attempts of Einstein to account for physically real gravitation by means of the convenient substitute of 'pure acceleration,' can therefore result in nothing but complete failure.

The substitution of a term, empty of dynamic being, does not warrant Einstein's claim for Equivalence. This artifice is on par with many other similar sophistical half-truths emanating from the Father of Relativity. The affair is nothing more than a clever shift of terms in two causal series. Acceleration produced mechanically is an *effect* arising from the application of power. The word 'gravitation' invariably refers to that *cosmic cause* which is capable of producing *gravitational acceleration* as an *effect*. Therefore it follows, that acceleration is not equivalent to gravitation. No one has ever disputed, however, that both mechanically produced acceleration and gravitational acceleration can be discussed analytically under the general term 'acceleration.'

Sophistical half-truths are always productive of dilemmas. If Einstein claims that cause and effect (in the case cited) are equivalent, then it follows, with equal show of sanity, that black is white, evil is good, error is truth, etc., etc. On the other hand, if Einstein claims extraordinary originality in having made the 'astounding' discovery that gravitational and mechanical acceleration are types of acceleration, then we must freely concede the truth of the latter statement whilst marvelling at the unparalleled audacity of the claim.

It is here pertinent to call attention again, now, however, by way of contrast, to the substantial work of Anderssohn, Zacharias, 'Kinertia,' Mewes, and Fricke, whose serious endeavors to probe the phenomenon of gravitation to its ultimate source, constitute lasting records in the history of science.

In the light of all this we are utterly unable to account for the wave of enthusiasm which swept the scientific world when Einstein announced 'his great discoveries.'

Conclusion.

Einstein's type of the 'Principle Of Equivalence' is a mere quibble and inversion of words, which is another illustration of 'Much ado about

Nothing.’ The right arch rib must consequently be declared worthless, because of the failure of this ‘Principle’ to establish a real ‘dynamical’ equivalence.

LEFT ABUTMENT HINGE. PERTURBED MOTION OF MERCURY.

It must be admitted that this ‘hinge’ is the strongest auxiliary member in Einstein’s Arch. Dr. William H. Pickering has shown that a discrepancy of about 10% exists between the observed advance of the perihelion and the amount calculated by Einstein. (Dr. Pickering made allowance for the fact that the sun is an oblate spheroid. Einstein assumed it to be a perfect sphere.)

In this connection Jeffreys points out a serious weakness in Einstein’s theory. There is, according to Jeffreys, ‘no arbitrary constituent (in Einstein’s theory) capable of adjustment to suit empirical facts.’

Moreover, it is a significant fact that Einstein’s theory is not successfully applicable to such other well known cases of perturbation as the secular acceleration of the Moon. In fact, his theory fails utterly in universal application. This fatal weakness in Einstein’s theory has been revealed by the able work of Professor C. L. Poor.

We have previously mentioned the formula of Paul Gerber (1898) which covered this ground in a much simpler manner. Therefore, even here where the theory is the strongest, it is not indispensable. Its speculative complexity is a serious fault. Since three of the four ‘main members’ of the structure have collapsed, this auxiliary hinge cannot save the Arch of Einstein from complete destruction. This verdict is in complete harmony with Einstein’s expressed opinion concerning his own theory: ‘If any deduction from it should prove untenable, it (the theory in its entirety) must be given up. A modification of it seems impossible without destruction of the whole.’

It still remains for Einstein to admit the priority of Gerber.

Conclusion.

This hinge cannot save the Einsteinian structure. It is based upon a fallacious theory. It is not universal in its application. A simple and consistent substitute is available. Therefore this hinge must be discarded.

RIGHT ABUTMENT HINGE. DEFLECTION OF LIGHT.

As far as the results of the calculations are concerned no legitimate criticism can be presented. The percentage of error is comparatively small when the observational difficulties are considered. Here again, however, the theory is not indispensable. The deflection can be calculated with greater precision and by a more direct and simple method. Attention has already been drawn to this fact in the preceding.

This work of Einstein is, moreover, open to severe criticism on the ground of perversion of facts. The ‘bending’ of light-rays by the sun is used to strengthen the ‘Curved Space’ phase of this theory. The rays are supposed to follow the *geodesic lines* of Einstein’s Curved World-Frame, and again we lose sight, in his theory, of the genuine cause of the phenomenon. In every phase of his system we encounter a departure from the direct and simple. Repeatedly the actual causes of a phenomenon are obscured by a complex

fabric spun in the looms of speculative mathematics. So in this case Einstein prefers the devious to the direct, perversion instead of simplicity, and *unreal* curved space becomes the all-important feature of the 'bending' instead of the simple interactional influence of the sun upon particles of matter. The direct attack of the problem should be as follows: Light-rays are composed of matter (since matter is the only known physical reality). The Sun is a great aggregate of matter. Groups of matter interact causing mutual deflections, whose relative amounts depend upon the magnitudes of the interacting groups. Therefore, light-rays being composed of very small particles of matter will be deflected when they pass near a great mass like the Sun.

Einstein's omission of the effects due to the Sun's atmosphere is a serious error.

The New Science has enough problems of real import with which to grapple without accepting the *unnecessary* burdens inconsiderately created by speculative mathematics. Any theory of unnecessary complexity must be regarded as a useless burden to the New Science. We have already seen the Einsteinian Arch crumble into dust. Whatever consideration we give to the hinges must be considered merely as formal and indulgent courtesy.

Conclusion.

The design of this hinge is based upon erroneous assumptions. The details of construction involve unnecessary and inconsistent complexity together with serious omissions. Since a simple and consistent substitute is available, this hinge must be rejected.

CROWN HINGE. DISPLACEMENT OF SPECTRAL LINES
TOWARD THE RED.

The average result of all the experiments made, fails to support Einstein's theory. Einstein, while in the United States, publicly stated that he is willing to hazard the truth of his entire theory on the results of this experiment. Up to date the average result has been decidedly against The Theory of Relativity. It is, indeed, strange if science accepts the implied mandate of Einstein in regard to this 'hazard.' The risk involved in such an acceptance is enormous because the displacement is exceedingly small. Moreover, only a limited number of lines can be used in the experiment. Excessively large displacements are likely to occur because of the rapid motion in the line of sight. This excess will vitiate the entire experiment unless absolute allowance for it becomes possible.

Now Einstein is willing to risk the truth of his theory upon this slight probability of apparent experimental confirmation. It would seem that either he has the faith of one obsessed, or even now, he realizes that his theory has no basis in fact. In the latter event his proposal would tend to delay the arrival of that, for him, most potent moment when he would be forced to confess to the world that his intricately spun fabric is worthless.

Dr. Pickering points out that St. John, in an experiment conducted at Mt. Wilson, found a displacement for the cyanogen lines of only +0.0018A, whereas the displacement predicated by Einstein, from his Theory of

Relativity, should be +0.0080A. The actual discrepancy is +0.0062A which represents an excess of 344 per cent. If Einstein had genuine confidence in the alleged affirmative results obtained by Grebe, Bachem, Schwarzschild, and Evershed he would not have made, while in the United States, the public statement cited above. In his work 'Relativity' he refers to this experiment as follows: 'It is an open question whether or not this effect exists At all events, a definite decision will be reached during the next few years.' He is like a man who uses the technical machinery of the courts to delay the final and inevitable verdict.

In view of the above one can but marvel at the extraordinary reception, a mounting to a triumphal ovation, which was accorded a theory, built upon a foundation of quicksand, and 'hinging', according to its originator, upon an experiment yet to be proved.

Conclusion.

This hinge must be rejected because it is not only unsafe, but also non-existent.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF TESTS.

RIGHT ABUTMENT. NON-EUCLIDEAN SPACE-TIME.

Non-Euclidean Space-Time is based upon unsound and erroneous departures from, and extensions of, Euclidean geometry. The Minkowski and Einstein version of four-dimensional Space-Time reduces to a type of four-dimensional space which is not a reality. Therefore, the right abutment is structurally non-existent. The Space-Time idea is not even original with Minkowski and Einstein. Palagyi, in 1901, expounded the essentials of this theory.

THE FLOOR.-MICHELSON-MORLEY-MILLER EXPERIMENT.

At the present time the results must be regarded as experimental facts. The significance of these results has been misconstrued by Larmor, Lorentz, and Einstein. Relativity is based upon a wrong interpretation of these results. We, however, must pronounce the floor as structurally safe.

LEFT ABUTMENT. THE FITZGERALD-LARMOR-LORENTZ TRANSFORMATION.

The Larmor-Lorentz contraction theory is a purely speculative mathematical device designed to meet an emergency. Its contentions have not been substantiated experimentally. Moreover, the Relativists (including Einstein) maintain that an experimental proof is impossible. Therefore we are forced to conclude that the left abutment is conceptually unsound, experimentally unverifiable, and structurally nonexistent. This transformation is not due to Einstein but is the work of Larmor and Lorentz based upon a suggestion by Fitzgerald.

LEFT ARCH RIB. THE CONSTANCY OF THE VELOCITY OF LIGHT.

The constancy of the velocity of light is an experimentally established fact. The left arch rib is, therefore, a sound and safe structural member. This experimental fact was not discovered by Einstein.

RIGHT ARCH RIB. THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUIVALENCE.

As defined by Einstein it is a mere quibble and inversion of words. It is an erroneous substitution of effect for cause, followed by a claim of 'Equivalence' of the reversed product and its causal source. This is a pure case of 'Much ado about Nothing.' The experimentally sound feature of the principle has been misinterpreted by Einstein, and as such, becomes a self-destructive member of his Arch. The discovery of the real facts, which were perverted by Einstein, are not even due to him but must be accredited to Anderssohn, Zacharias, 'Kinertia,' and Fricke.

LEFT ABUTMENT HINGE. PERTURBED MOTION OF MERCURY.

Here we have the best agreement of Einstein's theory with observed facts. The unnecessary complexity of Einstein's method of calculation, however, eliminates the result from serious consideration. This element in his unstable structure cannot save a theory which so blatantly lacks internal consistency and external verification. Einstein's theory is here impossible because it lacks universal applicability. The priority of Gerber here removes all ground for claims to originality on the part of Einstein.

RIGHT ABUTMENT HINGE. DEFLECTION OF LIGHT.

Einstein's calculated deflection is in comparatively close agreement with the observed amount. The calculated is less than the observed by about 11 per cent. Einstein's deflection is twice the amount obtained by the use of Newton's gravitational expression. Newton's is less than the observed by about 56%. This, then, is the status of the calculations which brought Einstein into prominent opposition to Newton. Einstein has committed a serious error in neglecting to allow for the retardational effect of the Sun's atmosphere.

We have previously mentioned that a closer approximation can be derived by simple methods founded upon the readily verifiable laws of dynamics. Therefore this attempt of Einstein is merely historically interesting. Moreover, the basic assumptions of the Einsteinian calculations are erroneous, being founded upon an untenable theory. This hinge must therefore, be removed from the world structure because it is both lacking in possible precision, and also involves unnecessary complexity in design.

THE CROWN HINGE. DISPLACEMENT OF SPECTRAL LINES TOWARD THE RED.

Einstein hazards the stability of his whole structure upon this hinge. Experimental evidence, now at hand, is decidedly damaging to Einstein's position. He admits that his contentions have not been verified. This is borne out by his own statements, recently made, in the United States.

The proposed experiment involves extremely small displacements. Varying pressure in the solar atmosphere together with the rapid motion in the line of sight, constitute decidedly detrimental extraneous influences which increase the inevitable inaccuracy of the experiment. Therefore, whatever may be the result of this proposed experiment, its significance will be open to challenge. It is never safe to base, even a less important theory, upon such dangerous experimental ground-work.

We must therefore, even now, discard the future result of this experiment as having significant bearing upon the validity of Einstein's theory.

In view of these facts we draw the inevitable conclusion that the crown hinge is not only unsafe but also non-existent.

CRITICAL WORKS ON EINSTEIN'S RELATIVITY.

E. Gehrcke—Die Relativitätstheorie, Berlin, 1920.

H. Fricke—Der Fehler in Einsteins Relativitätstheorie, Berlin, 1920.

Edouard Guillaume—La Theorie de la Relativite, Lausanne, Switzerland, 1921.

Edouard Guillaume—La Theorie De La Relativite Et Sa Signification. (Revue de Metaphysique et de Morale.)

A. N. Whitehead—An Enquiry Concerning The Principles of Natural Knowledge.

Cambridge University Press, 1919.

A. Patsche—Umsturz der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie.

P. Lenard is preparing a work on the errors of Einsteinism.

Rudolf Mewes—Raumzeitlehre oder Relativitätstheorie. (Berlin, 1921. The Collected Works of Mewes dating from 1884 to 1899 inclusive.)

William H. Pickering—The Einstein Theories. (Scientific American Monthly, April, 1921.)

John T. Blankart—Relativity or Interdependence. (The Catholic World, Feb., 1921.)

J. E. Turner—Some Philosophic Aspects of Scientific Relativity. (The Journal of Philosophy, April 14, 1921.)

Arvid Reuterdaahl—Scientific Theism Versus Materialism, The Space-Time Potential (1920).

The Fallacies Of Einstein. (Now in preparation.)

The writer has, in this brief article, presented facts not previously available in collected form. He will feel amply repaid for his labors if their presentation will further the cause of justice and truth."

From the *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, 21 August 1921,

"REVIEWER SAYS REUTERDAHL'S NEW BOOK

CLEARLY DRIVES EINSTEIN TO THE ROPES

William Wyckoff Clark of St. Paul, graduate of the University of Minnesota in its earlier days, has made a clear study of the theory of relativity, and an article by him entitled 'Divine Relativity,' discussing a metaphysical aspect of the theory, will appear soon in the Homoletic Magazine, a leading scientific journal. Prof. Arvid Reuterdaahl is dean of the department of engineering and architecture at the College of St. Thomas, and is widely known as a scientist. He challenged Einstein to a debate, some weeks ago, but never has had a reply from him.

Prof. Reuterdaahl is receiving daily letters and telegrams of

commendation of his book attacking the Einstein theory. They have come from Berlin, where Einstein is at present, from Prague, from Jugoslavia and Switzerland as well as from scientists in America.

Dr. T. J. J. See, director of the United States Naval observatory at Mare Island, Calif., writes: 'I am glad that you have punctured Einstein's bubble, which justifies the remark that 'Einstein is the Doctor Cook of physical science'.'

By William Wyckoff Clark

EINSTEIN AND THE NEW SCIENCE, Dean Arvid Reuterdaahl,
College of St. Thomas, St. Paul.

In this article, appearing in the Journal of the College of St. Thomas and reprinted for general circulation, Dean Reuterdaahl does three things creditably: First, he makes an accurate notation of the sources from which, it is claimed, Einstein acquired the various ideas composing the theory of relativity; offers a concise, vigorous and scholarly criticism of the theory; and, third, introduces an outline of his own striking and strikingly original Time-Space Potential, in so far as it is akin to relativistic principles.

The St. Paul mathematician is the most fearless and unrelenting foe of Einstein's relativity that has, up to the present time, voiced his criticism of the theory in the English language. German and French scientists have flayed Einstein and his teachings and his methods unmercifully, but for some reason or other, those English and American scientists, who have not joined the relativistic ranks, have maintained a very polite and kindly silence anent the theory. Many of them reject it, many of them adopt the Scotch verdict of 'not proven,' but few indeed are they who have taken pen in hand to write for publication even the mildest sort of adverse comment. Reuterdaahl, therefore, enters an almost empty field. That he does so willingly and even joyfully no one who has read the very brief comments on relativity contained in his book, 'Scientific Theism,' will for a moment doubt. He is a fighter, but withal fair and dignified.

Leaves Case With Jury.

Without any waving of arms or shouting of 'plagiarist,' 'thief,' 'robber,' Reuterdaahl introduces his evidence and leaves the case with the jury. He gives the names of scientists and mathematicians, with the titles and dates of publication of their various works, periodicals, etc., from which, it is claimed, Einstein obtained the data and the very ideas composing the theory of relativity, specifying accurately the subject matter appropriated. To such an extent and so thoroughly does Reuterdaahl perform this work of exhibiting 'parallelism' that the possibility of honest, independent origination by Einstein is made to appear very remote and the burden is clearly placed upon his friends to show any original work of value by him in connection with the theory. Practically all that the author concedes to Einstein is a limited amount of grouping of ideas and an unlimited amount of self-glorifying advertisement.

In his criticism of relativity Reuterdaahl is fair and discriminating,

conceding merit to certain parts of the theory and acknowledging as authentic a number of its important postulates. He very rightly regards Minkowski's Space-Time composite as one of the abutments on which the arch of relativity must necessarily rest. Minkowski is the man who coupled space and time together in an inseparable 'bund,' and then, in the ecstasy of delight over his achievement, made use of that expression which finds a place in every treatise on relativity, viz.: 'Henceforth Space in itself and Time in itself sink into mere shadows, and only a kind of bund of the two can be maintained as self-existent.' And it was Minkowski who worked out the process, on which all relativistic mathematics rests, in which time is treated as functionally equivalent to a fourth dimension of space.

'High Brow' Camp Annoyed.

The school of relativity is divided into two camps, on embracing those who frankly believe in a four-dimensional space with time actually one of the dimensions, and one embracing those who would merely assert that under certain conditions time enters the mathematics of relativity as quantitatively equivalent to a dimension of space. The latter group consider themselves the 'high-brows' of relativity and are much annoyed by the success which has attended the members of the other camp in conveying the impression to the public that relativity sponsors four-dimensional space.

In his consideration of the subject, Reuterdaahl starts out with the new, original and highly important demonstration that Minkowski's mathematics really gives a four-dimensional space. From page 11 I quote:

It can be shown that the Minkowski-Einstein space-time is a mathematically camouflaged type of four-dimensional space. In the invariant form of the General Quadratic Differential, which is basic to Relativity, the last term is formed by multiplying the velocity of light by time. Velocity is reducible to length divided by time. Therefore time is eliminated from this term, leaving it as a pure spatial expression. Consequently we have here nothing but a new version of four-dimensional space which is not a physical reality.

Relativists Put on Defensive.

Unless relativists are able to show that Reuterdaahl is mistaken in this analysis of Minkowski's Time-Space mathematics, the theory is left tied up with and bearing the burden of a four-dimensional space: and relativity is seriously handicapped by Reuterdaahl's initial attack.

Reuterdaahl next takes up the celebrated Michelson-Morley experiment and concedes that at the present time its results must be accepted as experimental facts. He agrees with relativity in regarding the experiment as conclusive proof that there is no ether. Relativity fails to provide any substitute for the ether and thereby lays itself open to the charge of incompleteness in providing no medium for the transmission of light or other electro-magnetic waves.

Reuterdaahl, however, avoids that mistake; his 'concurrent system' offers a satisfactory substitute for ether and one which is free from the inconsistent

and even contradictory properties ascribed by the scientists of the last generation to that medium.

Consideration is next given to the Fitzgerald-Lorentz contraction hypothesis and to the Larmor-Lorentz transformation equations. The importance of these matters to the theory of relativity amply warrants the extended space devoted to them by the writer, but his treatment is too technical to authorize an extended review of it at this time.

Reuterdaahl considers the contraction theory to be a 'purely mathematical device designed to meet an emergency.' It has not been and cannot be confirmed by experiment; it is a 'flagrant case of the misapplication of a mathematical product to physical reality.'

Taking up the subject of the constancy of the velocity of light, Reuterdaahl accepts the second postulate of Einstein's theory that this velocity, in a vacuum, is the same to all observers and is independent of the relative motion existing between the observer and the source of light. This is the startling postulate holding that, whether an observer were rapidly approaching a light source, or relatively at rest with it, or rapidly receding from it, in each of the three cases the waves of light would reach him with the same velocity. Paradoxical as this may seem, scientists in general accept it, although with great reluctance. In a recent letter to the writer of this review a former president of the American Academy for the Advancement of Science says:

I quite agree with you that the postulate of relativity as to constancy of the velocity of light without reference to the motion of the stars is unsatisfactory, and I hope that at some time the experimental grounds for this assumption will be found to be less compelling than seems to me to be the case at present.

Under the circumstances, therefore, Reuterdaahl's acceptance of this postulate is undoubtedly justified, especially so in view of the fact that he immediately points out the misinterpretation and misuse of the postulate by relativity.

Then follows that portion of the article which, to the philosophically inclined reader, will be found most intensely interesting, i. e., Reuterdaahl's own theory of the velocity of light together with an altogether too brief outline of his Space-Time Potential. The reviewer has tried, but without success, to contract within the space at his disposal an understandable resume of this work. Any more concise presentation of it than the author himself gives would necessarily be incomplete. An understanding of it involves an acquaintance with the author's former work, 'Scientific Theism.' It is therefore with great regret that we dismiss the topic with the totally inadequate comment that Reuterdaahl's Space-Time Potential and theory of light transmission are strikingly original, scientifically and philosophically consistent and worthy of the profoundest study.

Among the most outstanding features of relativity is Einstein's much-heralded 'Principle of Equivalence' between gravitation and acceleration. Reuterdaahl performs a very important bit of work in showing that the

identifying of the two by relativity is a confusion of cause and effect which robs the 'principle' of all heuristic value, indeed of all verity. Acceleration is an 'effect,' one that can be produced mechanically or by the action of that 'cosmic cause' which we call 'gravitation.' But acceleration, an effect, and gravitation, a cause, can not be identical or equivalent.

We must pass over without adequate consideration Einstein's proposed three tests for his theory, the perturbed motion of Mercury, the deflection of light and the displacement of spectral lines. Regarding the first, Reuterdahl admits the accuracy of the relativistic calculations to within about 10 per cent, but shows that the same system of computation, applied to other cases of perturbation, produces inconsistent results.

Regarding Einstein's calculated deflection of light the author concedes its approximate correctness, a variance of about 11 per cent being shown, but points out that 'the deflection can be calculated with greater precision and by a more direct and simple method.'

The third test, the displacement of spectral lines toward the red, not being claimed by relativity to have been confirmed, is dismissed by Reuterdahl with but little more than the passing comment that Einstein is taking long chances on resting the validity of his entire theory on this doubtful base.

'Einstein and the New Science' is a valuable addition to relativistic literature. Students of the subject, whether favorably inclined to the theory or otherwise, can not afford to miss reading it."

On 24 August 1921, *The New York Times* reported on page 2,

"CALL FITZGERALD FATHER OF RELATIVITY. English Writer Gives Him Credit for the Genesis of the Einstein Theory. Special Cable to THE NEW YORK TIMES. LONDON, Aug. 23.—Referring to the conferring by the Royal Society of its fellowship on Dr. Robb for his work on relativity, a scientific correspondent of The Daily Chronicle says that the credit for the evolution of the theories of time and space is due to the initiative of three Irishmen: Professor G. F. Fitzgerald of Trinity College, Dublin; Sir Joseph Larmor, who is Lucasian Professor of Mathematics at Cambridge, and Dr. Robb.

Robb has admitted his indebtedness to Larmor, but, says, the correspondent, the theory of relativity owes its origin to Fitzgerald's explanation, as far back as 1888, of Nicholson's [*sic*] and Morley's failure to detect any relative motion between earth and ether.

He showed that if all bodies contracted in the same proportion in the direction of their motion we should have no fixed standard of length, as measuring rules and all scientific instruments would likewise change their dimensions [*sic*]. Hence we could not ascertain the exact size of things, nor detect their motion relatively to fixed absolute space.

This was known as Fitzgerald's contraction theory, which, in the hands of Larmor and Sovenx [*sic*: Lorentz?] of Leyden has led up to the remarkable theories of space and time since developed by Robb and Einstein."

In 1921, Wolfgang Pauli set the record straight in the *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*,

“The metamorphoses in physical concepts brought about by the theory of relativity was a long time in the making. As far back as 1887, Voigt observed in one of his works [***] that it is mathematically possible to introduce a time of position t' into a moving reference system, whose origin is a linear function of the spatial coordinates, while the unit of time, however, is taken to be constant. Whereby, one can assert, of course, that the wave equation

$$\Delta\phi - \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial t^2} = 0$$

also remains valid in the moving system. [***] We now come to a review of the three works of *Lorentz*, *Poincaré* and *Einstein*, which contain the thoughts and developments which are the foundation of the theory of relativity. Lorentz' work led the way. Above all, it furnished the proof that Maxwell's equations are invariant under the transformation of coordinates [*Lorentz Transformation equations deleted*] provided that one at the same time suitably selects the field intensity in the primed system.”²¹³¹

Pauli argues that Lorentz holds priority for the proof of invariance. Pauli next addresses Poincaré's contribution,

“The formal gaps left by Lorentz's work were filled by Poincaré. He stated the relativity principle to be generally and rigorously valid. Since he, in common with the previously discussed authors, assumed Maxwell's equations to hold for the vacuum, this amounted to the requirement that all laws of nature must be covariant with respect to the ‘Lorentz transformation’ [The terms ‘Lorentz transformation’ and ‘Lorentz group’ occurred for the first time in this paper by Poincaré—*notation found in the original*]. The invariance of the transverse dimensions during the motion is derived in a natural way from the postulate that the transformations which affect the transition from a stationary to a uniformly moving system must form a group which contains as a subgroup the ordinary displacements of the coordinate system. Poincaré further corrected Lorentz's formulae for the transformations of charge density and current and so derived the complete covariance of the field equations of electron theory. We shall discuss his treatment of the gravitational problem, and his use of the imaginary coordinate ict , at a later stage (see §§ 50 and 7).”²¹³²

After giving Poincaré his due credit, and acknowledging that Einstein holds no priority for the special theory of relativity, Pauli, half-heartedly, pays the seemingly obligatory homage to Einstein, the then recently emerged celebrity,

“It was Einstein, finally, who in a way completed the basic formulation of this new discipline.”²¹³³

And it appears that Pauli was forced, or felt compelled, to praise Einstein with additional inappropriate and, evidently, insincere comments.

Einstein’s work was not so well-received, nor so perfect, as his present day sycophantic advocates would have us believe.²¹³⁴ Louis Essen wrote,

“But there have always been its critics: Rutherford treated it as a joke: Soddy called it a swindle: Bertrand Russell suggested that it was all contained in the Lorentz transformation equations and many scientists commented on its contradictions. These adverse opinions, together with the fact that the small effects predicted by the theory were becoming of significance to the definition of the unit of atomic time, prompted me to study Einstein’s paper. I found that it was written in imprecise language, that one assumption was in two contradictory forms and that it contained two serious errors.”²¹³⁵

John T. Blankart stated in 1921,

“The ‘Kinertia’ articles offer food for thought when considered in connection with the colossal claims made by Einstein’s supporters concerning his almost super-human originality. In fact, one begins to doubt the justice of these claims and to wonder if the charges made by a fast growing group of German scientists who, like E. Gehrcke, P. Lenard, and Paul Weyland, hold that Einstein is both a plagiarist and a sophist, are not, after all, true. We have done little justice in the above to the rare dialectic skill with which Dr. Einstein has applied his intellectual anæsthesia to the minds of his readers. All intellectual obstructions have been removed, and the reader is prepared to venture forth boldly into the mysterious realm of ‘curved’ space *whose geometrical properties depend upon the matter present*. This most curious inference of Einstein is the master stroke in his skillful massing of inconsistent sophistries.”²¹³⁶

Sydney T. Skidmore wrote, in 1921,

“THE MISTAKES OF DR. EINSTEIN

By SYDNEY T. SKIDMORE

WE begin this essay by saying that Einsteinism is an erudite elaboration of sophistry and is closely akin to, if indeed it does not spring from, the same root as classic sophistry. The tap root of that system of philosophy developed in the fifth century before the Christian era, and consisted in a denial of the existence of objective truth. Its thought and attitude can only become intelligible from a presentation of what ‘objective truth’ is, and for this, a little tax must be imposed on the reader’s patience.

Its definition is simple enough. It consists of, and includes, the being of

all created things and their relativities. It is objective because its essence is independent of subjective thinking which can apprehend it in part—can pick up pebbles of it from an ocean strand—and assemble what is gathered as knowledge. Since it inheres in the essence of created things it is coinstant with their creation.

Creation is originate; and all created things must have a beginning. The first creative act necessitated a ‘where’ for its occurrence, and that where has existed ever since as a changeless objective truth. Each creative act likewise necessitated a where, and the aggregate of all wheres, or whereness, constitutes a changeless, undistortable, frame of objective truth to which the term Space has been applied. Objective truth or ‘isness’ pertains to the wheres or loci in space, and since the loci are fixed, it also pertains to the changeless relations of loci.

The first creative act not only required a where, it also required a when—an instant—for its occurrence. Each creative act likewise required an instant, and the aggregate of all whens or whenness, constitutes another frame of objective truth, to which the term Time has been applied. Unlike loci, instants are not simultaneous, they are sequential, and their objective truth pertains to a procession rather than to a distribution.

In each creative event, therefore, three orders of objective truth are present, viz., cause, locus and instant. Since history is composed of events, and experience is concerned with them, the foregoing analysis may serve to show what the nature of objective truth is, and also that the objective truths, cause, space and time, supply and equip the generative arena of events, i.e., of physical phenomena.

Objective truths are presented in every fact and may be apprehended in all phenomena. They are not thoughts but they are thinkables, and are cognized by each mind according to its scope. Now, because the Eleatics failed to formulate it or define it as an abstract oneness, the Sophists denied that it had any existence whatever.

Since abstraction plays an important part in this discussion it must receive some attention. Abstraction consists in withdrawing attributes, or qualities, from their home correlatives in nature, and installing them in a psychical abode for mental contemplation. As the word stands it means the separation of something from something; but never a separation of something from nothing. Inception is usually the word for that. There must always be a residue from which the final abstraction is made. The relativity of attributes in and with a thing, although they are mentally withdrawn, is still codestructible only with the thing itself. An abstraction of qualities does not annihilate the residue; nor can a sound philosophy be constructed from the relativities of attributes alone, with the residue ignored. We give the following statement prodigious emphasis because it is so much involved in the reasoning farther on.

No amount of abstraction can resolve a thing to a philosophical nullity nor psychalize it into nonexistence. The residue with its relativities still

persists as objective truth.

The relativities of abstractions by themselves are subjective, mental, and may be correct, but are usually incorrect owing to the imperfection of mental action. True science is a developed knowledge of what *is* as revealed by discovery in wide open objectivity, and false or pseudo science is a knowledge of what *seems to be* as revealed by apprehendings in the inclusions of subjective recesses.

Since the Sophists denied the existence of objective truth they could not make it an objective goal of human endeavor. They must by necessity adopt a subjective goal, such as excellence, success, or victory. Truth, with them, was inherent in triumph. Whatever prevailed was true and true because it prevailed and truth had no other significance. It is easy to understand how such a philosophy as that should become reduced by human ambition, selfishness, and deceit, to the direct degradation. The success most esteemed by the Greeks was victory in debate, and after two centuries, Sophistry became such a system of thin verbal trickery that it fell into disrepute, and a stigmatum attached to its name.

Wherever the supreme goal of endeavor has been placed in things other than debate; and smartness of any kind has been substituted for objective truth, as an end anywhere, sophistry works the same degradation. While it appears to be always present as an inseparable corrupter, there have been some well marked epochs in which it acquired such dominance as to shape legislation and thinking and openly display its fruits. This occurred in the ancient sophistry of Greece as such; in medieval sophistry as Scholasticism; and in modern sophistry as Commercialism, Pragmatism, and Education. In war and politics it appears respectable as Strategy. In commercialism, somewhat less so as shrewdness; while in pragmatism and education it often wears the mask of efficiency.

Objective truths are distant and gloriously free. Subjective truths are stifled in mentality and subordinate to the ends of victorious achievement. Apprehendings of objective truths are obtained from objective things and, if incorrect, they may be checked up and corrected by reference to the things. Apprehendings of subjective truths are mental constructions, apart from things, and uncorrectable since subjectivity is not apt to correct itself. If they are crazed by mental inaccuracy the relativities of such truths are incurably queered likewise.

This presentation of sophistry as a system of thought, seems necessary to establish, by comparison, the validity of the statement made in the beginning of this essay; for we shall try to show that Einsteinism is sophistry, both in its nature, and in its dialectic construction.

It is purely subjective and Protagorean in that it ignores the objective truth of all steadfastness, and all relativity of steadfastness in general being.

There are two orders of relativity; that of the steadfast with changeables; and that of changeables with each other. Einstein relativity is exclusively of the second order. We are not aware that Einstein anywhere formally denies

the existence of steadfastness as objective truth, but since it cannot be psychalized he everywhere ignores it, and all arguments for Einstein relativity are based on its non-existence; and it is Einstein relativity, with its astounding pretensions, that we are criticising.

The primary positional steadfasts in nature are the loci (points) in space. The earth and all things in it move, but space units do not. All things in the earth have a first order relativity with the points of space, and a first or second order with each other according as their motions are alike or unlike each other. Now because the points of space are ultra to experience, imperceptible and unsubjective, together with their relativities, their being is summarily denied by sophists and ignored by Einsteinism; and all semblance of steadfastness, like that of car seats in a moving car, or houses on a moving earth, have no steadfast relativity with anything; it is only subjective thinking.

Einsteinism claims to open a vast extension of physics but, if adopted and followed, it would tend to a collapse of physics because it works from a psychological rather than from a physical basis. The two are in reversion. Physics stimulates discovery by trailing the scent of objective truths occluded in the unknown. Einsteinism represses discovery by holding truth corralled within subjectivity. Even Space and Time, the fundamental containers of those objective truths which physicists are continually transferring from the unknown to the known, are said to be 'devoid of the last vestige of physical objectivity.' (Schlick, pages 53, 76. Eddington, page 34) . [*Footnote: We shall quote in this paper from Schlick's 'Space and Time', and from Eddington's 'Space, Time and Gravitation', because both these books are recognized as authoritative in Einstein literature and they are somewhat more definite and explicit than Einstein's own writing.*]

Physical relativities are of the first order; Einstein relativities are of the second order and pertain to the relations of fluxing events as they are observed. Words such as cause, potential, and force, which are leaders in physics are of rare occurrence in Einstein literature and when used are slipped in edgewise. The relativity of physical effects with their causes is slightly discussed, but the relativity of mental states induced in observers when differently conditioned abounds, and forms the body of argument, and the plenitude of discussion.

Another citation, which shows how completely truth is restricted to the realm of subjective apprehendancy, appears in the interpretations given to the Michelson and Morley experiment.

Those investigators truly assumed that if a non-viscous static aether existed, an aether wind opposite to the earth's motion must blow through the moving earth; and that the velocity of light would be different when moving against this wind, than when moving at right angles with it. A very delicate and crucial experiment showed that the earth's motion had no effect whatever on the velocity of light. Now what? Something must be wrong, either with the aether belief, or with the motion of light; and the

mathematicians proceeded to explain it, as they usually do, by tinkering at space and time. Fitzgerald and Lorenz [*sic*] devised that everything in the line of motion transforms and contracts, and so increased time was exactly compensated by shortened distance, and the velocity of light, as shown by simultaneous arrival, was apparently unchanged.

This saved a clumsily apprehended aether belief from Michelson and Morley extinction; but Einstein proposed a different explanation. Quite indifferent to the fate of current aether belief, he found the difficulty lurking in the relativities of motion. All things, relatively at rest in a system, maintain that relativity whether the system, as a whole, is moving or not. The motion of a system, moving relatively with objects external to it, has zero effect on the relativity of things within it. The relative direction of city streets abides when their direction from the sun changes continually. Street cars run a mile east in the same time as when running north, although the earth rushes westward one thousand one hundred miles per minute, and northward not at all. The interferometer, mirrors, and source of light, in the Michelson experiment, were all in the same Earth system and therefore the light moved between them through equal distances in equal times, whatever the direction might be. This neither proves nor disproves the existence of an aether, but it does show that if an aether exist it is of such a character that currents and whirls in it do not perceptibly affect the velocity of light. It is not an externality by which the relativity of light movement with it can be sensibly apprehended. Now, because a static aether of a particular character does not exist, the reasoning dialectically pussyfoots into an assumption that there is neither aether nor staticity. The aether is of small consequence in the case, but it is essential to Einstein relativity to put out of existence the principle of staticity as an objective truth and the ultimate physical reference basis of all motion.

Whatever may be true in metaphysics it is certainly true, that in physics such a principle does and must exist, as a physical necessity. A bird does not take the air along with it in flight; a ship does not take the ocean with it in sailing; a moving car does not take the ties of the road bed with it, and no moving thing takes space with it. Air, ocean, and ties have a static relativity with the moving objects mentioned. Whatever moves has changing relations with everything that does not move precisely as it does; and static relations with everything that does: but a truce to such platitudes. Space contains all moving things which therefore have a shifting relativity with it, because it does not move like them. It is the physical ultimate of staticity since nothing physical exists external to it to which its motion can be referred.

The changing relativity of things with the points of space or instants of time is of the first order (primary) and all changing relativity of things with each other is of the second order (casual).

Einstein relativity is exclusively of the second order. The expounders of it deny that there is any other, and back up the denial by ignoring the staticity of space; but this they cannot do without postulating something in

metaphysics external to space which does not move as space does; and this they cannot do; so, to abolish its staticity, they must abolish space itself and replace it by a subjective creation.

Staticity must be removed from the space world to permit the entrance of Einstein curios and non-Euclidian queers. While it abides lineality abides. Forms in space are outlined in it by moveless points, and are differentiated from it just as an island boundary is different from the surrounding ocean. Points of space are located by rectilinear coordinates, and all other coordinates whether Gaussian, polar, or zigzag, only serve to locate places on the surface of a form in space, like the longitude and latitude circles on the surface of a terrestrial globe. They do not locate points of space; they merely locate points with reference to other points on the surface of a form in space. Hence arises the non-Euclidian sophistry of spherics, or elliptical space, and the Einstein sophistry of space curved and twisted around material bodies, like a swaddling striate aura, and the further sophistry that bodies moving through such space are impelled by inertia along curved rather than straight lines in accordance with a 'Principle of Least Action' that the longest way round is the shortest way home, because straight lines would lead across curving hurdles (Eddington, page 105).

Space as such has no form whatever. It is neither curved, flat, nor otherwise. The pure forms of things (the abstract residues) are defined in space by the fixed relativity of its moveless points. This statement squarely contradicts Einsteinism. It is based on logical inferences in objective creation, while its antithesis is grown from subjective apprehendings of shifting things. Whichever is truth, the other is devoid of truth and the choice is yours.

Staticity has been discussed at some length because it illustrates the attitude of Einstein relativity towards all objective truth. Because such truths, when postulated are imperceptible and make no psychic impression, words sophistically used present them as unreals, and cause them to appear as 'ambiguities and unnecessary thought elements', (Schlick, page 5) which should be thrown aside as meaningless and obstructive to a path that leads not to truth but to victory; not to amendment and improvement by new tributes of knowledge; but to a revolution of fundamental concepts which throws down an older and erects a new intellectual throne.

This revolution (when achieved) is a promise of something which will cause Newton and Copernicus to seem like infantile prattlers; 'inasmuch as the deepest foundations of our knowledge concerning physical nature have to be remodeled much more radically than after the discovery of Copernicus.' (Schlick, page 5.)

The signs of such an approaching revolution at present are not very auspicious. While one out of twenty, or possibly fifty, of savants are filling the world with a sounding applause of it, all the rest are waiting, silent, dubious, and withholding allegiance. Still it may come; for the human world delights in sophistry and dotes on truths of its own creation. Impressionism

which is so powerful in Art may also yet prevail in Philosophy.

That Einsteinism presents a revel in such truths is made evident by Eddington in Chapter XII: 'The conclusion is that the whole of those laws of nature which have been woven into a unified scheme—mechanics, optics, gravitation, electro-dynamics—have their origin not in any special mechanism of nature but in the workings of the mind.'

'Give me matter and motion,' said Descartes, 'and I will construct the universe.' 'The mind reverses this,' says Einstein. 'Give me a world in which there are relations, and I will construct matter and motion.' The world thus is what it is conceived to be; is what we think it is. That is precisely what Descartes and Einstein each professed to do. Both are subjectivists—sophists. One would replace the objective truths of real relations, by such queered relations as he could mentally construct from observed things, and the other would replace the objective truths of real things, by such queered things as he could mentally construct from observed relations. Both alike substitute their psychical apprehending of nature's content, for the content itself, and then call it truth.

Recent writings in current literature suggest that many inquiries are baffled in attempts to comprehend Einsteinism. They read about it and think there must be something in it, and so there is, but it is a something not included in their somethingness. It is shapen from non-Euclidian, or what is sometimes termed meta, geometry. This consists entirely of mental constructions that are purely subjective and correspond to nothing in nature. In fact it prides itself on a disbelief or at least a disregard of the existence of objective truth, and boasts that 'mathematicians are never so happy as when talking about something of which they know nothing.' (Eddington, page 14.) Really it is no geometry at all, for it measures nothing and disallows all mental standards. It is a fantastic jazz of mathematical symbols, devoid of quanta, in a dance hall, floored by a parquetry of ifs, supposings, and assumptions.

The attitude of Einsteinism toward physics, and the fate of physics by occlusion in this thing, misnamed geometry, is well stated by Eddington (page 183). 'As the geometry becomes more complex, the physics becomes simpler, until it finally almost appears that the physics has been absorbed into the geometry.' While parading the attractive banner of a 'New Physics' or a 'New Philosophy,' Einsteinism is really nothing but a special chapter in psychology, which is offered as a new style of incubator for hatching nature's eggs.

In popular discussion two things are mixed up in Einsteinism as if they belonged to it, but they do not. One of these is the prediction that space and time will have an end. This is nothing new. It is a philosophical deduct of long standing that whatever has a beginning is finite, and must have a boundary and an ending; and that space and time which began with creation will cease to be when created things become non-existent. The other is a scientific derivative from the electronic theory, and preceded Einstein by a

number of years. That theory changed the definition of mass from 'quantity of matter' in a body to 'quantity of force' in a body. The matter in a body is its mass or force in statu; the motion of a body is its mass or force in motu. Matter and motion together constitute the mass of a body and each is force with a modal difference. Mass and inertia are one and the same thing to which different names are given when differently apprehended.

This was all worked out physically before the time of Einstein and is no part of Einsteinism. If wonderful, it is a wonder of physical discovery and not a marvel of psychical geometry.

A peculiar feature of Einsteinism is that the crux of its doctrines is deeply submerged in mathematical obscurity. If one asks for proof he is told that it lies in mathematical profundities, quite beyond the reach of anyone other than an adept; and the unintelligible character of Einstein literature fully sustains the statement. Now the English language, with its rich vocabulary, direct idiom, and classic verbal quarries, is quite capable of expressing anything that has a meaning, and of rounding out the proof of any statement that admits proof. To understanding it is a wide open Bible; and cloistered secrets doled out by initiates for aweing the credulous are unnecessary. Proofs that vest in mathematical cryptograms are dubious. Mathematicians choose their own assumptions and, according to the assumption taken, they can prove that truth is truth; or falsehood is falsehood, or truth is falsehood, or falsehood is truth, with equal facility. Mathematics supplied cranks, cycles, and epicycles to Ptolemaic astronomy just as readily as it supplied ellipses, parabolas, and hyperbolas to Copernican. Cryptogramists follow rules of interpretation and have but slight regard for rules of philosophic sense.

A mathematician can only be trusted as far as he can be seen, or objectively checked up. Unlike space but quite like that of a political conscience, the mathematic psychology warps and twists in quaintest fashion to attain an end when left to its own devices. According to Einstein device, Space and Time are inseparable from matter. 'Space and Time determinations will henceforth be inseparably connected with matter and will have meaning only when connected with it.' (Schlick, page 4.) 'Time and Space can be dissociated from matter only by abstraction, i.e., mentally; the combination or oneness of space, time, and things is alone reality; each by itself is an abstraction' (a mental figment). (Schlick, page 6.) 'In this way Space and Time are deprived of the last vestige of physical objectivity, to use Einstein's words.' (Schlick, page 53.) 'Exactly so; Space is an abstraction of the extensional relations of matter.' (Eddington, page 8.) What matter has extensional relations with, is not stated; if it be with other matter, the thing that sustains the relationship is not stated; and you may find out if you can, but not from Einsteinism.

Since Space and Time as thus stated are mental investitures of matter, a bunch of it when moving must either take its space and time along with it as personal property, like clothes, color, or shape; or else find it as a place

endowment wherever it goes. We would much like to know whether space is regarded as the mental baggage of travelling matter, or is an omnipresent mental continuum which forms a ‘oneness’ with matter wherever the matter happens to be. We are not told which it is because that would resolve a psychologic mystery that can be handily employed in discussion. It is sometimes convenient to take it one way and sometimes the other.

The matter in other stars is assumed to be rather similar to that of the earth; but it is bunched together quite differently; and that would create different kinds of space and time. That presents no difficulty, however, because ‘there are different kinds of possible space to choose from, no one of which can be regarded more likely than any other.’ (Eddington, page 15.) The difficulty becomes serious, however, if it be true that space and time are purely mental determinations. Indeed it becomes an open question whether or not the stars have any space or time worth mentioning. Our mental determination of Arcturian space is restricted to a point; and unless there be a developed mentality in Arcturus, or somewhere else, the poor star has no space other than a point, and no time other than what is marked by star drift. Moreover, if there be any system of physics in Arcturus, it must be quite different from ours, unless the Arcturians have minds like ours, for, according to Eddington, as previously quoted, ‘the laws of nature . . . have their origin, not in any special mechanism of nature, but in the workings of the mind.’

The vice of Einsteinism is that it transfers sense deception from ordinary things which check it up, to space, time, motion, and energy, which do not check it up, because their nature is ultra to experience.

From a puny bunch of relativity as psychologically impressed on differently conditioned observers, a mathematical explosive has been prepared for deranging established foundations of thought. A petty scheme of psychalized relativity is given as interpretative of a grand world universe filled with objective relativities that have not as yet been psychalized. Its nature is purely subjective and sophistical.— Q. E. D.”²¹³⁷

There were many others who publicly opposed Einstein, the theory of relativity, and the deception of the general public by the pro-Einstein press on similar grounds, including: Adler,²¹³⁸ Weinmann,²¹³⁹ Mohorovičić,²¹⁴⁰ Bergson,²¹⁴¹ Guillaume,²¹⁴² Patschke,²¹⁴³ Dingle,²¹⁴⁴ Dingler,²¹⁴⁵ Strasser,²¹⁴⁶ Guggenheimer,²¹⁴⁷ Lynch,²¹⁴⁸ Mackaye,²¹⁴⁹ Nordenson,²¹⁵⁰ Essen,²¹⁵¹ Theimer,²¹⁵² Gut,²¹⁵³ etc. Early bibliographies appear in Gehrcke’s *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 95-98; and in H. Israel, *et al.*, editors., *Hundert Autoren Gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, (1931), pp. 75-78.

In 1922, Stjepan Mohorovičić acknowledged what Albert Einstein did not,

“I must point out what is little known, that the French physicist H. Poincaré had already called attention to the fact that the Lorentz Transformations form a group, he had already shown in 1900 (therefore 5 years before Einstein)

[Footnote: See the book, which is cited in note 22 {M. Abraham, *Theorie der Elektrizität*, Volume 2, Fourth Edition, Leipzig, Berlin, 1920}, S. 359. It appears that Poincaré did not mention Einstein even once in his lecture ‘*The New Mechanics*’ (Leipzig, Berlin, 1911) for this reason.], how one can set clocks by means of light signals to Lorentz’ local time. [***] Therefore we must understand the method of signaling (which, as we have stressed, H. Poincaré had already applied in 1900) only as an interpretation of Lorentz’ formulas.”

“Ich muß darauf hinweisen, was weniger bekannt ist, daß schon der französische Physiker H. Poincaré darauf aufmerksam gemacht hat, daß die Lorentzschen Transformationen eine Gruppe bilden; er hat schon 1900 (also 5 Jahre vor Einstein) gezeigt [Footnote: Siehe das Buch, welches in Anmerkung 22 zitiert ist {M. Abraham, *Theorie der Elektrizität*. II. Bd. 4. Aufl. Leipzig-Berlin 1920}, S. 359. Es scheint, daß deswegen Poincaré in seinem Vortrage »*Die neue Mechanik*« (Leipzig-Berlin 1911) Einstein nicht einmal erwähnt.], wie man die Uhren mittels der Lichtsignale auf die Lorentzsche Ortszeit richten kann. [***] [D]eswegen müssen wir die Methode der Signalisierung (welche — wie wir betont haben — schon H. Poincaré 1900 aufgebracht hat), nur als eine Interpretation der Lorentzschen Formeln auffassen²⁹⁾.”²¹⁵⁴

Stjepan Mohorovičić acknowledged Poincaré’s priority for realizing that the Lorentz Transformations form a group. Mohorovičić cites Max Abraham’s acknowledgment of Poincaré’s priority for the clock synchronization method with light signals,²¹⁵⁵ and asserts that Poincaré did not mention Einstein even once in his lecture *Die neue Mechanik* (*La mécanique nouvelle* = *The New Mechanics*),²¹⁵⁶ because Einstein had plagiarized Poincaré’s method of synchronizing clocks with light signals, which method is but an interpretation of Lorentz’ “Ortszeit”, and Poincaré’s assertion of the group properties of the Lorentz Transformation.²¹⁵⁷

Felix Klein had made similar assertions in a private letter to Wolfgang Pauli on 8 March 1921, that Poincaré was the first to recognize that the Lorentz Transformations form a group and that Poincaré felt an animosity towards Einstein, and this was the only explanation for the fact that Poincaré snubbed Einstein in Poincaré’s Göttingen lecture on the new mechanics. Klein wrote,

“Es ist nun doch einmal so, daß Poincarés erste Note in den Comptes Rendus 140 vor Einstein liegt und er im Anschluß daran (in den Rendiconti di Palermo) zuerst zeigte, daß es sich bei Lorentz um eine *Gruppe* von Transformationen handele. Von da aus ein Gegensatz, der allein es verständlich macht, daß P[oincaré] 1911 in seinem Göttinger Vortrag „sur la nouvelle mécanique“ den Namen Einstein überhaupt nicht nennt.”²¹⁵⁸

Poincaré’s silence also caught the attention of Max Born, who stated,

“One of these series of lectures was given by Henri Poincaré, April 22nd-28th 1909[.] The sixth lecture had the title ‘La mécanique nouvelle.’ It is a popular account of the theory of relativity without any formulae and with very few quotations. EINSTEIN and MINKOWSKI are not mentioned at all, only MICHELSON, ABRAHAM and LORENTZ. But the reasoning used by POINCARÉ was just that, which EINSTEIN introduced in his first paper of 1905, of which I shall speak presently. Does this mean that POINCARÉ knew all this before EINSTEIN? It is possible, but the strange thing is that this lecture definitely gives you the impression that he is recording LORENTZ’ work.”²¹⁵⁹

Arvid Reuterdahl also was aware that Poincaré resented Einstein,

“Professor Henri Poincaré, the famous French physicist and mathematician, advisedly ignores the name of Einstein in his lectures on ‘Relativity’.”²¹⁶⁰

And Johannes Riem reiterated the fact,

“Neben dieser Aufklärung durch die Presse ging dann eine wissenschaftliche Bekämpfung Einsteins, vor allem durch den Mathematiker und Ingenieur *Reuterdahl* am St. Thomas College, der selbst schon vor Einstein über Relativität gearbeitet und Einstein zu einer öffentlichen Aussprache aufgefordert hat, bei der dieser das Richterscheinen vorzog. Reuterdahl hat eine kleine leicht lesbare Broschüre im Journal seines College erscheinen lassen „Einstein und die neue Wissenschaft“. Hierin untersucht er physikalisch die Grundlagen der neuen Lehre. Er zeigt seinen Landsleuten, wie schon lange vor Einstein zahlreiche Gelehrte das Richtige der Relativitätstheorie gefunden und diesem als Quelle gedient haben, ohne daß dieser auf diese seine Vorgänger hinwies, so daß es ganz falsch ist, die Relativitätstheorie immer auf Einstein zurückzuführen, wie dies meist geschieht. Es ist dies so wenig berechtigt, daß z. B. Poincaré in seinen Vorlesungen über Relativität Einstein überhaupt nicht erwähnt. Quellenmäßig wird dann von Reuterdahl gezeigt, wie bedeutende Gelehrte die Einsteinsche Fassung der Relativitätstheorie als falsch bekämpfen und ganz andere Ueberlegungen and die Stelle setzen, wie *Lenard*, *Gehrcke*, *Fricke*, *Mewes* es tun. Endlich untersucht er das Einsteinsche Gebäude selbst auf seine Zusammensetzung, seine Grundlagen und Haltbarkeit, und findet, daß es ein Spiel mit Worten und Begriffen ist, denen in der Physik nichts tatsächliches entspricht. Es wäre sehr lohnend, die kleine Schrift von 26 Seiten zu übersetzen.”²¹⁶¹

Alexander Moszkowski was very confused by the letter of recommendation Poincaré allegedly wrote for Einstein in 1911—which letter makes no mention of the theory of relativity.²¹⁶² Moszkowski saw this as a reversal of the animosity Poincaré demonstrated towards Einstein in Berlin in 1910. Moszkowski wrote in 1921, describing his belief that Poincaré had come to recognize the “lasting importance of

Einstein's researches[.]” and had overcome any doubts about the accumulating number of hypotheses in the new mechanics,

“On the 13th October 1910 a memorable event took place in the Berlin Scientific Association: Henri Poincaré, the eminent physicist and mathematician, had been announced to give a lecture in the rooms of the institute ‘Urania’; an audience of rather meagre dimensions assembled. [***] It was at this lecture that we heard the name Albert Einstein pronounced for the first time. Poincaré’s address was on the New Mechanics [***] At that time, early in 1916, only a few members of the Literary Society divined who it was that was enjoying their hospitality. In the eyes of Berlin, Einstein’s star was beginning its upward course, but was still too near the horizon to be visible generally. My own vision, sharpened by the French lecture and by a friend who was a physicist, anticipated events, and already saw Einstein’s star zenith, although I was not even aware at that time that Poincaré had in the meantime overcome his doubts and had fully recognized the lasting importance of Einstein’s researches.”²¹⁶³

Poincaré did not mention Einstein in his lecture and Moszkowski must have heard Einstein’s name from his friend. Poincaré’s resentment of Einstein had nothing to do with the *ad hoc* hypotheses of the new mechanics, which he attributed to Lorentz, but was instead purely a product of Einstein’s plagiarism, which fact was acknowledged by the experts Felix Klein and Stjepan Mohorovičić.

Moszkowski was simply lying to his reading audience. He knew quite well that Poincaré, himself, was the father of the new mechanics and that Einstein had plagiarized it from Poincaré, though in 1904, Poincaré had generously attributed the “new mechanics” to Lorentz, before the Einsteins had published on the subject. Poincaré famously stated in 1904,

“From all these results, if they are confirmed, would arise an entirely new mechanics, which would be, above all, characterised by this fact, that no velocity could surpass that of light, any more than any temperature could fall below the zero absolute, because bodies would oppose an increasing inertia to the causes, which would tend to accelerate their motion; and this inertia would become infinite when one approached the velocity of light.”²¹⁶⁴

Moszkowski failed to emphasize the fact, which was known to him, that Poincaré was himself the father of this new mechanics and had coined the term in 1904. Poincaré did object to the growing number of *ad hoc* hypotheses, but Poincaré nevertheless created the special theory of relativity, and the Einsteins plagiarized the theory from him. The fact that Poincaré was aware of the fatal flaws in the theory, while the Einsteins irrationally pretended them away by deliberately confusing induction with deduction, does not change the fact that Poincaré created the theory and the Einsteins copied it directly from him. This proves that the Einsteins were not only opportunistic plagiarists, but that they were also incompetent and dishonest

scientists.

Moszkowski wrote,

“For the theory asks us to brush aside habits of thought that have claimed an hereditary position in pre-eminent minds. One of the foremost physicists, Henri Poincaré, had confessed as late as 1910 that it caused him the greatest effort to find his way into Einstein’s new mechanics. Another whole year passed before he gave up his last doubts. Then he passed with flying colours into Einstein’s camp, and recommended Einstein’s appointment to the Professorship at Zürich, in conjunction with the discoverer of radium, Madame Curie, in an exuberant letter which may add its note of appreciation here:

‘Herr Einstein,’ so wrote the great Poincaré, ‘is one of the most original minds that I have ever met. In spite of his youth he already occupies a very honourable position among the foremost savants of his time. What we marvel at in him, above all, is the ease with which he adjusts himself to new conceptions and draws all possible deductions from them. He does not cling tightly to classical principles, but sees all conceivable possibilities when he is confronted with a physical problem. In his mind this becomes transformed into an anticipation of new phenomena that may some day be verified in actual experience. . . . The future will give more and more proofs of the merits of Herr Einstein, and the University that succeeds in attaching him to itself may be certain that it will derive honour from its connexion with the young master.’”

Moszkowski simply lied when he claimed that Poincaré had a difficult time understanding the theory Poincaré himself had created. Moszkowski simply lied when he attributed the theory Henri Poincaré had created to his plagiarist friend, who promised to make him rich, Albert Einstein.

A letter of recommendation would have been a matter of course and found no counterpart in Poincaré’s published works. This alleged recommendation of Einstein was never met with public or private praise in the context of the theory of relativity, and it was Poincaré’s nature to give such praise, which he so lavished on an undeserving Lorentz at every opportunity. Moszkowski made no such attack on Poincaré until after Poincaré had died and Moszkowski, who was a career sycophant, had made it his life’s work to promote Einstein as a cult figure and in so doing promote himself and make his fortune. Alexander Moszkowski was biased and sought desperately to promote Einstein to the public. He wrote to Albert Einstein on 1 February 1917,

“Regardless of what happens, I would like to continue the ‘cult’; for you it is secondary, for me it is of paramount importance in life. Additionally, I have the encouraging feeling that, with my modest writing abilities, I may also serve the cause once in a while.”²¹⁶⁵

We know that Moszkowski's book of 1921 was deliberately deceitful, because he expressed very different feelings towards Poincaré in 1916 and 1917.²¹⁶⁶ Moszkowski's more immediate impression of Poincaré's lecture, in 1911, is on record,

“Am humansten verfährt eigentlich noch Henri Poincaré, und unter den Büchern mit sieben Siegeln, die er sonst zu schreiben pflegt, ist seine Schrift über „Die neue Mechanik“ noch das offenste. Anstatt von vornherein mit dem Geschütz unheimlicher Differentialgleichungen vorzurücken, vermenschlicht er die Aufgabe durch Einführung jenes Beobachters „Lumen“, der uns zuerst von Camille Flammarion vorgestellt worden ist. Mit diesem Lumen, „wie ich ihn sehe“ wollen wir uns zunächst ein wenig beschäftigen.”²¹⁶⁷

Though much has been made of Einstein's allegedly kinematic versus Poincaré's allegedly dynamic expositions of length contraction, which some assert indicates that Poincaré failed to understand the special theory of relativity, the facts are that Poincaré originated Einstein's plagiarized “kinematic” descriptions of length contraction and Poincaré went further by attempting a dynamic exposition of length contraction. This proves that Poincaré was the greater mind of the two, with the greater insight into the problem. Physics, as opposed to purely illustrative abstraction, compels a dynamic explanation for the physical dynamic interactions of matter in relative motion. To speak in terms of space and time without referring to physical bodies is scientifically meaningless.

It was Poincaré who first provided the quadri-dimensional exposition of length contraction, which Minkowski adopted, and which Einstein opposed for some time, and further which is truly the modern method of the theory of relativity as a mathematical formalism—a method of exposition which Einstein failed to understand for years, then when Minkowski published it in a form Einstein could almost understand, Einstein still opposed it for many years. Poincaré provided the conventionalist pseudo-kinematic exposition, the operational procedure and the space-time definition of length contraction, before Einstein and Minkowski manipulated credit for his ideas; and in 1909 Mittag-Leffler wrote to Poincaré that Ivar Fredholm recognized Poincaré's priority.²¹⁶⁸ The fact that Poincaré actually attempted to interject Physics back into this mathematical formalism, Metaphysics, conventionalism and operationalism, does not eradicate his proven priority for the rest of the theory, nor would a change of mind erase what he had once stated from the historic record or the minds of the plagiarists.

Those who deny Poincaré's priority based on perceived flaws in his theories which allegedly do not render the “perfect” theory of special relativity, *i. e.* the Einsteins' “two postulate” fallacy of *Petitio Principii*, do not deny Einstein's priority even when it is pointed out to them that the Einsteins' 1905 paper is not the modern form of the theory and contains numerous mistakes. These apologists for Einstein operate on a double standard. They also fail to realize that the special theory of relativity is an evolving theory and has yet to be perfected, and no arbitrary point can

be selected along this evolution and legitimately be called the first publication of the special theory of relativity.

Long before Einstein, Poincaré recognized the group properties of the Lorentz Transformation, perhaps as early as 1904, and wrote to Lorentz about his findings in a letter which is reproduced in Arthur I. Miller's *Albert Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity: Emergence (1905) and Early Interpretation, 1905-1911*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts, (1981), p. 81. Poincaré almost certainly wrote to the Einsteins, because it is highly doubtful that the Einsteins knew what a group was. Poincaré published this mathematical discovery in the *Comptes Rendus* on 5 June 1905 before the Einsteins had submitted their paper to the *Annalen der Physik*, and long before the final paper of the Einsteins was published—perhaps published with modifications. It was ludicrous for Moszkowski to claim that Poincaré failed to grasp what he had created and what Albert Einstein had openly opposed.

Olivier Darrigol stated in 1996,

“The physicist-historian and the philosopher-historian usually argue that Einstein's new kinematics was an extremely important innovation that overthrew previous physical and philosophical concepts of time; and they tend to interpret Poincaré's, Lorentz's, and others' fidelity to the ether as a failure to understand Einstein's superior point of view. On the contrary, the social historian would argue that in 1905 Einstein's relativity had no stabilized meaning, that it could be read and used in various manners depending on the receiving local culture, and that it acquired a precise meaning only at the end of a complex, social structuring process.”²¹⁶⁹

In 1922, Ludwig Lange, who had fought so hard for so long against so many, sought, without success, for acknowledgment of his parentage of the inertial system concept, which he published some twenty years before the Einsteins' absolutism. Lange wrote, *inter alia*,

“Als ich 1886 meine fünf Jahre lang fortgesetzten Forschungen über den Bewegungsbegriff abgeschlossen, in denen ich die relativistische Weiterentwicklung richtig vorausgesagt, im wesentlichen so, wie sie seitdem sich vollzogen hat, da harrte ich mit große Spannung, aber jahrelang vergeblich auf die werktätige Teilnahme der Physikerwelt. [***] Als ich nunmehr 1902 in der *Wundt-Festschrift* meine Revision des Systems der Inertialbegriffe herausgebracht hatte, überkam mich ein wohltuendes Gefühl der Befreiung, wie ich mir denke, daß es einer umfassenden und dabei nicht im mindesten zerknirschten Beichte auch sonst folgen mag. Von diesem Zeitpunkt an mußten aber immer noch drei weitere Jahre verstreichen, ehe mit Albert Einstein eine Denkrichtung unter den Physikern sich Bahn zu brechen begann, welche, wenn auch nur indirekt, auf verwandten Gedankengängen aufzubauen unternahm, und ein viertes Jahr mußte hinzukommen, bis H. v. Seeliger (1906) in der *Astronomie* meine Nomenklatur „Inertialsystem“ mit dem erfolg einführte, daß sie sich seitdem

bei seinen Fachgenossen nahezu völligdurchgesetzt zu haben scheint, während in der Physikfreilich erst die Ansätze dazu wahrzunehmen sind; denn Einstein selber und sein Anhang sträuben sich aus unverständlichen Gründen immer noch dagegen, eine so bequeme und charakteristische Bezeichnungsweise anzuwenden. Nun, die Zeit wird kommen, wo man mich als den Vater jener Nomenklatur und als den sorgfältigen Analysator des Sprachgebrauches der Mechanik, der die Wichtigkeit der relativistischen Richtung für die Physik besonders früh erkannte, nach Verdienst schätzen wird.”²¹⁷⁰

Friedrich Kottler, author of *Gravitation und Relativitätstheorie*²¹⁷¹ in 1903, revealed on March 31st, 1922, through the prestigious, widely read and well-respected *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*,

“*H. Poincaré*, Palermo Rend. Circ. Math. 21 (1906), p. 129-175, especially p. 175, Formula (14). — This work of *Poincaré’s* is dated July 23, 1905 and is the elaboration of a memorandum by the same title in the Parisian C. R. 140 (June 5, 1905), pp. 1504-8. The ‘postulate’ of relativity was enunciated here for the first time, *before Einstein.*”

“*H. Poincaré*, Palermo Rend. Circ. Math. 21 (1906), p. 129-175, insbes. p. 175, Formel (14). — Diese Arbeit *Poincarés* stammt vom 23. Juli 1905 und ist die Ausarbeit einer Note gleichen Titels aus den Paris C. R. 140 (5. Juni 1905), p. 1504-8. Hier wurde zum erstenmal, *vor Einstein*, das „Postulat“ der Relativität ausgesprochen.”²¹⁷²

In 1923, Einstein’s plagiarism became an international scandal, and some called for the revocation of his Nobel Prize. Thomas Jefferson Jackson See made a statement on 12 April 1923 picked up by the Associated Press and published in *The New York Times*,

“Professor Westin charges Einstein with downright plagiarism, saying:

‘From these facts the conclusion seems inevitable that Einstein cannot be regarded as a scientist of real note. He is not an honest investigator.’ Thus Westin protested to the Directorate of the Nobel Foundation against the reward of Einstein.”²¹⁷³

T. J. J. See published numerous articles accusing Albert Einstein of plagiarism.²¹⁷⁴

See’s quote originates from Arvid Reuterdahl’s article in *The Dearborn Independent* of 6 January 1923, in which Reuterdahl gives the fuller translation,

“From these facts the conclusions seem inevitable that Einstein cannot be regarded as a scientist of real note; that he is not an honest investigator; and that no valid reason can be assigned for awarding him the Nobel premium. It behooves the Nobel directorate carefully to examine all the charges of

plagiarism made against him before taking an irrevocable step which later may be regretted.”

In 1923, Arvid Reuterdahl published two long letters in *The New York Times* spelling out the case against Einstein and declared,

“No unprejudiced person can deny that, in the absence of direct and incontrovertible proofs establishing his innocence, Einstein must, in view of the circumstantial evidence previously presented, stand convicted before the world as a plagiarist.”²¹⁷⁵

Reuterdahl also published numerous articles accusing Einstein of plagiarism, the plagiarism of Reuterdahl’s works, as well as those of others.²¹⁷⁶ Reuterdahl challenged Einstein to a debate over his priority and the soundness of the theory of relativity.²¹⁷⁷ Reuterdahl’s challenge was heavily covered by the international press at the time. Einstein refused to accept the challenge.²¹⁷⁸

Reuterdahl made public the priority of Johann Heinrich (aka J. Henri) Ziegler over Einstein. Ziegler lectured in Switzerland while Einstein lived there and while Einstein was developing his copy of Lorentz’ theory. Ziegler asserted his priority over Einstein and accused Einstein of plagiarizing his work,

“Now if it was already suspicious that the antedated ‘hypothesis’ of the constancy of the speed of light appears in Einstein’s theory, then the new Einsteinian discovery of the replacement of the nonsensical æther by the integral primal atom of light and empty space must now appear to us beyond any doubt as an instance of plagiarism, though admittedly based on poor understanding. One can compare the premature, purely mathematical plagiarism to the copying of a Raphael painting by a modern cubist, where only the sharpest eye is still able to discover the resemblance with the original, but in the present case it was an attempt at an exact copy by a dull-witted incompetent.”

“War nun schon jene „Annahme“ von der Konstanz der Lichtgeschwindigkeit in Einstein’s Theorie verdächtig, so muß uns jetzt die neue Einstein’sche Entdeckung von der Ersetzbarkeit des sinnlosen Äthers durch die vollen Urlichtatome und den leeren Raum als ein ganz zweifelloses Plagiat erscheinen, aber allerdings als ein immer noch schlecht verstandenes. Das frühere, rein mathematische Plagiat kann man mit der Kopie eines Raphael’schen Gemäldes durch einen modernen Kubisten vergleichen, bei der nur schärfste Auge noch eine Ähnlichkeit mit dem Original zu entdecken vermag, das jetzige dagegen gleicht bereits einer gut gemeinten Kopie durch einen Stümper.”²¹⁷⁹

In 1927, Hans Thirring wrote,

“H. Poincaré had already completely solved the problem of time several years before the appearance of Einstein’s first work (1905). Beginning with an article in *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* which appeared in 1898 (later reprinted in his book ‘The Value of Science’ as a chapter on the concept of time), Poincaré settled the general problem of time from the physical standpoint and had already there referred to the fact that the principle of the constancy of the velocity of light serves as a basis for a definition of time. Poincaré, in his work ‘La Théorie de Lorentz et le Principe de Réaction’ [*Relevant citations and quotations found in endnote*²¹⁸⁰], then defined Lorentz’ local time (Fig. 23) as time, which time is to be measured with clocks synchronized by light signals.”

“Die Klärung des Zeitproblems war schon mehrere Jahre vor dem Erscheinen von EINSTEINS grundlegender Arbeit (1905) durch H. POINCARÉ weitgehend vorbereitet worden. Dieser hatte zunächst in einem im Jahre 1898 in der *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* erschienenen (später als Kapitel über den Begriff der Zeit in seinem Buche „Der Wert der Wissenschaft“ abgedruckten) Artikel das allgemeine Zeitproblem vom physikalischen Standpunkt aus behandelt und hatte dort schon erwähnt, daß sich auf den Satz von der Konstanz der Lichtgeschwindigkeit eine Zeitdefinition gründen läßt. Er hat dann in einer Arbeit „La Théorie de LORENTZ et le principe de réaction“ (Arch. Néerland. (2) Bd. 5. 1900, Lorentz-Festschrift) die LORENTZsche Ortszeit (Ziff. 23) als die Zeit definiert, die durch mit Lichtsignalen synchronisierte Uhren gemessen wird.”²¹⁸¹

On 7 February 1928, *The New York Times* reported on page 26,

“If [EINSTEIN] is the father of relativity, then LORENTZ is its grandfather.”

In 1929, Robert P. Richardson published an extensive article on Einstein’s plagiarism in *The Monist*, a publication famous for publishing the works of Mach, Hilbert, Poincaré, and others, from whom Einstein plagiarized,

“Thus, with what is known as the special theory, if we consider as paramount factor not the detail work but the guiding thoughts by which this was inspired, then the father of this special relativity theory was undoubtedly Henri Poincaré. [***] In the general theory of relativity the basic thought is that of Mach, *viz.* the replacement in dynamics of the law of gravitation by a law of motion. But in what Einstein built upon this basis the influence of Poincaré is again manifest. [***] And in view of all these facts one does not know at which to be most astounded: the magnanimity of Poincaré who was always over-anxious that there should be recognition of the labors of those who reaped where he himself had sown, the apathy of his friends after his death, or the peculiar attitude of Einstein and his coterie, exemplified by Born of Goettingen, who refers to Poincaré as one of those who

‘collaborated’ with Einstein in the development of the relativity theory!’²¹⁸²

Similar remarks are found in the writings of Haiser and Zettl.²¹⁸³

Accusations of plagiarism plagued Einstein throughout his career. *The New York Times* reported on 27 March 1931 on page 2 that Ira D. Edwards had attempted to sue Einstein for plagiarizing his book, which he had copyrighted in 1929. The *Times* reported that the suit was dismissed. It is difficult to prove accusations of plagiarism in a court of law, especially a specific instance of plagiarism, as opposed to a career-long pattern. This may be one reason why more individuals did not speak out against the plagiarist Einstein. They risked a defamation suit.

The *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, in its article on Lorentz, states,

“Einstein’s 1905 special relativity paper provided Lorentz’ theory with a physical reinterpretation. [***] Einstein deduced the Lorentz transformations and other results that had first been made known through Lorentz’ and others’ electron theories. [***] Lorentz admired, but never embraced, Einstein’s 1905 reinterpretation of the equations of his electron theory. The observable consequences of his and Einstein’s interpretations were the same, and he regarded the choice between them as a matter of taste. [***] Lorentz, and Einstein too, regarded the physical space of general relativity as essentially fulfilling the role of the ether of the older electron theory.”²¹⁸⁴

This statement is very significant. It reveals that the ultimate “fiction” (Vaihinger’s sense of the term in his *Die Philosophie des Als Ob*) of both Lorentz’ and the Einsteins’ theories is the same, with any distinctions between the two theories being *metaphysical* (truly just semantic) and not *scientific*—the theories make the same predictions; and are, therefore, *scientifically speaking*, indistinguishable. The Einsteins’ theory is a quasi-positivistic mathematical analysis of Lorentz’ synthetic physical theory—a “dimensional disguise” for it.²¹⁸⁵ Albert Einstein did not grasp the distinction between Metaphysics and science. He stated in 1930 that, “Science itself is metaphysics.”²¹⁸⁶

In this context, Hendrik B. G. Casimir stated,

“How[ever] brilliant Einstein’s conception may have been, the quantitative treatment and the accompanying concretisation of the atomic concept [by Lorentz] proved to be a greater and as to its consequences more important occurrence.”²¹⁸⁷

Einstein hid from the many accusations that his theory was metaphysical nonsense—an inconsistent jumble of fallacies of *Petitio Principii*—nothing but an excuse to plagiarize. Einstein conceded that he was overrated as a physicist, and that the cult of personality surrounding him was unjustified.²¹⁸⁸ Einstein stated in 1921,

“The cult of individuals is always, in my view, unjustified. To be sure, nature distributes her gifts unevenly among her children. But there are plenty of the

well-endowed, thank God, and I am firmly convinced that most of them live quiet, unobtrusive lives. It strikes me as unfair, and even in bad taste, to select a few of them for boundless admiration, attributing superhuman powers of mind and character to them. This has been my fate, and the contrast between the popular estimate of my powers and achievements and the reality is simply grotesque.”²¹⁸⁹

A meeting was arranged to discuss Vaihinger’s theory of fictions in 1920, and Einstein pledged that he would attend this meeting. Knowing that Einstein would be devoured in a debate over his mathematical fictions, which confused induction with deduction, Wertheimer and Ehrenfest helped Einstein fabricate an excuse to miss the meeting he had agreed to attend. Einstein was proven a liar.²¹⁹⁰ He also hid from many other criticisms, and Einstein refused to answer T. J. J. See’s many charges of plagiarism,²¹⁹¹ and refused to debate Reuterdahl or to answer his many charges of plagiarism.²¹⁹² When Robert Drill²¹⁹³ criticized the theory of relativity, Einstein tried to persuade Max Born and Moritz Schlick to not respond to the critique, but if they did so, to hide from his arguments and merely ridicule Drill with insults.²¹⁹⁴ Einstein hid from the French Academy of Sciences.²¹⁹⁵ Einstein hid from Cardinal O’Connell.²¹⁹⁶ Einstein hid from Dayton C. Miller’s falsification of the special theory of relativity.²¹⁹⁷ Einstein hid from Cartmel.²¹⁹⁸ Miller hammered Einstein in the press over the course of many years. *The New York Times Index* lists several articles in which Miller’s and William B. Cartmel’s falsifications of the special theory of relativity are discussed.²¹⁹⁹ Einstein and Lorentz were very worried by Miller’s results and could not find fault with them.²²⁰⁰ Einstein told R. S. Shankland not to perform an experiment which might falsify the special theory of relativity,

“[Einstein] again said that more experiments were not necessary, and results such as Synge might find would be ‘irrelevant.’ [Einstein] told me not to do any experiments of this kind.”²²⁰¹

Einstein knew he was caught at the Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher meeting in the Berlin Philharmonic, and wanted to run away from Germany. Einstein desired to hide from the Bad Nauheim debate, in which he had threatened to devour his opponents,²²⁰² then Einstein—after being talked into appearing and after much hype promoting the event which attracted thousand of visitors—then Einstein, when losing the debate, ran away during the lunch break and again wanted to run away from Germany.²²⁰³ Einstein prospered from hype and had no legitimacy as a supposed “genius”. The press rescued him again and again, while he hid. Einstein was unable to defend “his” theories in the light of strict scrutiny.

T. J. J. See wrote in *The San Francisco Journal*, on 13 May 1923, in an article entitled, “Einstein a Second Dr. Cook?”:

“**T**HE Magazine and newspaper press for the last eight years has been so filled with systematic propaganda, undoubtedly organized and directed by Einstein and his agents, that the public has become

familiar with the name of Einstein and with the phrase ‘Theory of Relativity’. Not one lay person in a thousand has any idea what this all means; and as the people do not understand it, the phrases are passed on in joke, or assumed to represent something important in the higher lines of physical science. It is well known that about six years ago Einstein tried to cast a halo of glory about his head by allowing the report to go forth that not over twelve mathematicians in the world could understand his benighted theory of relativity. Of course this is preposterous, and nobody knows it better than Einstein himself. [***] In short, I have at length become convinced that Einstein is a faker, with considerable skill in deceiving the the press and public, so as to ding-dong into the unthinking the idea that he is a great mathematician and philosopher, who is improving on Newton. Let us first notice the errors of Einstein, and the cunning way in which he gets away from them, owing to the layman’s inability to pin him down.”

T. J. J. See wrote in *The San Francisco Journal*, on 20 May 1923,

“No doubt is entertained by leading German physicists—like Professor Dr. E. Gehrcke, director of the Imperial Physical and Technical Institute of Berlin, and Dr. P. Lenard of Heidelberg, winner of the Nobel Prize in physics—that Einstein appropriated improperly the Newton-Soldner formula published 122 years before. Let the Einstein shouters explain these embarrassing coincidences if they can!

These unprofessional proceedings of Einstein have been a scandal in Europe for some time. The discussion rages all over Germany and, in fact, all over Europe. The revolt against Einstein extends from Spain to Russia, from Sweden to Italy. The learned and honored Professor Dr. Westin of Stockholm protested to the Nobel Foundation against any recognition of Einstein, accusing him of downright plagiarism, saying:

‘From these facts the conclusion seems inevitable that Einstein cannot be regarded as a scientist of real note; he is not an honest investigator.’

To the present day, be it said to the honor of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, they refused Einstein any recognition on the theory of relativity. Is it any wonder that the Paris Academy of Sciences (October 14, 1921) came out with conspicuous proclamations by Professors Picard and Painleve against Einsteinism, and in favor of Newtonian mechanics? It was near this time that Einstein visited Paris and sought to have the academy invite him to address the institute, though not a member of it. As this proposed proceeding was unprecedented, half a dozen leading academicians served notice on the officials of the institute that they would not have it, threatening to resign if the invitation were extended to Einstein. This put a stop to the display of Einstein planned for Paris. In fact, his reception there seems to have been quite a frost. The French are careful of the dignity of the Academy of Sciences, and in this respect they set a much better example than the Royal Society of London, which early championed Einsteinism and now is sorry for it.”

T. J. J. See wrote in *The San Francisco Journal*, on 27 May 1923, in an article entitled, “Einstein a Trickster?”

“When the Lick eclipse work was reported to [Einstein], with my criticism, April 12, 1923, he admitted to the correspondent, Karl H. von Wiegand, April 14, 1923, that:

‘In so far as precise measurement is concerned, Captain See may be said to be correct in denying that the tests proved the theory of relativity. But, he pointed out, under more favorable circumstances, even this might be removed.’

‘Einstein said he was not worried by the attack of Captain See, but would leave it to the scientific world to settle the matter. It the fate of all scientists to arouse antagonism by revolutionary theories.’ So feeble is [Einstein’s] defense.

As I had recalled the charges of plagiarism made against him by Gehrcke, Leonard and Westin, it will be seen that he does not answer these charges, but adroitly evades them. Thus it looks as if he has no defense and he wishes not to discuss it. The above statement of glittering generalities show the weakness of [Einstein’s] case—a tacit admission that he has no answer, and thus he prudently keeps still, hoping the public will forget the charges. So far as I can tell from the careful study of the whole business Einstein is a faker. Apparently he belongs in the company of Dr. Cook of Polar exploration noise and notoriety.”

William Cardinal O’Connell gave a speech on 7 April 1929, which attracted a great deal of attention. He stated, *inter alia*:

“What does all this worked-up enthusiasm about Einstein mean? It evidently is a worked-up, fictitious enthusiasm, because I have never yet met a man who understood in the least what Einstein is driving at, and I have been so impressed by this fact I very seriously doubt that Einstein himself knows really what he means. Truth is always very clear when seen with a clear eye. The fact that any theory cannot be enunciated and only succeeds in befogging the mind, is a patent proof that it is not really truth. [***] [O]ne weakness of the American public is to run after novelties which have nothing in them but their newness. The American student body is very often misled into false channels of knowledge by the sudden appearance of these glittering meteors who from time to time shoot across the horizon. And then it seems there is some sort of organized clique that boosts these sudden apparitions and as quickly disavows them and forgets them. [***] Now, for the moment, it is Einstein. Nobody knows what he is trying to reveal, but in a certain sense that adds mystery to his name[.] All this proves how careful the student youth must be in following this fanatical applause, which oftentimes is merely the outpouring of a sort of hero worship, but even as such can do endless harm to the impressionable mind of the young student.”²²⁰⁴

Cardinal O’Connell wrote in the 12 April 1929 edition of the *Boston Evening American*,

“I was rather amused the very next day to see by the Transcript that my opinion of Einstein’s theory and purpose had been conveyed to Einstein himself—that not he, but Frau Einstein, said that Einstein did not wish to dispute with me about his theories and that my assertions left him cold. That struck me [***] as little convincing as his general attitude to all, even the greatest scientists of Europe and America, who face him from time to time with indisputable proof of the fact that his so-called new theory of relativity is not new at all, but that whatever there is in it of scientific value is nothing but a plagiarism of Von Soldner’s system explaining the deflection of light published as far back as about 1810. [***] Again and again Einstein has been faced with what appears to be clear proofs of plagiarism and absolute philosophic sophistry by the best minds in Germany, and his only answer to them is what he now answers, ‘he is indifferent—it leaves him cold.’”

The Vatican newspaper *Observatore Romano* praised Cardinal O’Connell’s criticism of Einstein and the theory of relativity in an editorial on 23 May 1929.²²⁰⁵

Einstein’s advocate, Albert von Brunn, boasted in 1931 that Einstein was not interested in “academic disputes” and presented this vice as if a virtue in order to excuse Einstein’s inability to answer his critics. It was typical of the pattern of Einstein’s apologists of turning Einstein’s flaws into supposed virtues, his weaknesses into supposed strengths, through misguided heroic idolatry. Von Brunn wrote,

“Some reasonable critics in philosophy and physics have allowed themselves to be called in among these ‘authors’, with whom relativist scientists need not, and actually also do not consider it beneath their dignity to cross swords. (Although Einstein himself, by nature a pure scientist, is uninterested in such academic disputes!)”²²⁰⁶

In 1931, Friedrich Jacob Kurt Geissler complained that Einstein had plagiarized his work on relativity theory, which included the relativity of time, space and simultaneity, and a relativistic analysis of mass, events and causality,

“It is completely wrong, that the expression ‘theory of relativity’ or even ‘relativity’ is inseparably tied to the name ‘Einstein’, as the immoderate advertising has accomplished with the lay public and some scholars. Newton has already expounded a great deal upon the relative and the absolute in Mathematics and in Physics. Modern physicists, like E. Mach, whose work Einstein knows quite well and uses, have written about generalizing the concepts of relative space, relative time and motion (long before Einstein, 1865, 1901 ‘The Science of Mechanics; a Critical and Historical Account of Its Development’ and later); Mansion (Paris 1863) holds that the notion of

absolute motion is senseless and that the Ptolemaic and Copernican system are kinematically equally justified. Whereas Einstein first published something on relativity from 1905 on; I, myself, had already published an interdependent general ‘feasible’ theory of relativity in space, time, etc. in 1900; he, however, does not cite my book (‘Eine mögliche Wesenserklärung. . .’).”

“Es ist grundverkehrt, den Ausdruck „Relativitätslehre“ oder gar „Relativität“ mit dem Namen „Einstein“ als untrennbar zu kopulieren, wie es eine unmäßige Reklame beim Laienpublikum und einem Teil der Gelehrten fertig gebracht hat. Schon Newton spricht viel vom Relativen und Absoluten in der Mathematik und Physik. Moderne Physiker, wie E. Mach, den Einstein genau kennt und benutzt, haben über die Begriffe des relativen Raumes, der relativen Zeit und Bewegung verallgemeinernd geschrieben (längst vor Einstein, 1865, 1901 „Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwicklung“ und später); Mansion (Paris 1863) hielt die absolute Bewegung für sinnlos und das Ptolemäische und Kopernikanische System für kinematisch gleichberechtigt. Eine zusammenhängende allgemeine „mögliche“ Lehre der Relativität in Raum, Zeit usw. habe ich selbst schon 1900 veröffentlicht, während Einstein erst von 1905 ab einiges über Relativität veröffentlicht hat, mein Buch („Eine mögliche Wesenserklärung. . .“) aber nicht anführt.”²²⁰⁷

It is interesting to look for the source of the oft heard expression, “The Einstein Myth”, which refers to the disingenuous glorification of Albert Einstein. The *Minneapolis Sunday Tribune* declared, on 10 April 1921, on page 11, that the “Einstein Theory of Relativity Is Branded Myth”. Arvid Reuterdaahl, a fine artist, produced a card which was distributed on the occasion of the “Albert Einstein Jubilee” at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City on 16 April 1929 with a cartoon mockingly depicting a deified Einstein and his groveling sycophants, as well as a dignified dissenting physicist rejecting Einstein, on one side of the card, which declared on the other side,

“Einstein’s message to the audience, by the Associated Press from Berlin: ‘YOU MEET TO CELEBRATE A MYTH BEARING MY NAME.’
Comment by Dissenting Scientist: ‘THE TRUEST WORDS THAT EINSTEIN EVER SAID.’”²²⁰⁸

On 27 November 1932, *The New York Times* published a letter by Melvin Green in section 2 on page 2 under the title, “The Einstein ‘Myth.’” Melvin Green of Winchester, Virginia, wrote in his letter,

“When I read some of Einstein’s utterances, [***] and when I see all that he says taken as final absolute truth, I wonder whether we are not victims of an Einstein myth.”

In 1979, Dean Turner and Richard Hazelett published a book exposing this myth, *The EINSTEIN Myth and the Ives Papers*.²²⁰⁹ Who first referred to the “Einstein Myth” may never be known for certain, but what is certain is that the theories are mythological and Albert Einstein was a career plagiarist.

On 23 February 1929 *The New York Times* on page 15 quoted Robert Andrews Millikan on the source of Einstein’s work,

“[Millikan] Traces Einstein’s Contribution.

‘Einstein in 1905 generalized [the result of the Michelson-Morley experiment] by postulating that it is in the nature of the universe impossible to find the speed of the earth with respect to the ether,’ [Millikan] said. ‘This postulate rests most conspicuously upon and historically grew chiefly out of the negative result of the Michelson-Morey [*sic*] experiment.[.]’”

Hans Reichenbach published an article “Einstein’s Theory Traced to Sources” on 26 January 1929 in *The New York Times* on page 3 and stated,

“This is the aim of Einstein’s new theory, which he has now completed. [A New Field Theory]. It uses as an aid a peculiar mathematical source which, in its origin, goes back to the Zurich mathematician Weyl and the English astronomer Eddington.”

The New York Times on 2 September 1936, in a story which begins on the front page, quoted Elie Joseph Cartan on page 16,

“It is unnecessary to recall the great services which tensor analysis has rendered to geometry and to mathematical physics. Every one is aware that Einstein’s general theory of relativity might not have been conceived had this admirable instrument of research not been created, under the name of ‘absolute differential calculus,’ by G. Ricci and T. Levi-Civita.”

Sir Edmund Whittaker in his detailed survey, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume II, (1953), included a chapter entitled “The Relativity Theory of Poincaré and Lorentz”. Whittaker thoroughly documented the development of the theory, documenting the authentic history, and demonstrated through reference to primary sources that Einstein held no priority for the vast majority of the theory. Einstein offered no counter-argument to Whittaker’s famous book, in which the following passage appeared,

“Einstein published a paper which set forth the relativity theory of Poincaré and Lorentz with some amplifications, and which attracted much attention. He asserted as a fundamental principle the *constancy of the velocity of light*, i.e. that the velocity of light *in vacuo* is the same in all systems of reference which are moving relatively to each other: an assertion which at the time was widely accepted, but has been severally criticized by later writers.”²²¹⁰

Whittaker also wrote a biography of Einstein, in *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the Royal Society*, which reiterated the truth, that Einstein did not create the theory of relativity,

“The aggregate of all the transformations so obtained, combined with the aggregate of all the rotations in ordinary space, constitutes a *group*, to which Poincaré* gave the name the group of *Lorentz Transformations*.

Einstein [***] adopted Poincaré’s Principle of Relativity (using Poincaré’s name for it) as a new basis for physics and showed that the group of Lorentz transformations provided a new analysis connecting the physics of bodies in motion relative to each other. Notable results appearing in this paper for the first time were the relativist formulae for aberration and also for the Doppler effect.”²²¹¹

Even among Einstein’s admirers voices are heard which deny Einstein’s priority. Max Born averred that,

“Lorentz enunciated the laws according to which the measured quantities in various systems may be transformed into each other, and he proved that these transformations leave the field equations of the electron theory unchanged. This is the mathematical content of his discovery. Larmor (1900) and Poincaré (1905) arrived at similar results about the same time. It is interesting historically that the formula of transformation to a moving system, which we nowadays call Lorentz’ transformation (see vi, 2, p. 200 formula (72)), were set up by Voigt as early as 1877 [*sic*²²¹²] in a dissertation which was still founded on the elastic theory of light. [***] In the new theory of Lorentz the principle of relativity holds, in conformity with the results of experiment, for all electrodynamic events.”²²¹³

and,

“As mentioned already, Lorentz and Poincaré have succeeded in doing this by careful analysis of the properties of Maxwell’s equations. They were indeed in possession of a great deal of mathematical theory. Lorentz, however, was so attached to his assumption of an ether absolutely at rest that he did not acknowledge the physical significance of the equivalence of the infinite numbers of systems of reference which he had proved. He continued to believe that one of them represented the ether at rest. Poincaré went a step further. It was quite clear to him that Lorentz’s viewpoint was not tenable and that the mathematical equivalence of systems of reference meant the validity of the principle of relativity. He also was quite clear about the consequences of his theory.”²²¹⁴

and,

“I have now to say some words about the work of these predecessors of EINSTEIN, mainly of LORENTZ and POINCARÉ. [***] H. A. LORENTZ’ important papers of 1892 and 1895 on the electrodynamics of moving bodies contain much of the formalism of relativity. [***] POINCARÉ’s papers [***] show that as early as 1899 he regarded it as very probable that absolute motion is undetectable in principle and that no ether exists. He formulated the same ideas in a more precise form, though without any mathematics, in a lecture given in 1904 to a Congress of Arts and Science at St. Louis, U.S.A., and he predicted the rise of a new mechanics which will be characterized above all by the rule, that no velocity can exceed the velocity of light. [***] The reasoning used by POINCARÉ was just that, which Einstein introduced in his first paper of 1905 [***] Does this mean that POINCARÉ knew all this before Einstein? It is possible [***] Many of you may have looked up his paper ‘Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper’ in *Annalen der Physik* (4), vol. 17, p. 811, 1905, and you will have noticed some peculiarities. The striking point is that it contains not a single reference to previous literature. It gives you the impression of quite a new venture. But that is, of course, as I have tried to explain, not true.”²²¹⁵

Einstein’s friend, physicist Peter Gabriel Bergmann, asserted,

“The Dutch physicist, Hendrik Antoon Lorentz (1853-1928) contrived a theoretical scheme according to which absolute motion of physical objects, including measuring rods, should compress them in such a manner that differences in the speed of light remained undetectable by any conceivable apparatus. Jules Henri Poincaré (1854-1912), the French mathematician, suggested that the consistent failure to identify the frame representing absolute rest indicated that no such frame existed, and that Newton’s scheme of the multiplicity of inertial frames was valid after all. In 1905, Einstein combined Lorentz’ and Poincaré’s ideas into a new approach to the issue of frames of reference and so was able to explain why no experiment had uncovered the absolute motion of the earth, without contradicting Maxwell’s theory of electricity and magnetism.”²²¹⁶

The Einsteins’ 1905 paper failed to present references to the work it “combined” of Lorentz and Poincaré. That which was “new” in the “approach” is of minor significance. Poincaré’s work was itself the combination of Lorentz’ and Poincaré’s ideas, which “combination” Mileva and Albert did not create, but simply repeated, parroting Poincaré’s earlier works, virtually verbatim.

Prof. G. H. Keswani argued that,

“As far back as 1895, Poincaré the innovator had conjectured that it is impossible to detect absolute motion. In 1900 he introduced the ‘The principle of relative motion’ which he later called by the equivalent terms ‘The law of relativity’ and ‘The principle of relativity’ in his book *Science*

and Hypothesis published in 1902. He further asserted in this book that there is no absolute time and that we have no intuition of the ‘simultaneity’ of two ‘events’ (mark the words) occurring at different places. In a lecture given in 1904, Poincaré reiterated the principle of relativity, described the method of synchronisation of clocks with light signals, urged a more satisfactory theory of the electrodynamics of moving bodies based on Lorentz’s ideas and predicted a new mechanics characterized by the rule that the velocity of light cannot be surpassed. This was followed in June 1905 by a mathematical paper entitled ‘Sur la dynamique de l’électron’ in which the connection between relativity (impossibility of absolute motion) and the Lorentz Transformation given by Lorentz a year earlier was recognized. In point of fact, therefore, Poincaré was not only the first to enunciate the principle, but he also discovered in Lorentz’s work the necessary mathematical formulation of the principle. All this happened before Einstein’s paper appeared.”²²¹⁷

How do we account for the striking similarity between Lorentz’ and Poincaré’s writings and Einstein’s words in both the “special” and “general” theories of relativity? Who published what, first? Was it mere coincidence that time after time Einstein repeated what Poincaré had earlier published? The record indicates that Poincaré held priority over Einstein, often by many years. Why is it that Albert’s last name is a household word and is synonymous with “relativity”, and Poincaré’s name is substantially more obscure? Einstein believed,

“The secret to creativity is knowing how to hide your sources.”²²¹⁸

9.3 The Aether

Many criticized Einstein’s theories as metaphysical “nonsense”, as purely mathematical fictions lacking physical content. As Arthur Eddington explained,

“LET us suppose that an ichthyologist is exploring the life of the ocean. He casts a net into the water and brings up a fishy assortment. Surveying his catch, he proceeds in the usual manner of a scientist to systematise what it reveals. He arrives at two generalisations:

- (1) No sea-creature is less than two inches long.
- (2) All sea-creatures have gills.

These are both true of his catch, and he assumes tentatively that they will remain true however often he repeats it.

In applying this analogy, the catch stands for the body of knowledge which constitutes physical science, and the net for the sensory and intellectual equipment which we use in obtaining it. The casting of the net corresponds to observation; for knowledge which has not been or could not be obtained by observation is not admitted into physical science.

An onlooker may object that the first generalisation is wrong. ‘There are plenty of sea-creatures under two inches long, only your net is not adapted

to catch them.’ The ichthyologist dismisses this objection contemptuously. ‘Anything uncatchable by my net is *ipso facto* outside the scope of ichthyological knowledge, and is not part of the kingdom of fishes which has been defined as the theme of ichthyological knowledge. In short, ‘what my net can’t catch isn’t fish.’ Or—to translate the analogy—‘If you are not simply guessing, you are claiming a knowledge of the physical universe discovered in some other way than by the methods of physical science, and admittedly unverifiable by such methods. You are a metaphysician. Bah!’”²²¹⁹

The “ether”, or “æther”, is a hypothetical fluid, which may fill space and conduct electromagnetic waves such as light, and is perhaps an intervening medium between bodies, which causes gravity. Einstein tried to distinguish his work from Lorentz’ by calling the æther “superfluous”, which assertion Poincaré and countless others had long since enunciated. The existence of this “fluid” has been hotly disputed for thousands of years, but unless we deny dimension as an anthropomorphic delusion of consciousness, notional not real,²²²⁰ “space” as extension without “material” must be *something*. An empty box contains *something*, even if we evacuate the air from it. We can give this *something* any name we like, but changing its name is a matter of semantics, not discovery.

One cannot speak of “propagation” without tacitly or overtly referring to a medium, and the 1905 paper speaks of “propagation”. As Sir Arthur Schuster stated,

“Einstein, in a paper of great interest and power, has developed this idea, calling his imagined law ‘The principle of relativity,’ because it stipulates—*a priori*—that only the relative motion between material bodies can be detected. It is impossible for me to discuss in detail the reasoning by which this principle is justified, and an account without explanations of its consequences would lay me open to the charge that I was playing with your credulity. Suffice, therefore, it to say that strict adherers to the principle cannot admit the existence of an æther, and yet may speak of the transmission of light through space with a definite velocity. They must further accept, as a consequence of their dogma, that identical clocks placed on two bodies moving with different velocities have different rates of going and that, even on the same body, identical clocks indicate different times, when the line joining their positions lies in the direction of motion. The motion must be determined relative to another body, which is supposed to be at rest, and a clock placed on that body must serve as the ultimate standard of time. The theory appears to have an extraordinary power of fascinating mathematicians, and it will certainly take its place in any critical examination of our scientific beliefs; but we must not let the simplicity of the assumption underlying the principle hide the very slender experimental basis on which it rests at present, and more especially not lose sight of the fact, that it goes much beyond what is proved by Michelson’s experiment. In that experiment, the source of light and the mirrors which reflected the light were all connected together by rigid bodies, and their distances depended therefore

on the intensity of molecular forces. Einstein's generalisation assumes that the result of the experiment would still be the same, if performed in a free space with the source of light and mirrors disconnected from each other but endowed with a common velocity. This is a considerable and, perhaps, not quite justifiable generalisation. I am well aware that Bucherer's experiments with cathode rays are taken to confirm the validity of Einstein's principle, but if we say that they are not inconsistent with it, we should probably go as far as is justifiable."²²²¹

The Einsteins were under the spell of the new school of positivism which was to become "Logical Positivism", and which Sir Arthur Schuster would later categorize as a cowardly cop out to ignorance, and further which "Logical Positivism" Karl Popper would systematically discredit as solipsism.²²²² The Einsteins may have believed that they could disguise their piracy of Poincaré's interpretation of Lorentz' theory, by stating it in Poincaré's quasi-positivistic form, without mentioning Poincaré. The Einsteins would have found references in Mach's work to,

"Budde's conception of space as a sort of medium."²²²³

Schuster wrote against the emerging positivism, and the consequences of its cowardice,

"I have during these lectures contrasted on several occasions the former tendency to base our technical explanations of natural phenomena on definite models which we can visualise and even construct, with the modern spirit which is satisfied with a mathematical formula, and symbols which frequently have no strictly definable meaning. I ought to explain the distinction between the two points of view which represent two attitudes of mind, and I can do so most shortly by referring to the history of the electrodynamic theory of light, the main landmarks of which I have already pointed out in the second lecture. The undulatory theory—as it left the hands of Thomas Young, Fresnel and Stokes—was based on the idea that the æther possessed the properties of an elastic solid. Maxwell's medium being quite different in its behaviour, its author at first considered it to be necessary to justify the possibility of its existence, by showing how, by means of fly wheels and a peculiar cellular construction, we might produce a composite body having the required properties. Although later Maxwell laid no further stress on the ultimate construction of the medium, his ideas remained definite and to him the displacements which constituted the motion of light possessed a concrete reality. In estimating the importance of the support which Maxwell's views have received from experiment, we must distinguish between the fundamental assumptions on which Maxwell based his investigations and the mathematical formulæ which were the outcome of these investigations. It is clearly the mathematical formulæ only which are confirmed and the same formulæ might have been derived from quite

different premises. It has always been necessary, as a second step of great discovery, to clear away the immaterial portions which are almost invariable accessories of the first pioneer work, and Heinrich Hertz, who besides being an experimental investigator was a philosopher of great perspicacity, performed this part of the work thoroughly. The mathematical formula instead of being the result embodying the concrete ideas, now became the only thing which really mattered. To use an acute and celebrated expression of Gustav Kirchhoff, it is the object of science to *describe* natural phenomena, not to *explain* them. When we have expressed by an equation the correct relationship between different natural phenomena we have gone as far as we safely can, and if we go beyond we are entering on purely speculative ground. I have nothing to say against this as a philosophic doctrine, and I shall adopt it myself when lying on my death-bed, if I have then sufficient strength to philosophise on the limitations of our intellect. But while I accept the point of view as a correct death-bed doctrine, I believe it to be fatal to a healthy development of science. Granting the impossibility of penetrating beyond the most superficial layers of observed phenomena, I would put the distinction between the two attitudes of mind in this way: One glorifies our ignorance, while the other accepts it as a regrettable necessity. The practical impediment to the progress of physics, of what may reluctantly be admitted as correct metaphysics, is both real and substantial and might be illustrated almost from any recent volume of scientific periodicals. Everyone who has ever tried to add his mite to advancing knowledge must know that vagueness of ideas is his greatest stumbling-block. But this vagueness which used to be recognised as our great enemy is now being enshrined as an idol to be worshipped. We may never know what constitutes atoms or what is the real structure of the æther, why trouble therefore, it is said, to find out more about them. Is it not safer, on the contrary, to confine ourselves to a general talk on entropy, luminiferous vectors and undefined symbols expressing vaguely certain physical relationships? What really lies at the bottom of the great fascination which these new doctrines exert on the present generation is sheer cowardice: the fear of having its errors brought home to it. As one who believes that metaphysics is a study apart from physics, not to be mixed up with it, and who considers that the main object of the physicist is to add to our knowledge, without troubling himself much as to how that knowledge may ultimately be interpreted, I must warn you against the temptation of sheltering yourself behind an illusive rampart of safety. We all prefer being right to being wrong, but it is better to be wrong than to be neither right nor wrong.²²²⁴

James Mackaye wrote in 1931,

“Einstein’s explanation is a dimensional disguise for Lorentz’s. [***] Thus Einstein’s theory is not a denial of, nor an alternative for, that of Lorentz. It is only a duplicate and disguise for it. [***] Einstein continually maintains

that the theory of Lorentz is right, only he disagrees with his ‘interpretation.’ Is it not clear, therefore, that in this, as in other cases, Einstein’s theory is merely a disguise for Lorentz’s, the apparent disagreement about ‘interpretation’ being a matter of words only?”²²²⁵

Lorentz pointed out in 1913,

“The latter is, by the way, up to a certain degree a quarrel over words: it makes no great difference, whether one speaks of the vacuum or of the æther.”

“Letzteres ist übrigens bis zu einem gewissen Grade ein Streit über Worte: es macht keinen großen Unterschied, ob man vom Vakuum oder vom Äther spricht.”²²²⁶

In 1980, Friedrich Hund wrote about the general theory of relativity and the æther,

“Man kann *Einsteins* Leistung als „Abschaffung des Äthers“ bezeichnen, muß sich aber hüten, in einen Streit um Worte zu geraten. Heute, 75 Jahre später, kennen wir auch die „allgemeine Relativitätstheorie“, die ein lokales „Inertialfeld“ beschreibt, das was *H. Weyl* in seiner bildhaften Sprache den „Trägheitskompaß“ nannte, die lorentzinvariante Einbettung des lokalen Geschehens in die weltweite Umgebung. Wir kennen weiter kosmologische Fakten, die isotrope Expansion des Systems der Galaxien und die isotrope 3K-Strahlung, die ein lokales spezielles Bezugssystem, *Weyls* „Sternenkompaß“, festlegen. Diese Struktur des Universums, vielleicht nur des großen Ausschnittes aus ihm, der unserer Beobachtung zugänglich ist, sehen wir als geschichtlich geworden an. Diese Struktur hätte *H. Weyl* vielleicht Äther genannt und ihm „Kränze und Gesang geweiht.“²²²⁷

In 1934, Albert Einstein confirmed Mackaye’s assertions,

“Then came H. A. Lorentz’s great discovery. All the phenomena of electromagnetism then known could be explained on the basis of two assumptions: that the ether is firmly fixed in space—that is to say, unable to move at all, and that electricity is firmly lodged in the mobile elementary particles. Today his discoveries may be expressed as follows: physical space and the ether are only different terms for the same thing; fields are physical states of space.”²²²⁸

Einstein stated in 1953,

“It was here that H. A. Lorentz’ act of intellectual liberation set in. With great logic and consistency he based his investigations on the following

hypotheses: The seat of the electromagnetic field is empty space. [***] The really essential step forward, indeed, was precisely Lorentz' having reduced the facts to Maxwell's equations concerning empty space, or — as it was then called — the ether. H. A. Lorentz even discovered the 'Lorentz transformation', so named after him, — though ignoring its group-like quality. For him, Maxwell's equations concerning empty space applied only to a given system of co-ordinates, which, on account of its state of rest, appeared excellent in comparison to all other existing systems of co-ordinates. This was a truly paradoxical situation, since the theory appeared to restrict the inertial system more than classical mechanics. This circumstance, proving as it did quite incompatible with the empirical standpoint, simply *had* to lead to the special relativity theory."²²²⁹

Max Abraham stated in 1908,

“The æther is empty space.”

“Der Äther ist der leere Raum.”²²³⁰

We know that Einstein was familiar with this line from Abraham, because Gustav Mie quoted it to him in 1920 at the Bad Nauheim discussion.

Before Abraham was Horace Seal, who, in 1899, published the following,

“All the text-books and authorities agree that the luminiferous ether fills all space and pervades all bodies, solid, gaseous, and liquid, in that space. If this is true, there is really no such thing as space as a void in which celestial objects move, but the word only remains as a term of measurement of the ether which pervades all bodies and is continuous, both in breadth, length, and depth through the whole universe. In fact, ether does not fill space, but *is* space, and the old measuring of space, which except among mathematicians excluded bodies moving in that space, with the discovery (an actual one) of the luminiferous ether, becomes obsolete. A possible objection to the above is, that loading the shoulders of what after all is only accepted as a convenient hypothesis with another one less perhaps acceptable, is unscientific. But even if the wave-theory of light, heat, &c., were not by now almost fully accepted as that of gravitation, the objection does not really apply, as this luminiferous theory is absolutely independent of hypothesis. It is not a successful guess, but an organized statement of facts, therefore its existence rests upon a solid foundation. [***] According to our theory a child gradually acquires rudimentary ideas of motion by marking the difference of quick and slow movements; but what he does not recognize until after years is, that when he is resting, this rest of his is not absolute rest, which is unknown, but only relative rest[.]”²²³¹

Eugen Karl Dühring made similar arguments and even anticipated the general theory

of relativity in 1878.²²³² Bolliger also pursued this line of thought.²²³³

Without an æther, there is no logical ground for assuming light speed independence from the motion of the source. Without an æther of some sort at hypothetical “absolute rest”—at rest relative to itself, anisotropic light speed in at least one of two inertial frames of reference in motion with respect to each other would *not* violate the principle of relativity, but instead would be *compelled by it*. Therefore, the Einsteins’ two postulate myth of 1905 depends upon the premise of an æther, or absolute space, or “preferred frame of reference”.

Obviously, Einstein’s efforts to disguise his piracy through semantics and internally inconsistent Metaphysics are nonsense, for physical states compel physical substance, the æther, and Lorentz stated in 1906,

“We shall add the hypothesis that, though the particles may move, *the ether always remains at rest*. We can reconcile ourselves with this, at first sight, somewhat startling idea, by thinking of the particles of matter as of some local modifications in the state of the ether. These modifications may of course very well travel onward while the volume-elements of the medium in which they exist remain at rest.”²²³⁴

Herbert Dingle derided Einstein’s numerology, his “dimensional disguise for Lorentz’s” physical theory,

“This proposal became known as *the relativity theory of Lorentz*, and certain features of it call for attention here. [***] Like Maxwell, who realised the necessity, if he was to satisfy his mathematical desires, of postulating a ‘displacement current’ to justify them, so Lorentz, in order to justify his transformation equations, saw the necessity of postulating a physical effect of interaction between moving matter and ether, to give the mathematics meaning. Physics still had *de jure* authority over mathematics: it was Einstein, who had no qualms about abolishing the ether and still retaining light waves whose properties were expressed by formulae that were meaningless without it, who was the first to discard physics altogether and propose a wholly mathematical theory.”²²³⁵

As Vaihinger stated,

“Pure mathematical space is a fiction. Its concept has the marks of a fiction: the idea of an extension without anything extended, of separation without things that are to be separated, is something unthinkable, absurd and impossible.”²²³⁶

Albert Einstein, who in 1905 had called the æther “superfluous”, stated in 1920,

“To deny the ether is ultimately to assume that empty space has no physical qualities whatever. [***] Recapitulating, we may say that according to the

general theory of relativity space is endowed with physical qualities; in this sense, therefore, there exists an ether. According to the general theory of relativity space without ether is unthinkable; for in such space there not only would be no propagation of light, but also no possibility of existence for standards of space and time (measuring-rods and clocks), nor therefore any space-time intervals in the physical sense.”²²³⁷

The eminent physicist Oliver Heaviside, in a hand-written letter to Prof. Vilhelm Bjerknes, discussed Einstein’s compulsory shift in position from claiming that the æther was superfluous to stating directly that the æther was fundamental to “Einstein’s” theories,

“I don’t find Einstein’s Relativity agrees with me. It is the most unnatural and difficult to understand way of representing facts that could be thought of. His distorted space is chaos [***] The Einstein enthusiasts are very patronizing about the ‘classical’ electromagnetics and its ether, which they have abolished. But they will come back to it by and by. [***] But you must work fairly, with the Ether, and Forces, & Momentum etc. They are the realities, without Einstein’s distorted nothingness. [***] And I really think that Einstein is a practical joker, pulling the legs of his enthusiastic followers, more Einsteinisch than he. He knows the weakness of his 2nd Theory. He only does it to annoy [***] I can’t get away from Einstein the Joker. [***] Did such a clever man as Einstein not see the significance of Poisson’s theorem? It is said that it was by noticing some of H. A. Lorentz’ formulas, and those of Minkowski, led him to the result. Well, we must believe it, if he says so, and like the silent parrot, think the more.”²²³⁸

In 1938, Einstein and Infeld averred, in a statement highly reminiscent of Ernst Haeckel’s *Die Welträthsel* of 1899,

“Our only way out seems to be to take for granted the fact that space has the physical property of transmitting electromagnetic waves, and not to bother too much about the meaning of this statement. We may still use the word ether, but only to express some physical property of space. This word ether has changed its meaning many times in the development of science. At the moment it no longer stands for a medium built up of particles. Its story, by no means finished, is continued by the relativity theory.”²²³⁹

Haeckel wrote,

“I. Ether fills the whole of space, in so far as it is not occupied by ponderable matter, as a *continuous substance*; it fully occupies the space between the atoms of ponderable matter.

II. Ether has probably no chemical quality, and is not composed of atoms. If it be supposed that it consists of minute homogeneous atoms (for instance,

indivisible etheric particles of a uniform size), it must be further supposed that there is something else between these atoms, either ‘empty space’ or a third, completely unknown medium, a purely hypothetical ‘interether’; the question as to the nature of this brings us back to the original difficulty, and so on *in infinitum*.

III. As the idea of an empty space and an action at a distance is scarcely possible in the present condition of our knowledge (at least it does not help to a clear monistic view), I postulate for ether a special structure which is not atomistic, like that of ponderable matter, and which may provisionally be called (without further determination) *etheric* or *dynamic* structure.”²²⁴⁰

Herbert Spencer addressed the root of the problem of confusing pure Mathematics with Physics,

“To sum up this somewhat too elaborate argument:—We have seen how in the very assertion that all our knowledge, properly so called, is Relative, there is involved in the assertion that there exists a Non-relative. We have seen how, in each step of the argument by which this doctrine is established, the same assumption is made. We have seen how, from the very necessity of thinking in relations, it follows that the Relative is itself inconceivable, except as related to a real Non-relative. We have seen that unless a real Non-relative or Absolute be postulated, the Relative itself becomes absolute; and so brings the argument to a contradiction. And on contemplating the process of thought, we have equally seen how impossible it is to get rid of the consciousness of an actuality lying behind appearances; and how, from this impossibility, results our indestructible belief in that actuality.”²²⁴¹

Surely, the assertion of a physical æther is a scientific hypothesis, which recognizes the need of the real behind the relative, while the abstract set of human rules which constitute “space-time” represent nothing real or imagined. Einstein failed to understand the distinction between Physics and Metaphysics. He stated,

“I believe that physics is abstract and not obvious[.]”²²⁴²

Carlo Giannoni saw that Einstein’s theory differed only philosophically from the Poincaré-Lorentz theory, and Giannoni stresses the importance of the fact that Lorentz employed the principle of relativity in his 1904 paper.²²⁴³

9.4 The So-Called “Lorentz Transformation”

The mathematical transformations in relativity theory are called “Lorentz Transformations”,²²⁴⁴ an appellation supplied by Emil Cohn²²⁴⁵ and Henri Poincaré.²²⁴⁶ The record indicates that Woldemar Voigt,²²⁴⁷ Oliver Heaviside, George Francis FitzGerald, Hendrik Antoon Lorentz, Joseph Larmor, Henri Poincaré, Emil Cohn, Paul Langevin, and others, began developing the mathematical expressions

of the theory of relativity some 18 years before Einstein, and completed them before Einstein published on the subject.

9.4.1 Woldemar Voigt's Space-Time Transformation

The “Lorentz Transformation” is not Lorentz’ transformation, as is, and was, widely known,

“Nor did Lorentz discover these equations. They were first used by Voigt[sic].”²²⁴⁸

The *Brockhaus Enzyklopädie* succinctly states,

“Voigt [***] presented (among the introduction of the term ‘Tensor’) a theory of elasticity; in the treatment of optical properties, he formulated for the first time in 1887 the formulas, which later became known through the special theory of relativity as the Lorentz-Transformation.”

“Voigt [***] lieferte (unter Einführung des Begriffes >Tensor<) eine Elastizitätstheorie; bei der Behandlung der opt. Eigenschaften formulierte er 1887 erstmalig die später als Lorentz-Transformation durch die Spezielle Relativitätstheorie bekanntgewordenen Formeln.”²²⁴⁹

In 1887, Woldemar Voigt published the following relativistic transformation of space-time coordinates:

$$x' = x - vt, \quad y' = \frac{y}{\gamma}, \quad z' = \frac{z}{\gamma}, \quad t' = t - \frac{vx}{c^2},$$
$$\gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}.$$

Hermann Minkowski stated,

“Maxwell’s and Lorentz’ theory are not really opposites, but rather the rigid and the non-rigid, Zeppelin’s and Parseval’s electron. In the interest of history, I want yet to add, that the transformations which play the main rôle in the principle of relativity were first mathematically formulated by Voigt, in the year 1887. With the aid of these transformations, Voigt had already drawn conclusions at that time regarding the Doppler Effect.”

“Nicht die Maxwellsche und die Lorentzsche Theorie sind die eigentlichen Gegensätze, sondern das starre und das unstarre, das Zeppelinsche und das Parsevalsche Elektron. Historisch will ich noch hinzufügen, daß die

Transformationen, die bei dem Relativitätsprinzip die Hauptrolle spielen, zuerst mathematisch von Voigt im Jahre 1887 behandelt sind. Voigt hat damals bereits mit ihrer Hilfe Folgerungen in bezug auf das Dopplersche Prinzip gezogen.”

To which Voigt responded,

“Mr. Minkowski recalls an old work of mine. It addressed the application of the Doppler Effect to some special cases which arise due to the elastic theory of light, not the electromagnetic. It had already at that time revealed some of the consequences, which were later arrived at through the electromagnetic theory.”

“Herr Minkowski erinnert an eine alte Arbeit von mir. Es handelt sich dabei um Anwendungen des Dopplerschen Prinzips, die in speziellen Teilen auftreten, aber nicht auf Grund der elektromagnetischen, sondern auf Grund der elastischen Theorie des Lichtes. Indessen haben sich damals bereits einige derselben Folgerungen ergeben, die später aus der elektromagnetischen Theorie gewonnen sind.”²²⁵⁰

9.4.2 Length Contraction

In 1905, Mileva and Albert Einsteins asserted, without reference to prior authors,

“A rigid body which, measured in a state of rest, has the form of a sphere, therefore has in a state of motion—viewed from the stationary system—the form of an ellipsoid of revolution with the axes

$$R\sqrt{(1 - v^2/c^2)}, R, R.$$

Thus, whereas the Y and Z dimensions of the sphere (and therefore of every rigid body of no matter what form) do not appear modified by the motion, the X dimension appears shortened in the ratio $1 : \sqrt{(1 - v^2/c^2)}$, i.e. the greater the value of v , the greater the shortening. For $v = c$ all moving objects—viewed from the ‘stationary’ system—shrivel up into plane figures. [*Footnote:* That is, a body possessing spherical form when examined at rest.] For velocities greater than that of light our deliberations become meaningless; we shall, however, find in what follows, that the velocity of light in our theory plays the part, physically, of an infinitely great velocity.”²²⁵¹

Henri Poincaré stated, in 1904,

“From all these results, if they are confirmed, would arise an entirely new mechanics, which would be, above all, characterised by this fact, that no velocity could surpass that of light, any more than any temperature could fall below the zero absolute, because bodies would oppose an increasing inertia to the causes, which would tend to accelerate their motion; and this inertia would become infinite when one approached the velocity of light.”²²⁵²

Roger Joseph Boscovich argued, in 1763, in the second supplement to his *Natural Philosophy*,

“21. Again, it is to be observed first of all that from this principle of the [invariance] of those things, of which we cannot perceive the change through our senses, there comes forth the method that we use for comparing the magnitudes of intervals with one another; here, that, which is taken as a measure, is assumed to be [invariant]. Also we make use of the axiom, *things that are equal to the same thing are equal to one another*; & from this is deduced another one pertaining to the same thing, namely, *things that are equal multiples, or submultiples, of each, are also equal to one another*; & also this, *things that coincide are equal*. We take a wooden or iron ten-foot rod; & if we find that this is congruent with one given interval when applied to it either once or a hundred times, & also congruent to another interval when applied to it either once or a hundred times, then we say that these intervals are equal. Further, we consider the wooden or iron ten-foot rod to be the same standard of comparison after translation. Now, if it consisted of perfectly continuous & solid matter, we might hold it to be exactly the same standard of comparison; but in my theory of points at a distance from one another, all the points of the ten-foot rod, while they are being transferred, really change the distance continually. For the distance is constituted by those real modes of existence, & these are continually changing. But if they are changed in such a manner that the modes which follow establish real relations of equal distances, the standard of comparison will not be identically the same; & yet it will still be an equal one, & the equality of the measured intervals will be correctly determined. We can no more transfer the length of the ten-foot rod, constituted in its first position by the first real modes, to the place of the length constituted in its second position by the second real modes, than we are able to do so for intervals themselves, which we compare by measurement. But, because we perceive none of this change during the translation, such as may demonstrate to us a relation of length, therefore we take that length to be the same. But really in this translation it will always suffer some slight change. It might happen that it underwent even some very great change, common to it & our senses, so that we should not perceive the change; & that, when restored to its former position, it would return to a state equal & similar to that which it had at first. However, there always is some slight change, owing to the fact that the forces which connect the points of matter, will be changed to some slight extent, if its position is

altered with respect to all the rest of the Universe. Indeed, the same is the case in the ordinary theory. For no body is quite without little spaces interspersed within it, altogether incapable of being compressed or dilated; & this dilatation & compression undoubtedly occurs in every case of translation, at least to a slight extent. We, however, consider the measure to be the same so long as we do not perceive any alteration, as I have already remarked.

22. The consequence of all this is that we are quite unable to obtain a direct knowledge of absolute distances; & we cannot compare them with one another by a common standard. We have to estimate magnitudes by the ideas through which we recognize them; & to take as common standards those measures which ordinary people think suffer no change. But philosophers should recognize that there is a change; but, since they know of no case in which the equality is destroyed by a perceptible change, they consider that the change is made equally.

23. Further, although the distance is really changed when, as in the case of the translation of the ten-foot rod, the position of the points of matter is altered, those real modes which constitute the distance being altered; nevertheless if the change takes place in such a way that the second distance is exactly equal to the first, we shall call it the same, & say that it is altered in no way, so that the equal distances between the same ends will be said to be the same distance & the magnitude will be said to be the same; & this is defined by means of these equal distances, just as also two parallel directions will be also included under the name of the same direction. In what follows we shall say that the distance is not changed, or the direction, unless the magnitude of the distance, or the parallelism, is altered.”²²⁵³

George Francis FitzGerald wrote, in 1889,

“I HAVE read with much interest Messrs. Michelson and Morley’s wonderfully delicate experiment attempting to decide the important question as to how far the ether is carried along by the earth. Their result seems opposed to other experiments showing that the ether in the air can be carried along only to an inappreciable extent. I would suggest that almost the only hypothesis that can reconcile this opposition is that the length of material bodies changes, according as they are moving through the ether or across it, by an amount depending on the square of the ratio of their velocity to that of light. We know that electric forces are affected by the motion of the electrified bodies relative to the ether, and it seems a not improbable supposition that the molecular forces are affected by the motion, and that the size of a body alters consequently. It would be very important if secular experiments on electrical attractions between permanently electrified bodies, such as in a very delicate quadrant electrometer, were instituted in some of the equatorial parts of the earth to observe whether there is any diurnal and annual variation of attraction,—diurnal due to the rotation of the earth being

added and subtracted from its orbital velocity; and annual similarly for its orbital velocity and the motion of the solar system.”²²⁵⁴

Hendrik Antoon Lorentz had averred the same in 1892,²²⁵⁵ and stated, in 1895,

“The displacement would naturally bring about this disposition of the molecules of its own accord, and thus effect a shortening in the direction of motion in the proportion of 1 to $\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$, in accordance with the formulæ given in the above-mentioned paragraph.”²²⁵⁶

In 1904, Lorentz affirmed that,

“§ 8. Thus far we have only used the fundamental equations without any new assumptions. I shall now suppose *that the electrons, which I take to be spheres of radius R in the state of rest, have their dimensions changed by the effect of a translation, the dimensions in the direction of motion becoming kl times and those in perpendicular directions l times smaller.*

In this deformation, which may be represented by $(1/kl, 1/l, 1/l)$ each element of volume is understood to preserve its charge.”

9.4.2.1 Dynamic Length Contraction

In Lorentz’ synthetic physical theory, length contraction is a dynamic theorem following from Maxwell’s and Heaviside’s²²⁵⁷ work on the dynamics of the æther.

9.4.2.2 Kinematic Length Contraction

In the Einsteins’ fallacy of *Petitio Principii* of 1905, a change in length is merely presupposed without any physical theory to justify it, then the precise factor is arrived at through induction from the allegedly observed invariance of light speed, which is an allegedly known empirical fact, not an *a priori* postulate. No one disputes that Einstein knew Lorentz’ contraction hypothesis. The Einsteins simply used the idea without crediting Lorentz, then Einstein called it a natural consequence of the “two postulates” in 1907. Since the “postulates” are empirical observations, the “natural consequences” are arrived at through induction, not deduction. In other words, the hypothesis of length contraction is more fundamental than the law of light speed invariance.

One must first propose *a priori* a change in length before one can derive the precise factor of it through induction from the supposed empirical fact of light speed invariance, and the so-called “natural consequence” is instead the inductively determined factor arrived at from the presupposed *a priori* and *ad hoc* hypothesis that length must change with velocity relative to the “resting system” (in the Einsteins’ 1905 paper the “resting system” is Newton’s absolute space) in order for light speed to be invariant in “moving systems” (in the Einsteins’ 1905 paper

“moving systems” are systems in motion relative to Newton’s absolute space). This presupposed change in length is more *ad hoc* in the Einsteins’ 1905 paper than it is in Lorentz’ synthetic theory, which attempts a dynamic exposition on it, as physics must.

It was Poincaré, not Einstein nor Minkowski, who first recognized the group properties of the Lorentz Transformation and reciprocal length contraction and who introduced a quadri-dimensional exposition on length contraction, which renders it—in terms of a mathematical quadri-dimensional space-time—a matter of cognitive perspective. Later, many would attempt to mask Einstein’s plagiarism by arguing the issue of perspective, which nowhere appeared in the Einsteins’ work of 1905, where length contraction is merely presupposed without justification, then inductively demonstrated with Poincaré’s operationalist thought experiment of clocks synchronized by light signals on the suppositions that light speed is invariant and that length must change to render it so.

9.4.3 Time Dilatation

Roger Joseph Boscovich argued, in 1763, in the second supplement to his *Natural Philosophy*,

“24. What has been said with regard to the measurement of space, without difficulty can be applied to time; in this also we have no definite & constant measurement. We obtain all that is possible from motion; but we cannot get a motion that is perfectly uniform. We have remarked on many things that belong to this subject, & bear upon the nature & succession of these ideas, in our notes. I will but add here, that, in the measurement of time, not even ordinary people think that the same standard measure of time can be translated from one time to another time. They see that it is another, consider that it is an equal, on account of some assumed uniform motion. Just as with the measurement of time, so in my theory with the measurement of space it is impossible to transfer a fixed length from its place to some other, just as it is impossible to transfer a fixed interval of time, so that it can be used for the purpose of comparing two of them by means of a third. In both cases, a second length, or a second duration is substituted, which is supposed to be equal to the first; that is to say, fresh real positions of the points of the same ten-foot rod which constitute a new distance, such as a new circuit made by the same rod, or a fresh temporal distance between two beginnings & two ends. In my Theory, there is in each case exactly the same analogy between space & time. Ordinary people think that it is only for measurement of space that the standard of measurement is the same; almost all other philosophers except myself hold that it can at least be considered to be the same from the idea that the measure is perfectly solid & continuous, but that in time there is only equality. But I, for my part, only admit in either case the equality, & never the identity.”²²⁵⁸

Joseph Larmor agreed with Boscovich and set the scale for time dilatation thereby completing the misnamed “Lorentz Transformation”, which Lorentz, Poincaré and the Einsteins later adopted.

9.4.4 The Final Form of the Transformation

The components of the “Lorentz Transformation” evolved as follows: From the Aristotelian-Bradwardine-Galilean Transformation,²²⁵⁹ we have,

$$x' = x - vt, \quad y' = y, \quad z' = z, \quad t' = t.$$

Voigt (1887) introduced the relativity of simultaneity,

$$t' = t - \frac{vx}{c^2}.$$

FitzGerald (1889) introduced the scale factor of length contraction, giving mathematical voice to Boscovich’s concept,

$$x' = \frac{x - vt}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}.$$

Larmor (1894-1900) introduced the scale factor of time dilatation in order to quantify the Boscovichian concept of time dilatation, and published the “Lorentz Transformation” in 1897,

$$x' = \frac{x - vt}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}, \quad y' = y, \quad z' = z, \quad t' = \frac{t - \frac{vx}{c^2}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}.$$

Lorentz, himself, acknowledged Voigt’s priority, and was uncomfortable with Poincaré’s term “Lorentz Transformation”. Lorentz wrote to Voigt,

“Of course I will not miss the first opportunity to mention, that the concerned transformation and the introduction of a local time has been your idea.”²²⁶⁰

Lorentz kept his word:

“In a paper „Über das Doppler’sche Princip“, published in 1887 (Gött. Nachrichten, p. 41) and which to my regret has escaped my notice all these

years, Voigt has applied to equations of the form (6) (§3 of this book) a transformation equivalent to the formulae (287) and (288). The idea of the transformations used above (and in §44) might therefore have been borrowed from Voigt and the proof that it does not alter the form of the equations for the *free* ether is contained in his paper.”²²⁶¹

and,

“It was these considerations published by me in 1904, which gave rise to the dissertation by Poincaré on the dynamics of the electron, in which he has attached my name to the transformation of which I have just spoken. I am obliged to again note the observation that the same transformation itself was previously hit upon in an article from Mr. Voigt published in 1887, and I did not remove the artifice from it to the fullest extent possible. In fact, for certain of the physical magnitudes which enter in the formulas I have not indicated the transformation which suits best. This has been done by Poincaré, and later by Einstein and Minkowski. To discover the ‘transformations of relativity’, as I will call them now, . . .”

“Ce furent ces considérations publiées par moi en 1904 qui donnèrent lieu à POINCARÉ d’écrire son mémoire sur la Dynamique de l’électron, dans lequel il a attaché mon nom à la transformation dont je viens de parler. Je dois remarquer à ce propos que la même transformation se trouve déjà dans un article de M. Voigt publié en 1887 et que je n’ai pas tiré de cet artifice tout le parti possible. En effet, pour certaines des grandeurs physiques qui entrent dans les formules, je n’ai pas indiqué la transformation qui convient le mieux. Cela a été fait par POINCARÉ et ensuite par M. EINSTEIN et MINKOWSKI. Pour trouver les «transformations de relativité», comme je les appellerai maintenant”.²²⁶²

Though Lorentz denied knowledge of Voigt’s Transformation, it is quite likely Lorentz did know of it. Lorentz was keenly interested in theories which would explain Michelson’s negative result, as did Voigt’s theory which was published in the highly respected and widely read *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*.²²⁶³ Given that Voigt’s Transformation differs from the “Lorentz Transformation” of modern relativity theory, some have wondered why Lorentz credited Voigt with the transformation. Prof. Wilfried Schröder published a collection of letters between Emil Wiechert and Lorentz, “Hendrik Antoon Lorentz und Emil Wiechert (Briefwechsel und Verhältnis der beiden Physiker)”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 30, Number 2, (1984), pp. 167-187. In addition to the fact that Lorentz again denied his friend Poincaré’s legacy, Lorentz’ letters are noteworthy for their elucidation of his thought process and the development of his imperfect versions of the transformation which ill-advisedly bears his name. Schröder’s article should be read by all interested in the history of the “Lorentz Transformation”.

Among the highlights regarding Voigt's work we find: Wiechert to Lorentz 28 November 1911,

“Nun kenne ich von Ihnen aus jener Zeit die Arbeit Arch. neerl. 25, 363, 1892, das in Leiden 1895 erschienene Buch, und die Arbeit Proc. Amsterdam 1904, p. 809. Giebt es wohl noch andere Arbeiten, die für die Relativitätstheorie in Betracht kommen?”

Lorentz to Wiechert 21 December 1911,

“In der Arbeit von 1899 benutze ich eine Substitution, die in der im Bornschen' Referat benutzten Bezeichnungweise folgendermaßen lautet:

$$z' = az - bct, \quad \frac{1}{a} t' = at - \frac{b}{c} z.$$

und erst in 1904 habe ich ihre Transformation

$$z' = az - bct, \quad t' = at - \frac{b}{c} z$$

eingeführt, die sich übrigens schon viel früher bei Voigt findet (Über das Dopplersche Prinzip, Gött. Nachrichten, 1887).”

Wiechert to Lorentz 15 February 1912,

“In Ihrer Arbeit von 1899 (Archives Néerlandaises) benutzen Sie die Transformation

$$t' = t - k^2 \frac{w}{c^2} x.$$

In der Arbeit 1904 (Proceedings) lautet die Gleichung 5:

$$t' = t \frac{l}{k} - kl \frac{w}{c^2} x \left(\text{statt } t' = kl \left(t - \frac{w}{c^2} x \right) \right).$$

Das ist nun doch nicht die Transformation, die man als „Lorentz-Transformation“ bezeichnet. Ich vermute aber, dass es sich nur um einen Druckfehler handelt, denn die folgenden Formeln entsprechen der richtigen Formel. Dies ist doch eine richtige Ansicht?

Sie sagen, dass Prof. W. Voigt schon 1887 die Transformation benutzt habe. Es scheint mir aber, dass dieses *nicht* der Fall ist. W. Voigt scheint mir

für die Zeiten t' und t stets die gleichen Einheiten zu benutzen.”

Lorentz to Wiechert 5 March 1912,

“4. Was die Formeln von Voigt betrifft, so sind diese so wenig von oben angeführten (1) verschieden, dass man, wie mir scheint, wohl sagen kann, er habe die Rel.transformation angegeben. Die von ihm zu Grunde gelegten Differentialgleichungen behalten nämlich ihre Form, wenn man x , y , z , t alle mit ein und derselben Konstante multipliziert. Man findet nun in seiner Abhandlung über das Doppler'sche Prinzip die Substitution (die Formeln 10) auf S. 45)

$$\xi = x - kt,$$

$$\eta = qy,$$

$$\zeta = qz,$$

$$\tau = t - \frac{kx}{w^2}$$

wo w die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit bedeutet, und

$$q = \sqrt{1 - \frac{k^2}{w^2}}$$

ist.

Sie bemerken zu Recht, dass t und τ hier den gleichen Koeffizienten haben. Aber es kommt jetzt in der zweiten und dritten Gleichung der Koeffizient q vor. Setzt man

$$\xi = qx', \eta = qy', \zeta = qz', \tau = qt',$$

so verwandeln sich die Gleichungen in

$$x' = \frac{1}{q}x - \frac{k}{q}t, y' = y, z' = z, t' = \frac{1}{q}t - \frac{k}{qw^2}x,$$

und dies hat wirklich die Gestalt von (1), wenn man w mit c identifiziert und

$$a = \frac{1}{q}, \quad b = \frac{k}{q^2}$$

setzt.”

In 1900, Joseph Larmor published the following chapter in his most famous work, the award winning essay *Aether and Matter*, which was “completed at the end of the year 1898”, and had Larmor already published the “Lorentz Transformation” in near modern form in 1897,²²⁶⁴

“CHAPTER XI

MOVING MATERIAL SYSTEM : APPROXIMATION CARRIED TO THE SECOND ORDER

110. THE results above obtained have been derived from the correlation developed in § 106, up to the first order of the small quantity v/C , between the equations for aethereal vectors here represented by (f', g', h') and (a', b', c') referred to the axes (x', y', z') at rest in the aether and a time t'' , and those for related aethereal vectors represented by (f, g, h) and (a, b, c) referred to axes (x', y', z') in uniform translatory motion and a time t' . But we can proceed further, and by aid of a more complete transformation institute a correspondence which will be correct to the second order. Writing as before t'' for $t' - \frac{v}{C^2} \epsilon x'$, the exact equations for (f, g, h) and (a, b, c) referred to the moving axes (x', y', z') and time t' are, as above shown, equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} 4\pi \frac{df'}{dt''} &= \frac{dc'}{dy'} - \frac{db'}{dz'} & -(4\pi C^2)^{-1} \frac{da'}{dt''} &= \frac{dh'}{dy'} - \frac{dg'}{dz'} \\ 4\pi \epsilon \frac{dg'}{dt''} &= \frac{da'}{dz'} - \frac{dc'}{dx'} & -(4\pi C^2)^{-1} \epsilon \frac{db'}{dt''} &= \frac{df'}{dz'} - \frac{dh'}{dx'} \\ 4\pi \epsilon \frac{dh'}{dt''} &= \frac{db'}{dx'} - \frac{da'}{dy'} & -(4\pi C^2)^{-1} \epsilon \frac{dc'}{dt''} &= \frac{dg'}{dx'} - \frac{df'}{dy'}. \end{aligned}$$

Now write

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (x_1, y_1, z_1) \text{ for } \left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} x', y', z' \right) \\
 & (a_1, b_1, c_1) \text{ for } \left(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} a', b', c' \right) \text{ or } \left(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} a, b + 4\pi v h, c - 4\pi v g \right) \\
 & (f_1, g_1, h_1) \text{ for } \left(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} f', g', h' \right) \text{ or } \left(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} f, g - \frac{v}{4\pi C^2} c, h + \frac{v}{4\pi C^2} b \right) \\
 & dt_1 \text{ for } \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} dt'' \quad \text{or } \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(dt' - \frac{v}{C^2} \varepsilon dx' \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon = (1 - v^2/C^2)^{-1}$; and it will be seen that the factor ε is absorbed, so that the scheme of equations, referred to moving axes, which connects together the new variables with subscripts, is identical in form with the Maxwellian scheme of relations for the aethereal vectors referred to fixed axes. This transformation, from (x', y', z') to (x_1, y_1, z_1) as dependent variables, signifies an elongation of the space of the problem in the ratio $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ along the direction of the motion of the axes of coordinates. Thus if the values of (f_1, g_1, h_1) and (a_1, b_1, c_1) given as functions of x_1, y_1, z_1, t_1 express the course of spontaneous change of the aethereal vectors of a system of moving electrons referred to axes (x_1, y_1, z_1) at rest in the aether, then

$$\left(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} f, g - \frac{v}{4\pi C^2} c, h + \frac{v}{4\pi C^2} b \right)$$

and $\left(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} a, b + 4\pi v h, c - 4\pi v g \right)$,
 expressed by the same functions of the variables

$$\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} x', y', z', \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} t' - \frac{v}{C^2} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} x',$$

will represent the course of change of the aethereal vectors (f, g, h) and (a, b, c) of a correlated system of moving electrons referred to axes of (x', y', z') moving through the aether with uniform translatory velocity $(v, 0, 0)$. In this correlation between the courses of change of the two systems, we have

$$\frac{d\left(\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}f\right)}{d\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}x'\right)} \text{ equal to } \frac{df_1}{dx_1} - \frac{v}{C^2} \frac{df_1}{dt_1},$$

$$\frac{d}{dy'} \left(g - \frac{v}{4\pi C^2} c \right) \quad ,, \quad \frac{dg_1}{dy_1}$$

$$\frac{d}{dz'} \left(h + \frac{v}{4\pi C^2} b \right) \quad ,, \quad \frac{dh_1}{dz_1},$$

where $\frac{dc}{dy'} - \frac{db}{dz'} = 4\pi \left(\frac{df}{dt'} - v \frac{df}{dx'} \right)$

and also $\frac{df_1}{dt_1} = \frac{df}{dt'}$;

hence $\frac{df}{dx'} + \frac{dg}{dy'} + \frac{dh}{dz'} - \frac{v}{C^2} \left(\frac{df}{dt'} - v \frac{df}{dx'} \right)$ is equal to

$$\varepsilon \frac{df_1}{dx_1} + \frac{dg_1}{dy_1} + \frac{dh_1}{dz_1} - \frac{v}{C^2} \varepsilon \frac{df}{dt'},$$

so that, up to the order of (v/C^2) inclusive,

$$\frac{df}{dx'} + \frac{dg}{dy'} + \frac{dh}{dz'} = \frac{df_1}{dx_1} + \frac{dg_1}{dy_1} + \frac{dh_1}{dz_1}.$$

Thus the conclusions as to the corresponding positions of the electrons of the two systems, which had been previously established up to the first order of v/C , are true up to the second order when the dimensions of the moving system are contracted in comparison with the fixed system in the ratio $\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, or $1 - \frac{1}{2}v^2/C^2$, along the direction of its motion.

111. The ratio of the strengths of corresponding electrons in the two systems may now be deduced just as it was previously when the discussion was confined to the first order of v/C . For the case of a single electron in uniform motion the comparison is with a single electron at rest, near which (a_1, b_1, c_2) vanishes so far as it depends on that electron: now we have in the general correlation

$$g = g_1 + \frac{v}{4\pi C^2} (c_1 + 4\pi v g),$$

hence in this particular case

$$(g, h) = \varepsilon (g_1, h_1), \text{ while } f = \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} f_1.$$

But the strength of the electron in the moving system is the value of the integral $\iint (f dy' dz' + g dz' dx' + h dx' dy')$ extended over any surface closely surrounding its nucleus; that is here $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \iint (f_1 dy_1 dz_1 + g_1 dz_1 dx_1 + h_1 dx_1 dy_1)$, so that the strength of each

moving electron is $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ times that of the correlative fixed electron. As before, no matter what other electrons are present, this argument still applies if the surface be taken to surround the electron under consideration very closely, because then the wholly preponderating part of each vector is that which belongs to the adjacent electron [*Footnote:* This result follows more immediately from § 110, which shows that corresponding densities of electrification are equal, while corresponding volumes are as $\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$ to unity.].

112. We require however to construct a correlative system devoid of the translatory motion in which the strengths of the electrons shall be equal instead of proportional, since motion of a material system containing electrons cannot alter their strengths. The principle of dynamical similarity will effect this.

We have in fact to reduce the scale of the electric charges, and therefore of $\frac{df}{dx} + \frac{dg}{dy} + \frac{dh}{dz}$, in a system at rest in the ratio $\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Apply therefore a transformation

$$(x, y, z) = k(x_1, y_1, z_1), \quad t = lt_1,$$

$$(a, b, c) = \mathfrak{t}(a_1, b_1, c_1), \quad (f, g, h) = \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} k(f_1, g_1, h_1);$$

and the form of the fundamental circuitual aethereal relations will not be changed provided $k = l$ and $\mathfrak{t} = \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} k$. Thus we may have k and l both unity and $\mathfrak{t} = \varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}$; so that no further change of scale in space and time is required, but only a diminution of (a, b, c) in the ratio $\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

We derive the result, correct to the second order, that if the internal forces

of a material system arise wholly from electrodynamic actions between the systems of electrons which constitute the atoms, then an effect of imparting to a steady material system a uniform velocity of translation is to produce a uniform contraction of the system in the direction of the motion, of amount $\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ or $1 - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{v}^2 / C^2$. The electrons will occupy corresponding positions in this contracted system, but the aethereal displacements in the space around them will not correspond: if (f, g, h) and (a, b, c) are those of the moving system, then the electric and magnetic displacements at corresponding points of the fixed systems will be the values that the vectors

$$\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} f, g - \frac{\mathbf{v}}{4\pi C^2} c, h + \frac{\mathbf{v}}{4\pi C^2} b \right)$$

and $\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\epsilon^{-\frac{1}{2}} a, b + 4\pi \mathbf{v} h, c - 4\pi \mathbf{v} g \right)$ had at a time const. $+ \mathbf{v}x / C^2$ before the instant considered when the scale of time is enlarged in the ratio $\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

As both the electric and magnetic vectors of radiation lie in the wave-front, it follows that in the two correlated systems, fixed and moving, the relative wave-fronts of radiation correspond, as also do the rays which are the paths of the radiant energy relative to the systems. The change of the time variable, in the comparison of radiations in the fixed and moving systems, involves the Doppler effect on the wave-length.”

In 1899, Hendrik Antoon Lorentz published his transformation in near modern form.²²⁶⁵ In 1904, Hendrik Antoon Lorentz published the following transformation,

“§ 4. We shall further transform these formulae by a change of variables. Putting

$$\frac{c^2}{c^2 - w^2} = k^2, \quad (3)$$

and understanding by l another numerical quantity, to be determined further on, I take as new independent variables

$$x' = klx, \quad y' = ly, \quad z' = lz, \quad (4)$$

$$t' = \frac{l}{k} t - kl \frac{w}{c^2} x, \quad (5)”$$

In 1905, before the Einsteins, Poincaré published the following transformation and noted that it, together with all rotations of space, forms a group,

“The essential point, established by Lorentz, is that the equations of the electromagnetic field are not altered by a certain transformation (which I will call by the name of Lorentz) of the form:

$$x' = kl(x + \epsilon t), y' = ly, z' = lz, t' = kl(t + \epsilon x), \quad (1)$$

where x, y, z are the coordinates and t the time before the transformation and x', y', z' and t' after the transformation. Here ϵ is a constant which defines the transformation,

$$k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \epsilon^2}},$$

and l is an arbitrary function of ϵ . One sees that in this transformation the x -axis plays an essential role, but one can evidently construct a transformation in which this role would be played by any arbitrary line passing through the origin. The ensemble of all these transformations together with all rotations of space, should form a group; but for this it is necessary that $l = 1$. One is thus forced to take $l = 1$, and this is a conclusion to which Lorentz was led by a different way.”²²⁶⁶

Prof. Anatoly Alexeivich Logunov has stressed the fact that Poincaré selflessly attributed to Lorentz, that which Poincaré had accomplished. Lorentz, alternately, and depending upon the audience, credited Poincaré and Einstein for the same innovations. Poincaré’s priority is established by the dates of publication. Prof. Logunov has also stressed that many have failed to understand the significance of Poincaré’s statements, wrongfully attributing priority to Einstein, which rightfully belongs to Poincaré. Prof. Logunov states, *inter alia*,

“Poincare writes: «The idea of Lorentz», but Lorentz never wrote such words before Poincare. [***] We see that invariance of the equations of the electromagnetic field under transformations of the Lorentz group results in the relativity principle being fulfilled in electromagnetic phenomena. In other words, the relativity principle for electromagnetic phenomena follows from the Maxwell-Lorentz equations in the form of a rigorous mathematical truth. [***] It must be underlined that, by having established the group nature of the set of all purely spatial transformations together with the Lorentz transformations, that leave the equations of electrodynamics invariant, Poincare thus discovered the existence in physics of an essentially new type of symmetry related to the group of linear space-time transformations, which

he called the Lorentz group. [***] Poincare thus introduces the physical concept of gravitational waves, the exchange of which generates gravitational forces, and supplies and estimation of the contribution of relativistic corrections to Newton's law of gravity. For example, he shows that the terms of first order in \mathbf{v}/c cancel out exactly and so the relativistic corrections to Newton's law are quantities of the order of $(\mathbf{v}/c)^2$. [***] It is here that such concepts as the following first appeared: the Lorentz group, invariance of the equations of the electromagnetic field with respect to the Lorentz transformations, the transformation laws for charge and current, the addition formulae of velocities, the transformation laws of force. Here, also, Poincare extends the transformation laws to all the forces of Nature, whatever their origin might be.²²⁶⁷

In 1905, without reference to prior authors, Mileva and Albert Einstein wrote,

“It follows from this relation and the one previously found that $\phi(\mathbf{v}) = 1$, so that the transformation equations which have been found become

$$\begin{aligned}\tau &= \beta(t - \mathbf{v}x/c^2), \\ \xi &= \beta(x - \mathbf{v}t), \\ \eta &= y, \\ \zeta &= z,\end{aligned}$$

where $\beta = 1/\sqrt{1 - \mathbf{v}^2/c^2}$.²²⁶⁸

Given the facts that Galileo popularized the concept of the principle of relativity, Lange took from it absolute space and absolute time, Voigt introduced the relativistic transformation, and Poincaré first demonstrated relative simultaneity; why is the concept popularly referred to as “Einstein's special theory of relativity”? Einstein contributed next to nothing to the special principle of relativity. Why are the popular misconceptions of Einstein, and his supposed discoveries; which misconceptions are fed by the scientific community and the media; and the factual historic record, itself, at odds? Is exposing the truth counter-productive, if it means the downfall of a hero and the death of a religion?

Contrary to the view of some Einstein advocates that Einstein worked in near complete isolation from both the scientific literature and the physics community, many have pointed out that Einstein had easy access to the literature at the Swiss Patent Office and was heavily immersed in the most recent physics literature of the day as a prolific reviewer of that literature for the *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik*. Jules Leveugle has stressed the fact that Einstein and Planck were exposed to the recent writings of Poincaré and Lorentz through many sources including the *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik* and *Fortschritte der Physik*. Einstein published 21 reviews in the *Beiblätter* in 1905.²²⁶⁹ Jules Leveugle points out in his book *Poincaré et la Relativité : Question sur la Science*, that the *Beiblätter* published the

following review of Lorentz' 1904 paper by Richard Gans, in Volume 29, Number 4, (February, 1905), pp. 168-170:

“15. **H. A. Lorentz.** *Elektromagnetische Vorgänge in einem Systeme, das sich mit einer willkürlichen Geschwindigkeit (kleiner als die des Lichtes) bewegt* (Versl. K. Ak. van Wet. **12**, S. 986-1009. 1904). — Durch die ursprüngliche Lorentzsche Elektronentheorie ist nicht erklärt: 1. Daß die Erdbewegung auf die Interferenz des Lichtes keinen Einfluß hat (Michelson und Morley). 2. Daß auf einen geladenen Plattenkondensator kein Drehmoment wirkt (Trouton und Noble).

Die erste Tatsache ist durch eine neue Hypothese von FitzGerald und Lorentz erklärt worden, nämlich dadurch, daß die Dimensionen fester Körper in Richtung der Erdbewegung ein wenig kleiner werden.

3. Diese Hypothese verlangt eine Doppelbrechung des Lichtes in isotropen Körpern infolge der Erdbewegung; die Versuche ergaben ein negatives Resultat (Lord Rayleigh, Brace).

Um diese Widersprüche zu beseitigen, stellt der Verf. folgende Betrachtungen an:

Erfährt das elektromagnetische System eine konstante Geschwindigkeit w in Richtung der x -Achse, und ist die Lichtgeschwindigkeit c , setzen wir ferner

$$\frac{c^2}{c^2 - w^2} = k^2,$$

und bilden den Raum ab durch die Transformation $x' = kx$, $y' = y$, $z' = z$ und führen anstatt der Zeit t die „Ortszeit“

$$t' = \frac{t}{k} - \frac{kwx}{c^2}$$

ein, so erhalten wir, wenn wir anstatt der elektrischen und magnetischen Feldstärke \mathbf{d} bez. \mathbf{h} etwas andere Vektoren \mathbf{d}' und \mathbf{h}' einführen, Gleichungen im bewegten, durch die Abbildung transformierten System, welche genau so gebildet sind, wie die Lorentzschen Gleichungen im ursprünglichen ruhenden System. Es folgt daraus, daß das Feld (\mathbf{d}' , \mathbf{h}') in aller Strenge dem Felde im ruhenden System an entsprechenden Punkten gleich ist, d. h. im elektrostatischen oder optischen *Felde* ist kein Einfluß irgend einer Ordnung der Bewegung zu konstatieren. Die ponderomotorischen *Kräfte* auf die Volumeinheit dagegen erleiden eine kleine Änderung entsprechend der Volumänderung, es ist

$$f'_x = f_x \quad f'_y = \frac{f_y}{k} \quad f'_z = \frac{f_z}{k},$$

wo die gestrichenen Buchstaben im bewegten System gelten.

Diese Umformung gibt die Hypothese an die Hand, daß die Dimensionen der Elektronen durch die Bewegung in derselben Weise verändert werden wie der Raum durch die oben angegebene Transformation, daß aber die Ladung entsprechender Volumelemente dieselbe bleibt.

Ferner sollen auch nicht-elektrische (z. B. elastische) Kräfte dieselbe Veränderung durch die Translation erfahren, wie oben die ponderomotorischen Kräfte f elektrischen Ursprungs.

Daraus folgt, daß ein Körper, der durch die Anziehungen und Abstoßungen seiner inneren Kräfte im Gleichgewicht ist, *von selbst* durch die Bewegung seine Dimensionen ändert, denn war im ruhenden System die resultierende Kraft 0 (also Gleichgewicht), so ist sie 0 im bewegten *transformierten* System (also Gleichgewicht).

So erklärt sich der Michelson und Morleysche Interferenzversuch, ferner der von Trouton und Noble über das Drehmoment eines geladenen Plattenkondensators und auch die vergeblichen Doppelbrechungsversuche von Lord Rayleigh und Brace, denn der schon früher vom Verf. (bis auf Größen zweiter Ordnung) aufgestellte Satz, daß Helligkeit, Dunkelheit, Strahl im ruhenden System Helligkeit, Dunkelheit, Strahl im bewegten transformierten entsprechen, gilt bei der jetzigen Transformation streng in Gliedern aller Ordnungen.

Die Formeln für die elektromagnetische Masse ändern sich infolge der Abplattung der Elektronen, aber stellen trotzdem die Kaufmannschen Versuche über Becquerelstrahlen mit befriedigender Genauigkeit dar, wie eingehende Zahlenrechnungen zeigen. Gans."

Gans also published a paper, "Zur Elektrodynamik in bewegten Körpern", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 16, (1905), pp. 516-534.

Emil Cohn published a paper that cited Lorentz' 1904 paper containing the "Lorentz Transformation", with which Cohn paper Einstein was familiar, "Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Systeme", *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (November, 1904), pp. 1294-1303, at 1295. Einstein cited Cohn's paper in his *Jahrbuch* review article of 1907, and a copy of Cohn's 1904 paper is in his preserved collection. See: *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Note 128, Hardcover, p. 272. Cohn cites the Dutch version of Lorentz' work, "Electromagnetische Verschijnselen in een Stelsel dat zich met Willekeurige Snelheid, Kleiner dan die van het Licht, Beweegt." *Verlagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen der Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam*, Volume 12, (23 April 1904), pp. 986-1009. Einstein cites Cohn in the direct context of Lorentz' 1904 paper in: A. Einstein, "Über das

Relativitätsprinzip und die aus demselben gezogenen Folgerung”, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 4, (1907), pp. 411-462, at 413.

Jules Leveugle notes that Felix Klein annotated Lorentz’ article “Weiterbildung der Maxwellschen Theorie. Elektronentheorie”, in Volume 2, Part 2, Chapter 14, pp. 145-280, of the *Encyklopädie der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*, with note 113:

“113) Lorentz, Amsterdam Zittungsverslag Akad. v. Wet 12, 1904 (Amsterdam Proceedings, 1903-1904).”

and that Max Abraham also referred his readers to Lorentz’ 1904 paper, in Abraham’s “Die Grundhypothesen der Elektronentheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 5, (1904), pp. 576-579:

“2) H. A. Lorentz, K. Akad. van Wetensch. te Amsterdam 1899, S. 507 und 1904, S. 809.”

and that Sommerfeld cited Lorentz’ 1904 paper in his paper, “Simplified Deduction of the Field and Forces of an Electron, Moving in Any Given Way” in the Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam Proceedings of the Meeting of Saturday, November 26, 1904, p. 346:

“1) K. Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam Mei 1904. Proceedings p. 809.”

and that Grimm wrote of Lorentz’ work in *Die Fortschritte der Physik*, (1905), p. 29:

“**H. A. Lorentz.** Electrodynamical phenomena in a system moving with any velocity smaller than that of light. Proc. Amsterdam 6. 809-831, 1904. Versl. Amsterdam 12, 986-1009, 1904.

Nachdem neuerdings eine Reihe neuer Versuche gemacht worden sind, die sämtlich das Resultat hatten, daß auch ein Einfluß zweiter Ordnung der Erdbewegung nicht zu konstatieren ist, hat Verf. es als notwendig gefunden, seiner und FITZGERALDS Hypothese, daß die Dimensionen der Körper durch ihre Bewegung geändert würden, eine allgemeinere Grundlage zu geben. Er stellt zunächst die Grundgleichungen der Elektronentheorie auf für ein sich mit einer Geschwindigkeit bewegendes System, die geringer als Lichtgeschwindigkeit ist, und dann transformiert er die Gleichungen auf ein System, das gegen das erste in der Bewegungsrichtung deformiert ist. Er erhält somit Gleichungen, die ihm gestatten, die in einem Felde gegebenen Punkte bzw. Funktionen sofort auch im anderen Felde zu finden. Hiernach führt er nun die Hypothese ein, daß die Elektronen ihre Dimensionen in der Bewegung dieser Deformation entsprechend ändern, während sie in der Ruhe Kugeln sind, und daß die Kräfte, die zwischen ungeladenen Partikeln und zwischen solchen und Elektronen bestehen, in gleicher Weise wie die elektrischen Kräfte in einem elektrostatischen System durch Translation

beeinflusst werden. Es wird nun das elektromagnetische Moment eines einzelnen Elektrons berechnet und für die ARAHAMSCHE quasistationäre Bewegung ergibt sich dann eine rein elektromagnetische Masse des Elektrons. Dann wird der Einfluß der Bewegung auf optische Phänomene betrachtet, wobei Verf. zu dem Schlusse kommt, daß in der Deformation (l, l, kl) das $l = const$ sein muß und die Anwendung auf die übrigen neueren Versuche führt zu der allgemeinsten Hypothese, daß „die Massen aller Partikel durch die Bewegung in gleicher Weise beeinflusst werden, wie die elektromagnetischen Massen der Elektronen“. Im weiteren wird die Theorie an KAUFMANN'S Tabellen geprüft und gibt dabei ungefähr gleich gute Übereinstimmung, wie die KAUFMANN'Schen Formeln. Zum Schluß wird noch der Versuch von TROUTON diskutiert. *Grm.*”

9.4.5 Einstein's Fudge

As is well known, numerous authors have shown errors in the Einsteins' fallacy of *Petitio Principii*, including, among many others, Essen, Keswani, Miller, Planck, and Guillaume.

9.4.6 Einstein Begged the Question

Albert Einstein's arguments were almost always fallacies of *Petitio Principii*. He argued well-known experimental results as if they were *a priori* first principles. Einstein would then induce, as if deducing, the well-known hypotheses of others, and deduce from these plagiarized hypotheses the same experimental results as conclusions, which he had first stated as premises. This was Einstein's *modus operandi* for plagiarism. In the special theory of relativity, Einstein irrationally argued that light speed invariance, supposedly a well-known experimental result at the time, was an *a priori* first principle, which an empirical measurement cannot be, so that he could then induce through analysis, as if deducing in synthesis, the "Lorentz Transformation" hypotheses. Einstein then used the "Lorentz Transformation", the true set of hypotheses of the special theory of relativity, to deduce light speed invariance as a conclusion, a conclusion which Einstein had already presumed as a premise. Einstein also employed the generalized equivalence of all inertial systems he alleged was observed in the Michelson experiments, as if it were an *a priori* principle, instead of the *a posteriori* empirical observation it was, to then "deduce" from this supposed first principle, the principle itself—Michelson's result.

Einstein employed the same fallacious method in the general theory of relativity. Einstein irrationally asserted the well-known experimental gravitational-inertial mass equivalence of Newton, Bessel and Eötvös as if it were an "*a priori*" postulate, which an experimental result cannot be, only to arrive at it as an ultimate conclusion, a conclusion which was redundant to the premise. The quasi-positivistic analyses Einstein presented by turning the synthetic scientific theories of his predecessors on their heads have been applauded, ridiculed and often misrepresented as if they are

synthetic, which they are not.

Albert Einstein gave a lecture at King's College in June of 1921. *The London Times* reported on 14 June 1921, on page 8,

“PROFESSOR EINSTEIN said it gave him special pleasure to lecture in the capital of that country from which the most important and fundamental ideas of theoretical physics had spread throughout the world—the theories of motion and gravitation of Newton and the proposition of the electro-magnetic field on which Faraday and Maxwell built up the theories of modern physics. It might well be said that the theory of relativity formed the finishing stone of the elaborate edifice of the ideas of Maxwell and Lorentz by endeavouring to apply physics of ‘fields’ to all physical phenomena, including the phenomena of gravitation.

Professor Einstein pointed out that the theory of relativity was not of any speculative origin, but had its origin solely in the endeavour to adapt the theory of physics to facts observed. It must not be considered as an arbitrary act, but rather as the result of the observations of facts, that the conceptions of space, time, and motion, hitherto held as fundamental, had now been abandoned.

Two main factors, continued Professor Einstein, have led modern science to regard time as a relative conception in so far as each inertial system had to be coupled with its own peculiar time: the law of constancy of the velocity of light in vacuo, sanctioned by the development of the sciences of electro-dynamics and optics, and in connexion therewith the equivalence of all inertial systems (special principle of relativity) as clearly shown by Michelson's famous experiment. In developing this idea it appeared that hitherto the interconnexion between direct events on the one hand, and the space coordinates and time on the other, had not been thought out with the necessary accuracy.

The theory of relativity endeavours to define more concisely the relationship between general scientific conceptions and facts experienced. In the realm of the special theory of relativity the space coordinates and time are still of an absolute nature in so far as they appear to be measurable by rigid bodies, rods, and by clocks. They are, however, relative in so far as they are dependent upon the motion peculiar to the inertial system that happens to have been chosen. According to the special theory of relativity the four-dimensional *continuum*, formed by the amalgamation of time and space, retains that absolute character which, according to the previous theories, was attributed to space as well as to time, each individually. The interpretation of the spatial coordinates and of time as the result of measurements then leads to the following conclusions: motion (relative to the system of coordinates) influences the shape of bodies and the working of clocks; energy and inertial mass are equivalent.

GRAVITATIONAL FIELDS.

The general theory of relativity owes its origin, continued Professor

Einstein, primarily to the experimental fact of the numerical equivalence of the inertial and gravitational mass of a body; a fundamental fact for which the classical science of mechanics offered no interpretation. Such an interpretation is arrived at by extending the application of the principle of relativity to systems of coordinates accelerated with reference to one another. The introduction of systems of co-ordinates accelerated with reference to inertial systems causes the appearance of gravitational fields relative to the systems of coordinates. That is how the general theory of relativity, based on the equality of inertia and gravity, offers a theory of the gravitational field.

Now that systems of co-ordinates, accelerated with reference to one another, have been introduced as equivalent systems of co-ordinates, based on the identity of inertia and gravity, it follows that the laws governing the position of rigid bodies in the presence of gravitational fields do not conform to the rules of Euclidean geometry. The results as regards the working of clocks is analogous. These conclusions lead to the necessity of once more generalizing the theories of space and time, because it is no longer possible directly to interpret the co-ordinates of space and time by measurements with measuring rods and clocks. This generalization of metrics, which in the sphere of pure mathematics dates back to Gauss and Riemann, is based largely on the fact that the metrics of the special theory of relativity may be considered to apply in certain cases also to the general theory of relativity. In consequence, the co-ordinate system of space and time is no longer a reality in itself. Only by connecting the space and time co-ordinates with those mathematical figures which define the gravitational field can the objects which may be measured by measuring rods and by clocks be determined.

The idea of the general theory of relativity has yet another basis. As Ernst Mach has already emphasized, the Newtonian theory of motion is unsatisfactory in the following point:—if motion is regarded not from the casual but from the purely description point of view it will be found that there exists a relative motion of bodies with reference to each other. But the conception of relative motion does not of itself suffice to formulate the factor of acceleration to be found in Newton's equations of motion. Newton was forced to introduce a fictitious physical space with reference to which an acceleration was supposed to exist. This conception of absolute space introduced by Newton *ad hoc* is unsatisfactory, although it is logically correct. Mach, therefore, endeavoured so to alter the mechanical equations that the inertia of bodies is attributed to their relative motion with reference not to absolute space but with reference to the sum total of all other measurable bodies. Mach was bound to fail considering the state of knowledge at his time. But it is quite reasonable to put the problem as he did. In view of the general theory of relativity this line of thought comes more and more to the fore, because according to the theory of relativity the physical properties of space are influenced by matter.

Professor Einstein said he was of the opinion that the general theory of

relativity could only solve this problem satisfactorily by regarding the universe as spatially finite and closed. The mathematical results of the theory of relativity forced scientists to this view, if they assumed that the average density of matter within the universe was of finite, if ever so small a value.”

In 1905, Mileva Einstein-Marity and Albert Einstein coauthored a paper on the “electrodynamics of moving bodies”. Fallacies of begging the question emerge in the very introduction to the work. The Einsteins acknowledge in their introduction, that light speed invariance and the symmetry of electrodynamic phenomena were well-established phenomena. Well-known specific phenomena are not, by definition, “*a priori*” general concepts. However, the Einsteins asked us to abandon reason and assert specific experimental results and empirical observations, as if they were *a priori* general principles. In other words, the Einsteins engaged in an analysis of the problems of invariant light speed, and of the symmetry of electrodynamic phenomena in alleged violation of Maxwell’s theory, which problems faced physicists at the end of the Nineteenth Century. The Einsteins irrationally pretended that these two problems were solutions of themselves.

Henry August Rowland stated the two main problems facing the physicists of his day, on 28 October 1899, and I have italicized that which the Einsteins would later erroneously call “two assumptions”, or “postulates”:

“And yet, however wonderful [the ether] may be, its laws are far more simple than those of matter. *Every wave in it, whatever its length or intensity, proceeds onwards in it according to well known laws, all with the same speed, unaltered in direction, from its source in electrified matter to the confines of the Universe, unimpaired in energy unless it is disturbed by the presence of matter.* However the waves may cross each other, each proceeds by itself without interference with the others. [***] *To detect something dependent on the relative motion of the ether and matter has been and is the great desire of physicists. But we always find that, with one possible exception, there is always some compensating feature which renders our efforts useless.* This one experiment is the aberration of light, but even here Stokes has shown that it may be explained in either of two ways: first, that the earth moves through the ether of space without disturbing it, and second, if it carries the ether with it by a kind of motion called irrotational. Even here, however, the amount of action probably depends upon relative motion of the luminous source to the recipient telescope. So the principle of Doppler depends also on this relative motion and is independent of the ether. The result of the experiments of Foucault on the passage of light through moving water can no longer be interpreted as due to the partial movement of the ether with the moving water, an inference due to imperfect theory alone. The experiment of Lodge, who attempted to set the ether in motion by a rapidly rotating disc, showed no such result. The experiment of Michelson to detect the ethereal wind, although carried to the extreme of accuracy, also failed to detect any relative motion of the matter and the ether [*Emphasis Added*].”²²⁷⁰

The Einsteins turned reason on its head and called these two *a posteriori* problems, *a priori* “postulates”. The Einsteins phrased their two “postulates”, as follows:

- 1 (a). “Examples of a similar kind, as well as the failed attempts to find a motion of the earth relative to the ‘light medium’, lead to the supposition, that the concept of absolute rest corresponds to no characteristic properties of the phenomena not just in mechanics, but also in electrodynamics, on the contrary, for all systems of coordinates, for which the equations of mechanics are valid, the same electrodynamic and optical laws are also valid, as has already been proven for the magnitudes of the first order.”
- 1 (b). “The laws according to which the states of physical systems change do not depend upon to which of two systems of coordinates, in uniform translatory motion relative to each other, this change of state is referred.”
- 2 (a). “[L]ight in empty space always propagates with a determinate velocity c irrespective of the state of motion of the emitting body.”
- 2 (b). “Every ray of light moves in the ‘resting’ system of coordinates with the determinate velocity c , irrespective of whether this ray of light is emitted from a resting or moving body. Such that

$$\text{velocity} = (\text{path of light}) / (\text{interval of time}) ,$$

where ‘interval of time’ is to be construed in the sense of the definition of § 1.”

Note that the first “postulate”, the principle of relativity, refers only to “moving systems”; and that the second “postulate”, the light “postulate”, refers only to a proposed “resting system”. Note further, that the light “postulate” refers only to a proposed source independence of light speed, but not to an observer independence, because this “postulate” assumes a prior privileged frame and medium in the 1905 paper, which the Einsteins identify as the “resting system”. The expression “resting system” was well understood at the time to refer to “absolute space” and a system of coordinates at rest relative to the “fixed stars”. The Einsteins’ paper later presumes that $c' = c \pm v$, relative to the “resting system”.

Many assert that the Einsteins employed only these two “*a priori* postulates” in their theorization, as opposed to FitzGerald, Larmor, Lorentz, and Poincaré, who required the additional hypotheses of length contraction, time dilatation and an æther *to arrive at the same formulation—long before the Einsteins. Ad hoc* hypotheses were frowned upon at the time, due to Newton’s admonitions against them, such that

the removal of hypotheses was seen as an improvement. The two postulate myth is substantially and demonstrably false. The two postulates are not postulates, but rather are the deduced conclusions of the theory—summations of the supposedly observed phenomena of the day. The “postulates” are deducible from the more fundamental hypotheses of length contraction, time dilatation, relative simultaneity, inertial motion, an æther, etc.; and these are the actual fundamental hypotheses of the special theory of relativity.

Length contraction is not deduced from invariant light speed *a priori*. It is more fundamental than light speed, which is derived from it, and is logically induced from invariant light speed *a posteriori*. Length contraction is a specific factor which deduces the broad range of all velocity comparisons, not just light speed invariance, which represents but one of these comparisons and a deduced limit. The same is true of time dilatation and relative simultaneity. A wide range of hypotheses which deduce an æther and inertial motion are far more fundamental than the deduced conclusions of light speed source independence and the covariance of the laws of nature in inertial systems. It might be true that no one has yet created a fully fundamental theory to deduce these conclusions, but that does not render empirical observations *a priori*, nor does it mean that the attempt to inductively arrive at a such a set of hypotheses *a posteriori* is futile or detrimental. In addition, the evidence taken to justify the hypotheses which are accepted in the theory of relativity has not been rationally interpreted by the “relativists”.

After asserting the two “postulates”, the Einsteins raised a straw man argument based a *non sequitur*. They asserted that the two “postulates” appeared irreconcilable with each other. If light speed is constant in the “resting system”, then how can it also be isotropic in a “moving system” in motion relative to the “resting system”? This is a manufactured dilemma, because, in some inexplicable way, the Einsteins argue that the first postulate, the principle of relativity, compels that light speed from all sources be isotropic for all systems in uniform inertial motion with each respect to each other. However, this is clearly a *non sequitur*, because the principle of relativity no more compels light speed isotropy for all “moving systems”, then the principle of relativity requires that a body resting relative to one “moving system” *k* also rest relative to another “moving system” *K*, which is in motion relative to the first.

The Einsteins also raised the opposing problem. How can light speed be isotropic in the “resting system” and also be isotropic in a “moving system”? Of course, these questions presume the conclusion before it has been proven, the conclusion being that light speed from any given signal is isotropic in the “resting system” and all “moving systems”, which are in uniform translatory motion with respect to the “resting system”. This conclusion is an alleged empirical observation, which much be deduced from fundamental assertions. It is not an *a priori* fundamental assertion. The Einsteins’ “postulates” are in fact the very conclusions which they seek prove. They have manufactured a fallacy of *Petitio Principii*.

To knock down these straw men, the Einsteins turned the “two postulates” into one “postulate”, the ultimate conclusion which is sought. The Einsteins asserted that it is the *combination* of the two postulates, not either postulate by itself, which

“deduces” $c' = c$ between the moving system and the resting system, by simply asserting in their paper that $c' = c$, before it has in any way been logically proven (there is a distinction and difference between a logical proof and an empirical observation and the union of the “two postulates” does not constitute a logical proof, but rather discloses the redundancy of the “postulates” to each other—as Louis Essen has stated, they are one alleged empirical fact summarized in two redundant ways):

“It is easy, with the help of this result, to ascertain the magnitudes ξ, η, ζ , because one expresses by means of these equations, that light (as the principle of the constancy of the velocity of light, in conjunction with the principle of relativity, requires) also propagates with the velocity c as measured in the moving system.”

After irrationally presuming this conclusion that $c' = c$, before it has in any way been logically proven, the Einsteins proceeded to pretend that they had not presumed it:

“Now, we have to prove that every ray of light propagates with the velocity c as measured in the moving system, in case this is, as we have taken for granted, the case in the resting system, because we still have not offered up the proof that the principle of the constancy of the velocity of light is reconcilable with the principle of relativity.”

However, unless we presume that the “two postulates” are redundant, the combination of the two postulates results in $c' = c +/ - v$, not $c' = c$. If we do not presume that the “two postulates” are redundant, then the principle of relativity applies only to “moving systems” and the principle of the constancy of the velocity of light independent of the speed of the source is an æthereal principle of the “resting system” and only of the “resting system”.

In a rational approach to the problem, one must instead take the supposed empirical phenomenon of $c' = c$ as a point of departure for an *a posteriori* inductive analysis, not an *a priori* deductive synthesis, and from there induce a fundamental geometry *a posteriori*, which fundamental geometry then deduces the identity $c' = c$ and the covariance of the laws of physics *a priori*, in a synthetic scientific theory. Albert Einstein never accomplished such a theory and he politically obstructed valid criticisms of his irrationality by calling his critics “anti-Semitic” for daring to question his fallacies of *Petitio Principii*. Albert Einstein stifled scientific progress with disingenuous “racial” politics and was himself a racist and a segregationist, and therefore a dangerous hypocrite.

The Einsteins averred, before any proof was offered:

“It is easy, with the help of this result, to ascertain the magnitudes ξ, η, ζ , because one expresses by means of these equations, that light (as the

principle of the constancy of the velocity of light, in conjunction with the principle of relativity, requires) also propagates with the velocity c as measured in the moving system. For a ray of light emitted in the direction of increasing ξ at the time $\tau = 0$, the following equations are valid: $\xi = c\tau \dots$

Note the *non sequitur*, which begs the question: That allegedly if the speed of light is c in the “resting system” the principle of relativity compels that it also be measured to be c in the “moving system”; which, without the prior hypotheses of the Lorentz Transformation, clearly is not a rational conclusion, for if I rest in the resting system, the principle of relativity does not compel that I also rest in the moving system. The detection of an æther frame only violates the principle of relativity *if* we assume that the æther exists and that it is at *absolute rest*, and then only because it would provide a means to detect one’s speed relative to that æther which has arbitrarily been identified as being at rest in absolute space, which is another straw man argument because rest relative to a light medium does not constitute of necessity “absolute rest”—without the metaphysical presumption of an æther at absolute rest, there is no special theory of relativity, despite its advocates assertions to the contrary. At any rate, the assertion that the detection of the æther frame would violate the principle of relativity is false and is a straw man argument made to justify the assumption that the æther rests. On the contrary, the only principle the detection of the æther frame would violate is the arbitrary principle that the æther frame cannot be detected, and the means of resolving this principle that the æther cannot be detected is the Lorentz Transformation, not the principle of relativity. It is the Lorentz Transformation which renders the laws of electrodynamics covariant, not the principle of relativity. The Einsteins simply confused their conclusion as an additional premise, which renders the two “postulates” redundant, or renders one postulate deducible from the other, and in no sense a postulate.

There is also a fallacy in the special theory of relativity of defining a violation of the principle of relativity in at least four different and distinct ways and then pretending that those different and distinct definitions are one definition. The principle of relativity is on the one hand defined as the invariance of the laws of nature in inertial frames of reference. It must be borne in mind that this principle of relativity treats of abstract idealizations and not physical reality and that inertial frames of reference do not exist in nature. This first principle is the principle of relativity of classical mechanics, which has the consequence of making it impossible to determine “absolute space” by means dynamic experiments.

Though many have averred that this principle is equivalent to, or the same as, the negative assertion that it is impossible to determine the frame of absolute space by means of the laws of mechanics, or more broadly, by any means; this consequence is not the principle itself, and it might be possible someday to determine a preferred reference frame of space (as is the case with general relativity, or the “fixed stars”) without setting aside the principle of relativity. We have identified the classical principle of relativity of mechanics, and a distinct and different consequence of that principle, which is also wrongfully called the principle of relativity.

There is a third distinct and different principle of relativity introduced by Henri Poincaré, which states that the laws of electrodynamics are covariant in inertial frames of reference. This principle depends upon the presupposition of Maxwell's laws of electrodynamics and the preferred reference frame of the æther, which provides an *a priori* basis for an inertial frame of reference and for the source independence of light speed. However, this third principle is not a logical necessity, and defines the identity of the laws of physics in a different way from the classical principle of relativity by means of a different system of velocity addition. According to the classical principle of relativity, the æther ought to be detectable, and it is only rendered undetectable by the Lorentz Transformation, not the principle of relativity.

The fourth distinct and different principle of relativity is the assertion that it is impossible to detect the frame of reference of the æther itself, which is an alleged consequence of the principle of relativity of electrodynamics, not that principle itself. The æther may have properties other than electrodynamic properties which renders its position detectable, and therefore one might be able to detect the frame of the æther without violating the principle of relativity of electrodynamics, as may be the case with "tachyons" or other such proposed phenomena.

The Einsteins, following Poincaré's example, deliberately confused logical consistency between these four different definitions, an artificial consistency obtained through the *ad hoc* Lorentz Transformation; with the assertion, which is false, that logical necessity requires that if one of these principle is true, then the other three must also be true. The only binding agent between these different definitions is the tacit presumption and arbitrary definition that the detection of light speed anisotropy would constitute, of necessity, the detection of an æther at absolute rest, which would, by abstract definition alone, constitute the detection of "absolute space", which, by abstraction definition alone, is in principle not detectable in either definition.

This is a straw man argument and a *non sequitur* in that one can detect the medium of a sound wave without violating the principle of relativity, and the "relativists" have falsely and artificially confused the detection of a light medium with a violation of the "principle of relativity" and the detection of "absolute space". In addition, the "relativists" have falsely assumed that the detection of a preferred frame of reference by any means violates both the principle of relativity of mechanics and the principle of relativity of electrodynamics.

There is complete logical consistency between the detection of light speed anisotropy in a frame of reference moving with respect to the æther, and the principle of relativity of mechanics; and the entirely artificial addition to the principle of relativity of mechanics of the assertion that the principle of relativity of electrodynamics forbids the detection of an æther frame is *ad hoc* and a straw man argument, which presupposes an æther at absolute rest and which cannot exist without the supposition of an an æther at absolute rest, and which depends upon the false assumption that the detection of absolute space violates the principle of relativity of mechanics. The principle of relativity of mechanics only states that the laws of mechanics are the same in all inertial reference frames, which is different from the assertion that "absolute space" is undetectable. If "absolute space" were

detected by a “resting æther” (a definition alone), this in and of itself would not be a violation of the principle of relativity of mechanics nor the principle of relativity of electrodynamics, though it would put an end to the metaphysical myth of “space-time”.

Mileva and Albert have wrongly confused the fact that the *ad hoc* Lorentz Transformation renders the undetectability of the æther frame logically consistent with the classical principle of relativity when it otherwise would not be, with Henri Poincaré’s irrational assertion that the principle of relativity demands of logical necessity that the light medium be undetectable; as if that artificially derived logical consistency were itself a logical necessity, when it is not—quite the contrary, without the *ad hoc* Lorentz Transformation the principle of relativity demands that the æther frame be detectable, or that light speed be source and observer speed dependent. All of these tacit presumptions in the special theory of relativity presume the existence of an æther at absolute rest, and not only has the special theory of relativity not rendered an æther at absolute rest superfluous, the entire theory depends upon the tacit premise of an æther at absolute rest, which is in “principle” undetectable by means of electrodynamics, though it is theoretically detectable by means of superluminal velocities, or other means.

There is a difference between arguing that a set of circumstances renders a physical entity undetectable, and arguing that a set of circumstances renders a physical entity superfluous, and the Einsteins, following Poincaré’s example, have deliberately and falsely confused undetectability with superfluosity, just as they have deliberately and falsely confused logical consistency with logical necessity. The so-called “principle” that the æther at absolute rest is undetectable is in fact a corollary to the tacitly presumed properties of that æther and incorporates the presumption of such an æther at “absolute rest” in the very definition. The “principle” is a deducible conclusion, not a fundamental premise. The fundamental premise is the existence of an æther at “absolute rest”—though even this assertion is deducible from more fundamental elements.

There is also a difference between the assertion that the *resting frame* of an æther arbitrarily defined as at “absolute rest” is *undetectable*, and the assertion that the *æther* as a light medium is *undetectable*. In all of our human observations of physical entities we depend upon our senses and our definitions, and our consciousness of an image is not the actual entity reflected in our images of the physical world. Our knowledge of the æther exists in, among other things, the presumption of the source speed independence of light speed. The *æther* is detectable in the special theory of relativity even though its presumed *resting frame of reference* remains undetectable by means of electrodynamic experiments.

In addition, the entire structure of the Lorentz Transformation is built upon the presumption of light speed anisotropy in moving frames of reference, which fact is revealed by the use of the scalar c^2 . The Einsteins’ assertion of the absolute velocity of light in the “resting system” as a given axiomatic fact is an acknowledgment that the “resting system” is an æther at absolute rest, and this is how the Einsteins’ define it in Part 1, Section 1 of their paper. If light speed were not anisotropic in moving frames of reference, the Lorentz Transformation would not work, because light speed

would not then be measured to be c in a moving frame of reference by observers relatively resting in that moving frame—moving with respect to the æther. This has been adequately proven by Guillaume, Jánossy and others.²²⁷¹ Prof. Friedwardt Winterberg wrote,

“According to Einstein, two clocks, A and B , are synchronized if

$$t_B = \frac{1}{2} (t_A^1 + t_A^2) \quad (\text{VII.13})$$

where t_A^1 is the time a light signal is emitted from A to B , reflected at B back to A , arriving at A at the time t_A^2 , and where it is assumed that the time t_B at which the reflection at B takes place is equal the arithmetic average of t_A^1 and t_A^2 . Only by making this assumption does the velocity of light turn out always to be isotropic and equal to c . From an absolute point of view, the following is rather true: If t_R is the absolute reflection time of the light signal at clock B , one has for the out and return journeys of the light signal from A to B and back to A , if measured by an observer in an absolute system at rest in the distinguished reference system:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(t_R - t_A^1) &= d/c_+, \\ \gamma(t_A^2 - t_R) &= d/c_- \end{aligned} \quad (\text{VII.14})$$

where d is the distance between both clocks, and where c_+ and c_- are given by

$$\begin{aligned} c_+ &= \sqrt{c^2 - v^2 \sin^2 \psi} - v \cos \psi \\ c_- &= \sqrt{c^2 - v^2 \sin^2 \psi} + v \cos \psi \end{aligned}$$

Adding the equations (VII.14) one obtains

$$c(t_A^2 - t_A^1) = 2\gamma d \sqrt{1 - (v^2/c^2) \sin^2 \psi} \quad (\text{VII.15})$$

If an observer at rest with the clock wants to measure the distance from A to B , he can measure the time it takes a light signal to go from A to B and back to A . If he assumes that the velocity of light is constant and isotropic in all inertial reference systems, including the one he is in, moving together with A and B with the absolute velocity v , this distance is

$$d' = (c/2)(t_A^2 - t_A^1) \quad (\text{VII.16})$$

and because of (VII.15)

$$d' = \gamma d \sqrt{1 - (v^2/c^2) \sin^2 \psi} \quad (\text{VII.17})$$

Comparing this result with,

$$l' = l \sqrt{1 - (v^2/c^2) \cos^2 \varphi} = \frac{l}{\gamma \sqrt{1 - (v^2/c^2) \sin^2 \psi}}$$

one sees that he would obtain the same distance d' , if he uses a contracted rod as a measuring stick, of Einstein's constant light velocity postulate. The velocity of light between A and B by using a rod to measure the distance and the time it takes a light signal in going from A to B and back to A , of course, will turn out to be equal to c , because according to (VII.16)

$$\frac{2d'}{t_A^2 - t_A^1} = c \quad (\text{VII.18})$$

Rather than using a reflected light signal to measure the distance d' , the observer at A may try to measure the one-way velocity of light by first synchronizing the clock B with A and then measure the time for a light signal to go from A to B . However, since this synchronization procedure also uses reflected light signals, the result is the same. For the velocity he finds

$$\frac{d}{t_B - t_A^1} = \frac{d'}{(1/2)(t_A^1 + t_A^2) - t_A^1} = \frac{2d'}{t_A^2 - t_A^1} = c \quad (\text{VII.19})$$

By subtracting the equations (VII.14) one finds that

$$t_R = t_B + (\gamma/c^2) v d \cos \psi \quad (\text{VII.20})$$

which shows that from an absolute point of view the 'true' reflection time t_R at clock B is only then equal to t_B if $v = 0$. From an absolute point of view the propagation of light is isotropic only in the distinguished reference system, but anisotropic in a reference system in absolute motion against the distinguished reference system. This anisotropy remains hidden due to the

impossibility to measure the one way velocity of light. This impossibility is expressed in the Lorentz transformations themselves, containing the scalar c^2 rather than the vector \underline{c} , through which an anisotropic light propagation would have to be expressed.²²⁷²

The expected anisotropy from which the transformation evolved exhibits itself in the predictions the theory makes for an interferometer constructed and calibrated in an inertial reference system K_0 without rigid attachments, but instead assembled with rockets or automobiles at each of the relevant surfaces, which after being adjusted are then simultaneously and uniformly accelerated with respect to K_0 then allowed to travel in inertial motion in inertial reference system K_1 , but which do not suffer a Lorentz contraction due to the lack of rigid attachments between them and the uniform manner in which they are accelerated. The special theory of relativity predicts a shift in the interference fringe pattern on the interferometer, which matches the exact result for which Michelson and Morley originally sought but did not find, and which prediction results from light speed anisotropy in at least one of the two inertial reference systems employed in the experiment.

Lajos Jánosy proved this argument,

“§7. Im vorigen Abschnitt haben wir gezeigt, wie man ein materiales Bezugssystem K_1 konstruieren kann, das eine vollkommene Galileische Transformation des Systems K_0 ist. Das System K_1 ist jedoch ein sehr unbequemes Bezugssystem. Wir finden nämlich, daß 1. das Licht sich in K_1 nicht isotrop ausbreitet, und 2. daß bewegte Uhren Phasenverschiebungen erleiden, auch wenn sie sehr langsam in K_1 bewegt werden; die Phasenverschiebung verschwindet auch im Grenzfall der verschwindenden Verschiebungsgeschwindigkeit nicht.

Wir zeigen zunächst, daß diese erwähnte, unbequeme Eigenschaft in K_1 tatsächlich auftritt.

1. Daß Licht sich in K_0 isotrop ausbreitet, kann durch den Michelson-Morley-Versuch gezeigt werden. Betrachten wir nun ein Interferometer in K_0 , das aus vier unzusammenhängenden Teilen besteht (s. Abb. 2 [Figure deleted]): Eine halbversilberte Platte P , zwei Spiegel M_1 and M_2 und ein Fernrohr T . Wenn wir das System drehen, so daß die relativen Entfernungen von M_1 , M_2 , P und T unverändert bleiben, dann wird auch das Streifensystem in T unverändert bleiben. Wenn wir nun die vier Teile des Systems unabhängig, aber gleichzeitig beschleunigen, dann bringen wir das Interferometer in des System K_1 . Diese Beschleunigung wird aber das Streifensystem, das man in T sieht, beeinflussen. Diese Beschleunigung würde in der Tat eine Streifenverschiebung hervorrufen, die in Lichtzeit

ausgedrückt folgenden Wert besitzt.

$$\Delta T = l \left(\frac{4}{c} - \frac{2}{\sqrt{c^2 - v^2}} - \frac{1}{c - v} - \frac{1}{c + v} \right) = -\frac{lv^2}{c^2} + \dots \quad (13)$$

Der obige Wert der Verschiebung ist nämlich genau der, den seinerzeit Michelson und Morley erwartet hatten, aber nicht fanden. Der Unterschied zwischen dem hier beschriebenen Experiment und dem wirklichen Michelson-Morley-Experiment ist nämlich der, daß das wirkliche Interferometer nicht aus unabhängigen Bestandteilen „zusammengesetzt“ ist, sondern ein festes System bildete. Wenn die Teile unseres gedachten Interferometers durch materielle Stäbe verbunden wären, dann würden die einzelnen Teile nach Vollzug der Beschleunigung durch die in den Stäben auftretenden, elastischen Kräfte verschoben werden. Wenn wir also den elastischen Kräften freies Spiel gewähren würden, dann würden sie das Interferometer im Vergleich zum System K_1 in einer solchen Weise verzerren, daß die Verzerrung die Phasenverschiebung (13) genau kompensieren würde.

Um dies ganz klar zu machen, betrachten wir schematisch ein Interferometer, dessen vier Bestandteile auf vier Autos montiert sind. Setzen wir nun voraus, daß diese Autos gleichzeitig in der in §6 beschriebenen Weise losfahren. (Wir setzen voraus, daß die Autos so glatt fahren, daß die Interferenzstreifen während der Fahrt bestehen bleiben.) Das Interferometer, das auf diese Weise in Bewegung gesetzt worden ist, wird sicher eine Phasenverschiebung zeigen. Wir haben in §6/1 darauf hingewiesen, daß elastische Bänder, die zwischen Autos gespannt sind, in Spannung geraten, wenn die Autos sich in Bewegung setzen, weil nämlich diese Bänder sich zusammensziehen versuchen, aber daran verhindert werden durch die Autos. Wenn wir jetzt die Autos sich einander soweit nähern lassen, daß die elastische Spannung aufhört, dann verschieben wir damit die Spiegel genau in der richtigen Weise, um die nach der Beschleunigung aufgetretene Phasenverschiebung rückgängig zu machen. Zusammenfassend sehen wir, daß die Lichtfortpflanzung in K_1 nicht der isotrop erfolgt. Dieses Resultat setzt natürlich voraus, daß wir mit der Methode der Konstruktion von K_1 , wie sie in §6 beschreiben wurde, einverstanden sind.“²²⁷³

Metaphysical four-dimensional expositions, which would obfuscate these facts with the obvious fiction of a false *ad hoc* fourth dimension, are not science and depend upon an imaginary dimension to perform the mutations of physical bodies which must have a physical basis if they in fact occur.

As Einstein, himself, avowed, “the real basis of the special relativity theory” is not the deduced conclusion of light speed invariance and the covariance of the laws of electrodynamics in Ludwig Lange’s “inertial systems”. As Albert Einstein later

admitted, the real set of *a priori* postulates is the *ad hoc* “Lorentz Transformation”, replete with its dreaded *ad hoc* hypotheses of length contraction and time dilatation. The Lorentz Transformation deduces all velocity comparisons, not just invariant light speed, which is a specific speed, and a derived unit,²²⁷⁴ not a general and fundamental geometry. Therefore, the Lorentz Transformation is more fundamental than light speed invariance and the principle of relativity.

In the modern metaphysical theory of special relativity first developed by Henri Poincaré through the use of his pseudo-Euclidean geometry, it is space-time which is fundamental, and which provides the basis to deduce the quadri-dimensionality of numerous non-physical quantities.²²⁷⁵ Space-time is not the principle of relativity, nor is it the principle of light speed invariance. Space-time is more fundamental than either and both are deducible from space-time. But it must be borne in mind that when speaking of space-time one is dealing in metaphysical quantities and qualities, not physical and measurable ones. In other words, one is pretending in lieu of a formulating a rational physical theory.

Later formulations of the special theory of relativity change the 1905 light postulate, from the Einsteins’ constant speed of light exclusively in the “resting system”, into the invariance of light speed in all of Lange’s inertial systems. But this renders the principle of relativity redundant to, or deducible from, the light “postulate”, and, therefore, not a “postulate”, *per se*, because the light “postulate” then asserts the identity of Lange’s inertial systems as light speed invariance, and the principle of relativity is already proven in the light “postulate”. On the other hand, if we pretend that the principle of relativity is the covariance of the laws of physics embracing Maxwell’s theory of the æther, given the “Lorentz Transformation” as a premise, then the second “postulate” is already incorporated in the first “postulate”.

If we are to assume that the Einsteins, in their 1905 paper, deduced, not induced, the Lorentz Transformation from invariant light speed; we would further have to fallaciously assume that empirically observed Lorentz Transformation metrics provoked the Einsteins to induce an unobserved invariant light speed and the unobserved symmetry of electrodynamic phenomena, as self-evident general truths induced *a posteriori* from empirically observed and reciprocally measured: length contraction, time dilatation, relative simultaneity and inertial relative motion between two systems devoid of any net force. Such is obviously not what happened, and such is not what is argued in the 1905 paper.

On the contrary, supposedly observed invariant light speed and the supposedly observed symmetry of electrodynamic phenomena led Voigt, FitzGerald and Larmor to scientifically induce, *a posteriori*, the general geometry of the (misnamed) “Lorentz Transformation”, which general set of hypotheses supposedly deduced all “known” phenomena in non-existent hypothetical “inertial systems”. The Einsteins pseudo-Metaphysics, their ontology of redundancy, simply disguised the more scientific, though likewise irrational, work of their predecessors, in a way which attempted to make it appear that the Einsteins had deduced that which must be induced, and had avoided hypotheses, which they had not avoided, but rather attempted to induce, through fallacies of *Petitio Principii*.

Most of the post-1905 statements of the special theory of relativity substitute a

completely different proposition for the “two postulates”. Einstein, himself, substituted one light theorem in 1907 for the “two postulates” of 1905:

“the ‘principle of the constancy of the velocity of light’ [***] for a system of coordinates in a definite state of motion [as opposed to solely in the ‘resting system’ as in 1905.]”²²⁷⁶

which presumes the Lorentz Transformation from which this supposed “postulate” is deduced, and which presumes the tacit hypotheses of an isotropic and homogenous absolute space²²⁷⁷ and “a definite state of motion” relative to that absolute space. This new light “postulate” represents, therefore, not a postulate, but a deduction, a theorem, and a phenomenon.

Einstein admitted in 1907 that this “postulate” could not be *a priori*, but must instead be *a posteriori*:

“That the supposition made here, which we want to call the ‘principle of the constancy of the velocity of light’, is actually met in Nature, is by no means self-evident, nevertheless, it is—at least for a system of coordinates in a definite state of motion—rendered probable through its verification, which Lorentz’ theory based upon an absolutely resting aether has ascertained through experiment.”²²⁷⁸

The so-called “postulates” are simply a restatement of supposed experimental facts, and are not postulates, but empirical facts generalized as “laws” and “theorems”. As Robert Daniel Carmichael stated:

“The experiments which we have described (and others related to them) are fundamental in the theory of relativity. The postulates in the next chapter are based on them. These postulates are in the nature of generalizations of the facts established by experiment. [***] In the next chapter we shall begin the systematic development of the theory of relativity. It will be seen that its fundamental postulates, or laws, are based on the experiments of which we have given a brief account and on others related to them. [***] The postulates, as we shall see, are simply generalizations of experimental facts; and, unless an experiment can be devised to show that these generalizations are not legitimate, it is natural and in accordance with the usual procedure in science to accept them as ‘laws of nature.’”²²⁷⁹

There is an obnoxious pun in Carmichael’s argument related to the use of the word “generalization”. The generalization expressed is that: what happens in experiment *A* must happen in experiment *B*, given like conditions; and *not* that the like results of experiments *A* and *B* are general principles, *per se*. The “laws of nature” incorporate general principles to deduce the generalized experimental results, and there is an absolute distinction between the general principles and the generalization of experimental results, which the general principles must deduce. Carmichael blurs

the distinction with a pun.

Hendrik Antoon Lorentz questioned Albert Einstein's "method" of pretending that induction is deduction:

"Einstein simply postulates what we have deduced, with some difficulty and not altogether satisfactorily, from the fundamental equations of the electromagnetic field. [***] I have not availed myself of his substitutions, only because the formulae are rather complicated and look somewhat artificial".²²⁸⁰

We soon discover in the introduction of the Einsteins' 1905 paper a clear statement of the fallacious objective of their entire paper:

"These two assumptions are sufficient in order to arrive at a simple and consistent electrodynamics of moving bodies, taking as a basis Maxwell's theory for resting bodies."

Is Maxwell's theory for resting bodies a third postulate? One of the "two assumptions", the first "postulate", is that the laws electrodynamics of moving bodies be consistent among systems of reference in uniform translatory motion with respect to the "resting system". Of course, the reasoning presented is circular, first assuming via the first "postulate" that the laws of electrodynamics are consistent, then arguing that this mandated consistency, as a premise, deduces consistency as a conclusion. It is the first of many circular arguments found in the Einsteins' 1905 paper. How are we to determine that which constitutes an "inertial system", other than circularly, as in: An inertial system is one in which there is no net force acting on the system; *i. e.* there is no net force acting on a system, when it is in inertial motion?

Maxwell's theory for resting bodies is Maxwell's theory of the medium, a privileged frame, the æther. However, the Einsteins alleged that the æther was "superfluous" to their theory. The Einsteins irrationally wrote with the same pen that the æther was superfluous, while assuming it and its laws and properties as a basis for "their" theory.

In the introduction to the 1905 paper, we are being primed to venture forth from Maxwell's theorems for bodies resting in the æther, so that we can return to them, *Petitio Principii*, as the covariant laws of moving bodies, while being asked to pretend that the æther is superfluous, so that we aren't too shocked when simultaneity is claimed to be relative, again, *Petitio Principii*, via an impossible light signal clock synchronization operation which is itself based on the unproven assumption of light speed invariance, or $c' = c$, which premise of light speed invariance is also the conclusion of the theory. The unproven conclusion is redundant to the unproven premise. The Lorentz Transformations are then plagiarized as if from nowhere to save the day and provide the proof which otherwise does not exist, and which begins from the true postulates of length contraction, time dilatation, relative simultaneity, inertial motion, the æther, etc.

For example, Albert Einstein stated in 1949:

“[T]he following postulate is [***] sufficient for a solution [***] *L[ight]-principle holds for all inertial systems* (application of the special principle of relativity to the L[ight]-principle) [***] With the help of the Lorentz transformations the special principle of relativity can be expressed thus: The laws of nature are invariant with respect to Lorentz-transformations”²²⁸¹.

Compare Albert Einstein’s later statement to Willem de Sitter’s statement of 1911:

“The principle of relativity can be enunciated as the postulate that the transformations, with respect to which the laws of nature shall be invariant, are ‘Lorentz-transformations.’”²²⁸²

Einstein, ever the plagiarist, stated in 1952:

“The whole content of the special theory of relativity is included in the postulate: The laws of Nature are invariant with respect to the Lorentz transformations.”²²⁸³

Einstein disclosed his *modus operandi* for manipulating credit for the synthetic scientific theories of others, when he stated in 1936:

“There is no inductive method which could lead to the fundamental concepts of physics. Failure to understand this fact constituted the basic philosophical error of so many investigators of the nineteenth century. [***] Logical thinking is necessarily deductive; it is based upon hypothetical concepts and axioms. How can we expect to choose the latter so that we might hope for a confirmation of the consequences derived from them? The most satisfactory situation is evidently to be found in cases where the new fundamental hypotheses are suggested by the world of experience itself.”²²⁸⁴

This is a clear statement by Einstein that he would have science deduce a thing from itself, taking the world of experience as a hypothesis, only to deduce the world of experience as an effect, of itself. Albert Einstein avowed that,

“[A]ll knowledge of reality starts from experience and ends in it. [***] [E]xperience is the alpha and omega of all our knowledge of reality.”²²⁸⁵

Of course, Mileva and Albert were forced to present the real hypotheses, which they stuck in the middle of their arguments by way of induction, or an attempt at induction, which analyses they attempted to disguise as deductions from *a priori* principles, but which “*a priori* principles” were well-known summations of physical

phenomena.

Einstein wanted people to believe that it is irrelevant that his predecessors induced the theories he later copied, because Einstein just invented them, *sua sponte*, irrationally, after he had read them, and therefore deserved credit for them. Einstein stated,

“Invention is not the product of logical thought, even though the final product is tied to a logical structure.”²²⁸⁶

Einstein stated, together with Infeld:

“Physical concepts are free creations of the human mind, and are not, however it may seem, uniquely determined by the external world.”²²⁸⁷

This was a philosophy they took over from Henri Poincaré.²²⁸⁸

Certainly, the two “postulates” of the theory of relativity were not, “free creations of the human mind,” but were, instead, summations of the empirical observations of the well-known phenomena of the day framed with the familiar concepts of the day. What Infeld and Einstein meant by “free” is difficult to fathom, and it is simply repetitive to say that creations of the mind are creations of the mind. Einstein’s vague notions are perhaps the result of his plagiarizing Newton, Mach, Pearson, and others, on the principle of logical economy and watering down what they had written with Einstein’s simplistic and naïve talk. If “free” is to mean unrestricted in any sense, no human mind is “free”. We are limited in our concepts, experience, and scope, and we are socialized, indoctrinated and inculcated into certain beliefs.

Despite Einstein’s assertions to the contrary, there is no mutual exclusion between being creative and being logical. A true scientist can create logical hypotheses through creative induction, even though Albert Einstein lacked the talent needed to do it for himself.

It is the Lorentz Transformation which is the product of creative inductive logic, with its hypotheses of length contraction, time dilatation and relative simultaneity, and which is the fundamental postulation of the special theory of relativity. Invariant light speed and the covariance of the laws of physics, were observed, not induced, and are deducible from the Lorentz Transformation, the laws of physics, and the definition of inertial motion, which are more fundamental in the special theory of relativity than invariant light speed. Speed must be composed of the more fundamental elements of distance and duration. Speed is a derived unit. Therefore, the synthesis of the special theory of relativity comes in deducing invariant light speed from the hypotheses of an isotropic and homogenous space, Maxwell’s theory of the medium, the theory of inertial motion, and the hypotheses of length contraction, time dilation and relative simultaneity. This is precisely the conclusion Einstein was obliged to admit in 1935:

“The special theory of relativity grew out of the Maxwell electromagnetic equations. So it came about that even in the derivation of the mechanical

concepts and their relations the consideration of those of the electromagnetic field has played an essential role. The question as to the independence of those relations is a natural one because the Lorentz transformation, the real basis of the special relativity theory[. . .]”²²⁸⁹

To argue, as the Einsteins did argue in 1905, that invariant light speed and the mandated identity of Lange’s inertial systems deduces invariant light speed and the mandated identity of Lange’s inertial systems, is to argue in fallacies of *Petitio Principii*, which is precisely what the Einsteins did do, in an attempt to hide their plagiarism of the induced hypotheses of Boscovich, Voigt, FitzGerald and Larmor.

9.5 The “Two Postulates”

The two postulates, are not in fact postulates, but are instead summations of well-known empirical facts; which are deducible from more fundamental principles, and even from each other. Henry August Rowland stated the two “postulates” on October 28th, 1899,

“And yet, however wonderful [the ether] may be, its laws are far more simple than those of matter. *Every wave in it, whatever its length or intensity, proceeds onwards in it according to well known laws, all with the same speed, unaltered in direction, from its source in electrified matter to the confines of the Universe, unimpaired in energy unless it is disturbed by the presence of matter.* However the waves may cross each other, each proceeds by itself without interference with the others. [***] *To detect something dependent on the relative motion of the ether and matter has been and is the great desire of physicists. But we always find that, with one possible exception, there is always some compensating feature which renders our efforts useless.* This one experiment is the aberration of light, but even here Stokes has shown that it may be explained in either of two ways: first, that the earth moves through the ether of space without disturbing it, and second, if it carries the ether with it by a kind of motion called irrotational. Even here, however, the amount of action probably depends upon relative motion of the luminous source to the recipient telescope. So the principle of Doppler depends also on this relative motion and is independent of the ether. The result of the experiments of Foucault on the passage of light through moving water can no longer be interpreted as due to the partial movement of the ether with the moving water, an inference due to imperfect theory alone. The experiment of Lodge, who attempted to set the ether in motion by a rapidly rotating disc, showed no such result. The experiment of Michelson to detect the ethereal wind, although carried to the extreme of accuracy, also failed to detect any relative motion of the matter and the ether [*Emphasis Added*].”²²⁹⁰

9.5.1 The “Principle of Relativity”

Boscovich wrote of length contraction, time dilatation, relative simultaneity, and the “Principle of Invariance” resulting from these long ago in the 1700’s.²²⁹¹ Stallo, Streintz, Everett and Lange stressed the principle of relativity. The term “principle of relativity” was not original to the Einsteins. It was, in fact, a common term long before they entered the scene. It was found in German in: Lange,²²⁹² Stallo,²²⁹³ Violle,²²⁹⁴ Poincaré,²²⁹⁵ and the German translation, with notes by Felix Hausdorff,²²⁹⁶ of Huyghens’ Seventeenth Century seminal paper on relativity theory, “Über die Bewegung der Körper durch den Stoss / Über die Centrifugalkraft”; all before 1905. The term also appeared in many other languages, and was used by many other authors prior to 1905. Poincaré frequently iterated his electrodynamics-based “principle of relativity” long before the Einsteins repeated the same principle. Rowland had expressed it by 1900 and Maxwell in 1872.

Though it was an ancient notion, Galileo Galilei made the principle of relativity of mechanics famous,

“When you have observed all these things carefully (though there is no doubt that when the ship is standing still everything must happen in this way), have the ship proceed with any speed you like, so long as the motion is uniform and not fluctuating this way and that. You will discover not the least change in all the effects named, nor could you tell from any of them whether the ship was moving or standing still.”²²⁹⁷

Boscovich argued in 1763 in the second supplement to his *Natural Philosophy*,

“§ II

Of Space & Time, as we know them

18. We have spoken, in the preceding Supplement, of Space & Time, as they are in themselves; it remains for us to say a few words on matters that pertain to them, in so far as they come within our knowledge. We can in no direct way obtain a knowledge through the senses of those real modes of existence, nor can we discern one of them from another. We do indeed perceive, by a difference of ideas excited in the mind by means of the senses, a determinate relation of distance & position, such as arises from any two local modes of existence; but the same idea may be produced by innumerable pairs of modes or real points of position; these induce the relations of equal distances & like positions, both amongst themselves & with regard to our organs, & to the rest of the circumjacent bodies. For, two points of matter, which anywhere have a given distance & position induced by some two modes of existence, may somewhere else on account of two other modes of existence have a relation of equal distance & like position, for instance if the distances exist parallel to one another. If those points, we, & all the circumjacent bodies change their real positions, & yet do so in such a manner that all the distances remain equal & parallel to what they were at the start, we shall get exactly the same ideas. Nay, we shall get the same ideas, if, while the magnitudes of the distances remain the same, all their directions are

turned through any the same angle, & thus make the same angles with one another as before. Even if all these distances were diminished, while the angles remained constant, & the ratio of the distances to one another also remained constant, but the forces did not change owing to that change of distance; then if the scale of forces is correctly altered, that is to say, that curved line, whose ordinates express the forces; then there would be no change in our ideas.

19. Hence it follows that, if the whole Universe within our sight were moved by a parallel motion in any direction, & at the same time rotated through any angle, we could never be aware of the motion or the rotation. Similarly, if the whole region containing the room in which we are, the plains & the hills, were simultaneously turned round by some approximately common motion of the Earth, we should not be aware of such a motion; for practically the same ideas would be excited in the mind. Moreover, it might be the case that the whole Universe within our sight should daily contract or expand, while the scale of forces contracted or expanded in the same ratio; if such a thing did happen, there would be no change of ideas in our mind, & so we should have no feeling that such a change was taking place.

20. When either objects external to us, or our organs change their modes of existence in such a way that that first equality or similitude does not remain constant, then indeed the ideas are altered, & there is a feeling of change; but the ideas are the same exactly, whether the external objects suffer the change, or our organs, or both of them unequally. In every case our ideas refer to the difference between the new state & the old, & not to the absolute change, which does not come within the scope of our senses. Thus, whether the stars move round the Earth, or the Earth & ourselves move in the opposite direction round them, the ideas are the same, & there is the same sensation. We can never perceive absolute changes; we can only perceive the difference from the former configuration that has arisen. Further, when there is nothing at hand to warn us as to the change of our organs, then indeed we shall count ourselves to have been unmoved, owing to a general prejudice for counting as nothing those things that are nothing in our mind; for we cannot know of this change, & we attribute the whole of the change to objects situated outside of ourselves. In such manner any one would be mistaken in thinking, when on board ship, that he himself was motionless, while the shore, the hills & even the sea were in motion.”²²⁹⁸

Newton stated, in the fifth corollary to his *Principia*,

“C o r o l l a r y V.

“The motions of bodies included in a given space are the same among themselves, whether that space is at rest, or moves uniformly forwards in a right line without any circular motion.

For the differences of the motions tending towards the same parts, and

the sums of those that tend towards contrary parts, are at first (by supposition) in both cases the same; and it is from those sums and differences that the collisions and impulses do arise with which the bodies mutually impinge one upon another. Wherefore (by Law 2.) the effects of those collisions will be equal in both cases; and therefore the mutual motions of the bodies among themselves in the one case will remain equal to the mutual motions of the bodies among themselves in the other. A clear proof of which we have from the experiment of a ship: where all motions happen after the same manner, whether the ship is at rest, or is carried uniformly forwards in a right line.”²²⁹⁹

J. D. Everett expressly stated the principle of relativity at least as early as 1883, in anticipation of Lange,

“We cannot even assert that there is any such thing as absolute rest, or that there is any difference between absolute rest and uniform straight movement of translation.”²³⁰⁰

and, in 1895, Everett asserted the principle of relativity as a negative assertion,

“[T]here is no test by which we can distinguish between absolute rest and uniform velocity of translation”.²³⁰¹

As Joseph Larmor noted in 1898, and as G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister clarified,²³⁰² James Clerk Maxwell stated the principle of relativity of electromagnetism in 1873 in his *Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism* §§ 600, 601,

“*On the Modification of the Equations of Electromotive Intensity when the Axes to which they are referred are moving in Space.*

600.] Let x', y', z' be the coordinates of a point referred to a system of rectangular axes moving in space, and let x, y, z be the coordinates of the same point referred to fixed axes.

Let the components of the velocity of the origin of the moving system be u, v, w and those of its angular velocity $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3$ referred to the fixed system of axes, and let us choose the fixed axes so as to coincide at the given instant with the moving ones, then the only quantities which will be different for the two systems of axes will be those differentiated with respect to the time. If $\frac{\delta x}{\delta t}$

denotes a component velocity at a point moving in rigid connexion with the moving axes, and $\frac{dx}{dt}$ and $\frac{dx'}{dt}$ those of any moving point, having the same instantaneous position, referred to the fixed and the moving axes respectively, then

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = \frac{\delta x}{\delta t} + \frac{dx'}{dt}, \quad (1)$$

with similar equations for the other components.

By the theory of the motion of a body of invariable form,

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \frac{\delta x}{\delta t} &= u + \omega_2 z - \omega_3 y, \\ \frac{\delta y}{\delta t} &= v + \omega_3 x - \omega_1 z, \\ \frac{\delta z}{\delta t} &= w + \omega_1 y - \omega_2 x. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2)$$

Since F is a component of a directed quantity parallel to x , if $\frac{dF'}{dt}$ be the value of $\frac{dF}{dt}$ referred to the moving axes, it may be shewn that

$$\frac{dF'}{dt} = \frac{dF}{dx} \frac{\delta x}{\delta t} + \frac{dF}{dy} \frac{\delta y}{\delta t} + \frac{dF}{dz} \frac{\delta z}{\delta t} + G \omega_3 - H \omega_2 + \frac{dF}{dt}. \quad (3)$$

Substituting for $\frac{dF}{dy}$ and $\frac{dF}{dz}$ their values as deduced from the equations (A) of magnetic induction, and remembering that, by (2),

$$\frac{d}{dx} \frac{\delta x}{\delta t} = 0, \quad \frac{d}{dx} \frac{\delta y}{\delta t} = \omega_3, \quad \frac{d}{dx} \frac{\delta z}{\delta t} = -\omega_2, \quad (4)$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dF'}{dt} &= \frac{dF}{dx} \frac{\delta x}{\delta t} + F \frac{d}{dx} \frac{\delta x}{\delta t} + \frac{dG}{dx} \frac{\delta y}{\delta t} + G \frac{d}{dx} \frac{\delta y}{\delta t} + \frac{dH}{dx} \frac{\delta z}{\delta t} + H \frac{d}{dx} \frac{\delta z}{\delta t} \\ &\quad - c \frac{\delta y}{\delta t} + b \frac{\delta z}{\delta t} + \frac{dF}{dt}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

If we now put

$$-\Psi' = F \frac{\delta x}{\delta t} + G \frac{\delta y}{\delta t} + H \frac{\delta z}{\delta t}, \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{dF'}{dt} = -\frac{d\Psi'}{dx} - c \frac{\delta y}{\delta t} + b \frac{\delta z}{\delta t} + \frac{dF}{dt}. \quad (7)$$

The equation for P , the component of the electromotive intensity parallel to x , is, by (B),

$$P = c \frac{dy}{dt} - b \frac{dz}{dt} - \frac{dF}{dt} - \frac{d\Psi}{dx}, \quad (8)$$

referred to the fixed axes. Substituting the values of the quantities as referred to the moving axes, we have

$$P' = c \frac{dy'}{dt} - b \frac{dz'}{dt} - \frac{dF'}{dt} - \frac{d(\Psi + \Psi')}{dx}, \quad (9)$$

for the value of P referred to the moving axes.

601.] It appears from this that the electromotive intensity is expressed by a formula of the same type, whether the motions of the conductors be referred to fixed axes or to axes moving in space, the only difference between the formulæ being that in the case of moving axes the electric potential Ψ must be changed into $\Psi + \Psi'$.

In all cases in which a current is produced in a conducting circuit, the electromotive force is the line-integral

$$E = \int \left(P \frac{dx}{ds} + Q \frac{dy}{ds} + R \frac{dz}{ds} \right) ds, \quad (10)$$

taken round the curve. The value of Ψ disappears from this integral, so that the introduction of Ψ' has no influence on its value. In all phenomena, therefore, relating to closed circuits and the currents in them, it is indifferent whether the axes to which we refer the system be at rest or in motion. See Art. 668."

Maxwell wrote in his *Matter and Motion*,

"18. ABSOLUTE SPACE

Absolute space is conceived as remaining always similar to itself and immovable. The arrangement of the parts of space can no more be altered than the order of the portions of time. To conceive them to move from their places is to conceive a place to move away from itself.

But as there is nothing to distinguish one portion of time from another except the different events which occur in them, so there is nothing to distinguish one part of space from another except its relation to the place of

material bodies. We cannot describe the time of an event except by reference to some other event, or the place of a body except by reference to some other body. All our knowledge, both of time and place, is essentially relative. When a man has acquired the habit of putting words together, without troubling himself to form the thoughts which ought to correspond to them, it is easy for him to frame an antithesis between this relative knowledge and a so-called absolute knowledge, and to point out our ignorance of the absolute position of a point as an instance of the limitation of our faculties. Anyone, however, who will try to imagine the state of a mind conscious of knowing the absolute position of a point will ever after be content with our relative knowledge.

[***]

102. RELATIVITY OF DYNAMICAL KNOWLEDGE

Our whole progress up to this point may be described as a gradual development of the doctrine of relativity of all physical phenomena. Position we must evidently acknowledge to be relative, for we cannot describe the position of a body in any terms which do not express relation. The ordinary language about motion and rest does not so completely exclude the notion of their being measured absolutely, but the reason of this is, that in our ordinary language we tacitly assume that the earth is at rest.

As our ideas of space and motion become clearer, we come to see how the whole body of dynamical doctrine hangs together in one consistent system.

Our primitive notion may have been that to know absolutely where we are, and in what direction we are going, are essential elements of our knowledge as conscious beings.

But this notion, though undoubtedly held by many wise men in ancient times, has been gradually dispelled from the minds of students of physics.

There are no landmarks in space; one portion of space is exactly like every other portion, so that we cannot tell where we are. We are, as it were, on an unruffled sea, without stars, compass, soundings, wind, or tide, and we cannot tell in what direction we are going. We have no log which we can cast out to take a dead reckoning by; we may compute our rate of motion with respect to the neighbouring bodies, but we do not know how these bodies may be moving in space.”

Poincaré stated the principle of relativity of electrodynamics in 1895,

“Experience reveals an abundance of facts, which can be summed up in the following formula: it is impossible to make manifest the absolute motion of matter, or, more correctly, the relative motion of ponderable matter with reference to the æther; the only thing which can be observed is the motion of ponderable matter with reference to ponderable matter.”

“L’expérience a révélé une foule de faits qui peuvent se résumer dans la

formule suivante: il est impossible de rendre manifeste le mouvement absolu de la matière, ou mieux le mouvement relatif de la matière pondérable par rapport à l'éther; tout ce qu'on peut mettre en évidence, c'est le mouvement de la matière pondérable par rapport à la matière pondérable."²³⁰³

In 1899, Poincaré declared the principle of relativity to be rigorously valid,

“This strange property would appear to be a veritable ‘*fudging factor*’ given by nature to prevent the detection of the absolute movement of the Earth by optical phenomena. I find that unsatisfactory, and I feel a duty to express my feelings: I look upon it as very probable that the optical phenomena depend only on the relative movements of the material source of light, related bodies or optical apparatus; and *then not only with the quantities close to the order of the square or the cube of aberration, but rigorously*. As the experiments become more exact, this principle will be checked with greater precision. [***] a well made theory should enable us to demonstrate the principle in one fell swoop in all its rigor.”

“Cette étrange propriété semblerait un véritable «*coup de pouce*» donné par la nature pour éviter que le mouvement absolu de la terre puisse être révélé par les phénomènes optiques. Cela ne saurait me satisfaire et je crois devoir dire ici mon sentiment: je regarde comme très probable que les phénomènes optiques ne dépendent que des mouvements relatifs des corps matériels en présence, sources lumineuses ou appareils optiques et *cela non pas aux quantités près de l'ordre du carré ou du cube de l'aberration, mais rigoureusement*. A mesure que les expériences deviendront plus exactes, ce principe sera vérifié avec plus de précision. [***] une théorie bien faite devrait permettre de démontrer le principe d'un seul coup dans toute sa rigueur.”²³⁰⁴

In 1900, Poincaré declared,

“I do not believe, in spite of Lorentz, that more exact observations will ever make evident anything else but the relative displacements of material bodies. [***] No; the same explanation must be found for the two cases, and everything tends to show that this explanation would serve equally well for the terms of the higher order, and that the mutual destruction of these terms will be rigorous and absolute.”²³⁰⁵

Poincaré reiterated the principle of relativity in 1902 in his book *La Science et l'Hypothèse*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1902); and we know from Solovine's accounts²³⁰⁶ that Einstein had read Poincaré's book,

“*The Principle of Relative Motion*.—Sometimes endeavours have been made to connect the law of acceleration with a more general principle. The

movement of any system whatever ought to obey the same laws, whether it is referred to fixed axes or to the movable axes which are implied in uniform motion in a straight line. This is the principle of relative motion; it is imposed upon us for two reasons: the commonest experiment confirms it; the consideration of the contrary hypothesis is singularly repugnant to the mind.”²³⁰⁷

Poincaré’s 1904 principle of relativity states, and we know from Solovine’s accounts²³⁰⁸ that Einstein had read this lecture, which was reprinted as Chapters 7 and 8 of Poincaré’s book *La Valeur de la Science*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1904),

“The principle of relativity, according to which the laws of physical phenomena should be the same, whether for an observer fixed, or for an observer carried along in a uniform movement of translation; so that we have not and could not have any means of discerning whether or not we are carried along in such a motion.”²³⁰⁹

Poincaré stated, in 1905, before the Einsteins,

“It appears at first sight that the aberration of light and other related optical phenomena would furnish us a means of determining the absolute motion of the earth, that is, its motion relative to ether rather than relative to the stars; there are no such phenomena. The experiments in which one takes account only of the first power of aberration have been unsuccessful, and one knows the reasons for that. But Michelson, having thought of an experiment in which one could measure effects depending on the second power of aberration, was equally unsuccessful. It appears that this impossibility of demonstrating the absolute motion of the earth is a general law of nature.”²³¹⁰

In 1908, Poincaré reaffirmed the principle of relativity,

“*The Principle of Relativity* [***] Whatever be the means employed there will never be disclosed anything but relative velocities; I mean the velocities of certain material bodies with reference to other material bodies. [***] We have seen above the reasons which impel us to regard the principle of relativity as a general law of nature.”²³¹¹

It was Lorentz, who properly phrased the *corollary of relativity* in 1904,

“It would be more satisfactory, if it were possible to show, by means of certain fundamental assumptions, and without neglecting terms of one order of magnitude or another, that many electromagnetic actions are entirely independent of the motion of the system.”

The Einsteins wrote, in 1905, without reference to previous authors,

“Examples of a similar kind, as well as the failed attempts to find a motion of the earth relative to the ‘light medium’, lead to the supposition, that the concept of absolute rest corresponds to no characteristic properties of the phenomena not just in mechanics, but also in electrodynamics, on the contrary, for all systems of coordinates, for which the equations of mechanics are valid, the same electrodynamic and optical laws are also valid, as has already been proven for the magnitudes of the first order.”

and,

“The laws according to which the states of physical systems change do not depend upon to which of two systems of coordinates, in uniform translatory motion relative to each other, this change of state is referred.”

9.5.2 The “Light Postulate”

The Einsteins asserted the “light postulate”, in 1905, without reference to previous authors,

“[L]ight in empty space always propagates with a determinate velocity c irrespective of the state of motion of the emitting body.”

“Every ray of light moves in the ‘resting’ system of coordinates with the determinate velocity c , irrespective of whether this ray of light is emitted from a resting or moving body. Such that

$$\text{velocity} = (\text{path of light}) / (\text{interval of time}) ,$$

where ‘interval of time’ is to be construed in the sense of the definition of § 1.”

The references in Lorentz’ and Poincaré’s works to this velocity are too numerous to repeat. In the Einsteins’ 1905 paper, this velocity is the absolute velocity of light in its medium, absolute space. Einstein stated in 1912,

“To fill this gap, I introduced the principle of the constancy of the velocity of light, which I borrowed from H. A. Lorentz’s theory of the stationary luminiferous ether, and which, like the principle of relativity, contains a physical assumption that seemed to be justified only by the relevant experiments (experiments by Fizeau, Rowland, etc.).”²³¹²

We know that Einstein believed in absolute space, the “reference frame of the vacuum”, the “resting system”,

“Then I tried to discuss the Fizeau experiment on the assumption that the

Lorentz equations for electrons should hold in the frame of reference of the moving body as well as in the frame of reference of the vacuum as originally discussed by Lorentz.”²³¹³

Lorentz pointed out in 1913,

“The latter is, by the way, up to a certain degree a quarrel over words: it makes no great difference, whether one speaks of the vacuum or of the æther.”

“Letzteres ist übrigens bis zu einem gewissen Grade ein Streit über Worte: es macht keinen großen Unterschied, ob man vom Vakuum oder vom Äther spricht.”²³¹⁴

Lorentz, who knew the Einsteins’ theory well, would not have alleged that it made no difference to speak of vacuum as opposed to æther, if Einstein had discounted absolute space, a “resting system” in which light propagates independently of the speed of the source. Both Sommerfeld and Pauli also recognized that the “resting system” of the Einsteins’ 1905 paper was simply another appellation for Lorentz’ æther, with absolute *celeritas* being an æther concept. Einstein described the light postulate as an æthereal idea to Peter A. Bucky.²³¹⁵ Pauli stated, regarding *celeritas* in absolute space, that,

“There is no question of a *universal* constancy of the velocity of light in vacuo, if only because it has the constant value c only in Galilean systems of reference. On the other hand its independence of the state of motion of the light source obtains equally in the general theory of relativity. It proves to be the true essence of the old æther point of view.”²³¹⁶

And Sommerfeld held it up as,

“The only valid remnant of the ether concept”²³¹⁷

We discover in “Part I” of the Einsteins’ 1905 paper, that the “resting system” of the light postulate signifies absolute space, the “reference frame of the vacuum” a. k. a. the “æther”, as Albrecht Fölsing has noted,

“To that end he proceeds from a ‘system at rest,’ the customary three-dimensional Euclidean space with Cartesian coordinates, in which the movement of a body is described by its coordinates as a function of time. This is so conventional that many readers must have asked themselves why it was even mentioned. [***] For the ‘system at rest’ for which these observations were initially made, it may be stated ‘in accordance with experience’—i. e., in line with Maxwell-Lorentz theory—that the velocity of light in a vacuum is a universal constant. [***] To be sure, Einstein is using

almost ‘prerelativist’ terminology by referring, throughout this section, to a system ‘at rest’ in which the rod, either at rest or in motion, is observed. While this formulation lets the background of Lorentzian theory—a motionless ether—shine through, it also leads to complications in which even an attentive reader can lose the thread.”²³¹⁸

Philipp Frank makes clear that Einstein effectively adopted Lorentz’ æther, and certainly adopted Lorentz’ light postulate of the “resting system”,

“This law [***] may be called the *relativity principle of mechanistic physics*. It is a deduction from the Newtonian laws of motion and deals only with relative motions and not, as Newton’s laws proper, with absolute motion. In this form it is a positive assertion, but it can also be formulated in a negative way, thus: It is impossible by means of experiments such as those described above to differentiate one inertial system from another. [***] Besides this ‘principle of relativity,’ Einstein needed a second principle dealing with the interaction of light and motion. He investigated the influence of the motion of the source of light on the velocity of light emitted by it. From the standpoint of the ether theory, it is self-evident that it makes no difference whether or not the source of light moves; light considered as mechanical vibration in the ether is propagated with a constant velocity with respect to the ether. [***] Dropping the ether theory of light, Einstein had to reformulate this law into a statement about observable facts. There is one system of reference, F (the fundamental system), with respect to which light is propagated with a specific speed, c . No matter with what velocity the light source moves with respect to the fundamental system (F), the light emitted is propagated with the same specific velocity (c) relative to F . This statement is usually called the ‘principal [*sic*] of the constancy of the speed of light.’”²³¹⁹

Immanuel Kant and Carl Neumann reawoke an interest in the Newtonian concept of absolute space, and Hobbes had suggested that the æther far from major bodies is quiescent—a belief that held sway among many at least as late as Lorentz, Larmor and Volkmann. Thomas Young argued that the æther rests.²³²⁰ Neumann argued that absolute space is definable through a body, which is taken to be at absolute rest, the so-called “body Alpha”. Fresnel²³²¹ proposed that the æther only participates in the motion of bodies to a limited degree and rests outside of ponderable bodies. Many like Larmor, Lorentz, Volkmann, Maxwell, Heaviside, Hertz, Volterra and Drude believed that Young and Fresnel’s resting æther signified Neumann’s “body Alpha”, an absolute space endowed with special properties, as opposed to an absolute space of true vacuum, and they used the same nomenclature of “resting system” and “moving system” which the Einsteins used without distinctions and to mean absolute space and motion relative to it.²³²² Michelson set out to find the relative motion of the Earth in the supposedly still sea of æther, but wrecked on the static shores of his interferometer.

The Einsteins again and again refer to a “Resting System” with “resting” rods, clocks and observers and an empirically observed absolute speed of light and an absolute time in the “resting system”; and they asserted $c \pm v$ in the “moving system”. The nomenclature of the day, which stemmed from Newton, Maxwell, Larmor and Lorentz, among many others, was clearly that the “resting system” was a system of coordinates at rest with respect to the fixed stars, and *not* any and all inertial systems. Einstein wrote to Mach on 25 June 1913, “relative to the fixed stars (‘Restsystem’),”²³²³ which confirms Frank’s analysis of Einstein’s thought process.

In 1911, Albert Einstein again confirmed that it was his essential belief that the “resting system” is Lorentz’ æther at rest with respect to itself and with respect to the “fixed stars”, as expressed ontologically as “absolute space”,

“[W]e will extract from Lorentz’s theory of the stationary luminiferous ether the following aspects most essential to us. What is the physical meaning of the statement that there exists a stationary luminiferous ether? The most important content of this hypothesis can be expressed as follows: There exists a reference system (called in Lorentz’s theory ‘a system at rest relative to the ether’) with respect to which every light ray propagates in a vacuum with the universal velocity c . This ought to hold independently of whether the light-emitting body is in motion or at rest.”²³²⁴

The detection of an æther frame in no sense violates the principle of relativity unless the æther is defined to be at absolute rest—whatever that “absolute rest” should ultimately be interpreted to mean.

Max Abraham wrote in 1904,

“The electromagnetic theory addresses the absolute motion of light, which light issues forth in every direction with the same velocity (c)”

“Die elektromagnetische Theorie spricht von einer absoluten Bewegung des Lichtes, die nach jeder Richtung hin mit derselben Geschwindigkeit (c) erfolgt”²³²⁵

The absolute velocity of light was stated numerous times in history, for example, as an observed empirical result, by Cassini and Roemer (ca. 1676) and Bradley (ca. 1729).

Maxwell created his theorem of the velocity of light as a dynamic process in its medium. W. Stanley Jevons wrote in the 1870’s,

“In a first subclass we may place the velocity of light or heat undulations, the numbers expressing the relation between the lengths of undulations, and the rapidity of the undulations, these numbers depending only on the properties of the ethereal medium, and being probably the same in all parts of the universe.”²³²⁶

Willem de Sitter stated in his famous paper of 1911,

“The principle of relativity can be enunciated as the postulate that the transformations, with respect to which the laws of nature shall be invariant, are ‘Lorentz-transformations.’”²³²⁷

Einstein, ever the plagiarist, stated in 1952:

“The whole content of the special theory of relativity is included in the postulate: The laws of Nature are invariant with respect to the Lorentz transformations.”²³²⁸

The Einsteins argued, in 1905, that the æther is “superfluous”, without reference to prior authors,

“The introduction of a ‘luminiferous ether’ will prove to be superfluous inasmuch as the view here to be developed will not require an ‘absolutely stationary space’ provided with special properties”.

Johann Heinrich Ziegler gave widely-discussed lectures in Switzerland, in which he sought to abolish the concept of the æther. Ziegler directly accused Einstein of plagiarism. Ziegler wrote, in 1902,

“Und doch ist diese Annahme nichts anderes als ein greifbarer Unsinn. Der den Raum oder die Stofflosigkeit überall erfüllende stofflose Stoff, genannt Weltäther, ist ein unbegreiflicher Begriff, und alle Lehren, welche auf ihm beruhen, sind genau ebenso unvollkommen und trügerisch, wie die Grundlage. Keine der Wellenbewegungen, die man jenem wesenlosen Ding andichtet, um die Fortpflanzung des Lichtes zu erklären, ist wirklich vorhanden. Es sind dies bloß mathematische Fiktionen, die ausschließlich in der Einbildung der Physiker vorhanden sind, gerade wie jener phantomhafte Stoff selbst, der bald dem bewegten Wasser, bald einem geschlagenen, gespannten Seil ähnliche Schwingungen ausführen soll.”²³²⁹

Lorentz stated in 1895,

“It does not suit my purpose to examine more thoroughly such speculations, or to express presumptions about the nature of the æther. I merely wish, as far as possible, to free myself of all preconceived notions regarding this substance and not to ascribe to it, for example, any of the qualities of ordinary liquids and gasses. Should it be shown, that a description of the phenomena is best arrived at through the assumption of absolute permeability, then one must surely in the meantime adopt this sort of hypothesis, and leave it to further research, if possible, to open up a deeper understanding to us.

It stands to reason, that there can be no question of the *absolute* rest of the æther; the phrase would not even have made sense. When I concisely state, the æther rests, it is only meant that one part of this medium does not displace the other, and that all perceptible motions of the heavenly bodies are relative motions in reference to the æther.”

“Es liegt nicht in meiner Absicht, auf derartige Speculationen näher einzugehen oder Vermuthungen über die Natur des Aethers auszusprechen. Ich wünsche nur, mich von vorgefassten Meinungen über diesen Stoff möglichst frei zu halten und demselben z. B. keine von den Eigenschaften der gewöhnlichen Flüssigkeiten und Gase zuzuschreiben. Sollte es sich ergeben, dass eine Darstellung der Erscheinungen am besten unter der Voraussetzung absoluter Durchdringlichkeit gelänge, dann müsste man sich zu einer solchen Annahme einstweilen schon verstehen und es der weiteren Forschung überlassen, uns, womöglich, ein tieferes Verständniss zu erschliessen.

Dass von *absoluter* Ruhe des Aethers nicht die Rede sein kann, versteht sich wohl von selbst; der Ausdruck würde sogar nicht einmal Sinn haben. Wenn ich der Kürze wegen sage, der Aether ruhe, so ist damit nur gemeint, dass sich der eine Theil dieses Mediums nicht gegen den anderen verschiebe und dass alle wahrnehmbaren Bewegungen der Himmelskörper relative Bewegungen in Bezug auf den Aether seien.”²³³⁰

Joseph Larmor wrote, in 1900,

“At the same time all that is known (or perhaps need be known) of the aether itself may be formulated as a scheme of differential equations defining the properties of a *continuum* in space, which it would be gratuitous to further explain by any complication of structure; though we can with great advantage employ our stock of ordinary dynamical concepts in describing the succession of different states thereby defined.”²³³¹

In 1900, Paul Drude stated,

“*The velocity of light in space* [***] independent of what is understood by a light vector. [***] The conception of an ether absolutely at rest is the most simple and the most natural,—at least if the ether is conceived to be not a substance but merely space endowed with certain physical properties.”²³³²

Poincaré asserted in 1900,

“Does our ether actually exist? We know the origin of our belief in the ether. If light takes several years to reach us from a distant star, it is no longer on the star, nor is it on the earth. It must be somewhere, and supported, so to speak, by some material agency.

The same idea may be expressed in a more mathematical and more abstract form.”²³³³

Maxwell stated,

“These are some of the already discovered properties of that which has often been called vacuum, or nothing at all. They enable us to resolve several kinds of action at a distance into actions between contiguous parts of a contiguous substance. Whether this resolution is of the nature of explication or complication, I must leave to the metaphysicians.”²³³⁴

Poincaré also asserted in 1889 that,

“Whether the ether exists or not matters little—let us leave that to the metaphysicians; what is essential for us is, that everything happens as if it existed, and that this hypothesis is found to be suitable for the explanation of phenomena. After all, have we any other reason for believing in the existence of material objects? That, too, is only a convenient hypothesis; only, it will never cease to be so, while some day, no doubt, the ether will be thrown aside as useless.”²³³⁵

Poincaré likened the æther to “Shinola”,

“What is meant by the ether? In France or in Germany, it is little more than a system of differential equations; provided that these equations are internally consistent and account for the observed facts, one won’t worry if the picture which they suggest is more or less strange or unprecedented. On the other hand, W. Thomson immediately tries to carve out the figure of a familiar substance which has a greater likeness to the æther, it appears that it is *scotch shoe wax*, which is to say, a very tough species of shoemaker’s wax.”

“Que dire de l’éther? En France ou en Allemagne, ce n’est guère qu’un système d’équations différentielles; pourvu que ces équations n’impliquent pas contradiction et rendent compte des faits observés, on ne s’inquiétera pas si l’image qu’elles suggèrent est plus ou moins étrange ou insolite. W. Thomson, au contraire, cherche tout de suite quelle est la matière connue qui ressemble le plus à l’éther; il paraît que c’est le *scotch shoe wax*, c’est-à-dire une espèce de poix très dure.”²³³⁶

Poincaré stated,

“[If the ether] is able to explain everything, this is because it does not enable us to foresee anything; it does not enable us to decide between the different possible hypotheses, since it explains everything beforehand. It therefore

becomes useless.”²³³⁷

In 1901, Cohn averred,

“Like Maxwell and Hertz we address a chemically and physically homogenous medium as an entity, which is also completely characterized at all points electromagnetically by the same value of some constants. This type of medium fills each element of our space; it is perhaps a certain ponderable substance, or it may also be the vacuum. In light of this, we will avoid continuing to speak of an ‘æther’.”

“Wie Maxwell und Hertz behandeln wir ein chemisch und physikalisch homogenes Medium als ein Gebilde, welches auch elektromagnetisch in allen Punkten durch die gleichen Werte einiger Constanten vollständig charakterisiert ist. *Ein* solches Medium erfüllt jedes Element unseres Raumes; es kann eine bestimmte ponderable Substanz oder auch das Vacuum sein. Daneben noch von einem „Aether“ zu sprechen, werden wir vermeiden.”²³³⁸

Faraday argued, in April of 1846,

“The point intended to be set forth for consideration of the hearers was, whether it was not possible that the vibrations which in a certain theory are assumed to account for radiation and radiant phenomena may not occur in the lines of force which connect particles, and consequently masses of matter together; a notion which as far as it is admitted, will dispense with the æther, which, in another view, is supposed to be the medium in which these vibrations take place.

You are aware of the speculation² which I some time since uttered respecting that view of the nature of matter which considers its ultimate atoms as centres of force, and not as so many little bodies surrounded by forces, the bodies being considered in the abstract as independent of the forces and capable of existing without them. In the latter view, these little particles have a definite form and a certain limited size; in the former view such is not the case, for that which represents size may be considered as extending to any distance to which the lines of force of the particle extend: the particle indeed is supposed to exist only by these forces, and where they are it is. The consideration of matter under this view gradually led me to look at the lines of force as being perhaps the seat of the vibrations of radiant phenomena.

[***]

The view which I am so bold as to put forth considers, therefore, radiation as a high species of vibration in the lines of force which are known

to connect particles and also masses of matter together. It endeavours to dismiss the æther, but not the vibration. The kind of vibration which, I believe, can alone account for the wonderful, varied, and beautiful phenomena of polarization, is not the same as that which occurs on the surface of disturbed water, or the waves of sound in gases or liquids, for the vibrations in these cases are direct, or to and from the centre of action, whereas the former are lateral. It seems to me, that the resultant of two or more lines of force is in an apt condition for that action which may be considered as equivalent to a *lateral* vibration; whereas a uniform medium, like the æther, does not appear apt, or more apt than air or water.

The occurrence of a change at one end of a line of force easily suggests a consequent change at the other. The propagation of light, and therefore probably of all radiant action, occupies *time*; and, that a vibration of the line of force should account for the phenomena of radiation, it is necessary that such vibration should occupy time also. I am not aware whether there are any data by which it has been, or could be ascertained whether such a power as gravitation acts without occupying time, or whether lines of force being already in existence, such a lateral disturbance of them at one end as I have suggested above, would require time, or must of necessity be felt instantly at the other end.

As to that condition of the lines of force which represents the assumed high elasticity of the æther, it cannot in this respect be deficient: the question here seems rather to be, whether the lines are sluggish enough in their action to render them equivalent to the æther in respect of the time known experimentally to be occupied in the transmission of radiant force.

The æther is assumed as pervading all bodies as well as space: in the view now set forth, it is the forces of the atomic centres which pervade (and make) all bodies, and also penetrate all space. As regards space, the difference is, that the æther presents successive parts or centres of action, and the present supposition only lines of action; as regards matter, the difference is, that the æther lies between the particles and so carries on the vibrations, whilst as respects the supposition, it is by the lines of force between the centres of the particles that the vibration is continued.”²³³⁹

Faraday’s ideas were very influential. William Kingdon Clifford speculated in the year of his death and of Einstein’s birth, 1879, that light may be naught but flickering “space”,

“In order to explain the phenomena of light, it is not necessary to assume anything more than a periodical oscillation between two states at any given point of space.”²³⁴⁰

Karl Pearson noted, as second editor and annotator of Clifford’s *The Common Sense of the Exact Sciences* in 1884-1885,

“The most notable physical quantities which vary with position and time are heat, light, and electro-magnetism. It is these that we ought peculiarly to consider when seeking for any physical changes, which may be due to changes in the curvature of space. If we suppose the boundary of any arbitrary figure in space to be distorted by the variation of space-curvature, there would, by analogy from one and two dimensions, be no change in the volume of the figure arising from such distortion. Further, if we *assume* as an axiom that space resists curvature with a resistance proportional to the change, we find that waves of ‘space-displacement’ are precisely similar to those of the elastic medium which we suppose to propagate light and heat. We also find that ‘space-twist’ is a quantity exactly corresponding to magnetic induction, and satisfying relations similar to those which hold for the magnetic field. It is a question whether physicists might not find it simpler to assume that space is capable of a varying curvature, and of a resistance to that variation, than to suppose the existence of a subtle medium pervading an invariable homaloidal space.”²³⁴¹

In 1934, Einstein repeated Clifford’s idea without an attribution, which idea appeared before Lorentz’ theory appeared,

“Then came H. A. Lorentz’s great discovery. All the phenomena of electromagnetism then known could be explained on the basis of two assumptions: that the ether is firmly fixed in space—that is to say, unable to move at all, and that electricity is firmly lodged in the mobile elementary particles. Today his discoveries may be expressed as follows: physical space and the ether are only different terms for the same thing; fields are physical states of space.”²³⁴²

9.6 Relative Simultaneity

The concept of relative simultaneity appears repeatedly in the Nineteenth Century as a French conception, inspired perhaps by Fizeau and Flammarion, furthered by Bergson in his *Time and Free Will, an Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness* and by Guyau and Fouillée in *Genèse de l’idée de Temps*, and brought to fruition in Poincaré’s *The Measurement of Time* of 1898, and *La Théorie de Lorentz at le Principe de Réaction* of 1900, and *Science and Hypothesis* of 1902, and his 1904 St. Louis lecture, *The Principles of Mathematical Physics*—all of which Albert Einstein is known to have read. However, it was the Croatian Jesuit Boscovich who had the profoundest, and prior, insight regarding relative simultaneity.²³⁴³

Einstein claimed that he arose from bed once and wondered if events were absolutely simultaneous.²³⁴⁴ Was Einstein reading Poincaré, who had already expressly written that events are not absolutely simultaneous, in bed, before Einstein fell asleep? We know that Einstein had read Poincaré’s work on relative simultaneity before allegedly dreaming about it. Einstein also told an Eureka-like story of his

enlightenment of the special theory of relativity—a story which is suspiciously similar to Archimedes’ story.²³⁴⁵ He was compelled to invent these childish fairy tales of his divine inspiration, as if they accounted for his “research”, because there is no record of his having developed the theory, while there is a substantial record of others having published it before him.

9.6.1 Isotropic Light Speed

The equating of light speed to length and time was placed in the consciousness of physicists by Roemer, whose calculations of light’s finite speed underpin the definition of simultaneity in modern physics. Fizeau defined space as isotropic with respect to light speed and assumed that:

$$c = (2AB) \div (t'_A - t_A),$$

where $c = celeritas$, the wave speed of light, AB is the length of the path of light from point A to point B , and $(t'_A - t_A)$ is the time interval of the round trip path of light moving from A to B and reflected back to A .

Fizeau thereby presented a new circular definition of time. Poincaré demonstrated that, since c was supposedly a universal constant between systems in relative motion to each other, this new circular definition of time rendered simultaneity relative and that the presumption of an isotropic light speed was the presumption of a measurement of time. Time was previously defined by the circular definition²³⁴⁶ of uniform motion supplied by Galileo, where equal *spaces* are defined to be traversed in equal *times*. It is interesting to note that Gotthold Ephraim Lessing contrasted painting, sculpture and poetry in terms of events and time.²³⁴⁷

9.6.2 The “Aarau Question”

James Clerk Maxwell inspired Albert Abraham Michelson’s experiments.²³⁴⁸ Maxwell wrote an article on “Ether” in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* in 1878 and published a thought experiment Einstein later repeated as if a novel idea,

“If we consider what is going on at different points in the axis of a beam of light at the same instant, we shall find that if the distance between the points is a multiple of a wave-length the same process is going on at the two points at the same instant, but if the distance is an odd multiple of half a wave-length the process going on at one point is the exact opposite of the process going on at the other.

Now, light is known to be propagated with a certain velocity ($3\cdot004 \times 10^{10}$ centimetres per second in vacuum, according to Cornu). If, therefore, we suppose a movable point to travel along the ray with this velocity, we shall find the same process going on at every point of the ray as the moving point reaches it. If, lastly, we consider a fixed point in the axis of the beam, we shall observe a rapid alternation of these opposite processes, the interval of time between similar processes being the time light takes to travel a wave-length.”²³⁴⁹

Einstein, late in life, told a story of his supposed fantasy in 1895 of traveling at light speed, the so-called “Aarau Question”. This story is used as an example of Einstein’s supposed independence from Lorentz.²³⁵⁰ It was one of Einstein’s many “Eureka!” stories. Einstein, however, began to study Lorentz in 1895, and his work in 1905 was not independent of Lorentz’, but instead did little more than reiterate it.²³⁵¹ Albert Einstein stated,

“After ten years of reflection such a principle resulted from a paradox upon which I had already hit at the age of sixteen: If I pursue a beam of light with the velocity c (velocity of light in a vacuum), I should observe such a beam of light as a spatially oscillatory electromagnetic field at rest. [***] One sees that in this paradox the germ of the special theory of relativity is already contained.”²³⁵²

However, this fantasy was the subject of the novel *Lumen*, which was popular among physicists of Einstein’s day,²³⁵³ and with which Einstein was intimately familiar long before he fabricated his “Eureka!” story. One might even say that Einstein was an expert on the story of *Lumen*. Mr. Tobinkin noted that Einstein was an avid reader of fiction,

“After such a period of concentration, Einstein often rests himself by reading fiction.”²³⁵⁴

Alexander Moszkowski recounted a conversation he had with Einstein, in which Einstein essentially agreed with Lenard’s objections to the general principle of relativity and Oskar Kraus’ objections to the special theory of relativity, which Einstein publicly condemned, and Moszkowski reveals that Einstein knew Flammarion’s story of *Lumen* very well before he fabricated the Aarau myth in an attempt to take credit for Lorentz’ theory,

“**A** CONVERSATION held during April 1920 destroyed an illusion which had become dear to me.

It concerned the fantastic figure, ‘Lumen,’ conceived as an actual human being, imagined as endowed with an extraordinary power of motion and keenness of sight. Mr. Lumen is supposed to be the invention of the astronomer Flammarion, who produced him in the retort of fancy, as Faust produced Homunculus, to use him to prove the possibility of very remarkable happenings, in particular, the reversal of Time.

Einstein declared outright ‘Firstly, Lumen is not due to Flammarion, who has derived him from other sources; and secondly, Lumen can in no way be used as a means of proving things.’

MOSZKOWSKI: ‘It is at least very interesting to operate with him. Lumen is supposed to have a velocity greater than that of light. Let us assume this as given, then the rest follows quite logically. If, for example, he leaves the earth on the day of a great event, such as the battle of Waterloo, and— May

I trace out this example, at the risk of tiring you?

EINSTEIN: Do repeat it, and act as if you were telling something entirely new. It is clear that the Lumen-story gives you great amusement, so please talk quite freely. But I cannot forgo the privilege of showing later how the whole adventure and its consequences must be demolished.

M.: Well then, the person, Lumen, sets off at the end of the battle of Waterloo to make an excursion into space with a speed of 250,000 miles per second. He thus catches up all the light-rays that left the field of battle and moved in his direction. After an hour he will already have attained a lead of about twenty minutes. This lead will be gradually increased, so that at the end of the second day he will no longer be seeing the end of the battle, but the beginning. What has Lumen been seeing in the meantime? Clearly he has been observing events happening in the reverse direction, as in the case of a cinematograph which is exhibiting pictures backwards. He saw the projectiles leaving the objects they had struck, and returning into the mouths of the cannon. He saw the dead come to life, arise, and arrange themselves into battalion order. He would thus arrive at an exactly opposite view of the passing of time, for what he observes is as much his experience as what we observe is ours. If he had seen all the battles of history and, in fact, all events happening in the reverse order, then in his mind 'before' and 'after' would be interchanged. That is, he would experience time backwards; what are causes to us would be effects to him, and our effects would be his causes; antecedents and consequents would change places, and he would arrive at a causality diametrically opposite to our own. He would be quite as justified in adopting his view of the happening of things, according to his experiences, and of the causal nexus as it appears to him, as we are justified in adopting ours.

EINSTEIN: And the whole story is mere humbug, absurd, and based on false premises, leading to entirely false conclusions.

M.: But it is only to be taken as an imaginary experiment that plays with fantastic impossibilities to direct our ideas on to the relativity of time by a striking illustration. Did not Henri Poincaré adduce this extreme example to discuss the 'reversal' of time?

EINSTEIN: You may rest assured that Poincaré, even if he used this example as an entertaining digression in his lectures, took the same view of Lumen as I do. It is not an imaginary experiment: it is a farce, or, to express it more bluntly, it is a mere swindle! These experiences and topsy-turvy perceptions have just as little to do with the relativity of time, such as it is taught by the new mechanics, as have the personal sensations of a man, to whom time seems long or short according as he experiences pain or pleasure, amusement or boredom. For, in this case, at least the subjective sensation is a reality, whereas Lumen cannot have reality because his existence is based on nonsense. Lumen is to have a speed greater than that of light. This is not only an impossible, but a foolish assumption, because the theory of relativity has shown that the velocity of light cannot be exceeded. However great the

accelerating force may be, and for however long it may act, it cannot cause this limit to be transcended. Lumen is supposed to be equipped with the organ of sight, that is, he is supposed to have a corporal existence. But the mass of a body becomes infinitely great when it reaches the velocity of light, so that it is quite absurd to go beyond this stage. It is admissible to operate with impossibilities in imagination, that is, with things that contradict our practical experience, but not with absolute nonsense. That is why the other adventure of Lumen, in which he jumps to the moon, is also an absurdity. In this, he is supposed to leap with a speed greater than light, and, when he reaches the moon, to turn round instantaneously, with the result that he sees himself jumping from the moon to the earth backwards! This jump is logically meaningless; and if we try to make deductions of an optical nature from such a nonsensical assumption, we deceive ourselves.

M.: Nevertheless, I should claim extenuating circumstances for this case on the ground that I am enlisting the help of the conception of impossibility. A journey even at a speed of only 1000 miles per second is impossible for a man or a homunculus.

EINSTEIN: Yes, according to our experience, if we measure it against facts. We cannot state definitely that a journey into the universe at an enormous yet limited velocity is absolutely impossible. Within the indicated bounds every play of thought that is argued correctly is allowable.

M.: Now, suppose that I strip Lumen of all bodily organs and take him as being a pure creature of thought, entirely without substance. A velocity greater than that of light can be imagined, even if it cannot be realized physically. If, for example, we think of a lighthouse with a revolving light, and consider a beam of light about 600 miles long, which rotates 200 times per second. Then we could represent to ourselves that the light at the circumference of this beam travels with a speed of nearly 760,000 miles per second.

EINSTEIN: As for that, I can give you a much better example of the same thing. We need only imagine that the earth is poised in space, motionless, and non-rotating. This is physically admissible. Then the most distant stars, as judged by us, would describe their paths with almost unlimited velocities. But this projects us right out of the world of reality into a pure fiction of thought, which, if followed to its conclusion, leads to the most degenerate form of imagination, namely, to pathological individualism. It is in these realms of thought that such perversities as the reversal of time and causality occur.

M.: Dreams, too, are confined to the individual. Reality constrains all human beings to exist in one and the same world, whereas, in dreams, each one has his own world with a different kind of causality. Nevertheless, dreams are a positive experience, and signify a reality for the dreamer. Even for waking reality it would be easy to construct cases in which the causal relationship is shattered. Suppose a person who has grown up in a confined retreat, such as Kaspar Hauser, looks in a mirror for the first time in his life.

As he knows nothing of the phenomena of optical reflexion, he sees in it a new, objective world that gives a shock to, or even subverts, his own idea of causality in so far as it may have become developed in him. Lumen sees himself jump backwards, whereas Kaspar Hauser sees himself performing gestures on the wrong side of his body; should it not be possible to draw a reasonable parallel between these two cases?

EINSTEIN: Quite impossible. However you set about it, your Lumen will inevitably come to grief on the conception of time. Time, denoted in physical expressions by the symbol 't,' may, indeed, be given a negative value in these equations so that an event may be calculated in the reverse direction. But then we are dealing with pure matters of calculation, and in this case we must not allow ourselves to be drawn into the erroneous belief that time itself may travel negatively that is, retrogressively. This is the root of the misapprehension: that what is allowable and indeed necessary in calculations is confused with what may be thought possible in Reality. [*Footnote:* Perhaps an analogy will serve to make this clear. Suppose that a certain quantity of some foodstuff is consumed by $\frac{1}{10}$ head of population. The false inference would be that a population is possible which has $\frac{1}{10}$ heads! In the same way the statistics may be quite correct in arriving at the figure $\frac{1}{5}$ suicides, but if we leave the realms of calculation, then the $\frac{1}{5}$ suicide loses its meaning entirely.] Whoever seeks to derive new knowledge from the excursions of a creature like Lumen into space, confuses the time of an experience with the time of the objective event; but the former can have a definite meaning only if it is founded on a proper causal relation of space and time. In the above imaginary experiment the order of the experiences in time is the reverse of that of the events. And as far as causality is concerned, it is a scientific conception that relates only to events ordered in space and time, and not to experiences. In brief, the experiments with Lumen are swindles.

M.: I must resign myself to giving up these illusions. I must frankly confess that I do so with a certain sadness, for such bold flights of constructive fancy exert a powerful attraction on me. At one time I was near outdoing Lumen by assuming a Super-Lumen, who was to traverse all worlds at once with infinite velocity. He would then be in a position to take a survey of the whole of universal history at a single glance. From the nearest star, Alpha Centauri, he would see the earth as it was four years ago; from the Pole Star, as it was forty years ago; and from the boundary of the Milky Way, as it was four thousand years ago. At the same moment he could choose a point of observation that would enable him to see the First Crusade, the Siege of Troy, the Flood, and also the events of the present day simultaneously.

EINSTEIN: And this flight of thought, which, by the way, has been indulged in repeatedly by others too, has much more sense in it than the

former one, because you may make an abstraction which disregards speed altogether. It is only a limiting case of reflection.”²³⁵⁵

Moszkowski had written in 1911,

“Am humansten verfährt eigentlich noch Henri Poincaré, und unter den Büchern mit sieben Siegeln, die er sonst zu schreiben pflegt, ist seine Schrift über „Die neue Mechanik“ noch das offenste. Anstatt von vornherein mit dem Geschütz unheimlicher Differentialgleichungen vorzurücken, vermenschlicht er die Aufgabe durch Einführung jenes Beobachters „Lumen“, der uns zuerst von Camille Flammarion vorgestellt worden ist. Mit diesem Lumen, „wie ich ihn sehe“ wollen wir uns zunächst ein wenig beschäftigen.”²³⁵⁶

and then proceeded to explore his view of the story’s relevance to the problem of relativity.

Contrary to hypothesis that Einstein only required thought experiments to deduce the theory of relativity and that his work was independent of Lorentz’, Einstein himself admitted in 1921,

“‘There has been a false opinion widely spread among the general public,’ [Einstein] said, ‘that the theory of relativity is to be taken as differing radically from the previous developments in physics from the time of Galileo and Newton—that it is violently opposed to their deductions. The contrary is true. Without the discoveries of every one of the great men of physics, those who laid down preceding laws, relativity would have been impossible to conceive and there would have been no basis for it. Psychologically, it is impossible to come to such a theory at once without the work which must be done before. The four men who laid the foundations of physics on which I have been able to construct my theory are Galileo, Newton, Maxwell, and Lorenz.’”²³⁵⁷

Moszkowski again wrote of his fascination with Lumen in 1916 and 1917.²³⁵⁸ As Moszkowski correctly pointed out, Poincaré not only knew Flammarion’s story of *Lumen*, he used it in his lectures. In Poincaré’s lecture on “chance”, which was, *in all probability*, the inspiration for Einstein’s statement that “God does not play dice,” Poincaré stated:

“So we have, then, the reverse of what we found in the preceding examples, great differences in the cause and small differences in the effect. Flammarion once imagined an observer moving away from the earth at a velocity greater than that of light. For him time would have its sign changed, history would be reversed, and Waterloo would come before Austerlitz. Well, for this observer effects and causes would be inverted, unstable equilibrium would no longer be the exception; on account of the universal

irreversibility, everything would seem to him to come out of a kind of chaos in unstable equilibrium, and the whole of nature would appear to him to be given up to chance. [***] But we have not come to the end of paradoxes. I recalled just above Flammarion's fiction of the man who travels faster than light, for whom time has its sign changed. I said that for him all phenomena would seem to be due to chance. This is true from a certain point of view, and yet, at any given moment, all these phenomena would not be distributed in conformity with the laws of chance, since they would be just as they are for us, who, seeing them unfolded harmoniously and not emerging from a primitive chaos, do not look upon them as governed by chance.

What does this mean? For Flammarion's imaginary Lumen, small causes seem to produce great effects; why, then, do things not happen as they do for us when we think we see great effects due to small causes? Is not the same reasoning applicable to his case?

Let us return to this reasoning. When small differences in the causes produce great differences in the effects, why are the effects distributed according to the laws of chance? Suppose a difference of an inch in the cause produces a difference of a mile in the effect. If I am to win in case the effect corresponds with a mile bearing an even number, my probability of winning will be $\frac{1}{2}$. Why is this? Because, in order that it should be so, the cause must correspond with an inch bearing an even number. Now, according to all appearance, the probability that the cause will vary between certain limits is proportional to the distance of those limits, provided that distance is very small. If this hypothesis be not admitted, there would no longer be any means of representing the probability by a continuous function.

Now what will happen when great causes produce small effects? This is the case in which we shall not attribute the phenomenon to chance, and in which Lumen, on the contrary, would attribute it to chance. A difference of a mile in the cause corresponds to a difference of an inch in the effect. Will the probability that the cause will be comprised between two limits n miles apart still be proportional to n ? We have no reason to suppose it, since this distance of n miles is great. But the probability that the effect will be comprised between two limits n inches apart will be precisely the same, and accordingly it will not be proportional to n , and that notwithstanding the fact that this distance of n inches is small. There is, then, no means of representing the law of probability of the effects by a continuous curve. I do not mean to say that the curve may not remain continuous in the *analytical* sense of the word. To *infinitely small* variations of the abscissa there will correspond infinitely small variations of the ordinate. But *practically* it would not be continuous, since to *very small* variations of the abscissa there would not correspond very small variations of the ordinate. It would become impossible to trace the curve with an ordinary pencil: that is what I mean.

What conclusion are we then to draw? Lumen has no right to say that the probability of the cause (that of *his* cause, which is our effect) must

necessarily be represented by a continuous function. But if that be so, why have we the right? It is because that state of unstable equilibrium that I spoke of just now as initial, is itself only the termination of a long anterior history. In the course of this history complex causes have been at work, and they have been at work for a long time. They have contributed to bring about the mixture of the elements, and they have tended to make everything uniform, at least in a small space. They have rounded off the corners, levelled the mountains, and filled up the valleys. However capricious and irregular the original curve they have been given, they have worked so much to regularize it that they will finally give us a continuous curve, and that is why we can quite confidently admit its continuity.

Lumen would not have the same reasons for drawing this conclusion. For him complex causes would not appear as agents of regularity and of levelling; on the contrary, they would only create differentiation and inequality. He would see a more and more varied world emerge from a sort of primitive chaos. The changes he would observe would be for him unforeseen and impossible to foresee. They would seem to him due to some caprice, but that caprice would not be at all the same as our chance, since it would not be amenable to any law, while our chance has its own laws. All these points would require a much longer development, which would help us perhaps to a better comprehension of the irreversibility of the universe.²³⁵⁹

The story of *Lumen*, written by the famous astronomer Camille Flammarion, is filled with the positivistic dogma Einstein would later promote throughout his career. It was first published many decades before Einstein claimed credit for the story, before Einstein was even born, and discusses not only travel at luminal and superluminal velocities, but the complete relativity of simultaneity, time and space, and the use of light speed as a measurement of relative distance, time and simultaneity.

As a small example from *Lumen*,

“{The magnifying power of time. [Notes in “{}” are margin notes found in the original.]} It is this: If you set out from the Earth at the moment that a flash of lightning bursts forth, and if you travelled for an hour or more with the light, you would see lightning as long as you continued to look at it. This fact is established by the foregoing principles. But if, instead of travelling *exactly* with the velocity of light, you were to travel with a little less velocity; note the observation that you might make. I will suppose that this voyage away from the Earth, during which you look at the lightning, lasts a minute. I will suppose also, that the lightning lasts a thousandth part of a second. You will continue to see the lightning during 60,000 times its duration. In our first supposition this voyage is identical with that of light. Light has occupied 60,000 tenths of seconds to go from the Earth to the point in space where you are. Your voyage and that of light have co-existed. Now if instead of flying with just the same velocity as light, you had flown a little less quickly, and

if you had employed a thousandth part of a second more to arrive at the same point, instead of always seeing *the same moment of the lightning*, you would have seen, successively, the different moments which consulted the total duration of the lightning, equal to 1000 parts of a second. In this whole minute you would have had time to see first the beginning of the flash of lightning, and could analyse the development of it, the successive phases of it, to the very end. You may imagine what strange discoveries one could make in the secret nature of lightning, increased 60,000 times in the order of its duration, what frightful battles you would have time to discover in the flames! what pandemonium! what unlucky atoms! what a world hidden by its volatile nature from the imperfect eyes of mortals!

{Vision of the analysing eye.}

If you could see by your imagination sufficiently, to separate and count the atoms which constitute the body of a man, that body would disappear before you, for it consists of thousands of millions of atoms in motion, and to the analysing eye it would be a nebula animated by the forces of gravitation. Did not Swedenborg imagine that the universe by which he was surrounded, seen as a whole, was in the form of an immense man? That was anthropomorphism. But there are analogies everywhere. What we know most certainly is, that things *are not* what they appear to be, either in space or in time. But let us return to the delayed flash of lightning.

When you travel with the velocity of light, you see constantly the scene which was in existence at the moment of your departure. If you were carried away for a year, at the same rate, you would have before your eyes the same event for that time. But if, in order to see more distinctly an event which would have taken only a few seconds, such as the fall of a mountain, an avalanche, or an earthquake, you were to delay, to see the commencement of the catastrophe (in slackening a little, your steps on those of light), you would see the progress of the catastrophe, its first moment, its second, and so on successively, in thus nearly following the light, you would only see the end after an hour of observation. The event would last for you an hour instead of a few seconds. You would see the rocks, or the stones suspended in the air, and could thus ascertain the mode of production of the phenomenon, and its incidental delays. Already your terrestrial scientific knowledge enables you to take instantaneous photographs of the successive aspects of rapid phenomena, such as lightning, a meteor, the waves of the sea, a volcanic eruption, the fall of a building, and to make them pass before you graduated in accordance with their effect on the retina. Similarly you can, on the contrary, photograph the pollen of a flower, through each stage of expansion to its completion in the fruit, or the development of a child from its birth to maturity, and project these phases upon a screen, depicting in a few seconds the life of a man, or a tree.²³⁶⁰

Somewhat similar stories to the story of *Lumen* are told by Comte Didier de Chousy, *Ignis*; Aaron Bernstein, *Naturwissenschaftliche Volksbücher*, (*confer*: F.

Gregory, “The Mysteries and Wonders of Natural Science: Bernstein’s *Naturwissenschaftliche Volksbücher* and the Adolescent Einstein”, in J. Stachel and D. Howard, Editors, *Einstein: The Formative Years 1879-1909*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2000), pp. 23-41); John Venn, “Our Control of Space and Time”, *Mind*, Volume 6, Number 21, (January, 1881), pp. 18-31; and Hudson Maxim, *confer*: “Hudson Maxim’s Anticipations of Einstein”, *Current Opinion*, Volume 71, (November, 1921), pp. 636-638. The story of Dr. Faustus of the 1500's, as translated into English by P. F. Gent in 1592, also tells of travel through the heavens at the speed of thought, presents a Copernican view of the solar system, anticipates satellite images of the weather, etc. The book of *Enoch* also contains somewhat similar stories, as do stories of Mohammed’s flight with the angel Gabriel.

Johann Christoph Friedrich von Schiller wrote, in the Eighteenth Century:

Die Große der Welt

Die der schaffende Geist einst aus dem Chaos schlug,
 Durch die schwebende Welt flieg’ ich des Windes Flug,
 Bis am Strande
 Ihrer Wogen ich lande,
 Anker werf’, wo kein Hauch mehr weht
 Und der Markstein der Schöpfung steht.
 Sterne sah ich bereits jugendlich auferstehn,
 Tausendjährigen Gangs durchs Firmament zu gehn,
 Sah sie spielen
 Nach den lockenden Zielen;
 Irrend suchte mein Blick umher,
 Sah die Räume schon—sternenleer.
 Anzufeuern den Flug weiter zum Reich des Nichts,
 Steur’ ich muthiger fort, nehme den Flug des Lichts,
 Neblicht trüber
 Himmel an mir vorüber,
 Weltsysteme, Fluthen im Bach,
 Strudeln dem Sonnenwandler nach.
 Sieh, den einsamen Pfad wandelt ein Pilger mir
 Rasch entgegen—»Halt an! Waller, was suchst du hier?«
 »»Zum Gestade
 Seiner Welt meine Pfade!
 Segle hin, wo kein Hauch mehr weht
 Und der Markstein der Schöpfung steht!««
 »Steh! du segelst umsonst—vor dir Unendlichkeit!«
 »»Steh! du segelst umsonst—Pilger, auch hinter mir!—
 Senke nieder,
 Adlergedank’, dein Gefieder!
 Kühne Seglerin, Phantasie,
 Wirf ein muthloses Anker hie.«««

9.6.3 Light Signals and Clock Synchronization

There is a common misconception enunciated in numerous histories, that Albert Einstein was the first person to propose the relativity of simultaneity. It is often alleged that the paper, “Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 17, (1905), pp. 891-921, at 892-895, contained the first proposal of a clock synchronization method employing observers and light signals. Given the absence of references in Einstein’s work, it has been further assumed by some that the revised thought-experiment regarding a midpoint and relative simultaneity, which appeared in Einstein’s 1916 work, “Die Relativität der Gleichzeitigkeit”, *Über die spezielle und die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie*, Chapter 9, Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, (1917), pp. 16-19, was also an original idea. The historic record proves otherwise. Einstein’s thought experiments related to the relativity of simultaneity were first stated by Henri Poincaré, Daniel F. Comstock and Robert Daniel Carmichael.

Of course, Einstein’s parroting of Poincaré’s ideas did not go completely unnoticed. Poincaré, who was a very gracious person—he even allegedly wrote an undeserving Einstein a recommendation,²³⁶¹ never mentioned Einstein in the context of the theory of relativity in a positive way. In 1922, Stjepan Mohorovičić acknowledged what Einstein did not,

“I must point out what is little known, that the French physicist H. Poincaré had already called attention to the fact that the Lorentz Transformations form a group, he had already shown in 1900 (therefore 5 years before Einstein) [*Footnote*: See the book, which is cited in note 22 {M. Abraham, *Theorie der Elektrizität*, Volume 2, Fourth Edition, Leipzig, Berlin, 1920}, S. 359. It appears that Poincaré did not mention Einstein even once in his lecture ‘*The New Mechanics*’ (Leipzig, Berlin, 1911) for this reason.], how one can set clocks by means of light signals to Lorentz’ local time. [***] Therefore we must understand the method of signaling (which, as we have stressed, H. Poincaré had already applied in 1900) only as an interpretation of Lorentz’ formulas.”

“Ich muß darauf hinweisen, was weniger bekannt ist, daß schon der französische Physiker H. Poincaré darauf aufmerksam gemacht hat, daß die Lorentzschen Transformationen eine Gruppe bilden; er hat schon 1900 (also 5 Jahre vor Einstein) gezeigt [*Footnote*: Siehe das Buch, welches in Anmerkung 22 zitiert ist {M. Abraham, *Theorie der Elektrizität*. II. Bd. 4. Aufl. Leipzig-Berlin 1920}, S. 359. Es scheint, daß deswegen Poincaré in seinem Vortrage »Die neue Mechanik« (Leipzig-Berlin 1911) Einstein nicht einmal erwähnt.], wie man die Uhren mittels der Lichtsignale auf die Lorentzsche Ortszeit richten kann. [***] [D]eswegen müssen wir die Methode der Signalisierung (welche — wie wir betont haben — schon H. Poincaré 1900 aufgebracht hat), nur als eine Interpretation der Lorentzschen Formeln auffassen²⁹).”²³⁶²

Stjepan Mohorovičić acknowledged Poincaré's priority for realizing that the Lorentz Transformations form a group. Mohorovičić cites Max Abraham's acknowledgment of Poincaré's priority for the clock synchronization method with light signals,²³⁶³ and asserts that Poincaré did not mention Einstein even once in his lecture *Die neue Mechanik* (*La mécanique nouvelle* = *The New Mechanics*),²³⁶⁴ because Einstein had plagiarized Poincaré's method of synchronizing clocks with light signals, which method is but an interpretation of Lorentz' "Ortszeit", and Einstein had plagiarized Poincaré's assertion of the group properties of the Lorentz Transformation.²³⁶⁵

Felix Klein had made similar statements in a private letter to Wolfgang Pauli on 8 March 1921, that Poincaré first recognized that the Lorentz Transformations form a group and that Poincaré felt an animosity towards Einstein, and this was the only explanation for the fact that Poincaré did not mention Einstein in Poincaré's Göttingen lecture on the new mechanics. Klein wrote,

“Es ist nun doch einmal so, daß Poincarés erste Note in den Comptes Rendus 140 vor Einstein liegt und er im Anschluß daran (in den Rendiconti di Palermo) zuerst zeigte, daß es sich bei Lorentz um eine *Gruppe* von Transformationen handele. Von da aus ein Gegensatz, der allein es verständlich macht, daß P[oincaré] 1911 in seinem Göttinger Vortrag „sur la nouvelle mécanique“ den Namen Einstein überhaupt nicht nennt.”²³⁶⁶

Poincaré's silence also caught the attention of Max Born, who stated,

“One of these series of lectures was given by Henri Poincare, April 22nd-28th 1909[.] The sixth lecture had the title ‘La mécanique nouvelle.’ It is a popular account of the theory of relativity without any formulae and with very few quotations. EINSTEIN and MINKOWSKI are not mentioned at all, only MICHELSON, ABRAHAM and LORENTZ. But the reasoning used by POINCARÉ was just that, which EINSTEIN introduced in his first paper of 1905, of which I shall speak presently. Does this mean that POINCARÉ knew all this before EINSTEIN? It is possible, but the strange thing is that this lecture definitely gives you the impression that he is recording LORENTZ' work.”²³⁶⁷

Arvid Reuterdaahl also was aware that Poincaré resented Einstein,

“Professor Henri Poincaré, the famous French physicist and mathematician, advisedly ignores the name of Einstein in his lectures on ‘Relativity’.”²³⁶⁸

And Johannes Riem reiterated the fact,

“Neben dieser Aufklärung durch die Presse ging dann eine wissenschaftliche Bekämpfung Einsteins, vor allem durch den Mathematiker und Ingenieur *Reuterdaahl* am St. Thomas College, der selbst schon *vor* Einstein über Relativität gearbeitet und Einstein zu einer öffentlichen Aussprache

aufgefordert hat, bei der dieser das Richterscheinen vorzog. Reuterdahl hat eine kleine leicht lesbare Broschüre im Journal seines College erscheinen lassen „Einstein und die neue Wissenschaft“. Hierin untersucht er physikalisch die Grundlagen der neuen Lehre. Er zeigt seinen Landsleuten, wie schon lange vor Einstein zahlreiche Gelehrte das Richtige der Relativitätstheorie gefunden und diesem als Quelle gedient haben, ohne daß dieser auf diese seine Vorgänger hinwiese, so daß es ganz falsch ist, die Relativitätstheorie immer auf Einstein zurückzuführen, wie dies meist geschieht. Es ist dies so wenig berechtigt, daß z. B. Poincaré in seinen Vorlesungen über Relativität Einstein überhaupt nicht erwähnt. Quellenmäßig wird dann von Reuterdahl gezeigt, wie bedeutende Gelehrte die Einsteinsche Fassung der Relativitätstheorie als falsch bekämpfen und ganz andere Ueberlegungen and die Stelle setzen, wie *Lenard, Gehrcke, Fricke, Mewes* es tun. Endlich untersucht er das Einsteinsche Gebäude selbst auf seine Zusammensetzung, seine Grundlagen und Haltbarkeit, und findet, daß es ein Spiel mit Worten und Begriffen ist, denen in der Physik nichts tatsächliches entspricht. Es wäre sehr lohnend, die kleine Schrift von 26 Seiten zu übersetzen.”²³⁶⁹

Charles Nordmann stated, in 1921,

“The only time of which we have any idea apart from all objects is the psychological time so luminously studied by M. Bergson: a time which has nothing except the name in common with the time of physicists, of science.

It is really to Henri Poincaré, the great Frenchman whose death has left a void that will never be filled, that we must accord the merit of having first proved, with the greatest lucidity and the most prudent audacity, that time and space, as we know them, can only be relative. A few quotations from his works will not be out of place. They will show that the credit for most of the things which are currently attributed to Einstein is, in reality, due to Poincaré. [***] I venture to sum up all this in a sentence which will at first sight seem a paradox: in the opinion of the Relativists it is the measuring rods which create space, the clocks which create time. All this was maintained by Poincaré and others long before the time of Einstein, and one does injustice to truth in ascribing the discovery to him.”²³⁷⁰

Wolfgang Pauli wrote, in 1921,

“The formal gaps left by Lorentz’s work were filled by Poincaré. He stated the relativity principle to be generally and rigourously valid. Since he, in common with the previously discussed authors, assumed Maxwell’s equations to hold for the vacuum, this amounted to the requirement that all laws of nature must be covariant with respect to the ‘Lorentz transformation’ [*Footnote: The terms ‘Lorentz transformation’ and ‘Lorentz group’ occurred for the first time in this paper by Poincaré.*]. The invariance of the transverse

dimensions during the motion is derived in a natural way from the postulate that the transformations which affect the transition from a stationary to a uniformly moving system must form a group which contains as a subgroup the ordinary displacements of the coordinate system. Poincaré further corrected Lorentz's formulae for the transformations of charge density and current and so derived the complete covariance of the field equations of electron theory. We shall discuss his treatment of the gravitational problem, and his use of the imaginary coordinate *ict*, at a later stage (see §§ 50 and 7)."²³⁷¹

In 1927, Hans Thirring wrote,

“H. Poincaré had already completely solved the problem of time several years before the appearance of Einstein's first work (1905). Beginning with an article in *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* which appeared in 1898 (later reprinted in his book ‘The Value of Science’ as a chapter on the concept of time), Poincaré settled the general problem of time from the physical standpoint and had already there referred to the fact that the principle of the constancy of the velocity of light serves as a basis for a definition of time. Poincaré, in his work ‘La Théorie de Lorentz et le Principe de Réaction’ (*Arch. Néerland.* (2) Vol. 5. 1900, Lorentz-Festschrift), then defined Lorentz' local time (Fig. 23) as time, which time is to be measured with clocks synchronized by light signals.”

“Die Klärung des Zeitproblems war schon mehrere Jahre vor dem Erscheinen von EINSTEINS grundlegender Arbeit (1905) durch H. POINCARÉ weitgehend vorbereitet worden. Dieser hatte zunächst in einem im Jahre 1898 in der *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* erschienenen (später als Kapitel über den Begriff der Zeit in seinem Buche „Der Wert der Wissenschaft“ abgedruckten) Artikel das allgemeine Zeitproblem vom physikalischen Standpunkt aus behandelt und hatte dort schon erwähnt, daß sich auf den Satz von der Konstanz der Lichtgeschwindigkeit eine Zeitdefinition gründen läßt. Er hat dann in einer Arbeit „La Théorie de LORENTZ et le principe de réaction“ (*Arch. Néerland.* (2) Bd. 5. 1900, Lorentz-Festschrift) die LORENTZsche Ortszeit (Ziff. 23) als die Zeit definiert, die durch mit Lichtsignalen synchronisierte Uhren gemessen wird.”²³⁷²

Herbert Spencer argued that time, space and simultaneity are purely relative, at least as early as the 1860's,

“§ 93. But now what are we to say about the pure relations of Co-existence, of Sequence, and of Difference; considered apart from amounts of Space, of Time, and of Contrast? Can we say that the relation of Co-existence, conceived simply as implying two terms that exist at the same time, but are not specified in their relative positions, has anything answering to it beyond

consciousness? Can we say that out of ourselves there is such a thing as Succession, corresponding to the conception we have of one thing coming after another, without reference to the time between them? And can we say that what we know as Difference, apart from any particular degree of it, has objective unlikeness as its cause?

The reply is that we cannot frame ideas of Co-existence, of Sequence, and of Difference, without there entering into them ideas of quantity. Though we have examined apart the compound relations of these orders, into which consciousness of quantity avowedly enters; and though, in above defining the simple relations of these orders, the avowed contemplation of quantity is excluded; yet, on looking closely into the matter, we find that a tacit recognition of quantity is always present. Co-existence cannot be thought of without some amount of space. Sequence cannot be thought of without some interval of time. Difference cannot be thought of without some degree of contrast. Hence what has been said above respecting these relations in their definitely-compound forms, applies to them under those forms which, by a fiction, we regard as simple. All the proofs of relativity that held where the conceived quantities were large, hold however small the conceived quantities become. And as the conceived quantities cannot disappear from consciousness without the relations themselves disappearing, it follows inevitably that the relativities hold of the relations themselves in their ultimate elements. We are thus forced to the conclusion that the relations of Co-existence, of Sequence, and of Difference, as we know them, do not obtain beyond consciousness.

Let us simplify the matter by reducing derivative relations to the fundamental relation; and we shall then see more clearly the truth of this apparently-incredible proposition.

Every particular relation of Co-existence involves a cognition of some difference in the positions of the things co-existing; resolvable, ultimately, into differences of relative position towards self. And differences of relative position can be known only through differences between the states of consciousness accompanying the disclosure of the positions. But while positions in Space, and co-existing objects occupying them, are known through relations of Difference between the feelings accompanying disclosure of them; they are known through relations of Likeness, in respect of their order of presentation. The relation of Co-existence, which is that out of which all Space-conceptions are built, is one in which neither term is first or last: the terms exhibit equality in their order—no difference in their order.

Phenomena occurring in succession, like those occurring simultaneously, are known as occupying different positions in consciousness. Intervals between them are distinguished by differences in the feelings that arise in passing over the intervals; and where the intervals are alike, they are so classed from the absence of such differences. But while the relations among phenomena in Time are known as such or such through conceptions of Difference and No-difference yielded by comparisons of them, they are

known as alike in this, that their terms are unequal in order of presentation—differ in their order.

Thus all Space-relations and Time-relations—all relations of Co-existence and Sequence, are known through relations of Difference and No-difference. Sequence is Difference of order; Co-existence is No-difference of order. Hence we have at last to deal with the relations of Difference and No-difference. And our entire consciousness being built up of feelings which present these relations, both in themselves and in the secondary feelings constituting consciousness of their order, the whole question of the relativity of relations among feelings is reducible to the question of the relativity of the relation of Difference. This is readily demonstrable.

The sole elements, and the indissoluble elements, of the relation are these:—A feeling of some kind; a feeling coming next to it, which, being distinguishable as another feeling, proves itself to be not homogeneous with the first; a feeling of shock, more or less decided, accompanying the transition. This shock, which arises from the difference of the two feelings, becomes the measure of that difference—constitutes by its occurrence the consciousness of a relation of difference, and by its degree the consciousness of the amount of difference. That is, the relation of Difference as present in consciousness is nothing more than a change in consciousness. How, then, can it resemble, or be in any way akin to, its source beyond consciousness? Here are two colours which we call unlike. As they exist objectively, the two colours are quite independent—there is nothing between them answering to the change which results in us from contemplating first one and then the other. Apart from our consciousness they are not linked as are the two feelings they produce in us. Their relation as we think it, being nothing else than a change of our state, cannot possibly be parallel to anything between them, when they have both remained unchanged.”²³⁷³

Poincaré later spoke in very similar terms to Spencer’s arguments.

Wilhelm Bölsche wrote, in 1896,

“Noch einmal aber selbst nach diesem zwingt uns die einfache Thatsachenreihe, die mit jener Spekulation durchaus nichts weiter zu thun hat, zu einer letzten, allerungeheuerlichsten Erweiterung des Zeithorizontes: wenn wir nämlich von der Erde als einem anfänglich selbstleuchtenden Stern zu den glühenden Gebilden des Weltraums, den Sonnen und Nebelflecken, übergehen. Die Fülle der Analogien ist so zwingend, daß wir es müssen. Ein eigentümliches Verhältnis kommt uns auf dieser äusersten Stufe entgegen. Durch eine seltsame Verkettung nämlich vermischte sich hier räumliche Entfernung mit exakten Zeitangaben. Die vermittelnde Bewegung, die unseren Sinnen die deutlichste Kunde giebt von der Existenz außerirdischer Weltkörper, das Licht, wird von selbst zum Meßapparat für gewisse Zeiträume in der Existenz jener Körper. Das Licht pflanzt sich im Raume fort mit einer Geschwindigkeit von 40,000 Meilen in der Sekunde. Nun handelt

es sich aber bei den Sonnen und Nebeln außerhalb der Erde um Entfernungen von dieser Erde selbst, in denen jene nicht allzu hohe Ziffer von 40,000 Meilen sehr oft und in immer steigendem Maße aufgeht. Die Sekunden, die der Lichtstrahl braucht, mehren sich entsprechend. Von der Sonne zu uns verbraucht der Strahl bereits 8 ganze Minuten und einige Sekunden (die 20 Millionen Meilen Entfernung des Sonnenballs vom Erdball), so daß die Lichtpost stets um diese Zeitspanne verspätet eintrifft; ein jähes Verlöschen der Sonne würde erst nach Ablauf 8 Minuten von uns bemerkt werden. Nun aber ist der wahrscheinlich nächste Fixstern, der Stern α im Sternbild des Centauren (vorausgesetzt, daß die in solchen Entfernungsbestimmungen noch außerordentlich schwankenden Resultate der Rechnung einigermaßen stimmen), schon einige Billionen Meilen von uns entfernt und sein Licht entsprechend erst nach mehreren Jahren bei uns. Vom Sirius kommt die Lichtpost bereits mit einer Verspätung von 14 Jahren, von Stern Capella (bei sehr unsicherer Berechnung) mit etwa 42 Jahren Rückstand. Der fernsten Lichtäußerung von der Grenze unseres Fixsternsystems glaubte Herschel wenigstens zweitausend Jahre zugeben zu müssen. Jenseits der gedrängten Fixsternmasse, der unsere Sonne noch angehört, tauchen aber im öderen Raum jene geheimnisvollen, vielgestaltigen Stoffmassen auf, die man Nebelflecke nennt und deren chemische Zusammensetzung die Spektralanalyse zum Teil erfolgreich zu ergründen begonnen hat. Die Entfernung wachsen hier ins Ungemessene; und mit den Entfernungen datiert sich im Banne jener Lichtstrahlverzögerung die Geschichte jener Gebilde ins gleichfalls Unermeßliche zurück: was wir heute gewahren, sind Vorgänge und Formen, die in Wahrheit wahrscheinlich lange vor dem Anfang menschlicher Kultur, vielleicht vor Beginn der ältesten geologischen Epochen, vielleicht gar vor der Entstehung oder Isolierung des ursprünglichen irdischen Glutballs existiert haben. Der Nebelflecke ist für unser Suchen bis jetzt kein Ende. Und so auch kein Ende dieser zeitlichen Verschiebung nach rückwärts. Auch hier wieder stoßen wir auf die Million, bloß daß sie uns noch sinnlich anschaulicher entgegentritt als in der Urgeschichte der Erde selbst — innig verknüpft mit der Gegenwart, mit der Sekunde, da das milde Licht irgend einer solchen einsam schwebenden Nebelinsel fernster Himmelszone nach unermeßlicher Wanderung anspruchslos, wie ein eben aufglimmendes irdisches Lichtwölkchen, in das kunstvolle Teleskop unserer Sternwarte fällt, um uns, nach Humboldts schönem Wort, vielleicht „das älteste sinnliche Zeugnis von dem Dasein der Materie“ zu übermitteln.²³⁷⁴

In 1874, Richard A. Proctor wrote,

“We learn by view of the heavens that twenty years ago Sirius was shining with such and such brightness; that a hundred years ago some other star was shining with its degree of luster, and so on; but the star depths are never revealed to us exactly as they are at the moment, or exactly as they were at

any moment. Yet this is merely due to the imperfection of our senses. We judge by the light of these objects, and this light travels at such and such a rate. It is conceivable that creatures might have a sense enabling them to judge by some other form of action, exerted by the stars, as for instance by the action of gravity. If gravity were the action thus effective, the information conveyed respecting the universe would be far more nearly contemporaneous, since the action of gravity certainly travels many times faster than light, even if it does not travel with infinite velocity as some philosophers suppose.”²³⁷⁵

This was a view that would later lead to lingering doubts about the special theory of relativity with respect to the speed of gravity²³⁷⁶ and with respect to “tachyons”. Rudolf Lämmel posed the critical question to Einstein in 1911 and Einstein responded,

“If gravitation were to propagate with a (universal) superluminal velocity, this would suffice to bring down the principle of relativity once and for all. If it propagated infinitely fast, this would provide us with a means to determine the absolute time.”²³⁷⁷

Poincaré returned to Proctor’s Sirius, seriously attacking the notions of absolute space, time and simultaneity. Poincaré wrote, and notice that he provides cause with an alibi for effect,

“[I]t is possible to say that a ray of light is also one of our instruments. [***] One event takes place on Earth, another on Sirius; how shall we know whether the first occurs before, at the same time, or after the second? This can be so only as the result of a convention. [***] In this new mechanics there is no effect which is transmitted instantaneously; the maximum speed of transmission is that of light. Under these conditions it can happen that event *A* (as a consequence of the mere consideration of space and time) could be neither the effect nor the cause of event *B* if the distance between the places where they take place is such that light cannot travel in sufficient time from place *B* to place *A* nor from place *A* to place *B*.”²³⁷⁸

James Thomson stated the principle of relativity and pointed out the difficulty of “ascertaining simultaneity of occurrences in distant places” in 1884, which difficulty we attempt to resolve with light signals,

“There is no distinction known to men, among states of existence of a body which can give reason for any one state being regarded as a state of absolute rest in space, and any other being regarded as a state of uniform rectilinear motion. Men have no means of knowing, nor even of imagining, any one length rather than any other, as being the distance between the place occupied by the centre of a ball at present, and the place that was occupied

by that centre at any past instant; nor of knowing or imagining any one direction, rather than any other, as being the direction of the straight line from the former place to the new place, if the ball is supposed to have been moving in space. The point of space that was occupied by the centre of the ball at any specified past moment is utterly lost to us as soon as that moment is past, or as soon as the centre has moved out of that point, having left no trace recognisable by us of its past place in the universe of space.

There is then an essential difficulty as to our forming a distinct conception either of rest or of rectilinear motion through unmarked space.

We have besides no preliminary knowledge of any principle of chronometry, and for this additional reason we are under an essential preliminary difficulty as to attaching any clear meaning to the words *uniform rectilinear motion* as commonly employed, the uniformity being that of equality of spaces passed over in equal times.

If two balls are altering their distance apart, we cannot suppose that they are both at rest. One, at least, must be in motion.

Men have very good means of knowing in some cases, and of imagining in other cases, the distance between the points of space simultaneously occupied by the centres of two balls; if, at least, we be content to waive the difficulty as to imperfection of our means of ascertaining or specifying, or clearly idealising, simultaneity at distant places. For this we do commonly use signals by sound, by light, by electricity, by connecting wires or bars, and by various other means. The time required in the transmission of the signal involves an imperfection in human powers of ascertaining simultaneity of occurrences in distant places. It seems, however, probably not to involve any difficulty of idealising or imagining the existence of simultaneity. Probably it may not be felt to involve any difficulty comparable to that of attempting to form a distinct notion of identity of place at successive times in unmarked space.”²³⁷⁹

In 1885 in a Mach-like argument, Edmund Montgomery set the stage for Poincaré’s notion of relative simultaneity,

“An unsophisticated mind would think it obvious beyond controversy that, in spite of the lapse in time of all our feelings, there consciously appears within our mental presence, ready-made and persistently enduring, an unmistakably extended universe with all its parts simultaneously subsisting. [***] But how to consolidate by memory or otherwise into simultaneous extension and actual presence successive moments of ever-fleeting time, irretrievably dwindled away into the past—this is a task which transcends all thinkable possibility. [***] Time has to be somehow metamorphosed into space, inwardness into outwardness. From a lapsing succession of sensations, forming a series of unextended feelings, the permanent and simultaneous expanse of the outer world has to be constructed.”²³⁸⁰

G. Windred gave a brief history of theories of time and space, “The History of Mathematical Time: II”, *Isis*, Volume 20, Number 1, (November, 1933), pp. 192-219; which highlights some of the important contributions of Challis, Herschel, Whewell, Shadworth H. Hodgson, Airy, and others, towards Poincaré’s notion of relative simultaneity. Windred quotes Hodgson’s statement, “Time has one dimension—length[,]”²³⁸¹ and quotes astronomers to show that they recognized the need to correctly position events relative to time, given that we depend upon signals with a finite speed to observe these events.

In 1887, Woldemar Voigt²³⁸² published the following relativistic transformation of space-time coordinates:

$$x' = x - vt, \quad y' = \frac{y}{\gamma}, \quad z' = \frac{z}{\gamma}, \quad t' = t - \frac{vx}{c^2}$$

$$\text{where } \gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}$$

Poincaré asserted that Lorentz’ (Voigt’s) “position time” was “time” and that simultaneity is relative, in 1898, and we know from Solovine’s accounts²³⁸³ that Einstein had read this paper, which was reprinted as Chapter 2 of Poincaré’s book *La Valeur de la Science*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1904); and which was referred to in Poincaré’s book *La Science et l’Hypothèse*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1902);

“XII

But let us pass to examples less artificial; to understand the definition implicitly supposed by the savants, let us watch them at work and look for the rules by which they investigate simultaneity.

I will take two simple examples, the measurement of the velocity of light and the determination of longitude.

When an astronomer tells me that some stellar phenomenon, which his telescope reveals to him at this moment, happened nevertheless fifty years ago, I seek his meaning, and to that end I shall ask him first how he knows it, that is, how he has measured the velocity of light.

He has begun by *supposing* that light has a constant velocity, and in particular that its velocity is the same in all directions. That is a postulate without which no measurement of this velocity could be attempted. This postulate could never be verified directly by experiment; it might be contradicted by it if the results of different measurements were not concordant. We should think ourselves fortunate that this contradiction has not happened and that the slight discordances which may happen can be readily explained.

The postulate, at all events, resembling the principle of sufficient reason, has been accepted by everybody; what I wish to emphasize is that it furnishes

us with a new rule for the investigation of simultaneity, entirely different from that which we have enunciated above.

This postulate assumed, let us see how the velocity of light has been measured. You know that Roemer used eclipses of the satellites of Jupiter, and sought how much the event fell behind its prediction. But how is this prediction made? It is by the aid of astronomic laws, for instance Newton's law.

Could not the observed facts be just as well explained if we attributed to the velocity of light a little different value from that adopted, and supposed Newton's law only approximate? Only this would lead to replacing Newton's law by another more complicated. So for the velocity of light a value is adopted, such that the astronomic laws compatible with this value may be as simple as possible. When navigators or geographers determine a longitude, they have to solve just the problem we are discussing; they must, without being at Paris, calculate Paris time. How do they accomplish it? They carry a chronometer set for Paris. The qualitative problem of simultaneity is made to depend upon the quantitative problem of the measurement of time. I need not take up the difficulties relative to this latter problem, since above I have emphasized them at length.

Or else they observe an astronomic phenomenon, such as an eclipse of the moon, and they suppose that this phenomenon is perceived simultaneously from all points of the earth. That is not altogether true, since the propagation of light is not instantaneous; if absolute exactitude were desired, there would be a correction to make according to a complicated rule.

Or else finally they use the telegraph. It is clear first that the reception of the signal at Berlin, for instance, is after the sending of this same signal from Paris. This is the rule of cause and effect analyzed above. But how much after? In general, the duration of the transmission is neglected and the two events are regarded as simultaneous. But, to be rigorous, a little correction would still have to be made by a complicated calculation; in practise it is not made, because it would be well within the errors of observation; its theoretic necessity is none the less from our point of view, which is that of a rigorous definition. From this discussion, I wish to emphasize two things: (1) The rules applied are exceedingly various. (2) It is difficult to separate the qualitative problem of simultaneity from the quantitative problem of the measurement of time; no matter whether a chronometer is used, or whether account must be taken of a velocity of transmission, as that of light, because such a velocity could not be measured without *measuring* a time.

XIII

To conclude: We have not a direct intuition of simultaneity, nor of the equality of two durations. If we think we have this intuition, this is an illusion. We replace it by the aid of certain rules which we apply almost always without taking count of them.

But what is the nature of these rules? No general rule, no rigorous rule;

a multitude of little rules applicable to each particular case.

These rules are not imposed upon us and we might amuse ourselves in inventing others; but they could not be cast aside without greatly complicating the enunciation of the laws of physics, mechanics and astronomy.

We therefore choose these rules, not because they are true, but because they are the most convenient, and we may recapitulate them as follows: ‘The simultaneity of two events, or the order of their succession, the equality of two durations, are to be so defined that the enunciation of the natural laws may be as simple as possible. In other words, all these rules, all these definitions are only the fruit of an unconscious opportunism.’²³⁸⁴

Circa 1899, Poincaré clarified the fact that he saw no distinction between “time” and “local time”,

“Allow me a couple of remarks regarding the new variable t' : it is what Lorentz calls *the local time*. At a given point t and t' will not defer but by a constant, t' will, therefore, always represent the time, but the origin of the times being different for the different points serves as justification for his designation.”

“Disons deux mots sur la nouvelle variable t' : c’est ce que Lorentz appelle *le temps locale*. En un point donné t et t' ne différeront que par une constante, t' représentera donc toujours le temps mais l’origine des temps étant différente aux différents points: cela justifie sa dénomination.”²³⁸⁵

In his article on “Ether” for the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Maxwell proposed thought experiments which may have inspired Poincaré’s definition of relative simultaneity,

“*Relative motion of the æther*.—We must therefore consider the æther within dense bodies as somewhat loosely connected with the dense bodies, and we have next to inquire whether, when these dense bodies are in motion through the great ocean of æther, they carry along with them the æther they contain, or whether the æther passes through them as the water of the sea passes through the meshes of a net when it is towed along by a boat. If it were possible to determine the velocity of light by observing the time it takes to travel between one station and another on the earth’s surface, we might, by comparing the observed velocities in opposite directions, determine the velocity of the æther with respect to these terrestrial stations. All methods, however, by which it is practicable to determine the velocity of light from terrestrial experiments depend on the measurement of the time required for the double journey from one station to the other and back again, and the increase of this time on account of a relative velocity of the æther equal to

that of the earth in its orbit would be only about one hundred millionth part of the whole time of transmission, and would therefore be quite insensible.”²³⁸⁶

In 1900, Poincaré stated,

“In order for the compensation to occur, the phenomena must correspond, not to the true time t , but to some determined *local time* t' defined in the following way.

I suppose that observers located at different points synchronize their watches with the aid of light signals; which they attempt to adjust to the time of the transmission of these signals, but these observers are unaware of their movement of translation and they consequently believe that the signals travel at the same speed in both directions, they restrict themselves to crossing the observations, sending a signal from A to B , then another from B to A . The local time t' is the time determined by watches synchronized in this manner.

If in such a case $V = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K_0}}$ is the speed of light, and v the translation of the Earth, that I imagine to be parallel to the positive x axis, one will have:

$$t' = t - \frac{vx}{V^2}.”$$

“Pour que la compensation se fasse, il faut rapporter les phénomènes, non pas au temps vrai t , mais à un certain *temps local* t' défini de la façon suivante.

Je suppose que des observateurs placés en différents points, règlent leurs montres à l'aide de signaux lumineux; qu'ils cherchent à corriger ces signaux du temps de la transmission, mais qu'ignorant le mouvement de translation dont ils sont animés et croyant par conséquent que les signaux se transmettent également vite dans les deux sens, ils se bornent à croiser les observations, en envoyant un signal de A en B , puis un autre de B en A . Le temps local t' est le temps marqué par les montres ainsi réglées.

Si alors $V = \frac{1}{\sqrt{K_0}}$ est la vitesse de la lumière, et v la translation de la

Terre que je suppose parallèle à l'axe des x positifs, on aura:

$$t' = t - \frac{vx}{V^2}.”²³⁸⁷$$

We know that Einstein had read this paper.²³⁸⁸

In 1902 in his book *La Science et l'Hypothèse*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1902); Poincaré asserted, and we know, from Solovine's accounts,²³⁸⁹ that Einstein had read this work of Poincaré's,

“1. There is no absolute space, and we only conceive of relative motion; and yet in most cases mechanical facts are enunciated as if there is an absolute space to which they can be referred.

2. There is no absolute time. When we say that two periods are equal, the statement has no meaning, and can only acquire a meaning by a convention.

3. Not only have we no direct intuition of the equality of two periods, but we have not even direct intuition of the simultaneity of two events occurring in two different places. I have explained this in an article entitled ‘Mesure du Temps.’ [Footnote: *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, t. vi., pp. 1-13, January, 1898.]”²³⁹⁰

Philipp Frank stressed the influence Poincaré had on Einstein.²³⁹¹ Einstein once stated,

“The reading of Hume, along with Poincaré and Mach, had some influence on my development.”²³⁹²

In Lisbeth and Ferdinand Lindemann’s German translation; *Wissenschaft und Hypothese*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1904), pp. 286-289; of Poincaré’s 1902 work, *La Science et l’Hypothèse*; the Lindemanns included the following notation:

“43) S. 92. In der citierten Abhandlung [“la Mesure du temps”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, t. VI, p. 1-13 (janvier 1898).] kommt P o i n c a r é zu folgenden Schlüssen:

„Wir haben keine direkte Anschauung von der Gleichzeitigkeit zweier Zeitdauern, ebensowenig von der Gleichheit. — Wir behelfen uns mit gewissen Regeln, die wir beständig anwenden, ohne uns davon Rechenschaft zu geben. — Es handelt sich dabei um eine Menge kleiner Regeln, die jedem einzelnen Falle angepaßt sind, nicht um eine allgemeine und strenge Regel. — Man könnte dieselben auch durch andere ersetzen, aber man würde dadurch das Aussprechen der Gesetze in der Physik, Mechanik und Astronomie außerordentlich umständlich machen. — Wir wählen also diese Regeln nicht, weil sie wahr, sondern weil sie bequem sind, und wir können sie in folgendem Satze zusammenfassen: Die Gleichzeitigkeit zweier Ereignisse oder die Ordnung ihrer Aufeinanderfolge und die Gleichheit zweier Zeitdauern müssen so definiert werden, daß der Ausspruch der Naturgesetze möglichst einfach wird; mit anderen Worten: Alle diese Regeln und Definitionen sind nur die Frucht eines unbewußten Opportunismus.“

N e w t o n (dessen Anschauung man z. B. bei M a c h reproduziert findet: *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwicklung*, 2. Anfl., Leipzig 1889, S. 207) setzte die Existenz einer „absoluten Zeit“ voraus; d’A l e m b e r t , L o c k e u. a. hoben den relativen Charakter aller Zeitmaße hervor; vgl. die historischen Angaben bei A . V o ß in dem Artikel über die Prinzipien der rationellen Mechanik (*Enzyklopädie der math. Wissenschaften*, IV, 1). Nach d e T i l l y s Angabe (*Sur divers points de la philosophie des sciences*

mathématiques; Classe des sciences de l'Académie R. de Belgique, 1901) definiert z. B. L o b a t s c h e w s k y die Zeit als eine „Bewegung, welche geeignet ist, die anderen Bewegungen zu messen“. Auch eine solche Definition setzt voraus, daß es e i n e Bewegung gibt, die zum Messen der (also aller) anderen Bewegungen geeignet ist; und wann ist eine Bewegung „geeignet“, als Maß anderer zu dienen? Vielleicht kann die folgende analytische Erörterung hier zur Klärung beitragen.

Wir betrachten z. B. das Fallgesetz eines schweren Punktes auf der Erdoberfläche; dasselbe ist bekanntlich durch die Differentialgleichung:

$$(1) \quad \frac{d^2 z}{dt^2} = -g$$

vollständig dargestellt, wenn z eine vertikal nach oben gemessene Koordinate, t die Zeit, g die Beschleunigung der Schwere bedeutet. Führen wir nun ein anderes Zeitmaß τ ein, so wird τ eine Funktion von t sein:

$$\tau = \varphi(t), \quad t = \Phi(\tau),$$

und die Gleichung (1) nimmt, wenn wir τ einführen, folgende Gestalt an:

$$(2) \quad \left[\frac{1}{\Phi'(\tau)} \right]^2 \left(\frac{d^2 z}{d\tau^2} - \frac{dz}{d\tau} \Phi''(\tau) \right) = -g,$$

wo Φ' und Φ'' den ersten und zweiten Differentialquotienten der Funktion $\Phi(\tau)$ nach τ bezeichnen. Die einfache Form der Gleichung (1) beruht also wesentlich auf der Wahl eines für die Gesetze des Falles „geeigneten“ Zeitmaßes; jede andere Art der Zeitmessung würde zu wesentlich komplizierterem Ansätze führen; dadurch ist die Zeit t vor der Zeit τ ausgezeichnet. Dieses Zeitmaß wird praktisch durch eine Uhr, etwa eine Pendeluhr, gegeben; die Bewegung des Pendels wird selbst wieder durch die Fallgesetze bedingt; wir messen also in (1) eine Fallerscheinung durch eine andere Fallerscheinung, und deshalb ist die Einfachheit des Resultates nicht auffällig. Anders ist es, wenn wir eine durch eine Feder getriebene Uhr anwenden; hier ist es eine nicht selbstverständliche Tatsache, daß das Zeitmaß für das Ablaufen der Feder zur Beobachtung des freien Falles geeignet ist; immerhin wird der richtige und gleichmäßige Gang der Federuhr nur durch Vergleichung mit einer Pendeluhr reguliert, und dadurch wird dieses Zeitmaß auf das vorhergehende reduziert. Auf die gewählte Zeiteinheit, die der Rotation der Erde um ihre Achse entlehnt ist, kommt es hierbei nicht an; wir bestimmen allerdings die Länge des Sekundenpendels nach dieser Einheit, könnten aber auch mit gleichem Erfolge umgekehrt eine beliebig gewählte Pendellänge zur Definition der Einheit verwenden. Anders

ist es, wenn man zu kosmischen Problemen übergeht. Die Bewegung eines Planeten (x, y) um die im Anfangspunkte stehende Sonne mit der Masse m' wird durch die Gleichungen

$$(3) \quad \frac{d^2 x}{dt^2} = -\frac{m'x}{r^3}, \quad \frac{d^2 y}{dt^2} = -\frac{m'y}{r^3}$$

definiert, welche das Newtonische Gravitationsgesetz darstellen ($r = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$). Erfahrungsmäßig genügt auch hier dasselbe Zeitmaß, das beim freien Falle eingeführt wurde; denn alle aus den Gleichungen (3) zu ziehenden Folgerungen stimmen (auch wenn man die Störungen der anderen Planeten berücksichtigt) hinreichend mit den Beobachtungen überein, so daß man keine Veranlassung hat, eine andere Zeit τ einzuführen und die obige Transformation anzuwenden. Analog verhält es sich mit allen bekannten Erscheinungen; es genügt immer, die Komponenten der Beschleunigung durch die Ausdrücke $\frac{d^2 x}{dt^2}$, $\frac{d^2 y}{dt^2}$, $\frac{d^2 z}{dt^2}$ zu messen, und es ist überflüssig, die allgemeineren Ausdrücke

$$\left(\frac{d^2 x}{d\tau^2} - \frac{dx}{d\tau} \Phi''(\tau) \right) \frac{1}{\Phi'(\tau)^2}, \text{ etc.}$$

statt dessen einzuführen. In diesem Sinne kann man erfahrungsmäßig von einer absoluten Zeit sprechen, d. h. einer Zeit, die zur Beschreibung aller bisher beobachteten Erscheinungen gleichmäßig bequem ist, allerdings mit dem Vorbehalte, diese Vorstellung der absoluten Zeit sofort aufzugeben, wenn nun Tatsachen oder feinere Beobachtung alter Tatsachen dazu führen sollten, für irgendeine Erscheinung durch eine Funktion $\Phi(\tau)$ ein neues Zeitmaß τ einzuführen, so daß für diese Erscheinung die Beschleunigung durch $\frac{d^2 s}{d\tau^2}$ statt durch $\frac{d^2 s}{dt^2}$ dargestellt wird (d. h. das Produkt aus Masse und Beschleunigungskomponente $\frac{d^2 x}{dt^2}$ sich als Funktion des Ortes des

bewegten Punktes und anderer fester oder bewegter Punkte darstellen läßt). Aber auch dann würde man wohl versuchen, die entstehende Schwierigkeit durch Modifikation der anderen Annahmen, eventuell durch Hinzufügung weiterer fingierter Punkte und Kräfte (vgl. weiterhin die analogen Erörterungen auf S. 95 ff. beim Trägheitsgesetz) zu beseitigen, ehe man sich entschließt, bei verschiedenen Erscheinungen verschiedene Zeitmaße anzuwenden. Durch diese Überlegung kommt man zu wesentlich derselben

Auffassung, welche P o i n c a r é a. a. O. mit dem Worte Opportunismus charakterisiert.”

Again, in 1904, Poincaré asserted that simultaneity is relative, and elaborated on the light synchronization thought experiment Einstein copied in 1905 without citation to Poincaré’s prior works. We know from Solovine’s accounts²³⁹³ that Einstein had read Poincaré’s paper, which was reprinted as Chapters 7 and 8 of Poincaré’s book *La Valeur de la Science*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1904). Poincaré stated in 1904,

“We come to the principle of relativity: this not only is confirmed by daily experience, not only is it a necessary consequence of the hypothesis of central forces, but it is imposed in an irresistible way upon our good sense, and yet it also is battered.

Consider two electrified bodies; though they seem to us at rest, they are both carried along by the motion of the earth; an electric charge in motion, Rowland has taught us, is equivalent to a current; these two charged bodies are, therefore, equivalent to two parallel currents of the same sense and these two currents should attract each other. In measuring this attraction, we measure the velocity of the earth; not its velocity in relation to the sun or the fixed stars, but its absolute velocity.

I well know what one will say, it is not its absolute velocity that is measured, it is its velocity in relation to the ether. How unsatisfactory that is! Is it not evident that from the principle so understood we could no longer get anything? It could no longer tell us anything just because it would no longer fear any contradiction.

If we succeed in measuring anything, we would always be free to say that this is not the absolute velocity in relation to the ether, it might always be the velocity in relation to some new unknown fluid with which we might fill space.

Indeed, experience has taken on itself to ruin this interpretation of the principle of relativity; all attempts to measure the velocity of the earth in relation to the ether have led to negative results. This time experimental physics has been more faithful to the principle than mathematical physics; the theorists, to put in accord their other general views, would not have spared it; but experiment has been stubborn in confirming it.

The means have been varied in a thousand ways and finally Michelson has pushed precision to its last limits; nothing has come of it. It is precisely to explain this obstinacy that the mathematicians are forced to-day to employ all their ingenuity.

Their task was not easy, and if Lorentz has gotten through it, it is only by accumulating hypotheses. The most ingenious idea has been that of local time.

Imagine two observers who wish to adjust their watches by optical signals; they exchange signals, but as they know that the transmission of light

is not instantaneous, they take care to cross them.

When the station B perceives the signal from the station A, its clock should not mark the same hour as that of the station A at the moment of sending the signal, but this hour augmented by a constant representing the duration of the transmission. Suppose, for example, that the station A sends its signal when its clock marks the hour 0, and that the station B perceives it when its clock marks the hour t . The clocks are adjusted if the slowness equal to t represents the duration of the transmission, and to verify it, the station B sends in its turn a signal when its clock marks 0; then the station A should perceive it when its clock marks t . The time-pieces are then adjusted. And in fact, they mark the same hour at the same physical instant, but on one condition, which is that the two stations are fixed. In the contrary case the duration of the transmission will not be the same in the two senses, since the station A, for example, moves forward to meet the optical perturbation emanating from B, while the station B flies away before the perturbation emanating from A. The watches adjusted in that manner do not mark, therefore, the true time, they mark what one may call the *local time*, so that one of them goes slow on the other. It matters little since we have no means of perceiving it. All the phenomena which happen at A, for example, will be late, but all will be equally so, and the observer who ascertains them will not perceive it since his watch is slow; so as the principle of relativity would have it, he will have no means of knowing whether he is at rest or in absolute motion.”²³⁹⁴

Einstein reiterated Poincaré’s clock synchronization procedures, without acknowledging that Poincaré had stated them first. From Mileva and Albert Einstein’s 1905 co-authored paper,

“I. KINEMATICAL PART

§ 1. Definition of Simultaneity

Consider a system of coordinates, in which the Newtonian mechanical equations are valid. In order to put the contradistinction from the [*moving*] systems of coordinates to be introduced later into words, and for the exact definition of the conceptualization, we call this system of coordinates the ‘resting system’.

If a material point is at rest relatively to this system of co-ordinates, its position can be defined relatively thereto by the employment of rigid standards of measurement and the methods of Euclidean geometry, and can be expressed in Cartesian co-ordinates.

If we wish to describe the *motion* of a material point, we give the values of its co-ordinates as functions of the time. Now we must bear carefully in mind that a mathematical description of this kind has no physical meaning unless we are quite clear as to what we understand by ‘time.’ We have to take into account that all our judgments in which time plays a part are always judgments of *simultaneous events*. If, for instance, I say, ‘That train arrives

here at 7 o'clock,' I mean something like this: 'The pointing of the small hand of my watch to 7 and the arrival of the train are simultaneous events.' [Footnote: We shall not here discuss the inexactitude which lurks in the concept of simultaneity of two events at approximately the same place, which can only be removed by an abstraction.]

It might appear possible to overcome all the difficulties attending the definition of 'time' by substituting 'the position of the small hand of my watch' for 'time.' And in fact such a definition is satisfactory when we are concerned with defining a time exclusively for the place where the watch is located; but it is no longer satisfactory when we have to connect in time series of events occurring at different places, or—what comes to the same thing—to evaluate the times of events occurring at places remote from the watch.

We might, of course, content ourselves with time values determined by an observer stationed together with the watch at the origin of the co-ordinates, and co-ordinating the corresponding positions of the hands with light signals, given out by every event to be timed, and reaching him through empty space. But this co-ordination has the disadvantage that it is not independent of the standpoint of the observer with the watch or clock, as we know from experience. We arrive at a much more practical determination along the following line of thought.

If at the point A of space there is a clock, an observer at A can determine the time values of events in the immediate proximity of A by finding the positions of the hands which are simultaneous with these events. If there is at the point B of space another clock in all respects resembling the one at A, it is possible for an observer at B to determine the time values of events in the immediate neighbourhood of B. But it is not possible without further assumption to compare, in respect of time, an event at A with an event at B. We have so far defined only an 'A time' and a 'B time.' We have not defined a common 'time' for A and B, for the latter cannot be defined at all unless we establish *by definition* that the 'time' required by light to travel from A to B equals the 'time' it requires to travel from B to A. Let a ray of light start at the 'A time' t_A from A towards B, let it at the 'B time' t_B be reflected at B in the direction of A, and arrive again at A at the 'A time' t'_A .

In accordance with definition the two clocks synchronize if

$$t_B - t_A = t'_A - t_B.$$

We assume that this definition of synchronism is free from contradictions, and possible for any number of points; and that the following relations are universally valid:—

1. If the clock at B synchronizes with the clock at A, the clock at A synchronizes with the clock at B.
2. If the clock at A synchronizes with the clock at B and also with the

clock at C, the clocks at B and C also synchronize with each other.

Thus with the help of certain imaginary physical experiments we have settled what is to be understood by synchronous resting clocks located at different places, and have evidently obtained a definition of ‘simultaneous,’ or ‘synchronous,’ and of ‘time.’ The ‘time’ of an event is that which is given simultaneously with the event by a resting clock located at the place of the event, this clock being synchronous, and indeed synchronous for all time determinations, with a specified stationary clock.

We set forth, according to present experience, that the magnitude

$$\frac{2AB}{t'_A - t_A} = c,$$

is a universal constant (the velocity of light in empty space).

It is essential to have time defined by means of resting clocks in the resting system, and the time now defined being appropriate to the resting system we call it ‘the time of the resting system.’”²³⁹⁵

Albert Einstein believed he had a right to plagiarize, if he could put a new spin on an old idea. He asserted this “privilege” in 1907,

“It appears to me that it is the nature of the business that what follows has already been partly solved by other authors. Despite that fact, since the issues of concern are here addressed from a new point of view, I believe I am entitled to leave out what would be for me a thoroughly pedantic survey of the literature, all the more so because it is hoped that these gaps will yet be filled by other authors, as has already happened with my first work on the principle of relativity through the commendable efforts of Mr. *Planck* and Mr. *Kaufmann*.”²³⁹⁶

Daniel F. Comstock proposed a new approach to Poincaré’s idea of “relative simultaneity”, in 1910, in his popular exposition on the theory of relativity, which was cited by Robert Daniel Carmichael and Paul Carus,²³⁹⁷ before Einstein manipulated credit for Comstock’s idea,

“The whole principle of relativity may be based on an answer to the question: When are two events which happen at some distance from each other to be considered simultaneous? The answer, ‘When they happen at the same time,’ only shifts the problem. The question is, how can we make two events happen at the same time when there is a considerable distance between them.

Most people will, I think, agree that one of the very best practical and simple ways would be to send a signal to each point from a point half-way between them. The velocity with which signals travel through space is of course the characteristic ‘space velocity,’ the velocity of light.

Two clocks, one at A and the other at B , can therefore be set running in unison by means of a light signal sent to each from a place midway between them.

Now suppose both clock A and clock B are on a kind of sidewalk or platform moving uniformly past us with velocity v . In Fig. 1 (2) is the moving platform and (1) is the fixed one, on which we consider ourselves placed. Since the observer on platform (2) is moving uniformly he can have no reason to consider himself moving at all, and he will use just the method we have indicated to set his two clocks A and B in unison. He will, that is,

send a light flash from C , the point midway between A and B , and when this flash reaches the two clocks he will start them with the same reading.

To us on the fixed platform, however, it will of course be evident that the clock B is really a little behind clock A , for, since the whole system is moving in the direction of the arrow, light will take longer to go from C to B than from C to A . Thus the clock on the moving platform which leads the other will be behind in time.

Now it is very important to see that the two clocks *are in unison for the observer moving with them* (in the only sense in which the word ‘unison’ has any meaning for him), for if we adopt the first postulate of relativity, there is no way in which he can know that he is moving. In other words, *he has just as much fundamental right to consider himself stationary as we have to consider ourselves stationary*, and therefore just as much right to apply the midway signal method to set his clocks in unison as we have in the setting of our ‘stationary clocks.’ ‘Stationary’ is, therefore, a relative term and anything which we can say about the moving system dependent on its motion, can with absolutely equal right be said by the moving observer about our system.

We are, therefore, forced to the conclusion that, unless we discard one of the two relativity postulates, the simultaneity of two distant events means a different thing to two different observers if they are moving with respect to each other.

The fact that the moving observer disagrees with us as to the reading of his two clocks as well as to the reading of two similar clocks on *our* ‘stationary’ platform, gives us a complete basis for all other differences due to point of view.

A very simple calculation will show that the difference in time between the two moving clocks is [*Footnote*: The time it takes light to go from C to

B is $\frac{1}{2} / (V - v)$ and the time to go from C to A is $\frac{1}{2} / (V + v)$. The difference in these two times is the amount by which the clocks disagree and this difference becomes, on simplification, the expression given {immediately below}.]

$$1 / V \beta / (1 - \beta^2)$$

where

l = distance between clocks A and B ;

v = velocity of moving system;

V = velocity of light;

β = v / V .

The way in which this difference of opinion with regard to time between the moving observer and ourselves leads to a difference of opinion with regard to length also may very easily be indicated as follows:

Suppose the moving observer desires to let us know the *distance* between his clocks and says he will have an assistant stationed at each clock and each of these, at a given instant, is to make a black line on our platform. He will, therefore, he says, be able to leave marked on our platform an exact measure of the length between his clocks and we can then compare it at leisure with any standard we choose to apply.

We, however, object to this measure left with us, on the ground that the two assistants *did not make their marks simultaneously* and hence the marks left on our platform do not, we say, represent truly the distance between his clocks. The difference is readily shown in Fig. 2, where M represents the black mark made on our platform at a certain time by the assistant at A , and N that made by the assistant at B at a later time. The latter assistant waited, we say, until his clock read the same as clock A , waited, that is, until B was at B' ; and then made the mark N . The moving observer declares, therefore, that the distance MN is equal to the distance AB , while we say that MN is greater than AB .

Again it must be emphasized that, because of the first fundamental postulate, there is no universal standard to be applied in settling such a difference of opinion. Neither the standpoint of the 'moving' observer nor our standpoint is wrong. The two merely represent two different sides of reality. Any one could ask: What is the 'true' length of a metal rod? Two

observers working at different temperatures come to different conclusions as to the 'true length.' Both are right. It depends on what is meant by 'true.' Again, asking a question which might have been asked centuries ago, is a man walking toward the stern of an east bound ship really moving west? We must answer 'that depends' and we must have knowledge of the questioner's view-point before we can answer yes or no.

A similar distinction emerges from the principle of relativity. What is the distance between the two clocks? Answer: that depends. Are we to consider ourselves with the clock system when we answer, or passing the clocks with a hundredth the velocity of light or passing the clocks with a tenth the velocity of light? The answer in each case must be different, but in each case may be true.

It must be remembered that the results of the principle of relativity are as true and no truer than its postulates. *If future experience bears out these postulates then the length of the body, even of a geometrical line, in fact the very meaning of 'length,' depends on the point of view, that is, on the relative motion of the observer and the object measured.* The reason this conclusion seems at first contrary to common sense is doubtless because we, as a race, have never had occasion to observe directly velocities high enough to make such effects sensible. The velocities which occur in some of the newly investigated domains of physics are just as new and outside our former experience as the fifth dimension."²³⁹⁸

Citing Comstock's above quoted work, Robert Daniel Carmichael wrote in 1912,

“§ 9. *Simultaneity of Events Happening at Different Places.*—Let us now assume two systems of reference S and S' moving with a uniform relative velocity v . Let an observer on S' undertake to adjust two clocks at different places so that they shall simultaneously indicate the same time. We will suppose that he does this in the following very natural manner: [*Footnote:* Compare Comstock, *Science*, N. S., 31 (1900): 767-772.] Two stations A and B are chosen in the line of relative motion of S and S' and at a distance d apart. The point C midway between these two stations is found by measurement.

The observer is himself stationed at C and has assistants at A and B . A single light signal is flashed from C to A and to B , and as soon as the light ray reaches each station the clock there is set at an hour agreed upon beforehand.

The observer on S' now concludes that his two clocks, the one at A and the other at B , are simultaneously marking the same hour; for, in his opinion (since he supposes his system to be at rest), the light has taken exactly the same time to travel from C to A as to travel from C to B .

Now let us suppose that an observer on the system S has watched the work of regulating these clocks on S' . The distances CA and CB appear to him to be

$$\frac{1}{2} d \sqrt{1 - \beta^2}$$

instead of $\frac{1}{2} d$. Moreover, since the velocity of light is independent of the velocity of the source, it appears to him that the light ray proceeding from C to A has approached A at the velocity $c + v$, where c is the velocity of light, while the light ray going from C to B has approached B at the velocity $c - v$. Thus to him it appears that the light has taken longer to go from C to B than from C to A by the amount

$$\frac{\frac{1}{2} d \sqrt{1 - \beta^2}}{c - v} - \frac{\frac{1}{2} d \sqrt{1 - \beta^2}}{c + v} = \frac{v d \sqrt{1 - \beta^2}}{c^2 - v^2}.$$

But since $\beta = v / c$ the last expression is readily found to be equal to

$$\frac{v}{c^2} \cdot \frac{d}{\sqrt{1 - \beta^2}}.$$

Therefore, to an observer on S the clocks on S' appear to mark different times; and the difference is that given by the last expression above.

Thus we have the following conclusion:

THEOREM VII. *Let two systems of reference S and S' have a uniform relative velocity v . Let an observer on S' place two clocks at a distance d apart in the line of relative motion of S and S' and adjust them so that they appear to him to mark simultaneously the same time. Then to an observer on S the clock on S' which is forward in point of motion appears to be behind in point of time by the amount*

$$\frac{v}{c^2} \cdot \frac{d}{\sqrt{1 - \beta^2}},$$

where c is the velocity of light and $\beta = v / c$ (MVL R).

It should be emphasized that the clocks on S' are in agreement in the only sense in which they can be in agreement for an observer on that system who supposes (as he naturally will) that his own system is at rest—notwithstanding the fact that to an observer on the other system there appears to be an irreconcilable disagreement depending for its amount directly on the distance apart of the two clocks.

According to the result of the last theorem the notion of simultaneity of events happening at different places is indefinite in meaning until some convention is adopted as to how simultaneity is to be determined. In other words, *there is no such thing as the absolute simultaneity of events happening at different places.*"²³⁹⁹

Albert Einstein, who sought a “new point of view” from plagiarizing Poincaré’s (1900/1904) method of clock synchronization with light signals, instead plagiarized Comstock’s (1910) and Carmichael’s (1912) work in Einstein’s book of 1916,

“THE RELATIVITY OF SIMULTANEITY

Up to now our considerations have been referred to a particular body of reference, which we have styled a ‘railway embankment.’ We suppose a very long train travelling along the rails with the constant velocity v and in the direction indicated in Fig. 1. People travelling in this train will with advantage use the train as a rigid reference-body (co-ordinate system); they regard all events in reference to

the train. Then every event which takes place along the line also takes place at a particular point of the train. Also the definition of simultaneity can be given relative to the train in exactly the same way as with respect to the embankment. As a natural consequence, however, the following question arises:

Are two events (*e. g.* the two strokes of lightning A and B) which are simultaneous *with reference to the railway embankment* also simultaneous *relatively to the train*? We shall show directly that the answer must be in the negative.

When we say that the lightning strokes A and B are simultaneous with respect to the embankment, we mean: the rays of light emitted at the places A and B , where the lightning occurs, meet each other at the mid-point M of the length $A \rightarrow B$ of the embankment. But the events A and B also correspond to positions A and B on the train. Let M' be the mid-point of the distance $A \rightarrow B$ on the travelling train. Just when the flashes [*Footnote: As judged from the embankment.*] of lightning occur, this point M' naturally coincides with

the point M , but it moves towards the right in the diagram with the velocity v of the train. If an observer sitting in the position M' in the train did not possess this velocity, then he would remain permanently at M , and the light rays emitted by the flashes of lightning A and B would reach him simultaneously, *i. e.* they would meet just where he is situated. Now in reality (considered with reference to the railway embankment) he is hastening towards the beam of light coming from B , whilst he is riding on ahead of the beam of light coming from A . Hence the observer will see the beam of light emitted from B earlier than he will see that emitted from A . Observers who take the railway train as their reference-body must therefore come to the conclusion that the lightning flash B took place earlier than the lightning flash A . We thus arrive at the important result:

Events which are simultaneous with reference to the embankment are not simultaneous with respect to the train, and *vice versa* (relativity of simultaneity). Every reference-body (co-ordinate system) has its own particular time; unless we are told the reference-body to which the statement of time refers, there is no meaning in a statement of the time of an event.

Now before the advent of the theory of relativity it had always tacitly been assumed in physics that the statement of time had an absolute significance, *i. e.* that it is independent of the state of motion of the body of reference. But we have just seen that this assumption is incompatible with the most natural definition of simultaneity; if we discard this assumption, then the conflict between the law of the propagation of light *in vacuo* and the principle of relativity (developed in Section VII) disappears.

We were led to that conflict by the considerations of Section VI, which are now no longer tenable. In that section we concluded that the man in the carriage, who traverses the distance w *per second* relative to the carriage, traverses the same distance also with respect to the embankment *in each second* of time. But, according to the foregoing considerations, the time required by a particular occurrence with respect to the carriage must not be considered equal to the duration of the same occurrence as judged from the embankment (as reference-body). Hence it cannot be contended that the man in walking travels the distance w relative to the railway line in a time which is equal to one second as judged from the embankment.

Moreover, the considerations of Section VI are based on yet a second assumption, which, in the light of a strict consideration, appears to be arbitrary, although it was always tacitly made even before the introduction of the theory of relativity.²⁴⁰⁰

This chapter “by Einstein” has often been criticized as being “absolutist” and “Lorentzian” (as has his 1905 paper on relative simultaneity).²⁴⁰¹ One understands why it was written in the fashion that it was, when one reads the absolutist source material by Carmichael, which Einstein plagiarized to produce it.

Einstein’s book *Relativity: The Special and the General Theory* contains many other examples of his plagiarism, among them Appendix One, “Simple Derivation

of the Lorentz Transformation”, is suspiciously similar to Lorentz’ *Das Relativitätsprinzip: Drei Vorlesungen gehalten in Teylers Stiftung zu Haarlem*, which was first published in 1913, and which Einstein reviewed for *Die Naturwissenschaften* in 1914.²⁴⁰²

Einstein also reiterated Lorentz’ work on the Fresnel coefficient of drag in Einstein’s “Theorem of the Addition of the Velocities. The Experiment of Fizeau”, Chapter 13. While Einstein credits Lorentz, he credits his older works and attempts to draw a distinction between his analysis and Lorentz’ synthesis, but Lorentz makes clear in his 1913 lecture that he is fulfilling the principle of relativity. Einstein also fails to cite Laub and Laue’s work in this area, with which he was intimately familiar.²⁴⁰³ This misled some to conclude that Einstein’s statements about the Fresnel coefficient of drag were original. In private correspondence in 1919, Einstein wrote to Pieter Zeeman, “The derivation of the latter from the kinematics of the special theory of relativity was first provided by Laue.”²⁴⁰⁴

Chapter 20 of *Relativity: The Special and the General Theory*, “The Equality of Inertial and Gravitational Mass as an Argument for the General Postulate of Relativity”, as Arvid Reuterdahl noted, parrots “Kinertia”.²⁴⁰⁵ Einstein also fails to acknowledge Poincaré’s contributions of the principle of relativity of electrodynamics and of four-dimensional space-time. Einstein’s popular book effectively relegated Poincaré’s legacy with respect to the theory of relativity to a hushed scandal.

Another of Albert Einstein’s “Eureka!” stories was his “happiest thought in life”—the principle of equivalence. It was no more original to Einstein than the “Aarau question” or the concept of, and exposition on, relativity of simultaneity.

9.7 Conclusion

In the mid-1880’s, Ludwig Lange argued for the principle of relativity based on the empirical dynamics of inertial motion, as opposed to the ontological kinematic definitions based on absolute space and absolute time of Galileo, Newton and Neumann,²⁴⁰⁶ which absolutist notions lingered in the Einsteins’ absolutist theory of 1905. In 1887, Woldemar Voigt gave the principle a new mathematical form based on a new concept of time—the mathematical form of the special theory of relativity. Joseph Larmor (1894-1900) and George Francis FitzGerald (1889) changed scale factors from Voigt’s transformation, producing the “Lorentz Transformation”, before Hendrik Antoon Lorentz. In 1898, Poincaré argued that simultaneity is relative, based on his light synchronization procedure, which presumes that light speed is invariant in Lange’s “inertial systems”.

In 1887, Woldemar Voigt²⁴⁰⁷ published the following relativistic transformation,

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_1 &= x_1 - \kappa t \\ \eta_1 &= y_1 q \\ \zeta_1 &= z_1 q \\ \tau &= t - \frac{\kappa x_1}{\omega^2}, \text{ where } q = \sqrt{1 - \frac{\kappa^2}{\omega^2}}.\end{aligned}$$

In 1901, Albert Einstein wrote to Mileva Marić on 28 December 1901,

“I now want to buckle down and study what Lorentz and Drude have written on the electrodynamics of moving bodies. Ehrat must get the literature for me.”²⁴⁰⁸

In 1899, Lorentz published a paper setting forth the “Lorentz Transformation” within a scale factor, “Simplified Theory of Electrical and Optical Phenomena in Moving Bodies”.²⁴⁰⁹ In 1904, Lorentz published the transformation named in his honor. Einstein owned a copy of Drude’s *Lehrbuch der Optik* of 1900, which featured Lorentz’ theories.²⁴¹⁰

Emil Cohn cited Lorentz’ 1904 paper in his 1904 paper on the electrodynamics of moving systems. Einstein had a copy of Cohn’s paper containing a citation to Lorentz’ 1904 paper with the “Lorentz Transformation” and Einstein cited it in 1907 in the direct context of Lorentz’ 1904 paper.²⁴¹¹ Einstein was eager to read everything Lorentz published on the subject. In 1913, Lorentz’ 1904 article and the Einstein’s 1905 article were republished together in the book *Das Relativitätsprinzip*.

The Einsteins’ 1905 paper, which contained no references, so obviously plagiarized Lorentz’ prior work, that an unpalatable note was added in the book to deny the obvious, which note claimed that Einstein did not know of Lorentz’ prior work.²⁴¹² No notes were added to give Poincaré credit for the clock synchronization method by light signal that the Einsteins’ plagiarized, though Einstein had cited Poincaré’s 1900 paper containing this procedure in 1906, before the 1913 republication of the 1905 paper.²⁴¹³ Poincaré had died in 1912, and Lorentz and Einstein did not wait long to steal from him his legacy, publishing a book titled after *his* idea, without presenting any of his work in it—work with which both Lorentz and Einstein were intimately familiar.

10 “SPACE-TIME” OR IS IT “TIME-SPACE”?

The ancients expressed “space-time” theories thousands of years ago. Albert Einstein did not introduce the idea of space-time into the theory of relativity, rather it was Henri Poincaré who first propounded the special theory of relativity in its modern four-dimensional form. When Minkowski adopted Poincaré’s quadri-dimensional theory, Einstein opposed the idea, and did not adopt it until much later.

“As I’ve already said, it is not possible to conceive of more than three *dimensions*. However, a brilliant wit with whom I am acquainted considers duration a fourth *dimension*, and that the product of time multiplied by solidity would, in some sense, be a product of four *dimensions*.”—D’ALEMBERT

“This rigid four-dimensional space of the special theory of relativity is to some extent a four-dimensional analogue of H. A. Lorentz’s rigid three-dimensional æther.”—ALBERT EINSTEIN ²⁴¹⁴

10.1 Introduction

Popular myth has it that Albert Einstein originated the concept of “space-time”. However, not only did Einstein not originate the idea of “space-time”, he vigorously opposed it for quite some space of time.²⁴¹⁵ In fact, space-time theories have been quite common in folk-lore, philosophy, mathematics, religion,²⁴¹⁶ science, science fiction,²⁴¹⁷ psychology,²⁴¹⁸ and are even inherent in some languages.²⁴¹⁹

Space-time theories which antedate Einstein’s entrance into the arena include those of: the ancient Eleatic philosophers,²⁴²⁰ Ocellus Lucanus,²⁴²¹ Plato,²⁴²² Aristotle,²⁴²³ Critolaus of Phaselis, Jesus,²⁴²⁴ Philo Judæus,²⁴²⁵ Taurus,²⁴²⁶ St. Augustine,²⁴²⁷ Julius Firmicus Maternus,²⁴²⁸ Proclus,²⁴²⁹ *Zohar*,²⁴³⁰ Bruno,²⁴³¹ More,²⁴³² Locke,²⁴³³ Newton,²⁴³⁴ Clarke,²⁴³⁵ Leibnitz,²⁴³⁶ Berkeley,²⁴³⁷ Hartley,²⁴³⁸ Boscovich,²⁴³⁹ Lagrange,²⁴⁴⁰ Kant,²⁴⁴¹ Schopenhauer,²⁴⁴² Hegel, Herbart,²⁴⁴³ Fechner,²⁴⁴⁴ Poe,²⁴⁴⁵ Stallo,²⁴⁴⁶ Hamilton,²⁴⁴⁷ Spencer,²⁴⁴⁸ Mach,²⁴⁴⁹ Baumann,²⁴⁵⁰ Dühring,²⁴⁵¹ Lange,²⁴⁵² Green,²⁴⁵³ Hinton,²⁴⁵⁴ Venn,²⁴⁵⁵ Teichmüller,²⁴⁵⁶ “S.”,²⁴⁵⁷ Mewes,²⁴⁵⁸ Voigt,²⁴⁵⁹ Shand,²⁴⁶⁰ Bergson,²⁴⁶¹ Bradley,²⁴⁶² Guyau and Fouillée,²⁴⁶³ Wells,²⁴⁶⁴ Palágyi,²⁴⁶⁵ Fullerton,²⁴⁶⁶ Ziegler,²⁴⁶⁷ Smith,²⁴⁶⁸ Poincaré,²⁴⁶⁹ Mehmke,²⁴⁷⁰ Marcolongo,²⁴⁷¹ Hargreaves,²⁴⁷² Welby,²⁴⁷³ McTaggart²⁴⁷⁴ and Minkowski.²⁴⁷⁵ Secondary literature expressly referring to such theories before Einstein adopted the view includes that of: D’Alembert,²⁴⁷⁶ Klügel,²⁴⁷⁷ Cranz²⁴⁷⁸ and Wölffing.²⁴⁷⁹

10.2 The Ancients and “Space-Time”

The relational image of time to space and motion is an ancient conception. Consider Anaximander’s philosophy (ca. 611-546 B.C.), which speaks of the absolute world

of “space-time”, and hints at “Mach’s principle”,

“Anaximander, then, was the hearer of Thales. Anaximander was son of Praxiadas, and a native of Miletus. This man said that the originating principle of existing things is a certain constitution of the Infinite, out of which the heavens are generated, and the worlds therein; and that this principle is eternal and undecaying, and comprising all the worlds. And he speaks of time as something of limited generation, and subsistence, and destruction. This person declared the Infinite to be an originating principle and element of existing things, being the first to employ such a denomination of the originating principle. But, moreover, he asserted that there is an eternal motion, by the agency of which it happens that the heavens [Or, ‘men.’] are generated; but that the earth is poised aloft, upheld by nothing, continuing (so) on account of its equal distance from all (the heavenly bodies)”²⁴⁸⁰

As John Elof Boodin,²⁴⁸¹ Karl Popper and Dean Turner²⁴⁸² noted, “space-time”, as a concept, as a quadri-dimensional statue, harkens back to the ancients, to Parmenides and the Eleatics,

“For what is different from being does not exist, so that it necessarily follows, according to the argument of Parmenides, that all things that are are one and this is being.”²⁴⁸³

Paul Carus had already noted in 1912, that:

“Many who have watched the origin and rise of the new movement are startled at the paradoxical statements which some prominent physicists have made, and it is remarkable that the most materialistic sciences, mechanics and physics, seem to surround us with a mist of mysticism. The old self-contradictory statements of the Eleatic school revive in a modernized form, and common sense is baffled in its attempt to understand how the same thing may be longer and shorter at the same time, how a clock will strike the hour later or sooner according to the point of view from which it is watched; and the answer of this most recent conception of physics to the question, How is this all possible? is based on the principle of the relativity of time and space.”²⁴⁸⁴

Popper wrote,

“At the same time I realized that such myths may be developed, and become testable; that historically speaking all — or very nearly all — scientific theories originate from myths, and that a myth may contain important anticipations of scientific theories. Examples are Empedocles’ theory of evolution by trial and error, or Parmenides’ myth of the unchanging block universe in which nothing ever happens and which, if we add another

dimension, becomes Einstein's block universe (in which, too, nothing ever happens, since everything is, four-dimensionally speaking, determined and laid down from the beginning)."²⁴⁸⁵

When Minkowski, in 1908, uttered the infamous words,

"Henceforth space by itself, and time by itself, are doomed to fade away into mere shadows, and only a union of the two will preserve an independent reality,"²⁴⁸⁶

his words were not only unoriginal, they were trite, and more archaic, than arcane. Anton Reiser (Rudolf Kayser) proclaimed,

"The universe becomes a four-dimensional continuum in the time-space sense of Minkowski. Physical occurrences are now represented by three spatial coördinates as well as by one time coördinate, or in other words, there is no Becoming, only Being."²⁴⁸⁷

One is left to wonder how "the universe Becomes a four-dimensional continuum", if "there is no Becoming, only Being."

Hermann Weyl stated,

"The great advance in our knowledge described in this chapter consists in recognising that the scene of action of reality is not a three-dimensional Euclidean space but rather a **four-dimensional world, in which space and time are linked together indissolubly**. However deep the chasm may be that separates the intuitive nature of space from that of time in our experience, nothing of this qualitative difference enters into the objective world which physics endeavours to crystallise out of direct experience. It is a four-dimensional continuum, which is neither 'time' nor 'space'. Only the consciousness that passes on in one portion of this world experiences the detached piece which comes to meet it and passes behind it, as **history**, that is, as a process that is going forward in time and takes place in space."²⁴⁸⁸

and

"The objective world simply *is*, it does not *happen*. Only to the gaze of my consciousness, crawling upward along the lifeline of my body, does a section of the world come to life as a fleeting image in space which continuously changes in time."²⁴⁸⁹

Ebenezer Cunningham wrote,

"With Minkowski space and time become particular aspects of a single four-dimensional concept; the distinction between them as separate modes of

correlating and ordering phenomena is lost, and the motion of a point in time is represented as a stationary curve in four-dimensional space. The whole history of a physical system is laid out as a changeless whole.”²⁴⁹⁰

and,

“1. The main objections urged against the Principle of Relativity are [***] (*iii*) that time and space are such immediate objects of perception that the artificial view which it adopts of them cannot in any sense correspond to reality.

2. In respect of the last difficulty little can be said to meet the natural shrinking which the observer of natural phenomena feels from such a calculus as Minkowski’s, in which we seem to lose sight of the most obvious distinction between time and space as essentially different modes of ordering events.

It must be remarked, however, that an essential part in the practice of the calculus is the final process of interpreting the analytical result in terms of the ordinary modes of thought. There is perhaps an analogy to be drawn between the analysis which lays out the whole history of phenomena as a single whole, and the things in themselves, the natural phenomena apart from the human intelligence, for which consciousness of time and space does not exist, the laws of which, when expressed for instance by means of a principle of least action, consist in a relation between the whole aggregate of configurations which their history contains; in which, so far as they are mechanically determinate, the past and the future are interchangeable. Such a view of the universe is inseparable from a mechanical determinism in which the future is unalterably determined by the past and in which the past can be uniquely inferred from the present state of the universe. It is the view of an intelligence which could comprehend at one glance the whole of time and space.

But the limitations of the human mind resolve this changeless whole into its temporal and spatial aspects, and the past and future of the physical world is the past and future of the intelligence perceiving it. Only to a being outside the physical universe, free from participation in its phenomena, is time a meaningless term. The human consciousness and the physical universe are inseparably parts of a greater whole. They run parallel to one another, and the brain cannot do otherwise than order physical and external events relative to the internal sequences of its own consciousness.

It is by such a process of correlation that any analytical scheme of relations is constructed for the description of natural processes. When this has been carried out, it is claimed for it that it, at any rate approximately, contains within it the whole history of those processes for the mind to grasp as one whole. Thus the very act of formulating a set of equations which make the present state of the system to contain implicitly within it the whole history, past and to be, is one step, and that the largest, towards eliminating

the peculiar characteristic of time as a product of the inner consciousness from its place in physical relations. It is but a small step further to the timeless universe of Minkowski.

It is in fact the sole aim of theoretical physics to distinguish between and disentangle one from the other those factors in perceived events which are dependent upon human consciousness and those which are completely independent of it. The achievements of the past in this direction are quite sufficient to warrant further and continuous effort. That the mind should be able to conceive such a daring project and to progressively realize it, seems almost in itself sufficient to indicate that the resolution of its own workings into a chain of physically determinate processes is one incapable of complete realization.²⁴⁹¹

Milič Čapek opposed this mystical “myth of the frozen passage.”²⁴⁹²

It was a great injustice to attribute priority for this Eleatic stance to Minkowski. Charles Howard Hinton justified the classical principle of relativity in four-dimensions in 1880. It is irrational to assert that the principle of relativity compels invariant light speed, on the same grounds that it is irrational to assert that the principle of relativity requires that if I rest in inertial system *A*, I also rest in inertial system *B*, which is in motion relative to inertial system *A*.

In 1882, Gustav Teichmüller presented an Eleatic space-time theory—H. N. Gardiner explained in 1902,

“The most precise elucidation, and perhaps the most original development of the subjectivistic doctrine of time since Kant, may probably be ascribed to Teichmüller (*Met.*, 192 ff.). Teichmüller conceives time as entirely a perspective order given to objects by a timeless, substantial ego, and duration as a mere immanent measuring of that order. According to this, if we abstract from the perspective nature of consciousness and the comparison, through memory and expectation, of part of its ideal content with other parts, all chronological arrangement and temporal duration disappear. The bare concept of time, he says, has in it nothing of magnitude, just as the concept ‘mammal’ has in it nothing of the specific nature of tiger, sheep, and elephant. Further, the determination of magnitude in the realm of time is purely relative. Hence the duration of the world has no absolute magnitude, nor has any given time-interval, a day or a second. The objective time-order is a perspective view, like every other. It is the product of scientific thinking, based on comparison of individual consciousnesses and aided by language. It is the order of history, and this order is true, but also, like every other content of scientific truth, timeless. A real order of actual activities corresponds to the perspective order, but this is to be ultimately conceived as a technical system. As all determination of duration is relative, we cannot say that the future is separated by any time-interval actually given from the present or the past. Indeed, taken absolutely, the whole series of the world’s phenomena must be regarded as being all together at once. But only an

absolute consciousness could so intuit it.

The standing objection to the doctrine thus or similarly expressed is that it denies the metaphysical reality of change. This objection is urged in various forms. It is said, for example, that if time is merely a form of intuition or a perspective ordering of phenomena, then the world is really a changeless unity, and consequently not only is all effort on our part to determine in any degree the course of things illusory, but past and future are contemporaneous—Nero is still burning Rome and the unborn babe now lives—which is absurd. Again, it is urged, positively, that change, and therefore time, which is the form of change, is real. For at least, it is argued, the succession of ideas is real, since it is only as ideas that phenomena can properly be said to exist at all. If, however, the succession of ideas is held to be phenomenal, the reply is that while this may be true if ‘ideas’ are taken as ‘objects,’ yet it is not true of the necessarily successive series of synthetic acts whereby their succession is presented. But not only, the argument continues, is change real in the subject, it is also real in external things; for the specific changes and the specific order of change appearing in objects, as they are certainly not due to a mere *a priori* form of the subject, imply a real succession in things themselves. Some writers appeal directly to the ‘trans-subjective’ nature of consciousness¹. Much of this criticism, however loses its force when it is pointed out that the form of change, as such, is not time at all. Aristotle already distinguished between motion and time as number of motion. Time is a certain arrangement and measure of motion, a further determination of the content. It would be quite possible, therefore, to hold to any amount of real change and yet to regard the temporal view of such change as subjective. But the conception of a subject indifferently related to series of changes which it arranges in temporal order cannot, of course, be ultimate.”²⁴⁹³

In the years 1884-1894, Rudolf Mewes worked on the laws of causality based on nature and matter in “space-time”. Palágyi added the German nomenclature, and more precise mathematical formalism; and he also iterated the principle of relativity as a quadri-dimensional Eleatic ideal of a motionless, spaceless and timeless world, in 1901, stating, *inter alia*,

“However, it would also be, in reality, a spaceless conception of the world, since all points of this four-dimensional space would be given to us at the same time and it would not take up any length of time to grasp this four-dimensional world in all its parts. The four-dimensional conception of space would accordingly actually signify the complete removal of the spatiotemporalness of the world.”

“Es wäre aber im Grunde genommen auch ein raumloses Auffassen der Welt, da alle Punkte dieses vierdimensionalen Raumes uns gleichzeitig gegeben wären und es keine Zeitdauer in Anspruch nehmen dürfte, diese

vierdimensionale Welt in allen ihren Teilen zu überblicken. Die vierdimensionale Raumvorstellung würde sonach eigentlich die völlige Aufhebung der Raumzeitlichkeit der Welt bedeuten.²⁴⁹⁴

This belief system is truly archaic. Ueberweg, writing about the ancient Eleatics, penned these words before Einstein was born:

“§ 18. Xenophanes, of Colophon, in Asia Minor (born 569 B. C.), who removed later to Elea, in Lower Italy, combats in his poems the anthropomorphic and anthropopathic representations of God presented by Homer and Hesiod, and enounces the doctrine of the one, all-controlling God-head. God is all eye, all ear, all intellect; untroubled, he moves and directs all things by the power of his thought. [***] That the God of Xenophanes is the unity of the world is a supposition that was early current. We do not find this doctrine expressed in the fragments which have come down to us, and it remains questionable whether Xenophanes pronounced himself positively in this sense, in speaking of the relation of God to the world, or whether such a conception was not rather thought to be implied in his teachings by other thinkers, who then expressed it in the phraseology given above. In the (Platonic?) dialogue, *Sophistes* (p. 242), the leading interlocutor, a visitor from Elea, says: ‘The Eleatic race among us, from Xenophanes and even from still earlier times, assume in their philosophical discourses that what is usually called All, is One [***]. The ‘still earlier’ philosophers are probably certain Orphists, who glorified Zeus as the all-ruling power, as beginning, middle, and end of all things. Aristotle says, *Metaph.*, I. 5: ‘Xenophanes, the first who professed the doctrine of unity—Parmenides is called his disciple—has not expressed himself clearly concerning the nature of the One, so that it is not plain whether he has in mind an ideal unity (like Parmenides, his successor) or a material one (like Melissus); he seems not to have been at all conscious of this distinction, but, with his regard fixed on the whole universe, he says only that God is the One.’ [***]

§ 19. Parmenides of Elea, born about 515—510 B. C. (so that his youth falls in the time of the old age of Xenophanes), is the most important of the Eleatic philosophers. He founds the doctrine of unity on the conception of being. He teaches: Only being is, non-being is not; there is no becoming. That which truly is exists in the form of a single and eternal sphere, whose space it fills continuously. Plurality and change are an empty semblance. The existent alone is thinkable, and only the thinkable is real. Of the one true existence, convincing knowledge is attainable by thought; but the deceptions of the senses seduce men into mere opinion and into the deceitful, rhetorical display of discourse respecting the things, which are supposed to be manifold and changing.—In his (hypothetical) explanation of the world of appearance, Parmenides sets out from two opposed principles, which bear to each other, within the sphere of appearance, a relation similar to that which exists

between being and non-being. These principles are light and night, with which the antithesis of fire and earth corresponds. [***] Truth consists in the knowledge that being is, and non-being can not be; deception lies in the belief that non-being also is and must be. [***] The predicate being belongs to thought itself; that I think something and that this, which I think, *is* (in my thought), are identical assertions; non-being—that which is not—can not be thought, can, so to speak, not be reached, since every thing, when it is thought, exists as thought; no thought can be non-existent or without being, for there is nothing to which the predicate being does not belong, or which exists outside of the sphere of being.—In this argumentation Parmenides mistakes the distinction between the subjective being of thought and an objective realm of being to which thought is directed, by directing his attention only to the fact that both are subjects of the predicate being. [***] Not the senses, which picture to us plurality and change, conduct to truth, but only thought, which recognizes the being of that which is, as necessary, and the existence of that which is not, as impossible. [***] Much severer still than his condemnation of the naïve confidence of the mass of men in the illusory reports of the senses, is that with which Parmenides visits a philosophical doctrine which, as he assumes, makes of this very illusion (not, indeed, as illusion, in which sense Parmenides himself proposes a theory of the sensible, but as supposed truth) the basis of a theory that falsifies thought, in that it declares non-being identical with being. It is very probable that the Heraclitean doctrine is the one on which Parmenides thus animadverts, however indignantly Heraclitus might have resented this association of his doctrine with the prejudice of the masses, who do not rise above the false appearances of the senses; [***] Parmenides (in a passage of some length, given by Simpl., *Ad Phys.*, fol. 31 a b) ascribes to the truly existent all the predicates which are implied in the abstract conception of *being*, and then proceeds further to characterize it as a continuous sphere, extending uniformly from the center in all directions—a description which we are scarcely authorized in interpreting as merely symbolical, in the conscious intention of Parmenides. That which truly is, is without origin and indestructible, a unique whole, only-begotten, immovable, and eternal; it was not and will not be, but *is*, and forms a continuum. [***] For what origin should it have? How could it grow? It can neither have arisen from the non-existent, since this has no existence, nor from the existent, since it is itself the existent. There is, therefore, no becoming, and no decay [***]. The truly existent is indivisible, everywhere like itself, and ever identical with itself. It exists independently, in and for itself [***], thinking, and comprehending in itself all thought; it exists in the form of a well-rounded sphere [***]. The Parmenidean doctrine of the *apparent* world is a cosmogony, suggesting, on the one hand, Anaximander’s doctrine of the warm and the cold as the first-developed contraries and the Heraclitean doctrine of the transformations of fire, and, on the other, the Pythagorean opposition of ‘limit’ and ‘the unlimited’ [***], and the Pythagorean doctrine of contraries generally. It is

founded on the hypothesis of a universal mixture of warm and cold, light and dark. The warm and light is ethereal fire, which, as the positive and efficient principle, represents within the sphere of appearance the place of being; the cold and dark is air and its product, by condensation [***], earth. The combining or 'mixing' of the contraries is effected by the all-controlling Deity [***] at whose will Eros came into existence as first, in time, of the gods [***]. That which fills space and that which thinks, are the same; how a man shall think, depends on the 'mixture' of his bodily organs; a dead body perceives cold and silence [***]. If the verse in the long fragment, [***], could be amended (as is done by Gladisch, who seeks in it an analogue to the Maja of the Hindus) so as to read: [***], Parmenides would appear as having explained the plurality and change attested by the senses, as a dream of the one true existence. But this conjecture is arbitrary; and the words cited in the *Soph.*, p. 242: [***], as also the doctrine of the Megarians concerning the many names of the One, which alone really exists, confirm the reading [***] of the MSS. The sense of the passage is therefore: 'All the manifold and changing world, which mortals suppose to be real, and which they call the sum of things, *is* in reality only the One, which alone truly is.' In the philosophy of Parmenides no distinction is reached between appearance, or semblance, and phenomenon. The terms being and appearance remain with him philosophically unreconciled; the existence of a realm of mere appearance is incompatible with the fundamental principle of Parmenides.

§ 20. Zeno of Elea (born about 490—485 B. C.) defended the doctrine of Parmenides by an indirect demonstration, in which he sought to show that the supposition of the real existence of things manifold and changing, leads to contradictions. In particular, he opposed to the reality of motion four arguments: 1. Motion can not begin, because a body in motion can not arrive at another place until it has passed through an unlimited number of intermediate places. 2. Achilles can not overtake the tortoise, because as often as he reaches the place occupied by the tortoise at a previous moment, the latter has already left it. 3. The flying arrow is at rest; for it is at every moment only in one place. 4. The half of a division of time is equal to the whole; for the same point, moving with the same velocity, traverses an equal distance (*i.e.*, when compared, in the one case, with a point at rest, in the other, with a point in motion) in the one case, in half of a given time, in the other, in the whole of that time. [***] In the (Platonic?) dialogue *Parmenides*, a prose writing [***] of Zeno is mentioned, which was distributed into several series of argumentations [***], in each of which a number of hypotheses [***] were laid down with a view to their *reductio in absurdum*, and so to the indirect demonstration of the truth of the doctrine that Being is One. It is probably on account of this (indirect) method of demonstration from hypotheses, that Aristotle [***] called Zeno the inventor of dialectic [***]. If the manifold exists, argues Zeno [***], it must be at the same time infinitely small and infinitely great; the former, because its last divisions are without magnitude, the latter, on account of the infinite number

of these divisions. (In this argument Zeno leaves out of consideration the inverse ratio constantly maintained between magnitude and number of parts, as the division advances, whereby the same product is constantly maintained, and he isolates the notions of smallness and number, opposing the one to the other.) In a similar manner Zeno shows that the manifold, if it exists must be at the same time numerically limited and unlimited. Zeno argues, further [***], against the reality of space. If all that exists were in a given space, this space must be in another space, and so on *in infinitum*. Against the veracity of sensuous perception, Zeno directed [***] the following argument: If a measure of millet-grains in falling produce a sound, each single grain and each smallest fraction of a grain must also produce a sound ; but if the latter is not the case, then the whole measure of grains, whose effect is but the sum of the effects of its parts, can also produce no sound. (The method of argumentation here employed is similar to that in the first argument against plurality.) The arguments of Zeno against the reality of motion [***] have had no insignificant influence on the development of metaphysics in earlier and later times. Aristotle answers the two first [***] with the observation [***] that the divisions of time and space are the same and equal [***] for both time and space are continuous [***]; that a distance divisible *in infinitum* can therefore certainly be traversed in a finite time, since the latter is also in like manner divisible *in infinitum*, and the divisions of time correspond with the divisions of space; the infinite in division [***] is to be distinguished from the infinite in extent [***]; his reply to the third argument [***] is, that time does not consist of single indivisible points (conceived as discontinuous) or of ‘nows’ [***]. In the fourth argument he points out what Zeno, as it seems, had but poorly concealed, viz., the change of the standard of comparison [***]. It can be questioned whether the Aristotelian answers are fully satisfactory for the first three arguments (for in the fourth the paralogism is obvious). Bayle has attacked [***]. Hegel [***] defends Aristotle against Bayle. Yet Hegel himself also sees in motion a contradiction; nevertheless, he regards motion as a real fact. Herbart denies the reality of motion on account of the contradiction which, in his opinion, it involves. [***]

§ 21. Melissus of Samos attempts by a direct demonstration to establish the truth of the fundamental thought of the Eleatic philosophy, that only the One is. By unity, however, he understands rather the continuity of substance than the notional identity of being. That which is, the truly existent, is eternal, infinite, one, in all points the same or ‘like itself,’ unmoved and passionless. [***] If nothing were, argues Melissus, how were it then even possible to speak of it, as of something being? But if any thing is, then it has either become or is eternal. In the former case, it must have arisen either from being or from non-being. But nothing can come from non-being; and being can not have arisen from being, for then there must have been being, before being came to be (became). Hence being did not become; hence it is eternal. It will also not perish; for being can not become non-being, and if

being change to being, it has not perished. Therefore it always was and always will be. As without genesis, and indestructible, being has no beginning and no end; it is, therefore, infinite. (It is easy to perceive here the leap in argumentation from temporal infinity to the infinity of space, which very likely contributed essentially to draw on Melissus Aristotle's reproach of feebleness of thought.) As infinite, being is One; for if it were dual or plural, its members would mutually limit each other, and so would not be infinite. As one, being is unchangeable; for change would pluralize it. More particularly, it is unmoved; for there exists no empty space in which it can move, since such a space, if it existed, would be an existing nothing; and being can not move within itself for then the One would become a *divisum*, hence manifold. Notwithstanding the infinite extension which Melissus attributes to being, he will not have it called material, since whatever is material has parts, and so can not be a unity."²⁴⁹⁵

Ocellus Lucanus also had a space-time theory thousands of years before Einstein:

"OCELLUS LUCANUS
ON THE UNIVERSE.

CHAP. I.

OCELLUS LUCANUS has written what follows concerning the Nature of the Universe; having learnt some things through clear arguments from Nature herself, *but others from opinion, in conjunction with reason* [*Footnote: See Additional Notes, (A.)*], it being his intention [in this work] to derive what is probable from intellectual perception.

It appears, therefore, to me, that the Universe is indestructible and unbegotten, since it always was, and always will be; for if it had a temporal beginning, it would not have always existed: thus, therefore, the universe is unbegotten and indestructible; for if some one should opine that it was once generated, he would not be able to find anything into which it can be corrupted and dissolved, since that from which it was generated would be the first part of the universe; and again, that into which it would be dissolved would be the last part of it.

But if the universe was generated, it was generated together with all things; and if it should be corrupted, it would be corrupted together with all things. This, however, is impossible [*Footnote: The universe could not be generated together with all things, for the principle of it must be unbegotten; since everything that is generated, is generated from a cause; and if this cause was also generated, there must be a progression of causes ad infinitum, unless the unbegotten is admitted to be the principle of the universe. Neither, therefore, can the universe be corrupted together with all things; for the*

principle of it being unbegotten is also incorruptible; that only being corruptible, which was once generated.]. The universe, therefore, is without a beginning, and without an end; nor is it possible that it can have any other mode of subsistence.

To which may be added, that everything which has received a beginning of generation, and which ought also to participate of dissolution, receives two mutations; one of which, indeed, proceeds from the less to the greater, and from the worse to the better; and that from which it begins to change is denominated generation, but that at which it at length arrives, is called acme. The other mutation, however, proceeds from the greater to the less, and from the better to the worse: but the termination of this mutation is denominated corruption and dissolution.

If, therefore, the whole and the universe were generated, and are corruptible, they must, when generated, have been changed from the less to the greater, and from the worse to the better; but when corrupted, they must be changed from the greater to the less, and from the better to the worse. Hence, if the world was generated, it would receive increase, and would arrive at its acme; and again, it would afterwards receive decrease and an end. For every nature which has a progression, possesses three boundaries and two intervals. The three boundaries, therefore, are generation, acme, and end; but the intervals are, the progression from generation to acme, and from acme to the end.

The whole, however, and the universe, affords, as from itself, no indication of a thing of this kind; for neither do we perceive it rising into existence, or becoming to be, nor changing to the better and the greater, nor becoming at a certain time worse or less; but it always continues to subsist in the same and a similar manner, and is itself perpetually equal and similar to itself.

Of the truth of this, the orders of things, their symmetry, figurations, positions, intervals, powers, swiftness and slowness with respect to each other; and, besides these, their numbers and temporal periods, are clear signs and indications. For all such things as these receive mutation and diminution, conformably to the course of a generated nature: for things that are greater and better acquire acme through power, but those that are less and worse are corrupted through imbecility of nature.

I denominate, however, the whole and the universe, the whole world; for, in consequence of being adorned with all things, it has obtained this appellation; since it is from itself a consummate and perfect system of the nature of all things; for there is nothing external to the universe, since whatever exists is contained in the universe, and the universe subsists together with this, comprehending in itself all things, some as parts, but others as supervenient.

Those things, therefore, which are comprehended in the world, have a congruity with the world; but the world has no concinnity with anything else, but is itself co-harmonized with itself. For all other things have not a

consummate or self-perfect subsistence, but require congruity with things external to themselves. Thus animals require a conjunction with air for the purpose of respiration, but sight with light, in order to see; and the other senses with something else, in order to perceive their peculiar sensible object. A conjunction with the earth also is necessary to the germination of plants. The sun and moon, the planets, and the fixed stars, have likewise a coalescence with the world, as being parts of its common arrangement. The world, however, has not a conjunction with anything else than itself.

Further still [*Footnote*: Critolaus, the Peripatetic, employs nearly the same arguments as those contained in this paragraph, in proof of the perpetuity of the world, as is evident from the following passage, preserved by Philo, in his Treatise *Περὶ Αφθαρσίας Κοσμου*, “On the Incorruptibility of the World”: το αιτιον αυτω του υγαινειν, ανοσον εστι· αλλα και το αιτιον αυτω του αγρουπνειν, αγρουπνον εστιν. ει δε τουτο, και το αιτιον αυτω του υπαρχειν, αιδιον εστιν. αιτιος δε ο κοσμος αυτω του υπαρχειν, ειγε και τοις αλλοις απασιν. αιδιος ο κοσμος εστιν. i. e. “That which is the cause to itself of good health, is without disease. But, also, that which is the cause to itself of a vigilant energy, is sleepless. But if this be the case, that also which is the cause to itself of existence, is perpetual. The world, however, is the cause to itself of existence, since it is the cause of existence to all other things. The world, therefore, is perpetual.” Everything divine, according to the philosophy of Pythagoras and Plato, being a self-perfect essence, begins its own energy from itself, and is therefore primarily the cause to itself of that which it imparts to others. Hence, since the world, being a divine and self-subsistent essence, imparts to itself existence, it must be without non-existence, and therefore must be perpetual.], what has been said will be easily known to be true from the following considerations. Fire, which imparts heat to another thing, is itself from itself hot; and honey, which is sweet to the taste, is itself from itself sweet. The principles likewise of demonstrations, which are indicative of things unapparent, are themselves from themselves manifest and known. Thus, also, that which becomes to other things the cause of self-perfection, is itself from itself perfect; and that which becomes to other things the cause of preservation and permanency, is itself from itself preserved and permanent. That, likewise, which becomes to other things the cause of concinnity, is itself from itself co-harmonized; but the world is to other things the cause of their existence, preservation, and self-perfection. The world, therefore, is from itself perpetual and self-perfect, has an everlasting duration, and on this very account becomes the cause of the permanency of the whole of things.

In short, if the universe should be dissolved, it would either be dissolved into that which has an existence, or into nonentity. But it is impossible that it should be dissolved into that which exists, for there will not be a corruption of the universe if it should be dissolved into that which has a being; for being is either the universe, or a certain part of the universe. Nor can it be dissolved into nonentity, since it is impossible for being either to be produced from

non-beings, or to be dissolved into nonentity. The universe, therefore, is incorruptible, and can never be destroyed.

If, nevertheless, some one should think that it may be corrupted, it must either be corrupted from something external to, or contained in the universe, but it cannot be corrupted by anything external to it; for there is not anything external to the universe, since all other things are comprehended in the universe, and the world is *the whole* and *the all*. Nor can it be corrupted by the things which it contains, for in this case it will be requisite that these should be greater and more powerful than the universe. This, however, is not true [*Footnote*: i. e. It is not true that the universe can contain anything greater and more powerful than itself.], for all things are led and governed by the universe, and conformably to this are preserved and co-adapted, and possess life and soul. But if the universe can neither be corrupted by anything external to it, nor by anything contained within it, the world must therefore be incorruptible and indestructible; for we consider the world to be the same with the universe [*Footnote*: Philo Judæus, in his before-mentioned Treatise Περὶ Αφθαρσίας Κοσμου, has adopted the arguments of Ocellus in this paragraph, but not with the conciseness of his original.].

Further still, the whole of nature surveyed through the whole of itself, will be found to derive continuity from the first and most honourable of bodies, attenuating this continuity proportionally, introducing it to everything mortal, and receiving the progression of its peculiar subsistence; for the first [and most honourable] bodies in the universe, revolve according to the same, and after a similar manner. The progression, however, of the whole of nature, is not successive and continued, nor yet local, but subsists according to mutation.

Fire, indeed, when it is congregated into one thing, generates air, but air generates water, and water earth. From earth, also, there is the same circuit of mutation, as far as to fire, from whence it began to be changed. But fruits, and most plants that derive their origin from a root, receive the beginning of their generation from seeds. When, however, they bear fruit and arrive at maturity, again they are resolved into seed, nature producing a complete circulation from the same to the same.

But men and other animals, in a subordinate degree, change the universal boundary of nature; for in these there is no periodical return to the first age, nor is there an antiperistasis of mutation into each other, as there is in fire and air, water and earth; but the mutations of their ages being accomplished in a four-fold circle [*Footnote*: This four-fold mutation of ages in the human race, consists of the infant, the lad, the man, and the old man, as is well observed by Theo of Smyrna. See my Theoretic Arithmetic, p. 189.], they are dissolved, and again return to existence; these, therefore, are the signs and indications that the universe, which comprehends [all things], will always endure and be preserved, but that its parts, and such things in it as are supervenient, are corrupted and dissolved.

Further still, it is credible that the universe is without a beginning, and

without an end, from its figure, from motion, from time, and its essence; and, therefore, it may be concluded that the world is unbegotten and incorruptible: for the form of its figure is circular; but a circle is on all sides similar and equal, and is therefore without a beginning, and without an end. The motion also of the universe is circular, but this motion is stable and without transition. Time, likewise, in which motion exists is infinite, for this neither had a beginning, nor will have an end of its circulation. The essence, too, of the universe, is without egression [into any other place], and is immutable, because it is not naturally adapted to be changed, either from the worse to the better, or from the better to the worse. From all these arguments, therefore, it is obviously credible, that the world is unbegotten and incorruptible. And thus much concerning the whole and the universe.

CHAP. II.

SINCE, however, in the universe, one thing is generation, but another the cause of generation; and generation indeed takes place where there is a mutation and an egression from things which rank as subjects; but the cause of generation then subsists where the subject matter remains the same: this being the case, it is evident that the cause of generation possesses both an effective and motive power, but that the recipient of generation is adapted to passivity, and to be moved.

But the Fates themselves distinguish and separate the impassive part of the world from that which is perpetually moved [or mutable] [*Footnote*: In the original, το τε απαθες μερος του κοσμου και το ακινητον, which is obviously erroneous. Nogarola, in his note on this passage, says, “Melius arbitror si legatur το τε αιιπαθες μερος, και αιικινητον, ut sit sensus, semper patibilem, et semper mobilem partem distinguunt ac separant.” But though he is right in reading αιικινητον for ακινητον, he is wrong in substituting αιιπαθες for απαθες; for Ocellus is here speaking of the distinction between the celestial and sublunary region, the former of which is *impassive*, because not subject to generation and corruption, but the latter being subject to both these is *perpetually mutable*.]. For the course of the moon is the isthmus of immortality and generation. The region, indeed, above the moon, and also that which the moon occupies, contain the genus of the gods; but the place beneath the moon is the abode of strife and nature; for in this place there is a mutation of things that are generated, and a regeneration of things which have perished.

In that part of the world, however, in which nature and generation predominate, it is necessary that the three following things [*Footnote*: Aristotle, in his treatise on Generation and Corruption, has borrowed what Ocellus here says about the three things necessary to generation. See my translation of that work.] should be present. In the first place, the body which yields to the touch, and which is the subject of all generated natures. But this

will be an universal recipient, and a signature of generation itself having the same *relation* to the things that are generated from it, as water to taste, *silence to sound* [*Footnote*: In the original, και ψοφος προς σιγην, instead of which it is necessary to read και σιγη προς ψοφον, conformably to the above translation. See the Notes to my translation of the First Book of Aristotle’s Physics, p. 73, &c., in which the reader will find a treasury of information from Simplicius concerning matter. But as matter is devoid of all quality, and is a privation of all form, the necessity of the above emendation is immediately obvious.], darkness to light, and the matter of artificial forms to the forms themselves. For water is tasteless and devoid of quality, yet is capable of receiving the sweet and the bitter, the sharp and the salt. Air, also, which is formless with respect to sound, is the recipient of words and melody. And darkness, which is without colour, and without form, becomes the recipient of splendour, and of the yellow colour and the white; but whiteness pertains to the statuary’s art, and to the art which fashions figures from wax. Matter, however, has a relation in a different manner to the statuary’s art; for in matter all things prior to generation are in capacity, but they exist in perfection when they are generated and receive their proper nature. Hence matter [or a universal recipient] is necessary to the existence of generation.

The second thing which is necessary, is the existence of contrarities, in order that mutations and changes in quality may be effected, matter for this purpose receiving passive qualities, and an aptitude to the participation of forms. Contrariety is also necessary, in order that powers, which are naturally mutually repugnant, may not finally vanquish, or be vanquished by, each other. But these powers are the hot and the cold, the dry and the moist.

Essences rank in the third place; and these are fire and water, air and earth, of which the hot and the cold, the dry and the moist, are powers. But essences differ from powers; for essences are locally corrupted by each other, but powers are neither corrupted nor generated, for the reasons [or forms] of them are incorporeal.

Of these four powers, however, the hot and the cold subsist as causes and things of an effective nature, but the dry and the moist rank as matter and things that are passive [*Footnote*: Thus also Aristotle, in his Treatise on Generation and Corruption, θερμον δε και ψυχρον, και υγρον, τα μεν τω ποιητικα ειναι, τα δε τω παθητικα λεγεται. i. e. “With respect to heat and cold, dryness and moisture, the two former of these are said to be effective, but the two latter passive powers.”]; but matter is the first recipient of all things, for it is that which is in common spread under all things. Hence, the body, which is the object of sense in capacity, and ranks as a principle, is the first thing; but contrarities, such as heat and cold, moisture and dryness, form the second thing; and fire and water, earth and air, have an arrangement in the third place. For these change into each other; but things of a contrary nature are without change.

But the differences of bodies are two: for some of them indeed are

primary, but others originate from these: for the hot and the cold, the moist and the dry, rank as primary differences; but the heavy and the light, the dense and the rare, have the relation of things which are produced from the primary differences. All of them, however, are in number sixteen, viz, the hot and the cold, the moist and the dry, the heavy and the light, the rare and the dense, the smooth and the rough, the hard and the soft, the thin and the thick, the acute and the obtuse. But of all these, the touch has a knowledge, and forms a judgement; hence, also, the first body in which these differences exist in capacity, may be sensibly apprehended by the touch.

The hot and the dry, therefore, the rare and the sharp, are the powers of fire; but those of water are, the cold and the moist, the dense and the obtuse; those of air are, the soft, the smooth, the light, and the attenuated; and those of earth are, the hard and the rough, the heavy and the thick.

Of these four bodies, however, fire and earth are the transcendencies and summits [or extremities] of contraries. Fire, therefore, is the transcendency of heat, in the same manner as ice is of cold: hence, if ice is a concretion of moisture and frigidity, fire will be the fervour of dryness and heat. On which account, nothing is generated from ice, nor from fire [*Footnote: The substance of nearly the whole of what Ocellus here says, and also of the two following paragraphs, is given by Aristotle, in his Treatise on Generation and Corruption.*].

Fire and earth, therefore, are the extremities of the elements, but water and air are the media, for they have a mixed corporeal nature. Nor is it possible that there could be only one of the extremes, but it is necessary that there should be a contrary to it. Nor could there be two only, for it is necessary that there should be a medium, since media are opposite to the extremes.

Fire, therefore, is hot and dry, but air is hot and moist; water is moist and cold, but earth is cold and dry. Hence, heat is common to air and fire; cold is common to water and earth; dryness to earth and fire; and moisture to water and air. But with respect to the peculiarities of each, heat is the peculiarity of fire, dryness of earth, moisture of air, and frigidity of water. The essences, therefore, of these remain permanent, through the possession of common properties; but they change through such as are peculiar, when one contrary vanquishes another.

Hence, when the moisture in air vanquishes the dryness in fire, but the frigidity in water, the heat in air, and the dryness in earth, the moisture in water, and vice versa, when the moisture in water vanquishes the dryness in earth, the heat in air, the coldness in water, and the dryness in fire, the moisture in air, then the mutations and generations of the elements from each other into each other are effected.

The body, however, which is the subject and recipient of mutations, is a universal receptacle, and is in capacity the first tangible substance.

But the mutations of the elements are effected, either from a change of earth into fire, or from fire into air, or from air into water, or from water into

earth. Mutation is also effected in the third place, when that which is contrary in each element is corrupted, but that which is of a kindred nature, and connascent, is preserved. Generation, therefore, is effected, when one contrariety is corrupted. For fire, indeed, is hot and dry, but air is hot and moist, and heat is common to both; but the peculiarity of fire is dryness, and of air moisture. Hence, when the moisture in air vanquishes the dryness in fire, then fire is changed into air.

Again, since water is moist and cold, but air is moist and hot, moisture is common to both. The peculiarity however of water is coldness, but of air heat. When, therefore, the coldness in water vanquishes the heat in air, the mutation from air into water is effected.

Further still, earth is cold and dry, but water is cold and moist, and coldness is common to both; but the peculiarity of earth is dryness, and of water moisture. When, therefore, the dryness in earth vanquishes the moisture in water, a mutation takes place from water into earth.

The mutation, however, from earth, in an ascending progression, is performed in a contrary way; but an alternate mutation is effected when one whole vanquishes another, and two contrary powers are corrupted, nothing at the same time being common to them. For since fire is hot and dry, but water is cold and moist; when the moisture in water vanquishes the dryness in fire, and the coldness in water the heat in fire, then a mutation is effected from fire into water.

Again, earth is cold and dry, but air is hot and moist. When, therefore, the coldness in earth vanquishes the heat in air, and the dryness in earth, the moisture in air, then a mutation from air into earth is effected.

But when the moisture of air corrupts the heat of fire, from both of them fire will be generated; for the heat of air and the dryness of fire will still remain. And fire is hot and dry.

When, however, the coldness of earth is corrupted, and the moisture of water, from both of them earth will be generated. For the dryness of earth, indeed, will be left, and the coldness of water. And earth is cold and dry.

But when the heat of air, and the heat of fire are corrupted, no element will be generated; for the contraries in both these will remain, viz, the moisture of air and the dryness of fire. Moisture, however, is contrary to dryness.

And again, when the coldness of earth, and in a similar manner of water, are corrupted, neither thus will there be any generation; for the dryness of earth and the moisture of water will remain. But dryness is contrary to moisture. And thus, we have briefly discussed the generation of the first bodies, and have shown how and from what subjects it is effected.

Since, however, the world is indestructible and unbegotten, and neither received a beginning of generation, nor will ever have an end, it is necessary that the nature which produces generation in another thing, and also that which generates in itself, should be present with each other. And that, indeed, which produces generation in another thing, is the whole of the region above

the moon; but the more proximate cause is the sun, who, by his accessions and recessions, continually changes the air, so as to cause it to be at one time cold, and at another hot; the consequence of which is, that the earth is changed, and everything which the earth contains.

The obliquity of the zodiac, also, is well posited with respect to the motion of the sun, for it likewise is the cause of generation. And universally this is accomplished by the proper order of the universe; so that one thing in it is that which makes, but another that which is passive. Hence, that which generates in another thing, exists above the moon; but that which generates in itself, has a subsistence beneath the moon; and that which consists of both these, viz, of an ever-running divine body, and of an ever-mutable generated nature, is the world.

CHAP. III.

THE origin, however, of the generation of man was not derived from the earth, nor that of other animals, nor of plants; but the proper order of the world being perpetual, it is also necessary that the natures which exist in it, and are aptly arranged, should, together with it, have a never-failing subsistence. For the world primarily always existing, it is necessary that its parts should be co-existent with it: but I mean by its parts, the heavens, the earth, and that which subsists between these; which is placed on high, and is denominated aerial; for the world does not exist without, but together with, and from these.

The parts of the world, however, being consubsistent, it is also necessary that the natures, comprehended in these parts, should be co-existent with them; with the heavens, indeed, the sun and moon, the fixed stars, and the planets; but with the earth, animals and plants, gold and silver; with the place on high, and the aerial region, pneumatic substances and wind, a mutation to that which is more hot, and a mutation to that which is more cold; for it is the property of the heavens to subsist in conjunction with the natures which it comprehends; of the earth to support the plants and animals which originate from it; and of the place on high, and the aerial region, to be consubsistent with all the natures that are generated in it.

Since, therefore, in each division of the world, a certain genus of animals is arranged, which surpasses the rest contained in that division; in the heavens, indeed, the genus of the gods, but in the earth men, and in the region on high demons;— this being the case, it is necessary that the race of men should be perpetual, since reason truly induces us to believe, that not only the [great] parts of the world are consubsistent with the world, but also the natures comprehended in these parts.

Violent corruptions, however, and mutations, take place in the parts of the earth; at one time, indeed, the sea overflowing into another part of the earth; but at another, the earth itself becoming dilated and divulsed, through wind or water latently entering into it. But an entire corruption of the

arrangement of the whole earth never did happen, nor ever will.

Hence the assertion, that the Grecian history derived its beginning from the Argive Inachus, must not be admitted as if it commenced from a certain first principle, but that it originated from some mutation which happened in Greece; for Greece has frequently been, and will again be, barbarous, not only from the migration of foreigners into it, but from nature herself, which, though she does not become greater or less, yet is always younger, and with reference to us, receives a beginning.

And thus much has been sufficiently said by me respecting *the whole* and *the universe*; and further still, concerning the generation and corruption of the natures which are generated in it, and the manner in which they subsist, and will for ever subsist; one part of the universe consisting of a nature which is perpetually moved, but another part of a nature which is always passive; and the former of these always governing, but the latter being always governed.

CHAP. IV.

CONCERNING the generation of men, however, from each other, after what manner, and from what particulars, it may be most properly effected, law, and temperance and piety at the same time cooperating, will be, I think, as follows. In the first place, indeed, this must be admitted,—that we should not be connected with women for the sake of pleasure, but for the sake of begetting children.

For those powers and instruments, and appetites, which are subservient to copulation, were imparted to men by Divinity, not for the sake of voluptuousness, but for the sake of the perpetual duration of the human race. For since it was impossible that man, who is born mortal, should participate of a divine life, if the immortality of his genus was corrupted; Divinity gave completion to this immortality through individuals, and made this generation of mankind to be unceasing and continued. This, therefore, is one of the first things which it is necessary to survey,—that copulation should not be undertaken for the sake of voluptuous delight.

In the next place, the co-ordination itself of man should be considered with reference to the whole, viz, that he is a part of a house and a city, and (which is the greatest thing of all) that each of the progeny of the human species ought to give completion to the world [*Footnote* In the original, *επειτα δε και την αυτην τω ανθρωπω συνταξιν προς το ολον, οτι μερος υπαρχων οικου τε και πολεως, και το μεγαιστον κοσμου, συμπληρουν οφειλει το απογενομενον τουτων εκαστον, κ. τ. λ.* Here, for *και το μεγαιστον κοσμου, συμπληρουν, κ. τ. λ.*, it is requisite to read, conformably to the above translation, *και το μεγαιστον, κοσμου συμπληρουν, κ. τ. λ.* Nogarola, in his version, from not perceiving the necessity of this emendation, has made Ocellus say that man is the greatest part of the universe; for his translation is as follows: “Mox eandem hominis constitutionem ad universam

referendam, quippe qui non solum domûs et civitatis, verum etiam mundi maxima habetur pars,” &c.], if it does not intend to be a deserter either of the domestic, or political, or divine Vestal hearth.

For those who are not entirely connected with each other for the sake of begetting children, injure the most honourable system of convention. But if persons of this description procreate with libidinous insolence and intemperance, their offspring will be miserable and flagitious, and will be execrated by gods and demons, and by men, and families, and cities.

Those, therefore, who deliberately consider these things, ought not, in a way similar to irrational animals, to engage in venereal connections, but should think copulation to be a necessary good. For it is the opinion of worthy men, that it is necessary and beautiful, not only to fill houses with large families, and also the greater part of the earth [*Footnote:* This observation applies only to well regulated cities, but in London and other large cities, where the population is not restricted to a definite number, this abundant propagation of the species is, to the greater part of the community, attended with extreme misery and want. Plato and Aristotle, who rank among the wisest men that ever lived, were decidedly of opinion, that the population of a city should be limited. Hence, the former of these philosophers says, “that in a city where the inhabitants do not know each other, there is no light, but profound darkness;” and the latter, “that as 10,000 inhabitants are too few for a city, so 100,000 are too many.”], (for man is the most mild and the best of all animals,) but, as a thing of the greatest consequence, to cause them to abound with the most excellent men.

For on this account men inhabit cities governed by the best laws, rightly manage their domestic affairs, and [if they are able] impart to their friends such political employments as are conformable to the polities in which they live, since they not only provide for the multitude at large, but [especially] for worthy men.

Hence, many err, who enter into the connubial state without regarding the magnitude of [the power of] fortune, or public utility, but direct their attention to wealth, or dignity of birth. For in consequence of this, instead of uniting with females who are young and in the flower of their age, they become connected with extremely old women; and instead of having wives with a disposition according with, and most similar to their own, they marry those who are of an illustrious family, or are extremely rich. On this account, they procure for themselves discord instead of concord; and instead of unanimity, dissention; contending with each other for the mastery. For the wife who surpasses her husband in wealth, in birth, and in friends, is desirous of ruling over him, contrary to the law of nature. But the husband justly resisting this desire of superiority in his wife, and wishing not to be the second, but the first in domestic sway, is unable, in the management of his family, to take the lead.

This being the case, it happens that not only families, but cities, become miserable. For families are parts of cities, but the composition of the whole

and the universe derives its subsistence from parts [*Footnote: For whole, according to the philosophy of Pythagoras and Plato, has a triple subsistence; since it is either prior to parts, or consists of parts, or exists in each of the parts of a thing. But a whole, prior to parts, contains in itself parts causally. The universe is a whole of wholes, the wholes which it comprehends in itself (viz, the inerratic sphere, and the spheres of the planets and elements) being its parts. And in the whole which is in each part of a thing, every part according to participation becomes a whole, i. e. a partial whole.*]. It is reasonable, therefore, to admit, that such as are the parts, such likewise will be the whole and the all which consists of things of this kind.

And as in fabrics of a primary nature the first structures co-operate greatly to the good or bad completion of the whole work; as, for instance, the manner in which the foundation is laid in building a house, the structure of the keel in building a ship, and in musical modulation the extension and remission of the voice; so the concordant condition of families greatly contributes to the well or ill establishment of a polity.

Those, therefore, who direct their attention to the propagation of the human species, ought to guard against everything which is dissimilar and imperfect; for neither plants nor animals, when imperfect, are prolific, but to their fructification a certain portion of time is necessary, in order that when the bodies are strong and perfect, they may produce seeds and fruits.

Hence, it is necessary that boys, and girls also while they are virgins, should be trained up in exercises and proper endurance, and that they should be nourished with that kind of food, which is adapted to a laborious, temperate, and patient life.

Moreover, there are many things in human life of such a kind, that it is better for the knowledge of them to be deferred for a certain time. Hence, it is requisite that a boy should be so tutored, as not to seek after venereal pleasures before he is twenty years of age, and then should rarely engage in them. This, however, will take place, if he conceives that a good habit of body, and continence, are beautiful and honourable.

It is likewise requisite that such legal institutes as the following should be taught in Grecian cities, viz. that connection with a mother, or a daughter, or a sister, should not be permitted either in temples, or in a public place; for it is beautiful and advantageous that numerous impediments to this energy should be employed.

And universally, it is requisite that all preternatural generations should be prevented, and those which are attended with wanton insolence. But such as are conformable to nature should be admitted, and which are effected with temperance, for the purpose of producing a temperate and legitimate offspring.

Again, it is necessary that those who intend to beget children, should providentially attend to the welfare of their future offspring. A temperate and salutary diet, therefore, is the first and greatest thing which should be attended to by him who wishes to beget children; so that he should neither be

filled with unseasonable food, nor become intoxicated, nor subject himself to any other perturbation, from which the habits of the body may become worse. But, above all things, it is requisite to be careful that the mind, in the act of copulation, should be in a tranquil state: for, from depraved, discordant, and turbulent habits, bad seed is produced.

It is requisite, therefore, to endeavour, with all possible earnestness and attention, that children may be born elegant and graceful, and that when born, they should be well educated. For neither is it just that those who rear horses, or birds, or dogs, should, with the utmost diligence, endeavour that the breed may be such as is proper, and from such things as are proper, and when it is proper [*Footnote:* In the original, ὡς δεῖ, καὶ ἐξ ὧν δεῖ, καὶ ὅτε δεῖ, a mode of diction which frequently occurs in Aristotle, and from him in Platonic writers.]; and likewise consider how they ought to be disposed when they copulate with each other, in order that the offspring may not be a casual production; —but that men should pay no attention to their progeny, but should beget them casually; and when begotten, should neglect both their nutriment and their education: for these being disregarded, the causes of all vice and depravity are produced, since those that are thus born will resemble cattle, and will be ignoble and vile.

OCELLUS LUCANUS ON LAWS.

A FRAGMENT PRESERVED BY STOBÆUS, ECLOG. PHYS.
LIB. 1. CAP. 16.

LIFE, connectedly—contains in itself bodies; but of this, soul is the cause. Harmony comprehends, connectedly, the world; but of this, God is the cause. Concord binds together families and cities; and of this, law is the cause. Hence, there is a certain cause and nature which perpetually adapts the parts of the world to each other, and never suffers them to be disorderly and without connection. Cities, however, and families, continue only for a short time; the progeny of which, and the mortal nature of the matter of which they consist, contain in themselves the cause of dissolution; for they derive their subsistence from a mutable and perpetually passive nature. For the destruction

[*Footnote:* In the original, ἀπογενεσις; but the true reading is doubtless ἀπώλεια, and Vizzanus has in his version *interitus*. What is here said by Ocellus is in perfect conformity with the following beautiful lines of our admirable philosophic poet, Pope, in his Essay on Man:

“All forms that perish other forms supply;
By turns they catch the vital breath and die;
Like bubbles on the sea of matter born,

They rise, they break, and to that sea return.”]

of things which are generated, is the salvation of the matter from which they are generated. That nature, however, which is perpetually moved [*Footnote*: i. e. The celestial region.] governs, but that which is always passive [*Footnote*: i. e. The sublunary region.] is governed; and the one is in capacity prior, but the other posterior. The one also is divine, and possesses reason and intellect, but the other is generated, and is irrational and mutable.”²⁴⁹⁶

10.3 Einstein and “Space-Time”

Albert Einstein stated,

“This rigid four-dimensional space of the special theory of relativity is to some extent a four-dimensional analogue of H. A. Lorentz’s rigid three-dimensional æther.”²⁴⁹⁷

and,

“I think, that the ether of the general theory of relativity is the outcome of the Lorentzian ether, through relativation.”²⁴⁹⁸

Henri Poincaré provided the “four-dimensional analogue”²⁴⁹⁹ to Lorentz’ æther in 1905 and relativized the “Lorentzian ether” in 1895, long before Hermann Minkowski or Albert Einstein manipulated credit for his work. The Einsteins’ 1905 paper contains no four-dimensional analogue, and is, therefore, a theory of the “unrelativized Lorentzian æther”, *per se*. Though Einstein credited Minkowski with the quadri-dimensional analogue,

“And now let me say just a few words about the highly interesting mathematical elaboration that the theory has undergone, thanks, mainly, to the sadly so prematurely deceased mathematician Minkowski,”²⁵⁰⁰

in fact, Minkowski was well aware of Poincaré’s earlier work, before Minkowski recited it in 1907, as if it were his own.²⁵⁰¹ Max Born recounts that,

“My first encounter with the difficulties of this orthodox creed happened in 1905, the year which we celebrate today, in a seminar on the theory of electrons, held not by a physicist but by a mathematician, HERMANN MINKOWSKI. My memory of these long bygone days is of course blurred, but I am sure that in this seminar we discussed what was known at this period about the electrodynamics and optics of moving systems. We studied papers by HERTZ, FITZGERALD, LARMOR, LORENTZ, POINCARÉ, and others but also got an inkling of MINKOWSKI’S own ideas which were published only two years later.”²⁵⁰²

and,

“[In 1905] I was a student in Göttingen and attended a seminar conducted by the mathematicians David Hilbert and Hermann Minkowsky. They dealt with the electrodynamics and optics of moving bodies — the subject that was Einstein’s point of departure for the theory of relativity. We studied papers by H. A. Lorentz, Henri Poincaré, G. F. Fitzgerald, Larmor and others, but Einstein was not mentioned. [***] When I mentioned Minkowsky’s contributions to the seminars in Göttingen, which already contained the germ of his four-dimensional representation of the electromagnetic field, published in 1907-8, Reiche and Loria told me about Einstein’s paper and suggested that I should study it.”²⁵⁰³

and,

“The result was that in the same year (I have forgotten whether simultaneously or in consecutive terms) two advanced seminars were held on mathematical physics: one by Klein and Runge on elasticity, the other by Hilbert and Minkowski on electromagnetic theory. It was the latter which fascinated me. We studied the papers of Lorentz, Poincaré and others on the difficulties which the theories of the electromagnetic ether had run into as a result of Michelson’s celebrated experiment. [***] One day Reiche asked me whether I knew a paper by a man named Einstein on the principle of relativity. He said Planck considered it most important. I had not heard of it, but when I learned that it had something to do with the fundamental principles of electrodynamics and optics which years ago had fascinated me in Hilbert’s and Minkowski’s seminar, I agreed at once to join Reiche in studying it.”²⁵⁰⁴

The nature of these lectures at the Göttingen Academy and their historical importance is treated by Jules Leveugle, Reid and Pyenson.²⁵⁰⁵ Both Hilbert and Minkowski failed to give Lorentz and Poincaré due credit for their contributions to the development of the theory of relativity, and the contributions of Hilbert and Minkowski have likewise since been underrated or forgotten by others.

Roberto Marcolongo,²⁵⁰⁶ also, in 1906, published a four-dimensional analysis of the Poincaré-Lorentz theory of relativity, before Minkowski. Einstein’s brief evaluation exclusively cites work which was accomplished by Poincaré before Minkowski copied it, but Einstein nowhere mentions Poincaré or Marcolongo. Mehmke’s work is significant and preceded Poincaré’s.²⁵⁰⁷ Richard Hargreaves²⁵⁰⁸ and Harry Bateman²⁵⁰⁹ also deserve mention, for their development of the special and the general theories of relativity. In this same lecture, followed by a discussion which is on record,²⁵¹⁰ Einstein shamelessly parroted Poincaré’s enquiries into the nature of simultaneity²⁵¹¹ and his clock synchronization procedures, without citing Poincaré; and Einstein failed to correct those who credited Einstein with the ideas he repeated, which he knew were not his own.

Harry Bateman wrote of Hargreaves contributions,

“§ 2. In the year 1908 two very important papers on electromagnetic theory were published. One of these was Minkowski’s paper on the electro-dynamical equations for moving bodies,¹ a paper which soon influenced mathematical thought very considerably and received world wide attention. The other paper was by Mr. Richard Hargreaves, of Southport, England, and was entitled ‘Integral forms and their connection with physical equations.’ This paper which is perhaps the more important of the two, contains two new presentations of the principles of electromagnetism in terms of space-time integrals. This at once places the time coördinate on the same level as the other coördinates and suggests the idea of space-time vectors just as in Minkowski’s work. The chief importance of Mr. Hargreaves’ work lies, however, in the fact that it throws light at once upon the nature of the solutions of the electromagnetic equations and that the principles are presented in a form which is independent of the choice of the space and time coördinates. The last circumstance enables one to obtain the transformations of the theory of relativity in a simple and natural manner and makes it easy to obtain the invariants by a simple application of the methods of the absolute calculus of Ricci and Levi Civita.”²⁵¹²

Consider the psychological import of the attitude of some later writers toward those who actually originated the ideas compared to their attitude toward the *heroes* “Einstein” and “Minkowski”, who merely parroted what others had pioneered,

“All the main ideas, of course, are due to Einstein and Minkowski. [***] It may be mentioned that the historical order of appearance of the ideas of our subject, as so often happens, has been quite different from the order which seems natural and in which we have presented them. First the formulas of transformation involving space coordinates and time were introduced by Lorentz without, however, giving to them the meaning they now have. In Lorentz’s theory there exists one universal time t , and other times t' play only an auxiliary part. The credit for taking the decisive step recognizing the fact that all these variables are on the same footing is due to Einstein (1905). The four-dimensional point of view, after some preliminary work had been done by Poincaré and Marcolongo, was introduced most emphatically by Minkowski in 1908.”²⁵¹³

One must wonder how Minkowski “introduced” in 1908, that which was already extant in Poincaré’s work of 1905, and in Marcolongo’s work of 1906. It was Poincaré who first attacked Lorentz’ and Larmor’s distinction between local time and time, beginning in 1898, and eliminated said distinction long before 1905—which distinction was not even present in Voigt’s formulation of 1887.

Olivier Darrigol stated in 1996,

“The physicist-historian and the philosopher-historian usually argue that Einstein’s new kinematics was an extremely important innovation that overthrew previous physical and philosophical concepts of time; and they tend to interpret Poincaré’s, Lorentz’s, and others’ fidelity to the ether as a failure to understand Einstein’s superior point of view. On the contrary, the social historian would argue that in 1905 Einstein’s relativity had no stabilized meaning, that it could be read and used in various manners depending on the receiving local culture, and that it acquired a precise meaning only at the end of a complex, social structuring process.”²⁵¹⁴

There was no novelty in asserting time as a fourth dimension in 1908. In 1907, Victoria Welby wrote,

“Or we may, if we like, compare our ‘present’ to the sweep of our outlook from horizon to horizon, and the great mind’s area of vision to the broad land- or sea-scape from a high mountain. But then the present moment must be seen as dimensional. It must give us the cube, the volume, the solid. It must be the true analogue of what from the highest vantage point attainable is the range and content of our bodily vision. The Future, then, to begin with, becomes that which is yet below a given horizon; if you will, the antipodes to the Present whereon we stand. But see what follows. For the Past, that is the world already explored by Man on his great journey through the life-country, has thus sunk below the horizon behind us; the Future is the world waiting for him, ready for the Columbus of the race, *the Copernicus of Time*. When that Time-Explorer appears he will know how to set forth on his voyage of exploration, and will bring us evidence that his discoveries are not conjectural nor fantastic. He will show that the prophet actually sees and gives us here and now, what the ordinary man merely predicts, foretells and guesses at, as far away; and that if we will learn to use his means and use them with his energy, we too may go forth into ‘new continents’ of Time and colonise the ‘future’ at our will.”²⁵¹⁵

In 1906, Cassius J. Keyser wrote,

“Herewith is immediately suggested the generic concept of dimensionality: *if an assemblage of elements of any given kind whatsoever, geometric or analytic or neither, as points, lines, circles, triangles, numbers, notions, sentiments, hues, tones, be such that, in order to distinguish every element of the assemblage from all the others, it is necessary and sufficient to know exactly n independent facts about the element, then the assemblage is said to be n -dimensional in the elements of the given kind.* It appears, therefore, that the notion of dimensionality is by no means exclusively associated with that of space but on the contrary may often be attached to the far more generic concept of assemblage, aggregate or manifold. For example, duration, the total aggregate of time-points, or instants, is a simple or one-fold assemblage.

[*Emphasis found in the original.*]²⁵¹⁶

In 1902, Walter Smith observed,

“The first thing to be noticed in regard to time is its spatial character. This statement is not a mere paradox. When a succession of events is thought of, the events are ranged in spatial order. We speak of time as long or short; we speak of the distant past and the near future, or of the receding past and the coming years; we ‘look before and after.’ These expressions are not simply figures of speech; they indicate what forms are present in consciousness when a temporal succession is referred to. Nor does this spatial form of the temporal series mean merely that images originally intuited in space are reproduced with this spatial character. If the images simply arise and dissolve in what seems to be one space, there is little if any perception of time; when the sense of time is present, the images of the past recede into the distance. It is very important to note this feature of the time-concept. It has received too little attention from students of the mind. Kant speaks of time as a line; and psychologists are learning to regard time as a projection at right angles to the plane of the present. But that this spatiality is essential to the time-concept has not been, in general, recognized. To F. A. Lange¹ belongs the credit of having given it due emphasis.”²⁵¹⁷

With respect to psychologists and their equating of time with space, G. F. Stout stated in 1902,

“Psychologists generally hold the same type of theory for the two cases of space and time cognition, and the indications of individual views given under Extension (q. v.) hold largely also for time.”²⁵¹⁸

Herbert Spencer wrote extensively on space and time in his works on psychology. Henry Longueville Mansel wrote in the “Psychology” section of his *Metaphysics*, “Much of what has been said of space is applicable of time also.”²⁵¹⁹

Neither Minkowski, nor the Einsteins, nor Poincaré, hold priority on the concept of four-dimensional space-time. In 1894, H. G. Wells wrote about it in a popular novel, *The Time Machine*, long before Minkowski claimed priority,

“‘Can a cube that does not last for any time at all, have a real existence?’ Filby became pensive. ‘Clearly,’ the Time Traveller proceeded, ‘any real body must have extension in *four* directions: it must have Length, Breadth, Thickness, and—Duration. But through a natural infirmity of the flesh, which I will explain to you in a moment, we incline to overlook this fact. There are really four dimensions, three which we call the three planes of Space, and a fourth, Time. There is, however, a tendency to draw an unreal distinction between the former three dimensions and the latter, because it happens that our consciousness moves intermittently in one direction along the latter from

the beginning to the end of our lives.”

An article by “S.” had appeared in *Nature*, Volume 31, Number 804, (26 March 1885), p. 481, titled, “Four-Dimensional Space”, which presented the concepts of “time-space”, “four-dimensional solid” (“sur-solid”, after Des Cartes), “time area”, and “time-line”; which later became “space-time”²⁵²⁰ (“*Zeit-Raum*” is a confusing pun in German with the word “*Zeitraum*”). It was used for quite some time in the theory of relativity but has largely died out. Rudolf Mewes was using the term “Space-Time” at least as early as 1889²⁵²¹ and Palágyi used the “*Raumzeit*” combination in 1901.²⁵²²), “absolute world”, and “world-line”. Here is the work of 1885, which appeared some 23 years before Minkowski’s derivative lecture on the same subject:

“Four-Dimensional Space

POSSIBLY the question, What is the fourth dimension? may admit of an indefinite number of answers. I prefer, therefore, in proposing to consider Time as a fourth dimension of our existence, to speak of it as *a* fourth dimension rather than *the* fourth dimension. Since this fourth dimension cannot be introduced into space, as commonly understood, we require a new kind of space for its existence, which we may call time-space. There is then no difficulty in conceiving the analogues in this new kind of space, of the things in ordinary space which are known as lines, areas, and solids. A straight line, by moving in any direction not in its own length, generates an area; if this area moves in any direction not in its own plane it generates a solid; but if this solid moves in any direction, it still generates a solid, and nothing more. The reason of this is that we have not supposed it to move in the fourth dimension. If the straight line moves in its own direction, it describes only a straight line; if the area moves in its own plane, it describes only an area; in each case, motion in the dimensions in which the thing exists, gives us only a thing of the same dimensions; and, in order to get a thing of higher dimensions, we must have motion in a new dimension. But, as the idea of motion is only applicable in space of three dimensions, we must replace it by another which is applicable in our fourth dimension of time. Such an idea is that of successive existence. We must, therefore, conceive that there is a new three-dimensional space for each successive instant of time; and, by picturing to ourselves the aggregate formed by the successive positions in time-space of a given solid during a given time, we shall get the idea of a four-dimensional solid, which may be called a sur-solid. It will assist us to get a clearer idea, if we consider a solid which is in a constant state of change, both of magnitude and position; and an example of a solid which satisfies this condition sufficiently well, is afforded by the body of each of us. Let any man picture to himself the aggregate of his own bodily forms from birth to the present time, and he will have a clear idea of a sur-solid in time-space.

Let us now consider the sur-solid formed by the movement, or rather, the

successive existence, of a cube in time-space. We are to conceive of the cube, and the whole of the three-dimensional space in which it is situated, as floating away in time-space for a given time; the cube will then have an initial and a final position, and these will be the end boundaries of the sur-solid. It will therefore have sixteen points, namely, the eight points belonging to the initial cube, and the eight belonging to the final cube. The successive positions (in time-space) of each of the eight points of the cube, will form what may be called a time-line; and adding to these the twenty-four edges of the initial and final cubes, we see that the sur-solid has thirty-two lines. The successive positions (in time-space) of each of the twelve edges of the cube, will form what may be called a time area; and, adding these to the twelve faces of the initial and final cubes, we see that the sur-solid has twenty-four areas. Lastly, the successive positions (in time-space) of each of the six faces of the cube, will form what may be called a time-solid; and, adding these to the initial and final cubes, we see that the sur-solid is bounded by eight solids. These results agree with the statements in your article. But it is not permissible to speak of the sur-solid as resting in ‘space,’ we must rather say that the section of it by any time is a cube resting (or moving) in ‘space.’ S. March 16”²⁵²³

This article, “Four-Dimensional Space”, was probably a reaction to an earlier one, “Scientific Romances”, *Nature*, Volume 31, Number 802, (March 12, 1885), p. 431; which discusses Hinton’s question, “What is the Fourth Dimension?” and Edwin A. Abbott’s book *Flatland: A Romance of Many Dimensions*.²⁵²⁴ *Nature* and *Mind* published numerous articles, which discussed time and space.

The author of “Four-Dimensional Space” is named as “S.”, who may have been Simon Newcomb. Wells’ *The Time Machine* includes the following passage,

“It is simply this. That Space, as our mathematicians have it, is spoken of as having three dimensions, which one may call Length, Breadth, and Thickness, and is always definable by reference to three planes, each at right angles to the others. But some philosophical people have been asking why *three* dimensions particularly—why not another direction at right angles to the other three?—and have even tried to construct a Four-Dimension geometry. Professor Simon Newcomb was expounding this to the New York Mathematical Society only a month or so ago. You know how on a flat surface, which has only two dimensions, we can represent a figure of a three-dimensional solid, and similarly they think that by models of three dimensions they could represent one of four—if they could master the perspective of the thing. See?”

A bibliography of Newcomb’s works on the fourth-dimension is to be found in the endnote.²⁵²⁵ However, Newcomb does not seem to be a believer in *time* as a fourth dimension—so the mysterious “S.” may well have been someone else, “S.” Tolver Preston, perhaps? James E. Beichler believes that James Joseph Sylvester was the

mysterious “S.”²⁵²⁶

Before Wells, in 1881, in a work which reminds one of Camille Flammarion’s *Lumen*, John Venn wrote,

“These requirements seem reducible to the two following—regard being had to the nature of our faculties and the general conditions under which we have to employ them: power to move about as freely as we may wish in space or time, and power to enlarge space and time to any extent we may need. [***] Let us begin with the former, *viz.*, our power of locomotion (the reader will observe that we are obliged to use, in many cases, space-words for time-ideas, and *vice versâ*, from inadequacy in ordinary terminology). What our powers in this respect as regards space, every one knows. Within very small limits we can move ourselves, or the objects with which we are concerned, up and down and about, in three dimensions, as we please. Within wider limits, *viz.*, that of the surface of the globe, we are restricted to two dimensions. Beyond that again we are hampered still further by being confined to one dimension only, our motion along that even being quite beyond our own control. [***] Now this state of powerlessness represents almost exactly our relation to events in respect of time. We are bound, as we all know, to go steadily forwards: we have no power to stand still, go sideways or backwards. [***] What we want is the power to stop still and to go backwards whenever we please. [***] What we want in fact is a microscope with a double set of stage-screws; one set to move the stage about as is now done, in respect of space, and the other to move it about in a similar way in respect of time. [***] Physical speculators have not unfrequently indulged in fanciful modes of attaining the equivalent of such a power as that just indicated. Since light travels with finite velocity, we are at liberty to conceive an object moving so fast as to outstrip it. Suppose a human eye receding from our system into space with a velocity greater than that of light, and occasionally pausing for a moment so as to permit the rays from the objects which it was leaving behind to overtake it and record their impression. We should then invert, so far as that eye was concerned, the relative course of events, and this would be, so far as all visual considerations are applied, precisely that regression into past time which is desired.”²⁵²⁷

Charles Howard Hinton queried as to what might be the fourth dimension in 1880, and argued that time constitutes a fourth dimension resulting in an Eleatic universal state of being, without cause or effect,

“And in the first place, a being in four dimensions would have to us exactly the appearance of a being in space. A being in a plane would only know solid objects as two dimensional figures—the shapes namely in which they intersected his plane. So if there were four-dimensional objects, we should only know them as solids—the solids, namely, in which they intersect our space. Why, then, should not the four-dimensional beings be ourselves, and

our successive states the passing of them through the three-dimensional space to which our consciousness is confined?

Let us consider the question in more detail. And for the sake of simplicity transfer the problem to the case of three and two dimensions instead of four and three.

Suppose a thread to be passed through a table cloth. It can be passed through in two ways. Either it can be pulled through, or it can be held at both ends, and moved downwards as a whole. Suppose a thread to be grasped at both ends, and the hands to be moved downwards perpendicularly to the tablecloth. If the thread happens to be perpendicular to the tablecloth it simply passes through it, but if the thread be held, stretched slanting wise to the tablecloth, and the hands are moved perpendicularly downwards, the thread will, if it be strong enough, make a slit in the tablecloth.

If now the tablecloth were to have the faculty of closing up behind the thread, what would appear in the cloth would be a moving hole.

Suppose that instead of a tablecloth and a thread, there were a straight line and a plane. If the straight line was placed slanting wise in reference to the plane and moved downwards, it would always cut the plane in a point, but that point of section would move on. If the plane were of such a nature as to close up behind the line, if it were of the nature of a fluid, what would be observed would be a moving point. If now there were a whole system of lines sloping in different directions, but all connected together, and held absolutely still by one framework, and if this framework with its system of lines were as a whole to pass slowly through the fluid plane at right angles to it, there would then be the appearance of a multitude of moving points in the plane, equal in number to the number of straight lines in the system. The lines in the framework will all be moving at the same rate—namely, at the rate of the framework in which they are fixed. But the points in the plane will have different velocities. They will move slower or faster according as the lines which give rise to them are more or less inclined to the plane. A straight line perpendicular to the plane will, on passing through, give rise to a stationary point. A straight line that slopes very much inclined to the plane will give rise to a point moving with great swiftness. The motions and paths of the points, would be determined by the arrangement of the lines in the system. It is obvious that if two straight lines were placed lying across one another like the letter X, and if this figure were to be stood upright and passed through the plane, what would appear would be at first two points. These two points would approach one another. When the part where the two strokes of the X meet came into the plane, the two points would become one. As the upper part of the figure passed through, the two points would recede from one another.

If the lines be supposed to be affixed to all parts of the framework, and to loop over one another, and support one another, [*figure deleted*] it is obvious that they could assume all sorts of figures, and that the points on the plane would move in very complicated paths. The annexed figure represents

a section of such a framework. Two lines X X and Y Y are shown, but there must be supposed to be a great number of others sloping backwards and forwards as well as sideways.

Let us now assume that instead of lines, very thin threads were attached to the framework: they on passing through the fluid plane would give rise to very small spots. Let us call the spots, atoms, and regard them as constituting a material system in the plane. There are four conditions which must be satisfied by these spots if they are to be admitted as forming a material system such as ours. For the ultimate properties of matter (if we eliminate attractive and repulsive forces, which may be caused by the motions of the smallest particles), are—1, Permanence; 2, Impenetrability; 3, Inertia; 4, Conservation of energy.

According to the first condition, or that of permanence, no one of these spots must suddenly cease to exist. That is, the thread which by sharing in the general motion of the system gives rise to the moving point, must not break off before the rest of them. If all the lines suddenly ended this would correspond to a ceasing of matter.

2. Impenetrability.—One spot must not pass through another. This condition is obviously satisfied. If the threads do not coincide at any point, the moving spots they give rise to cannot.

3. Inertia.—A spot must not cease to move or cease to remain at rest without coming into collision with another point. This condition gives the obvious condition with regard to the threads, that they, between the points where they come into contact with one another, must be straight. A thread which was curved would, passing through the plane, give rise to a point which altered in velocity spontaneously. This the particles of matter never do.

4. Conservation of energy.—The energy of a material system is never lost, it is only transferred from one form to another, however it may seem to cease. If we suppose each of the moving spots on the plane to be the unit of mass, the principle of the conservation of energy demands that when any two meet, the sum of the squares of their several velocities before meeting shall be the same as the sum of the squares of their velocities after meeting. Now we have seen that any statement about the velocities of the spots in the plane is really a statement about the inclinations of the threads to the plane. Thus the principle of the conservation of energy gives a condition which must be satisfied by the inclinations of the threads of the plane. Translating this statement, we get in mathematical language the assertion that the sum of the squares of the tangents of the angles the threads make with the normal to the plane remains constant.

Hence, all complexities and changes of a material system made up of similar atoms in a plane could result from the uniform motion as a whole of a system of threads.

We can imagine these threads as weaving together to form connected shapes, each, complete in itself, and these shapes as they pass through the

fluid plane give rise to a series of moving points. Yet, inasmuch as the threads are supposed to form consistent shapes, the motion of the points would not be wholly random, but numbers of them would present the semblance of moving figures. Suppose, for instance, a number of threads to be so grouped as to form a cylinder for some distance, but after a while to be pulled apart by other threads with which they interlink. While the cylinder was passing through the plane we should have in the plane a number of points in a circle. When the part where the threads deviated came to the plane, the circle would break up by the points moving away. These moving figures in the plane are but the traces of the shapes of threads as those shapes pass on. These moving figures may be conceived to have a life and a consciousness of their own.

Or if it be irrational to suppose them to have a consciousness when the shapes of which they are momentary traces have none, we may well suppose that the shapes of threads have consciousness, and that the moving figures share this consciousness, only that in their case it is limited to those parts of the shapes that simultaneously pass through the plane. In the plane, then, we may conceive bodies with all the properties of a material system moving and changing, possessing consciousness. After a while it may well be that one of them becomes so disassociated that it appears no longer as a unit, and its consciousness as such may be lost. But the threads of existence of such a figure are not broken, nor is the shape which gave it origin altered in any way. It has simply passed on to a distance from the plane. Thus nothing which existed in the conscious life on the plane would cease. There would in such an existence be no cause and effect, but simply the gradual realisation in a superficies of an already existent whole. There would be no progress, unless we were to suppose the threads as they pass to interweave themselves in more complex shapes.

Can a representation such as the preceding be applied to the case of the existence in space with which we have to do? Is it possible to suppose that the movements and changes of material objects are the intersections with a three-dimensional space of a four-dimensional existence? Can our consciousness be supposed to deal with a spatial profile of some higher actuality?

It is needless to say that all the considerations that have been brought forward in regard to the possibility of the production of a system satisfying the conditions of materiality by the passing of threads through a fluid plane, holds good with regard to a four-dimensional existence passing through a three-dimensional space. Each part of the ampler existence which passed through our space would seem perfectly limited to us. We should have no indication of the permanence of its existence. Were such a thought adopted, we should have to imagine some stupendous whole, wherein all that has ever come into being or will come co-exists, which, passing slowly on, leaves in this flickering consciousness of ours, limited to a narrow space and a single moment, a tumultuous record of changes and vicissitudes that are but to us.

Change and movement seem as if they were all that existed. But the appearance of them would be due merely to the momentary passing through our consciousness of ever existing realities.

In thinking of these matters it is hard to divest ourselves of the habit of visual or tangible illustration. If we think of a man as existing in four dimensions, it is hard to prevent ourselves from conceiving him as prolonged in an already known dimension. The image we form resembles somewhat those solemn Egyptian statues which in front represent well enough some dignified sitting figure, but which are immersed to their ears in a smooth mass of stone which fits their contour exactly.

No material image will serve. Organised beings seem to us so complete that any addition to them would deface their beauty. Yet were we creatures confined to a plane, the outline of a Corinthian column would probably seem to be of a beauty unimprovable in its kind. We should be unable to conceive any addition to it, simply for the reason that any addition we could conceive would be of the nature of affixing an unsightly extension to some part of the contour. Yet, moving, as we do in space of three dimensions, we see that the beauty of the stately column far surpasses that of any single outline. So all that we can do is to deny our faculty of judging of the ideal completeness of shapes in three dimensions.

Our conception of existence in four dimensions need not be confined to any particular supposition. There is no reason why a being existing in four dimensions should not be conceived to be as completely limited in all four directions as we are in three. All that we can say in regard to the possibility of such beings is, that we have no experience of motion in four directions. The powers of such beings and their experience would be ampler, but there would be no fundamental difference in the laws of force and motion.

Such a being would be able to make but a part of himself visible to us. He would suddenly appear as a complete and finite body, and as suddenly disappear, leaving no trace of himself, in space. There would be no barrier, no confinement of our devising that would not be perfectly open to him. He would come and go at pleasure; he would be able to perform feats of the most surprising kind. It would be possible by an infinite plane extending in all directions to divide our space into two portions absolutely separated from one another; but a four-dimensional being would slip round this plane with the greatest ease.

With regard to the possibility of the application of any test to discover whether a fourth dimension does exist or not, all that can be said is that no such test has succeeded. And, indeed, before searching for tests a theoretical point of the utmost importance has to be settled. In discussing the geometrical properties of straight lines and planes, we suppose them to be respectively of one and two dimensions, and by so doing deny them any real existence. A plane and a line are mere abstractions. Every portion of matter is of three dimensions. If we consider beings on a plane not as mere idealities, we must suppose them to be of some thickness. If their experience

is to be limited to a plane this thickness must be very small compared to their other dimensions. If, then, we suppose a fourth dimension to exist, either our consciousness itself must consist in a limitation of the knowledge of existence to three instead of four dimensions, or we must be very small in the fourth dimension as compared to others. In such a case it would probably be in the phenomena of the ultimate particles of matter, where the dimensions in all four directions would be comparable, that any indication of the new direction would have to be sought.

It is evident that these speculations present no point of direct contact with fact. But this is no reason why they should be abandoned. The course of knowledge is like the flow of some mighty river, which, passing through the rich lowlands, gathers into itself the contributions from every valley. Such a river may well be joined by a mountain stream, which, passing with difficulty along the barren highlands, flings itself into the greater river down some precipitous descent, exhibiting at the moment of its union the spectacle of the utmost beauty of which the river system is capable. And such a stream is no inapt symbol of a line of mathematical thought, which, passing through difficult and abstract regions, sacrifices for the sake of its crystalline clearness the richness that comes to the more concrete studies. Such a course may end fruitlessly, for it may never join the main course of observation and experiment. But if it gains its way to the great stream of knowledge, it affords at the moment of its union the spectacle of the greatest intellectual beauty, and adds somewhat of force and mysterious capability to the onward current.”²⁵²⁸

Hinton’s and Abbott’s works are highly derivative of another *Nature* article by G. F. Rodwell, “On Space of Four Dimensions”, *Nature*, Volume 8, Number 183, (May 1, 1873), pp. 8-9. This same volume of *Nature* contains Clifford’s translation of Riemann’s, “On the Hypotheses which Lie at the Bases of Geometry”.²⁵²⁹

Long before Hinton, Abbott, Rodwell, and even Riemann, was Stallo, who expressed the fundamental “space-time” concept in 1847,

“THE Spiritual, the absolute primitive movement within itself, can be real and substantial only in stating itself exteriorly; and we have repeatedly seen that this statement is absolute multiplicity. That the result of the statement, the Exterior, is BUT *a statement*, and the statement of an internal *movement*, implies its transience; the statement is from its very nature transient. This transience must exhibit itself, therefore, in the stated Exterior, wherever we take it; it must appear throughout, for the Exterior is *inherently* transient. Otherwise expressed: the Exterior is but a transience in position; a position *in One* of existence and non-existence,—or a *position* and a *negation* in one. The Exterior can therefore first be taken *as such*, and then it is SPACE, in which the transience, dependency, shows itself as absolute *relativity*; secondly, as *the bearer of its vivifying movement*, and thus it is TIME. Or, the Exterior as an *existence*, as positive, fixed, is *space*; as a *negation*, non-

existence, it is *time*. Logically, the first two exteriorations of the Spiritual are therefore *space* and *time*. They are both *abstractions*, i.e. they *are* only, inasmuch as the understanding forcibly keeps them asunder, though their truth is their *being in one*, their inseparability in spite of their distinctness. [***] Time and space, whose *first* reality is their difference, will therefore further state their identity as *real unity*; and this statement is real MOTION. Real motion is the union of space and time. The motion under consideration here, namely, the *primitive motion in the sphere of the Exterior*, is not motion in *any given, definite direction*; it is motion IN ALL DIRECTIONS, to which we have no observable analogon. *It is the pure movement of abstract statement and annulment*. [***] The so-called *dimensions* of space present no difficulty in their deduction, and depend, like all deductions, upon the inherent *references* of space. Space, the absolute extension, as OPPOSED to the Spiritual, is *spatial infinitude, unbounded* (mathematical) *solidity*; as opposed TO THE SPIRITUAL, to the absolute intensity, it is *a point*, —in space, and yet spaceless; as the unity of the two, it is the *line*, —extended intensity or punctuality. If we seek for a spatial analogon of time, it must be the line, for it has been seen that time is the Extensive considered in its ideal bearing, the mediating unity therefore between extension and intensity. Now the absolutely Extensive, the Solid, is from its nature limited, —it contains the limit; and this limit of solidity is the *surface*. Thus punctuality, solidity, surface, and linearity are inherent in the idea of space; we are logically compelled to see space under this fourfold aspect. The mathematical statement, that the motion of a point generates a line, that of a line a surface, and that of a surface a solid, is true only in the following sense:—Spatiality, extension as such, is the absolute reference to the without, *beyond itself*, absolute relativity. If, then, we ideally isolate a point, we are at the same moment compelled to refer it to ideal adjacent points, and thus the idea of the line starts up in the mind spontaneously. The same takes place with the line and with the surface. The ideas of point, line, surface, &c., from their nature, give birth to each other. The movement of a point, &c., however, *as something real, to which the motion accedes*, is a false assumption. [*Notation in the original: Already Hegel has pointed this out. See my exposition of his philosophy of nature.*]²⁵³⁰

Before Stallo, Gustav Theodor Fechner presented a four-dimensional theory of space-time in 1846 under the pseudonym “Dr. Mises”.²⁵³¹ Fechner stated, *inter alia*, in 1846,

“Jedoch, um mein Möglichstes zu tun, sehe ich wieder bei dem Farbenmännchen in zwei Dimensionen nach; weiß ich erst in zwei Dimensionen die dritte zu packen, so muß es ja dann um so leichter sein, in dreien die vierte zu packen. Auch ist dies nur eine besondere Anwendung der von jeher mit Frucht angewandten Methode, das, was man in drei Dimensionen nicht realiter finden kann, in zwei Dimensionen, d. h. auf dem

Papier zu suchen und zu finden. Und siehe da, es gelingt.

Zur Sache: ich nehme die Fläche, worin mein Scheinmännchen sich befindet, und führe sie durch die dritte Dimension hindurch, so erfährt das Scheinmännchen alles, was in dieser dritten Dimension ist; es wird sogar, indem es in andere Lichträume kommt, wo sich die Strahlen anders ordnen und färben, selbst sich hiermit ändern und vielleicht zu Ende des Weges bleich und runzlig aussehen, während es zu Anfange des Weges rot und glatt aussah. Freilich hat das Männchen niemals ein Stück der dritten Dimension auf einmal und glaubt also in jedem Augenblicke immer noch bloß in seinen zwei Dimensionen zu sein; es faßt von der ganzen Bewegung bloß das zeitliche Element und die vor sich gehende Änderung auf. Aber faktisch durchmißt es doch die dritte Dimension und Alles, was darin ist. Demgemäß sagt das Männchen: es gibt eine Zeit und in der Zeit ändert sich Alles, auch ich selbst.

Nun, wir sagen auch: es gibt eine Zeit und in der Zeit ändert sich alles, auch wir selbst. Was liegt dem also zu Grunde? Die Bewegung unsers Raums von drei Dimensionen durch die vierte, von welcher Bewegung wir aber auch nur das zeitliche Element und die Veränderung, welche erfolgt, wahrnehmen.

Nichts ist auch im Grunde einfacher und natürlicher: unsere Welt von drei Dimensionen ist eine ungeheure Kugel, die in eine Menge einzelner Kugeln zerfällt. Jede von diesen läuft; also wird die große Urkugel wohl auch laufen; aber wo sollte sie hinlaufen, wenn es nicht eine vierte Dimension gäbe? Indem sie aber selbst durch diese vierte Dimension läuft, laufen natürlich auch alle Kugeln in ihr, und alles was auf diesen Kugeln lebt und webt, durch die vierte Dimension mit durch.”²⁵³²

Boscovich stated, centuries ago,

“Hence, the number of other points of space is an infinity of the third order; & thus the probability is infinitely greater with an infinity of the third order, when we are concerned with any other particular instant of time.”²⁵³³

Joseph Larmor, in 1900, raised space-time’s significance to relativity theory and expressly called it a “*continuum*”, long before Minkowski. Larmor is perhaps guilty of pun, using “continuum” with both its mathematical and metaphysical meanings,

“At the same time all that is known (or perhaps need be known) of the aether itself may be formulated as a scheme of differential equations defining the properties of a *continuum* in space, which it would be gratuitous to further explain by any complication of structure; though we can with great advantage employ our stock of ordinary dynamical concepts in describing the succession of different states thereby defined.”²⁵³⁴

Note the absolutism implicit in the term “continuum”, which Minkowski dubbed the “absolute world”. The “continuum” is Newton’s unchanging God—his myth that the

human Self does not change during a lifetime, and, therefore, neither can God—absolute “space-time”.

Eugen Karl Dühring²⁵³⁵ published a space-time theory in 1873, which inspired Rudolf Mewes’ space-time theory of 1889.²⁵³⁶ Inspired by Johann Julius Baumann,²⁵³⁷ Friedrich Albert Lange²⁵³⁸ presented a theory of the space-time manifold in 1877. In 1882, Gustav Teichmüller²⁵³⁹ published a lengthy treatise enunciating an Eleatic space-time theory free from paradoxes, in which he recognized the abstract nature, and absolute relativity, of space and time, and created a space-time with three space dimensions and three time dimensions. E. H. Sygne argued that Sir William Rowan Hamilton’s space-time theory anticipated Minkowski’s theory by sixty-five years.²⁵⁴⁰ Menyhért (Melchior) Palágyi, in 1901, published *Neue Theorie des Raumes und der Zeit (New Theory of Space and of Time)*, in which he argued for an Eleatic quadri-dimensional space-time, and in which he justified the principle of relativity in four-dimensions.²⁵⁴¹ Before Palágyi, was Rudolf Mewes, who, in 1889-1894, developed a relativistic space-time theory, declaring in 1889, “*Und doch beruht die ganze Wirklichkeit allein auf der Vereinigung von Raum und Zeit.*”²⁵⁴² Johann Heinrich Ziegler lectured in Switzerland in 1902 on the unity of space, time and force and the significance of light in empty space, doing away with the æther hypothesis.²⁵⁴³ Poincaré established the Palágyi-style four-dimensional analysis of the “Lorentz Transformation”, before Minkowski, or Einstein. Roberto Marcolongo²⁵⁴⁴ presented his four-dimensional view of the “Lorentz Transformation”, before Minkowski.

Henri Bergson wrote in 1888 in his lengthy and detailed theory of space and time,

“in a word, we create for them a fourth dimension of space, which we call homogenous time, and which enables the movement of the pendulum, although taking place at one spot, to be continually set in juxtaposition to itself.”²⁵⁴⁵

Prior to Bergson, Ernst Mach discussed quadri-dimensional position in 1866,

“Now, I think that we can go still farther in the scale of presentations of space and thus attain to presentations whose totality I will call *physical space*.”

It cannot be my intention here to criticize our conceptions of matter, whose insufficiency is, indeed, generally felt. I will merely make my thoughts clear. Let us imagine, then, a something behind (*unter*) matter in which different states can occur; say, for simplicity, a pressure in it, which can become greater or smaller.

Physics has long been busied in expressing the mutual action, the mutual attraction (opposite accelerations, opposite pressures) of two material particles as a function of their distance from each other—therefore of a spatial relation. Forces are functions of the distance. But now, the spatial relations of material particles can, indeed, only be recognized by the forces

which they exert one on another.

Physics, then, does not strive, in the first place, after the discovery of the fundamental relations of the various pieces of matter, but after the derivation of relations from other, already given, ones. Now, it seems to me that the fundamental law of force in nature need not contain the spatial relations of the pieces of matter, but must only state a dependence between the states of the pieces of matter.

If the positions in space of the material parts of the whole universe and their forces as functions of these positions were once known, mechanics could give their motions completely, that is to say, it could make all the positions discoverable at any time, or put down all positions as functions of time.

But, what does time mean when we consider the universe? This or that ‘is a function of time’ means that it depends on the position of the vibrating pendulum, on the position of the rotating earth, and so on. Thus, ‘All positions are functions of time’ means, for the universe, that all positions depend upon one another.

But since the positions in space of the material parts can be recognized only by their states, we can also say that all the states of the material parts *depend upon one another*.

The physical space which I have in mind—and which, at the same time, contains time in itself—is thus nothing other than *dependence of phenomena on one another*. A complete physics, which would know this fundamental dependence, would have no more need of special considerations of space and time, for these latter considerations would already be included in the former knowledge.”²⁵⁴⁶

I confine the discussion to quadri-dimensional hyperspace in which the fourth dimension signifies time or spiritual motion of some kind in a fourth dimension, whatever that should be interpreted to mean as ghosts retreating into a “fourth dimension” to undo tri-dimensional knots, leaving from one position in our world to return in another; but there was a tremendous body of work involving hyperspace beyond this restriction, with a long history pre-dating the special and the general theories of relativity.

For example, Stewart and Tait, in their widely read *Unseen Universe*, averred, in the then fairly recent tradition of the transcendental geometers,

“Just as points are the terminations of lines, lines the boundaries of surfaces, and surfaces the boundaries of portions of space of three dimensions:—so we may suppose our (essentially three-dimensional) matter to be the mere skin or boundary of an Unseen whose matter has *four* dimensions.”²⁵⁴⁷

The history of four-dimensional spaces is aptly recorded in Henry Parker Manning’s *Geometry of Four Dimensions*, Macmillan, (1914), republished by Dover, (1956). Bibliographies appear in Manning’s *The Fourth Dimension Simply*

Explained, Dover, (1960), pp. 40-41; and in Duncan M'Laren Young Sommerville, *Bibliography of Non-Euclidean Geometry*, Harrison & Sons, London, (1911); reprinted Chelsea Pub. Co., New York, (1970); and George Bruce Halsted, "Bibliography of Hyper-Space and Non-Euclidean Geometry", *American Journal of Mathematics*, Volume 1, (1878), pp. 261-276, 384-385. The development of non-Euclidean geometry is outlined by Oswald Veblen, "The Foundations of Geometry", *Popular Science Monthly*, Volume 68, Number 1, (January, 1906), pp. 21-28. Other important works include Roland Weitzenböck's *Der vierdimensionale Raum*, F. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, (1929); reprinted Birkhäuser, Basel, (1956); and E. Wölffing, "Die vierte Dimension", *Die Umschau*, Volume 1, Number 18, (1 May 1897), pp. 309-314. A good overview with an emphasis on the religious and spiritualistic aspects of hyperspace theories is found in Carl Cranz' popular "Gemeinverständliches über die sogenannte vierte Dimension", *Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge*, New Series, Volume 5, Number 112/113, (1890), pp. 567-636.

Returning to the concept of *time* as the fourth dimension, Edgar Allen Poe wrote in 1848,

"A rational cause for the phænomenon, I maintain that Astronomy has palpably failed to assign: — but the considerations through which, in this Essay, we have proceeded step by step, enable us clearly and immediately to perceive that Space and Duration are one."²⁵⁴⁸

Poe was under the spell of Alexander von Humboldt (and opium). Humboldt stated "Mach's Principle" long before Mach, but long before Humboldt, Boscovich stated it. Humboldt's influence on Stallo, Poe and the general intellectual community toward relativism cannot be emphasized strongly enough!

Immanuel Kant stated in his inaugural dissertation of 1770,

"*Simultaneous facts* are not such for the reason that they do not succeed each other. Removing succession, to be sure, a conjunction is withdrawn which existed by the time-series. Yet thence does not originate *another* true relation, the conjunction of all things in the same moment. For simultaneous things are joined in the same moment of time exactly as successive things are joined in different moments. Hence, though time is of but one dimension, still the *ubiquity* of time, to speak with Newton, by which all things sensuously thinkable are *some time*, adds to the quantity of actual things another dimension, inasmuch as they hang, so to speak, on the same point of time. For designating time by a straight line produced infinitely, and the simultaneous things at any point of time whatever by lines applied in succession, the surface thus generated will represent the *phenomenal world*, both as to substance and accidents."²⁵⁴⁹

D'Alembert let us in on a secret back in 1754,

“As I’ve already said, it is not possible to conceive of more than three *dimensions*. However, a brilliant wit with whom I am acquainted considers duration a fourth *dimension*, and that the product of time multiplied by solidity would, in some sense, be a product of four *dimensions*. This idea is perhaps contestable, but it appears to me to be of some merit, even if it is only that of novelty.”²⁵⁵⁰

Lagrange worked out a new mechanics with time as the fourth dimension, ca. 1788,

“We will apply the theory of functions to mechanics. Here, the functions absolutely correspond to time, which we will always designate with t , and, since the position of a point in space depends upon the three rectilinear coordinates x, y, z , these coordinates, in the problems of mechanics, will be assumed to be functions of t . In this way, we can look upon mechanics as a geometry of four dimensions, and the analysis of mechanics like an extension of the analysis of geometry.”

“Nous allons employer la théorie des fonctions dans la Mécanique. Ici les fonctions se rapportent essentiellement au temps, que nous désignerons toujours par t , et, comme la position d’un point dans l’espace dépend de trois coordonnées rectangulaires x, y, z , ces coordonnées, dans les problèmes de Mécanique, seront censées être des fonctions de t . Ainsi, on peut regarder la Mécanique comme une Géométrie à quatre dimensions et l’Analyse mécanique comme une extension de l’Analyse géométrique.”²⁵⁵¹

John Locke asserted, ca. 1689,

“To conclude: expansion and duration do mutually embrace and comprehend each other; every part of space being in every part of duration, and every part of duration in every part of expansion. Such a combination of two distinct ideas is, I suppose, scarce to be found in all that great variety we do or can conceive, and may afford matter to further speculation.”²⁵⁵²

In 1671, Henry More argued that spirits inhabit four dimensions.²⁵⁵³ The fourth dimension as a “realm of spirits” became a popular topic, and it often appears in the literature.²⁵⁵⁴ Samuel Clarke, of the Newton-Leibnitz dispute fame, wrote an Eleatic treatise on the universal nature of God, which certainly qualifies as a space-time theory: *A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God*. The clerical inspired the profane, and four dimensional fantasies become a common theme in popular fiction.²⁵⁵⁵

The spiritualistic belief was pursued by astrophysicist Johann Karl Friedrich Zöllner, in the 1870’s,²⁵⁵⁶ and Bernhard Riemann,²⁵⁵⁷ who used the spiritual concept to explain gravitation; which spiritualistic four-dimensional views were questioned by physicist Ernst Mach,²⁵⁵⁸ but embraced by physicist A. E. Dolbear²⁵⁵⁹ and by T.

Proctor Hall,²⁵⁶⁰ who was criticized by Edmund C. Sanford.²⁵⁶¹ Hall noted, in 1892, that the fourth dimension is useful; in that,

“the theologian could use it for the world of spirits; the physicist for forces [***] ‘All are but parts of one stupendous whole, Whose body Nature is, and God the soul.’ [Alexander Pope, *Essay on Man*] If four-fold space exists, it is evident that it must contain an infinite variety of three-fold spaces, of which we know only one. It must also be everywhere possible for a four-fold being to step out of our space at any point and re-enter it at any other point; for his relation to our space is nearly the same as our relation to a plane. If ghosts are four-fold beings, the erratic nature of their movements may become more comprehensible in the course of time. An ordinary knot could in four-fold space be readily untied by carrying one loop out of our space and bringing it back in a different place. In fact, a knot in our space would be simply a loop or coil in four-fold space. A flexible closed shell could be turned inside out as easily as a thin hoop can with us; and many other apparent impossibilities become mere child’s play.”

Hermann Schubert attacked Zöllner and the Spiritualists, and their fourth dimension,

“The high eminence on which the knowledge and civilization of humanity now stands was not reached by the thoughtless employment of fanciful ideas, nor by recourse to a four-dimensional world, but by hard, serious labor, and slow, unceasing research. Let all men of science, therefore, band themselves together and oppose a solid front to methods that explain everything that is now mysterious to us by the interference of independent spirits. For these methods, owing to the fact that they can explain everything, explain nothing, and thus oppose dangerous obstacles to the progress of real research, to which we owe the beautiful temple of modern knowledge.”²⁵⁶²

Zöllner could not even find respite in *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, where George Stuart Fullerton attacked him.²⁵⁶³ In 1878, P. G. Tait published a polemic against Zöllner, and his fourth dimension, in the journal *Nature*, which evinces the emerging prejudice against Metaphysics, generated by Bacon,²⁵⁶⁴ and later by the positivists,

“He is, as Helmholtz long ago said, a genuine Metaphysician, and (as such) is a curiosity really worthy of study:—not of course merely because he is a Metaphysician, but because in this nineteenth century he attempts to bring his metaphysics into pure physical science. [***] In conclusion, though I cannot make pretensions to any minute acquaintance with the German language, I think I may venture to suggest to Prof. Zöllner, for his next edition, a title which shall at least more accurately describe the contents of his work than does his present one. I cannot allow that the title ‘Scientific Papers’ is at all

correctly descriptive. But I think that something like the following would suit his book well

Patriotische
METAPHYSIK DER PHYSIK,
für moderne deutsche Verhältnisse.

Mit speciellem Bezug auf die vierte Dimension und den Socialdemokratismus bearbeitet.

With this little hint, which I hope will be taken, as it is meant, in good part, I heartily wish him and his work farewell. P. G. TAIT²⁵⁶⁵

It is ironic that what was considered metaphysical in the Nineteenth Century, with its belief in an observable reality; is today, with the scientific method turned on its head,²⁵⁶⁶ considered scientific; *i. e.* unobservable and purely abstract “space-time” is today considered the absolute world, and questioning this internally contradictory ontological “nonsense” is today incorrectly, pejoratively and hypocritically referred to as “Metaphysics”.

Just as quadri-dimensional speculation and non-Euclidean geometry have a long and continuing history, so, too, does opposition to it.²⁵⁶⁷ Eugen Karl Dühring (a Socialist who was attacked by Friedrich Engels²⁵⁶⁸ and alternatively praised and mocked by Rudolf Mewes, Ernst Mach, Alexander Moszkowski and Albert Einstein²⁵⁶⁹) lampooned the transcendental mysticism of Helmholtz, Gauss and Riemann. Johann Bernhard Stallo wrote much against hyperspace, concluding,

“If Riemann’s argument were fundamentally valid, it could be presented in very succinct and simple form. It would be nothing more than a suggestion that, because algebraic quantities of the first, second, and third degrees denote geometrical magnitudes of one, two, and three dimensions respectively, there must be geometrical magnitudes of four, five, six, etc., dimensions corresponding to algebraic quantities of the fourth, fifth, sixth, etc., degree. [*Stallo notes*: It is not unworthy of remark, here, that the practice of reading x^2 and x^3 as x square and x cube, instead of x of the second order or third power, is founded upon the silent or express assumption that an algebraic quantity has an inherent geometric import. The practice is, therefore, misleading, and ought to be disused. *Principiis obsta!*]

It is hardly necessary to say, after all this, that the analytical argument in favor of the existence, or possibility, of transcendental space is another flagrant instance of the reification of concepts.”²⁵⁷⁰

Stallo’s and Schubert’s foreboding is profound, given the absolutist ontology of the special theory of relativity, which soon followed their admonitions to us. James H. Hyslop wrote in 1896

“THE FOURTH DIMENSION OF SPACE.

MR. SCHILLER’S summary of the discussion on this subject in the March number of this REVIEW indicates very clearly that the advocates

of a fourth dimension latterly show a decided tendency to withdraw from some of their original claims, but it omits to notice a matter of very considerable importance in the problem which has received very scant attention on the part of the defenders of the doctrine, and has not been developed by its opponents, whose arguments often imply it. I allude to the purely logical principles at the basis of the matter. That these must first be satisfied, I think, is shown by several facts: (a) the tendency to abandon certain arguments in the case; (b) the absence of all deductive proof for a fourth dimension; (c) the want of data in experience to make the claim inductively rational; (d) the dependence upon analogies and symbolic conceptions as evidence.

But I shall waive all proof of the claim here made and allow the discussion itself to show its truth. The first step is to consider the general grounds upon which the doctrine is supposed to rest, as stated by some of its ablest advocates. They are: (a) the empirical nature of the Euclidean axioms; (b) the relativity of knowledge in general, shutting out a dogmatic denial of the hypothesis; (c) the Kantian doctrine of space, which, though it may prove the inconceivability (non-imaginable nature) of a fourth dimension, supports its possibility beyond the limits of experience; (d) the necessities of non-Euclidean geometry, especially for pseudo-spherical surfaces.

The first thing to be said regarding these arguments is that, if the laws of logic have first been respected, they may be entitled to some weight, but if these laws have been violated, the arguments can count for nothing. Hence I wish to call attention to certain irrelevancies in them, in order to show how the prior conditions of all intelligible discussion in this problem are certain logical principles that reveal very clearly where the confusion originates in the controversy. This irrelevancy is that which connects the question with the problems about empiricism, intuitionism, transcendentalism, realism, idealism, etc. These, in fact, have nothing to do with the matter until after we know the logical terms of the problem. In all cases we have to do with certain conceptions which carry with them the same implications *logically*, whether we choose to regard them as real or ideal, objective or subjective, empirical or intuitive. What I have to consider, therefore, is the logical use made of the conceptions 'space,' 'property,' 'dimension,' 'mathematics,' etc., in the attempt to prove a fourth dimension.

Now I shall first state a few simple logical principles upon which I shall proceed, and which determine the limits of legitimate reasoning in this problem. They are perfectly familiar laws to the logician, but seem to be wholly ignored by mathematicians. They are summarized in this one proposition: *The transfer of predicates and implications from one conception to another is limited to a qualitative identity between them.* This can be clearly illustrated by reference to the relation between certain conceptions and certain tendencies in the growth of knowledge.

Concepts express certain definite relations between genus and species, and between different species. We may express this generally by the formula that their extension varies inversely with their intension. In common parlance, this is only to say that the number of individuals denoted by the

genus is greater than the number denoted by the species, while the number of qualities denoted by the species is greater than that denoted by the genus. It is not necessary here to assert or defend the *absolute* universality of this rule, but only that it is unquestionable in a certain class of conceptions, and these are the conceptions with which we have to deal in our present discussion. Now the plain simple rule here is that we can never transfer the differential predicates of the species to the genus, and also that general formulas have to be modified to suit the differentia of the species. For example, I cannot transfer the differential quality expressed by ‘Caucasian’ over to the concept ‘man,’ and I cannot express the meaning of ‘Caucasian’ by stopping with the predicates of the term ‘man.’ These are simple truisms, but they get great importance in connection with discussions that violate them, owing to the additions made to knowledge by intellectual progress.

The development of knowledge involves two different changes in conceptions. They may be widened or they may be narrowed in their import. These two processes are known to the logician as generalization and specialization. Until the new meaning becomes the only and fixed import of the term, it gives rise to equivocation. In this way an interchange of predicates and implications will occur, and often unconsciously. But this is the illusion for which intelligent men are required to be on the alert. This difficulty, however, is greatly increased by the several ways in which concepts may grow in denotation and meaning. First, concepts may increase or decrease in nothing but quantitative import. Secondly, they may increase or decrease only in qualitative import. Thirdly, quantitative and qualitative import may vary in an inverse ratio with each other. Thus the first of these processes occurs when a new individual or species is added to the genus, or an old one withdrawn, without affecting the conferentia (common qualities) expressed by it. Here the change does not affect the transfer of predicates. It is purely quantitative, and this is the peculiarity of all purely mathematical concepts. In the second process the change occurs when a new quality is added, or an old one withdrawn from a concept, without changing its quantitative import or extension. This change also does not affect the truth or universality of old propositions, and a transfer of predicates will not take place. No equivocation, however, will occur. But it is the third form that causes all the trouble. In this the extension may increase at the expense of the intension and *vice versa*. This occurs when a new species is added to a genus so as to decrease the intension, or a species withdrawn so as to increase the intension. In such cases the transfer of predicates cannot take place. Or, to summarize the discussion, when conceptions change quantitatively, but not qualitatively, the transfer of predicates can be made with perfect logical impunity. When they change qualitatively, but not quantitatively, new predicates are added which are differentially distinct from the old ones, but there is no occasion for a transfer. But when quantitative and qualitative import vary inversely, a transfer of predicates cannot be assumed without proof. Now, since mathematics is limited to the quantitative concepts or

qualities, and logic extends to both quantitative and qualitative meanings of terms, it is apparent how they come into relation with each other, and how a habit contracted in the quantitative determinations of mathematics may pass over to cases where the changes are qualitative as well. In mathematics we either do not deal at all with genus and species, but with whole and part, which are qualitatively identical; or, if we call the broader and narrower concepts 'genus' and 'species,' they are still qualitatively of the same import. But in logic, besides whole and part we deal with genus and species, which are qualitatively different from each other. The consequences of this may be brought out by illustration.

The instance is taken from the fluctuations in the conception 'metal.' In physics and chemistry brass and bronze are not metals; in common parlance they are. Now in scientific usage I can say, 'All metals are elements'; in common parlance I cannot say it, because brass and bronze are compounds. Here, with the extension of the term 'metal,' I cannot carry the predicate of its narrower import with me. With this increase of extension, 'element' becomes the differentia of a species. Hence in any case where we undertook to define the differential quality of brass and bronze, we should have to call it non-elemental, not having any right to use the term 'element' to describe it, unless it also be generalized. On the other hand, the same process is illustrated by another interesting generalization of the same term. At one time it was assumed that a specific gravity greater than water was an essential property of metals. It was conceived as essential to a metal that it sink in water. This conception excluded at least three of the alkali metals, potassium, sodium, and lithium. But the discovery that these substances possessed metallic lustre and probably other metallic properties, resulted in extending the class 'metals' to include them while diminishing the conferentia, and this in spite of the fact that their specific gravity is *less* than water. Now we have here a generalization of the term 'metal' in which we cannot carry with us the old proposition, 'All metals sink in water.' This relation now becomes the differentia of a species, and is no longer a conferentia. If the reverse process had taken place, it would have been necessary to have added a new predicate to the species.

The value of these principles will be apparent in the examination of the argument for a fourth dimension, most especially as it appears in Helmholtz' celebrated articles in *Mind*, [Footnote: Vol. I, p. 301; vol. III, p. 212.] which have done more than anything else to make philosophers take the subject seriously. The first illusion of which he and mathematicians generally have been the victims, is not one which comes under the principles just enunciated, but is nevertheless an important weakness in their argument. It is the transference to the conception of space of assumptions and conceptions that are true of material substance. Now the mathematician tells us that geometry deals with the properties of space. Dimension is said to be one of these properties, if not the only one, and as there are admittedly three of these dimensions, the limitations of our empirical knowledge at once suggest the

possibility of more of them. The only problem is to produce the facts which will either prove their real existence, or show that they are thinkable and possible. The fact that we know of no limits to the properties of matter, and that discovery constantly shows additions to our knowledge of new properties, forces, or modes of action (the Röntgen rays, for example), or at least new phenomena, stands in good stead to shut off dogmatic denials of other than the known dimensions of space. But it is precisely here that the illusion occurs. The mathematician permits himself to be fooled by words, and pays no attention to their real import. He assumes without criticism that the relation between space and its dimensions is the same as that between matter or a metaphysical substance and its properties. This assumption may be absolutely denied, and I certainly deny the right to make it. The illusion arises first from the language about the ‘properties’ of space, and secondly from identifying ‘properties’ with dimensions, while distinguishing tacitly between space and its ‘properties’ on the one hand, and space and its dimensions on the other. Metaphysical realities, subjects or substances, like matter, spirit, ether, etc., may have any number of properties, known and unknown. But we have no *a priori* right to carry this possibility over to space, because no one entertains for a moment the supposition that it is a metaphysical substance like matter or other reality. It is qualitatively distinguished from such conceptions. It may be that space possesses an indefinite number of properties, but we can neither assume the fact or possibility from what we hold to be true of matter, mind, and other subjects or substances, nor assume that we can treat the conception of space in the same way. We have to prove on other grounds that the conception of space is subject to the same treatment. What I contend for is, that we cannot logically pass, as the mathematicians do, from one of these conceptions to the other, and that propositions in the two cases, notwithstanding their formal resemblances, do not have the same meaning and implication unless proved on other grounds than this formal identity; so that the very first step in the argument for a fourth dimension is vitiated by presumptions which have no right to exist.

The whole problem of the advocates of a fourth dimension is to find a basis for non-Euclidean geometry. Euclidean geometry is admittedly based upon the three dimensions, and they assume that this new kind of geometry requires a new differential principle. They are at least formally correct, according to the principles established regarding the relation between genus and species or between different species. But we must examine what difference they assume to exist between the two kinds of geometry. If the two are the same, the demand for a fourth dimension would be absurd, according to their own admission. If they are different, if non-Euclidean geometry is different from Euclidean, the difference must be either quantitative, or qualitative, or both. If it be merely quantitative, the qualitative principle or condition is the same as the Euclidean; if it be qualitatively different, then the new principle must be a new quality, a new property of space, as the fourth

dimension is supposed to be. If the difference be both quantitative and qualitative, then the distinction between Euclidean and non-Euclidean geometry is not absolute, but they interpenetrate in the dimensions determining Euclidean geometry. After ascertaining the alternatives between which we are placed, the only question that remains to determine concerns the conceptions of the problem entertained by non-Euclidean mathematicians. The second alternative is the one maintained; and this with its qualitative distinction between the two kinds of geometry, implies that the fourth dimension must be a new quality or property of space, or qualitatively different from the other dimensions. The first alternative is fatal because it limits the difference to quantity, the qualitative principle remaining the same, so that but one rational course is open to the mathematician, which is to affirm a difference of kind. We start, then, with the assumption that non-Euclidean geometry requires a principle for its basis qualitatively distinct from that of Euclidean geometry. What is the consequence of this step?

The basis of geometry is said to be the 'properties of space.' We may ask what is meant by the 'properties' of space, and this question proposes the problem of determining whether 'space' is synonymous with its 'dimensions,' or may include other 'properties' than dimension, and whether its 'properties' are the same as its dimensions. This problem ought first to be solved by the non-Euclidean geometer before he takes any other step. But I know of no attempt to do this. He has two alternatives. He may limit the intension of space to the dimensions, or he may extend it to include other properties than dimension, such as penetrability and divisibility or indivisibility. (I hold that space is absolutely indivisible, though it is usually spoken of as divisible. In reality it is body that is divisible.) Now if space denote or imply other properties than dimension, we may ask what evidence is there that the so-called 'fourth dimension' is a dimension at all. The non-Euclidean agree that their geometry is based upon the 'properties of space.' This limits them to two alternative conceptions, assuming that the two geometries must be distinguished. Either 'space' denotes other properties than dimension, or in being limited to dimension we must suppose, as they do, that the fourth dimension is qualitatively different from the other three. The supposition that the 'fourth dimension' is different in kind from the other three, and at the same time that space denotes only the three dimensions, would imply that non-Euclidean geometry is non-spatial; that is, not based upon space at all, which is contrary to the original assumption. But, taking the two conceptions just mentioned, it should be noticed that the first may justify us in selecting some other property than dimension for the basis of non-Euclidean geometry. What reason have the non-Euclidean for distinguishing between the fourth dimension and some other property not a dimension at all, especially as they admit that this new 'dimension' cannot be pictured or represented in experience? Taking the second alternative, we find that a generalization either of the term 'space' or of the term 'dimension' has been made. If of the term 'space,' the 'fourth dimension' either becomes

a non-dimensional property, or the basis of geometry has been altered in its conception, which might enable us to take any quality of anything as the principle of non-Euclidean geometry.

Let me make the case clearer by another form of statement. If we assume the qualitative difference between Euclidean and non-Euclidean geometry, there are four conceptions of space to be considered, three of them absolutely necessary to satisfy this assumption: (1) Space = three dimensions ; (2) space = three plus the fourth dimension or n dimensions; (3) space = three dimensions plus other properties ; (4) space = four or n dimensions plus other properties.

Taking space in the first of these three conceptions, the fourth dimension must make non-Euclidean geometry nonspatial, which is contrary to the supposition. On the third conception, the principle of non-Euclidean geometry is not a dimension, but some other property. Assuming the fourth conception, the non-Euclidean geometer must show the distinction to be made between the fourth dimension and other properties, especially that this dimension is qualitatively different from the other three. If not qualitatively different, non-Euclidean geometry falls to the ground as anything more than a modification of Euclidean geometry. This leaves, as the only alternative for the non-Euclidean, the second, which is the conception, and the only conception, of space that can present even a plausible claim in favor of a fourth dimension for the principle of non-Euclidean geometry.

Now, in regard to this second conception of space, the first remark is that it is an extension of the meaning involved in the first. But passing this by as unimportant, though necessary to non-Euclidean geometry, the second remark is that the term ‘dimension’ is either generalized in its import qualitatively, or it is a name to denote a non-dimensional property. The only other alternative is to hold that the three dimensions and the fourth are not different from each other. I want, therefore, to show the logical consequences to the doctrine from each one of these alternatives.

The assumption is that the fourth dimension is qualitatively different from the other three dimensions. It is, therefore, a species in contradistinction to them as other species. Now, when the term ‘dimension’ includes all of them, it denotes a common property, the *conferentia*, or genus; and cannot be used to denote the species. This would be in violation of the principle of logical division, which is that the same conception cannot denominate both genus and species. Assuming that it denotes only the genus, or common quality of all the dimensions, we find that both Euclidean and non-Euclidean geometry are based upon the same quality of space, which is contrary to the supposition. On the other hand, if it denote only a species, it must be limited either to the three dimensions or to the fourth, if a qualitative distinction between them is to be maintained. If limited to the three, then it is not legitimate to call the ‘fourth dimension’ a dimension at all, and non-Euclidean geometry would be based upon a non-dimensional property, say penetrability or indivisibility, which is contrary to the original supposition.

If it be limited to the fourth, then the other three are not ‘dimensions’ properly considered, and Euclidean geometry would be non-dimensional, which is also contrary to the supposition. The only alternative left is to apply the term equally to all four dimensions. But this identifies them qualitatively and breaks down the distinction between Euclidean and non-Euclidean geometry, which again is contrary to the supposition, unless we go outside of space altogether for the basis of the latter, which again contradicts the first assumption. Such a fatal set of dilemmas could hardly have been suspected on a first glance at the controversy; but they are there as long as we use the word ‘dimension’ in the case, and distinguish qualitatively between Euclidean and non-Euclidean geometry.

The fundamental fault of the mathematicians has been in extending the meaning of the term ‘dimension’ by adding a new species and calling it by the same name as the old. This mistake never occurs in the natural sciences. When a new species is discovered, increasing the extension of the genus, a new name must be adopted expressing the differentia by which this species is distinguished from the others. If the fourth dimension be a new species qualitatively different from the others, it should either not be called a dimension at all, or something should be indicated to determine the differentia by which it is presumably differentiated from the others. We may generalize the term ‘dimension’ if we choose, but we must not carry with it the differentia which separates the species; and we are equally forbidden to employ the same term for the species. The reply to this criticism would be that the differentia is expressed in the number of the dimension, and this reply is formally legitimate. But it is fatal in two respects to the hypothesis of a new dimension qualitatively determined. First, if number be the differentia of the species, it is purely quantitative, and the basis of non-Euclidean geometry is not qualitatively distinguished from the Euclidean. Secondly, if the conception ‘fourth,’ *i.e.*, number, determines a qualitative differentia, then the first, second, and third dimensions should be qualitatively different from each other, which is contrary to the supposition of Euclidean geometry. They are assumed to express the same commensurable quality, while their supposed differences are only relations of direction from a given point.

The language easily lends itself to an illusion, because it is formally the same as that in which qualitative differences are actually expressed or implied. But in mathematics our first duty is to remember that our conceptions are primarily quantitative, and that when we go beyond purely quantitative distinctions we are transcending mathematics altogether.

What I have said here about the illusory nature of the language in the case is beautifully illustrated in the expression, ‘Space has dimension.’ This proposition resembles the ordinary intensive judgment (such as ‘Man is wise,’ where it is possible to have other predicates in the same subject) only when we conceive the subject, space, as possibly having other properties than dimension; but when the term ‘space’ is made convertible with ‘dimension,’

as is usually or always the case in mathematics, we should either not assume that ‘Space *has* dimension,’ or when using the phrase we should recognize logically its true import, namely, that ‘Space *is* dimension.’ For geometry, space and dimension are the same, and hence in reality to assert the existence of a fourth dimension is equivalent to saying that the three dimensions have a fourth or n dimension, or that the three dimensions are four or n dimensions. The absurdity of this is apparent, but it is concealed by the formal correctness of the proposition, ‘Space has properties,’ or, ‘Space has dimension.’ But the moment we see that, for geometry, space and its dimensions are the same, we are forced to recognize that the fourth dimension becomes a predicate of the other three dimensions, which is contrary to the supposition of non-Euclidean geometry.

We are now prepared to examine some concrete fallacies and illusions of the same kind committed by Helmholtz in the celebrated articles in *Mind* already referred to, on the ‘Origin and Meaning of Geometrical Axioms.’ His argument here is to prove the empirical nature of geometrical axioms, and thus to avail himself of the inference, which the limitations of empiricism justify, that there are possibly other data in existence than the three known dimensions. In order to establish this empiricism, he undertakes to show that the axioms do not have the universal and necessary application which they are supposed to have. In this procedure he is half conscious of the principle that I have here laid down about the impossibility of transferring differential predicates when an increase in the extension of our concepts takes place, and the force of his argument derives all its influence from the truth of this principle. But he immediately violates the principle by equivocations which are due to specializing terms without reckoning with the logical consequences of the act. Let us examine his procedure briefly.

He calls attention to the assumed universality of the axiom about a straight line being the shortest path between two points, only to show that it is not true to a being living on a curved surface, to whom a *curved* line is the shortest distance between two points. This fact is supposed to set aside the universality of the Euclidean axiom. But there is a curious illusion in this claim which can be dispelled in two ways. In the first place, there is an equivocation in the word ‘shortest.’ Mathematically speaking, the Euclidean axiom still remains true to any being living on a spherical surface, though it may not be *physically* true. Even if it be assumed that such a being could not move directly at all from one point to the other, the distance physically and temporally the shortest to him would be a curved line, but this truth has nothing in it to contradict or modify the Euclidean axiom which still remains true mathematically where we have to do with *pure* space relations and not with qualities other than the spatial. Secondly, if the being living on the sphere *knew* that this surface was curved, it would recognize the Euclidean axiom, and, if influenced by any economic motives prevalent about walking on the diagonals of street corners, would sigh for the *physical* capacity to conform to mathematical principles. But if it did not know that the surface

was a curved one, *it could not draw any distinction between a straight and a curved line*. Its mathematical and physical conceptions of 'shortest' would coincide, so that *straight* and *curved* would mean the same thing, and the Euclidean axiom would still remain. But Helmholtz happens to know the difference between mathematical space and physical body, and by an equivocation in the use of 'shortest' can obtain an apparent limitation to this axiom, when applying it from the standpoint of his own assumed knowledge compared with that of a being supposed to be ignorant of his point of view. But the equivocation does not help the matter, and the ignorance of the other being does not interfere with the truth of the Euclidean axiom.

A long examination of another instance by Helmholtz, impeaching the universality of the proposition that the sum of the angles of a triangle is equal to two right angles, might be given, but it is sufficient to take note of two omissions in order to vitiate the conclusion that he wishes to draw from his result. In the first place, he confuses two different degrees of extension in the use of the term 'triangle,' one limited to plane and the other including spherical triangles, which shows only that the universality of a proposition is never intended to extend beyond its subject. The proposition about the sum of the angles remains forever true within these limits, and Helmholtz forgets that the language, while it may include spherical triangles, is *conceived* by the mathematician concretely to mean plane triangles. He can also obtain a universal proposition for both. Secondly, Helmholtz fails to see that, although a modification of the formula or principle in this proposition is required to meet the conditions of a new species, this modification is purely *quantitative*, not qualitative, and hence the analogy lends no support to the qualitative difference implied or asserted in the fourth dimension as the basis of the relations in pseudo-spherical surfaces. There is an illusion also in assuming or insinuating that pseudo-spherical surfaces are more than quantitatively different from plane and spherical surfaces, so far as commensurable quality is concerned.

The effect of the equivocation in the use of the word 'dimension' is apparent in another way, to which attention must be called. If there is anything upon which mathematicians and mankind generally are agreed, it is that space has at least three dimensions, Euclidean geometers and most others holding that it has *only* three dimensions. But I think both can be denied, without favoring the contention of non-Euclidean mathematicians that there is a fourth dimension in any sense in which they are understood to affirm it. In denying the existence of three dimensions, we have two alternative affirmative propositions, both of which may be true if we assume two meanings for the term 'dimension.' They are: (1) that space has only *one* dimension; (2) that it has an indefinite or infinite number of dimensions. This claim is borne out by the fact that, when we speak of space as having 'dimension,' we express a single quality which is divided up into 'three dimensions,' without implying that the species are qualitatively different from their base, but are only relations of the same quality to different points

of view. In fact the ‘three dimensions’ are properly defined and reducible to *commensurable quality* in which the units are always the same in each dimension. The three dimensions, therefore, cannot qualitatively differ from this without losing their commensurable nature. Why, then, are they called ‘dimensions,’ as if they were species of a genus? The answer to this question must be, either that the term is illegitimate altogether, or that it expresses only certain quantitative relations having mathematical convenience in the mensuration of bodies. Both alternatives are fatal to the supposition of a fourth ‘dimension’ in a qualitative sense without either going outside the meaning of dimension as denoting commensurable quality, or going outside the conception of space, which are both contrary to the supposition of non-Euclidean.

The supposition that there are three dimensions instead of one, or that there are only three dimensions, is purely arbitrary, though convenient for certain practical purposes. Here the supposition expresses only differences of relation; that is, *differences of direction from an assumed point*. Thus, what would be said to lie in a plane in one relation, would lie in the third dimension in another. There is no way to determine absolutely what is the first, second, or third dimension. If the plane horizontal to the sensorium be called plane dimension, the plane vertical to it will be called solid, or the third dimension, but a change of position will change the names of these dimensions without involving the slightest qualitative change or difference in meaning. Moreover, we usually select three lines or planes terminating vertically at the same point, the lines connecting the three surfaces of a cube with the same point, as the representatives of what is meant by three dimensions, and reduce all other lines and planes to these. But interesting facts are observable here. (1) If the vertical relation between two lines be necessary for defining a ‘dimension,’ then all other lines than the specified ones are either not in any dimension at all, or they are outside the three given dimensions. This is denied by all parties, which only shows that a vertical relation to other lines is not necessary to the determination of a dimension. (2) If lines outside the three vertically intersecting lines still lie in dimension, or are reducible to the other dimensions, they may lie in more than one dimension at the same time, which after all is a fact. This only shows that qualitatively all three dimensions are the same, and that any line outside of another can only represent a dimension in the sense of *direction* from a given point or line, and we are entitled to assume as many dimensions as we please, all within the ‘three dimensions.’

This mode of treatment shows the source of the illusion about the ‘fourth dimension.’ The term in its generic import denotes commensurable quality and denotes only one such quality, so that the property supposed to determine non-Euclidean geometry must be qualitatively different from this, if its figures involve the necessary qualitative differentiation from Euclidean mathematics. But this would shut out the idea of ‘dimension’ as its basis, which is contrary to the supposition. On the other hand, the term has a

specific meaning, which, as different qualitatively from the generic, excludes the right to use the generic term to describe them differentially, but if used only quantitatively, that is, to express *direction*, as it in fact does in these cases, involves the admission of the *actual*, not a supposititious, existence of the fourth dimension, which again is contrary to the supposition of non-Euclidean geometry. Stated briefly, dimension as commensurable quality makes the existence of a fourth dimension a transcendental problem, but as mere direction an empirical problem, and the last conception satisfies all the requirements of the case, because it conforms to the purely quantitative differences which exist between Euclidean and non-Euclidean geometry, as the very language about ‘surfaces,’ ‘triangles,’ etc., in spite of the prefix ‘pseudo,’ necessarily implies. If the difference be made qualitative, neither the conception of direction will satisfy the case, because this is quantitative, nor that of dimension, because the fourth dimension would have to be *non-dimensional*. The simple illusion of Helmholtz lies in the confusion of dimension, now denoting commensurable quality, with direction, now denoting certain quantitative relations, and he merely carries this confusion over to the ‘fourth dimension,’ with the implications of transcendentalism in its qualitative differentiation from the others.

Why Helmholtz should have been guilty of this confusion it is hard to say, when we remember his own conception of the basis of geometry. In the very article above referred to, he says: ‘In conclusion, I would again urge that the axioms of geometry are not propositions pertaining only to the pure doctrine of space. As I said before, they are concerned with quantity.’ If geometry can be based upon the notion of quantity as well as space quality, he ought to have seen at once that his ‘fourth dimension’ did not require to be a new quality, but only a new quantitative relation of the one quality of space, which it in reality is. Distinguish between ‘dimension’ as commensurable quality and the use of the term to denote directional relations, and the problem is solved. The fourth and even n ‘dimensions’ can be admitted as empirical *facts*, and there will be no necessity for showing the empirical nature of geometrical axioms, in order to obtain an *a priori* presumption, from the limitations and indefinite capacities of experience, in favor of a possible existence for transcendental properties of space.

There is one more illusion growing out of this confusion of ‘dimension’ with direction. It relates to the movements of points, lines, and figures, assumed by mathematicians in representing the various relations expressed by Euclidean space. The motion of a point is said to produce a line in one dimension; the motion of a line about one end produces a plane, and the motion of a plane about one of its sides will produce a solid, or the third dimension. The ‘fourth dimension’ is demanded for a certain motion of a solid! But we may say first that, in mathematical parlance, a point cannot be made to move, nor can a line or a plane. Only bodies can move. This may be admitted to be quibbling, but it calls attention to the fact that, if mechanical motion is to determine the matter of dimension, the motion of a ‘point,’ or

‘atom,’ must be in more than one ‘dimension’ at a time. A solid, being in three dimensions, will move in them, and, if it gets out of them, will either not be a solid at all, or, if it is in the ‘fourth dimension,’ we should require a transcendental physics as the basis of non-Euclidean geometry, and this is not in the contract of the mathematician, but only a new property of space. But to dismiss quibbling, if we accept the fact that the dimensions can be constructively represented as described, why assume that a point can move only in one dimension, a line in two, and a plane in the third? From what has been said about the relative and interchangeable nature of the dimensions, any one being the other according to point of view, and from the fact that the motion of a point must pass *through* what is called the third dimension and also exists in a plane at the same time, it is evident that even a moving point must imply all three dimensions. It cannot move in all three *directions* at the same time, but the whole commensurable quality of space is implied by the existence of a point, a line, and a plane, as well as a solid. Hence geometry, constructive and symbolic, is based, not upon dimensions as commensurable quality, but upon dimensions as directions, and in this way creates no presumptions in favor of any new commensurable quality. To argue for it is simply one of those equivocations which ought not to deceive a common schoolboy, not to say anything of men with the reputation of Helmholtz and Riemann.

Several other similar illusions might be pointed out, such as Helmholtz’ language about *flat space* and *curved space*, but I shall not discuss them here. They are either a confusion of the abstract with the concrete, or of quantitative with qualitative logic; and after our lengthy exposure of this latter all-pervading fallacy, it is not necessary to do more than to reiterate the one important rule that qualitative differences can never be expressed by the same term, so that all this discussion about a fourth dimension is simply an extended mass of equivocations turning upon the various meanings of the term ‘dimension.’ This, when once discovered, either makes the controversy ridiculous or the claim for non-Euclidean properties a mere truism, but effectually explodes the logical claim for a new dimensional quality for space, as a piece of mere jugglery in which the juggler is as badly deceived as his spectators. It simply forces mathematics to transcend its own functions as defined and limited by its own advocates, and to assume the prerogatives of metaphysics. With the non-Euclidean it would become a science of quality as well as, or instead of, quantity, and would hardly stop with Helmholtz’ empiricism for an argument in favor of its transcendental ‘dimension.’

I have intended this exhaustive logical criticism as a precaution against a great deal of crazy metaphysics which might support itself upon the authority of men like Helmholtz and Riemann. Occultism simply revels in the doctrine of a fourth dimension, and is absolved from the duty of proving it *in se* by the authority of presumably sane scientific men; and while it may be sufficient simply to laugh at the pretensions of the occultist, and while it

only dignifies his speculations seriously to consider them, there are some at least quasi-genuine phenomena which throw the reins to madhouse theories, when both parties soberly discuss the claims for a fourth dimension and remain wholly ignorant of the logical principles, which not only vitiate the argument for the existence, or even possibility, of this ‘dimension,’ but make the talk about it mere child’s play. In taking this position, however, it is not necessary to deny the fact of other than the known properties of existence, nor to deny that there is more than is dreamt of in any of our philosophies, but only that the logical terms of the problem take us wholly beyond the limits of geometry and mathematics for our ‘metadimension.’ Not only must we distort and change our conception of space, but we require equally to modify that of geometry and mathematics, so that they cease to deal with mere quantity and are made to share the precarious fortunes of metaphysics. We may take this course if we like, but our science would lose its much boasted certitude by the change, and would very soon turn into a fool’s paradise. We cannot limit mathematics by definition to the consideration of pure quantity, and then introduce into our data qualitative differentials which bear no quantitative import but the name. If we do this, the futility of our procedure is only concealed by one of the simplest of illusions, unless it is our distinct purpose to base mathematics upon a system of metaphysics which is as fanciful as wonderland. An equivocation is a poor compass, when we set out on Kant’s shoreless ocean in search of a harbor, and, if we discover its character before we make the venture, we shall be all the wiser for it. But without equivocation we can in no case accomplish any more than the man in Mother Goose, who ‘ran fourteen miles in fifteen days and never looked behind him,’ only to find in the end that he was just where he had started.”²⁵⁷¹

Edward H. Cutler succinctly stated in 1909,

“The fourth dimension has no real existence in the sense in which the external world that we know by means of our senses has real existence. It is a philosophical and metaphysical conception, whose actual existence cannot be demonstrated by observation or by logical reasoning.”²⁵⁷²

Manning and Whitrow cite Michael Stifel, in 1553, and John Wallis, in 1685, as stigmatizing the conjecture of a fourth or higher dimension, as being *unnatural*, an expression with religious implications in those times.²⁵⁷³

Aristotle, in contrast to Stewart and Tait, argued for a limitation of three, his favorite number, dimensions,

“The line has magnitude in one way, the plane in two ways, and the solid in three ways, and beyond these there is no other magnitude because three are all [***] There is no transfer from length to area and from area to a solid.”²⁵⁷⁴

And then there was Ptolemy,

“The admirable Ptolemy in his book *On Distance* well proved that there are not more than three distances, because of the necessity that distances should be taken along perpendicular lines, and because it is possible to take only three lines that are mutually perpendicular, two by which the plane is defined and a third measuring depth; so that if there were any other distance after the third it would be entirely without measure and without definition. Thus Aristotle seemed to conclude from induction that there is no transfer into another magnitude, but Ptolemy proved it.”²⁵⁷⁵

Galileo questioned on what basis Aristotle drew his conclusion, but did not really dispute it.

Not only did Albert Einstein not originate the idea of space-time, he initially strongly opposed it. Einstein, together with Jakob Laub, denounced Minkowski’s recitation of Poincaré’s four-dimensional interpretation of the Lorentzian æther, in 1908, in a paper fraught with mistakes.²⁵⁷⁶ It wasn’t until it was made clear to Einstein that Poincaré’s quadri-dimensional interpretation of Lorentz’ quasi-rigid æther could be exploited to arrive at Paul Gerber’s 1898 formulation of gravitation, that Einstein ended his attack on it, and instead copied it in the general theory of relativity of 1915—though, predictably, Einstein failed to cite either Poincaré or Gerber.²⁵⁷⁷

In 1930, Einstein effectively admitted that he did not originate the special theory of relativity, though he wrongly attributes the theory’s basis to an undeserving Minkowski. Einstein stated,

“The next step in the development of the concept of space is that of the special theory of relativity. The law of the transmission of light in empty space in connection with the principle of relativity with reference to uniform movement led necessarily to the conclusion that space and time had to be combined in a unified four-dimensional continuum. For it was recognized that nothing real corresponded to the inclusive concept of all simultaneous events. As MINKOWSKI was the first to see clearly, this four-dimensional space had to be regarded as possessing a Euclidean metric which was quite analogous to the metric of the three-dimensional space of Euclidean geometry with the use of an imaginary time-coordinate.”²⁵⁷⁸

Einstein, by his own definitions, did not achieve the special theory of relativity in 1905, and instead, when first made aware of it, he opposed it! Poincaré created the theory, and Einstein repeatedly stole credit for it and wrongfully gave Minkowski credit for many of Poincaré’s ideas. Each element of Einstein’s argument as to what constitutes the uniqueness of the special theory of relativity was stated by Poincaré before Einstein and Minkowski.

Minkowski noted that Lorentz *and Einstein* believed in absolute space,

“Neither Einstein nor Lorentz made any attack on the concept of space[.]”²⁵⁷⁹

Einstein’s admission that the æther of relativity theory is analogous to Lorentz’ æther is an admission that Lorentz holds priority on the formalism of the theory, and, further, that Einstein felt forced to switch camps from that of Lorentz to that of Poincaré, in 1916, much after the 1905 paper appeared, to a theory which Einstein, himself, together with Jakob Laub, had denounced in 1908, only to admit in 1920 that this “absolute world” of Minkowski “space-time” resulted again in Lorentz’ æther. As Einstein stated,

“According to the general theory of relativity space without ether is unthinkable; for in such space there not only would be no propagation of light, but also no possibility of existence for standards of space and time (measuring-rods and clocks), nor therefore any space-time intervals in the physical sense.”²⁵⁸⁰

Relativists would counter this citation by pointing out that Einstein’s æther differs from that of Lorentz in that it is ultimately vague, a word without meaning, and no supposition is made as to its fundamental properties, such as the assertion that the æther may be an ideal fluid of particles immersed in a void of empty space.²⁵⁸¹ Einstein denied it the property of “motion”, an assertion made many decades earlier by Philipp Spiller in a much read work.²⁵⁸² However, this argument over semantics is one made against a straw man, for Lorentz stated as early as 1895,

“It does not suit my purpose to examine more thoroughly such speculations, or to express presumptions about the nature of the æther. I merely wish, as far as possible, to free myself of all preconceived notions regarding this substance and not to ascribe to it, for example, any of the qualities of ordinary liquids and gasses. Should it be shown, that a description of the phenomena is best arrived at through the assumption of absolute permeability, then one must surely in the meantime adopt this sort of hypothesis, and leave it to further research, if possible, to open up a deeper understanding to us.”

“Es liegt nicht in meiner Absicht, auf derartige Speculationen näher einzugehen oder Vermuthungen über die Natur des Aethers auszusprechen. Ich wünsche nur, mich von vorgefassten Meinungen über diesen Stoff möglichst frei zu halten und demselben z. B. keine von den Eigenschaften der gewöhnlichen Flüssigkeiten und Gase zuzuschreiben. Sollte es sich ergeben, dass eine Darstellung der Erscheinungen am besten unter der Voraussetzung absoluter Durchdringlichkeit gelänge, dann müsste man sich zu einer solchen Annahme einstweilen schon verstehen und es der weiteren Forschung überlassen, uns, womöglich, ein tieferes Verständniss zu erschliessen.”²⁵⁸³

Compare this with Schubert’s views,

“In mathematics, in fact, the extension of any notion is admissible, provided such extension does not lead to contradictions with itself or with results which are well established. Whether such extensions are necessary, justifiable, or important for the advancement of science is a different question. It must be admitted, therefore, that the mathematician is justified in the extension of the notion of space as a point-aggregate of three dimensions, and in the introduction of space or point-aggregates of more than three dimensions, and in the employment of them as means of research. Other sciences also operate with things which they do not know exist, and which, though they are sufficiently defined, cannot be perceived by our senses. For example, the physicist employs the ether as a means of investigation, though he can have no sensory knowledge of it. The ether is nothing more than a means which enables us to comprehend mechanically the effects known as action at a distance and to bring them within the range of a common point of view. Without the assumption of a material which penetrates everything, and by means of whose undulations impulses are transmitted to the remotest parts of space, the phenomena of light, of heat, of gravitation, and of electricity would be a jumble of isolated and unconnected mysteries. The assumption of an ether, however, comprises in a systematic scheme all these isolated events, facilitates our mental control of the phenomena of nature, and enables us to produce these phenomena at will. But it must not be forgotten in such reflexions that the ether itself is even a greater problem for man, and that the ether-hypothesis does not solve the difficulties of phenomena, but only puts them in a unitary conceptual shape. Notwithstanding all this, physicists have never had the least hesitation in employing the ether as a means of investigation. And as little do reasons exist why the mathematicians should hesitate to investigate the properties of a four-dimensioned point-aggregate, with the view of acquiring thus a convenient means of research.”²⁵⁸⁴

Though Schubert allowed for mathematical speculation—useful fictions, he opposed pretending that such four-dimensional fantasies be taken to signify a reflection of physical reality,

“The high eminence on which the knowledge and civilization of humanity now stands was not reached by the thoughtless employment of fanciful ideas, nor by recourse to a four-dimensional world, but by hard, serious labor, and slow, unceasing research. Let all men of science, therefore, band themselves together and oppose a solid front to methods that explain everything that is now mysterious to us by the interference of independent spirits. For these methods, owing to the fact that they can explain everything, explain nothing, and thus oppose dangerous obstacles to the progress of real research, to which we owe the beautiful temple of modern knowledge.”²⁵⁸⁵

Wölffing wrote in 1897,

“It has also been suggested that the vainly sought after fourth dimension is to be found in *time*, whereby Kinematics (Kinetics) transforms into a four-dimensional Geometry. This is incorrect because time has nothing in common with and (pursuant to this viewpoint) interchangeable with the remaining dimensions; nevertheless, time can be used to advantage to produce four-dimensional bodies from three-dimensional ones.”

“Man hat auch in der *Zeit* die vergeblich gesuchte vierte Dimension zu finden geglaubt, wodurch sich die Kinematik (Bewegungslehre) in eine vierdimensionale Geometrie verwandelt. Richtig ist dies deshalb nicht, weil die Zeit nichts mit den übrigen Dimension gleichartiges und (je nach dem Standpunkt) vertauschbares ist; immerhin kann die Zeit bei der Erzeugung der vierdimensionalen Körper durch dreidimensionale mit Vorteil Verwendung finden.”²⁵⁸⁶

Archbishop Tillotson preached that,

“Others say, God sees and knows future Things by the presentiality and co-existence of all Things in Eternity; For they say, that future Things are actually present and existing to God, though not *in mensura propria*, yet *in mensura aliena*. The Schoolmen have much more of this Jargon and canting Language. I envy no Man the understanding these Phrases: But to me they seem to signify nothing, but to have been Words invented by idle and conceited Men; which a great many ever since, lest they should seem to be ignorant, would seem to understand. But I wonder most, that Men, when they have amused and puzzled themselves and others with hard Words, should call this *Explaining* Things.”²⁵⁸⁷

Both Hendrik Antoon Lorentz and Albert Einstein maintained a tri-dimensional privileged frame of “physical space” or “æther”, which is the same *physical* hypothesis given two different names. The appellation “æther”, which more clearly maintains the concept of a physical entity, is the more fitting title. It was Poincaré, Marcolongo and Minkowski, who incorporated Stallo’s quadri-dimensional æther into the theory of relativity, not Albert Einstein. Stallo stated in 1847 in the explicit context of four-dimensional “space-time”,

“The abstract totality of extension in itself is devoid of all internal difference and distinction. It is, from its ideal origin and nature, absolutely *moving*; but *this motion is yet perfectly the same as absolute repose*. For there are no distinct particles as yet successively occupying distinct spaces; in every respect there is thorough homogenousness. We have absolute multiplicity, but a multiplicity intimately and completely blended in extensive continuous unity. It is indifferent to me whether this primitive matter be called *ether*, or

any other name be given it; the only thing important is, to keep this absence of further material differentiation in view.”

11 HILBERT'S PROOFS PROVE HILBERT'S PRIORITY

In 1997, amid much fanfare, Leo Corry announced to the world that he had uncovered proof that Albert Einstein arrived at the generally covariant field equations of gravitation before David Hilbert. Leo Corry joined with Jürgen Renn and John Stachel and published an article in the journal Science arguing against Hilbert's priority. Their claims were largely based on a set of printer's proofs of David Hilbert's 20 November 1915 Göttingen lecture, which Corry had uncovered. However, in this 1997 article, "Belated Decision in the Hilbert-Einstein Priority Dispute," Corry, Renn and Stachel failed to disclose the fact that these printer's proofs were mutilated, and are missing a critical part. Full disclosure of the facts reveals that even in their mutilated state, these proofs prove that Hilbert had a generally covariant theory of gravitation before Einstein.

“Artistic proof is, like artistic anything else, simply a matter of selection. If you know what to put in and what to leave out you can prove anything you like, quite conclusively.”—ANTHONY BERKELEY COX²⁵⁸⁸

11.1 Introduction

David Hilbert presented the generally covariant field equations of gravitation of the general theory of relativity to the Göttingen Royal Academy of Sciences on 20 November 1915, five days before Albert Einstein presented them to the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences. In 1978, a letter from Einstein to Hilbert dated 18 November 1915 surfaced, and it proved that Einstein learned these equations from an advanced copy of Hilbert's work, which Hilbert had sent to Einstein at Einstein's request.

11.2 Corry, Renn and Stachel's Baseless Historical Revisionism

In 1997, Leo Corry, of the Cohn Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Ideas, University of Tel-Aviv, announced to the world that he believed he had found conclusive proof that Albert Einstein must have arrived at the generally covariant field equations of general relativity before David Hilbert. Corry based this extraordinary claim on a set of printer's proofs of Hilbert's 20 November 1915 paper "The Foundations of Physics," which Corry had "brought to light" having found them in Hilbert's *Nachlaß* in the Göttingen archives.²⁵⁸⁹ These printer's proofs of Hilbert's paper are dated with a printer's stamp of 6 December 1915 and do not *today* contain the explicit field equations of gravitation of the general theory of relativity containing the trace term which appeared in the published version of Hilbert's work. However, the proofs do, even in their present mutilated condition, contain generally covariant field equations of gravitation, which renders Corry, Renn and Stachel's argument pointless.

In 1997, Corry teamed up with Jürgen Renn, Director of the Max Planck Institute

for the History of Science, Berlin; and John Stachel, an early editor of Einstein's *Collected Papers* and currently Director of the Center for Einstein Studies at Boston University. Corry, Renn and John Stachel together published an article in the widely read, multidisciplinary journal *Science*²⁵⁹⁰ declaring that Hilbert had conceded Einstein's priority, and that Hilbert had not arrived at a generally covariant form of the field equations of gravitation as of 6 December 1915, and deduced them only after Einstein had submitted his presentation on 25 November 1915. This article has since been relied upon by others to deny Hilbert's priority.²⁵⁹¹ The story received vast press coverage,²⁵⁹² and some of these news reports stated that Hilbert had plagiarized Einstein's equations.

When I read this 1997 article "Belated Decision in the Hilbert-Einstein Priority Dispute" in *Science* I considered it to be in poor taste and illogical, in that it was sensationalistic and the conclusions it contained did not follow from the premises it stated. The article contradicted a well-established fact, acknowledged by Einstein himself. I chose not to mention the article in my recent book *Albert Einstein: The Incurable Plagiarist*.²⁵⁹³

After I published said book in 2002, which twice states that Einstein plagiarized Hilbert's equations, I began to receive letters of encouragement from physicists around the world. Prof. Friedwardt Winterberg, theoretical physicist at the University of Nevada, Reno, after reading my book requested a copy of the proofs. He informed me that the printer's proofs of Hilbert's paper, upon which Corry, Renn and Stachel had relied, were in an incomplete set, which had been mutilated at some point in its history in a way which removed the very equations the *Science* article claimed were missing from Hilbert's formulation, which renders Corry, Renn and Stachel's argument baseless as well as pointless.

Prof. Winterberg submitted a paper to *Science* refuting the claims of Corry, Renn and Stachel, which *Science* rejected. Prof. Winterberg then submitted a later version of his paper to the *Zeitschrift für Naturforschung*, which was published in October of 2004.²⁵⁹⁴ I published an article in *The Canberra Times* in September of 2002 in which I pointed out that Hilbert was first to deduce the equations and that Einstein plagiarized them with irrational arguments.²⁵⁹⁵ I argued in internet forums for many years prior to the publication of *Albert Einstein: The Incurable Plagiarist* that Einstein plagiarized Hilbert's work and I publicly called for a forensic investigation of the proofs. When I learned of the mutilation, I spread the word across the world. I informed John Stachel that I intended to publish on the proofs, and he published a negative review of my book *Albert Einstein: The Incurable Plagiarist*, which failed to mention our correspondence and which contained numerous errors, to which I responded in *Infinite Energy* in 2003.²⁵⁹⁶ In my response I repeatedly pointed out that the facts clearly prove that Einstein plagiarized Hilbert's equations.

I explained Prof. Winterberg's arguments in a book I published in 2003 *Anticipations of Einstein in the General Theory of Relativity*. I also proved in several ways in this book that Einstein must have plagiarized Hilbert's equations and could not have arrived at them independently, which arguments will here be repeated. I tried to convince Prof. Winterberg of this fact and in 2005 he came to agree with me and submitted a paper to *Zeitschrift für Naturforschung* which explained my proofs

of Einstein's plagiarism and which presented Prof. Winterberg's insight that Einstein fudged his equations in his 18 November 1915 paper on Mercury to derive the doubled Newtonian prediction of a light ray grazing the limb of the Sun.

The fact that Hilbert's proofs were mutilated came as a surprise to me, because in their four-page article in *Science* disputing Hilbert's well-established priority, Corry, Renn and Stachel failed to mention the fact that the printer's proofs were incomplete, mutilated at some point in their history, and were missing the very section where the equations they claimed Hilbert did not know would originally have been found. While it is true that the printer's proofs do not today contain the express final form of the field equations of gravitation expressing the trace term, it is also true that the missing mutilated section had room for them, and it is a fact that someone at some point in their history had physically cut out a crucial section of the proofs—no one knows who did the cutting, or when, or why the document was mutilated. We do know that Corry, Renn and Stachel elected to not mention the mutilation in their 1997 article in *Science*. The remainder of the proofs are republished in my book *Anticipations of Einstein in the General Theory of Relativity* as Appendix C; and a facsimile of mutilated page 8 appears in Prof. Winterberg's October, 2004, article for the *Zeitschrift für Naturforschung*.

In 1998, Dr. Tilman Sauer, of the Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, proved that even in their mutilated state these proofs prove that Hilbert had a generally covariant theory of gravitation before Einstein, and still contain generally covariant field equations of gravitation. Dr. Sauer published his findings in the *Archive for History of Exact Sciences* in an article entitled, "The Relativity of Discovery: Hilbert's First Note on the Foundations of Physics."²⁵⁹⁷ In 2004, Professors A. A. Logunov (former Vice-President of the Russian Academy of Sciences and currently Director of the Institute for High Energy Physics in Moscow), V. A. Petrov and M. A. Mestvirishvili also published an important paper discrediting the views of Corry, Renn and Stachel.²⁵⁹⁸

Corry, Renn and Stachel acknowledged in their 1997 article in *Science* that the fact that Hilbert anticipated Einstein was the "commonly accepted view" "presently accepted[. . .] among physicists and historians of science[.]" They excitedly proclaimed in their article in *Science*, "Detailed analysis[. . .] of these proofs[. . .] enabled us to construct an account[. . .] that radically differs from the standard view[.]" but failed to mention that their radical revisionism was based on an incomplete document, which had been mutilated at some point in its history removing the very part which likely contained that which they claimed was missing from Hilbert's formulation.

John Stachel informed me that he has since made mention of the mutilation in a work he coauthored with Jürgen Renn, "Hilbert's Foundation of Physics: From a Theory of Everything to a Constituent of General Relativity," Preprint 118 of the Max-Planck-Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte, (1999), which also disputes Hilbert's priority. This preprint notes the mutilation in at least three separate places, unlike the *Science* article, which failed to mention it even once. It appears that this comparatively obscure preprint, and the public disclosure that the printer's proofs were mutilated, have not met with anywhere near as much publicity as the *Science*

article's "Belated Decision" that "Detailed analysis[...] of these proofs[. . .] enabled us to construct an account[. . .] that radically differs from the standard view[.]"

The preprint article by Renn and Stachel appeared only after the 1998 article by Dr. Tilman Sauer, which raised the issue of the mutilation of the proofs and formally proved that Hilbert did demonstrate a generally covariant theory of gravitation in the printer's proofs, as is clear even in the remainder of the mutilated proofs. Renn and Stachel refer to Dr. Sauer's paper in their 1999 article. One would have hoped that Dr. Sauer's article would have been sufficient to end Renn and Stachel's attempts to deny Hilbert's priority based on the mutilated proofs, which efforts should never have begun.

In addition to Renn and Stachel's subsequent 1999 article disputing Hilbert's priority, Vladimir Pavlovich Vizgin, of the S. I. Vavilov Institute of Natural Sciences and Technology, Moscow, published an article as recently as 2001 in the *Uspekhi Fizicheskikh Nauk*, which denies Hilbert's well-established priority.²⁵⁹⁹ Vizgin takes up a good deal of space in his article to thank those who prompted him to write it and supplied him with a copy of the printer's proofs. Vizgin refers many times to Dr. Sauer's paper, but does not mention the mutilation of the printer's proofs, or Dr. Sauer's arguments which vindicate Hilbert. Vizgin's paper has since been discredited by Professors A. A. Logunov, V. A. Petrov and M. A. Mestvirishvili.²⁶⁰⁰

Though Dr. Sauer proved Hilbert's priority, he mistakenly believed that Einstein could not have copied Hilbert's results, and Dr. Sauer's vague and arbitrary arguments regarding Einstein's plagiarism do not follow from his premises. There is no evidence or circumstance which would preclude Einstein's plagiarism. On the contrary, the evidence and the circumstances surrounding Einstein's publication of the generally covariant field equations of gravitation containing the trace term on 25 November 1915 prove beyond any reasonable doubt that Einstein plagiarized them from David Hilbert. Jürgen Renn, himself, once admitted,

"I had personally come to the conclusion that Einstein plagiarized Hilbert[.] [The] conclusion is almost unavoidable, that Einstein must have copied from Hilbert."²⁶⁰¹

The Ottawa Citizen, 14 November 1997, Final Edition, page A13, reported in an article entitled "Einstein's Rival was Relatively Late with Solution: Investigation Removes Stigma of Plagiarism from Scientist's Milestone Theory" with the byline Roger Highfield, *The Daily Telegraph*,

"Mr. Renn said yesterday that at first he feared Einstein had stolen Hilbert's ideas. But this discovery marks 'one of the very rare cases that one has a smoking gun' to clear Einstein's name, he said."

Corry, Renn and Stachel together wrote in their article in *Science*,

"[. . .]the arguments by which Einstein is exculpated are rather weak[.]"²⁶⁰²

It is odd that a set of mutilated printer's proofs caused Renn & Co. to reverse such strongly held beliefs. It is stranger still that they failed to mention the mutilation in their sensationalistic article in *Science* in 1997.

In the very first line of their 1999 preprint article, Renn and Stachel again made clear that they sought to overturn a well-established fact,

“Hilbert is commonly seen as having publicly presented the derivation of the field equations of general relativity five days before Einstein on 20 November 1915 — after only half a year's work on the subject in contrast to Einstein's eight years of hardship from 1907 to 1915.”

The authors boast of their radically revisionist viewpoint and quote from the renowned expert on general relativity Kip Thorne to show us how well-established is the fact they would have us disavow. Thorne wrote, in agreement with the accepted view of the history,

“Remarkably, Einstein was not the first to discover the correct form of the law of warpage[. . . .] Recognition for the first discovery must go to Hilbert.”²⁶⁰³

11.3 Historical Background and the Correspondence

By late 1915, Albert Einstein had engaged in an on-again, off-again struggle for many years to express the inertial and gravitational mass equivalence principle, which he learned from Max Planck,²⁶⁰⁴ in a generally covariant form of gravitational field equations. Einstein was unable to arrive at a solution. He solicited help from Ernst Mach, Marcel Grossmann, and others, but to no avail.

The problem seemed almost insurmountable. Meanwhile, the illustrious mathematician David Hilbert was after an all-encompassing axiomatic theory of physics, which would bring mathematical inference to a fundamental end.²⁶⁰⁵ Einstein turned to Hilbert to solve the seemingly unsolvable. Employing his axiomatic approach, David Hilbert deduced the generally covariant field equations of gravitation of the general theory of relativity by 13 November 1915, and arrived at them before Albert Einstein. Hilbert probably had deduced these equations in early October of 1915.²⁶⁰⁶ We know that as late as 18 November 1915, Einstein was still publishing unsuccessful attempts at a general theory of relativity, which depended upon his erroneous field equations of gravitation.²⁶⁰⁷

On 13 November 1915, Hilbert wrote to Einstein and informed Einstein that he, Hilbert, had solved the problem,

“But since you are so interested, I would like to lay out my th[eory] in very complete detail on the coming Tuesday[. . . .] I find it ideally beautiful[. . . .] As far as I understand your new pap[er], the solution giv[en] by you is entirely different from mine[. . . .]”²⁶⁰⁸

On 15 November 1915, Einstein solicited a copy of Hilbert's work, before it appeared in final printed form,

“Your analysis interests me tremendously[. . .] If possible, please send me a correction proof of your study to mitigate my impatience.”²⁶⁰⁹

Hilbert, trusting Einstein, sent him a copy of his manuscript, sometime prior to 18 November 1915. Einstein wrote a letter to Hilbert on 18 November 1915, acknowledging that he had received Hilbert's manuscript and echoed Hilbert's line expressing hesitation about his understanding of the other's work. Einstein claimed in this letter that he had independently arrived at Hilbert's solution, when he had not, and we know that he had not, because the papers Einstein submitted in this period missed the mark. Einstein erroneously claimed,

“The system you furnished agrees—as far as I can see—exactly with what I found in the last few weeks and have presented to the Academy.”²⁶¹⁰

Hermann Weyl wrote in his book *Space-Time-Matter*,

“In the first paper in which Einstein set up the gravitational equations without following on from Hamilton's Principle, the term $-\frac{1}{2} \delta_i^k \mathbf{T}$ was missing on the right-hand side; he recognised only later that it is required as a result of the energy-momentum-theorem.”²⁶¹¹

Tilman Sauer noted that Hilbert objected to Weyl's book, because Weyl failed to explicitly acknowledge Hilbert's priority, as had Gustav Herglotz. Sauer notes that Herglotz responded to an objection by Hilbert that Herglotz had not acknowledged Hilbert's priority. Herglotz wrote,

“It is true that I should have specifically referred to the fact that the Tensor $K_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} K$ appeared for the very first time in your ‘Foundations [of Physics]’ as the natural consequence of the variation of $\int K \sqrt{g} d\omega$.”

“Ich hätte freilich auf das erstmalige natürliche Auftreten des Tensors $K_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} K$ als Variation von $\int K \sqrt{g} d\omega$ in Ihren ‘Grundlagen’ besonders hinweisen sollen.”²⁶¹²

Sauer adds,

“And in a draft of a letter to Weyl, dated 22 April 1918, written after he had read the proofs of the first edition of Weyl's ‘Raum-Zeit-Materie’ Hilbert also objected to being slighted in Weyl's exposition. In this letter again ‘in

particular the use of the Riemannian curvature [scalar] in the Hamiltonian integral' ('insbesondere die Verwendung der Riemannschen Krümmung unter dem Hamiltonschen Integral') was claimed as one of his original contributions. SUB Cod. Ms. Hilbert 457/17."²⁶¹³

Dr. Tilman Sauer informs us that,

"Hilbert, in his first communication, introduced gravitational field equations which are derived from a variational principle and which are generally covariant. Thus, in contrast to Einstein's *Entwurf* theory and in contrast to Einstein's first November communication, he did not write down gravitational field equations of restricted covariance, and, in contrast to Einstein's second November communication, Hilbert did formulate the generally covariant field equations in terms of a variational principle."²⁶¹⁴

Einstein was furious. He wanted desperately to distinguish himself as progressing beyond the limitations of the special theory of relativity, which was then commonly referred to as the "Lorentz-Einstein theory."²⁶¹⁵ Albert Einstein sought to characterize the general theory of relativity as his achievement. But this dream was destroyed. Hilbert had succeeded where Einstein and his industrious collaborators Marcel Grossmann and Erwin Freundlich had not. Einstein posed the problem to Hilbert, and Hilbert solved it. Hilbert was overly generous in referencing Einstein's work, to the exclusion of many of Einstein's predecessors, but Hilbert did not take credit for this work unto himself.

Hilbert presented his equations,

$$[\sqrt{g} K]_{\mu\nu} = \sqrt{g} \left(K_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} K g_{\mu\nu} \right),$$

containing the needed trace term missing in all of Einstein's work until 25 November 1915, to the Göttingen Royal Academy of Sciences on 20 November 1915.²⁶¹⁶ Einstein rushed to plagiarize Hilbert's equations in a paper submitted to the Berlin Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences on 25 November 1915,²⁶¹⁷ with an inductive analysis of Hilbert's synthesis.²⁶¹⁸ Both the "bottom up" axiomatic method of Hilbert, and the "top down" inductive "principle theory" method of Einstein resulted in the same field equations. Einstein's equations are stated in the following terms:

$$G_{im} = -\kappa \left(T_{im} - \frac{1}{2} g_{im} T \right),$$

and are fully equivalent to Hilbert's prior work. Einstein does not deduce this equation in his 25 November 1915 paper, but simply copies it from Hilbert's work, then provides examples to show that it works.

David Hilbert's former lecture assistant Max Born wrote to Hilbert on 23

November 1915 and acknowledged Hilbert's priority for the generally covariant field equations of gravitation of the general theory of relativity.²⁶¹⁹ Born refers to the equations as Hilbert's and states that Einstein's work was subsequent to Hilbert's and less general, and that Einstein acknowledged that he was using Hilbert's solution. Einstein could not lie to Born as easily as he lied to Zangger, because Born knew from the lecture notes Dr. Baade had sent Erwin Freundlich that Hilbert had the equations before Einstein. Born's letter is further proof that Einstein copied from Hilbert. The letter also evinces that Freundlich was the real source of the papers on gravitation and Mercury attributed to Einstein in November of 1915 and of Einstein's famous review of the general theory of relativity published in *Annalen der Physik* in 1916—Einstein lacked the skills needed to have written it.

Einstein claimed that he was going to solve the problem in the same way that Hilbert already had, therefore he must first have seen Hilbert's solution. Einstein published his 25 November 1915 paper two days after Born sent his letter in the knowledge that Hilbert had publicly delivered the correct equations before him, but Einstein did not mention Hilbert in his paper. Born obviously knew that Hilbert was first to the equations and Einstein was copying from him, though it was a primitive attempt.

Note that Einstein must have discussed Hilbert's correct and novel equations with Born, which differed from those of all of Einstein's papers published before 23 November 1915, because Born states that his knowledge of the new equations Einstein intended to use was derived from discussions with Einstein and only from discussions, not from the 18 November 1915 paper which he had read, and Born was intent to read everything published on the subject. On the day Einstein submitted his Mercury paper on 18 November 1915, or perhaps even later, the editor of the reports in which the paper was published noted on page 803 that Einstein held to his obsolete equations. On this date Einstein received Hilbert's correct equations, which he subsequently copied. He could not have arrived at the equations independently of Hilbert, because he had Hilbert's correct equations on hand before adopting them.

When discussing the question with Born, Einstein had just adopted Hilbert's solution and had no written theory such that Born could only know of Einstein's plagiarism from discussions with him and with Freundlich. Einstein's mathematical skills were comparatively poor. The strong emphasis on astronomical observations was demonstrably Freundlich's influence. While Hilbert more aggressively pursued the microscopic world, Freundlich more aggressively pursued the macroscopic world, but the solution to the gravitational problem was Hilbert's, not Einstein's nor Freundlich's.

Einstein and Freundlich's inability to ever deduce the relevant equations with the trace term is further proof that they plagiarized Hilbert's paper and lacked even the creative intelligence²⁶²⁰ needed to induce a complete theory around Hilbert's results. Einstein was disappointed by Freundlich's inability to provide him with a synthetic theory he could assert as if his own. Again, Einstein never succeeded in publishing a paper in which he derived the gravitational field equations of the general theory of relativity. He was always forced to simply copy Hilbert's equations outright in their final form without a derivation and then provide examples that they worked to solve

known problems. This is further proof that neither Einstein nor Freundlich could have independently arrived at the equations before Hilbert, because even after having the equations handed to them, they were unable to derive them, and they could not have independently arrived at the equations without first deriving them. Hilbert, on the other hand, provides a complete proof of how he derived the equations in a logical deduction which proceeded from fundamental axioms.

Prof. Jagdish Mehra wrote,

“In his third and fourth communications on this subject, Lorentz derived the Hilbert-Einstein field equations, in particular Equation (37), by a variation of the gravitational potential for the two cases, namely the $T_{\mu\nu}$ being due to the electromagnetic or the mechanical part respectively. Altogether Lorentz had produced a complete proof of the equivalence of Einstein’s inductive and Hilbert’s deductive methods, treating all the delicate points clearly and in detail.”²⁶²¹

Hans Reichenbach accused Einstein of simply *guessing* the solution to the problem of generally covariant field equations of gravitation.²⁶²² However, there was no need for Einstein to have guessed at the equations, because Einstein had the benefit of Hilbert’s correct solution on 18 November 1915, before presenting it as if his own on 25 November 1915.

On 26 November 1915, Einstein wrote to Heinrich Zangger and unfairly smeared Hilbert. Einstein even plagiarized Hilbert’s description of the theory as “ideally beautiful,” while smearing Hilbert,

“The theory is beautiful beyond comparison. However, only *one* colleague has really understood it, and he is seeking to ‘partake’ in it (Abraham’s expression) in a clever way. In my personal experience I have hardly come to know the wretchedness of mankind better than as a result of this theory and everything connected to it.”²⁶²³

This letter is further proof that Einstein plagiarized Hilbert’s work; in that Einstein, on 26 November 1915, averred that Hilbert really understood the theory Einstein presented on 25 November 1915 and sought to appropriate it. The only evidence Einstein had for this statement was Hilbert’s manuscript, which Einstein had received by 18 November 1915, and Dr. Baade’s lecture notes from Hilbert’s presentation of his theory. Given the bizarre hypothesis of Corry, Renn and Stachel, that Hilbert revised his 20 November 1915 manuscript to match Einstein’s 25 November 1915 presentation, Hilbert would have to have become aware of the equations in Einstein’s presentation of 25 November 1915, rewritten his work, and have presented it to Einstein on or before 26 November 1915.

It would not have been physically possible for Hilbert to have learned the equations from Einstein’s 25 November 1915 paper, and then rewritten his, Hilbert’s, paper to match Einstein’s, and then to have sent Einstein this hypothetical revised paper, and for Einstein to have then received this hypothetical manuscript, all within

24 hours. And what would it have profited Hilbert to have sent Einstein this fictitious plagiarized work? As Radhakrishnan Srinivasan has eloquently argued, the alternative scenario is the irrational assertion (given the completely unfounded allegation of Corry, Renn and Stachel that Hilbert changed course after coming to know Einstein's alleged innovation) that Einstein accused Hilbert of plagiarism, *before it had supposedly occurred*.

In Corry, Renn and Stachel's revisionist account, one must choose between the impossible and the irrational, while excluding the obvious. Their 1997 article would have us make this Hobson's choice without the knowledge that Hilbert's proofs were mutilated—without the knowledge that they have no basis for their bizarre revisionism.

Corry, Renn and Stachel attempt to make much of Einstein's 18 November 1915 letter to Hilbert. They claim that this letter was a sharp reaction against Hilbert.

Despite Corry, Renn and Stachel's obfuscation, this alleged reaction by Einstein would have been for Hilbert's claiming originality for deducing the generally covariant field equations of gravitation, before Einstein, as claimed by Hilbert in his paper. However, Corry, Renn and Stachel aver that Hilbert had not yet deduced these equations. Their argument, when brought into agreement with the known facts, is self-contradictory. In addition, Einstein's letter, in contradiction to Corry, Renn and Stachel's claim of bitter arguer, is ostensibly friendly, though Einstein's assertion that he had developed the exact same result as Hilbert was evidently an intentional falsehood—Einstein coyly tried to deceive Hilbert into believing he had been anticipated, when he had not—and Hilbert responded to Einstein's lies and contradicted them. If Einstein had hoped that he could dissuade Hilbert from publishing Hilbert's results, Einstein was mistaken.

"Einstein's" theory is really the melding of Ernst Mach's ideas with those of Marcel Grossmann, as completed by David Hilbert, and then transcribed by Erwin Freundlich and stamped with Einstein's name. Einstein and Grossmann together published A. Einstein and M. Grossmann, *Entwurf einer verallgemeinerten Relativitätstheorie und einer Theorie der Gravitation. I. Physikalischer Teil, von Albert Einstein; II. Mathematischer Teil, von Marcel Grossmann*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1913); reprinted in *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik*, Volume 62, (1914), pp. 225-259 and "Kovarianzeigenschaften der Feldgleichungen der auf die verallgemeinerte Relativitätstheorie gegründeten Gravitationstheorie", *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik*, Volume 63, (1914), pp. 215-225. In 1913 and 1914, Einstein repeatedly credited Mach as the source of Einstein's contribution to what Einstein repeatedly and expressly called the "Einstein-Grossmann theory",²⁶²⁴ and Einstein expressly stated again and again that this theory was a collaboration between him and Grossmann.

It is important to note that Einstein credits Marcel Grossmann with participating in the development of the field equations in Einstein's 18 November 1915 letter to Hilbert and in Einstein's review article for the *Annalen der Physik* in 1916,²⁶²⁵ but Einstein demeaned his close friend and teacher Marcel Grossmann and relegated Grossmann to the status of a lackey in a letter to Arnold Sommerfeld dated 15 July 1915,²⁶²⁶ and Einstein makes no mention of Grossmann, Besso, Hilbert or Freundlich

in Einstein's 25 November 1915 paper. Therefore, we have several proven examples of Einstein's appropriation of his trusting colleagues' work in this one 25 November 1915 paper. In Einstein's 1916 article on general relativity for the *Annalen der Physik*, Einstein gives Hilbert a minor reference, and gives Grossmann only a token mention in the introduction, which introduction is missing in the English reprint of this article in the book *The Principle of Relativity*.²⁶²⁷

The facts, examined without bias and in the full light of day, are consistent and clear. On 18 November 1915, Einstein, by lying to him, attempted to dissuade Hilbert from publishing Hilbert's generally covariant theory of gravitation. Hilbert was not dissuaded and presented his work on 20 November 1915. Einstein plagiarized Hilbert's work on 25 November 1915, and then immediately instigated a smear campaign against Hilbert in a 26 November 1915 letter to Heinrich Zangger.

In this period of his life, Einstein had unnecessarily brought enormous pressures upon himself and in this period of his life, Albert Einstein viciously betrayed the trust of many of those who were closest to him. In the same letter to Zangger, Albert Einstein unfairly smears Mileva Einstein-Marity, his first wife, in the next paragraph after unfairly smearing David Hilbert.

In one letter, Albert Einstein blamed Mileva Einstein-Marity for the problems Albert had created with their children and Einstein accused Hilbert of the plagiarism *Einstein* had committed. In one paper, Albert Einstein sought to appropriate the contributions of his friends Marcel Grossmann and Erwin Freundlich, and the man who had trusted in him and who had solved a problem he had long sought to solve, David Hilbert.

Hilbert resented Einstein's plagiarism. Einstein wrote to Hilbert on 20 December 1915 and stated,

“There has been a certain ill-feeling between us[.]”²⁶²⁸

Hilbert would have had no grounds for hostility towards Einstein, unless Einstein had plagiarized his work. Einstein resented Hilbert for daring to publish the results Einstein could not achieve without knowledge of Hilbert's solution.

Einstein failed to mention that he was adopting Hilbert's work, until 1916, when Hilbert forced Einstein to publicly acknowledge Hilbert's priority. Einstein referred his readers to Hilbert's 20 November 1915 paper in Einstein's 1916 review article on the general theory of relativity “Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie” for *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 49, Number 7, pages 769-822, at 810,

“Sie liefern die Gleichungen des materiellen Vorganges vollständig, wenn letzterer durch vier voneinander unabhängige Differentialgleichungen charakterisierbar ist. [Footnote: Vgl. hierüber D. Hilbert, Nachr. d. K. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Math.-phys. Klasse. p. 3. 1915.]”

Prof. Jagdish Mehra, who greatly admires Einstein, wrote in this context that Einstein was less than fair when referencing Hilbert's work,

“Hilbert, in retrospect, could not have been satisfied by this weak reference to his work. In a sense, Einstein had ‘appropriated’ Hilbert’s contribution to the gravitational field equations as a march of his own ideas—or so it would seem from the reading of his 1916 *Ann. d. Phys.* paper on the foundations of general relativity.”²⁶²⁹

Hilbert wrote in the published version of his 1915 lecture in defense of his priority,

“It appears to me that the differential equations of gravitation arrived at in [my] way are in agreement with those of Einstein in his subsequent papers setting forth the broad theory of general relativity[.]”²⁶³⁰

As Prof. Mehra has noted, Hilbert again declared his priority in 1924. Hilbert wrote,

“Einstein [. . .] in his last publications ultimately returns directly to the equations of my theory.”²⁶³¹

As was already mentioned, Tilman Sauer has shown that David Hilbert asked Hermann Weyl and Gustav Herglotz to recognize his priority.

Albert Einstein, himself, repeatedly, though somewhat resentfully, acknowledged Hilbert’s priority in 1916,²⁶³² though Einstein had given no one else their due credit in 1915,

“The general theory of relativity has recently been given in a particularly clear form by H. A. Lorentz and D. Hilbert, [*Footnote:* Four papers by Lorentz in the Publications of the Koninkl. Akad. van Wetensch. te Amsterdam, 1915 and 1916; D. Hilbert, *Göttinger Nachr.*, 1915, Part 3.] who have deduced its equations from one single principle of variation. The same thing will be done in the present paper. But my purpose here is to present the fundamental connexions in as perspicuous a manner as possible, and in as general terms as is permissible from the point of view of the general theory of relativity. In particular we shall make as few specializing assumptions as possible, in marked contrast to Hilbert’s treatment of the subject. On the other hand, in antithesis to my own most recent treatment of the subject, there is to be complete liberty in the choice of the system of co-ordinates.”²⁶³³

In 1919, Einstein again simply asserted Hilbert’s equations without a derivation in a fallacy of *Petitio Principii* without a deductive synthesis and in full knowledge of Hilbert’s work, and again acknowledged David Hilbert’s priority,

“In spite of the beauty of the formal structure of this theory, as erected by Mie, Hilbert, and Weyl, its physical results have hitherto been unsatisfactory. [***] So far the general theory of relativity has made no change in this state

of the question. If we for the moment disregard the additional cosmological term, the field equations take the form

$$\mathbf{G}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{G} = -\kappa \mathbf{T}_{\mu\nu} \quad . \quad . \quad . \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{G}_{\mu\nu}$ denotes the contracted Riemann tensor of curvature, \mathbf{G} the scalar of curvature formed by repeated contraction, and $\mathbf{T}_{\mu\nu}$ the energy-tensor of 'matter.' The assumption that the $\mathbf{T}_{\mu\nu}$ do *not* depend on the derivatives of the $\mathbf{G}_{\mu\nu}$ is in keeping with the historical development of these equations. For these quantities are, of course, the energy components in the sense of the special theory of relativity, in which variable $g_{\mu\nu}$ do not occur. The second term on the left-hand side of the equation is so chosen that the divergence of the left-hand side of (1) vanishes identically, so that taking the divergence of (1), we obtain the equation

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mu}^{\sigma}}{\partial x_{\sigma}} + \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu}^{\sigma\tau} \mathbf{T}_{\sigma\tau} = 0 \quad . \quad . \quad . \quad (2)$$

which in the limiting case of the special theory of relativity gives the complete equations of conservation

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{T}_{\mu\nu}}{\partial x_{\nu}} = 0.$$

Therein lies the physical foundation for the second term of the left-hand side of (1). It is by no means settled *a priori* that a limiting transition of this kind has any possible meaning. [***] Thus if we hold to $\left[\mathbf{G}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{G} = -\kappa \mathbf{T}_{\mu\nu} \right]$ we are driven on to the path of Mie's theory.

[Footnote: Cf. D. Hilbert, Göttinger Nachr., 20 Nov., 1915.]²⁶³⁴

Emil Wiechert,²⁶³⁵ Gustav Mie,²⁶³⁶ Felix Klein,²⁶³⁷ Hermann Weyl,²⁶³⁸ Wolfgang Pauli,²⁶³⁹ Friedrich Kottler,²⁶⁴⁰ Sir Joseph Larmor,²⁶⁴¹ Sir William Cecil Dampier,²⁶⁴² Sir Edmund Whittaker,²⁶⁴³ and many others, have acknowledged Hilbert's work of 20 November 1915, with most acknowledging that Hilbert was first to the equations. In 1974, Jagdish Mehra presented the most comprehensive treatment of the subject ever published.²⁶⁴⁴ Prof. Mehra's thoroughly documented treatise was met with great enthusiasm and it prompted a sudden surge of research into the origins of the general theory of relativity.

Damning evidence against Einstein appeared in 1978²⁶⁴⁵ in the form of Einstein's 18 November 1915 letter to Hilbert acknowledging receipt of Hilbert's manuscript,

before Einstein's 25 November 1915 presentation. This letter proves Einstein's plagiarism; in that Einstein could not have arrived at the equations independently of Hilbert, in spite of the fact that Einstein did not credit Hilbert with providing the solution in Einstein's presentation of 25 November 1915. Max Born's letter to David Hilbert has provided yet more proof of Einstein's plagiarism—as have the printer's proofs.

11.4 Hilbert's Proofs Prove Hilbert's Priority

Even though Corry's claims that Einstein anticipated Hilbert are clearly untenable, Corry's discovery is not without some redeeming historical value. Corry correctly notes that Hilbert changed his final published work from the version printed in the proofs. Prof. Winterberg believes this was done in cooperation with Felix Klein in an effort to render Hilbert's paper clearer. This in no way casts doubt on Hilbert's priority.

It is my opinion that the proofs are of secondary importance to the fact that Klein, Born, Hilbert and Einstein each acknowledged that Hilbert was first to the covariant equations. They are, after all, printer's proofs which were rejected, and printer's proofs are often inaccurate representations of the author's work. An entire block of text and/or equations may have been missed or misrepresented by the typesetter.

Beyond that, the proofs are in a mutilated and incomplete condition. The burden of proof lies with the radical revisionists Corry, Renn and Stachel, and in the full light of day, we see that they have no evidence to support their absurd claim.

In marked contrast to Corry, Renn and Stachel's baseless revisionism, Dr. Tilman Sauer and Prof. Friedwardt Winterberg have set forth compelling arguments, which demonstrate that even in their mutilated state the proofs prove that Hilbert had a generally covariant theory of gravitation *and these incomplete proofs do present, even in their mutilated state, generally covariant field equations of gravitation.*

Dr. Sauer wrote,

“Hilbert, in his communication, introduced gravitational field equations which are derived from a variational principle and which are generally covariant. Thus, in contrast to Einstein's *Entwurf* theory and in contrast to Einstein's first November communication, he did not write down gravitational field equations of restricted covariance, and, in contrast to Einstein's second November communication, Hilbert did formulate the generally covariant field equations in terms of a variational principle.”²⁶⁴⁶

However, Dr. Sauer also states,

“In the proofs, the field equations are not explicitly specified.”²⁶⁴⁷

Prof. Winterberg argues that they were present—before the proofs were defaced by some unknown person.

The upper portion of page 8 of the printer's proofs is missing about twenty-five

percent of the text block which was original to it. As a result, several lines of the original text are missing from the top of the page and at least two equations, numbered equations (14) and (17), are known to be missing. About twenty text lines worth of material in total has been obliterated, including about ten lines from the top of page 8. It appears that it was this material the person who defaced the proofs intended to remove, because the wandering cut splits a line on page 7, but is an even break on page 8.

Sauer, Winterberg, Renn and Stachel agree that this missing section of the proofs contained equation (17), which they believe was,

$$H = K + L.$$

This equation appears in the published version of Hilbert's lecture as equation (20). Prof. Winterberg has noted that on page 404, the published paper proceeds from this equation as follows:

“Es bleibt noch übrig, bei der Annahme

$$(20) \quad H = K + L,$$

direkt zu zeigen, wie die oben aufgestellten verallgemeinerten Maxwell'schen Gleichungen (5) eine Folge der Gravitationsgleichungen (4) in dem oben angegebenen Sinne sind.

Unter Verwendung der vorhin eingeführten Bezeichnungsweise für die Variationsableitungen bezüglich der $g^{\mu\nu}$ erhalten die Gravitationsgleichungen wegen (20) die Gestalt

$$(21) \quad [\sqrt{g} K]_{\mu\nu} + \frac{\partial \sqrt{g} L}{\partial g^{\mu\nu}} = 0.$$

Das erste Glied linker Hand wird

$$[\sqrt{g} K]_{\mu\nu} = \sqrt{g} \left(K_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} K g_{\mu\nu} \right)."$$

Therefore, Prof. Winterberg contends, the missing section of the proofs contained the unnumbered equation of the variational derivative with the trace term,

$$[\sqrt{g} K]_{\mu\nu} = \sqrt{g} \left(K_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} K g_{\mu\nu} \right),$$

which Prof. Winterberg notes appeared in the published version following the equation $H = K + L$ and equation (21):

$$[\sqrt{g} K]_{\mu\nu} + \frac{\partial\sqrt{g} L}{\partial g^{\mu\nu}} = 0.$$

Prof. Winterberg also holds that, even if we assume the proofs did not originally include the unnumbered equation for the variational derivative,

$$[\sqrt{g} K]_{\mu\nu} = \sqrt{g} \left(K_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} K g_{\mu\nu} \right),$$

it is still certain that Hilbert had arrived at the generally covariant field equations of gravitation. Prof. Winterberg states that one need only express, “the variational derivative of the Lagrangian $H = K + L$ in Hilbert’s variational principle,

$$\delta \int H \sqrt{g} d\tau = 0,$$

where, apart from the surface terms which vanish at ∞ ,

$$\delta \int K \sqrt{g} d\tau = \int \left(K_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} K g_{\mu\nu} \right) \delta g^{\mu\nu} \sqrt{g} d\tau. ”^{2648}$$

Winterberg further observes that the printer’s proofs, at equation (26), give an abbreviated statement of the field equations of gravitation,

$$[\sqrt{g} K]_{\mu\nu} + \frac{\partial\sqrt{g} L}{\partial g^{\mu\nu}} = 0,$$

which, according to Prof. Winterberg, is identical to the equation,

$$K_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} K g_{\mu\nu} = \text{const. } T_{\mu\nu}.$$

It is interesting to note that Hilbert changed a key phrase in the published paper, which appeared after Einstein had plagiarized Hilbert’s equations, from: “in dem von Einstein geforderten Sinne” or, “in the sense requested by Einstein” in the proofs at page 13, to: “in dem von Einstein dargelegten Sinne” or, “in the sense stated by Einstein” in the published paper at page 407, which indicates that it was Einstein who adopted Hilbert’s solution, without an attribution.

11.5 A Question of Character

The difference in character between David Hilbert and Albert Einstein can be

summed up by their respective attitudes towards women (in Einstein's case, *disrespectful*). Hilbert championed women's rights and fought hard for Emmy Noether's acceptance as a *Privatdozent* at Göttingen. When it was objected that if Noether became a *Privatdozent* she might one day enter the University's Senate, Hilbert famously responded that the sex of a candidate was not an issue, for, after all, "the Senate is not a bath house!"

Albert Einstein was a misogynist. Einstein stated,

"We men are deplorable, dependent creatures. But compared with these women, every one of us is king, for he stands more or less on his own two feet, not constantly waiting for something outside of himself to cling to. They, however, always wait for someone to come along who will use them as he sees fit. If this does not happen, they simply fall to pieces."²⁶⁴⁹

Albert Einstein believed,

"where you females are concerned, your production centre is not situated in the brain."²⁶⁵⁰

and,

"Women are there to cook and nothing else."²⁶⁵¹

Peter A. Bucky wrote in his book *The Private Albert Einstein*,

"[Einstein] once told one of his female students that women are not gifted as theoretical physicists and that he would never allow a daughter of his to study physics. [***] [Einstein] once wrote in a letter to a friend, a Dr. Muesham in Haifa, that his definition of a good wife was someone who stood somewhere between a pig and a chronic cleaner."²⁶⁵²

There are allegations that Albert Einstein may have beaten his first wife Mileva Marić and their children.²⁶⁵³ Einstein's son, Hans Albert Einstein, stated, "Oh, he beat me up, just like anyone else would do."²⁶⁵⁴ Einstein cruelly abandoned Marić during her pregnancy with their first child Lieserl. The fate of this poor child, who vanished from the record early in life, is to this day a mystery.²⁶⁵⁵

Brutality was nothing new to Albert Einstein. As a child, Albert Einstein physically abused his sister Maja, and attacked his violin instructor. Maja Winteler-Einstein wrote in her biography of Albert,

"The usually calm small boy had inherited from grandfather Koch a tendency toward violent temper tantrums. At such moments his face would turn completely yellow, the tip of his nose snow-white, and he was no longer in control of himself. On one such occasion he grabbed a chair and struck at his teacher, who was so frightened that she ran away terrified and was never seen

again. Another time he threw a large bowling ball at his little sister's head; a third time he used a child's hoe to knock a hole in her head."²⁶⁵⁶

There are many accounts which portray Einstein as incontinent. According to some accounts, Einstein was perhaps even a foul-mouthed²⁶⁵⁷ syphilitic, who likely contracted the disease from his many encounters with prostitutes.²⁶⁵⁸ Albert Einstein was, by his own admission on 23 December 1918, an incestuous adulterer at the time he plagiarized Hilbert's work.

Einstein stated,

"It is correct that I committed adultery. I have been living together with my cousin, Elsa Einstein, divorced Löwenthal, for about 4 1/2 years and have been continuing these intimate relations since then."²⁶⁵⁹

Albert Einstein was a blood relative with his second wife Elsa Einstein through both his mother *and* his father.²⁶⁶⁰ Einstein even felt that he had the option to choose between a marriage with his cousin Elsa, or one of her young daughters, whom he aggressively pursued, much to her disgust.²⁶⁶¹ Dismayed, Ilse Einstein wrote to Georg Nicolai about Albert Einstein's sexual advances toward her,

"I have never wished nor felt the least desire to be close to [Albert Einstein] physically. This is otherwise in his case—recently at least.—He himself even admitted to me once how difficult it is for him to keep himself in check."²⁶⁶²

Albert Einstein was perhaps dissuaded from his perverse wish to marry Ilse Einstein by his uncle Rudolf Einstein's (Rudolf Einstein was Elsa Einstein's father and Ilse Einstein's grandfather, as well as Albert Einstein's uncle and father-in-law) dowry of 100,000 Marks, which Albert Einstein accepted when he married his cousin Ilse—Albert continued to have access to Ilse.²⁶⁶³ Dennis Overbye tells the story of Ilse Einstein's letter to Georg Nicolai of 22 May 1918 in which she complains of Albert Einstein's sexual advances towards her. Albert Einstein was conducting an incestuous and adulterous relationship with her mother, his cousin, Elsa Einstein at the time. Overbye states that Wolf Zuelzer preserved the letter,

"despite pressure from Margot Einstein, Helen Dukas, and lawyers representing the Einstein estate to surrender it or destroy it. The tale, an example of the difficulties scholars have faced in telling the Einstein story, is preserved in Zuelzer's correspondence in the American Heritage archive at the University of Wyoming."²⁶⁶⁴

Marrying Ilse enabled Einstein to have her and her daughters. Einstein referred to his wife and cousin Elsa Einstein, and her two daughters, as his "small harem". Einstein wrote to Max Born, in an undated letter thought to have been written sometime between 24 June 1918 and 2 August 1918,

“We are well, and the small harem eat well and are thriving.”²⁶⁶⁵

Philipp Frank wrote,

“Einstein’s wife Elsa died in 1936. [***] Of Einstein’s two stepdaughters, one died after leaving Germany; the other, Margot, a talented sculptress, was divorced from her husband and now lives mostly with Einstein in Princeton.”²⁶⁶⁶

Even this might not have been enough for Einstein. There are reasons to believe he had an affair with Elsa’s sister, Paula, another of Albert Einstein’s cousins.²⁶⁶⁷ Einstein’s son, Hans Albert Einstein, believed that his father was having an affair with his father’s secretary Helen Dukas.²⁶⁶⁸ After decades of disingenuous hype promoting Einstein as an angelic figure, it is necessary to show that he was not only capable of plagiarism, but that we know for a fact that he committed far worse moral offenses—Albert Einstein’s plagiarism is among the least of his *many* psychopathic sins. Einstein attempted to blame his psychopathic personality on an old professor from Munich he once visited after becoming a professor himself. The professor could not remember Einstein. Einstein told Peter A. Bucky,

“For some reason, this made me realize that I was on my own, so to speak—fully independent in respect to everybody—and I felt after that that I owed no obligation to any individual.”²⁶⁶⁹

Albert Einstein told Peter A. Bucky,

“I was, as a matter of fact, the only Jewish child in the school. This actually worked to my advantage, since it made it easier for me to isolate myself from the rest of the class and find that comfort in solitude that I so cherished.”²⁶⁷⁰

It is helpful to know Einstein’s habits. Einstein clearly plagiarized the special theory of relativity, as well as many important aspects of the general theory of relativity from Henri Poincaré and Hendrik Antoon Lorentz. In fact, Einstein evinced a career-long pattern of plagiarism, and has often been accused of appropriating the work of others, accusations he most often tried to avoid, and never refuted.²⁶⁷¹ For example, in 1916, when Gehrcke²⁶⁷² effectively accused Einstein of plagiarizing Gerber’s formula for the perihelion motion of Mercury, Einstein wrote to Willy Wien,

“[. . .] I am not going to respond to Gehrcke’s tasteless and superficial attacks, because any informed reader can do this himself.”²⁶⁷³

Einstein had quite a reputation as a plagiarist throughout his career. Einstein’s plagiarism became an international scandal in the early 1920’s.

11.6 A Question of Ability

David Hilbert is remembered as one of the most brilliant mathematical minds in all of history. He did not *guess* at the generally covariant field equations of gravitation. Unlike Einstein, Hilbert did *not* inductively fabricate by *Petitio Principii* the derivation of these equations from the known result. Hilbert deduced the generally covariant field equations of gravitation from a variational principle in an axiomatic synthesis.

McCrea wrote in 1933,

“GENERAL RELATIVITY

This theory has never been placed on an axiomatic basis. Einstein himself in his original development⁹ of it explicitly refrained from any attempt to do so (and his followers have remained loyal to his example!) The first stage of the theory is to represent space-time by means of a four-dimensional Riemannian space. (This gives at once as a pragmatic reason for the absence of an axiomatic development the great difficulty of formulating axioms for differential geometry.¹⁰ Any system of axioms for general relativity would have to include ones corresponding to those of the differential geometry of Riemannian space). This is usually treated as a generalisation of the result that the consequences of the theory of special relativity may be represented by means of Minkowski geometry, the generalisation being guided by the Principle of Equivalence and the Principle of Covariance.¹¹ Or use may be made of the arguments, extended to four dimensions, which Riemann himself gave for regarding what is now known as Riemannian geometry as a natural extension of euclidean geometry and for its possible applications in physics.¹² But either way we get only plausibility arguments which lead to the attitude, Let us try what consequences follow from assuming that the geometry of space-time may be a general Riemannian geometry instead of Minkowski geometry. That this step is a very tentative one is shown by the immense amount of research to which a further analysis of it can lead.¹³ In particular the usual developments do not at this stage enter into the problem of what a system of coordinates in space-time means in terms of possible observations by an observer belonging to it. The whole thing is in fact an example of *hypothesis suggested by mathematical form*, a feature which is not present in any purely deductive theory, of which we say a little more later on.”²⁶⁷⁴

Albert Einstein was not a mathematically minded person. Albert Einstein stated, “I am not a mathematician.”²⁶⁷⁵ Einstein also famously stated,

“Since the mathematicians have attacked the relativity theory, I myself no longer understand it anymore.”²⁶⁷⁶

Einstein's son-in-law, Rudolf Kayser (a. k. a. Anton Reiser) records that, while Einstein was studying,

“He showed very little love for [the] study [of mathematics], which seemed to him rather limitless in relation to other sciences. No one could stir him to visit the mathematical seminars.”²⁶⁷⁷

While still a child, Einstein’s parents and teachers suspected that he was mentally retarded.²⁶⁷⁸ Numerous eyewitnesses (literally) described Albert Einstein’s vacant childlike eyes and childlike behavior and naïveté.²⁶⁷⁹ For example, when Einstein arrived in America in 1921, *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), described Einstein on the front page:

“Under a high, broad forehead are large and luminous eyes, almost childlike in their simplicity and unworldliness.”

Charles Nordmann, who chauffeured Einstein around France, sarcastically described him as a vacant-eyed simian clod.²⁶⁸⁰ Nordmann sarcastically ranked Einstein with Newton, Des Cartes or *Henri Poincaré*—from whom Einstein had copied the principle of relativity.²⁶⁸¹ Like Rabelais and Voltaire before him, Nordmann lavished sarcastic praise on the new hero and derided him in ways which would elude the unsophisticated, but which were clear to those knowledgeable of the facts. Nordmann was careful not to be too blunt, for he wished to advocate the theory of relativity, and it was politically expedient for him to ride on Einstein’s coat tails, but Nordmann never failed to get his digs in. Charles Nordmann wrote,

“Einstein is big (he is about 1 m 76), with large shoulders and the back only very slightly bent. His head, the head where the world of science has been re-created, immediately attracts and fixes the attention. His skull is clearly, and to an extraordinary degree, brachycephalic, great in breadth and receding towards the nape of the neck without exceeding the vertical. Here is an illustration which brings to nought the old assurances of the phrenologists and of certain biologists, according to which genius is the prerogative of the dolichocephales. The skull of Einstein reminds me, above all else, of that of Renan, who was also a brachycephale. As with Renan the forehead is huge; its breadth exceptional, its spherical form striking one more than its height. A few horizontal folds cross this moving face which is sometimes cut, at moments of concentration or thought, by two deep vertical furrows which raise his eyebrows.

His complexion is smooth, unpolished, of a certain duskiness, bright. A small moustache, dark and very short, decorates a sensual mouth, very red, fairly large, whose corners gradually rise in a smooth and permanent smile. The nose, of simple shape, is slightly aquiline.

Under his eyebrows, whose lines seem to converge towards the middle of his forehead, appear two very deep eyes whose grave and melancholy expression contrast with the smile of this pagan mouth. The expression is usually distant, as though fixed on infinity, at times slightly clouded over. This gives his general expression a touch of inspiration and of sadness which

accentuates once again the creases produced by reflection and which, almost linking with his eyelids, lengthen his eyes, as though with a touch of *kohl*. Very black hair, flecked with silver, unkempt, falls in curls towards the nape of his neck and his ears, after having been brought straight up, like a frozen wave, above his forehead.

Above all, the impression is one of disconcerting youth, strongly romantic, and at certain moments evoking in me the irrepressible idea of a young Beethoven, on which meditation had already left its mark, and who had once been beautiful. And then, suddenly, laughter breaks out and one sees a student. Thus appeared to us the man who has plumbed with his mind, deeper than any before him, the astonishing depths of the mysterious universe."²⁶⁸²

Albert Einstein would often simply agree with whomever he had last spoken,²⁶⁸³ and it is likely that he was little more than a mere parrot. Upon meeting with colleagues, he would often grill them for information on their theories, seemingly soaking it all in to repeat it later as if the ideas were his own.

Certain anecdotal accounts paint Einstein in a bad light. Upon refusing to brush his teeth, Einstein allegedly proclaimed that, "pigs' bristles can drill through diamond, so how should my teeth stand up to them?"²⁶⁸⁴ Explaining why he didn't wear a hat in the rain, he asserted that hair dries faster than hats, and irritably asserted that such was obvious. It apparently eluded him that the objective was, in the first place, to keep the hair dry. Explaining why he didn't wear socks, Einstein commented, "When I was young I found out that the big toe always ends up by making a hole in the sock. So I stopped wearing socks"²⁶⁸⁵ and "What use are socks? They only produce holes."²⁶⁸⁶ Felix Klein told Wolfgang Pauli that Einstein wrote to him that Klein's paper²⁶⁸⁷ delighted him like a child given a bar of chocolate by his mommy.²⁶⁸⁸ *The New York Times* reported on 6 November 1927 on page 22 that Einstein forgot his bags in the waiting room when boarding a train in Gare de l'Est. *The New York Times* reported on 13 July 1924 on page 22 in an article entitled, "Einstein Counted Wrong", that Einstein counted the change a street car conductor had given him:

"After counting it hurriedly, Einstein insisted that the conductor had made a mistake. The latter recounted the change deliberately, explaining to Herr Einstein that it was correct, and then turned to the next passenger with a shrug of his shoulders and the remark:

'His arithmetic is weak.'"

Einstein's private physician Prof. Janos Plesch wrote,

"Einstein never took any exercise beyond a short walk when he felt like it (which wasn't often, because he has no sense of direction, and therefore would seldom venture far afield), and whatever he got sailing his boat, though that was sometimes quite arduous—not the sailing exactly, but the

rowing home of the heavy yacht in the evening calm when there wasn't a breath of air to stretch the sails."²⁶⁸⁹

Peter A. Bucky recounted many such anecdotes and told how Einstein had decided to live in one room as opposed to four so that the next time he lost a button from his shirt it would be easier to find.²⁶⁹⁰

Einstein was taken in by a con man named Otto Reiman, who convinced Einstein that he could describe a person after blindly touching a sample of his or her handwriting.²⁶⁹¹ Many physicists including Albert Einstein, A. E. Dolbear and Sir Oliver Lodge, believed in telepathy; but Einstein was perhaps the only one to find proof of it in the fact that we humans do not have skins as thick as an elephant's hide.²⁶⁹² Albert Einstein was taken in by the psychic Roman Ostoja and attended a séance with Upton Sinclair.²⁶⁹³ Einstein wrote a preface for the Thomas edition of Upton Sinclair's book on telepathy, *Mental Radio*,²⁶⁹⁴ in which Einstein—"the greatest mind in the world"²⁶⁹⁵—asked that psychologists seriously consider Sinclair's findings.

Elsa Einstein was Albert Einstein's second wife and his cousin and they were related by blood through both her mother and father. The inbred Einsteins were as arrogant as they were ridiculous. Denis Brian wrote in his book *Einstein: A Life*,

"The Sinclairs arranged for Einstein to meet some of their distinguished writer friends for dinner at the exclusive Town House in Los Angeles. When Einstein arrived, he somehow missed the cloakroom and appeared in the dining room wearing a 'humble' black overcoat and a much-worn hat. In what might have been a scene from a Chaplin film, he removed his overcoat, 'folded it neatly, and laid it on the floor in a vacant corner and set the hat on top of it. Then he was ready to meet the literary elite of Southern California.' There was even something Chaplinesque in the way Einstein flirted with the attractive women, while Elsa—"my old lady" he called her—was at his elbow.

Elsa confirmed Mrs. Sinclair's view of her as a dutiful and utterly devoted German hausfrau during a discussion about God. Einstein had stated his belief in God, but not a personal God—a distinction which Mrs. Sinclair didn't get. She replied, 'Surely the personality of God must include all other personalities.' Afterwards, Elsa gently admonished Mrs. Sinclair for arguing with Albert, adding, 'You know, my husband has the greatest mind in the world.' 'Yes, I know,' said Mrs. Sinclair, 'but surely he doesn't know everything!'"²⁶⁹⁶

Though Roman Ostoja was unable to conjure up a ghost for Albert Einstein, the media were able to put the American public into a trance-like state of adulation. Brian continued,

"Back in his gift-strewn cottage Einstein found tangible evidence that 'America was prepared to go mad over him.' A millionairess gave Caltech

\$10,000 for the privilege of meeting him.”²⁶⁹⁷

Peter Micheltore tells a story of how Einstein dropped his saliva saturated cigar butt into the dust, then unashamedly picked up the gritty stub and shoved it back into his mouth defiantly declaring, “I don’t care a straw for germs.”²⁶⁹⁸ R. S. Shankland records that Einstein,

“apparently put his cigarette into his coat pocket, and as we took off our coats he had a small conflagration in his.”²⁶⁹⁹

Einstein wasn’t too handy around the house,²⁷⁰⁰ and seemingly had a difficult time conceptualizing geometric problems. In a joke perhaps first told of Ampère, it was said that Einstein insisted that two holes be bored through his front door, one larger than the other, so that both the large cat, *and the small cat*, could pass through the door.²⁷⁰¹ This anecdote is significant, because it is a historical indication of the low esteem in which some of the people who had met Einstein held his intelligence.

After meeting Einstein, Max von Laue found it difficult to believe that Einstein had written the 1905 paper,

“[T]he young man who met me made such an unexpected impression on me, that I did not believe him to be capable of being the father of the theory of relativity.”

“[D]er junge Mann, der mir entgegen kam, machte mir einen so unerwarteten Eindruck, daß ich nicht glaubte, er könne der Vater der Relativitätstheorie sein.”²⁷⁰²

Minkowski, who had been Einstein’s professor, found it difficult to believe that “lazy” Einstein had written the 1905 paper. Minkowski did not think Einstein capable of it.²⁷⁰³ Minkowski thought that Einstein was a poor mathematician.²⁷⁰⁴ According to both Heaviside and Born, Minkowski anticipated Einstein.²⁷⁰⁵ Max Born wrote in his autobiography,

“I went to Cologne, met Minkowski and heard his celebrated lecture ‘Space and Time’, delivered on 21 September 1908. Outside the circle of physicists and mathematicians, Minkowski’s contribution to relativity is hardly known. Yet it is upon his work that the imposing structures of modern field theories have been built. He discovered the formal equivalence of the three space coordinates and the time variable, and developed the transformation theory in this four-dimensional universe. He told me later that it came to him as a great shock when Einstein published his paper in which the equivalence of the different local times of observers moving relative to each other was pronounced; for he had reached the same conclusions independently but did not publish them because he wished first to work out the mathematical structure in all its splendour. He never made a priority claim and always gave

Einstein his full share in the great discovery. After having heard Minkowski speak about his ideas, my mind was made up at once. I would go to Göttingen and to help him in his work.”²⁷⁰⁶

On 2 February 1920, Albert Einstein wrote a letter to Paul Ehrenfest, in which Einstein made obvious blunders in his arithmetic,

“I have received the 10000 marks.^[1] The accounting now looks like this: 16500 marks is what the grand piano costs, 239 marks is the cost of packing, delivery to the train station, and export permit. Remainder is 111 marks,^[2] which is consequently being applied toward the violins.^[3]”²⁷⁰⁷

Ehrenfests response to Einstein of 8 February 1920 is telling and hints that he knew that Einstein was incompetent beyond mere questions of finances,

“We had a great laugh today about your brilliant miscalculation. You write the following, verbatim:

‘I have received the 10000 marks. The acct. looks like this: 16500 marks is what the grand piano costs, 239 marks is the cost of packing, delivery —. Remainder is 111 marks, which is consequently being applied toward the violins’^[4] —

God said, ‘Let Einstein be’ and all was skew!—A nice non-Euclidity in the series of numbers!!—After this exercise, I understand perfectly why destitution [*Dallessicität*] is your normal state!^[5]”²⁷⁰⁸

Abraham Pais tells a revealing story of one of Einstein’s blunders.²⁷⁰⁹ Einstein, himself, described his goals, strengths and limitations as follows in an essay dated 18 September 1896,

“They are, most of all, my individual inclination for abstract and mathematical thinking, lack of imagination and of practical sense.”²⁷¹⁰

Einstein later found himself in deeper waters and wrote to Paul Hertz on 22 August 1915,

“You do not have the faintest idea what I had to go through as a mathematical ignoramus before coming into this harbor.”²⁷¹¹

Albert Einstein wrote to Felix Klein, on 26 March 1917, and confessed that,

“As I have never done non-Euclidean geometry, the more obvious elliptic geometry had escaped me when I was writing my last paper.”²⁷¹²

Einstein often tried to justify his enormous difficulties in school²⁷¹³ and his ignorance by admitting that he had thought mathematics unimportant and thought

that formulas and facts need not be memorized because one can simply look them up in text books.²⁷¹⁴

Dr. Tilman Sauer stated,

“[Hilbert] would soon [. . .] pinpoint flaws in Einstein’s rather pedestrian way of dealing with the mathematics of his gravitation theory.”²⁷¹⁵

It is well-established that Einstein had relied upon collaborators to accomplish the mathematical work for which he would sometimes take sole credit. Einstein admitted to Peter A. Bucky that he relied upon experts to do his mathematical work,

“[E]ven after I became well-known I many times made use of experts to assist me in complicated calculations in order to prove certain physics problems. Also, I have always strongly believed that one should not burden his mind with formulae when one can go to a textbook and look them up. I have done that, too, on many occasions.”²⁷¹⁶

At this point in his career, Einstein had already collaborated with Mileva Marić, Jacob Laub, Walter Ritz, Ludwig Hopf, Otto Stern, Marcel Grossmann, Michele Besso, Adriaan Fokker, and Wander de Haas. He had copied the formulae of Lorentz, Poincaré, Gerber, and countless others, without attribution. On 3 April 1921, *The New York Times* quoted Chaim Weizmann,

“When [Einstein] was called ‘a poet in science’ the definition was a good one. He seems more an intuitive physicist, however. He is not an experimental physicist, and although he is able to detect fallacies in the conceptions of physical science, he must turn his general outlines of theory over to some one else to work out.”²⁷¹⁷

Einstein told Leopold Infeld, “I am really more of a philosopher than a physicist.”²⁷¹⁸ Not only did Einstein not offer to include Grossmann and Hilbert in Einstein’s 25 November 1915 paper, Einstein attempted to discourage Hilbert from publishing the generally covariant field equations of gravitation, which Hilbert had deduced by 13 November 1915 and probably had in early October of 1915.

Einstein hid from the many accusations that his theory was metaphysical nonsense—an inconsistent jumble of fallacies of *Petitio Principii*—nothing but an excuse to plagiarize. A meeting was arranged to discuss Vaihinger’s theory of fictions in 1920. Einstein pledged that he would attend this meeting. Knowing that Einstein would be devoured in a debate over his mathematical fictions, which confused induction with deduction, Wertheimer and Ehrenfest helped Einstein fabricate an excuse to miss the meeting he had agreed to attend. Einstein was proven a liar.²⁷¹⁹ Einstein also hid from many other criticisms, and Einstein refused to answer T. J. J. See’s many charges of plagiarism,²⁷²⁰ and refused to debate Arvid Reuter Dahl or to answer his many charges of plagiarism.²⁷²¹ Einstein hid from the French Academy of Sciences.²⁷²² Einstein hid from Cardinal O’Connell.²⁷²³ Einstein

hid from Dayton C. Miller's falsification of the special theory of relativity.²⁷²⁴ Einstein hid from Cartmel.²⁷²⁵ Miller hammered Einstein in the press over the course of many years. *The New York Times Index* lists several articles in which Miller's and William B. Cartmels' falsifications of the special theory of relativity are discussed. Einstein and Lorentz were very worried by Miller's results and could not find fault with them.²⁷²⁶ Einstein told R. S. Shankland not to perform an experiment which might falsify the special theory of relativity,

“[Einstein] again said that more experiments were not necessary, and results such as Synge might find would be ‘irrelevant.’ [Einstein] told me not to do any experiments of this kind.”²⁷²⁷

Einstein knew that he was caught at the Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher meeting in the Berlin Philharmonic, and wanted to run away from Germany. Einstein desired to hide from the Bad Nauheim debate, in which he had threatened to devour his opponents,²⁷²⁸ then Einstein—after being talked into appearing and after much hype promoting the event which attracted thousands of visitors—then Einstein, when losing the debate, ran away during the lunch break and again wanted to run away from Germany. Einstein prospered from hype and had no legitimacy as a supposed “genius”. The press rescued him again and again, while he hid. Einstein was unable to defend his theories in the light of strict scrutiny.

11.7 Conclusion

Since the printer's proofs were mutilated at some point in their history in a way which removed critical material relevant to Hilbert's formulation of the generally covariant field equations of gravitation; and since Einstein acknowledged receipt of Hilbert's manuscript containing Hilbert's results, before Einstein presented them as if his own and attempted to discourage Hilbert from publishing Hilbert's work; it is clear that the “Belated Decision” is that Einstein plagiarized Hilbert's work, as is apparent even in the mutilated printer's proofs of Hilbert's paper. Jürgen Renn was quoted in *The Washington Post*, on 14 November 1997, as having said,

“I had personally come to the conclusion that Einstein plagiarized Hilbert[.] [***] [The] conclusion is almost unavoidable, that Einstein must have copied from Hilbert.”²⁷²⁹

The Ottawa Citizen, 14 November 1997, Final Edition, page A13, reported in an article entitled “Einstein's Rival was Relatively Late with Solution: Investigation Removes Stigma of Plagiarism from Scientist's Milestone Theory” with the byline Roger Highfield, *The Daily Telegraph*,

“Mr. Renn said yesterday that at first he feared Einstein had stolen Hilbert's ideas. But this discovery marks ‘one of the very rare cases that one has a smoking gun’ to clear Einstein's name, he said.”

The “smoking gun” was firing blanks. Now that the smoke has cleared, I borrow a line from Corry, Renn and Stachel’s 1997 article in the journal *Science*, “the arguments by which Einstein is exculpated are rather weak[.]” Since the proofs are in a mutilated condition and lack the critical section of Hilbert’s work which originally contained his generally covariant field equations of gravitation, and further since the remainder of the proofs prove that Hilbert had the generally covariant equations of gravitation of the general theory of relativity before Einstein—easily derived trace term or no—Corry, Renn and Stachel’s arguments are not only weak, they are both baseless and pointless.

12 GERBER'S FORMULA

In 1915, Albert Einstein manipulated credit for Paul Gerber's 1898 formula for the perihelion motion of Mercury. The extensive history of the question of the speed at which gravitational effects propagate and the perihelion motion of the planet Mercury has largely been forgotten, with the full credit for the raising of these questions and their solution too often wrongfully given to an undeserving Einstein.

“In the general theory of relativity, Einstein tried to explain the perihelion shift of the planets, and he arrived at the same formula P. Gerber had found a long time before him, based on the assumption that the effects of gravitation do not propagate at an infinite speed in space.”—STJEPAN MOHORVIČIĆ

12.1 Introduction

In 1898, Paul Gerber published a widely read paper in which he derived a solution to the question of the speed of the propagation of gravitational effects. Gerber, taking the known perihelion motion of the planet Mercury as empirical evidence, set the speed of gravity at the speed of light, and presented the formula for the perihelion of Mercury which Einstein copied in 1915 without an attribution. In 1900, Hendrik Antoon Lorentz argued that gravity propagates at light speed and introduced the perihelion motion of Mercury into the theory of relativity. In 1905, Jules Henri Poincaré attempted a relativistic, covariant (scalar) theory of gravitation based on the presupposition that gravity must propagate at light speed and in 1908 sought to apply it to Mercury's motion.

Albert Einstein plagiarized some of these ideas on 18 November 1915 in a lecture entitled, “Explanation of the Perihelion Motion of Mercury from the General Theory of Relativity.”²⁷³⁰ Einstein, who had already been accused of being a plagiarist,²⁷³¹ should (at a bare minimum) have cited at least something from Soldner,²⁷³² Mach,²⁷³³ Tisserand,²⁷³⁴ Lehmann-Filhés,²⁷³⁵ Lévy,²⁷³⁶ Hall,²⁷³⁷ Drude,²⁷³⁸ Gerber,²⁷³⁹ Lorentz,²⁷⁴⁰ Zenneck,²⁷⁴¹ Oppenheim²⁷⁴² and Poincaré,²⁷⁴³ and should have acknowledged the help he had received from his close friends Michele Besso, Marcel Grossmann and Erwin Freundlich on the field equations of gravitation and on the perihelion motion of the planet Mercury.

Einstein did not hesitate to cite the empirical evidence, just the explanations of those effects supplied by his predecessors. Richard Moody, Jr. has stressed the fact that as a former patent clerk Einstein knew the value of intellectual property and the need to recognize the property rights of others, though he failed to meet his moral obligations to give his predecessors their due credit.²⁷⁴⁴ Einstein was not naïve in this regard. His experience at the patent office taught Einstein the value of a good idea and may have provided him with the incentive to copy what he could not create. Witnessing patent disputes perhaps taught him to deny his theft when caught and

leave as little evidence behind as was possible.

Einstein knew how to reference his papers and did so to the extent necessary to sponsor and justify an analysis of known problems. Einstein then confused induction with deduction and employed the formulas his predecessors had provided as solutions to those problems before him, without acknowledging their work, to solve the known problems with known solutions. The history of the problem of the perihelion motion of Mercury was one of the best documented histories to date, when Einstein published on the subject. The readily available articles by Drude, Oppenheim and Zenneck are filled with copious and detailed references, and there is no excuse for Einstein not to have made any effort to acknowledge this prior work on the problem.

When Gehrcke confronted Einstein with the fact that Gerber was first to publish the formula, Einstein professed that he was the first to correctly explain the perihelion motion of Mercury, and snidely attacked Gerber on this basis, as if that awarded Einstein the privilege to repeat Gerber's formula without an attribution,

“[. . .]Gerber, who has given the correct formula for the perihelion motion of Mercury before I did. The experts are not only in agreement that Gerber's derivation is wrong through and through, but the formula cannot be obtained as a consequence of the main assumption made by Gerber. Mr. Gerber's work is therefore completely useless, an unsuccessful and erroneous theoretical attempt. I maintain that the theory of general relativity has provided the first real explanation of the perihelion motion of mercury. I have not mentioned the work by Gerber originally, because I did not know it when I wrote my work on the perihelion motion of Mercury; even if I had been aware of it, I would not have had any reason to mention it.”²⁷⁴⁵

It is well-established that Einstein had relied upon collaborators to accomplish the mathematical work for which he would sometimes take sole credit. Einstein admitted to Peter A. Bucky that he relied upon experts to do his mathematical work and copied his formulae from others,

“[E]ven after I became well-known I many times made use of experts to assist me in complicated calculations in order to prove certain physics problems. Also, I have always strongly believed that one should not burden his mind with formulae when one can go to a textbook and look them up. I have done that, too, on many occasions.”²⁷⁴⁶

At this point in his career, Einstein had already demonstrably and deliberately copied the formulae of Lorentz, Poincaré, and countless others, without an attribution.

12.2 How Fast Does Gravity Go?

Newton had assumed that gravity acted instantaneously at a distance. Reviewing many previous theories, Paul Drude published a well-referenced paper calling into

question the speed of the propagation of gravitational effects and the perihelion motion of Mercury. Drude's paper appeared in 1897.²⁷⁴⁷ Paul Gerber took up this challenge and presented a solution to the perihelion motion of the planet Mercury one year later, in 1898, concluding that gravitational effects propagate at light speed. In 1902, Gerber published a brochure which further explained his ideas and which presented an extensive historical background for his work, which Ernst Gehrcke later republished in *Annalen der Physik* in 1917.²⁷⁴⁸ Gerber's 1898 paper states,

“Man erhält daher schliesslich

$$c^2 = \frac{6\pi\mu}{a(1 - \varepsilon^2)\psi}.$$

Hierin ist

$$\mu = \frac{4\pi^2 a^3}{\tau^2},$$

wenn τ die Umlaufszeit des Planeten bedeutet. Speziell für Merkur gelten folgende Werte:

$$a = 0,3871 \cdot 149 \cdot 10^6 \text{ km},$$

$$\varepsilon = 0,2056,$$

$$\tau = 88 \text{ Tage},$$

$$\psi = 4,789 \cdot 10^{-7}.$$

Man findet damit

$$c = 305500 \text{ km/sec.}$$

Die kleinste bisher gefundene Geschwindigkeit des Lichtes hat Foucault erhalten, gleich 298000 km/sec; die grösste ergibt sich nach der Methode von Römer aus den neuesten Beobachtungen zu 308000 km/sec; die Geschwindigkeit der elektrischen Wellen fand Hertz in seinen Versuchen 320000 km/sec. Also stimmt die Geschwindigkeit, mit der sich das Gravitationspotential ausbreitet, mit der Geschwindigkeit des Lichtes und der elektrischen Wellen überein. Darin liegt zugleich die Bürgschaft, dass diese Geschwindigkeit existiert.”²⁷⁴⁹

Ernst Gehrcke noted that if we substitute for μ as provided for in Gerber's paper, we obtain,

$$c^2 = 24\pi^3 \frac{a^2}{\tau^2 \psi (1 - e^2)}, \text{ or, } \psi = 24\pi^3 \frac{a^2}{\tau^2 c^2 (1 - e^2)}.$$

Albert Einstein submitted a paper on 18 November 1915, and stated without reference to Gerber,

“Bei einem ganzen Umlauf rückt also das Perihel um

$$\varepsilon = 3\pi \frac{a}{a(1 - e^2)} \quad (13)$$

im Sinne der Bahnbewegung vor, wenn mit a die große Halbachse, mit e die Exzentrizität bezeichnet wird. Führt man die Umlaufszeit T (in Sekunden) ein, so erhält man, wenn c die Lichtgeschwindigkeit in cm/sec. bedeutet:

$$\varepsilon = 24\pi^3 \frac{a^2}{T^2 c^2 (1 - e^2)}. \quad (14)$$

Die Rechnung liefert für den Planeten Merkur ein Vorschreiten des Perihels um 43'' in hundert Jahren, während die Astronomen 45'' ± 5'' als unerklärten Rest zwischen Beobachtungen und NEWTONScher Theorie angeben. Dies bedeutet volle Übereinstimmung.²⁷⁵⁰

As Gehrcke noted, one need only standardize the notation to see that Einstein's 1915 solution to the problem of the perihelion motion of the planet Mercury is *identical* to Gerber's much earlier 1898 solution.

Contrary to the impression one receives from the majority of modern histories on the theory of relativity which make it appear that Einstein created the problem of the perihelion motion of Mercury in his imagination and solved it by force of will in a completely unprecedented attempt, Einstein was not even the first to pose the questions of the speed of gravity and the perihelion motion of Mercury in the theory of relativity, let alone in the history of Physics and Astronomy. The question of the speed of the propagation of gravitational effects and the use of Mercury as a test case for the theory were introduced into the theory of relativity long before Einstein took credit for them.

In 1900 Lorentz wrote extensively on gravitation and the perihelion motion of the planet Mercury, concluding, after Gerber and Mewes, that gravity propagates at light speed.²⁷⁵¹ Lorentz' work was highly derivative of the works of Mewes,²⁷⁵² Zöllner,²⁷⁵³ Mossotti,²⁷⁵⁴ Hall²⁷⁵⁵ and Lehmann-Filhés,²⁷⁵⁶ among many others—contrary to the modern impression that Einstein was an innovator in attacking the problem of Mercury. In fact, a non-Newtonian law of gravity and the problem of the perihelion motion of Mercury were much discussed problems long before Einstein addressed them, and Einstein, Besso, Grossmann and Freundlich

immersed themselves in this thoroughgoing and widely read literature, though you wouldn't know it from reading Albert Einstein's 1915 paper with its complete lack of references to the works of these men.

In 1903, Jonathan A. Zenneck wrote in his famous article "Gravitation" in the widely read *Encyklopädie der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*, referring to Lorentz' April, 1900, paper "Considerations on Gravitation":

"Die Zusatzkräfte, welche *Lorentz* ausser den vom *Newton*'schen Gesetz gelieferten bekommt, enthalten als Faktor entweder $\left(\frac{p}{c}\right)^2$ oder $\frac{p \cdot w}{c^2}$,

worin p die konstant angenommene Geschwindigkeit des Centralkörpers, w die Geschwindigkeit des Planeten relativ zum Centralkörper und c die Lichtgeschwindigkeit bedeutet. Diese Zusatzkräfte sind also so klein, dass sie wohl in allen Fällen sich der Beobachtung entziehen werden, im Falle des Merkur, wie die Rechnung von *Lorentz* zeigt, sicher unter dem Beobachtbaren liegen. Daraus folgt, dass die *Lorentz*'schen Gleichungen, verbunden mit der *Zöllner*'schen Anschauung über die Natur der gravitierenden Moleküle, auf die Gravitation zwar angewandt werden können [*Footnote*: Das schliesst die Möglichkeit in sich, dass die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation gleich der Lichtgeschwindigkeit ist.—*emphasis found in the original*], aber zur Beseitigung der bestehenden Differenzen zwischen Beobachtung und Berechnung nichts beitragen."²⁷⁵⁷

Lorentz wrote often on the speed of gravity and the case of the perihelion motion of Mercury. In 1910, in a work republished in the book *Das Relativitätsprinzip* in 1913, a book which included two of Einstein's papers, Lorentz wrote,

"Schließlich wollen wir uns der *Gravitation* zuwenden. Das Relativitätsprinzip erfordert eine Abänderung des Newtonschen Gesetzes, vor allem eine Fortpflanzung der Wirkung mit Lichtgeschwindigkeit. [***] Es sollen nun die Störungen erörtert werden, welche durch jene Zusatzglieder zweiter Ordnung entstehen können. Es gibt da neben vielen kurzperiodischen Störungen, die keine Bedeutung haben, eine säkulare Bewegung des Perihels der Planeten. De Sitter berechnet diese für den Merkur zu 6,69" pro Jahrhundert.*) Nun kennt man seit Laplace eine Perihelanomalie des Merkurs vom Betrage 44" pro Jahrhundert; wenn diese auch das richtige Vorzeichen hat, ist sie doch viel zu groß, um durch jene Zusatzglieder erklärt werden zu können."²⁷⁵⁸

Citing Poincaré's 1905 *Rendiconti* paper²⁷⁵⁹ and his own 1910 *Physikalische Zeitschrift* article referenced immediately above, Lorentz wrote in 1913, in a book Albert Einstein reviewed for *Die Naturwissenschaften* in 1914,²⁷⁶⁰

“Das Relativitätsprinzip ist eine physikalische Hypothese, die in sich schließt, daß all Kräfte sich mit der Geschwindigkeit c fortpflanzen. So auch die Gravitation. [***] Erstens bemerken wir, daß das Newtonsche Attraktionsgesetz nicht mit dem Relativitätsprinzip in Übereinstimmung ist, und daß dieses Prinzip also eine Änderung des Gravitationsgesetz erfordert.¹⁾ [***] Eine der Folgen der angegebene Änderung des Newtonschen Gravitationsgesetzes würde in einer langsamen Bewegung des Perihels des Mercurius bestehen. Eine solche Bewegung existiert tatsächlich. Die beobachtete Bewegung beträgt in einem Jahrhundert 44''.”²⁷⁶¹

Beginning in 1905 and continuing over the years in several of his papers, Henri Poincaré attacked the problem of gravitation and the motion of the perihelion of Mercury from the perspective that gravity must propagate at light speed and comply with the principle of relativity. Henri Poincaré wrote in 1905 in his note in the *Comptes Rendus*,

“[. . .]I was first led to propose that the propagation of gravitation is not instantaneous, but it propagates with the velocity of light.”²⁷⁶²

We know from Henri Vergne’s lecture notes that Poincaré addressed the perihelion motion of Mercury in his lectures of 1906 and 1907,²⁷⁶³ and in 1908 Poincaré published the following statement,

“The effect will be more sensible in the movement of Mercury, because this is the planet which has the greatest speed.”

“C’est dans le mouvement de Mercure que l’effet sera plus sensible, parce que cette planète est celle qui possède la plus grande vitesse.”²⁷⁶⁴

Poincaré stated in 1909,

“If there is an appreciable difference, it will therefore be greatest for Mercury, which has the greatest velocity of all the planets. Now it happens precisely that Mercury presents an anomaly not yet explained. The motion of its perihelion is more rapid than the motion calculated by the classic theory. The acceleration is 38'' too great. Leverrier attributed this anomaly to a planet not yet discovered and an amateur astronomer thought he observed its passage across the sun. Since then no one else has seen it and it is unhappily certain that this planet perceived was only a bird.

Now the new mechanics explains perfectly the sense of the error with regard to Mercury, but it still leaves a margin of 32'' between it and observation. It therefore does not suffice for bringing concord into the explanation of the velocity of Mercury. If this result is hardly decisive in favor of the new mechanics, still less is it unfavorable to its acceptance since

the sense in which it corrects the deviation from the classic theory is the right one. Our explanation of the velocity of the other planets is not sensibly modified in the new theory and the results coincide, to within the approximation of the measurements, with those of the classic theory.”²⁷⁶⁵

12.3 Gerber's Formula was Well-Known

Contrary to the view that Paul Gerber's work was obscure,²⁷⁶⁶ his 1898 paper in the *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik* was very well known and easily accessible. In fact, few papers received as much notice as Gerber's work on Mercury and gravity. Lampe immediately called attention to it in the *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 22, Number 8, (1898), pp. 529-530:

“34. **Paul Gerber.** *Die räumliche und zeitliche Ausbreitung der Gravitation* (Ztschr. f. Math. u. Phys. **43**, p. 93-104. 1898). — Betrachtungen von sehr allgemeiner Art führen den Verf. zur Aufstellung des folgenden Ausdrucks für das Gravitationspotential eines Massenpunktes auf einen andern m :

$$(1) \quad V = \frac{\mu}{r \left(1 - \frac{1}{c} \frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2},$$

wo c die Geschwindigkeit ist, mit der das Potential sich bewegt. Aus (1) folgt für im Vergleich zu dr/dt grosse Werte von c bis zur zweiten Potenz genau:

$$(2) \quad V = \frac{\mu}{r} \left[1 + \frac{2}{c} \frac{dr}{dt} + \frac{3}{c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 \right],$$

und hieraus ergibt sich für die Beschleunigung φ von m :

$$(3) \quad \varphi = -\frac{\mu}{r^2} \left[1 - \frac{3}{c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 + \frac{6r}{c^2} \frac{d^2r}{dt^2} \right] = -\frac{\mu}{r^2} (1 - F),$$

Setzt man diesen Wert von φ in die Differentialgleichungen der Planetenbewegungen ein, so folgt aus dem Zusatzfaktor $(1 - F)$ eine Bewegung des Perihels. Aus der bekannten Perihelbewegung beim Merkur im Betrage von $41''$ in einem Jahrhundert berechnet nun der Verf. unter der Voraussetzung, dass dieselbe einzig von jenem Faktor herrührt, die Konstante c und findet sie gleich **305 500 km / sec**, also gleich der Lichtgeschwindigkeit. Für die übrigen Planeten würden auf dieselbe Weise

die folgenden säkularen Perihelbewegungen sich berechnen: Venus $8''$, Erde $3,6''$, Mond $0,06''$, Mars $1,3''$, Jupiter $0,06''$, Saturn $0,01''$, Uranus $0,002''$, Neptun $0,0007''$. Eine Abfindung mit den astronomischen Arbeiten (vgl. Oppenheim: Zur Frage nach der Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation. Wien 1895), welche aus den Störungen die Unmöglichkeit einer so geringen Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation folgern, ist nicht versucht worden. Lp.”

Lampe wrote in *Die Fortschritte der Physik im Jahre 1898*, Volume 54, Part 1, (1898), p. 390,

“PAUL GERBER. Die räumliche und zeitliche Ausbreitung der Gravitation. ZS. f. Math. **43**, 93-104, 1898 †.

Betrachtungen von sehr allgemeiner Art führen den Verf. zur Aufstellung des folgenden Ausdruckes für das Gravitationspotential eines Massenpunktes auf einen anderen m :

$$1) \quad V = \frac{\mu}{r \left(1 - \frac{1}{c} \frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2},$$

wo c die Geschwindigkeit ist, mit der das Potential sich bewegt. Aus (1) folgt für grosse Werthe von c (im Vergleich zu $\frac{dr}{dt}$) bis zur zweiten Potenz von c genau:

$$2) \quad V = \frac{\mu}{r} \left[1 + \frac{2}{c} \frac{dr}{dt} + \frac{3}{c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 \right],$$

und hieraus ergibt sich für die Beschleunigung φ von m :

$$3) \quad \varphi = -\frac{\mu}{r^2} \left[1 - \frac{3}{c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 + \frac{br}{c^2} \frac{d^2r}{dt^2} \right] = -\frac{\mu}{r^2} (1 - F).$$

Setzt man diesen Werth von φ in die Differentialgleichungen der Planetenbewegungen ein, so ergibt sich aus dem Zusatzfaktor $(1 - F)$ eine Bewegung des Perihels. Mit Hülfe der bekannten Perihelbewegung beim Merkur im Betrage von $41''$ in einem Jahrhundert berechnet der Verf. unter der Voraussetzung, dass diese Bewegung einzig von jenem Zusatzfactor herrührt, die Constante c und erhält dafür die Zahl:

$$c = 305\,500 \text{ km/sec.},$$

also die Lichtgeschwindigkeit. Für die übrigen Planeten würden die auf diese Weise entstehenden Perihelbewegungen in einem Jahrhundert betragen: Erde $3,6''$, Mond $0,06''$, Mars $1,3''$, Jupiter $0,06''$, Saturn $0,01''$, Uranus $0,002''$, Neptun $0,0007''$.

Die entgegenstehenden Ergebnisse der bezüglichen Untersuchungen von Astronomen sind nicht erwähnt. Lp."

Lampe published a quite similar review in *Die Fortschritte der Physik im Jahre 1898*, Volume 54, Part 3, (1898), pp. 412-413,

“PAUL GERBER. Die räumliche und zeitliche Ausbreitung der Gravitation. *ZS. f. Math.* **43**, 93-104, 1898.

Verf. will nur die Annahme machen, dass in dem Raume zwischen zwei gravitirenden Massen etwas geschehe, das Theil an der Gravitation hat. Er leitet dann mit Hülfe eines in MACH'S Principien der Wärmelehre aufgestellten Mittelwerthsatzes für das Potential ruhender gravitirender Massen den NEWTON'schen Ausdruck μ/r ab. Sind die Massen dagegen in Bewegung, so folgt für das Potential der Ausdruck

$$V = \frac{\mu}{r \left(1 - \frac{1}{c} \frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2},$$

wobei unter c die Ausbreitungsgeschwindigkeit des Gravitationspotentials verstanden wird und ausserdem vorausgesetzt ist, dass $\frac{dr}{dt}$ gegen c klein sei. Unter dieser Annahme kann man auch nach dem binomischen Satze entwickeln und findet dann näherungsweise:

$$V = \frac{\mu}{r} \left\{ 1 + \frac{2}{c} \cdot \frac{dr}{dt} + \frac{3}{c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 \right\}.$$

Hieraus resultirt die Beschleunigung:

$$-\frac{\mu}{r^2} \left\{ 1 - \frac{3}{c^2} \cdot \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 + \frac{6r}{c^2} \cdot \frac{d^2r}{dt^2} \right\} = -\frac{\mu}{r^2} \{ 1 - F \}.$$

Um den Werth von c zu bestimmen, wird die Perihelbewegung des Mercur herangezogen. Das Zusatzglied F veranlasst nämlich, wie leicht zu erkennen, eine solche, und darum lässt sich umgekehrt aus der bekannten

Perihelbewegung F und damit c finden. Für c wird die Formel abgeleitet:

$$c = \frac{6\pi}{a(1 - \varepsilon^2)\psi} \cdot \frac{4\pi^2 a^3}{\tau^2}$$

wo a die halbe grosse Axe der Planetenbahn, ε die numerische Excentricität, τ die Umlaufszeit und ψ die jährliche Perihelbewegung bedeutet. Setzt man den Theil der Perihelbewegung des Mercur, der nicht aus Störungen zu erklären ist, gleich 41'' in einem Jahrhundert, so ergibt sich:

$$c = 305\,500 \text{ km/sec.},$$

also ein Werth, der mit der Geschwindigkeit des Lichtes und der Electricität übereinstimmt."

The *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik*,²⁷⁶⁷ *Die Fortschritte der Physik im Jahre 1904*,²⁷⁶⁸ and *Physikalische Zeitschrift*²⁷⁶⁹ also featured another of Gerber's works, *Über den Einfluß der Bewegung der Körper auf die Fortpflanzung der Wirkungen im Äther*, Aus dem Osterprogramm der Realschule in Stargard in Pommern, (1904). The *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik*, Volume 26, Number 9, (1902), p. 840, spotlighted Gerber's work on the speed of the propagation of gravitational effects in a review by Gustav Mie when Gerber released his 1902 brochure *Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation*,

"9. **P. Gerber.** *Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation* (Progr. d. städt. Realgymn. in Stargard 1902, 24 S.). — Der Verf. hat eine neue Theorie der Ausbreitung der Gravitation entwickelt (Beibl. 22, S. 529), welche sich von den älteren Versuchen wesentlich dadurch unterscheidet, dass sie mit der Fernwirkungsauffassung konsequent bricht. Von der neuerdings mehrfach vertretenen Anschauung, die besonders H. A. Lorentz ausgearbeitet hat, nach welcher die Gravitation ein ähnlicher Zustand sein soll, wie der des elektrischen Zwanges, und wie dieser eine transversale Fortpflanzung mit Lichtgeschwindigkeit erleiden soll, hat die Theorie des Verf. aber ebenfalls gar nichts gemeinsam. Ihre Grundannahmen sind, dass von dem Massenkörper das Gravitationspotential dauernd ausgestrahlt wird, wie eine Wellenbewegung, dass ein im Gravitationsfeld befindlicher zweiter Körper von diesem Potential nur einen Bruchteil „annimmt“, der umgekehrt proportional der relativen Geschwindigkeit ist, mit der sich das Potential durch ihn hindurch bewegt, dass endlich drittens Wirkung und Gegenwirkung entgegengesetzt gleich sind. Auf die Frage nach Verteilung und Fortpflanzung der Gravitationsenergie im Raum wird nicht eingegangen. M."

Lampe reviewed Gerber's *Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation*

of 1902 in *Die Fortschritte der Physik im Jahre 1902*, Volume 58, Part 1, (1902), pp. 259-260,

“P A U L G E R B E R. Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation. Progr. Realprogymn. Stargard. 24 S. 1902 †.

Die Abhandlung ergänzt die frühere Arbeit des Verf.: „Die räumliche und zeitliche Ausbreitung der Gravitation“ (ZS. f. Math. u. Ph. **43**, 93-104). In dem Referat über diesen Aufsatz (diese Ber. **54** [1], 390, 1898) war schon angedeutet, daß die einleitenden Betrachtungen von sehr allgemeiner Art waren, weshalb sie nicht gerade überzeugend wirkten, und daß eine Auseinandersetzung mit den entgegenstehenden Ergebnissen der Rechnungen von Astronomen vermißt wurde. Beides wird jetzt nachgeholt. Während in der ersten Veröffentlichung gleich mit der Vorstellung eines zeitlich sich ausbreitenden Potentials begonnen wurde, wird jetzt die bloße Tatsache zum Ausgangspunkte genommen, „daß die Gravitation auf einer Wirkung beruhe, die Zeit brauche, um sich fortzupflanzen. Die Einmischung hypothetischer Elemente in die Reihe der Überlegungen ist völlig vermieden. Was sich weiter daraus ergibt, ist also allein durch jene Annahme bedingt; und alle Rechenmethoden, die sich damit nicht in Einklang befinden, müssen als unzureichend betrachtet werden“. In der Besprechung der bezüglichen astronomischen Arbeiten zeigt sich der prinzipielle Unterschied der Vorstellungen des Verf. von denen der übrigen Autoren, so daß nach seiner Anschauung die Schlußweisen jener Astronomen alle mit Fehlern behaftet sind. — Zur Vervollständigung der früheren Arbeit wird dann im vorletzten Abschnitte der Gang der Rechnungen am Merkur in den Grundzügen hinzugefügt; hieraus war ja die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit des „Zwangszustandes“ im umgebenden Mittel zu **305 500 km** in der Sekunde berechnet worden. Der letzte kurze Abschnitt von einer Seite enthält allgemeine Überlegungen. Lp.”

Die Fortschritte der Physik im Jahre 1903, Volume 59, Part 3, (1903), p. 397, again took notice of Gerber's *Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation* of 1902.

Ludwig C. Glaser noted, as recorded in Paul Weyland's brochure *Betrachtungen über Einsteins Relativitätstheorie und die Art ihrer Einführung* at page 30, that Gerber's formula was noted in: E. Riecke, *Lehrbuch der Physik, zu eigenem Studium und zum Gebrauche bei Vorlesungen*, Zweiter verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage, Second Enlarged and Improved Edition, Veit & Comp., Leipzig, (1902).

The *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 4, Number 12, (1903), p. 355, wrote,

“**Paul Gerber, Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation.**

(Progr. d. Realprogymn. i. Stargard i. Pommern 1902.) 25 S.

Bei der Bestimmung des Potentials zweier bewegter Teilchen folgt der Verf. zunächst C. N e u m a n n in der Anschauung, dass das an der einen Masse eben wirkende Potential von der anderen um die zum Durchlaufen der

gegenseitigen Entfernung nötige Zeit $\frac{r}{c}$ früher ausging, d. h. als diese

$$r - \frac{r}{c} \frac{dr}{dt}$$

war und daher den Betrag

$$\frac{1}{r \left(1 - \frac{1}{c} \frac{dr}{dt} \right)}$$

hat. Nun aber bemerkt der Verf. weiter, dass infolge der Bewegung beider Massen das Potential mit der

$$\frac{1}{c} \left(c - \frac{dr}{dt} \right)$$

fachen Geschwindigkeit, als im Falle der Ruhe beider Teilchen, an der angezogenen Masse vorüberstreicht und nimmt an, dass es deshalb einen im gleichen Verhältnis kleineren Effekt hervorbringt, wodurch er das Potential erhält:

$$\frac{1}{r \left(c - \frac{1}{c} \frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2} = \frac{1}{r} \left\{ 1 + \frac{2}{c} \frac{dr}{dt} + \frac{3}{c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 \right\}$$

oder die Kraft:

$$\frac{1}{r^2} \left\{ 1 - \frac{3}{c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 + \frac{6r}{c^2} \frac{d^2r}{dt^2} \right\}.$$

Also gerade das dreifache Zusatzglied des Weberschen Gesetzes, wodurch die aus diesem unter der Annahme $c = 3.10^{10} \frac{c}{s}$ folgende Perihelstörung des

Merkur von $13''65$ (pro 100 Jahre), den durch die Beobachtungen geforderten Wert von $3 \times 13''65 = 41''$ erreicht. Ausserdem enthält die Arbeit eine kritische Darstellung der verschiedenen seit Laplace gemachten Versuche, die zeitliche Ausbreitung der Gravitation in Rechnung zu ziehen.

G. Herglotz.

(Eingegangen 24. Oktober 1902.)"

Jonathan A. Zenneck's famous 1903 review of gravitational theories in the *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, in addition to featuring Lorentz' work, also featured Paul Gerber's theory and its use of the known perihelion motion of Mercury to determine the speed of the propagation of gravitational effects, which as Mie had noted turns out to be light speed in Gerber's and in Lorentz' theories. Zenneck wrote,

“**24. Die Annahme von Gerber.** Die beiden Voraussetzungen von *P. Gerber* [*Footnote: Zeitschr. Math. Phys.* 43 (1898), p. 93-104.] sind die folgenden.

a) Das von einer Masse μ nach einer zweiten m ausgesandte Potential P ist $\frac{\mu}{r}$, wo r den Abstand von μ und m im Moment der Aussendung des Potentials bedeutet. Dieses Potential pflanzt sich mit der endlichen Geschwindigkeit c fort.

b) Es ist eine gewisse Dauer nötig, damit das Potential „bei m “ angelangt, dieser Masse sich mitteile, d. h. den ihm entsprechenden Bewegungszustand von m hervorrufe“. „Wenn die Massen ruhen, geht die Bewegung des Potentials mit ihrer eigenen Geschwindigkeit an m vorüber; dann bemisst sich sein auf m übertragener Wert nach dem umgekehrten Verhältnis zum Abstände. Wenn die Massen aufeinander zueilen, verringert sich die Zeit der Übertragung, mithin der übertragene Potentialwert im Verhältnis der eigenen Geschwindigkeit des Potentials zu der aus ihr und der Geschwindigkeit der Massen bestehenden Summe, da das Potential in Bezug auf m diese Gesamtgeschwindigkeit hat.“

Zu dem Wert, den das Potential unter diesen Annahmen haben muss, gelangt *Gerber* auf folgende Weise:

„Das Potential bewegt sich ausser mit seiner Geschwindigkeit c noch mit der Geschwindigkeit der anziehenden Masse. Der Weg $r - \Delta r$, [*Footnote: $\Delta r > 0$ bei wachsendem r .*] den die beiden sich entgegenkommenden Bewegungen, die des Potentials und die der angezogenen Masse, in der Zeit Δt zurücklegen, beträgt daher

$$\Delta t \left(c - \frac{\Delta r}{\Delta t} \right),$$

während $r = c\Delta t$ ist. Also erhält man für den Abstand, bei dem sich das Potential zu bilden anfängt und dem es umgekehrt proportional ist,

$$r - \Delta r = r \left(1 - \frac{1}{c} \frac{\Delta r}{\Delta t} \right).$$

Weil ferner die Geschwindigkeit, mit der die Bewegungen aneinander vorbeigehen, den Wert

$$c - \frac{\Delta r}{\Delta t}$$

hat, fällt das Potential wegen des Zeitverbrauchs zu seiner Mitteilung an m auch proportional

$$\frac{c}{c - \frac{\Delta r}{\Delta t}}$$

aus. Man findet so

$$P = \frac{\mu}{r \left(1 - \frac{1}{c} \frac{\Delta r}{\Delta t} \right)^2}.$$

Solange der Weg Δr kurz und deshalb $\frac{\Delta r}{\Delta t}$ gegen c klein ist, darf man dafür $\frac{dr}{dt}$ setzen. Dadurch wird

$$P = \frac{\mu}{r \left(1 - \frac{1}{c} \frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2},$$

woraus mit Hülfe des binomischen Satzes bis zur zweiten Potenz folgt:

$$P = \frac{\mu}{r} \left[1 + \frac{2}{c} \frac{dr}{dt} + \frac{3}{c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 \right].$$

Die Anwendung dieser Gleichung auf die Planetenbewegungen ergibt das bemerkenswerte Resultat: Bestimmt man aus der beobachteten Perihelbewegung des Merkur die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit c , so erhält man $c = 305\,500 \text{ km/sec}$, also überraschend genau die Lichtgeschwindigkeit oder: *Setzt man in der Gerber'schen Gleichung als Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation die Lichtgeschwindigkeit ein, so ergibt diese Gleichung genau die beobachtete anomale Perihelbewegung*

des Merkur.

Für die anderen Planeten folgen aus der *Gerber'schen* Annahme keine Schwierigkeiten, ausgenommen für Venus, wo der *Gerber'sche* Ansatz die etwas zu grosse säkulare Perihelbewegung von 8" ergibt.

Die *Gerber'sche* Annahme zeigt also, ebenso wie diejenige von *Lévy*, dass eine Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation von derselben Grösse wie die Lichtgeschwindigkeit nicht nur möglich ist, sondern sogar dazu dienen kann, die schlimmste Differenz, welche bisher zwischen astronomischer Beobachtung und Berechnung vorhanden war, aus der Welt zu schaffen. Allerdings ist dies nur erreicht worden dadurch, dass die Gültigkeit des *Newton'schen* Gesetzes auf ruhende Körper beschränkt und für bewegte Körper ein erweitertes Gesetz zu Grunde gelegt wurde.²⁷⁷⁰

The topic of the speed of gravity was hot in 1903. Samuel Oppenheim wrote in his book *Kritik des Newtonschen Gravitationsgesetzes*, in 1903,

“§31. Die Analogie, welche zwischen dem Newtonschen und dem Coulombschen Gesetze der Anziehung zweier elektrischer oder magnetischer Teilchen besteht, führt zu einer dritten Art, den Einfluß der Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation auf die Bewegung der Planeten zu untersuchen. Nach der älteren elektrodynamischen Theorie kann man nämlich das Webersche oder Riemannsche Gesetz der Wechselwirkung zweier bewegter elektrischer Teilchen als eine Erweiterung des Coulombschen Gesetzes betrachten, die dahin zielt, die elektrodynamischen Kräfte aus der nicht instantanen, sondern in ähnlicher Weise wie beim Licht mit der Zeit sich fortpflanzenden Wirkung der statischen Elektrizität abzuleiten. Es liegt dieser Anschauung bekanntlich ein Gedanke zu Grunde, den zuerst Gauß [*Footnote in the Ann der Physik reprint: G a u ß Werke. Bd. 5. p. 627. Nachlaß: „Aus einem Briefe von G a u ß an W. W e b e r“ aus dem Jahre 1845.*] ausgesprochen hat und Riemann [*Footnote in the Ann der Physik reprint: B. R i e m a n n, „Ein Beitrag zur Elektrodynamik“ in den Ges. Abh. 1858.*], sowie, mit mehr Erfolg, C. N e u m a n n [*Footnote in the Annalen der Physik reprint: C. Neumann, „Prinzipien der Elektrodynamik“.* Festschrift zum Jubiläum der Universität in Bonn. 1868. Siehe auch die Kritik von C l a u s i u s „Über die von G a u ß angeregte neue Auffassung der elektrodynamischen Erscheinungen“. *Ann. d. Phys. 135.* 1868; ferner C. N e u m a n n, *Allgemeine Untersuchungen über das N e w t o n s c h e Prinzip der Fernwirkungen.* Leipzig 1896. Besonders Kap. VIII „über das H a m i l t o n s c h e Prinzip und das effektive Potential“.] haben eine solche Ableitung versucht.

Die Voraussetzung, von welcher C. Neumann ausgeht, ist die, daß das Potential der gegenseitigen Anziehung zweier Teilchen (m_1 und m_2), das

für ruhende Punkte durch $\frac{k^2 m_1 m_2}{r}$ gegeben ist, einiger Zeit bedarf, um von

m_1 zu m_2 zu gelangen, und daher dort nicht zur Zeit t sondern etwas später ankommt, ebenso wie das zur Zeit t in m_1 angekommene und von m_2 ausgesandte Potential von dort etwas früher ausging. Beiden Fällen entspricht eine Vergrößerung des Potentials im Verhältnisse von $r : r - \Delta r$, wo Δr von der Zeitdifferenz abhängig ist, die das Potential zu seiner Fortpflanzung benötigt. Das Anziehungspotential ist daher

$$P = \frac{k^2 m_1 m_2}{r - \Delta r}$$

und stimmt nach gehöriger Entwicklung, durch welche es in

$$P = \frac{k^2 m_1 m_2}{r} \left[1 + \frac{1}{c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 \right]$$

übergeht, formell mit dem Weberschen Gesetze überein.

Man kann, wie dies Gerber [*Footnote in the 1903 edition: Gerber: Zeitschrift für Math. u. Physik Band 43. 1898. Gerber nimmt in seinen Entwicklungen $\lambda = 2$ an.*] getan hat, die Rechnung C. Neumanns dadurch verallgemeinern, d. h. den Ausdruck für das Potential noch um eine zweite zu bestimmende Konstante erweitern, daß man

$$P = \frac{k^2 m_1 m_2}{r \left(1 - \frac{\Delta r}{r} \right)^\lambda}$$

setzt. Man erhält so

$$P = \frac{k^2 m_1 m_2}{r} \left[1 + \frac{\lambda(\lambda + 1)}{1 \cdot 2 c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 \right]$$

als ein neues, dem Weberschen Gesetze analoges, Fernkraftgesetz, das 2 Konstante enthält, die sich den Beobachtungen anpassen können. Die Berechnung der Bewegung der Planeten unter der Annahme, daß an Stelle des Newtonschen Gesetzes dieses erweiterte tritt, führt zu dem Resultate, daß säkularen Störungen die Länge des Perihels sowie die mittlere Länge unterworfen sind, daß aber bloß die erstere ausschlaggebend ist, indem die letztere das Quadrat der Exzentrizität als Faktor erhält und daher wegen der Kleinheit dieser stets unmerklich bleibt. Die säkulare Störung in der Länge des Perihels ist

$$\Delta\pi = \frac{\lambda(\lambda + 1)}{1 \cdot 2} \cdot \frac{n^3 a^2}{c^2}$$

und muß, soll sie die Anomalie in der Bewegung des Merkur beseitigen, die Gleichung

$$\frac{\lambda(\lambda + 1)}{1 \cdot 2} \cdot \frac{n^3 a^2}{c^2} = 41''25$$

erfüllen. Die aus dem Weberschen Gesetze ($\lambda = 1$) allein resultierende Perihelstörung unter der Annahme, daß die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation, c , identisch ist mit der des Lichtes, ($c = 300000 \text{ km/sek.}$) beträgt $13''65$. Es bleibt daher für λ die Gleichung

$$\frac{\lambda(\lambda + 1)}{1 \cdot 2} = \frac{41''25}{13''65} = 3$$

aus der die 2 Werte

$$\lambda = 2 \text{ und } \lambda = -3$$

folgen. Wie man sieht, läßt sich unter der Annahme, daß das Potential der anziehenden Kraft zweier bewegter Teilchen durch den Ausdruck

$$\frac{k^2 m_1 m_2}{r} \left[1 + \frac{3}{c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 \right]$$

gegeben ist, in welchem c als die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation identisch angenommen werden kann mit der des Lichtes, der Widerspruch in der Bewegungstheorie des Planeten Merkur vollständig lösen. Auch für die anderen Planeten folgen, wie die folgenden Zahlen es zeigen, Differenzen, die noch, etwa den Planeten Venus ausgenommen, innerhalb der möglichen Beobachtungsfehler liegen:

$$\underline{\lambda = 1 \text{ (Weber)}} \quad \underline{\lambda = 2. \text{ (Gerber)}}$$

Planet Merkur	$\Delta\pi = 13''65 \dots 40''95$
Venus	$= 2 \cdot 86 \dots 8 \cdot 58$
Erde	$= 1 \cdot 27 \dots 3 \cdot 81 \text{ Zeiteinheit} = 100 \text{ Jahre.}$
Mars	$= 0 \cdot 44 \dots 1 \cdot 32$

$$\text{Jupiter} = 0.02 \dots 0.06$$

Das Grundgesetz, welches Riemann für das Webersche substituiert, lautet

$$P = \frac{k^2 m_1 m_2}{r} \left(1 - \frac{1}{c^2} \left[\left(\frac{dx}{dt} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{du}{dt} \right)^2 \left(\frac{dz}{dt} \right) \right] \right)$$

Auch unter Zugrundelegung dieses ergibt sich für die Bewegung der Planeten nur eine Störung, die merklich werden kann, u. z. ebenfalls in der Länge des Perihels. Dieselbe ist doppelt so groß als die aus dem Weberschen sich ergebende, so daß, wenn man nach einem Vorschlag von Lévy [*Footnote in the Annalen der Physik reprint: Lévy, Sur l'application des lois électrodynamiques au mouvement des planètes. Compt. rend. Paris 1890.*] beide unter Einführung einer erst zu bestimmenden Konstanten λ zu einem vereinigt in der Form

$$\begin{aligned} P &= P_{\text{Weber}} + \lambda (P_{\text{Riemann}} - P_{\text{Weber}}) \\ &= \frac{k^2 m_1 m_2}{r} \left[1 - \left((1 - \lambda) \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 + \lambda \left[\left(\frac{dx}{dt} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{du}{dt} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{dz}{dt} \right)^2 \right] \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

man eine Perihelstörung von der Größe

$$13''65 + \lambda (27''30 - 13''65) = 13''65 (1 + \lambda)$$

erhält. Soll dieselbe gleich sein $41''25$, so wird $\lambda = 2$ und die Gesetze

$$P_1 = \frac{k^2 m_1 m_2}{r} \left(1 + \frac{1}{c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 - \frac{2}{c^2} \left[\left(\frac{dx}{dt} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{du}{dt} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{dz}{dt} \right)^2 \right] \right)$$

ebenso wie

$$P_2 = \frac{k m_1 m_2}{r} \left[1 + \frac{3}{c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 \right]$$

beseitigen, das Newtonsche Gesetz substituierend, mindestens eine der bisher in den Bewegungen der Planeten konstatierten Unregelmäßigkeiten, d. i. die im Perihel des Merkur, unter der gewiß einfachen Annahme, daß die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation der des Lichtes an Größe gleich ist, ohne gar zu große Schwierigkeiten in den Bewegungen der

anderen Planeten hervorzurufen. Es muß jedoch hervorgehoben werden, daß dieses einzige Ergebnis, so zutreffend es auch sein mag, nicht genügt, um die volle Substitution des Newtonschen Gesetzes durch eines derselben P_1 oder P_2 nach allen Richtungen hin zu rechtfertigen. Zunächst bleibt nämlich, wie man sich leicht überzeugen kann, die Schwierigkeit bestehen, die nach Seeliger in der Ausdehnung ihrer Gültigkeit auf den unendlichen Raum liegt, andererseits müßte auch noch die Bewegung sehr sonnennaher Kometen untersucht werden, hauptsächlich was mögliche periodische Störungen anlangt, um eine endgültige Entscheidung zu treffen.

§ 32. Auch die neuere elektromagnetische Theorie, insbesondere in ihre weiteren Ausbildung als Elektronentheorie durch H. Lorentz wurde schon auf die Bewegung der Planeten um die Sonne angewandt.

H. A. Lorentz [*Footnote in the original book: H. A. Lorentz, „Considérations on Gravitation“ in den koninkl. Akad. von Wetensk. Verslag. Amsterdam 1900.*] nimmt zur Erklärung der Gravitation an, daß die 2 Störungen, welche durch das Vorhandensein eines positiven und negativen Elektrons im Äther hervorgerufen werden, sich nicht vollständig aufheben, sondern ein wenig von einander verschieden sind, und zeigt, daß diese Annahme genügt, um eine Anziehung zwischen 2 körperlichen Molekullen zu erhalten, die dem Newtonschen Gesetz gehorcht. Indem er dann die weitere Annahme macht, daß diese Ätherstörungen sich mit derselben Geschwindigkeit fortpflanzen, wie die in einem elektromagnetischen Felde indem er ferner die Maxwellschen Feldgleichungen auch auf sie ausdehnt, kommt er zu dem Ergebnis, daß die Anziehung zweier materieller Teilchen nur dann dem Newtonschen Gesetze folgt, wenn die 2 Teilchen in Ruhe sind, daß aber Zusatzkräfte auftreten, wenn die Teilchen in Bewegung sich befinden. Diese Zusatzkräfte enthalten als Faktoren entweder $\frac{p^2}{c^2}$ oder $\frac{w^2}{c^2}$

oder $\frac{p w \cos \vartheta}{c^2}$ wenn p die absolute Geschwindigkeit des anziehenden

Punktes, w die relative Geschwindigkeit des bewegten Körpers um den anziehenden Punkt, ϑ der Winkel zwischen den beiden Geschwindigkeiten und c die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation im Äther bedeutet, wobei diese mit der der Elektrizität identisch angenommen wird.

H. A. Lorentz wendet die von ihm so abgeleiteten Gleichungen auf die Bewegung des Merkur um die Sonne an. Er identifiziert hiebei die absolute Geschwindigkeit p der Sonne mit ihrer Eigenbewegung (im astronomischen Sinne genommen) und setzt für diese fest $\alpha = 276^\circ$

$\delta = +34^\circ$ die Geschwindigkeit 15 km/sec . Die Störungen der Bahnelemente, die hieraus resultieren, sind so gering, daß sie stets vernachlässigt und daher nicht dazu herangezogen werden können, beispielweise die Anomalie in der Bewegung des Merkurperihels zu erklären.

An die Entwicklungen von Lorentz schließen sich die Untersuchungen

von Wien [*Footnote in the original book: Wien: „Über die Möglichkeit einer elektromagnetischen Begründung der Mechanik.“* Archiv. néerl. 1900] und Abraham [*Footnote in the original book: Abraham: „Prinzipien der Dynamik eines Elektrons.“* Physik. Zeitschrift 1902.] welche eine vollständig neue Begründung der Mechanik auf Grundlage der elektromagnetischen Theorie bezwecken. Das Wesentliche in ihnen scheint eine Änderung des Begriffs der Masse eines Körpers zu sein. Diese ist elektromagnetischen Ursprunges und hängt hauptsächlich von der absoluten Geschwindigkeit des Körpers ab. Eine Untersuchung der Bewegung der Planeten auf Grund dieses neuen Massenbegriffs ist jedoch bisher nicht versucht worden.²⁷⁷¹

Oppenheim republished section 31 of his 1903 book in an article in *Annalen der Physik* in 1917, with some changes. The full article is reproduced in the endnote.²⁷⁷²

Einstein had studiously read Mach, who paraphrased Paul Gerber's work in Mach's book *Science of Mechanics*, in 1904,

“Paul Gerber alone (“Ueber die räumliche u. zeitliche Ausbreitung der Gravitation,” *Zeitschrift f. Math. u. Phys.*, 1898, II), from the perihelial motion of Mercury, forty-one seconds in a century, finds the velocity of propagation of gravitation to be the same as that of light. This would speak in favor of the ether as the medium of gravitation. (Compare W. Wien, “Ueber die Möglichkeit einer elektromagnetischen Begründung der Mechanik,” *Archives Néerlandaises*, The Hague, 1900, V, p. 96.)”²⁷⁷³

“Nur Paul Gerber („Ueber die räumliche u. zeitliche Ausbreitung der Gravitation“, *Zeitschr. f. Math. u. Phys.*, 1898, II) findet aus der Perihelbewegung des Mercur, 41 Secunden in einem Jahrhundert, die Ausbreitungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation gleich der Lichtgeschwindigkeit. Dies spräche für den Aether als Medium der Schwere. Vgl. W. Wien, Ueber die Möglichkeit einer elektromagnetischen Begründung der Mechanik. (*Archives Néerlandaises*, La Haye 1900, V, S. 96.)”²⁷⁷⁴

In 1910, de Tunzelmann wrote of Gerber's work,

“P. Gerber [*Footnote: Zeitschr. Math. Phys.*, vol. xliii., 1898, p. 93.] approaches the problem by regarding the gravitational potential as something propagated from the attracting mass m_1 to the attracted mass m_2 with a proper velocity of its own, v , to which is to be added the velocity of m_1 relative to m_2 . Suppose these to be at a distance r at the time t , and to be approaching each other with a velocity which is small compared with v . When the bodies are not in relative motion the potential will be

$$V_0 = \frac{m_1 m_2}{r}.$$

When m_1 and m_2 are approaching each other, then, if Δt be the time taken by the potential emitted from m_1 to reach m_2 , we shall have $r = v\Delta t$, and therefore the distance traversed will be

$$r - \Delta r = \Delta t \left(v - \frac{\Delta r}{\Delta t} \right) = r \left(1 - \frac{1}{v} \frac{\Delta r}{\Delta t} \right).$$

The amount of transmitted potential will be inversely proportional to this distance, and the relative velocity of transmission is $v - \Delta r/\Delta t$, so that the potential V will be proportional to

$$\frac{v}{v - \frac{\Delta r}{\Delta t}},$$

and therefore

$$V = \frac{m_1 m_2}{r \left(1 - \frac{1}{v} \frac{\Delta r}{\Delta t} \right)^2};$$

or, if the velocity of approach be sufficiently small compared with v ,

$$V = \frac{m_1 m_2}{r \left(1 - \frac{\dot{r}}{v} \right)^2} = \frac{m_1 m_2}{r} \left(1 + \frac{2\dot{r}}{v} + \frac{3\dot{r}^2}{v^2} \right).$$

Gerber finds that the anomaly of forty-one seconds will be completely accounted for by taking $v = 305\,500$ kilometers per second, that is to say, within the limits of errors of observation, by taking $v = e$, the velocity of radiation in the ether. For the perihelion motion of Venus this value introduces an anomaly of about eight seconds per century, but does not lead to any difficulties in the cases of the other planets, the amounts of the anomaly in the motion of the perihelion being:—for the Earth, $3\cdot6$ seconds per century; for the moon, $\cdot06$ sec.; for Mars, $1\cdot3$ secs.; for Jupiter, $\cdot06$ sec.; for Saturn, $\cdot01$ sec.; for Uranus, $\cdot002$ sec.; and for Neptune, $\cdot0007$ sec. per century.

This investigation is not one that suggests any physical representation of gravitational action, and is only presented as a preliminary inquiry into some of the conditions to be satisfied by a satisfactory theory, and as indicating the possibility of gravitational propagation with the velocity of radiation. It could not, however, with such a velocity, be of the nature of radiation, as the impossibility of this was shown in Chapter XXIII.”²⁷⁷⁵

In 1914, before the appearance of Einstein’s 1915 paper, Ebenezer Cunningham asserted that Paul Gerber had solved the riddle of Mercury, and had done so in conformity with the principle of relativity, making Cunningham, not Einstein, the first to use Gerber’s formula as the fulfillment of the principle of relativity,

“16. The second order corrections inappreciable.

The possibility of obtaining equations which, to the first order, are of Newtonian form removes the old objection to the velocity of propagation of gravitation being c , an objection which was based on the prediction of a *first order* effect.

But for a complete comparison with astronomical observations it is necessary to examine the nature and magnitude of the second order effect. This has been carefully and exhaustively done by Professor de Sitter. [*Footnote: Monthly Notices of Roy. Astr. Soc.* Mar. 1911, p. 388.] It would carry us too far to give the calculations here, but the results may be summarized.

Taking the following equations, either of which is a particular case of (α), p. 176,

$$m_1 \frac{d^2(x_1, y_1, z_1)}{dt_0^2} = \frac{\mu}{\rho_2^3} \left\{ (x, y, z) - \frac{\rho_1 \mathbf{v}_2}{\gamma c} \right\} \dots\dots\dots (I),$$

and

$$m_2 \frac{d^2(x_1, y_1, z_1)}{dt_0^2} = \frac{\mu(-\gamma)}{\rho_2^3} \left\{ (x, y, z) - \frac{\rho_1 \mathbf{v}_2}{\gamma c} \right\} \dots\dots (II),$$

(II) differing from (I) only in the extra invariant factor $(-\gamma)$ on the right-hand side—de Sitter approximates to the second order in both cases and comes to the following conclusions.

Case I.

(i) The coordinates of a planet of small mass are expressed by the ordinary formulae of elliptical motion.

(ii) But to express the eccentric anomaly in terms of the heliocentric time

we must take a slightly altered eccentricity, the difference between heliocentric and geocentric time consisting in a small change of scale together with small periodic fluctuations.

(iii) Kepler's third law is not quite exact, but there are periodic variations.

(iv) The difference between the constant of precession as determined from the fixed stars and from the motions in the solar system would be of the order of

$$-0''\cdot0000044 \text{ per century.}$$

The variation in the eccentricity in (ii) is of the order $(v/c)^2$ of itself, and for the earth this is of the order 10^{-8} .

The periodic change in the time in (ii) has amplitude $(v^2 e / c^2 n)$, n being the mean angular velocity, and is approximately equal to $0\cdot0008$ second.

The deviation from the Keplerian angular velocity in (iii) is again of the order $(v/c)^2$ of the mean, that is of the order 10^{-8} .

All these effects are inappreciable.

There is really no need to go any further, as these results, if correct, shew that *there is no essential inconsistency between astronomical observations and the Principle of Relativity.*

De Sitter however goes on to shew that the equation (II) also leads to results which are at present incapable of observation, except in one important respect. He finds in fact that this equation would lead to a secular motion of the perihelia of the planets which in the case of Mercury amounts to about $7''$ per century. An effect of this kind has for some time been known by practical astronomers to exist, though the magnitude is about $40''$ per century. Various hypotheses have been suggested to explain it. One of them proposed by Gerber [*Footnote: Zeitschr. für Math. Phys.* 43 (1908), pp. 93-104. See also *Enzyk. der Math. Wiss.* Vol. v. p. 49.] in 1898 quite independently of the principle of relativity is the possibility that the Newtonian Law of Gravitation is only approximate, and that more accurately gravitational influence is propagated with the velocity of light, and that a correction of nature very similar to that suggested by equation (II) must be applied to the usual expression for the force on the planet. He arrives at the conclusion that the known motion of the perihelia can be so explained.

By using instead of equation (II) an equation derived from (I) by multiplying the right-hand side by another power of the invariant factor $(-\gamma)$ instead of the first, the magnitude of the effect predicted could be made just of the actual order, and Gerber's conclusion is thereby corroborated and found to be perfectly consistent with the hypothesis of relativity."

Ernst Gehrcke noticed that Einstein's 1915 solution to the problem of the

perihelion motion of the planet Mercury was identical to Paul Gerber's 1898 solution. Gehrcke published numerous articles effectively accusing Einstein of plagiarism.²⁷⁷⁶ But Gehrcke was not alone. Einstein's two dear friends Michele Besso and Friedrich Adler also noticed that Einstein had repeated Gerber's solution.

Besso, who had worked with Einstein for years on the problem of the perihelion motion of Mercury (and Einstein did not mention Besso in Einstein's 1915 paper²⁷⁷⁷), wrote to Einstein on 5 December 1916,

“Thus I want to offer an aperçu in the phys. colloquium on earlier attempts to explain perihelion motion [***] I have found interesting material by Zenneck on gravitation in the *Enzyklop. der mathem. Wiss.*^[12] I have also thought about Gerber's idea:^[13] It can be presented in a way that makes it entirely reasonable.”²⁷⁷⁸

Besso and Einstein had worked together on the problem of the perihelion motion of Mercury before Einstein's 18 November 1915 paper, and Besso's letter makes it appear that Einstein knew of Gerber's work during that period, which was before Einstein wrote his 1915 paper. Note that Besso gives no citation for Gerber and makes no mention of Gehrcke. Was he talking to an old friend about an old issue, when Besso mentioned “Gerber's idea”?

Friedrich Adler wrote to Einstein on 23 March 1917,

“Are you familiar with: Paul *Gerber* ‘Die räumliche und zeitliche Ausbreitung der Gravitation’ [***] For, Gerber obviously comes to his result using Euclidean geometry. Therefore, I think that it ought to be possible to explain the perihelion motion of Mercury using the *old* tools, thus that the verification of the gen. theory of relativity through this result is *not as far-reaching* as you assume it to be.”²⁷⁷⁹

Since Gehrcke, Besso and Adler noticed that Einstein parroted Gerber, it seems quite reasonable to believe that Albert Einstein, who had worked harder than any of them on the problem, must have been aware of Gerber's work. How could Einstein have missed it? He surely studied at least some of the many works, which referred directly to Gerber's paper. We know that Einstein studiously read Mach. Could Einstein have missed the widely read and often cited works of Riecke, Zenneck, Cunningham, Oppenheim *and* de Tunzelmann? And what of Gerber's work, itself, which twice appeared? How was it that Lampe, Herglotz, Mie, Riecke, Mach, Zenneck, Oppenheim, de Tunzelmann, Cunningham, Gehrcke, Besso and Adler each knew of Gerber's work, but Einstein claimed he did not—though he presented Gerber's solution? Is Einstein's claim plausible?

And what of Einstein's attitude when forced to acknowledge Gerber? Why was he so spiteful toward Gerber, who had simply dared to solve the problem with a solution Einstein later copied without an acknowledgment? Albert Einstein wrote in 1920,

“. . . Gerber, who has given the correct formula for the perihelion motion of Mercury before I did. The experts are not only in agreement that Gerber's derivation is wrong through and through, but the formula cannot be obtained as a consequence of the main assumption made by Gerber. Mr. Gerber's work is therefore completely useless, an unsuccessful and erroneous theoretical attempt. I maintain that the theory of general relativity has provided the first real explanation of the perihelion motion of mercury. I have not mentioned the work by Gerber originally, because I did not know it when I wrote my work on the perihelion motion of Mercury; even if I had been aware of it, I would not have had any reason to mention it.”²⁷⁸⁰

Instead of delighting in the fact that he had been anticipated and instead of thanking those who informed him of the fact, Einstein issued a vindictive attack against Gerber, who was deceased, declaring that even if he had known of Gerber's work, and he denied that he had, *he would not have mentioned it*. Therefore, it is easy to believe that Einstein did know of Gerber's work and failed to mention it. Einstein also failed to mention the work of Lorentz, Poincaré, de Sitter, Drude, Lehmann-Filhés, Hall, Tisserand, Besso, etc. on the problem of the perihelion motion of Mercury and the speed of gravity.

Albert Einstein believed he had a right to plagiarize the ideas of others, if he could put a new spin on the old ideas. Einstein asserted this “privilege” in 1907 after Max Planck²⁷⁸¹ and Walter Kaufmann²⁷⁸² publicly pointed out that Einstein's theory of relativity was merely a generalization of Lorentz' theory, and note that in order for Einstein to allege that his viewpoint was “new” he must have known what the “old” viewpoint was,

“It appears to me that it is the nature of the business that what follows has already been partly solved by other authors. Despite that fact, since the issues of concern are here addressed from a new point of view, I believe I am entitled to leave out what would be for me a thoroughly pedantic survey of the literature, all the more so because it is hoped that these gaps will yet be filled by other authors, as has already happened with my first work on the principle of relativity through the commendable efforts of Mr. *Planck* and Mr. *Kaufmann*.”

“Es scheint mir in der Natur der Sache zu liegen, daß das Nachfolgende zum Teil bereits von anderen Autoren klargestellt sein dürfte. Mit Rücksicht darauf jedoch, daß hier die betreffenden Fragen von einem neuen Gesichtspunkt aus behandelt sind, glaubte ich, von einer für mich sehr umständlichen Durchmusterung der Literatur absehen zu dürfen, zumal zu hoffen ist, daß diese Lücke von anderen Autoren noch ausgefüllt werden wird, wie dies in dankenswerter Weise bei meiner ersten Arbeit über das Relativitätsprinzip durch Hrn. P l a n c k und Hrn. K a u f m a n n bereits geschehen ist.”²⁷⁸³

12.4 Einstein's Fudge

Prof. Friedwardt Winterberg, theoretical physicist at the University of Nevada, Reno, who received his Ph.D. under Nobel Prize laureate Werner Heisenberg, argues that Einstein fudged the equations in Einstein's 18 November 1915 paper on the perihelion motion of Mercury. Einstein had not yet plagiarized David Hilbert's generally covariant field equations of gravitation incorporating the essential trace term, and, therefore, Einstein could not properly derive the solution to the problem of Mercury's motion, which Gerber had published in 1898, or the amount of deflection of ray of light grazing the limb of the Sun.

In Einstein's 11 November 1915 addendum to his 4 November 1915 paper in the *Berliner Sitzungsberichte*, "Zur allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie", Einstein states,

"The energy tensor of 'matter' T_{μ}^{λ} possesses a scalar $\sum_{\mu} T_{\mu}^{\mu}$. It is well-known that this vanishes for the electromagnetic field. On the other hand, it appears to be different from zero for *true* matter. [***] Now suppose that [***] the scalar of the energy tensor would vanish as well! [***] Then $\sum_{\mu} T_{\mu}^{\mu}$ can *seemingly* be positive for the whole thing, whereas in reality only $\sum_{\mu} (T_{\mu}^{\mu} + t_{\mu}^{\mu})$ is positive, while $\sum_{\mu} T_{\mu}^{\mu}$ vanishes everywhere. *We assume in what follows, that the condition $\sum_{\mu} T_{\mu}^{\mu} = 0$ really is generally fulfilled.*"

Einstein begins his 18 November 1915 lecture on the perihelion motion of Mercury,

"In a work which recently appeared in these reports, I have introduced field equations of gravitation, which are covariant for arbitrary transformations of the determinate 1. In an addendum, I have shown that the field equations are generally covariant if the trace of the energy tensor of 'matter' vanishes, and I have demonstrated that no objections made on principle stand in the way of the introduction of this hypothesis, by means of which time and space are robbed of the last vestiges of objective reality¹.

In the present paper, I find an important confirmation of this most radical relativity theory; which is to say, it will be shown that the secular rotation of the orbit of Mercury discovered by Leverrier, which is about 45" per century, can be qualitatively and quantitatively explained without having to presuppose any special hypothesis.

Furthermore, it will be shown that the theory increases, (by twice) the curvature of a ray of light due to a gravitational field than resulted from my earlier investigations."

Tellingly, Einstein annotates the published paper of his 18 November 1915 lecture on the perihelion motion of Mercury just quoted above (which was published

on 25 November 1915) with a refutation of his own arguments,

“¹ In a report soon to follow, it will be shown that this hypothesis is non-essential. It is only essential that the determinate $|g_{\mu\nu}|$ assumes the value -1, because such a choice of reference system is possible. The following analysis is independent of this.”

The presiding secretary Hr. Waldeyer prefaced the *Sitzungsberichte* on 18 November 1915 on page 803 with the introductory comments:

“3. Mr. EINSTEIN submitted an article: *Explanation of the Perihelion Motion of Mercury from the General Theory of Relativity*.

It is shown that the general theory of relativity explains the perihelion motion of Mercury discovered by Leverrier both qualitatively and quantitatively, thus confirming the hypothesis that the trace of the energy tensor of ‘matter’ vanishes. In addition, it is shown that the investigation of the curvature of a ray of light in a gravitational field also offers a possibility to test this important hypothesis.”

“3. Hr. EINSTEIN machte eine Mitteilung: Erklärung der Perihelbewegung des Merkur aus der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie.

Es wird gezeigt, daß die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie die von LEVERRIER entdeckte Perihelbewegung des Merkur qualitativ und quantitativ erklärt. Dadurch wird die Hypothese vom Verschwinden des Skalars des Energietensors der »Materie« bestätigt. Ferner wird gezeigt, daß die Untersuchung der Lichtstrahlenkrümmung durch das Gravitationsfeld ebenfalls eine Möglichkeit der Prüfung dieser wichtigen Hypothese bietet.”²⁷⁸⁴

Einstein contradicts the first footnote of his paper, which footnote must have been added after 18 November 1915, probably shortly before 25 November 1915, otherwise Waldeyer would not have written what he wrote on 18 November 1915, or later, the date of Einstein's submission. The letter from Max Born to David Hilbert of 23 November 1915,²⁷⁸⁵ suggests that Einstein had not yet produced even a written draft of his paper on the equations of gravitation submitted 25 November 1915, because Born stated that he only knew of Einstein's work from discussions between them.

Einstein states later in his 18 November 1915 lecture on the perihelion motion of Mercury, *in contradiction to the first footnote of the paper which was added sometime after 18 November 1915 and after Einstein had sight of Hilbert's generally covariant equations of gravitation containing the trace term*, that his derivation of the amount of deflection of a ray of light grazing the limb of the Sun depended upon the (erroneous) hypothesis $\sum T_{\mu}^{\mu} = 0$,

“Upon the application of Huygen's principle, we find from equations (5) and

(4b), after a simple calculation, that a light ray passing at a distance Δ suffers an angular deflection of magnitude $\frac{2\alpha}{\Delta}$, while the earlier calculation, which was not based upon the hypothesis $\sum T_{\mu}^{\mu} = 0$, had produced the value $\frac{\alpha}{\Delta}$. A light ray grazing the surface of the sun should experience a deflection of 1.7 sec of arc instead of 0.85 sec of arc.²⁷⁸⁶

Einstein must have learned the correct equations from Hilbert. His letter to Hilbert of 18 November 1915 demonstrates that he had not yet delivered his lecture on the perihelion of Mercury when writing to Hilbert after having read Hilbert's manuscript. Einstein wrote to Hilbert on 18 November 1915,

“Today I am presenting to the Academy a paper in which I derive quantitatively out of general relativity, without any guiding hypothesis, the perihelion motion of Mercury discovered by Le Verrier.”²⁷⁸⁷

In his 25 November 1915 paper on the field equations of gravitation, in which Einstein plagiarized Hilbert's generally covariant field equations of gravitation, Einstein was forced to abandon his hypothesis that $\sum T_{\mu}^{\mu} = 0$, which Einstein had maintained even shortly after receiving Hilbert's manuscript with the correct equations, as evinced not only twice by Einstein in his Mercury paper, but also by Waldeyer's comments on page 803.

Presiding Secretary Waldeyer noted that Einstein had changed his equations after having had sight of Hilbert's equations, on 25 November 1915:

“2. Mr. EINSTEIN presented an article: ‘*The Field Equations of Gravitation*’.

It is shown that the general theory of relativity allows field equations of gravitation, which do not presuppose the disappearance of the energy trace of matter.”

“2. Hr. EINSTEIN überreichte eine Mitteilung: »Die Feldgleichungen der Gravitation«.

Es wird gezeigt, daß die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie Feldgleichungen der Gravitation zuläßt, welche nicht das Verschwinden des Energieskalars der Materie voraussetzen.”²⁷⁸⁸

Einstein wrote in this 25 November 1915 paper on the field equations of gravitation,

“The development was as follows. First of all, I found the equations which contained the Newtonian theory as an approximation and were covariant under arbitrary substitutions of the determinate 1. Thereupon, I found that

these equations correspond to generally covariant equations, if the scalar of the energy tensor of 'matter' vanishes. [***] However, as mentioned, the hypothesis had to be introduced, that the scalar of the energy tensor of matter vanishes. As of late, I now find that one can get by without hypotheses about the energy tensor of matter, if one formulates the energy tensor of matter in a somewhat different way from that of my two earlier communications. The vacuum field equations, upon which I founded the explanation of the perihelion motion of Mercury, remain unaffected by this modification."

Einstein cleverly words his 25 November 1915 paper and avoids addressing the issue of his 18 November 1915 self-contradictory derivation of Gerber's formula based on his since abandoned hypothesis that $\sum T_{\mu}^{\mu} = 0$, and recall that Einstein asserted that it was this hypothesis that led him to double the Newtonian prediction of deflection for a light ray grazing the Sun. Though the vacuum field equations remained unaffected in Einstein's 25 November 1915 paper, the derivation of Gerber's formula for the perihelion motion of Mercury and the calculation of the deflection of a light ray grazing the limb of the Sun did not.

Einstein also failed to mention in his 25 November 1915 paper that it was David Hilbert who had provided him with the somewhat different formulation of the energy tensor of matter. In a 28 November 1915 letter to Arnold Sommerfeld,²⁷⁸⁹ Einstein admitted that he could not deduce Hilbert's equations and dishonestly reversed the order of "discovery" of his copying of Hilbert's equations and of his 18 November 1915 paper on Mercury, making it appear to Sommerfeld that he had found Hilbert's equations before conceiving of his Mercury paper of the 18th, which lie is contradicted by the face of the paper itself and by Waldeyer's comments.

This constitutes positive proof that Einstein plagiarized Hilbert's work on 25 November 1915, because Einstein and Waldeyer affirm that on 18 November 1915 after having sight of Hilbert's solution Einstein still did not know the correct field equations and was still relying on his false hypothesis that $\sum T_{\mu}^{\mu} = 0$; and further because Einstein, after reading Hilbert's manuscript, wrote to Hilbert on 18 November 1915 that he, Einstein, had derived and published the correct equations in the prior weeks.

Since Einstein published incorrect equations not only weeks prior to 18 November 1915 but on the selfsame date and either believed that these erroneous equations were correct upon first sight of Hilbert's manuscript or attempted to deceive Hilbert into believing he had been anticipated him, Einstein must have plagiarized Hilbert's manuscript on 25 November 1915. Of course, Einstein and his collaborator Erwin Freundlich most probably understood that Hilbert's manuscript solved the riddle on first sight of it and simply lied to Hilbert in order to discourage him from publishing his paper. In any event, it is a proven fact that Einstein had sight of Hilbert's equations before revising his, Einstein's, theory to duplicate Hilbert's results, and Einstein failed to acknowledge that Hilbert was the original discoverer of these equations.

Einstein's 18 November 1915 paper contradicts itself and its derivations are

erroneous. Prof. Winterberg holds that, because Einstein assumed that $T = 0$ for the trace of the energy-momentum tensor of matter, Einstein derived incorrect field equations, which lacked the needed trace term supplied by Hilbert. Since Einstein believed that $T = 0$, he was compelled to treat the Sun as if it were composed of electromagnetic radiation, instead of normal mass. Einstein wrote to Michele Besso on 3 January 1916,

“The first paper along with the addendum still suffers from want of the term $\frac{1}{2} \kappa g_{\mu\nu} T$ on the right-hand side; therefore the postulate $T = 0$. The matter must naturally be executed as in the last paper, whereby no conditions result on the structure of matter.”²⁷⁹⁰

It is noted in R. Schulmann, A. J. Kox, M. Janssen, J. Illy, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 178, Princeton University Press, (1998), page 236, note 14; that,

“The condition $T = 0$ would have suggested that matter is electromagnetic in nature[.]”

As a result of Einstein’s incorrect hypothesis, Einstein’s theory as of 18 November 1915, if it were stated in consistent terms, leads to a predicted value for the deflection of a ray of light grazing the Sun coming from infinity and passing to infinity *four* times as great as the Newtonian prediction. Richard C. Tolman explained,

“disordered radiation in the interior of a fluid sphere contributes roughly speaking *twice* as much to the gravitational field of the sphere as the same amount of energy in the form of matter. [***] the gravitational deflexion of light in passing an attracting mass is *twice* as much as would be calculated from a direct application of Newtonian theory for a particle moving with the velocity of light.”²⁷⁹¹

In the case of the attraction between the Sun and a ray of light, Newton’s law becomes, in Einstein’s view, if stated consistently,

$$F_g = G \frac{2m_1 \cdot 2m_2}{r^2}.$$

Einstein obviously knew Gerber’s formula. Knowing this solution, Einstein inductively fabricated by fallacy of *Petito Principii* a theory around it and employed a fudge factor of one half of the solar mass in order to achieve Gerber’s 1898 formula, which formula accurately describes the observed perihelion motion of the planet Mercury.

Alexander Moszkowski asked Einstein,

“Notwithstanding, cases may arise in which a certain result is to be verified by observation and experiment. This might easily give rise to nerve-racking experiences. If, for instance, a theory leads to a calculation which does not agree with reality, the propounder must surely feel considerably oppressed by this mere possibility. Let us take a particular event. I have heard that you have made a new calculation of the path of the planet Mercury on the basis of your doctrine. This must certainly have been a laborious and involved piece of work. You were firmly convinced of the theory, perhaps you alone. It had not yet been verified by an actual fact. In such cases conditions of great psychological tension must surely assert themselves. What in Heaven's name will happen if the expected result does not appear? What if it contradicts the theory? The effect on the founder of the theory cannot even be imagined!”

Moszkowski's premise was false. The “result” had been confirmed before Einstein was born. Einstein answered Moszkowski,

“Such questions, did not lie in my path. That result could not be otherwise than right. I was only concerned in putting the result into a lucid form. I did not for one second doubt that it would agree with observation. There was no sense in getting excited about what was self-evident.”²⁷⁹²

The “lucid form” Einstein put the result into was Gerber's form. According to Prof. Winterberg, Einstein also ended up with a prediction for the deflection of a light ray grazing the sun *twice* as great as the Newtonian prediction, as a consequence of using a fudge factor of one half of the solar mass in his calculations. Without the fudge factor, Einstein's 18 November 1915 theory produces a prediction for the deflection of the light ray *four times as large* as the Newtonian prediction.

Prof. Winterberg explains that the gravitational field equation for the vacuum surrounding the Sun is $R_{ik} = 0$, which is equivalent to Einstein's equation (1):

$$\sum_{\alpha} \frac{\partial \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\alpha}}{\partial x_{\alpha}} + \sum_{\alpha\beta} \Gamma_{\mu\beta}^{\alpha} \Gamma_{\nu\alpha}^{\beta} = 0.$$

However, according to Prof. Winterberg, the constant of integration is, in the instant case, the solar mass. In equations (4b), Einstein gives:

$$g_{44} = 1 - \frac{\alpha}{r}.$$

Einstein defines α as “a constant determined by the mass of the sun.”²⁷⁹³ In equation

(13), Einstein gives,

$$\varepsilon = 3\pi \frac{a}{a(1-e^2)},$$

where ε is the perihelion advance following one full orbit, a is the orbit's semi-major axis, and e is the eccentricity. Einstein then asserts, without proof, that,

“If we introduce the orbital period T (in seconds), we obtain

$$\varepsilon = 24\pi^3 \frac{a^2}{T^2 c^2 (1-e^2)}, \quad (14)$$

where c denotes the velocity of light in units of cm sec^{-1} .²⁷⁹⁴

Einstein's equation (14) is identical to the formula Gerber published in 1898. Gerber gave,

$$c^2 = \frac{6\pi\mu}{a(1-\varepsilon^2)\psi}, \text{ where } \mu = \frac{4\pi^2 a^3}{\tau^2}.$$

Ernst Gehrcke and Arvid Reuterdaahl noted that if we substitute for μ in Gerber's formula; and standardize the notation from Gerber's τ for the time of the orbital period to Einstein's T , change Gerber's ε to Einstein's e for the eccentricity and change Gerber's ψ to Einstein's ε for the advance of the perihelion's motion and solve for it while assuming that the speed of gravity is the speed of light, instead of solving for the speed of gravity squared (which is what Zenneck proposed we do, in 1903); we obtain Einstein's equation (14),

$$\varepsilon = 24\pi^3 \frac{a^2}{T^2 c^2 (1-e^2)}.$$

ENTER EINSTEIN'S FUDGE: In accord with Newtonian theory, Poisson's equation $\nabla^2 \varphi = 4\pi G\rho$ results in the gravitational potential:

$$\varphi = -\frac{GM}{r},$$

where M is the solar mass and G is the gravitational constant. In the vacuum field equation $\nabla^2 \varphi = 0$, the constant in $\varphi = \frac{\text{const.}}{r}$ is left open.

The correct field equations of gravitation are:

$$R_i^k = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} \left(T_i^k - \frac{1}{2} \delta_i^k T \right)$$

Prof. Winterberg explains that Einstein's erroneous field equation,

$$R_i^k = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} T_i^k,$$

within the limits of $i = k = 0$, produces instead,

$$R_0^0 = \frac{8\pi G}{c^2} \rho \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla^2 \varphi = 8\pi G \rho.$$

As previously noted, Einstein defines α as "a constant determined by the mass of the sun."²⁷⁹⁵ Einstein also states,

"Moreover, it should be observed that equations (7b) and (9) for the case of circular motion give no deviation from Kepler's three laws."²⁷⁹⁶

Kepler's third law gives us:

$$T^2 = \frac{4\pi^2 a^3}{GM},$$

where M is the mass of the sun. Prof. Winterberg demonstrates that if we replace T^2 with $\frac{4\pi^2 a^3}{GM}$ in Einstein's expression for ϵ , then we obtain:²⁷⁹⁷

$$\epsilon = \frac{6\pi GM}{ac^2(1-e^2)}.$$

It is clear from Einstein's equation (13):

$$\epsilon = 3\pi \frac{\alpha}{a(1-e^2)},$$

that Einstein merely assumes, without offering up any proof, that the constant α is equal to $\frac{2GM}{c^2}$ (which matches the Schwarzschild radius of the solar system), in contradiction to the results of Einstein's own erroneous theory.²⁷⁹⁸ Pursuant to Einstein's equation (10):

$$r^2 \frac{d\varphi}{ds} = B,$$

and Einstein's equation (11):

$$\left(\frac{dx}{d\varphi} \right)^2 = \frac{2A}{B^2} + \frac{\alpha}{B^2} x - x^2 + \alpha x^3,$$

one finds that: $\frac{\alpha}{B^2} = \frac{2GM}{c^2 B^2}$.

As Prof. Winterberg has shown, Einstein's erroneous field equations result in $\nabla^2 \varphi = 8\pi G\rho$ in the approximation of the weak field limit, therefore, the gravitational potential is, in Einstein's view:

$$\varphi = -\frac{2GM}{r}.$$

In the weak field limit,

$$g_{44} = 1 + \frac{2\varphi}{c^2} = 1 - \frac{4GM}{c^2 r}.$$

Though Einstein erroneously assumed without proof that,

$$\alpha = \frac{2GM}{c^2};$$

in fact, according to Einstein's incorrect theory of the perihelion motion of Mercury based on the erroneous hypothesis that the trace of the energy-momentum tensor is $T = 0$, made before Einstein plagiarized David Hilbert's generally covariant field equations of gravitation, Einstein was instead obliged to conclude that,

$$\alpha = \frac{4GM}{c^2}.$$

Prof. Winterberg argues that Einstein was, therefore, forced to fudge the equations with a factor of one half of the solar mass in order to derive Gerber's formula:

$$\delta\psi = \frac{6\pi GM}{a(1-e^2)c^2}.$$

Einstein must have known the result he was after and simply employed induction

to fabricate what is shown to be an inconsistent theory around Gerber's well-known formula, without mentioning Gerber. Charles Lane Poor found Einstein's derivations suspect and published several articles in the 1920's and 1930's, in which he attempted to expose Einstein's trickery.²⁷⁹⁹ Poor wrote in 1930,

“[Einstein] starts his wonderful fabric by defining his tensor symbol, g_{44} , in such a way as to make it the exact equivalent of the Newtonian potential of ordinary astronomy. [***] The fact is that Einstein made a slip in his preparations for his public exhibition of relativity: he did not work his mathematical machine correctly. [***] The golden nugget that Einstein thus forgot to transform is the mathematical symbol which represents the mass of the sun. [***] Thus the claim of Einstein to have found a new law of gravitation and the many assertions that the theory of relativity has worked in accounting for the motions of Mercury and has been conclusively proved by the eclipse observations and by the displacement of spectral lines are all merely unproved, and, so far, really unsupported illusions. Einstein and his followers have been dwelling in the ‘pleasing land of drowsyshed—’; in the land ‘Of dreams that wave before the half shut eye.’”²⁸⁰⁰

12.5 Who Was Paul Gerber?

There has been very little published on the life of Paul Gerber. Three letters I found in the papers of Arvid Reuterdahl in the Department of Special Collections, O'Shaunessy-Frey Library, University of St. Thomas, reveal some of the details of his somewhat tragic life and that of his widow, as well as his death at age 55 in 1909. Two are from Paul Gerber's widow Marta Gerber to Arvid Reuterdahl (Prof. Friedwardt Winterberg has kindly transcribed Mrs. Gerber's handwriting):

“Stargard Pm. d. 7. 9. 21.
Barminstr. 10.

Sehr geehrter Herr Professor!

Entschuldigen Sie bitte, wenn ich Ihnen deutsch schreibe, aber ich kann nicht englisch. Zu gleicher Zeit mit diesem Brief gehen die zwei Bilder, meines Mannes, an Sie Herr Professor, als Drucksache ab.

Recht von Herzen, danke ich Ihnen, dass Sie fuer meinen Mann, das Wort ergreifen wollen, so ist seine viele Arbeit doch nicht ganz umsonst gewesen. Sehr gerne moechte ich das Heft oder Buch sehen, wohinein das Bild kommt, wenn ich auch wohl nichts davon verstehe. Duerfte ich Sie wohl bitten mir, wenn es soweit ist, eines zukommen zu lassen, wenn es auch nur zur Ansicht ist, ich kann es ja spaeter zurueckschicken. Ein Herr Kursch von hier, hat an Sie Herr Professor geschrieben, da er aber nur Minnesota auf Ihre Adresse geschrieben, wird der Brief wohl kaum in Ihre Haende gelangt sein.

An Hernn Professor Gehrcke will ich schreiben und ihn bitten, mir doch zu

erklären wie sich eigentlich die Einstein'sche Sache verhält, ich weiss davon so wenig. Indem ich Ihrer Schrift recht viel Glück auf den Weg wünsche, bleibe ich, hochachtungsvoll und ergebenst

Marta Gerber²⁸⁰¹

and,

“Stargard d. 2. 10. 21.

Sehr geehrter Herr Professor!

Herr Prof. Gehrke sandte mir gestern 2 Checks ueber 200 Mk. fuer die ich Ihnen Herr Professor herzlich danke.

Auch fuer Ihren so liebenswuerdigen Brief an Herrn Kursch vielen vielen Dank. Auf dem Bild sieht mein Mann so ernst aus und doch konnte er so vergnuegt sein und so herzlich lachen. Vielleicht interessiert es Sie, Herr Professor etwas naeheres ueber das Leben meines Mannes zu hoeren. In Berlin, wo sein Vater Kaufmann war, ist er geboren, hat dort die Schule besucht, ‘das graue Kloster’ hiess das Gymnasium, studiert hat er auch in Berlin; er wollte, als er die Stelle, an der hiesigen, jetzigen Oberschule hier annahm, gar nicht seine Buecher auspacken, weil er hoffte recht bald nach Berlin zurueck zu kommen. Diese Hoffnung hat sich nicht erfuellt. In Freiburg in Baden ist er 1909 gestorben, 55 Jahre alt. Wir waren oben im Gebirge [das muss der black forest gewesen sein—Friedwardt Winterberg], als er einen Schlaganfall bekam, er wurde noch nach Freiburg ins Krankenhaus gebracht, wo er nach zwei Wochen starb, ohne die Besinnung zurueck zu bekommen. Traurige Ferienreise, nicht wahr? Hier in Stargard ist er begraben. 26 Jahre waren wir verheiratet unser einzigstes Kind starb als es 1 1/2 Jahre alt war. Zuerst wurde es mir, als geborene Rheinlaenderin recht schwer hier, mich einzuleben und als mein Mann gestorben war und ich wohnen konnte wo ich wollte, blieb ich doch hier, obwohl meine Geschwister am Rhein und in Westfalen wohnen. In diesem Jahr feierte mein Bruder seinen 70 ten Geburtstag, ich waere so gerne hingefahren, wie ich es vor dem Krieg auch oefter getan, aber die fahrt auf der Bahn kostete allein 500 Mk. also war an eine Reise nicht zu denken. Was hat uns doch der Krieg fuer ein Elend gebracht und was wird noch kommen? Aber alles Klagen nutzt nichts, wir muessen auf bessere Zeiten hoffen, und wuenschen das wir sie noch erleben. Hoffentlich habe ich Sie Herr Professor, mit meinem Schreiben nicht gelangweilt und bleibe ich mit vorzueglicher Hochachtung ergebenst Marta Gerber.

Am 8. Sept. habe ich Ihnen die beiden Bilder an Sie abgeschickt, hoffentlich sind sie jetzt schon in Ihrem Besitz, Herr Professor.”²⁸⁰²

12.6 Conclusion

Edouard Guillaume stated in 1920,

“The expression $\epsilon = \frac{6\pi\mu m}{a(1-e^2)}$ was given for the first time by the German physicist Gerber.”

“L’expression (37) a été donnée pour la première fois par le physicien allemand Gerber.”²⁸⁰³

Stjepan Mohorovičić wrote in 1922,

“In the general theory of relativity, Einstein tried to explain the perihelion shift of the planets, and he arrived at the same formula P. Gerber had found a long time before him, based on the assumption that the effects of gravitation do not propagate at an infinite speed in space.”

“In der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie hat Einstein versucht, die Perihelverschiebung der Planeten zu erklären, und er gelangte zu derselben Formel⁴⁷⁾, welche längst vorher P. Gerber⁴⁸⁾ gefunden hat, unter der Voraussetzung, daß die Wirkung der Gravitation (der Schwerkraft) sich im Raume nicht unendlich rasch fortpflanzt.”²⁸⁰⁴

Similar statements, or more direct accusations of Einstein's plagiarism of Gerber's work, are found in the writings of Gehrcke, Silberstein, Lenard, Reuterdahl, See, Weyland, Riem, Glaser, Gleich, Roseveare, Beckmann, and others.²⁸⁰⁵

While there has long been a controversy over the viability of Gerber's theory, such a controversy cannot take from the man his priority for producing the correct formula for the perihelion motion of Mercury long before Einstein plagiarized it (if indeed the formula is correct²⁸⁰⁶). Nor would any flaw in Gerber's derivation or theorization preclude the possibility of Einstein's plagiarism. Einstein simply worked inductively from Gerber's successful result to fabricate a theory around it, and in the process was forced to fudge his equations. Ludwig Silberstein, who assumed that Einstein had independently derived Gerber's much older formula, nevertheless insisted that it be properly called “Gerber's formula”. Silberstein wrote in March of 1917, *inter alia*,

“It is well known that as early as 1845 Le Verrier found that the motion of the perihelion of Mercury, as derived from observations of transits, was greater by $38''$ per century than it should be from the perturbation due to all the other planets of our system. A recent discussion of the subsequent investigations has shown the excess of motion to be about $5''$ greater, viz., per century,

$$\delta\omega = +42''.9.$$

Equally well known are the attempts of Newcomb and of Seeliger to account for this excess of motion of Mercury's perihelion. A discussion of Seeliger's results (which, broadly speaking, were very satisfactory) and a modification of his treatment have been given by H. Jeffreys (*M. N.*, vol. lxxvii. p. 112). On the other hand, a great sensation has been recently produced among astronomers by the surprising circumstance that Einstein's newest 'generalised theory of relativity' has yielded for the said excess just its full value, *i.e.*, in round figures, 43''. In fact, Einstein gives in his recent paper, [Footnote: *Annalen der Physik*, vol. xlix., 1916, pp. 769-822. See also Professor de Sitter's papers in *M. N.*, vol. lxxvi., 1916, p. 699, and vol. lxxvii. p. 155.] for the angle ϵ through which the elliptic orbit of a planet is turned, in the direction of motion, per period T , the formula

$$\epsilon = 24\pi^3 \frac{a^2}{T^2 c^2 (1 - e^2)}. \quad (G)$$

where a , e stand for the major semi-axis and the eccentricity of the orbit, and c is the velocity of light in empty space. Substituting $a = 0.3871 \cdot 1.49 \cdot 10^6 \text{ km.}$, $e = 0.206$, $T \doteq 87.97 \text{ days}$, $c = 3 \cdot 10^5 \text{ km./sec.}$, the reader will find, for $\delta\omega$ per century, 43''.1, which is the desired angle. The reason why I have denoted the above formula by (G) is, with all respect due to Einstein, that identically the same formula was given eighteen years earlier by Gerber, [Footnote: P. Gerber, *Zeitschr. math. Phys.*, xliii., 1898, pp. 93-104. A short account of Gerber's theory is given in *Enc. d. math. Wiss.*, vol. V. I, pp. 49-51; a still shorter, and very unfair, account is given by Herr E. Gehrcke in *Annalen der Physik*, li., 1916, pp. 122-124.] whose investigation, entirely independent of any relativity ('old' or 'new'), seems to have passed unobserved, most likely owing to its badly supported fundamental assumptions. To enter upon these latter would not answer the purposes of the present paper. It may, however, be interesting to notice that Gerber replaces Newton's potential $\frac{M}{r}$ by $\frac{M}{r \left(1 - \frac{1}{c} \frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2}$,

where c is the 'velocity of propagation of the gravitation potential'; rejecting the third, and the higher, powers of dr/cdt , Gerber obtains for any (isolated) planet in its motion round the central body the above formula. It is historically interesting that Gerber does not identify c with the velocity of light, but determines its value from the observed excess of the secular motion of the perihelion of Mercury, and finds $c = 305\,500 \text{ km./sec.}$, *i.e.* 'surprisingly near the light velocity.' Thus, whatever his theory, the formula

(G), accounting for *the full excess* of Mercury's perihelion motion, will appropriately be called *Gerber's formula*.

Now, to repeat it, Gerber has deduced his formula from an untenable theory, or at least from one which has not been based upon well-established general principles. Einstein, eighteen years later, but undoubtedly without knowing Gerber's formula, has rediscovered it by deducing it from his 'generalised' theory of relativity, which, in its turn, is again very far from being well established. In fact, notwithstanding its broadness and mathematical elegance, it certainly offers many serious difficulties in its very foundations, while none of its predictions of new phenomena, as the deflection of a ray by the sun, have thus far been verified. And even the fact that Einstein's new theory gives Gerber's formula, and therefore the *full excess* of 43'' for Mercury, does not seem to be decisive in its favour. As far as I can understand from Jeffreys's investigation, [*Footnote: loc. cit.*, see especially p. 113, and the final paragraph of the paper, p. 118.] it would rather alleviate the astronomer's difficulties if the Sun by itself gave only a *part* of these 43 seconds."²⁸⁰⁷

Prof. Friedwardt Winterberg contends that Einstein (who as of 18 November 1915 had not yet plagiarized Hilbert's generally covariant field equations of gravitation, and, therefore, did not have a tenable theory) fudged the equations to produce the forced result, Gerber's result, by taking *half* of the solar mass. Einstein's fudge factor also doubled the value of the Newtonian prediction of the total deflection of a light ray grazing the Sun coming from infinity and passing to infinity, by halving the result of Einstein's erroneous 18 November 1915 theory; which, if stated consistently, predicts a deflection four times as great as the Newtonian prediction.²⁸⁰⁸

Those who would deny Gerber's priority based on perceived flaws in his derivation and/or theorization must likewise deny Einstein any priority. However, Gerber deserves credit for first stating the formula. Zenneck proposed that we assume for the speed of gravity the speed of light and employ Gerber's formula as an accurate description of the perihelion motion of Mercury. Cunningham deserves credit for introducing Gerber's formula into the theory of relativity as the fulfillment of the principle of relativity. Grossmann and Hilbert derived the generally covariant field equations of gravitation of the general theory of relativity. To Schwarzschild²⁸⁰⁹ goes the honor of first providing the correct and exact derivation of Gerber's formula in the general theory of relativity.

13 SOLDNER'S PREDICTION

In 1919, (on dubious grounds²⁸¹⁰) Frank Watson Dyson, Charles Davidson and Arthur Stanley Eddington made Albert Einstein internationally famous by affirming that experiment had confirmed, without an attribution to Soldner, Johann Georg von Soldner's 1801 hypothesis that the gravitational field of the Sun should curve the path of a light ray coming from a star and grazing the limb of the Sun.²⁸¹¹ Shortly after that Einstein won the Nobel Prize, though it is unclear why he won it, other than as a reward for his newly found fame for reiterating Soldner's ideas, and for his pacifist stance during World War I—the law of the photoelectric effect was mentioned as a possible reason for the prize.

“That the idea of a bending of light rays was bound to emerge at the time of the emission theory is quite natural, as is the fact that the numerical result is exactly the same as that according to the equivalence hypothesis.”—ALBERT EINSTEIN²⁸¹²

13.1 Introduction

Isaac Newton asked if mass is convertible into light, and wondered if light might be subject to gravity. From Newton's *Opticks*,

“QUERY 1. Do not bodies act upon light at a distance, and by their action bend its rays; and is not this action (*cæteris paribus*) strongest at the least distance?”

and,

“QUERY 30. Are not gross bodies and light convertible into one another, and may not bodies receive much of their activity from the particles of light which enter their composition? [***] The changing of bodies into light, and light into bodies, is very conformable to the course of Nature, which seems delighted with transmutations. [***] [W]hy may not Nature change bodies into light, and light into bodies?”

Newton's corpuscular theory of light demands that light be subject to the force of gravity. As a result, Newton's theory predicts that light emitted from a distant star grazing the Sun is deflected by the gravitational field of the Sun before it reaches the Earth. This predicted effect was already known in the 1700's.²⁸¹³ Huyghens' wave theory of light produces the same result on other grounds. It is theoretically possible to measure the amount of any deflection during an eclipse of the Sun.

Arthur Stanley Eddington acknowledged Newton's priority for predicting that gravitational fields would deflect the path of a ray of light. *The Times* of London reported on 28 November 1919, on page 14,

“PROFESSOR EDDINGTON ON NEWTON’S
FORESIGHT.

In an article in the *Contemporary Review* on ‘Einstein’s Theory of Space and Time,’ Professor A. S. Eddington, referring to the recent observations of the eclipse of the sun, says:—

‘The deflection of the star images means a bending of the ray of light as it passes near the sun, just as though the light had weight which caused it to drop towards the sun. But it is not the bending of light that threatens the downfall of Newton. On the contrary, were Newton alive he would be congratulating himself on his foresight. In his ‘Opticks’ we read:—Query 1.—Do not bodies act upon light at a distance, and by their action bend its rays, and is not this action (*cæteris paribus*) strongest at the least distance?

‘Weight of light seemed less strange to Newton than to us, because he believed light to consist of minute corpuscles, whereas for us the bending of a wave of light is a much more difficult conception. This confirmation of Newton’s speculation is in itself a striking result; it might perhaps be described as the first new thing that has been learnt about gravitation in more than 200 years.’

13.2 Soldner’s Hypothesis and Solution

Johann Georg von Soldner²⁸¹⁴ predicted in 1801 and that the gravitational mass of a ray of light from a distant star would curve its trajectory when it passed near the Sun. Soldner gave a value for the deflection twice as great as the Newtonian prediction, as did Einstein, the second time around. Soldner anticipated Einstein by more than a century.²⁸¹⁵

In 1907, Albert Einstein wrote without an attribution to anyone,

“As a result, the light rays which do not proceed along the ξ - axis are bent by the gravitational field; as is easily seen, the deflection comes to $\frac{\gamma}{c^2} \sin \varphi$

per centimeter of the path of light, where φ is the angle between the direction of the gravitational force and that of the ray of light.

Employing these equations and those equations known from the optics of resting bodies among the field strength and electrical current at a point, we are able to determine the influence of the gravitational field on optical phenomena in resting bodies. We must keep in mind the fact that the equations of the optics of resting bodies hold for the local time σ . Unfortunately, according to our theory, the influence of the gravitational field of the Earth is so slight (owing to the minuteness of $\frac{\gamma x}{c^2}$), as to afford no possibility to test the results of the theory against experience.”²⁸¹⁶

Einstein's lamentations remind one of Soldner's work of 1801.

In 1911, Einstein repeated the Newtonian prediction²⁸¹⁷ for the deflection of a light ray grazing the limb of the Sun without giving an attribution to anyone:

“By equation (4) a ray of light passing along by a heavenly body suffers a deflexion to the side of the diminishing gravitational potential, that is, on the side directed toward the heavenly body, of the magnitude

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{c^2} \int_{\theta = -\frac{1}{2}\pi}^{\theta = \frac{1}{2}\pi} \frac{kM}{r^2} \cos \theta ds = 2 \frac{kM}{c^2 \Delta}$$

where k denotes the constant of gravitation, M the mass of the heavenly body, Δ the distance of the ray from the centre of the body. A ray of light going past the Sun would accordingly undergo deflexion to the amount of $4 \cdot 10^{-6} = \cdot 83$ seconds of arc. The angular distance of the star from the centre of the Sun appears to be increased by this amount. As the fixed stars in the parts of the sky near the Sun are visible during total eclipses of the Sun, this consequence of the theory may be compared with experience. With the planet Jupiter the displacement to be expected reaches to about $\frac{1}{100}$ of the amount given. It would be a most desirable thing if astronomers would take up the question here raised. For apart from any theory there is the question whether it is possible with the equipment at present available to detect an influence of gravitational fields on the propagation of light.”²⁸¹⁸

As was demonstrated in Section 12.4 *Einstein's Fudge*, Einstein mysteriously doubled the predicted amount of deflection in 1915, which is to say he doubled the value of the Newtonian prediction to match Soldner's 1801 prediction. Einstein based this new prediction upon his erroneous assumption that $\sum T_{\mu}^{\mu} = 0$ for the trace of the energy-momentum tensor of matter, which should have netted him a quadrupled value had he been logically consistent and had he not fudged his equations by halving the mass of the Sun. Einstein wrote on 18 November 1915, without giving an attribution to anyone:

“Upon the application of Huygen's principle, we find from equations (5) and (4b), after a simple calculation, that a light ray passing at a distance Δ suffers an angular deflection of magnitude $2\alpha/\Delta$, while the earlier calculation, which was not based upon the hypothesis $\sum T_{\mu}^{\mu} = 0$, had produced the value α/Δ . A light ray grazing the surface of the sun should experience a deflection of 1.7 sec of arc instead of 0.85 sec of arc.”²⁸¹⁹

This doubled figure is quite significant, in that it enabled Einstein to distinguish his work from Newton's and it was this doubled figure which was allegedly confirmed in 1919 by the dubious eclipse observations of Dyson, *et al.*—an event which made Einstein world-famous almost overnight. In truth, the eclipse observations did not achieve the results or the accuracy claimed and were little more than a publicity stunt and a fraud perpetrated on the general public. Before this event, the general public had not yet become acquainted with Albert Einstein. After this event, Einstein was promoted as the new Newton and immediately became an international celebrity. The story of the eclipse observations and Einstein's alleged greatness was covered by most every major newspaper around the world.

Prof. Friedwardt Winterberg holds that Einstein's doubled figure, which nearly matches Soldner's 1801 value, is the result of Einstein's fudging of the figures in his attempts to appropriate Gerber's formula for the perihelion motion of Mercury. Prof. Winterberg argues that Einstein, before having the benefit of plagiarizing Hilbert's generally covariant field equations of gravitation, used *half* of the solar mass in Einstein's formulation of the perihelion motion of Mercury. This inductively determined fudge factor allowed him to deduce Gerber's result *and Soldner's result*. However, Einstein's 18 November 1915 theory, if it were stated in consistent terms, results in a prediction of the deflection of a ray of light *four* times as great as the Newtonian prediction.

13.3 Einstein Knew the Newtonian Prediction

Soldner's work of 1801 was fresh on the mind's of physicists in 1915. Franz Johann Müller presented an analysis of Soldner's work in 1914. Müller wrote,

“3. Über die Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahls von seiner geradlinigen Bewegung durch die Attraktion eines Weltkörpers, an welchem er nahe vorbeigeht.

Soldner kommt auf Grund der zu seiner Zeit herrschenden Newton'schen Emanationstheorie zu der Ansicht, daß der Lichtstrahl die Bahn eines mit Lichtstoff angefüllten (schweren) Massenpunktes sei, welcher der Newton'schen Attraktion unterworfen ist. Hiemit ist die Aufgabe auf ein äußerst einfaches Problem der Punktmechanik zurückgeführt.

Soldner läßt den leuchtenden Punkt von der Oberfläche des störenden Körpers in den Weltraum hinausgehen und findet dadurch, daß die Bahnkurve zur Verbindungslinie des Anfangspunktes (vielmehr Endpunktes) und dem Zentrum des störenden Körpers symmetrisch sein muß, weil die Bedingungen auf beiden Seiten dieser Geraden dieselben sind.

Aus den Elementen der Mechanik ist bekannt, daß ein so affizierter Massenpunkt einen Kegelschnitt beschreibt, dessen einer Brennpunkt mit dem Attraktionszentrum zusammenfällt und dessen Hauptachsenrichtung durch die oben beschriebene Gerade gegeben ist.

Die Exzentrizität ε des in Frage stehenden Kegelschnitts ist gegeben durch die Formel:

$$\varepsilon = \sqrt{1 + \frac{K^2}{\mu^2} \left[C^2 - \frac{2\mu}{n} \right]}$$

k ist die Konstante des Flächensatzes, C die Lichtgeschwindigkeit. Da Soldner in seiner Überlegung die Bewegung in einem Scheitelpunkt beginnen läßt, so findet er $k = C$; μ ist die am störenden Himmelskörper herrschende Schwerebeschleunigung. Da die Lichtgeschwindigkeit pro Sekunde bekanntlich 308 043 km beträgt, so ist ohne weiteres klar, daß die in obiger Formel auftretende algebraische Summe stets positiv ist. Die Bahn ist also hyperbolisch. Soldner denkt sich den leuchtenden Punkt als aus dem Unendlichen kommend, so daß die Ablenkung w aus der im Horizonte des Beobachtungsortes nach dem leuchtenden Punkt gezogenen Geraden durch die Gleichung:

$$\operatorname{tg} w = \frac{\mu}{C \sqrt{C^2 - \frac{2\mu}{n}}} \quad (\text{Asymptotenwinkel})$$

geben ist.

n setzt Soldner gleich der Einheit; der wirkliche Wert dieser Größe ist:

$$\sqrt{a^2 + b^2} - a.$$

wo a und b die zwei Achsen der Hyperbel vorstellen.

Für die Erde als störenden Körper findet Soldner:

$$w = 0,0009798''.$$

Er schließt seine Untersuchung mit den Worten: „Also ist es ausgemacht, daß man, wenigstens bei dem jetzigen Zustande der praktischen Astronomie, nicht nötig hat, auf die Perturbationen der Lichtstrahlen durch anziehende Weltkörper Rücksicht zu nehmen.“²⁸²⁰

Albert Einstein knew in 1911 that he was only repeating the Newtonian prediction for the deflection of light based upon the “corpuscular” emission theory of light. Einstein wrote to Erwin Freundlich in August of 1913,

“That the idea of a bending of light rays was bound to emerge at the time of the emission theory is quite natural, as is the fact that the numerical result is

exactly the same as that according to the equivalence hypothesis.²⁸²¹

Jürgen Renn believes that Einstein may have been inspired by Ferdinand Rosenberger's famous book on Newton, *Isaac Newton und seine physikalischen Principien*,

“Nach dieser, der Undulationstheorie jedenfalls nicht günstig erscheinenden Behandlung der Doppelbrechung des Lichtes geht NEWTON ohne weiteres zu den Fragen über, in welchen er nicht bloss alle Aethertheorien mit der Existenz des Aethers selbst für unmöglich erklärt, sondern auch positiv in sehr langen Auseinandersetzungen eine reine Emissionstheorie des Lichtes entwickelt und über die Natur der physikalischen Attraktionen sich weiter und offener als jemals sonst verbreitet. (27.) Muss man nicht, so heisst es nun, alle Hypothesen für unrichtig halten, welche, wie man das bisher gethan, die Erscheinungen des Lichtes aus neuen Modifikationen erklären wollen, die die Lichtstrahlen erst auf ihrem Wege durch dichtere Mittel erleiden und die nicht ursprünglich dem Licht eigenthümlich sind? (28.) Sind nicht alle Hypothesen, welche das Wesen des Lichtes als einen Druck oder eine Bewegung auffassen, die in einem flüssigen Medium fortgepflanzt werden, schon darum irrig, weil in allen diesen Hypothesen die Erscheinungen des Lichtes durch Modifikationen erklärt werden müssten, die dasselbe erst in den Körpern erleidet? Wenn das Licht nur aus einem Druck ohne thatsächliche Bewegung bestände, so würde es nicht fähig sein, die Theilchen der Körper in Bewegung zu versetzen und so die Körper zu erhitzen. Wenn es in einer Bewegung bestände, die sich augenblicklich durch alle Entfernungen fortpflanzt, so würde zu seiner Fortpflanzung eine unendlich grosse Kraft gehören. Und wenn es in einem Druck oder einer Bewegung bestände, die sich zeitlich oder momentan verbreiteten, so könnte es sich nicht in geraden Linien an einem Hinderniss vorbei bewegen, sondern müsste sich auch seitwärts in den ruhenden Raum hinter dem Hinderniss ausbreiten. Die Schwere ist nach unten gerichtet, aber der durch dieselbe in einer Flüssigkeit erzeugte Druck breitet sich nach allen Richtungen gleich stark und gleich schnell in geraden, wie in krummen Linien aus. Die Wellen eines stehenden Gewässers gehen nicht einfach an einem Hinderniss vorüber, sondern biegen allmählich in das ruhige Wasser hinter demselben ein. Auch die Wellen und Schwingungen der Luft, durch welche die Tone entstehen, beugen sich augenscheinlich, wenn auch nicht so stark wie die des Wassers; denn der Schall einer Kanone wird auch hinter einem Hügel gehört und der Ton verbreitet sich ebenso durch krumme Pfeifen wie durch gerade. Aber vom Licht bemerken wir niemals, dass es gekrümmten Bahnen folgt, oder dass es in den Schatten einbiegt. Das Licht der Fixsterne verschwindet bei der Dazwischenkunft der Planeten, und ebenso geschieht das bei der Sonne theilweise durch Mond, Venus und Merkur. Zwar werden auch die Lichtstrahlen beim Vorübergange an einem Körper ein wenig gebeugt, aber

diese Beugung geschieht nicht nach dem Schatten hin, sondern von demselben weg und geschieht nur in nächster Nähe des Körpers; dicht hinter demselben setzt der Strahl geradlinig seinen Weg fort. [*Footnote*: HUYGENS hatte allerdings die Undulationstheorie in seinem *Discours de la Lumière* gegen diesen Vorwurf, den NEWTON schon früher erhoben, vertheidigt; der Letztere beachtet nur diese Vertheidigung nicht weiter. HUYGENS meint, dass in der That auch beim Lichte, wie bei jeder Wellenbewegung, eine seitliche Ausbreitung stattfindet; er hält aber dafür, dass diese seitliche Ausbreitung viel zu schwach ist, um als Licht von uns empfunden zu werden. Wenn NEWTON behauptete, sagt er, dass der Schall in voller Stärke auch nach den Seiten sich fortpflanze, so widerspreche das den Beobachtungen am Echo, bei dem sich jedenfalls eine viel stärkere geradlinige Fortpflanzung des Schalles, ja sogar eine Gleichheit von Einfall- und Reflexionswinkel bemerken lasse. (S. *Discours de la Cause de la Pesanteur, Addition*, p. 164 u. p. 165.) Allerdings war die Schwächung des Lichtes bei der seitlichen Ausbreitung hier nur eine Behauptung, die erst in unserem Jahrhundert durch die Interferenz erklärt wurde.] Die ausserordentliche Brechung des isländischen Krystalles durch Fortpflanzung eines Druckes oder einer Bewegung zu erklären, ist bis jetzt meines Wissens nur von HUYGENS versucht worden, welcher zu dem Zwecke zwei verschieden vibrirende Medien in dem Krystalle annahm, der aber selbst erklärte, dass er die oben beschriebene Brechung in zwei auf einander folgenden Stücken nicht zu erklären wisse. [*Footnote*: Vergl. S. 313 dieses Werkes.]”²⁸²²

Others hold that Aaron Bernstein’s popular books on science *Naturwissenschaftliche Volksbücher* influenced Einstein, which books Einstein had read as an adolescent.²⁸²³ Einstein cited none of this work in 1911-1915, though he did discuss it with Alexander Moszkowski shortly thereafter,²⁸²⁴ and mentioned it in his autobiographical statements, in each instance only in the most general of terms,

“Auch hatte ich das Glück, die wesentlichen Ergebnisse und Methoden der gesamten Naturwissenschaft in einer vortrefflichen populären, fast durchweg aufs Qualitative sich beschränkenden Darstellung kennen zu lernen (Bernsteins naturwissenschaftliche Volksbücher, ein Werk von 5 oder 6 Bänden), ein Werk, das ich mit atemloser Spannung las.”²⁸²⁵

Maja Winteler-Einstein also mentioned that her brother Albert had read Bernstein’s books.²⁸²⁶

As Samuel Guggenheimer²⁸²⁷ and Charles Lane Poor²⁸²⁸ discovered, Einstein effectively conceded in 1920 that in 1911 he had simply repeated the Newtonian prediction. Einstein stated,

“It may be added that, according to the theory, half of this deflection is produced by the Newtonian field of attraction of the sun, and the other half

by the geometrical modification ('curvature') of space caused by the sun."²⁸²⁹

After Philipp Lenard and Ernst Gehecke accused Einstein of plagiarism in 1921, which caused an international scandal, Einstein lied in 1923 in a Czech translation of his book *Relativity: The Special and the General Theory* and publicly contradicted his own private statements,

"[. . .]I discovered in 1911 that the principle of equivalence demands a deflection of the light rays passing by the sun with observable magnitude—this without knowing that more than one hundred years ago a similar consequence had been anticipated from Newton's mechanics in combination with Newton's emission theory of light."²⁸³⁰

On the advice of Wodetzky of Budapest, Philipp Lenard noted that Poisson wrote of light's being attracted by gravity, the curvature of a ray of light by the sun, and the change in wavelength of light by the sun.²⁸³¹ Thomas Jefferson Jackson See mentioned the priority of Cavendish, and Jaki²⁸³² and Eisenstaedt²⁸³³ refer to Laplace's and John Michell's priority. In 1801, Soldner published the doubled Newtonian prediction Einstein presented in 1915, as if novel.

Edwin E. Slosson wrote in 1919,

"The amount of the observed angular deviation of the light rays from the straight line is 1.75 seconds, which is the same as was predicted by Einstein in 1911[*sic*], and considerably more than the deviation (.83 second) to be expected if Newton's law of gravitation applied to light."²⁸³⁴

The eclipse observations were one of the big three empirical demonstrations taken to justify the complicated geometry of the general theory of relativity. The eclipse observations were also employed as a publicity stunt to promote Einstein as the new and improved Newton. The other two alleged verifications were the perihelion motion of Mercury and the displacement of spectral lines towards the red.

13.4 Soldner's Formulation

"Two g or not $2g$?" that is the question. It is widely held that Soldner's formulation includes an erroneous factor of two and is not the true Newtonian formulation. Soldner's 1801 factor of two anticipated Einstein's 1915 predicted result by more than a century. Robert Trumpler wrote in the 31 August 1923 edition of *Science*,

"In setting up the differential equations for the motion of the particle [Soldner] erroneously used for the gravitational force the expression

$$2gr^{-2}$$

where g = acceleration at the surface of the attracting body, and

r = distance from the center of the attracting body (adopting the radius of this body as unit distance).

The factor 2 has no justification and should be omitted.”²⁸³⁵

Trumpler wrote to Mr. L. A. Redman on 30 September 1925 and explained that Soldner erred in his first equations:

$$\frac{ddx}{dt^2} = -\frac{2g}{r^2} \cos \varphi \quad (\text{I})$$

$$\frac{ddy}{dt^2} = -\frac{2g}{r^2} \sin \varphi \quad (\text{II})$$

Trumpler contended that,

“If these equations are applied to the point A on the Sun’s surface it will read $\frac{d^2x}{dt^2} = -2g$ or the acceleration is equal to twice the acceleration: $1 = 2$ which evidently must be wrong.”²⁸³⁶

Soldner not only revealed his doubled Newtonian prediction in his equations, but also in his diagram, and on page 170 of his paper he states,

“If one were to investigate by means of the given formula how much the moon would deviate a light ray when it goes by the moon and comes to earth, then one must, after substituting the corresponding magnitudes and taking the radius of the moon for unity, double the value found through the formula, because a light ray, which goes by the moon and comes to the earth describes two arms of a hyperbola.”²⁸³⁷

In 1918, Eddington asserted that Einstein’s 1915 prediction was twice that of the Newtonian prediction.²⁸³⁸ H. H. Turner wrote on 30 November 1919, where E is Einstein and N is Newton,

“On Einstein’s theory the deflection would be just twice this amount, $E = 2N$.”²⁸³⁹

Arvid Reuterdaahl stated on 22 March 1924,

“In *Science* (August 31, 1923), Dr. Robert Trumpler calls attention to the *error in Soldner’s work*. Note that it is Soldner that is wrong despite the fact that Einstein’s 1911 formula is identical with that of Soldner. It is also curious that when Einstein tried again in 1916 to produce a formula it did not

agree with his first effort, in fact, the 1916 formula gives a value twice as large as the one of 1911. Both are right according to the Einsteinians:—*two equals one.*”²⁸⁴⁰

Reuterdaahl, relying upon Philipp Lenard's somewhat confusing analysis, mistakenly believed that Soldner's result matched Einstein's 1911 prediction, when in fact it comes closer to Einstein's revised 1915 prediction. (Abraham Pais²⁸⁴¹ and many others have made the same mistake Reuterdaahl made.) In fact,

$$E = \frac{1}{2}E'' = 2E' = S = 2N,$$

where E is Einstein's 18 November 1915 prediction, E'' is the prediction Einstein's 18 November 1915 paper would have presented, if it were expressed in logically consistent terms, S is Soldner's 1801 prediction (warts and all), and E' is Einstein's 1911 prediction, which simply duplicates the Newtonian prediction N . Reuterdaahl later came to understand what Soldner had predicted and spent years trying to justify his prediction, claiming that it is the correct Newtonian prediction.

Some have speculated as to why Soldner might have added the factor of two. Richard de Villamil argued in a letter to Arvid Reuterdaahl²⁸⁴² (in which de Villamil called Einstein's "Relativity" the "finest spoof of the century!" nay, "of modern times") that Soldner's logic should have led him to,

$$v = -\frac{G}{R^2} \times \text{Time}$$

which after differentiating becomes,

$$\frac{d^2x}{dt^2} = -\frac{G}{R^2}.$$

de Villamil notes that Soldner instead refers to Laplace's equation of velocity in *distance* or *space*, as opposed to *time*,

$$v^2 = -2\frac{G}{R^2} \times \text{Distance} + \text{constant}$$

or,

$$\left(\frac{dx}{dt}\right)^2 = \frac{dx^2}{dt^2} = -\frac{2G}{R^2} \times \text{Distance} + \text{constant}.$$

de Villamil holds that if $\frac{d^2x}{dt^2}$ is correct, then Soldner's $2g$ should be g , and if

Soldner had instead,

“differentiated v^2 he would have got a ‘2’ on the left side of his equation ;
 [i. e. $2 \cdot \frac{d^2 x}{dt^2} = -\frac{2G}{R^2}$] and, eventually, this would (after cancelling the
 ‘2’s) have resolved itself into $\frac{d^2 x}{dt^2} = -\frac{G}{R^2}$!”

de Villamil concludes,

“Soldner in differentiating $\left(\frac{dx}{dt}\right)^2$ squared, appears to have overlooked that
 this involves the use of a ‘2’.”²⁸⁴³

13.5 Conclusion

In the case of the Sun, Soldner gives a prediction of $\omega = 0''.84$ for *half* of the deflection of a ray of light going from infinity past the sun to infinity; and $1''.68$ for the full deflection from infinity to infinity—quite nearly the same as Einstein’s $1''.7$ of 1915—which was allegedly confirmed in 1919. As is the case with Paul Gerber, either Johann Georg von Soldner deserves credit for first making the correct prediction, or Einstein deserves no credit due to his flawed derivation based on half of the solar mass and his erroneous hypothesis that $T = 0$ for the trace of the energy-momentum tensor of matter.

14 THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUIVALENCE, ETC.

Albert Einstein was fond of propounding thought experiments as if they would somehow account for the research he had never conducted. Einstein also tried to lay claim to well-known experimental facts by propounding that a posteriori problems were instead a priori first principles. He confused induction with deduction and analysis with synthesis. However, even Einstein's thought experiments were unoriginal.

“In 1907 Planck broke new ground. It had been established by the careful experiments of R. v. Eötvös that *inertial mass* [***] and *gravitational mass* [***] are always exactly equal [***] Now, said Planck, all energy has inertial properties, and therefore *all energy must gravitate*. Six months later Einstein published a memoir in which he introduced what he later called the *Principle of Equivalence*[.]”—SIR EDMUND WHITTAKER²⁸⁴⁴

14.1 Introduction

Galileo Galilei criticized Aristotle for leaving to logic and assumption that which could be experimentally tested. Albert Einstein became famous for pretending that he had used logic and assumption to create “thought experiments” in lieu of real experiments. In fact, Einstein either copied these thought experiments from his predecessors, or converted the actual experiments others had performed into “thought experiments” so that he could lay claim to them as if he were the first to argue the point. Just as Galileo disproved many of Aristotle’s assumptions, many of the fundamental assumptions of the theory of relativity have been physically contradicted.

14.2 Eötvös’ Experimental Fact and Planck’s Proposition

Maxwell’s equations implicitly contain the formula $E = mc^2$. Simon Newcomb pioneered the concept of relativistic energy in 1889.²⁸⁴⁵ S. Tolver Preston,²⁸⁴⁶ J. J. Thomson,²⁸⁴⁷ Henri Poincaré,²⁸⁴⁸ Olinto De Pretto,²⁸⁴⁹ Fritz Hasenöhl,²⁸⁵⁰ [etc. etc. etc.] each effectively (Albert Einstein, himself, did not expressly state it in 1905), or directly, presented the formula $E = mc^2$, before 1905, and Max Planck²⁸⁵¹ refined the concept in 1906-1908, including Galileo’s,²⁸⁵² Huyghens’,²⁸⁵³ Newton’s,²⁸⁵⁴ Boscovich’s,²⁸⁵⁵ Schopenhauer’s,²⁸⁵⁶ Mach’s,²⁸⁵⁷ Bolliger’s,²⁸⁵⁸ Geissler’s,²⁸⁵⁹ Bessel’s,²⁸⁶⁰ Stas’,²⁸⁶¹ Eötvös’,²⁸⁶² Kreichgauer’s,²⁸⁶³ Landolt’s,²⁸⁶⁴ Heydweiller’s,²⁸⁶⁵ and Hecker’s implications that inertial mass and gravitational mass are equivalent—before Albert Einstein.²⁸⁶⁶ Einstein was familiar with Henri Poincaré’s 1900 paper, which implicitly contained the formula $E = mc^2$, and which presented the thought experiment of synchronizing clocks with light signals that Einstein copied without an attribution.²⁸⁶⁷ Einstein also copied Hasenöhl’s thought

experiments without an attribution.²⁸⁶⁸

With respect to Planck's equation,²⁸⁶⁹ G. N. Lewis gave us relativistic mass in 1908,²⁸⁷⁰ and in 1909,

“drew attention to the formula for the kinetic energy

$$\frac{m_0 c^2}{(1 - v^2/c^2)^{1/2}} - m_0 c^2$$

and suggested that the last term should be interpreted as the energy of the particle at rest.²⁸⁷¹

Louis Rougier's *Philosophy and the New Physics*²⁸⁷² contains much useful information on this subject. Max Jammer's *Concepts of Mass in Classical and Modern Physics*²⁸⁷³ is yet more detailed, and Sir Edmund Whittaker's *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity* in two volumes is phenomenal.

In 1908, Einstein published a review article on the special theory of relativity. Einstein²⁸⁷⁴ cited Planck's earlier 1907 work, which enunciated the principle of equivalence of inertial and gravitational mass. Later, in the same paper, Einstein appears to “nostrify” the principle.

Max Planck wrote on 13 June 1907, before Einstein ever touched upon the subject,

“An diese Betrachtung schliesst sich sogleich ein drittes Beispiel, nämlich die Frage nach der Identität von träger und ponderabler Masse. Die Wärmestrahlung in einem vollständig evacuirten, von spiegelnden Wänden begrenzten Raume besitzt sicher träge Masse; aber besitzt sie auch ponderable Masse? Wenn diese Frage zu verneinen ist, was wohl das Nächstliegende sein dürfte, so ist damit offenbar die durch alle bisherige Erfahrungen bestätigte und allgemein angenommene Identität von träger und ponderabler Masse aufgehoben. Man darf nicht einwenden, dass die Trägheit der Hohlraumstrahlung unmerklich klein ist gegen die der begrenzenden materiellen Wände. Im Gegentheil: durch ein gehörig grosses Volumen des Hohlraumes lässt sich die Trägheit der Strahlung sogar beliebig gross machen gegen die der Wände. Eine solche, durch dünne starre spiegelnde Wände von dem äusseren Raum vollständig abgeschlossene, im Übrigen frei bewegliche Hohlraumstrahlung liefert ein anschauliches Beispiel eines starren Körpers, dessen Bewegungsgesetze von denen der gewöhnlichen Mechanik total abweichen. Denn während er, äusserlich betrachtet, sich durch Nichts von anderen starren Körpern unterscheidet, auch eine gewisse träge Masse besitzt und dem Gesetz des Beharrungsvermögens gehorcht, ändert sich seine Masse merklich mit der Temperatur, ausserdem hängt sie in bestimmter angebbarer Weise von der Grösse der Geschwindigkeit ab sowie von der Richtung, welche die bewegende Kraft mit der

Geschwindigkeit bildet. Dabei haben die Eigenschaften eines solchen Körpers gar nichts Hypothetisches an sich, sondern lassen sich quantitativ in allen Einzelheiten aus bekannten Gesetzen ableiten.

Angesichts der geschilderten Sachlage, durch welche einige der bisher gewöhnlich als festeste Stütze für theoretische Betrachtungen aller Art benutzten Anschauungen und Sätze ihres allgemeinen Charakters entkleidet werden, muss es als eine Aufgabe von besonderer Wichtigkeit erscheinen, unter den Sätzen, welche bisher der allgemeinen Dynamik zu Grunde gelegt wurden, diejenigen herauszugreifen und besonders in den Vordergrund zu stellen, welche sich auch den Ergebnissen der neuesten Forschungen gegenüber als absolut genau bewährt haben; denn sie allein werden fernerhin Anspruch erheben dürfen, als Fundamente der Dynamik Verwendung zu finden. Damit soll natürlich nicht gesagt werden, dass die oben als merklich unexact gekennzeichneten Sätze künftig ausser Gebrauch zu setzen wären: denn die enorme praktische Bedeutung, welche die Zerlegung der Energie in eine innere und eine fortschreitende, oder die Annahme der absoluten Unveränderlichkeit der Masse, oder die Voraussetzung der Identität der trägen und der ponderablen Masse in der ungeheuren Mehrzahl aller Fälle besitzt, wird ja durch die hier angestellten Betrachtungen überhaupt gar nicht berührt, und niemals wird man in die Lage kommen, auf die Benutzung jener so wesentlich vereinfachenden Annahmen Verzicht leisten zu können. Aber vom Standpunkt der allgemeinen Theorie aus wird man unbedingt und principiell unterscheiden müssen zwischen solchen Sätzen, die nur als Annäherungen aufzufassen sind, und solchen, welche genaue Gültigkeit beanspruchen, schon deshalb, weil heute noch gar nicht abzusehen ist, zu welchen Konsequenzen die Weiterentwicklung der exacten Theorie einmal führen wird; sind ja doch häufig genug weitreichende Umwälzungen, auch in der Praxis, von der Entdeckung fast unmerklich kleiner Ungenauigkeiten in einer bis dahin allgemein für exact gehaltenen Theorie ausgegangen.

Fragen wir daher nach den wirklich exacten Grundlagen der allgemeinen Dynamik, so bleibt von allen bekannten Sätzen zunächst nur übrig das Princip der kleinsten Wirkung, welches, wie H. VON HELMHOLTZ [*Footnote*: H. VON HELMHOLTZ, Wissenschaftl. Abhandl. III, S. 203, 1895.] nachgewiesen hat, die Mechanik, die Elektrodynamik und die beiden Hauptsätze der Thermodynamik in ihrer Anwendung auf reversible Prozesse umfasst. Dass in dem nämlichen Princip auch die Gesetze einer bewegten Hohlraumstrahlung enthalten sind, habe ich im Folgenden (vergl. unten Gl. [12]) besonders gezeigt. Aber das Princip der kleinsten Wirkung genügt noch nicht zur Fundamentirung einer vollständigen Dynamik ponderabler Körper; denn für sich allein gewährt es keinen Ersatz für die oben als unhaltbar nachgewiesene und daher hier nicht einzuführende Zerlegung der Energie eines Körpers in eine fortschreitende und eine innere Energie. Dagegen steht ein solcher Ersatz in vollem Umfang in Aussicht bei der Einführung eines anderen Theorems: des von H. A. LORENTZ [*Footnote*: H. A. LORENTZ, Versl. Kon. Akad. v. Wet., Amsterdam S. 809, 1904.] und

in allgemeinsten Fassung von A. EINSTEIN [*Footnote*: A. EINSTEIN, Ann. D. Phys. (4) 17, S. 891, 1905.] ausgesprochenen **P r i n c i p s d e r R e l a t i v i t ä t**. Wenn auch von directen Bestätigungen der Gültigkeit dieses Principis nur eine einzige, allerdings sehr gewichtige, zu nennen ist: das Ergebniss der Versuche von MICHELSON und MORLEY [*Footnote*: A. A. Michelson und E. W. Morley, Amer. Journ. of Science (3) 34, S. 333, 1887.], so ist doch andererseits bis jetzt keine Thatsache bekannt, die es direct hinderte, diesem Princip allgemeine und absolute Genauigkeit zuzuschreiben. Andererseits erweist sich das Princip als so durchgreifend und fruchtbar, dass eine möglichst eingehende Prüfung wünschenswerth erscheint, und diese kann offenbar nur durch Untersuchung der Consequenzen erfolgen, welche es in sich birgt.

Dieser Erwägung folgend hielt ich es für eine lohnende Aufgabe, die Schlüsse zu entwickeln, zu welchen eine Combination des Principis der Relativität mit dem Princip der kleinsten Wirkung für beliebige ponderable Körper führt. Es haben sich dabei gewisse weitere Ausblicke ergeben, sowie auch einige Folgerungen, die vielleicht einer directen experimentellen Prüfung zugänglich sind.”²⁸⁷⁵

Though Einstein’s 4 December 1907 *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik* article was meant as a review article of the special theory of relativity, Einstein did not refer to any of Poincaré’s many important and relevant works.

Einstein failed to acknowledge that Poincaré had iterated the general principle of relativity, the concept of and exposition on relative simultaneity, the synchronization of clocks by light signals, a generally covariant relativistic theory of gravitation in which gravitational effects propagate at light speed, the group properties of the Lorentz transformation, etc.; before Einstein.²⁸⁷⁶

Einstein again raised the issue of the principle of equivalence in 1911 in a paper he published on the effects of gravity on the propagation of light. Einstein did not mention Planck in this 1911 paper, and Einstein’s “nostrification” of the principle of equivalence of inertial and gravitational mass was complete.

14.3 Kinertia’s Elevator is Einstein’s Happiest Thought

While the principle of equivalence, the excuse given for Einstein’s 1911 Newtonian prediction for the deflection of a light ray grazing the Sun, was known before Einstein was born, tales of its practical manifestation were also enunciated before him in thought experiments and real experiments. There was, of course, Jules Verne’s famous novel of 1865 *From the Earth to the Moon*.²⁸⁷⁷ Then came Kinertia’s elevator and train experiments.

In 1919, Einstein promulgated another of his “Eureka!” stories meant to supply a history of his development of an idea, and passed word among reporters that he had been inspired to independently invent the then well-known inertial and gravitational mass equivalence principle,

“According to tradition, Isaac Newton was led to his theory of gravitation by observing an apple falling from a tree in his garden. The newspaper correspondents start a similar tradition by reporting that Einstein got his theory of gravitation by observing a man falling from the roof of a building in Berlin. Now a man has the advantage of an apple in that he is able to tell his sensations. When Dr. Einstein, who had seen the accident from his library window in the top story of a neighboring apartment house, reached the spot he found the man had hit upon a pile of soft rubbish and had escaped almost without injury. Asked how it felt to fall he told Dr. Einstein that he had no sensation of downward pull at all. This led Dr. Einstein to consider whether the relativity theory, which he had applied only to the case of uniform motion in a straight line, could not be extended to difform or accelerated motion by gravitation. So the special relativity theory which he had enunciated in 1905 developed ten years later into a generalized relativity theory (*Verallgemeinerte Relativitätstheorie*).”²⁸⁷⁸

The New York Times interviewed Albert Einstein and reported on 3 December 1919 that Einstein was,

“Inspired as Newton was[,] but by the fall of a man from a roof instead of the fall of apple. [***] The doctor lives on the top floor of a fashionable apartment house on one of the few elevated spots in Berlin—so to say, close to the stars which he studies, not with a telescope, but rather with the mental eye, and so far only as they come within the range of his mathematical formulae; for he is not an astronomer but a physicist.

It was from his lofty library, in which this conservation took place, that he observed years ago a man dropping from a neighboring roof—luckily on a pile of soft rubbish—and escaping almost without injury. This man told Dr. Einstein that in falling he experienced no sensation commonly considered as the effect of gravity, which, according to Newton’s theory, would pull him down violently toward the earth. This incident, followed by further researches along the same line, started in his mind a complicated chain of thoughts leading finally, as he expressed it, ‘not to a disavowal of Newton’s theory of gravitation, but to a sublimation or supplement of it. [***] It was during the development of the formulas for difform motions that the incident of the man falling from the roof gave me the idea that gravitation might be explained by difform motion.’”²⁸⁷⁹

Einstein’s “Eureka!” story varied and therefore must have been a lie. Einstein stated on 14 December 1922,

“The breakthrough came suddenly one day. I was sitting on a chair in my patent office in Bern. Suddenly a thought struck me: If a man falls freely, he would not feel his weight, I was taken aback. This simple thought experiment made a deep impression on me. This led me to the theory of gravity.”²⁸⁸⁰

In another account written sometime after 22 January 1920, Einstein stated,

“When I was busy (in 1907) writing a summary of my work on the theory of special relativity [***] I got the happiest thought of my life [***] *for an observer in free-fall from the roof of a house there is during the fall—at least in his immediate vicinity—no gravitational field.* Namely, if the observer lets go of any bodies, they remain relative to him, in a state of rest or uniform motion [***] The observer, therefore, is justified in interpreting his state as being ‘at rest.’”²⁸⁸¹

Einstein continues with his story in a fashion that, as Arvid Reuterdaahl noted, is remarkably derivative of the “Kinertia” articles, which had appeared years earlier in *Harper’s Weekly*.

However, as late as 1916, Einstein had not yet revealed his *happiest thought in life*. Instead, Einstein told another “Kinertia” story in 1916, the elevator analogy,

“We imagine a large portion of empty space, so far removed from stars and other appreciable masses that we have before us approximately the conditions required by the fundamental law of Galilei. It is then possible to choose a Galileian reference-body for this part of space (world), relative to which points at rest remain at rest and points in motion continue permanently in uniform rectilinear motion. As reference-body let us imagine a spacious chest resembling a room with an observer inside who is equipped with apparatus. Gravitation naturally does not exist for this observer. He must fasten himself with strings to the floor, otherwise the slightest impact against the floor will cause him to rise slowly towards the ceiling of the room.

To the middle of the lid of the chest is fixed externally a hook with rope attached, and now a ‘being’ (what kind of a being is immaterial to us) begins pulling at this with a constant force. The chest together with the observer then begin to move ‘upwards’ with a uniformly accelerated motion. In course of time their velocity will reach unheard-of values—provided that we are viewing all this from another reference-body which is not being pulled with a rope.

But how does the man in the chest regard the process? The acceleration of the chest will be transmitted to him by the reaction of the floor of the chest. He must therefore take up this pressure by means of his legs if he does not wish to be laid out full length on the floor. He is then standing in the chest in exactly the same way as anyone stands in a room of a house on our earth. If he release a body which he previously had in his hand, the acceleration of the chest will no longer be transmitted to this body, and for this reason the body will approach the floor of the chest with an accelerated relative motion. The observer will further convince himself *that the acceleration of the body towards the floor of the chest is always of the same magnitude, whatever kind of body he may happen to use for the experiment.*

Relying on his knowledge of the gravitational field (as it was discussed

in the preceding section), the man in the chest will thus come to the conclusion that he and the chest are in a gravitational field which is constant with regard to time. Of course he will be puzzled for a moment as to why the chest does not fall in this gravitational field. Just then, however, he discovers the hook in the middle of the lid of the chest and the rope which is attached to it, and he consequently comes to the conclusion that the chest is suspended at rest in the gravitational field.

Ought we to smile at the man and say that he errs in his conclusion? I do not believe we ought to if we wish to remain consistent; we must rather admit that his mode of grasping the situation violates neither reason nor known mechanical laws. Even though it is being accelerated with respect to the 'Galileian space' first considered, we can nevertheless regard the chest as being at rest. We have thus good grounds for extending the principle of relativity to include bodies of reference which are accelerated with respect to each other, and as a result we have gained a powerful argument for a generalised postulate of relativity.

We must note carefully that the possibility of this mode of interpretation rests on the fundamental property of the gravitational field of giving all bodies the same acceleration, or, what comes to the same thing, on the law of the equality of inertial and gravitational mass. If this natural law did not exist, the man in the accelerated chest would not be able to interpret the behaviour of the bodies around him on the supposition of a gravitational field, and he would not be justified on the grounds of experience in supposing his reference-body to be 'at rest.'

Suppose that the man in the chest fixes a rope to the inner side of the lid, and that he attaches a body to the free end of the rope. The result of this will be to stretch the rope so that it will hang 'vertically' downwards. If we ask for an opinion of the cause of tension in the rope, the man in the chest will say: 'The suspended body experiences a downward force in the gravitational field, and this is neutralised by the tension of the rope; what determines the magnitude of the tension of the rope is the *gravitational mass* of the suspended body.' On the other hand, an observer who is poised freely in space will interpret the condition of things thus: 'The rope must perforce take part in the accelerated motion of the chest, and it transmits this motion to the body attached to it. The tension of the rope is just large enough to effect the acceleration of the body. That which determines the magnitude of the tension of the rope is the *inertial mass* of the body.' Guided by this example, we see that our extension of the principle of relativity implies the *necessity* of the law of the equality of inertial and gravitational mass. Thus we have obtained a physical interpretation of this law.

From our consideration of the accelerated chest we see that a general theory of relativity must yield important results on the laws of gravitation. In point of fact, the systematic pursuit of the general idea of relativity has supplied the laws satisfied by the gravitational field. Before proceeding farther, however, I must warn the reader against a misconception suggested

by these considerations. A gravitational field exists for the man in the chest, despite the fact that there was no such field for the co-ordinate system first chosen. Now we might easily suppose that the existence of a gravitational field is always only an *apparent* one. We might also think that, regardless of the kind of gravitational field which may be present, we could always choose another reference-body such that *no* gravitational field exists with reference to it. This is by no means true for all gravitational fields, but only for those of quite special form. It is, for instance, impossible to choose a body of reference such that, as judged from it, the gravitational field of the earth (in its entirety) vanishes.

We can now appreciate why that argument is not convincing, which we brought forward against the general principle of relativity at the end of Section XVIII. It is certainly true that the observer in the railway carriage experiences a jerk forwards as a result of the application of the brake, and that he recognises in this the non-uniformity of motion (retardation) of the carriage. But he is compelled by nobody to refer this jerk to a 'real' acceleration (retardation) of the carriage. He might also interpret his experience thus: 'My body of reference (the carriage) remains permanently at rest. With reference to it, however, there exists (during the period of application of the brakes) a gravitational field which is directed forwards and which is variable with respect to time. Under the influence of this field, the embankment together with the earth moves non-uniformly in such a manner that their original velocity in the backwards direction is continuously reduced.'²⁸⁸²

Jules Verne, whose analysis of the problem was not perfect, wrote in 1865 (and we must not forget Galileo) a story of a projectile-ship, fired from a cannon, carrying men to the moon,

"The president approached the window, and saw a sort of flattened sack floating some yards from the projectile. This object seemed as motionless as the projectile, and was consequently animated with the same ascending movement. [***] 'Because we are floating in space, my dear captain, and in space bodies fall or move (which is the same thing) with equal speed whatever be their weight or form; it is the air, which by its resistance creates these differences in weight. When you create a vacuum in a tube, the objects you send through it, grains of dust or grains of lead, fall with the same rapidity. Here in space is the same cause and the same effect.' [***] In looking through the scuttle Barbicane saw the spectre of the dog, and other divers objects which had been thrown from the projectile, obstinately following them. Diana howled lugubriously on seeing the remains of Satellite, which seemed as motionless as if they reposed on solid earth. [***] Then they struck up a frantic dance, with maniacal gestures, idiotic stampings, and somersaults like those of the boneless clowns in the circus. Diana, joining in the dance, and howling in her turn, jumped to the top of the

projectile. An unaccountable flapping of wings was then heard amid most fantastic cock-crows, while five or six hens fluttered like bats against the walls. [***] Such was their situation; and Barbicane clearly explained the consequences to his travelling companions, which greatly interested them. But how should they know when the projectile had reached this neutral point situated at that distance, especially when neither themselves, nor the objects enclosed in the projectile, would be any longer subject to the laws of weight?

Up to this time, the travellers, while admitting that this action was constantly decreasing, had not yet become sensible to its total absence.

But that day, about eleven o'clock in the morning, Nicholl having accidentally let a glass slip from his hand, the glass, instead of falling, remained suspended in the air.

'Ah!' exclaimed Michel Ardan, 'that is rather an amusing piece of natural philosophy.'

And immediately divers other objects, firearms and bottles, abandoned to themselves, held themselves up as by enchantment. Diana too, placed in space by Michel, reproduced, but without any trick, the wonderful suspension practiced by Caston and Robert Houdin. Indeed the dog did not seem to know that she was floating in air.

The three adventurous companions were surprised and stupefied, despite their scientific reasonings. They felt themselves being carried into the domain of wonders! They felt that weight was really wanting to their bodies. If they stretched out their arms, they did not attempt to fall. Their heads shook on their shoulders. Their feet no longer clung to the floor of the projectile. They were like drunken men having no stability in themselves.

Fancy has depicted men without reflection, others without shadow. But here reality, by the neutralisations of attractive forces, produced men in whom nothing had any weight, and who weighed nothing themselves.

Suddenly Michel, taking a spring, left the floor and remained suspended in the air, like Murillo's monk of the *Cusine des Anges*.

The two friends joined him instantly, and all three formed a miraculous 'Ascension' in the centre of the projectile. [***] A slight side movement brought Michel back toward the padded side; thence he took a bottle and glasses, placed them 'in space' before his companions, and, drinking merrily, they saluted the line with a triple hurrah."

Jules Verne's book was illustrated with images depicting the principle of equivalence. It influenced film pioneer Georges Méliès, whose film *A Trip to the Moon* (*La Voyage dans la Lune*) based on Verne's book appeared in 1902 and was shown around the world. Many of Méliès' films²⁸⁸³ depict the principle of equivalence, perhaps most notably his *Faust in Hell* (*Faust aux Enfers*) of 1903, and Méliès' *The Merry Frolics of Satan* (*Les Quat' Cents Farces du Diable*) of 1906. These films had little competition and were very popular. It is likely that Einstein had seen them.

Robert Stevenson, a.k.a. "Kinertia", was born in Glasgow in 1844. At age 24, he

began to manage the mining interests of Baron Rothschild. In 1882, Stevenson emigrated to the United States and purchased a gold mine in California. He died in New York City, on 2 July 1922, at his residence at 606 West 115th Street; survived by his widow, Georgia Stevenson. In what follows, Stevenson's articles are greatly condensed. All figures have been deleted. The goal here is to record his anticipations of Einstein's thought experiments and the principle of equivalence, with respect to the nature of "weight" and the rejection of the "Newtonian" doctrine of "mutual attraction". Kinertia did *not* present a non-Euclidean geometry to account for the apparent "force" of gravity. Those interested in understanding Kinertia's full theory are encouraged to read his full article. Arvid Reuterdaahl informs us that Kinertia filed a description detailing the mechanical workings of Kinertia's "gravity machine" with the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences on 27 June 1903, which Reuterdaahl describes as,

"The 'gravity machine' of 'Kinertia', when water only is used, generates a spiral vortex in space similar to the vortex of a spiral nebulae. When lead balls are projected from the machine by means of either water or compressed air, then the balls describe elliptical orbits, like the planets, while advancing along the neutral axis of rotation. The resultant path, in the latter case, is therefore an elliptical spiral."²⁸⁸⁴

Reuterdaahl believed that Kinertia was the first to present the path of the planets as a corkscrew in space.

"Kinertia" wrote, *inter alia*, in *Harper's Weekly* in 1914,

"THIS statement is concerning a discovery in natural science, and the ordinary phenomena of daily life, which I discovered about fifteen years ago while engaged in carrying on some experiments to verify what I had previously suspected to be the true physical cause of *Elasticity*, *Gravity*, *Weight* and *Energy*.

While at college in the year 1866, my attention was called by Lord Kelvin to the possibility and importance of the discovery of the true physical cause of Elasticity, and Gravity, which he said for many years engrossed his attention. In his class lectures he devoted much time to the experimental verification of the fundamental principles of the Newtonian system of natural philosophy; and in interpreting an experiment that seemed to establish one of those principles, regarding Newton's theory of force, it struck me that the experiment did not confirm, but rather disproved the action he claimed for it, that in fact his explanation was a misinterpretation of the true action.

As I was too young to challenge his interpretations, I allowed it to remain in abeyance in my mind; and in my practice as an engineer, I often met it as an unsolvable obstacle in many forms of the mechanical application of forces. Theory failed in these particular cases, and empirical formulae were used in text books to meet the requirements of engineering practice.

When I rose in my profession in Great Britain, and was General Manager

of extensive works, I devoted some time to investigating this obscure principle, and corresponded with many of the scientific authorities, such as Kelvin, Tait, and Niven of Cambridge, from 1877 to 1881, but I found that each of them had a different theory of the cause of the discrepancy between theory and practice; and this satisfied me that there was something at the foundation of all natural action which was worth investigating.

Years passed, and through an accident I was deprived of my hearing, causing me to give up my position and go out to California to a rancher's life. There I had a little more leisure, and I worked on this idea until I found it to be the true principle, which as the cause of Elasticity and Gravity, is the fundamental natural cause of all physical phenomena. I found that the fall of bodies is not due to the Newtonian force of attraction inherent in matter.

When I told the scientific authorities this, they seemed to be terribly shocked at such a sacrilegious statement, and many of them thought it was a case for Torquemado to deal with. However, my old professors, Lord Kelvin, and Blackburn, wrote to me that I would first have to prove that Newton's first law of motion was a fallacy, and that Galileo and Newton were fools in believing that they were experimenting with falling bodies at the earth's surface. I did not think the first law was violated, but the more I studied the subject I could see that if the fall of bodies were a reality, as Galileo and Newton believed it to be, it would prove a serious obstacle to the acceptance of my theory.

I set to work to find out by experiment whether bodies actually did fall with the acceleration which the force of attraction was said to produce. Years before that, when in England, where some of our coal mines had vertical shafts about 1500 feet deep, I had studied the cause of weight by having the hoisting engine drop me down with the full acceleration for about 500 feet. Then, by retardation during the lowest 500 feet, I could experience increase of weight all over me so marked that my legs could hardly support me. That taught me that acceleration was the proximate cause of weight, but at the time of these experiments I still thought the acceleration of the falling cage was really caused by the earth's attraction.

In California, while trying to prove that bodies actually fall, as they appear to do, I thought of those experiments and remembered that in the fall down the shaft I did not lose my consciousness. I reasoned that if my body was actually accelerated at a rate of 32 feet per second, I would instantly lose my consciousness, owing to my breath and the light portions of my body not falling as fast as the heavier portion. I read the accounts of parachuters, and bridge jumpers, who declared they were perfectly conscious until the water struck them, and they thought that the water and ground under them was rising towards them. Thus I was led to the conclusion that there was a possibility, after all, Galileo and Newton had been fooled by the apparent fall of bodies, which instead of being a reality, was simply an illusion of the senses, in every way similar to the diurnal revolution of the sun around the earth, which Copernicus proved to be an illusion of the senses.

I wrote to a number of my scientific friends, asking them what they thought of the possibility of falling bodies being an illusion of the senses, but I found that this was the one thing needed to destroy their respect for me. Very few replied, and those who did reply thought I was joking.

After some years of fruitless endeavor to find a crucial experiment that I could present as proof to the scientific authorities, I set to work to study the subject from a mathematical point of view, and in a short time found the conclusive kinematical proof that bodies do not fall. I tried to convince scientists of this fact, but I could not make any impression. They began to think I was a crank.

Now I am retired from business, and will devote the few years of my life in an effort to arouse the public to force scientists to investigate, and either confirm the truth that bodies do not fall or prove that they do fall, as they appear to do and as the universities are teaching all over the world. I hope to find some lover of truth who will back my effort by making a substantial offer to the first scientist who will prove that bodies actually fall with acceleration. Such an offer as that would put the scientific authorities on their mettle, and place them before a world wide audience that will want to know the truth, and it will prevent them from sacrificing any individual professor who dares to teach the unorthodox truth.

The kinematical proof which I am prepared to present gives the *qualitative* analysis of the action, showing how the earth, in its orbital motion round the sun, when combined with its rotations round its axis in the direction of its orbital motion, produces on persons on its surface the illusion that bodies are actually falling of their own gravity to the earth. The proof is of the simplest possible character, and yet so conclusive that any ordinarily educated person can understand it, if he is not controlled by prejudice produced by a life time of training.

[***]

IHAVE set out to prove that the fall of bodies as at present believed and taught, is a pure illusion of the senses, of a character similar to that of the apparent motion of the sun round the earth daily.

The illusion of the sun's motion was believed and taught for twelve hundred years, and it took the combined efforts of Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Huygens, Newton, and many other great minds, agitating and demonstrating for more than one hundred and fifty years, to convince the then scientific authorities that the apparent fact was an absurd fallacy.

For fifteen years I have been trying to persuade scientists that the apparent fall of bodies is a similar illusion, and I am met with the same inertia of mind and reluctance to investigate.

The fact that the present doctrine of the fall of bodies has been established and taught as an orthodox truth for nearly two hundred years, is considered by professional scientists as a good reason for their refusal to investigate anything that is contrary to what they believe to be the truth.

The Dean of Science of one of our largest universities told me, in 1903,

that if he was known by the University authorities to be investigating this unorthodox doctrine, he would be in danger of losing his professorship at the University. When I asked if he would allow me to demonstrate the truth by an experiment, he said that if it were known to his colleagues that he had so little faith in what he was teaching as to watch an experiment that professed to prove the contrary of what was being taught, he would be jeered at for his credulity. It was the same old story that Doctor Sissi at Padua University told Galileo, when asked to look through the telescope at a new planet. He said that it would be sacrilege for him to do so, since the number 7 is a perfect number, all God's works are perfect, there are 7 planets, and therefore the eighth one seen in the glass is an illusion. [***] The 'Principia' of Newton and the 'Mechanique Celeste' of Laplace are the established authorities on all questions dealing with the motions and configurations of the solar system, as now taught in the universities of the world. But as basis of their mathematical deduction is the apparent fall of bodies, towards the earth, with acceleration.

I shall prove that this apparent fall is a pure illusion of the senses, in every way comparable to the illusion which deceived Ptolemy. We are on the eve of a revolution in physical and astronomical science.

We shall find that weight on the surface of the earth can be produced without attraction;

That the moon is not attracted to the earth, and does not fall with the same acceleration toward the earth, as Newton supposed;

That the tides are not caused by the moon's attraction, but by a peculiar motion of the earth itself;

That the pressure and density of the atmosphere resting on the earth is not caused by its weight due to the earth's attraction:

But that the weight of the atmosphere is caused by the earth's continual pressure against the atmosphere;

That this same pressure (which is intermittent) is the cause of the internal work of the air—a fact which puzzled the mind of the great Langley so long;

That the 'holes in the air' which startle the aviator are due to the same peculiar motion of the earth, where its surface underneath the aviator is not a plain surface but has houses and chasms and trees;

That the same peculiar motion of the earth causes the atmosphere, or air, above a choppy sea, to rock the aeroplane;

That even the Brownian movements, which are thought by some to be the very essence of vitality in organic life, are caused by this same peculiar intermittent pressure of the earth's surface against the inertia of the organized fluid cells within the organism under the pressure of the atmosphere. [***] Ptolemy based his mathematical treatment on the Earth as the fixed centre of the universe.

Newton used the Sun as the fixed centre of coördinates in his mathematical system, and being nearer the truth, he was able to present a much simpler mathematical system than that of Ptolemy.

Now we know that the Sun is not a fixture in the heavens, and consequently to reach a true physical as well as mathematical system of the universe, it is necessary to have fixed coördinates in space, which will enable mathematicians to demonstrate to astronomers the true helicoidal motions and configurations of the planets in fixed space.

The possible motion of the Sun in space, as adrift with the planets, was anticipated by Newton; but his laws of motion prevented him from reaching the true corkscrew path of the planets in space as they revolve round the Sun.

That is the work which is now awaiting the mathematicians of this age, and which will revolutionize the Newtonian System now being taught, even more than that system revolutionized the Ptolemaic System which it supplanted.

Now we have a simple and beautiful mathematical system, from which we can understand the configurations and relative motions of the planets; but, as Newton himself said, there could be no physical cause of these conditions deduced from the mathematical explanation of the phenomena.

Laplace, who stands next to Newton as the greatest exponent of the system, was more daring but less philosophical than Newton. He said the force of attraction which is innate in all matter, and which acts throughout the Universe according to Newton's law of gravitation, is all the physical force which necessary to create and sustain all the phenomena of the Universe. And as he told Napoleon, 'No, Sire, there is no need for any other God but this force of Attraction.'

But now, since it can be proven that there is no such force in the Universe as attraction and that the supposed fall of bodies toward the Earth by that force is only an illusion of the senses, there will be new ground upon which theologians can meet the Laplace attractionists, and Haeckel and his materialists. [***] The very suggestion that modern scientists are teaching to the university students a fallacy has been resented by them to an extent that has prevented me, up to this time, from securing an opportunity to present my proof. Yet the complete and perfect proof of the new theory of Gravitation must, of course, be passed on ultimately by professional scientists, after they have been convinced that the fall of bodies at the earth's surface is an illusion of the senses.

Therefore, what I propose to do in these pages is to show good reasons for believing that what is being taught about the fall of bodies to the students at the universities is an error. I hope that the might of public opinion will force the scientific authorities to investigate this error, and prevent them from sacrificing individual professors who are anxious to study the true theory.

If they cannot force the authorities to investigate, they can at least be challenged to prove that what they are teaching at present about the fall of bodies is a truth.

I have now been fifteen years trying to persuade the scientists of this age to investigate the fact that the Earth falls against bodies with acceleration, instead of the erroneous illusion that bodies fall against the Earth. Though till

now it seems that I have made no progress, I feel sure that during the few remaining years of my life I shall, after all, be able at least to set the leaven to working. [***] Thus we hope by ordinary experimental reasoning to be able to prove to the ordinary reader that Newton's cause of gravity is only an imaginary cause, used by him as a 'mathematical metaphor', and that his law is only a law of configuration, not a physical law at all.

As an illustration of what is meant by the difference between a quality and a quantity, and their application in the case of laws and causes, let us take the underground cable car system which Halliday constructed in the city of San Francisco thirty years ago. The cars seemed to run of their own volition, from the bay on the one side of the city to the ocean on the other side. That fact was a source of never ending astonishment to the Chinamen when they first arrived in the city. Here then was a case like that of the Solar System in the days of Galileo, requiring a great philosopher to explain the cause of this most wonderful phenomenon.

LET us suppose that a modern Kepler in charge of the Chabot observatory trained his instruments on these apparently self moving cars, and by reason of his position relative to their lines of motion he found that they described an ellipse in going from the bay to the ocean, and that their angular motion from his position varied inversely as the square of the distance, and that the area described by the radius vector per unit of time was always constant; and, furthermore, that the time taken in making a complete journey to and fro, when squared, was found to be proportionate to the cube of the major axis of the ellipse.

Now with these facts all found by observation, by a careful study of a map of the route, it would be possible to compile a time table that would fix the exact position of the cars every minute of the day, if their motion was uniform, and never interfered with.

That time table would be the *law* of their motion. But the *cause* of their motion would still have to be explained; and here is where the genius of a great philosopher like Newton can attract the admiration of a world.

After a complete study of Kepler's facts, and the rates of acceleration and retardation of the cars as they start from the bay and stop at the ocean and retrace their course without any apparent push or pull, the attention of the scientists is called to the fact that there is water at both termini, which is always in constant flux and reflux, that such an enormous quantity of water in motion to and fro like a pendulum must exert an enormous push and pull on everything that comes within the range of its attraction, which power is just like the power of the magnet in its quality, and is not visible to mortal eyes. Though it is beyond our ken, we must be satisfied to know that this power of attraction is *necessary* to enable us to formulate a mathematical law that will also set at rest the curiosity of the non-scientists who worry so much about causes. [***] In like manner I have been told by these champions of orthodoxy that they would not believe that it is the Earth which falls with acceleration against a falling body, even if I could prove it to be true; that it

is an impossibility and an insult to mankind to ask their belief in such a ridiculous supposition.

That being the position that the scientific authorities have assumed towards this great truth for fifteen years, I can only suggest one way to settle this matter, and that is to shame them by the force of public opinion to prove that what they are teaching about the fall of bodies is really true.

I would like to see posted a large monetary prize for the orthodox scientist who can prove that a stone when let go from a height of 16 feet above the surface of the Earth actually falls that distance in space in one second. Lacking this, I can only challenge scientists to give their proof. I will give my proofs in these pages, showing that it is the Earth which falls that 16 feet towards the body or stone in one second of time, and let the readers of this weekly decide who is correct. That appears to me to be a fair way to overcome both inertia and prejudice. As was the custom of the ancient Greeks and Romans, the contest should be in the open forum. There should be no star chamber proceedings in a case, which, when established, will not only free mankind from a ridiculous fallacy, and an illusion of the senses, but will supply a true knowledge of the constitution of the Universe. [***] I remember fifty years ago when I first began to study weight and falling bodies, the impression I got was that weight was an attribute of matter instead of being a mere property, and the consequence was that I believed matter could not exist without weight, nor weight without matter; and it took years of study to get rid of these mistakes, owing to the prejudice they produced on the mind.

Weight, then, is a property of Matter, not an attribute as some scientists believe. Consequently matter can exist constitutionally without weight, and weight can exist without matter, as we know in the case of a hypnotic subject who by suggestion can be made to feel the weight of one hundred pounds, when it only exists as an idea.

The proof that matter can exist without weight depends on the first law of motion; because if a mass moves uniformly in a straight line in space, it cannot have any weight. If weight is caused by the mutual attraction of matter, then a mass subject to attraction must move in a curve. If weight is caused by acceleration, then it cannot follow Newton's laws and move with uniform velocity in a straight line. [***] Perhaps Leonardo da Vinci was the first scientist to record the fact that a ball projected parallel to a horizontal plane offered a different resistance at the start to the same ball thrown vertically upwards with the same velocity. But neither he nor Galileo, nor even Newton, seemed to be fully aware of the dynamical importance of that difference.

The want of a correct knowledge of that fact led to seventy five years' war from Des Cartes to D'Alembert, as to whether a force was proportional to the velocity, or to the square of the velocity.

Newton's definition of mass as the quantity of matter in a body, and proportional to the volume and density conjointly, does not give the

dynamical meaning of mass as a component part of the resistance of weight.

Mechanical matter is supposed to be a group, aggregate, or quantum of substance, on which weight has been superimposed by *force*. Newton says, by an innate force; I say, by an applied force; this is the kernel of the whole controversy about gravitation.

Newton's theory is a static theory.

My theory is a kinetic theory of gravitation.

When you hold a weight in your hand you feel a pressure, and it can be proven experimentally that wherever there is weight there is the quality of pressure. Consequently pressure is an attribute of weight; but all pressure is not weight. Therefore weight is not a physical reality; it can be produced and annihilated by force. But if weight were wholly due to attraction, then it could neither be produced nor annihilated by an applied force. Weight is not a kinetic force because it cannot produce acceleration. If a body were accelerated in proportion to its weight, then weight would be a force.

When weight of any magnitude is held in a fixed position 16 feet above the surface of the earth, and let go, it will appear to fall against the surface of the earth in one second of time, and strike with a velocity of 32 feet per second; consequently the acceleration is said to be 32 feet per second, per second.

But if it can be shown that the earth in its curvilinear motion rushes up against the body with that acceleration, then it is unnecessary to adopt the Newtonian theory of attraction to explain the apparent fall of bodies.

Figure 2 gives a kinetic illustration, showing how the Earth in its orbit, without rotation, falls against the body, with the acceleration of gravity, in one second, when the body is held at a height of 16 feet above the surface and let go, so that it is free from the earth's orbital motion; and, according to the Lex I of Newton, the body moves with uniform velocity in the straight line PP' in space, until the earth's acceleration in its orbital curve brings the earth up against the body with a differential velocity 32 feet per second in one second of time from when the body at P is released. [***] Now just think of dear old Galileo dropping different weights from 1 pound to 100 pounds from the top of the tower of Pisa, to prove to the Pope and his Cardinals that Aristotle was wrong in saying that the heavier weight fell the faster, and these celebrities standing amazed with their mouths wide open at the spectacle, which proved Aristotle to be a false guide for the Church, when in reality the weights were not falling at all. And just think of Newton being knighted, and idolized by the Royal Society and all the rest of the world for nearly two centuries, for proving by mathematical reasoning that the fall and acceleration of the body is caused by the attraction of the earth.

Yet the truth will establish itself and then the world will smile at the present day fallacy that is being taught; and especially when it reads in the writings of great philosophers such adoration of Newton's law of gravitation.

[***]

I SHALL now quote in condensed form the opinions of a few of the great philosophers and scientists who have since the days of Newton studied this subject of attraction—in order to show that I am fully warranted in challenging the doctrine of orthodox science regarding the existence, nature, cause, and laws of this idol, this unknown God, they have so long worshipped. These quotations show that this theory of attraction has always been looked upon by great and independent thinkers as a bogus theory; and when I complete the proof that bodies do not fall—that will be proof positive that they cannot be under the influence of the Earth's attraction. And when I prove to the scientists what Kinertia in its nature, cause, and laws really is, then it will be seen that the Sun does not attract the planets and that the force of gravitation is not of an attractive character at all.

[***]

I HAVE shown the absurdity of attraction from various dynamical standpoints, and I have shown that many of the greatest natural philosophers during the last two hundred years, including Newton himself, could not be brought to believe that attraction was a physical quality; but held that it was only useful as a mathematical metaphor, to give to the law of the distance a comprehensive form. [***] According to the present erroneous doctrine, Gravity and Weight are produced throughout the Universe by the mutual attraction of one particle for another, in the manner mentioned in Newton's law of Gravitation. See the text books and encyclopedias on Gravity and Weight. I will now show by the following proposition that the above theory is an absurd fallacy.

Prop. I—*To prove that Gravity and Weight can be produced by man's power and intelligence combined, without the mutual attraction of matter.*

In Fig. 1 let $XX'YY'$ be a fixed coordinate system in the plane of the paper. Let A, B, C, be a ball of any mass M (without weight), gyrating in a circle in free space, with any uniform velocity V, without rotation, and with radius R from the centre of the circle to the centre of the mass of the ball. Let $2r = 1 \text{ mile} = \text{diameter of ball}$; then any particle P on the surface of the ball would be pressed towards the centre of the ball, with the same physical quality as that which gravity and weight are supposed to produce. Now to cause a mass to gyrate in a circle requires not only power, but also some Intelligence to direct the power in its application.

If $R = 53,200 \text{ miles}$, $V = 18 \text{ miles per second of time}$.

The pressure of P on the surface of the ball towards its centre would be $M 32 = mg = \text{Weight at the Earth's surface}$, where $M = \text{mass of Particle P}$. (See textbooks, both qualitative and quantitative treatment.) See Newton's rule of reason, in Article V, which shows that if gravity and weight can be produced so easily as by this experiment, then there is not need for the Newtonian force of attraction.

I am only dealing with weight as a physical quality due to pressure. There is no need to ask what happens on the other side of the ball, because if the

ball were sliding along a rigid circle of radius $R + r$, the same weight pressure would be there also.

Further Kinetic Illustration

Fig. 2. I use these car illustrations so that the reader may imagine himself as a passenger and actually experiencing the pressure and weight due to the gyration of the car in its circle, and so be convinced of the absurdity of the theory of attraction.

Let C be an imponderable car of mass M , gyrating in a circle of radius $R = 53,200$ miles, with uniform velocity of $V = 18$ miles per second, in free space, fixed and infinite; without any other material body in the same space to which it could bear any space or time relationship; taking the plane of the paper for the plane of the motion, and looking down from above. Then its motion in fixed space would be absolute, and its momentum absolute, its acceleration absolute, and its mass absolute. Suppose it to be inhabited like the earth by intelligent beings whose minds during ten thousand generations had been gradually developed to a point when they began to study the nature, cause, and laws of the phenomena that affected their senses within the car. This **motion V** , going on from generation to generation, without any visible point of reference, would be unknowable to the inhabitants; but there would be several facts within the car which would be knowable and likely to excite their curiosity and wonder.

First, every loose thing, and every person within the car, would be apparently pulled by some invisible force towards one side of the car; and those with the best gift of forming hypotheses on the subject would be called at first philosophers, because they would base their theories on the laws of thought, and deduce by geometrical and logical reasoning many wonderful results. They would believe, of course, the car to be absolutely at rest in space. Then after ages of speculation on the *what*, and the *why*, of this phenomena, a period would arrive when these metaphysicians would become more practical and would say as Galileo said, 'Why bother about the nature and cause of the phenomena?' (See Dialogue 202.) 'Let us experiment and find its laws, or what is called the *how* of the performance', as Lord Verulam [Francis Bacon] in his *Novum Organum* recommended. This inductive method of research was the genetic starting point of what is now called Science, and its professors are now called Scientists, instead of Philosophers. The scope of the study has been narrowed, but the results have increased beyond all comparison.

Aristotle (the master of those who know) explained that weight was caused by the tendency of material bodies to return to their proper place in nature, and that tendency caused them to fall towards the side of the car, from which it took an effort to lift them; and that the rate of fall was proportional to their weight.

Epicurus, on the other hand, compared the tendency of a body to fall to the tendency he felt when hungry and passing a restaurant where a savory stew was being cooked. He said it was a case of appetite or desire, and that

a physical quality or substance was naturally endowed with physical desire, as the physiological quality had the craving for food, and the spiritual for truth.

The theologians for fifteen hundred years preferred the explanation of Aristotle, until a great experimental philosopher called Galileo began to investigate the subject. He said, Why bother about causes? Let us find the laws of falling bodies first, and by that means we can better arrive at a knowledge of causation. (See Dialogue 202.) He lifted bodies of various sizes, densities, and weights, to great distances from the side of the car, and let them fall back of their own volition; and by careful measurements with pendulums and clepsydrias he established the laws of their motion, on the supposition that the car was at rest, and the motion was all in the apparently falling body.

Then he projected them parallel to the sides, and at various distances with various velocities, and found the trajectory to be a parabola, and he found numerous other facts, all of which you can find in his dialogues already mentioned. When he was threatened by the Inquisition, he took up the speculative study of the causes; and in his other great work on the system of the world he showed that he was nearer to the truth than either Kepler, Descartes, or Newton, but the infirmities of age prevented him from completing the task.

Newton, another great philosopher, was born the same year that Galileo died; and in his youth was trained in Galileo's system by the greatest mathematician of that age, Doctor Barrow of Cambridge. He became interested in the fall of bodies, and by using established facts which Kepler had deduced from Tycho Brache's observations, he formulated a geometrical law of motion, which if the car had been stationary, or moving in a straight line in space, as Newton supposed, would have been as marvellous as true. So wonderfully correct was this law in its geometrical application that it seemed to hypnotize with its brilliancy all the scientist of the world for two hundred years. He actually made them believe that the weight and fall were caused by the mutual attraction between the mass of the apparently falling bodies and the mass of the car, all concentrated in the side of the car; that it did not matter whether the car was absolutely at rest or moving with any finite velocity in space; that the cause of the weight and rate of acceleration, or fall of bodies towards the side of the car, depended on the mutual innate desire they had to pull each other; and that the relative resultant pull was always equal to $Mm \div D^2$, where M = mass of car, and m = mass of body, and D = distance from the side of the car to the centre of the body; and that it did not depend on the velocity at all. And beyond this point no human research has been able to penetrate. You will notice that this is a mathematical resultant, not a natural or physical resultant, because physically, Nature in producing an aggregate resultant mass always adds its masses, but by this law they are multiplied to meet the mathematical requirements of the case.

Anyone acquainted with Dynamics, or Mechanics, will see at a glance that weight can be produced in the way shown in these diagrams without any innate force of attraction in matter, and as astronomical dynamics is only a special application of the general laws of mechanics, you will wonder why science should have been so long hypnotized with such an absurd fallacy as this Newtonian doctrine of attraction.”²⁸⁸⁵

Of course, Galileo Galilei is famous for dropping balls from the leaning tower of Pisa and is the ultimate source of the principle of equivalence. Einstein was quoted in *The New York Times*, on 3 April 1921, on the front page:

“The interview took place in the Captain’s cabin, where Professor Einstein was almost surrounded by speakers after knowledge.

‘It is a theory of space and time, so far as physics are concerned,’ he said.

‘How long did it take you to conceive your theory?’ he was asked.

‘I have not finished yet,’ he said with a laugh. ‘But I have worked on it for about sixteen years. The theory consists of two grades or steps. On one I have been working for about six years and on the other about eight or nine years.

‘I first became interested in it through the question of the distribution and expansion of light in space; that is, for the first grade or step. The fact that an iron ball and a wooden ball fall to the ground at the same speed was perhaps the reason which prompted me to take the second step.’”

Albert Einstein stated in 1921,

“Two of the great facts explained by the theory are the relativity of motion and the equivalence of mass of inertia and mass of weight, said Prof. Einstein.

‘There has been a false opinion widely spread among the general public,’ [Einstein] said, ‘that the theory of relativity is to be taken as differing radically from the previous developments in physics from the time of Galileo and Newton—that it is violently opposed to their deductions. The contrary is true. Without the discoveries of every one of the great men of physics, those who laid down preceding laws, relativity would have been impossible to conceive and there would have been no basis for it. Psychologically, it is impossible to come to such a theory at once without the work which must be done before. The four men who laid the foundations of physics on which I have been able to construct my theory are Galileo, Newton, Maxwell, and Lorenz.’”²⁸⁸⁶

Philipp Frank gave a lecture in 1909, which presented thought experiments pertaining to the principle of equivalence Einstein would essentially later repeat,²⁸⁸⁷

“The system of the fixed stars constitutes a fundamental body. Even in

shooting a cannon ball towards the south we see no deviation from the law of inertia if we consider it with reference to the fixed stars. The ball remains in the same plane; but this plane does not retain the same relative position to the meridian of the earth, wherefore, of course, with reference to the earth the law of inertia is violated. On the whole it is evident that we really recover all the observed motor phenomena when we refer Newton's laws of motion to the fixed stars. Not until they are referred to the fixed stars do these laws acquire an exact sense which makes it possible to apply them to concrete conditions.

We shall call those motions which are referred to a fundamental body 'true movements' and those related to any other body of reference 'apparent movements.' For instance the immobility of my chair is only apparent, for when referred to the fixed stars it is in motion.

We now ask whether there are any other fundamental bodies aside from the system of the fixed stars. Obviously not any body revolving in an opposite direction to the fixed stars can be such a fundamental body, for considered with reference to such a body all rectilinear movements are curved. Therefore the law of inertia could not hold with reference to the body in question if it is valid with reference to the fixed stars. Then too a fundamental body can possess no acceleration with reference to the fixed stars, because otherwise there would be no uniformity of the motion of inertia with reference to it. However, these conditions are not only necessary but they are sufficient to characterize a fundamental body. All bodies moving uniformly and in a straight line with reference to the fixed stars will also be fundamental bodies inasmuch as rectilinearity and uniformity continue to hold for them, as do likewise the supplementary velocities determined by the second law. Accordingly Newton's laws do not indicate one single fundamental body, but an infinite number moving in opposite directions with a uniform and rectilinear motion.

Hence we may well speak of 'true' in contrast to apparent rotary motion; for all bodies revolving with reference to a fundamental body revolve with reference to all other bodies. The same is true of true acceleration because an acceleration with respect to a fundamental body is also acceleration (i. e., change of velocity) with respect to all the rest. On the other hand, there is no sense in speaking of 'true' uniform rectilinear motion; for if a body possesses a uniform velocity with respect to the fixed stars, it is itself a fundamental body possessing of course with respect to itself a velocity of zero; it is at rest.

Accordingly there is true acceleration, but not true velocity. From this is easily derived a proposition established by Newton which is called the principle of relativity of mechanics, namely that a uniform rectilinear movement of the system as a whole makes no change in the processes within the system; that is to say, we can not tell from the processes within the system what velocity the uniform rectilinear movement possesses with reference to the fixed stars. On the other hand, the rotary motion of a system has indeed an influence on the processes within the system, as for instance

in the phenomena of centrifugal force; thus the earth has become flattened at its poles because of its rotation, or if I revolve a dish full of water the water will rise at the sides.

[***]

Is it to a certain extent accidental, or is it essential, that the totality of the fixed stars coincides with that fundamental body in relation to which the laws of Newton hold valid? Or to put it more clearly: If the fixed stars were set violently in motion among each other and hence could no longer constitute a fixed body of reference, would the mechanical processes on earth proceed exactly as they did before? For instance, would the Foucault pendulum move just as at present, even though it now turns with the fixed stars, whereas in that case it would not be quite clear which constellation's revolution it should join?

Were everything to remain as of old the fundamental system of reference would not be determined by the fixed stars but would only accidentally coincide with them, and would in reality be some merely ideal or yet undiscovered body. In the other case all mechanical occurrences on earth would have to be completely altered to correspond with the promiscuous movements of the fixed stars.

It is well known that this is the view held by Ernst Mach. It alone holds with consistent firmness to physical relativism, and it alone answers the second main question of physics in the relativistic sense.

The opposite view is represented by Alois Höfler in his studies on the current philosophy of mechanics, and lately by G. Hamel, professor of mechanics at the technical high school of Brünn, in an essay which appeared in the annual report of the German mathematical society of 1909 on 'Space, Time and Energy as a priori Forms of Thought.'

Before I enter upon the controversy itself I would like further to elucidate Mach's view by carrying out its results somewhat farther. In his well-known essay on the *History and Root of the Principle of the Conservation of Energy* Mach ascribes to the distant masses in space a direct influence on the motor phenomena of the earth which supplements the influence afforded by gravitation. Of course no effect of gravitation from the fixed stars upon the earth can be observed, yet in spite of this they influence, for instance, the plane of oscillation of the Foucault pendulum because in Mach's opinion it remains parallel to them.

The question now arises according to what general law of nature this influence operates which does not, like gravity, produce accelerations but velocities instead. Obviously this influence must be a property belonging to every mass, for according to our present conception the fixed stars of course are precisely the same sort of masses as earthly bodies.

However, experience teaches us that terrestrial masses have no more influence on the plane of oscillation of the Foucault pendulum than has the changing position of the moon, sun and planets; but on the other hand it is exactly the most distant masses, the fixed stars, which determine its plane of

oscillation. Accordingly we must either assume that the effect is directly proportional to the distance of the masses (which would be very strange indeed) or simply assume that this effect is proportional to the effective masses and independent of the distance, whence the dominant influence of the more remote, as the far greater and more numerous, bodies would naturally follow, and Mach inclines to this latter view.

Mach's view shows most clearly in his position with regard to Newton's famous bucket experiment. In this Newton intended to show that the centrifugal force produced by a revolving body is due not to its relative but to its absolute velocity of rotation. He suspended a bucket filled with water by a vertical cord, twisted the cord quite tightly and then let it untwist itself, in this way setting the bucket to revolve rapidly. At first the water did not rotate with the bucket and therefore the bucket had a velocity of rotation with reference to the water while in the meantime the surface of the water remained undisturbed. In time, however, friction caused the water to become so affected by the rotary motion that bucket and water revolved like one homogeneous mass whereby the centrifugal force caused the water to rise at the sides of the bucket and the surface became concave.

Hence it is evident that the centrifugal force reached its greatest strength at the moment when the relative motion of the water with respect to the bucket became zero; hence according to Newton this force can be produced only by the absolute rotary motion of the water.

To this now Mach justly protests that only the relative rotation of the water with reference to the fixed stars is to be considered, for this system of the fixed stars and not the bucket is the fundamental body. And indeed at first the water was at rest with reference to the fixed stars, but at the close of the experiment it was revolving. The mass of the bucket compared to the mass of the fixed stars is an entirely negligible quantity, so that it does not depend in the least upon the rotation. But we can not know, adds Mach, how the experiment would turn out if the sides of the bucket were miles thick; and by this he apparently means so thick that their mass would be considerable even when compared with the mass of the system of fixed stars. Then indeed might the rotation of the bucket disturb the action of the fixed stars.

Höfler protests, on the other hand, that a system which is symmetrical round its axis could not according to all our experience in mechanics produce by its rotation that sort of an effect on the water within it.

This also is quite true. But the effect of the masses assumed by Mach is such that it can not be expressed in our ordinary experiences with mechanics except by means of the facts of the inertia of all motion with reference to the fixed stars. New conditions such as the rotation of an enormously thick bucket might give rise to new phenomena. If we agree with Mach's view that the rotation of the plane of the Foucault pendulum is directly produced by the masses of the fixed stars, we must likewise admit, in order to be consistent, that the relative rotation of the very thick bucket might give rise to similar effects with reference to the water, as the rotation of the system of the fixed

stars with reference to the earth to the plane of oscillation.

Höfler expresses his contention against Mach's thesis in the form of the following question: If in Galileo's time the sky had been clouded over and had never become clear again so that we would never have been able to have taken the stars into our calculation, would it then have been impossible to have established our present mechanics solely by the aid of terrestrial experiments? By this question Höfler means to say that if the connection with the fixed stars were a constituent of the concept of uniform motion, we would never have been able in such an overclouded world to have established the law of inertia, for instance, whereas in reality it is clear that this would nevertheless have been possible.

I will not dwell on the more psychological question as to whether or how easily this would have been possible, but will only consider now the logical construction of mechanics in such a darkened world on the hypothesis that easily or with difficulty in one way or another we would have attained to our present knowledge of mechanics.

Let us for a moment imagine ourselves in such a world. Above our heads extends a uniform vault of uninterrupted gray or black. Were we to shoot projectiles toward the south we would see that they describe paths which are curved towards the west; if we started pendulums to vibrating we would see that they would revolve their planes of oscillation in mysterious periods—I say mysterious because we might perhaps be able to perceive the change of day and night as an alternation of light and darkness, but would not be able to refer it to the movements of celestial bodies. Perhaps at first we would surmise that the motion of the pendulum could be ascribed to optical influences. I would like to see placed in such a world one of the philosophers who regard the law of inertia as an *a priori* truth. In the face of these mysterious curvatures and deflections he would probably find no adherents and he would not know himself what to make of his own standpoint.

Finally, let us assume, there arises a dauntless man, the Copernicus of this starless world, who says that all motions proceed spontaneously in a straight line, but that this straight line is not straight with reference to the earth but with respect to a purely ideal system of reference which turns in a direction opposite to that of the earth. The period of this rotation is supplied by the period of the Foucault pendulum.

This man would of course deny physical relativism upon the earth, for in his opinion terrestrial processes would not depend only on the relative velocities of terrestrial bodies but on something else besides, viz., their velocities with respect to a purely ideal system of reference. Nevertheless, he would not introduce any non-physical element because for the purpose of the physicist a purely ideal system of reference whose motion with respect to an empirical system is known serves the same purpose as would the empirical system itself. This bold innovator might finally refer the words 'true rest' and 'true motion' to his ideal fundamental body and so ascribe true motion and only apparent rest to the earth, thus maintaining a mechanics which would

coincide literally with that of ours to-day, except that no small luminous points would be seen sparkling in connection with the fundamental body.

Hence we see that physical relativism is not a necessary tool of the physicist. Apart, perhaps, from the psychological improbability—of which, however, nothing more positive can be said—the possibility of the development here indicated is logically free from objections throughout, and, therefore the same is also true of the possibility of a nonrelativistic physics.

But I would like to strengthen the argument of Höfler even somewhat further. That is to say, I would ask whether the world in which we live is then really so essentially different from that fictitious one. Imagine the dark roof which conceals the sky placed somewhat higher so that there is room beneath it for the fixed stars, perhaps as the dark background which may be seen nightly in the starry sky. The whole difference then consists in the fact that not only the Foucault pendulum and similar appliances move with reference to the earth, but enormously greater masses as well—all the twinkling lights of the sky by which the thought of a fundamental body in motion with respect to the earth is psychologically greatly facilitated, but logically is not much changed. Now imagine the sky of this earlier dark world suddenly illuminated; then we would see that the fictitious system of reference is closely linked to enormous cosmic masses, and it would be easy enough to accept Mach's hypothesis that these masses condition the fundamental system. . . .

If a distinction must be drawn between the respective values of the conceptions of Mach and Höfler, it is as follows: Mach's view adds decidedly more to the observed facts; for that it retains physical relativism does not involve freedom from hypothesis, because at best this relativism is theory and not fact. Mach sets up, hypothetically of course, a new formal natural law with regard to the action of masses existing side by side with gravitation, affecting the experiment very materially but unable to raise any claim to the simplest description of actual conditions.

The other view, which simply introduces the system of reference procured by observation of the terrestrial and celestial movements without asking whence all this is derived, represents the present state of our knowledge most adequately without any arbitrary addendum but also without giving the spirit of inquiry any incentive to new experiments.

It is the old contrast between the most exact and least hypothetical representation possible of the known science, and progressive inquiry after new things in more or less daring and fantastic hypotheses. But Mach in this case stands in the opposite camp as in most other cases where his repugnance to all hypothesis has made him a pioneer in the phenomenological direction.

. . .

I therefore believe I have proved that we can grant the following: Physical phenomena do not depend only on the relative motion of bodies without at the same time admitting the possibility of the concept of an absolute motion in the philosophical sense."²⁸⁸⁸

“Mach’s” principle fails for many reasons. It depends upon the mystical notion of *instantaneous* “action at a distance”, *i.e.* mutual attraction, and it does not tell us what general laws dictate that the fixed stars be fixed, which laws are more fundamental than Mach’s fundamental assertions. Frank sought to provide an answer, as did Newton with absolute space, and many others with the æther hypothesis. Other possibilities certainly exist, though the minute expanse of the visible universe leaves us guessing.

14.4 Dynamism

Long before Einstein was born, Roger Joseph Boscovich introduced a theory of Dynamism. Boscovich argued in the 1700's for a general principle of relativity, length contraction, time dilatation, “Mach’s principle” and the notion that “atoms” are point centers of force.²⁸⁸⁹

Boscovich wrote in 1763 in the second supplement to his *Natural Philosophy*,

“§ II

Of Space & Time, as we know them

{We cannot obtain an absolute knowledge of local modes of existence nor yet of absolute distances or magnitudes. [The original margin notes are here reproduced inside of braces {}.]}

18. We have spoken, in the preceding Supplement, of Space & Time, as they are in themselves; it remains for us to say a few words on matters that pertain to them, in so far as they come within our knowledge. We can in no direct way obtain a knowledge through the senses of those real modes of existence, nor can we discern one of them from another. We do indeed perceive, by a difference of ideas excited in the mind by means of the senses, a determinate relation of distance & position, such as arises from any two local modes of existence; but the same idea may be produced by innumerable pairs of modes or real points of position; these induce the relations of equal distances & like positions, both amongst themselves & with regard to our organs, & to the rest of the circumjacent bodies. For, two points of matter, which anywhere have a given distance & position induced by some two modes of existence, may somewhere else on account of two other modes of existence have a relation of equal distance & like position, for instance if the distances exist parallel to one another. If those points, we, & all the circumjacent bodies change their real positions, & yet do so in such a manner that all the distances remain equal & parallel to what they were at the start, we shall get exactly the same ideas. Nay, we shall get the same ideas, if, while the magnitudes of the distances remain the same, all their directions are turned through any the same angle, & thus make the same angles with one another as before. Even if all these distances were diminished, while the angles remained constant, & the ratio of the distances to one another also remained constant, but the forces did not change owing to that change of distance; then if the scale of forces is correctly altered, that is to say, that

curved line, whose ordinates express the forces; then there would be no change in our ideas.

{The motion, if any, common to us & the Universe could not come within our knowledge; nor could we know it, if it were increased in any ratio, or diminished, as a whole.}

19. Hence it follows that, if the whole Universe within our sight were moved by a parallel motion in any direction, & at the same time rotated through any angle, we could never be aware of the motion or the rotation. Similarly, if the whole region containing the room in which we are, the plains & the hills, were simultaneously turned round by some approximately common motion of the Earth, we should not be aware of such a motion; for practically the same ideas would be excited in the mind. Moreover, it might be the case that the whole Universe within our sight should daily contract or expand, while the scale of forces contracted or expanded in the same ratio; if such a thing did happen, there would be no change of ideas in our mind, & so we should have no feeling that such a change was taking place.

{Since, if our position & that of everything we see is changed, our ideas are not changed; therefore we can ascribe no motion to ourselves or to anything else.}

20. When either objects external to us, or our organs change their modes of existence in such a way that that first equality or similitude does not remain constant, then indeed the ideas are altered, & there is a feeling of change; but the ideas are the same exactly, whether the external objects suffer the change, or our organs, or both of them unequally. In every case our ideas refer to the difference between the new state & the old, & not to the absolute change, which does not come within the scope of our senses. Thus, whether the stars move round the Earth, or the Earth & ourselves move in the opposite direction round them, the ideas are the same, & there is the same sensation. We can never perceive absolute changes; we can only perceive the difference from the former configuration that has arisen. Further, when there is nothing at hand to warn us as to the change of our organs, then indeed we shall count ourselves to have been unmoved, owing to a general prejudice for counting as nothing those things that are nothing in our mind; for we cannot know of this change, & we attribute the whole of the change to objects situated outside of ourselves. In such manner any one would be mistaken in thinking, when on board ship, that he himself was motionless, while the shore, the hills & even the sea were in motion.

{The manner in which we are to judge of the equality of two things from their equality with a third; there never can be congruence in length, any more than there can be in time; the matter is to be inferred from causes.}

21. Again, it is to be observed first of all that from this principle of the [invariance] of those things, of which we cannot perceive the change through our senses, there comes forth the method that we use for comparing the magnitudes of intervals with one another; here, that, which is taken as a

measure, is assumed to be [invariant]. Also we make use of the axiom, *things that are equal to the same thing are equal to one another*; & from this is deduced another one pertaining to the same thing, namely, *things that are equal multiples, or submultiples, of each, are also equal to one another*; & also this, *things that coincide are equal*. We take a wooden or iron ten-foot rod; & if we find that this is congruent with one given interval when applied to it either once or a hundred times, & also congruent to another interval when applied to it either once or a hundred times, then we say that these intervals are equal. Further, we consider the wooden or iron ten-foot rod to be the same standard of comparison after translation. Now, if it consisted of perfectly continuous & solid matter, we might hold it to be exactly the same standard of comparison; but in my theory of points at a distance from one another, all the points of the ten-foot rod, while they are being transferred, really change the distance continually. For the distance is constituted by those real modes of existence, & these are continually changing. But if they are changed in such a manner that the modes which follow establish real relations of equal distances, the standard of comparison will not be identically the same; & yet it will still be an equal one, & the equality of the measured intervals will be correctly determined. We can no more transfer the length of the ten-foot rod, constituted in its first position by the first real modes, to the place of the length constituted in its second position by the second real modes, than we are able to do so for intervals themselves, which we compare by measurement. But, because we perceive none of this change during the translation, such as may demonstrate to us a relation of length, therefore we take that length to be the same. But really in this translation it will always suffer some slight change. It might happen that it underwent even some very great change, common to it & our senses, so that we should not perceive the change; & that, when restored to its former position, it would return to a state equal & similar to that which it had at first. However, there always is some slight change, owing to the fact that the forces which connect the points of matter, will be changed to some slight extent, if its position is altered with respect to all the rest of the Universe. Indeed, the same is the case in the ordinary theory. For no body is quite without little spaces interspersed within it, altogether incapable of being compressed or dilated; & this dilatation & compression undoubtedly occurs in every case of translation, at least to a slight extent. We, however, consider the measure to be the same so long as we do not perceive any alteration, as I have already remarked.

{Conclusion reached; the difference between ordinary people & philosophers in the matter of judgement.}

22. The consequence of all this is that we are quite unable to obtain a direct knowledge of absolute distances; & we cannot compare them with one another by a common standard. We have to estimate magnitudes by the ideas through which we recognize them; & to take as common standards those measures which ordinary people think suffer no change. But philosophers

should recognize that there is a change; but, since they know of no case in which the equality is destroyed by a perceptible change, they consider that the change is made equally.

{Although, when the ten-foot rod is moved in position, those modes that constitute the relations of the interval are also altered, yet equal intervals are reckoned as same for the reasons stated.}

23. Further, although the distance is really changed when, as in the case of the translation of the ten-foot rod, the position of the points of matter is altered, those real modes which constitute the distance being altered; nevertheless if the change takes place in such a way that the second distance is exactly equal to the first, we shall call it the same, & say that it is altered in no way, so that the equal distances between the same ends will be said to be the same distance & the magnitude will be said to be the same; & this is defined by means of these equal distances, just as also two parallel directions will be also included under the name of the same direction. In what follows we shall say that the distance is not changed, or the direction, unless the magnitude of the distance, or the parallelism, is altered.

{The same observations apply equally to Time; but in it, it is well known, even to ordinary people, that the same temporal interval cannot be translated for the purpose of comparing two intervals; it is because of this that they fall into error with regard to space.}

24. What has been said with regard to the measurement of space, without difficulty can be applied to time; in this also we have no definite & constant measurement. We obtain all that is possible from motion; but we cannot get a motion that is perfectly uniform. We have remarked on many things that belong to this subject, & bear upon the nature & succession of these ideas, in our notes. I will but add here, that, in the measurement of time, not even ordinary people think that the same standard measure of time can be translated from one time to another time. They see that it is another, consider that it is an equal, on account of some assumed uniform motion. Just as with the measurement of time, so in my theory with the measurement of space it is impossible to transfer a fixed length from its place to some other, just as it is impossible to transfer a fixed interval of time, so that it can be used for the purpose of comparing two of them by means of a third. In both cases, a second length, or a second duration is substituted, which is supposed to be equal to the first; that is to say, fresh real positions of the points of the same ten-foot rod which constitute a new distance, such as a new circuit made by the same rod, or a fresh temporal distance between two beginnings & two ends. In my Theory, there is in each case exactly the same analogy between space & time. Ordinary people think that it is only for measurement of space that the standard of measurement is the same; almost all other philosophers except myself hold that it can at least be considered to be the same from the idea that the measure is perfectly solid & continuous, but that in time there is only equality. But I, for my part, only admit in either case the equality, & never the identity.²⁸⁹⁰

Arthur Schopenhauer expressed a “space-time” theory of matter in the early 1800's:

“§ 4. Whoever has recognised the form of the principle of sufficient reason, which appears in pure time as such, and on which all counting and arithmetical calculation rests, has completely mastered the nature of time. Time is nothing more than that form of the principle of sufficient reason, and has no further significance. Succession is the form of the principle of sufficient reason in time, and succession is the whole nature of time. Further, whoever has recognised the principle of sufficient reason as it appears in the presentation of pure space, has exhausted the whole nature of space, which is absolutely nothing more than that possibility of the reciprocal determination of its parts by each other, which is called position. The detailed treatment of this, and the formulation in abstract conceptions of the results which flow from it, so that they may be more conveniently used, is the subject of the science of geometry. Thus also, whoever has recognised the law of causation, the aspect of the principle of sufficient reason which appears in what fills these forms (space and time) as objects of perception, that is to say matter, has completely mastered the nature of matter as such, for matter is nothing more than causation, as any one will see at once if he reflects. Its true being is its action, nor can we possibly conceive it as having any other meaning. Only as active does it fill space and time; its action upon the immediate object (which is itself matter) determines that perception in which alone it exists. The consequence of the action of any material object upon any other, is known only in so far as the latter acts upon the immediate object in a different way from that in which it acted before; it consists only of this. Cause and effect thus constitute the whole nature of matter; its true being is its action. (A fuller treatment of this will be found in the essay on the Principle of Sufficient Reason, § 21, p. 77.) The nature of all material things is therefore very appropriately called in German *Wirklichkeit*,¹ [*Footnote: Mira in quibusdam rebus verborum proprietas est, et consuetudo sermonis antiqui quædam efficacissimis notis signat. Seneca, epist. 81.*] a word which is far more expressive than *Realität*. Again, that which is acted upon is always matter, and thus the whole being and essence of matter consists in the orderly change, which one part of it brings about in another part. The existence of matter is therefore entirely relative, according to a relation which is valid only within its limits, as in the case of time and space.

But time and space, each for itself, can be mentally presented apart from matter, whereas matter cannot be so presented apart from time and space. The form which is inseparable from it presupposes space, and the action in which its very existence consists, always imports some change, in other words a determination in time. But space and time are not only, each for itself, presupposed by matter, but a union of the two constitutes its essence, for this, as we have seen, consists in action, *i. e.*, in causation. All the innumerable conceivable phenomena and conditions of things, might be

coexistent in boundless space, without limiting each other, or might be successive in endless time without interfering with each other: thus a necessary relation of these phenomena to each other, and a law which should regulate them according to such a relation, is by no means needful, would not, indeed, be applicable: it therefore follows that in the case of all co-existence in space and change in time, so long as each of these forms preserves for itself its condition and its course without any connection with the other, there can be no causation, and since causation constitutes the essential nature of matter, there can be no matter. But the law of causation receives its meaning and necessity only from this, that the essence of change does not consist simply in the mere variation of things, but rather in the fact that at the *same part of space* there is now *one thing* and then *another*, and at *one* and the same point of time there is *here* one thing and *there* another: only this reciprocal limitation of space and time by each other gives meaning, and at the same time necessity, to a law, according to which change must take place. What is determined by the law of causality is therefore not merely a succession of things in time, but this succession with reference to a definite space, and not merely existence of things in a particular place, but in this place at a different point of time. Change, *i. e.*, variation which takes place according to the law of causality, implies always a determined part of space and a determined part of time together and in union. Thus causality unites space with time. But we found that the whole essence of matter consisted in action, *i. e.*, in causation, consequently space and time must also be united in matter, that is to say, matter must take to itself at once the distinguishing qualities both of space and time, however much these may be opposed to each other, and must unite in itself what is impossible for each of these independently, that is, the fleeting course of time, with the rigid unchangeable perduration of space: infinite divisibility it receives from both. It is for this reason that we find that co-existence, which could neither be in time alone, for time has no contiguity, nor in space alone, for space has no before, after, or now, is first established through matter. But the co-existence of many things constitutes, in fact, the essence of reality, for through it permanence first becomes possible; for permanence is only knowable in the change of something which is present along with what is permanent, while on the other hand it is only because something permanent is present along with what changes, that the latter gains the special character of change, *i. e.*, the mutation of quality and form in the permanence of substance, that is to say, in matter¹. [*Footnote:* It is shown in the Appendix that matter and substance are one.] If the world were in space alone, it would be rigid and immovable, without succession, without change, without action; but we know that with action, the idea of matter first appears. Again, if the world were in time alone, all would be fleeting, without persistence, without contiguity, hence without co-existence, and consequently without permanence; so that in this case also there would be no matter. Only through the union of space and time do we reach matter, and matter is the possibility

of co-existence, and, through that, of permanence; through permanence again matter is the possibility of the persistence of substance in the change of its states.² [*Footnote*: This shows the ground of the Kantian explanation of matter, that it is ‘that which is movable in space,’ for motion consists simply in the union of space and time.] As matter consists in the union of space and time, it bears throughout the stamp of both. It manifests its origin in space, partly through the form which is inseparable from it, but especially through its persistence (substance), the *a priori* certainty of which is therefore wholly deducible from that of space³ [*Footnote*: Not, as Kant holds, from the knowledge of time, as will be explained in the Appendix.] (for variation belongs to time alone, but in it alone and for itself nothing is persistent). Matter shows that it springs from time by quality (accidents), without which it never exists, and which is plainly always causality, action upon other matter, and therefore change (a time concept). The law of this action, however, always depends upon space and time together, and only thus obtains meaning. The regulative function of causality is confined entirely to the determination of what must occupy *this time and this space*. The fact that we know *a priori* the unalterable characteristics of matter, depends upon this derivation of its essential nature from the forms of our knowledge of which we are conscious *a priori*. These unalterable characteristics are space-occupation, *i. e.*, impenetrability, *i. e.*, causal action, consequently, extension, infinite divisibility, persistence, *i. e.*, indestructibility, and lastly mobility: weight, on the other hand, notwithstanding its universality, must be attributed to *a posteriori* knowledge, although Kant, in his ‘Metaphysical Introduction to Natural Philosophy,’ p. 71 (p. 372 of Rosenkranz’s edition), treats it as knowable *a priori*.

But as the object in general is only for the subject, as its idea, so every special class of ideas is only for an equally special quality in the subject, which is called a faculty of perception. This subjective correlative of time and space in themselves as empty forms, has been named by Kant pure sensibility; and we may retain this expression, as Kant was the first to treat of the subject, though it is not exact, for sensibility presupposes matter. The subjective correlative of matter or of causation, for these two are the same, is understanding, which is nothing more than this. To know causality is its one function, its only power; and it is a great one, embracing much, of manifold application, yet of unmistakable identity in all its manifestations. Conversely all causation, that is to say, all matter, or the whole of reality, is only for the understanding, through the understanding, and in the understanding. The first, simplest, and ever-present example of understanding is the perception of the actual world. This is throughout knowledge of the cause from the effect, and therefore all perception is intellectual. The understanding could never arrive at this perception, however, if some effect did not become known immediately, and thus serve as a starting-point. But this is the affection of the animal body. So far, then, the animal body is the *immediate object* of the subject; the perception of all

other objects becomes possible through it. The changes which every animal body experiences, are immediately known, that is, felt; and as these effects are at once referred to their causes, the perception of the latter as *objects* arises. This relation is no conclusion in abstract conceptions; it does not arise from reflection, nor is it arbitrary, but immediate, necessary, and certain. It is the method of knowing of the pure understanding, without which there could be no perception; there would only remain a dull plant-like consciousness of the changes of the immediate object, which would succeed each other in an utterly unmeaning way, except in so far as they might have a meaning for the will either as pain or pleasure. But as with the rising of the sun the visible world appears, so at one stroke, the understanding, by means of its one simple function, changes the dull, meaningless sensation into perception. What the eye, the ear, or the hand feels, is not perception; it is merely its data. By the understanding passing from the effect to the cause, the world first appears as perception extended in space, varying in respect of form, persistent through all time in respect of matter; for the understanding unites space and time in the idea of matter, that is, causal action. As the world as idea exists only through the understanding, so also it exists only for the understanding. In the first chapter of my essay on 'Light and Colour,' I have already explained how the understanding constructs perceptions out of the data supplied by the senses; how by comparison of the impressions which the various senses receive from the object, a child arrives at perceptions; how this alone affords the solution of so many phenomena of the senses; the single vision of two eyes, the double vision in the case of a squint, or when we try to look at once at objects which lie at unequal distances behind each other; and all illusion which is produced by a sudden alteration in the organs of sense. But I have treated this important subject much more fully and thoroughly in the second edition of the essay on 'The Principle of Sufficient Reason,' § 21. All that is said there would find its proper place here, and would therefore have to be said again; but as I have almost as much disinclination to quote myself as to quote others, and as I am unable to explain the subject better than it is explained there, I refer the reader to it, instead of quoting it, and take for granted that it is known.

The process by which children, and persons born blind who have been operated upon, learn to see, the single vision of the double sensation of two eyes, the double vision and double touch which occur when the organs of sense have been displaced from their usual position, the upright appearance of objects while the picture on the retina is upside down, the attributing of colour to the outward objects, whereas it is merely an inner function, a division through polarisation, of the activity of the eye, and lastly the stereoscope,—all these are sure and incontrovertible evidence that perception is not merely of the senses, but intellectual—that is, *pure knowledge through the understanding of the cause from the effect*, and that, consequently, it presupposes the law of causality, in a knowledge of which all perception—that is to say all experience, by virtue of its primary and only

possibility, depends. The contrary doctrine that the law of causality results from experience, which was the scepticism of Hume, is first refuted by this. For the independence of the knowledge of causality of all experience,—that is, its *a priori* character—can only be deduced from the dependence of all experience upon it; and this deduction can only be accomplished by proving, in the manner here indicated, and explained in the passages referred to above, that the knowledge of causality is included in perception in general, to which all experience belongs, and therefore in respect of experience is completely *a priori*, does not presuppose it, but is presupposed by it as a condition. This, however, cannot be deduced in the manner attempted by Kant, which I have criticised in the essay on ‘The Principle of Sufficient Reason,’ § 23.”²⁸⁹¹

Ernst Mach wrote:

“Obviously it does not matter whether we think of the earth as turning round on its axis, or at rest while the celestial bodies revolve round it. Geometrically these are exactly the same case of a relative rotation of the earth and of the celestial bodies with respect to one another. Only, the first representation is astronomically more convenient and simpler.

But if we think of the earth at rest and the other celestial bodies revolving round it, there is no flattening of the earth, no Foucault’s experiment, and so on—at least according to our usual conception of the law of inertia. Now, one can solve the difficulty in two ways: Either all motion is absolute, or our law of inertia is wrongly expressed. Neumann preferred the first supposition, I, the second. The law of inertia must be so conceived that exactly the same thing results from the second supposition as from the first. By this it will be evident that, in its expression, regard must be paid to the masses of the universe.

In ordinary terrestrial cases, it will answer our purposes quite well to reckon the direction and velocity with respect to the top of a tower or a corner of a room; in ordinary astronomical cases, one or other of the stars will suffice. But because we can also choose other corners of rooms, another pinnacle, or other stars, the view may easily arise that we do not need such a point at all from which to reckon. But this is a mistake; such a system of co-ordinates has a value only if it can be determined by means of bodies. We here fall into the same error as we did with the representation of time. Because a piece of paper money need not necessarily be funded by a definite piece of money, we must not think that it need not be funded at all.

In fact, any one of the above points of origin of co-ordinates answers our purposes as long as a sufficient number of bodies keep fixed positions with respect to one another. But if we wish to apply the law of inertia in an earthquake, the terrestrial points of reference would leave us in the lurch, and, convinced of their uselessness, we would grope after celestial ones. But, with these better ones, the same thing would happen as soon as the stars showed movements which were very noticeable. When the variations of the

positions of the fixed stars with respect to one another cannot be disregarded, the laying down of a system of co-ordinates has reached an end. It ceases to be immaterial whether we take this or that star as point of reference; and we can no longer reduce these systems to one another. We ask for the first time which star we are to choose, and in this case easily see that the stars cannot be treated indifferently, but that because we can give preference to none, the influence of all must be taken into consideration.

We can, in the application of the law of inertia, disregard any particular body, provided that we have enough other bodies which are fixed with respect to one another. If a tower falls, this does not matter to us; we have others. If Sirius alone, like a shooting-star, shot through the heavens, it would not disturb us very much; other stars would be there. But what would become of the law of inertia if the whole of the heavens began to move and the stars swarmed in confusion? How would we apply it then? How would it have to be expressed then? We do not inquire after one body as long as we have others enough; nor after one piece of money as long as we have others enough. Only in the case of a shattering of the universe, or a bankruptcy, as the case may be, we learn that *all* bodies, each with its share, are of importance in the law of inertia, and all money, when paper money is funded, is of importance, each piece having its share.

Yet another example: A free body, when acted upon by an instantaneous couple, moves so that its central ellipsoid with fixed centre rolls without slipping on a tangent-plane parallel to the plane of the couple. This is a motion in consequence of inertia. Here the body makes very strange motions with respect to the celestial bodies. Now, do we think that these bodies, without which one cannot describe the motion imagined, are without influence on this motion? Does not that to which one must appeal explicitly or implicitly when one wishes to describe a phenomenon belong to the most essential conditions, to the causal nexus of the phenomenon? The distant heavenly bodies have, in our example, no influence on the acceleration, but they have on the velocity.

Now, what share has every mass in the determination of direction and velocity in the law of inertia? No definite answer can be given to this by our experiences. We only know that the share of the nearest masses vanishes in comparison with that of the farthest. We would, then, be able completely to make out the facts known to us if, for example, we were to make the simple supposition that all bodies act in the way of determination proportionately to their masses and independently of the distance, or proportionately to the distance, and so on. Another expression would be: In so far as bodies are so distant from one another that they contribute no noticeable acceleration to one another, all distances vary proportionately to one another.

[***]

ON THE DEFINITION OF MASS

The circumstance that the fundamental propositions of mechanics are neither wholly *a priori* nor can wholly be discovered by means of

experience—for sufficiently numerous and accurate experiments cannot be made—results in a peculiarly inaccurate and unscientific treatment of these fundamental propositions and conceptions. Rarely is distinguished and stated clearly enough what is *a priori*, what empirical, and what is hypothesis.

Now, I can only imagine a scientific exposition of the fundamental propositions of mechanics to be such that one regards these theorems as hypotheses to which experience forces us, and that one afterwards shows how the denial of these hypotheses would lead to contradictions with the best-established facts.

As evident *a priori* we can only, in scientific investigations, consider the law of causality or the law of sufficient reason, which is only another form of the law of causality. No investigator of nature doubts that under the same circumstances the same always results, or that the effect is completely determined by the cause. It may remain undecided whether the law of causality rests on a powerful induction or has its foundation in the psychical organization (because in the psychic life, too, equal circumstances have equal consequences).

The importance of the law of sufficient reason in the hands of an investigator was proved by Clausius's works on thermodynamics and Kirchoff's researches on the connexion of absorption and emission. The well-trained investigator accustoms himself in his thought, by the aid of this theorem, to the same definiteness as nature has in its actions, and then experiences which are not in themselves very apparent suffice, by exclusion of all that is contradictory, to discover very important laws connected with the said experiences.

Usually, now, people are not very chary of asserting that a proposition is immediately evident. For example, the law of inertia is often stated to be such a proposition, as if it did not need the proof of experience. The fact is that it can only have grown out of experience. If masses imparted to one another, not acceleration, but, say, velocities which depended on the distance, there would be no law of inertia; but whether we have the one state of things or the other, only experience teaches. If we had merely sensations of heat, there would be merely equalizing velocities (*Ausgleichungsgeschwindigkeiten*), which vanish with the differences of temperature.

One can say of the motion of masses: 'The effect of every cause persists,' just as correctly as the opposite: 'Cessante causa cessat effectus'; it is merely a matter of words. If we call the resulting velocity the 'effect,' the first proposition is true, if we call the acceleration the 'effect,' the second is true.

Also people try to deduce *a priori* the theorem of the parallelogram of forces; but they must always bring in tacitly the supposition that the forces are independent of one another. But by this the whole derivation becomes superfluous.

I will now illustrate what I have said by *one* example, and show how I think the conception of mass can be quite scientifically developed. The

difficulty of this conception, which is pretty generally felt, lies, it seems to me, in two circumstances: (1) in the unsuitable arrangement of the first conceptions and theorems of mechanics; (2) in the silent passing over important presuppositions lying at the basis of the deduction.

Usually people define $m = \frac{p}{g}$ and again $p = mg$. This is either a very repugnant circle, or it is necessary for one to conceive force as 'pressure.' The latter cannot be avoided if, as is customary, statics precedes dynamics. The difficulty, in this case, of defining magnitude and direction of a force is well-known.

In that principle of Newton, which is usually placed at the head of mechanics, and which runs: 'Actioni contrariam semper et aequalem esse reactionem: sive corporum duorum actiones in se mutuo semper esse aequales et in partes contrarias dirigi,' the actio is again a pressure, or the principle is quite unintelligible unless we possess already the conception of force and mass. But pressure looks very strange at the head of the quite phronomical mechanics of today. However, this can be avoided.

If there were only one kind of matter, the law of sufficient reason would be sufficient to enable us to perceive that two completely similar bodies can impart to each other only *equal* and *opposite* accelerations. This is the one and only effect which is completely determined by the cause.

Now, if we suppose the mutual independence of forces, the following easily results. A body *A*, consisting of *m* bodies *a*, is the presence of another body *B*, consisting of *m'* bodies *a*. Let the acceleration of *A* be ϕ and that of *B* be ϕ' . Then we have $\phi : \phi' = m' : m$.

If we say that a body *A* has the mass *m* if it contains the body *a* *m* times, this means that the accelerations vary as the masses.

To find by experiment the mass-ratio of two bodies, let us allow them to act on one another, and we get, when we pay attention to the sign of the acceleration, $\frac{m}{m'} = -\left(\frac{\phi'}{\phi}\right)$.

If the one body is taken as a unit of mass, the calculation gives the mass of the other body. Now, nothing prevents us from applying this definition in cases in which two bodies of different matter act on one another. Only, we cannot know *a priori* whether we do not obtain other values for a mass when we consult other bodies used for purposes of comparison and other forces. When it was found that *A* and *B* combine chemically in the ratio *a* : *b* of their weights and that *A* and *C* do so in the ratio *a* : *c* of their weights, it could not be known beforehand that *B* and *C* combine in the ratio *b* : *c*. Only experience can teach us that two bodies which behave to a third as equal masses will also behave to one another as equal masses.

If a piece of gold is opposed to a piece of lead, the law of sufficient reason leaves us completely. We are not even justified in expecting contrary

motions: both bodies might accelerate in the same direction. The calculation would then lead to negative masses.

But that two bodies which behave as equal masses to a third behave as such to one another, with respect to any forces, is very likely, because the contrary would not be reconcilable with the law of the conservation of work (*Kraft*), which has hitherto been found to be valid.

Imagine three bodies *A*, *B*, and *C* movable on an absolutely smooth and absolutely fixed ring. The bodies are to act on one another with any forces. Further, both *A* and *B*, on the one hand, and *A* and *C*, on the other, are to behave to one another as equal masses. Then the same must hold between *B* and *C*.

If, for example, *C* behaved to *B* as a greater mass to a lesser one, and we gave *B* a velocity in the direction of the arrow, it would give this velocity wholly to *A* by impact, and *A* would give it wholly to *C*. Then *C* would communicate to *B* a greater velocity and yet keep some itself. With every revolution in the direction of the arrow, then, the *vis viva* in the ring would increase; and the contrary would take place if the original motion were in a direction opposite to that of the arrow. But this would be in glaring contradiction with the facts hitherto known.

If we have thus defined mass, nothing prevents us from keeping the old definition of force as product of mass and acceleration. The law of Newton mentioned above then becomes a mere identity.

Since all bodies receive from the earth an equal acceleration, we have in this force (their weight) a convenient measure of their masses; again, however, only under the two suppositions that bodies which behave as equal masses to the earth do so to one another, and with respect to every force. Consequently, the following arrangement of the theorems of mechanics would appear to me to be the most scientific.

Theorem of experience.—Bodies placed opposite to one another communicate to each other accelerations in opposite senses in the direction of their line of junction. The law of inertia is included in this.

Definition.—Bodies which communicate to each other equal and opposite accelerations are said to be of equal mass. We get the mass-value of a body

by dividing the acceleration which it gives the body with which we compare others, and choose as the unit, by the acceleration which it gets itself.

Theorem of experience.—The mass-values remain unaltered when they are determined with reference to other forces and to another body of comparison which behaves to the first one as an equal mass.

Theorem of experience.—The accelerations which many masses communicate to one another are mutually independent. The theorem of the parallelogram of forces is included in this.

Definition.—Force is the product of the mass-value of a body into the acceleration communicated to that body.”²⁸⁹²

Fechner stated,

“All that is given is what can be seen and felt, movement and the laws of movement. How then can we speak of force here? For physics, force is nothing but an auxiliary expression for presenting the laws of equilibrium and of motion; and every clear interpretation of physical force brings us back to this. We speak of laws of force; but when we look at the matter more closely, we find that they are merely laws of equilibrium and movement which hold for matter in the presence of matter. To say that the sun and the earth exercise an attraction upon one another, simply means that the sun and earth behave in relation to one another in accordance with definite laws. To the physicist, force is but a law, and in no other way does he know how to describe it. . . All that the physicist deduces from his forces is merely an inference from laws, through the instrumentality of the auxiliary word ‘force’.”²⁸⁹³

In his professorial address, Hendrik Antoon Lorentz avowed,

“The word ‘forces’ is but a name for certain entities present in our formulae[.]”²⁸⁹⁴

In 1877, Frederick William Frankland stated,

“[T]he conception of space is a particular variety of a wider and more general conception. This wider conception, of which time and space are particular varieties, it has been proposed to denote by the term manifoldness.”²⁸⁹⁵

In an argument dating as far back as 1870, the journal *Mind* published an article by Frankland in 1881, which set forth a version of “Mach’s principle”:

“Our first step will show us how thoroughly interdependent all these conceptions are. *Matter* can only be defined as that which possesses *inertia*—as that which requires a *force* proportional to its amount (designated

its *mass*) to effect a given change in its *motion* (either a change in velocity, or a change in direction, or both) in a given *time*. *Force*, again, can only be defined as that which causes a change in the velocity or direction of the *motion* of *matter*. It is tacitly assumed, though not often expressed, that the only thing which can cause such a change in velocity or direction is the co-existence of other matter. This amounts to saying that force is a relation of co-existence between different portions of matter. But every relation of co-existence in the material or phenomenal world is a relation of mutual positions in space. Hence force is a relation of mutual position between different portions of matter. *Motion*, in the kinetic, or dynamical, as opposed to the merely kinematical sense, is a change in the position of *matter*, and is completely determined when the mass of the moving body and the kinematical conditions of the case are given. The notion of *energy* does not require the introduction of any fundamentally new conception. Hence the phenomenal world is accurately described if we speak of it as a complex of motions, varying in infinite ways as regards mass on the one hand, and velocity and the other kinematical aspects on the other, tending severally to constancy in all these respects, but having a mutual action on one another, determined by their relations of co-existence, and, therefore, undergoing perpetual transformation. Now mark the parallelism. The noumenal world, we have seen, may be described as a complex of feeling elements, or Mind-Stuff units, having, just as motion has, extension in Time, varying in infinite ways as regards volume, intensity, and quality or timbre, having a mutual action on one another, determined by their mutual relations of co-existence, and undergoing perpetual transformations.”²⁸⁹⁶

W. K. Clifford published an influential article in 1878, “On the Nature of Things-inThemselves”,

“Mind-stuff is the reality which we perceive as Matter. [***] Matter is a mental picture in which mind-stuff is the thing represented.”²⁸⁹⁷

It is interesting to note that Cunningham, in 1914, uses Clifford’s term “mind-stuff” (which perhaps derives from Riemann) in the context of Minkowski’s “imaginary space of four dimensions”.²⁸⁹⁸ Eddington (appropriately enough also, like Frankland, in the journal *Mind*) later in 1920 relegated many aspects of Physics to solipsism, as if this were a novel approach by Einstein, when it clearly was not,

“THE theory of relativity has introduced into physics new conceptions of time and space, which have aroused widespread interest. Less attention has been paid to the position of matter in the new theory; but a natural interpretation suggests a view of the nature of matter, which is in some respects novel and is more precise than the theories hitherto current. It is perhaps a commonplace that, whatever may be the true nature of matter, it is the *mind* which from the crude substratum constructs the familiar picture of a

substantial world around us. On the present theory we seem able to discern something of the motives of the mind in selecting and endowing with substantiality one particular quality of the external world, and to see that practically no other choice was possible for the rational mind. It will appear in the discussion that many of the best-known laws of physics are not inherent in the external world, but were automatically imposed by mind when it made the selection.”²⁸⁹⁹

R. B. Braithwaite stated in 1929,

“Mr. Eddington’s metaphysic is, it is true, what W. K. Clifford’s would have been had he been a member of the Society of Friends instead of a militant atheist[.]”²⁹⁰⁰

And, indeed, Eddington had quoted Clifford in a long section of his Gifford lectures of 1927 dedicated to the definition of “*Mind-Stuff*”,

“The mind-stuff is the aggregation of relations and relata which form the building material for the physical world. Our account of the building process shows, however, that much that is implied in the relations is dropped as unserviceable for the required building. Our view is practically that urged in 1875 by W. K. Clifford—

‘The succession of feelings which constitutes a man’s consciousness is the reality which produces in our minds the perception of the motions of his brain.’

That is to say, that which the man himself knows as a succession of feelings is the reality which when probed by the appliances of an outside investigator affects their readings in such a way that it is identified as a configuration of brain-matter.”²⁹⁰¹

David Hilbert declared in the concluding paragraph of his 1915 lecture “The Foundations of Physics” that “the possibility draws near that in principle from Physics a science evolves which is a type of geometry”. In the 1800’s, the anti-Kantian Bolliger sought to attribute gravity to geometry, as did W. W. R. Ball.²⁹⁰²

In 1881, Johann Bernhard Stallo summarized the movement to abolish the term “force” from Physics, a movement often wrongfully attributed to Einstein,²⁹⁰³ as if originator,

“The prevailing errors respecting the inertia of matter have naturally led to corresponding delusions as to the nature of force. Here we are met, *in limine*, by an ambiguity in the meaning of the term force in physics and mechanics. When we speak of a ‘force of nature,’ we use the word force in a sense very different from that which it bears in mechanics. A ‘force of nature,’ is a survival of ontological speculation; in common phraseology the term stands for a distinct and real entity. But, as a determinate mechanical function, force

is simply the rate of change of momentum—mathematically expressed, the differential of momentum at a given instant of time. ‘Momentum,’ says Mr. Tait, [*Footnote: On Some Recent Advances in Physical Science*, second ed., p. 347.] ‘is the time-integral of force, because force is the rate of change of momentum.’ In the canonical text-books on physics, force is defined as the cause of motion. ‘Any cause,’ says Whewell, [*Footnote: Mechanics*, p. 1.] ‘which moves or tends to move a body, or which changes or tends to change its motion, is called force.’ So Clerk Maxwell: [*Footnote: Theory of Heat*, p. 83.] ‘Force is whatever changes or tends to change the motion of a body by altering either its direction or its magnitude.’ Far greater insight into the nature of force is exhibited in the definition of Somoff, though the word ‘cause’ is retained: ‘A material point is moved by the presence of matter without it. This action of extraneous matter is attributed to a cause which is named force.’ [*Footnote: Somoff, Theoretische Mechanik* (trans. by Ziwet), vol. ii, p. 155.] Taking these definitions as correctly representing the received theories of physical science, it is manifest, irrespective of the considerations I have presented in this and the preceding chapters, that force is not an individual thing or entity that presents itself directly to observation or to thought, but that, so far as it is treated as a definite and unital term in the operations of thought, it is purely an incident to the conception of the interdependence of moving masses. The cause of motion, or of the change of motion, in a body is the condition or group of conditions upon which the motion depends; and this condition or group of conditions is always a corresponding motion, or change of motion, of the bodies outside of the body in question which are its dynamical correlates. [*Footnote: ‘Der gegenwaertig klar entwickelte mechanische Begriff der Kraft,’* says Zoellner (*Natur der Kometen*, p. 328), ‘enthalt nichts Anders als den Ausdruck einer raemlichen und zeitlichen Beziehung zweier Koerper.’] Otherwise expressed, force is a mere inference from the motion itself under the universal conditions of reality, and its measure and determination lie solely in the effect for which it is postulated as a cause; it has no other existence. The only reality of force and its action is the correspondence between physical phenomena in conformity with the principle of the essential relativity of all forms of physical existence.

That force has no independent reality is so plain and obvious that it has been proposed by some thinkers to abolish the term *force*, like the term *cause*, altogether. However desirable a sparing use of such terms may be (as is illustrated in the clearness of some modern mechanical treatises [*Footnote: Cf. e. g. Kirchhoff, Vorlesungen ueber mathematische Physik. Heidelberg, 1876.*]), it is impracticable wholly to dispense with it, for the reason that the conceptual element force, when properly interpreted in terms of experience, is a legitimate incident to the conception of physical action, and, if its name were disused, it would instantly reappear under another name. There are few concepts which have not, in science as well as in metaphysics, given rise to the same confusion that prevails in regard to ‘force’ and ‘cause;’ and the

blow leveled at these would demolish all concepts whatever. Nevertheless, it is of the greatest moment, in all speculations concerning the interdependence of physical phenomena, never to lose sight of the fact that force is a purely conceptual term, and that it is not a distinct tangible or intangible thing.”²⁹⁰⁴

In the Nineteenth Century, Robert Mayer, and many others argued for the “correlation and conservation of force.”²⁹⁰⁵ Also in the Nineteenth Century, among the Anti-Kantians, Monists, mathematicians, Positivists, æther theorists and field theorists, there were primarily two schools of thought *pushing* for the abandonment of the term “force” as a mystical Newtonian concept. One school opposed the Newtonian mythology of “action at a distance” and sought the unification of all “forces” long before Einstein pursued Hilbert’s goal of a unified field theory. Hilbert wrote in 1915,

“Wie man sieht, genügen bei sinngemäßer Deutung die wenigen einfachen in den Axiomen I und II ausgesprochenen Annahmen zum Aufbau der Theorie: durch dieselbe werden nicht nur unsere Vorstellungen über Raum, Zeit und Bewegung von Grund aus in dem von E i n s t e i n dargelegten Sinne umgestaltet, sondern ich bin auch der Überzeugung, daß durch die hier aufgestellten Grundgleichungen die intimsten bisher verborgenen Vorgänge innerhalb des Atoms Aufklärung erhalten werden und insbesondere allgemein eine Zurückführung aller physikalischen Konstanten auf mathematische Konstanten möglich sein muß — wie denn überhaupt damit die Möglichkeit naht, daß aus der Physik im Prinzip eine Wissenschaft von der Art der Geometrie werde: gewiß der herrlichste Ruhm der axiomatischen Methode, die hier wie wir sehen die mächtigen Instrumente der Analysis, nämlich Variationsrechnung und Invariantentheorie, in ihre Dienste nimmt.”²⁹⁰⁶

This school included Pasley,²⁹⁰⁷ Faraday,²⁹⁰⁸ Secchi,²⁹⁰⁹ Anderssohn,²⁹¹⁰ Spiller,²⁹¹¹ Vogt,²⁹¹² Haeckel,²⁹¹³ Jahr,²⁹¹⁴ Sutherland,²⁹¹⁵ See,²⁹¹⁶ Wiechert,²⁹¹⁷ etc. and most of them sought a universal æther as a cause of the motions hitherto attributed to mystical nondescript “force”. The other school included Herbart,²⁹¹⁸ Mossotti,²⁹¹⁹ Poe,²⁹²⁰ Dühring,²⁹²¹ Mach,²⁹²² Bolliger,²⁹²³ Stallo,²⁹²⁴ Geissler,²⁹²⁵ Noble,²⁹²⁶ Hilbert,²⁹²⁷ etc. and they believed in relativity, geometry and multiplicity as the apparent “cause” of the seeming “effects” attributed to mysterious Newtonian “forces”. This all happened long before Lorentz,²⁹²⁸ Ishiwara,²⁹²⁹ de Donder,²⁹³⁰ Nordström,²⁹³¹ Einstein, Weyl,²⁹³² Thirring,²⁹³³ Kaluza²⁹³⁴ and Klein, etc. took up the research program of the unification of forces and fields in the theory of relativity, which followed directly from Faraday’s experimental work.²⁹³⁵

Schopenhauer stated in 1819 in his book *The World as Will and Representation*,

“Force and substance are inseparable, because at bottom they are one; for, as Kant has shown, matter itself is given to us only as the union of forces, that

of expansion and that of attraction. Therefore there exists no opposition between force and substance; on the contrary, they are precisely one.”²⁹³⁶

Michael Faraday, like many others, pursued Boscovich’s atomic theory of atoms as point centers of force and expressed Dynamism as a field theory without an æther. Faraday was inspired by Peter Mark Roget, famous for the theory of persistent vision and for his thesaurus. The editors of the English translation of Mossotti’s influential article “On the Forces which regulate the Internal Constitution of Bodies”, *Scientific Memoirs*, Volume 1, Richard Taylor, London, (1837), pp. 448-469; included the following endnote:

“[The readers of this Memoir will doubtless be interested in referring to Dr. Roget’s “Treatise on Electricity” in the Library of Useful Knowledge, published March 15th, 1828; the following passage from which was noticed with reference to M. Mossotti’s views, by Prof. Faraday in his lecture at the Royal Institution, Jan. 20th of the present year.— EDIT.]

‘(239.) It is a great though a common error to imagine, that the condition assumed by Æpinus, namely that the particles of matter when devoid of electricity repel one another, is in opposition to the law of universal gravitation established by the researches of Newton; for this law applies, in every instance to which inquiry has extended, to matter in its ordinary state; that is, combined with a certain proportion of electric fluid. By supposing, indeed, that the mutual repulsive action between the particles of matter is, by a very small quantity, less than that between the particles of the electric fluid, a small balance would be left in favour of the attraction of neutral bodies for one another, which might constitute the very force which operates under the name of gravitation; and thus both classes of phænomena may be included in the same law.’”

Edgar Allen Poe wrote in his Monistic and Dynamystic *Eureka: A Prose Poem* of 1848, which contains many of the elements of modern relativity theory,

“Discarding now the two equivocal terms, ‘gravitation’ and ‘electricity,’ let us adopt the more definite expressions, ‘Attraction’ and ‘Repulsion.’ The former is the body, the latter the soul; the one is the material, the other the spiritual, principle of the Universe. *No other principles exist. All phenomena are referable to one, or to the other, or to both combined.* So rigorously is this the case, so thoroughly demonstrable is it that Attraction and Repulsion are the *sole* properties through which we perceive the Universe—in other words, by which Matter is manifested to Mind — that, for all merely argumentative purposes, we are fully justified in assuming that Matter *exists* only as Attraction and Repulsion—that Attraction and Repulsion *are* matter; there being no conceivable case in which we may not employ the term ‘Matter’ and the terms ‘Attraction’ and ‘Repulsion,’ taken together, as equivalent, and

therefore convertible, expressions in Logic.”²⁹³⁷

Faraday wrote in 1845,

“2146. I HAVE long held an opinion, almost amounting to conviction, in common I believe with many other lovers of natural knowledge, that the various forms under which the forces of matter are made manifest have one common origin; or, in other words, are so directly related and mutually dependent, that they are convertible, as it were, one into another, and possess equivalents of power in their action. [*Footnote: Experimental Researches*, 57, 366, 376, 877, 961, 2071.] In modern times the proofs of their convertibility have been accumulated to a very considerable extent, and a commencement made of the determination of their equivalent forces.”²⁹³⁸

Faraday’s statement caught the attention of Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton, who referred to it soon after in Chapter 7 of his novel *The Coming Race*,

“‘What is vril?’ I asked.

Therewith Zee began to enter into an explanation of which I understood very little, for there is no word in any language I know which is an exact synonym for vril. I should call it electricity, except that it comprehends in its manifold branches other forces of nature, to which, in our scientific nomenclature, differing names are assigned, such as magnetism, galvanism, etc. These people consider that in vril they have arrived at the unity in natural energetic agencies, which has been conjectured by many philosophers above ground, and which Faraday thus intimates under the more cautious term of ‘correlation’:—

‘I have long held an opinion,’ says that illustrious experimentalist, ‘almost amounting to a conviction, in common, I believe, with many other lovers of natural knowledge, that the various forms under which the forces of matter are made manifest have one common origin; or, in other words, are so directly related and mutually dependent, that they are convertible, as it were, into one another, and possess equivalents of power in their action.’

These subterranean philosophers assert that, by one operation of vril, which Faraday would perhaps call ‘atmospheric magnetism,’ they can influence the variations of temperature—in plain words, the weather; that by other operations, akin to those ascribed to mesmerism, electro-biology, odic force, etc., but applied scientifically through vril conductors, they can exercise influence over minds, and bodies animal and vegetable, to an extent not surpassed in the romances of our mystics. To all such agencies they give the common name of ‘vril.’”²⁹³⁹

Helene Petrovna Blavatsky in turn referred to both Faraday’s statement and Bulwer-Lytton’s “vril” in her *Isis Unveiled: A Master-key to the Mysteries of Ancient and Modern Science and Theology*, Volume 1, Chapter 5, J.W. Bouton, New York,

(1877), pp. 125-126,

“Sir E. Bulwer-Lytton, in his *Coming Race*, describes it as the VRIL,[*Footnote*: We apprehend that the noble author coined his curious names by contracting words in classical languages. Gy would come from gune; vril from virile.] used by the subterranean populations, and allowed his readers to take it for a fiction. ‘These people,’ he says, ‘consider that in the vril they had arrived at the unity in natural energetic agencies’; and proceeds to show that Faraday intimated them ‘under the more cautious term of correlation,’ thus:

‘I have long held an opinion, almost amounting to a conviction, in common, I believe, with many other lovers of natural knowledge, that the various forms under which the forces of matter are made manifest, HAVE ONE COMMON ORIGIN; or, in other words, are so directly related and naturally dependent, that they are convertible, as it were, into one another, and possess equivalents of power in their action.’

Absurd and unscientific as may appear our comparison of a fictitious vril invented by the great novelist, and the primal force of the equally great experimentalist, with the kabalistic astral light, it is nevertheless the true definition of this force.”

Faraday stated in 1850,

“2702. THE long and constant persuasion that all the forces of nature are mutually dependent, having one common origin, or rather being different manifestations of one fundamental power (2146), has made me often think upon the possibility of establishing by experiment, a connexion between gravity and electricity, and so introducing the former into the group, the chain of which, including also magnetism, chemical force and heat, binds so many and such varied exhibitions of force together by common relations. Though the researches I have made with this object in view have produced only negative results, yet I think a short statement of the matter, as it has presented itself to my mind, and of the result of the experiments, which offering at first much to encourage, were only reduced to their true value by most careful searchings after sources of error, may be useful, both as a general statement of the problem, and as awakening the minds of others to its consideration.”²⁹⁴⁰

Faraday argued, on 15 April 1846,

“AT your request I will endeavour to convey to you a notion of that which I ventured to say at the close of the last Friday-evening Meeting, incidental to the account I gave of Wheatstone’s electro-magnetic chronoscope; but from first to last understand that I merely threw out as matter for speculation, the vague impressions of my mind, for I gave nothing as the result of

sufficient consideration, or as the settled conviction, or even probable conclusion at which I had arrived.

The point intended to be set forth for consideration of the hearers was, whether it was not possible that the vibrations which in a certain theory are assumed to account for radiation and radiant phænomena may not occur in the lines of force which connect particles, and consequently masses of matter together; a notion which as far as it is admitted, will dispense with the æther, which, in another view, is supposed to be the medium in which these vibrations take place.

You are aware of the speculation [*Footnote: Philosophical Magazine, 1844, vol xxiv, p136; or Exp. Res. ii.284.*] which I some time since uttered respecting that view of the nature of matter which considers its ultimate atoms as centres of force, and not as so many little bodies surrounded by forces, the bodies being considered in the abstract as independent of the forces and capable of existing without them. In the latter view, these little particles have a definite form and a certain limited size; in the former view such is not the case, for that which represents size may be considered as extending to any distance to which the lines of force of the particle extend: the particle indeed is supposed to exist only by these forces, and where they are it is. The consideration of matter under this view gradually led me to look at the lines of force as being perhaps the seat of the vibrations of radiant phænomena.

Another consideration bearing conjointly on the hypothetical view both of matter and radiation, arises from the comparison of the velocities with which the radiant action and certain powers of matter are transmitted. The velocity of light through space is about 190,000 miles in a second; the velocity of electricity is, by the experiments of Wheatstone, shown to be as great as this, if not greater: the light is supposed to be transmitted by vibrations through an æther which is, so to speak, destitute of gravitation, but infinite in elasticity; the electricity is transmitted through a small metallic wire, and is often viewed as transmitted by vibrations also. That the electric transference depends on the forces or powers of the matter of the wire can hardly be doubted, when we consider the different conductivity of the various metallic and other bodies; the means of affecting it by heat or cold; the way in which conducting bodies by combination enter into the constitution of non-conducting substances, and the contrary; and the actual existence of one elementary body, carbon, both in the conducting and non-conducting state. The power of electric conduction (being a transmission of force equal in velocity to that of light) appears to be tied up in and dependent upon the properties of the matter, and is, as it were, existent in them.

I suppose we may compare together the matter of the æther and ordinary matter (as, for instance, the copper of the wire through which the electricity is conducted), and consider them as alike in their essential constitution; *i. e.* either as both composed of little nuclei, considered in the abstract as matter,

and of force or power associated with these nuclei, or else both consisting of mere centres of force, according to Boscovich's theory and the view put forth in my speculation; for there is no reason to assume that the nuclei are more requisite in the one case than in the other. It is true that the copper gravitates and the æther does not, and that therefore the copper is ponderable and the æther is not; but that cannot indicate the presence of nuclei in the copper more than in the æther, for of all the powers of matter gravitation is the one in which the force extends to the greatest possible distance from the supposed nucleus, being infinite in relation to the size of the latter, and reducing that nucleus to a mere centre of force. The smallest atom of matter on the earth acts directly on the smallest atom of matter in the sun, though they are 95,000,000 miles apart; further, atoms which, to our knowledge, are at least nineteen times that distance, and indeed in cometary masses, far more, are in a similar way tied together by the lines of force extending from and belonging to each. What is there in the condition of the particles of the supposed æther, if there be even only *one* such particle between us and the sun, that can in subtilty and extent compare to this?

Let us not be confused by the *ponderability* and *gravitation* of heavy matter, as if they proved the presence of the abstract nuclei; these are due not to the nuclei, but to the force super-added to them, if the nuclei exist at all; and, if the *æther* particles be without this force, which according to the assumption is the case, then they are more material, in the abstract sense, than the matter of this our globe; for matter, according to the assumption, being made up of nuclei and force, the æther particles have in this respect proportionately more of the nucleus and less of the force.

On the other hand, the infinite elasticity assumed as belonging to the particles of the æther, is as striking and positive a force of it as gravity is of ponderable particles, and produces in its way effects as great; in witness whereof we have all the varieties of radiant agency as exhibited in luminous, calorific, and actinic phænomena.

Perhaps I am in error in thinking the idea generally formed of the æther is that its nuclei are almost infinitely small, and that such force as it has, namely its elasticity, is almost infinitely intense. But if such be the received notion, what then is left in the æther but force or centres of force? As gravitation and solidity do not belong to it, perhaps many may admit this conclusion; but what are gravitation and solidity? certainly not the weight and contact of the abstract nuclei. The one is the consequence of an *attractive* force, which can act at distances as great as the mind of man can estimate or conceive; and the other is the consequence of a *repulsive* force, which forbids for ever the contact or touch of any two nuclei; so that these powers or properties should not in any degree lead those persons who conceive of the æther as a thing consisting of force only, to think any otherwise of ponderable matter, except that it has more and other *forces* associated with it than the æther has.

In experimental philosophy we can, by the phænomena presented,

recognize various kinds of lines of force; thus there are the lines of gravitating force, those of electro-static induction, those of magnetic action, and others partaking of a dynamic character might be perhaps included. The lines of electric and magnetic action are by many considered as exerted through space like the lines of gravitating force. For my own part, I incline to believe that when there are intervening particles of matter (being themselves only centres of force), they take part in carrying on the force through the line, but that when there are none, the line proceeds through space. [*Footnote:* Experimental Researches in Electricity, pars. 1161, 1613, 1663, 1770, 1729, 1735, 2443.] Whatever the view adopted respecting them may be, we can, at all events, affect these lines of force in a manner which may be conceived as partaking of the nature of a shake or lateral vibration. For suppose two bodies, A B, distant from each other and under mutual action, and therefore connected by lines of force, and let us fix our attention upon one resultant of force, having an invariable direction as regards space; if one of the bodies move in the least degree right or left, or if its power be shifted for a moment within the mass (neither of these cases being difficult to realise if A and B be either electric or magnetic bodies), then an effect equivalent to a lateral disturbance will take place in the resultant upon which we are fixing our attention; for, either it will increase in force whilst the neighboring results are diminishing, or it will fall in force as they are increasing.

It may be asked, what lines of force are there in nature which are fitted to convey such an action and supply for the vibrating theory the place of the æther? I do not pretend to answer this question with any confidence; all I can say is, that I do not perceive in any part of space, whether (to use the common phrase) vacant or filled with matter, anything but forces and the lines in which they are exerted. The lines of weight or gravitating force are, certainly, extensive enough to answer in this respect any demand made upon them by radiant phenomena; and so, probably, are the lines of magnetic force: and then who can forget that Mossotti has shown that gravitation, aggregation, electric force, and electro-chemical action may all have one common connection or origin; and so, in their actions at a distance, may have in common that infinite scope which some of these actions are known to possess?

The view which I am so bold as to put forth considers, therefore, radiation as a high species of vibration in the lines of force which are known to connect particles and also masses of matter together. It endeavours to dismiss the æther, but not the vibration. The kind of vibration which, I believe, can alone account for the wonderful, varied, and beautiful phenomena of polarization, is not the same as that which occurs on the surface of disturbed water, or the waves of sound in gases or liquids, for the vibrations in these cases are direct, or to and from the centre of action, whereas the former are lateral. It seems to me, that the resultant of two or more lines of force is in an apt condition for that action which may be

considered as equivalent to a *lateral* vibration; whereas a uniform medium, like the æther, does not appear apt, or more apt than air or water.

The occurrence of a change at one end of a line of force easily suggests a consequent change at the other. The propagation of light, and therefore probably of all radiant action, occupies *time*; and, that a vibration of the line of force should account for the phænomena of radiation, it is necessary that such vibration should occupy time also. I am not aware whether there are any data by which it has been, or could be ascertained whether such a power as gravitation acts without occupying time, or whether lines of force being already in existence, such a lateral disturbance of them at one end as I have suggested above, would require time, or must of necessity be felt instantly at the other end.

As to that condition of the lines of force which represents the assumed high elasticity of the æther, it cannot in this respect be deficient: the question here seems rather to be, whether the lines are sluggish enough in their action to render them equivalent to the æther in respect of the time known experimentally to be occupied in the transmission of radiant force.

The æther is assumed as pervading all bodies as well as space: in the view now set forth, it is the forces of the atomic centres which pervade (and make) all bodies, and also penetrate all space. As regards space, the difference is, that the æther presents successive parts or centres of action, and the present supposition only lines of action; as regards matter, the difference is, that the æther lies between the particles and so carries on the vibrations, whilst as respects the supposition, it is by the lines of force between the centres of the particles that the vibration is continued. As to the difference in intensity of action within matter under the two views, I suppose it will be very difficult to draw any conclusion, for when we take the simplest state of common matter and that which most nearly causes it to approximate to the condition of the æther, namely the state of the rare gas, how soon do we find in its elasticity and the mutual repulsion of its particles, a departure from the law, that the action is inversely as the square of the distance!

And now, my dear Phillips, I must conclude. I do not think I should have allowed these notions to have escaped from me, had I not been led unawares, and without previous consideration, by the circumstances of the evening on which I had to appear suddenly and occupy the place of another. Now that I have put them on paper, I feel that I ought to have kept them much longer for study, consideration, and, perhaps final rejection; and it is only because they are sure to go abroad in one way or another, in consequence of their utterance on that evening, that I give them a shape, if shape it may be called, in this reply to your inquiry. One thing is certain, that any hypothetical view of radiation which is likely to be received or retained as satisfactory, must not much longer comprehend alone certain phænomena of light, but must include those of heat and of actinic influence also, and even the conjoined phænomena of sensible heat and chemical power produced by them. In this respect, a view, which is in some degree founded upon the ordinary forces

of matter, may perhaps find a little consideration amongst the other views that will probably arise. I think it likely that I have made many mistakes in the preceding pages, for even to myself, my ideas on this point appear only as the shadow of a speculation, or as one of those impressions on the mind which are allowable for a time as guides to thought and research. He who labours in experimental inquiries knows how numerous these are, and how often their apparent fitness and beauty vanish before the progress and development of real natural truth.”²⁹⁴¹

Faraday’s ideas were very influential. William Kingdon Clifford argued for a space theory of matter in the 1870’s. Clifford speculated in the year of his death and of Einstein’s birth, 1879, that light may be naught but flickering “space”,

“In order to explain the phenomena of light, it is not necessary to assume anything more than a periodical oscillation between two states at any given point of space.”²⁹⁴²

Karl Pearson noted, as second editor and annotator of Clifford’s *The Common Sense of the Exact Sciences* in 1884-1885,

“The most notable physical quantities which vary with position and time are heat, light, and electro-magnetism. It is these that we ought peculiarly to consider when seeking for any physical changes, which may be due to changes in the curvature of space. If we suppose the boundary of any arbitrary figure in space to be distorted by the variation of space-curvature, there would, by analogy from one and two dimensions, be no change in the volume of the figure arising from such distortion. Further, if we *assume* as an axiom that space resists curvature with a resistance proportional to the change, we find that waves of ‘space-displacement’ are precisely similar to those of the elastic medium which we suppose to propagate light and heat. We also find that ‘space-twist’ is a quantity exactly corresponding to magnetic induction, and satisfying relations similar to those which hold for the magnetic field. It is a question whether physicists might not find it simpler to assume that space is capable of a varying curvature, and of a resistance to that variation, than to suppose the existence of a subtle medium pervading an invariable homaloidal space.”²⁹⁴³

Clifford stated, in 1870, in his lecture, “On the Space Theory of Matter,”

“RIEMANN has shown that as there are different kinds of lines and surfaces, so there are different kinds of space of three dimensions; and that we can only find out by experience to which of these kinds the space in which we live belongs. In particular, the axioms of plane geometry are true within the limits of experiment on the surface of a sheet of paper, and yet we know that the sheet is really covered with a number of small ridges and furrows, upon

which (the total curvature not being zero) these axioms are not true. Similarly, he says although the axioms of solid geometry are true within the limits of experiment for finite portions of our space, yet we have no reason to conclude that they are true for very small portions; and if any help can be got thereby for the explanation of physical phenomena, we may have reason to conclude that they are not true for very small portions of space.

I wish here to indicate a manner in which these speculations may be applied to the investigation of physical phenomena. I hold in fact

(1) That small portions of space *are* in fact of a nature analogous to little hills on a surface which is on the average flat; namely, that the ordinary laws of geometry are not valid in them.

(2) That this property of being curved or distorted is continually being passed on from one portion of space to another after the manner of a wave.

(3) That this variation of the curvature of space is what really happens in that phenomenon which we call the *motion of matter*, whether ponderable or ethereal.

(4) That in the physical world nothing else takes place but this variation, subject (possibly) to the law of continuity.

I am endeavouring in a general way to explain the laws of double refraction on this hypothesis, but have not yet arrived at any results sufficiently decisive to be communicated.”²⁹⁴⁴

Clifford stated, in a work published posthumously in 1885, some six years after his death,

“§19. *On the Bending of Space*

The peculiar topic of this chapter has been position, position namely of a point P relative to a point A. This relative position led naturally to a consideration of the geometry of steps. I proceeded on the hypothesis that all position is relative, and therefore to be determined only by a stepping process. The relativity of position was a postulate deduced from the customary methods of determining position, such methods in fact always giving relative position. *Relativity of position is thus a postulate derived from experience.* The late Professor Clerk-Maxwell fully expressed the weight of this postulate in the following words:—

All our knowledge, both of time and place, is essentially relative. When a man has acquired the habit of putting words together, without troubling himself to form the thoughts which ought to correspond to them, it is easy for him to frame an antithesis between this relative knowledge and a so-called absolute knowledge, and to point out our ignorance of the absolute position of a point as an instance of the limitation of our faculties. Any one, however, who will try to imagine the state of a mind conscious of knowing the absolute position of a point will ever after be content with our relative knowledge.²⁹⁴⁵

It is of such great value to ascertain how far we can be certain of the truth of our postulates in the exact sciences that I shall ask the reader to return to our conception of position albeit from a somewhat different standpoint. I shall even ask him to attempt an examination of that state of mind which Professor Clerk-Maxwell hinted at in his last sentence.

[***]

But we may press our analogy a step further, and ask, since our hypothetical worm and fish might very readily attribute the effects of changes in the bending of their spaces to changes in their own physical condition, whether we may not in like fashion be treating merely as physical variations effects which are really due to changes in the curvature of our space; whether, in fact, some or all of those causes which we term physical may not be due to the geometrical construction of our space. There are three kinds of variation in the curvature of our space which we ought to consider as within the range of possibility.

(i) Our space is perhaps really possessed of a curvature varying from point to point, which we fail to appreciate because we are acquainted with only a small portion of space, or because we disguise its small variations under changes in our physical condition which we do not connect with our change of position. The mind that could recognize this varying curvature might be assumed to know the absolute position of a point. For such a mind the postulate of the relativity of position would cease to have a meaning. It does not seem so hard to conceive such a state of mind as the late Professor Clerk-Maxwell would have had us believe. It would be one capable of distinguishing those so-called physical changes which are really geometrical or due to a change of position in space.

(ii) Our space may be really same (of equal curvature), but its degree of curvature may change as a whole with the time. In this way our geometry based on the sameness of space would still hold good for all parts of space, but the change of curvature might produce in space a succession of apparent physical changes.

(iii) We may conceive our space to have everywhere a nearly uniform curvature, but that slight variations of the curvature may occur from point to point, and themselves vary with the time. These variations of the curvature with the time may produce effects which we not unnaturally attribute to physical causes independent of the geometry of our space. We might even go so far as to assign to this variation of the curvature of space 'what really happens in that phenomenon which we term the motion of matter.'

We have introduced these considerations as to the nature of our space to bring home to the reader the character of the postulates we make in the exact sciences. These postulates are *not*, as too often assumed, necessary and universal truths; they are merely axioms based on our experience of a certain limited region. Just as in any branch of physical inquiry we start by making experiments, and basing on our experiments a set of axioms which form the foundation of an exact science, so in geometry our axioms are really,

although less obviously, the result of experience. On this ground geometry has been properly termed at the commencement of Chapter II a *physical* science. The danger of asserting dogmatically that an axiom based on the experience of a limited region holds universally will now be to some extent apparent to the reader. It may lead us to entirely overlook, or when suggested at once reject, a possible explanation of phenomena. The hypotheses that space is not homaloidal, and again, that its geometrical character may change with the time, may or may not be destined to play a great part in the physics of the future; yet we cannot refuse to consider them as possible explanations of physical phenomena, because they may be opposed to the popular dogmatic belief in the universality of certain geometrical axioms—a belief which has arisen from centuries of indiscriminating worship of the genius of Euclid.”²⁹⁴⁶

14.5 Mach’s Principle

The pantheistic Cabalist Henry More (who was also inspired by Aristotle and who inspired John Locke, Isaac Newton and Samuel Clarke) wrote that absolute space is God, as proved by the thought experiment of the hypothetical annihilation of all matter,

“But if this will not satisfy, ’tis no detriment to our cause: For if, after the removal of *corporeal Matter* out of the world, there will be still *Space* and *Distance* in which this very Matter, while it was there, was also conceiv’d to lie, and this *distant Space* cannot but be something, and yet not corporeal, because neither impenetrable nor tangible; it must of necessity be a Substance Incorporeal necessarily and eternally existent of it self: which the clearer *Idea* of a *Being absolutely perfect* will more fully and punctually inform us to be the *Self-subsisting God*.”²⁹⁴⁷

John Locke raised the issue in his essay *Concerning Human Understanding*, Chapter 13, Section 22, which would lead Berkeley to “Mach’s Principle” some 150 years before Mach. Locke wrote,

“22. *The power of annihilation proves a vacuum*. Farther, those who assert the impossibility of space existing without matter, must not only make body infinite, but must also deny a power in God to annihilate any part of matter. No one, I suppose, will deny that God can put an end to all motion that is in matter, and fix all the bodies of the universe in a perfect quiet and rest, and continue them so long as he pleases. Whoever then will allow that God can, during such a general rest, *annihilate* either this book or the body of him that reads it, must necessarily admit the possibility of a vacuum. For, it is evident that the space that was filled by the parts of the annihilated body will still remain, and be a space without body. For the circumambient bodies being in perfect rest, are a wall of adamant, and in that state make it a perfect

impossibility for any other body to get into that space. And indeed the necessary motion of one particle of matter into the place from whence another particle of matter is removed, is but a consequence from the supposition of plenitude; which will therefore need some better proof than a supposed matter of fact, which experiment can never make out;—our own clear and distinct ideas plainly satisfying us, that there is no necessary connexion between space and solidity, since we can conceive the one without the other. And those who dispute for or against a vacuum, do thereby confess they have distinct *ideas* of vacuum and plenum, i.e. that they have an idea of extension void of solidity, though they deny its *existence*; or else they dispute about nothing at all. For they who so much alter the signification of words, as to call extension body, and consequently make the whole essence of body to be nothing but pure extension without solidity, must talk absurdly whenever they speak of *vacuum*; since it is impossible for extension to be without extension. For *vacuum*, whether we affirm or deny its existence, signifies space without body; whose very existence no one can deny to be possible, who will not make matter infinite, and take from God a power to annihilate any particle of it.”

Locke’s idea was pursued by Isaac Newton,²⁹⁴⁸ Samuel Clarke,²⁹⁴⁹ and Carl Neumann, who stated in 1869,

“This seems to be the right place for an observation which forces itself upon us and from which it clearly follows how unbearable are the contradictions that arise when motion is conceived as something relative rather than something absolute. Let us assume that among the stars there is one which is composed of fluid matter and is somewhat similar to our terrestrial globe and that it is rotating around an axis that passes through its center. As a result of such a motion, and due to the resulting centrifugal forces, this star would take on the shape of a flattened ellipsoid. We now ask: What shape will this star assume if all remaining heavenly bodies are suddenly annihilated (turned into nothing)? These centrifugal forces are dependent only on the state of the star itself; they are totally independent of the remaining heavenly bodies. Consequently, this is our answer: These centrifugal forces and the spherical ellipsoidal form dependent on them will persist regardless of whether the remaining heavenly bodies continue to exist or suddenly disappear.”²⁹⁵⁰

Berkeley, Mach and others opposed the ontological supposition that space is an entity unto itself and that inertia would exist without other matter. Des Cartes asserted that extension is a property of matter, and only by mental abstraction becomes “space”. Leibnitz’ monadistic philosophy emphasized that, “without matter no space”.²⁹⁵¹

Berkeley was one of many who argued against Newtonian absolutism. From Berkeley’s *Principles of Human Knowledge* of 1710,

“97. Beside the external existence of the objects of perception, another great source of errors and difficulties with regard to ideal knowledge is the doctrine of *abstract ideas*, such as it hath been set forth in the Introduction. The plainest things in the world, those we are most intimately acquainted with and perfectly know, when they are considered in an abstract way, appear strangely difficult and incomprehensible. Time, place, and motion, taken in particular or concrete, are what everybody knows, but, having passed through the hands of a metaphysician, they become too abstract and fine to be apprehended by men of ordinary sense. Bid your servant meet you at such a *time* in such a *place*, and he shall never stay to deliberate on the meaning of those words; in conceiving that particular time and place, or the motion by which he is to get thither, he finds not the least difficulty. But if *time* be taken exclusive of all those particular actions and ideas that diversify the day, merely for the continuation of existence or duration in abstract, then it will perhaps gravel even a philosopher to comprehend it.

98. For my own part, whenever I attempt to frame a simple idea of *time*, abstracted from the succession of ideas in my mind, which flows uniformly and is participated by all beings, I am lost and embrangled in inextricable difficulties. I have no notion of it at all, only I hear others say it is infinitely divisible, and speak of it in such a manner as leads me to entertain odd thoughts of my existence; since that doctrine lays one under an absolute necessity of thinking, either that he passes away innumerable ages without a thought, or else that he is annihilated every moment of his life, both which seem equally absurd. Time therefore being nothing, abstracted from the succession of ideas in our minds, it follows that the duration of any finite spirit must be estimated by the number of ideas or actions succeeding each other in that same spirit or mind. Hence, it is a plain consequence that the soul always thinks; and in truth whoever shall go about to divide in his thoughts, or abstract the *existence* of a spirit from its *cogitation*, will, I believe, find it no easy task.

99. So likewise when we attempt to abstract extension and motion from all other qualities, and consider them by themselves, we presently lose sight of them, and run into great extravagances. All which depend on a twofold abstraction; first, it is supposed that extension, for example, may be abstracted from all other sensible qualities; and secondly, that the entity of extension may be abstracted from its being perceived. But, whoever shall reflect, and take care to understand what he says, will, if I mistake not, acknowledge that all sensible qualities are alike *sensations* and alike *real*; that where the extension is, there is the colour, too, *i.e.*, in his mind, and that their archetypes can exist only in some other *mind*; and that the objects of sense are nothing but those sensations combined, blended, or (if one may so speak) concreted together; none of all which can be supposed to exist unperceived.

[***]

110. The best key for the aforesaid analogy or natural Science will be

easily acknowledged to be a certain celebrated Treatise of *Mechanics*. In the entrance of which justly admired treatise, Time, Space, and Motion are distinguished into *absolute* and *relative*, *true* and *apparent*, *mathematical* and *vulgar*; which distinction, as it is at large explained by the author, does suppose these quantities to have an existence without the mind; and that they are ordinarily conceived with relation to sensible things, to which nevertheless in their own nature they bear no relation at all.

111. As for *Time*, as it is there taken in an absolute or abstracted sense, for the duration or perseverance of the existence of things, I have nothing more to add concerning it after what has been already said on that subject. [Sect. 97 and 98] For the rest, this celebrated author holds there is an *absolute Space*, which, being unperceivable to sense, remains in itself similar and immovable; and relative space to be the measure thereof, which, being movable and defined by its situation in respect of sensible bodies, is vulgarly taken for immovable space. *Place* he defines to be that part of space which is occupied by any body; and according as the space is absolute or relative so also is the place. *Absolute Motion* is said to be the translation of a body from absolute place to absolute place, as relative motion is from one relative place to another. And, because the parts of absolute space do not fall under our senses, instead of them we are obliged to use their sensible measures, and so define both place and motion with respect to bodies which we regard as immovable. But, it is said in philosophical matters we must abstract from our senses, since it may be that none of those bodies which seem to be quiescent are truly so, and the same thing which is moved relatively may be really at rest; as likewise one and the same body may be in relative rest and motion, or even moved with contrary relative motions at the same time, according as its place is variously defined. All which ambiguity is to be found in the apparent motions, but not at all in the true or absolute, which should therefore be alone regarded in philosophy. And the true as we are told are distinguished from apparent or relative motions by the following properties.—First, in true or absolute motion all parts which preserve the same position with respect of the whole, partake of the motions of the whole. Secondly, the place being moved, that which is placed therein is also moved; so that a body moving in a place which is in motion doth participate the motion of its place. Thirdly, true motion is never generated or changed otherwise than by force impressed on the body itself. Fourthly, true motion is always changed by force impressed on the body moved. Fifthly, in circular motion barely relative there is no centrifugal force, which, nevertheless, in that which is true or absolute, is proportional to the quantity of motion.

112. But, notwithstanding what has been said, I must confess it does not appear to me that there can be any motion other than *relative*; so that to conceive motion there must be at least conceived two bodies, whereof the distance or position in regard to each other is varied. Hence, if there was one only body in being it could not possibly be moved. This seems evident, in that the idea I have of motion doth necessarily include relation.

113. But, though in every motion it be necessary to conceive more bodies than one, yet it may be that one only is moved, namely, that on which the force causing the change in the distance or situation of the bodies, is impressed. For, however some may define relative motion, so as to term that body *moved* which changes its distance from some other body, whether the force or action causing that change were impressed on it or no, yet as relative motion is that which is perceived by sense, and regarded in the ordinary affairs of life, it should seem that every man of common sense knows what it is as well as the best philosopher. Now, I ask any one whether, in his sense of motion as he walks along the streets, the stones he passes over may be said to *move*, because they change distance with his feet? To me it appears that though motion includes a relation of one thing to another, yet it is not necessary that each term of the relation be denominated from it. As a man may think of somewhat which does not think, so a body may be moved to or from another body which is not therefore itself in motion.

114. As the place happens to be variously defined, the motion which is related to it varies. A man in a ship may be said to be quiescent with relation to the sides of the vessel, and yet move with relation to the land. Or he may move eastward in respect of the one, and westward in respect of the other. In the common affairs of life men never go beyond the earth to define the place of any body; and what is quiescent in respect of that is accounted *absolutely* to be so. But philosophers, who have a greater extent of thought, and juster notions of the system of things, discover even the earth itself to be moved. In order therefore to fix their notions they seem to conceive the corporeal world as finite, and the utmost unmoved walls or shell thereof to be the place whereby they estimate true motions. If we sound our own conceptions, I believe we may find all the absolute motion we can frame an idea of to be at bottom no other than relative motion thus defined. For, as hath been already observed, absolute motion, exclusive of all external relation, is incomprehensible; and to this kind of relative motion all the above-mentioned properties, causes, and effects ascribed to absolute motion will, if I mistake not, be found to agree. As to what is said of the centrifugal force, that it does not at all belong to circular relative motion, I do not see how this follows from the experiment which is brought to prove it. See *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica, in Schol. Def. VIII*. For the water in the vessel at that time wherein it is said to have the greatest relative circular motion, hath, I think, no motion at all; as is plain from the foregoing section.

115. For, to denominate a body *moved* it is requisite, first, that it change its distance or situation with regard to some other body; and secondly, that the force occasioning that change be applied to it. If either of these be wanting, I do not think that, agreeably to the sense of mankind, or the propriety of language, a body can be said to be in motion. I grant indeed that it is possible for us to think a body which we see change its distance from some other to be moved, though it have no force applied to it (in which sense there may be apparent motion), but then it is because the force causing the

change of distance is imagined by us to be applied or impressed on that body thought to move; which indeed shews we are capable of mistaking a thing to be in motion which is not, and that is all.

116. From what has been said it follows that the philosophic consideration of motion does not imply the being of an *absolute Space*, distinct from that which is perceived by sense and related bodies; which that it cannot exist without the mind is clear upon the same principles that demonstrate the like of all other objects of sense. And perhaps, if we inquire narrowly, we shall find we cannot even frame an idea of *pure Space* exclusive of all body. This I must confess seems impossible, as being a most abstract idea. When I excite a motion in some part of my body, if it be free or without resistance, I say there is *Space*; but if I find a resistance, then I say there is *Body*; and in proportion as the resistance to motion is lesser or greater, I say the space is more or less *pure*. So that when I speak of pure or empty space, it is not to be supposed that the word ‘space’ stands for an idea distinct from or conceivable without body and motion—though indeed we are apt to think every noun substantive stands for a distinct idea that may be separated from all others; which has occasioned infinite mistakes. When, therefore, supposing all the world to be annihilated besides my own body, I say there still remains *pure Space*, thereby nothing else is meant but only that I conceive it possible for the limbs of my body to be moved on all sides without the least resistance, but if that, too, were annihilated then there could be no motion, and consequently no Space. Some, perhaps, may think the sense of seeing doth furnish them with the idea of pure space; but it is plain from what we have elsewhere shewn, that the ideas of space and distance are not obtained by that sense. See the Essay concerning Vision.”

Berkeley presented a long and detailed argument against Newton’s bucket experiment to detect absolute motion²⁹⁵² in Berkeley’s *De Motu* of 1721 in sections 53-66, iterating what later came to be known as “Mach’s Principle”.

Newton wrote in the *Principia*, Book I, Definition VIII, Scholium, *inter alia*,

“The Effects which distinguish absolute from relative motion are, the forces of receding from the axe of circular motion. For there are no such forces in a circular motion purely relative, but in a true and absolute circular motion, they are greater or less, according to the quantity of the motion. If a vessel, hung by a long cord, is so often turned about that the cord is strongly twisted, then fill’d with water, and held at rest together with the water; after by the sudden action of another force, it is whirl’d about the contrary way, and while the cord is untwisting it self, the vessel continues for some time in this motion; the surface of the water will at first be plain, as before the vessel began to move: but the vessel, by gradually communicating its motion to the water, will make it begin sensibly to revolve, and recede by little and little from the middle, and ascend to the sides of the vessel, forming itself into a concave figure, (as I have experienced) and the swifter the motion becomes,

the higher will the water rise, till at last, performing its revolutions in the same times with the vessel, it becomes relatively at rest in it. This ascent of the water shows its endeavour to recede from the axe of its motion; and the true and absolute circular motion of the water, which is here directly contrary to the relative, discovers it self, and may be measured by this endeavour. At first, when the relative motion of the water in the vessel was greatest, it produc'd no endeavour to recede from the axe: the water shew'd no tendency to the circumference, nor any ascent towards the sides of the vessel, but remain'd of a plain surface, and therefore its True circular motion had not yet begun. But afterwards, when the relative motion of the water had decreas'd, the ascent thereof towards the sides of the vessel, prov'd its endeavour to recede from the axe; and this endeavour shew'd the real circular motion of the water perpetually increasing, till it had acquir'd its greatest quantity, when the water rested relatively in the vessel. And therefore this endeavour does not depend upon any translation of the water in respect of the ambient bodies, nor can true circular motion be defin'd by such translation. There is only one real circular motion of any one revolving body, corresponding to only one power of endeavouring to recede from its axe of motion, as its proper and adequate effect: but relative motions in one and the same body are innumerable, according to the various relations it bears to external bodies, and like other relations, are altogether destitute of any real effect, any otherwise than they may perhaps participate of that one only true motion. And therefore in their system who suppose that our heavens, revolving below the sphere of the fixt Stars, carry the Planets along with them; the several parts of those heavens, and the Planets, which are indeed relatively at rest in their heavens, do yet really move. For they change their position one to another (which never happens to bodies truly at rest) and being carried together with their heavens, participate of their motions, and as parts of revolving wholes, endeavour to recede from the axe of their motions."²⁹⁵³

Berkeley objected to Newton's argument, and wrote, *inter alia*,

“Therefore we must say that the water forced round in the bucket rises to the sides of the vessel, because when new forces are applied in the direction of the tangent to any particle of water, in the same instant new equal centripetal forces are not applied. From which experiment it in no way follows that absolute circular motion is necessarily recognized by the forces of retirement from the axis of motion. [***] [I]t would be enough to bring in, instead of absolute space, relative space as confined to the heavens of the fixed stars, considered as at rest. But motion and rest marked out by such relative space can conveniently be substituted in place of the absolutes, which cannot be distinguished from them by any mark.”²⁹⁵⁴

Boscovich argued in the second supplement to his *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, Section 20,

“20. When either objects external to us, or our organs change their modes of existence in such a way that that first equality or similitude does not remain constant, then indeed the ideas are altered, & there is a feeling of change; but the ideas are the same exactly, whether the external objects suffer the change, or our organs, or both of them unequally. In every case our ideas refer to the difference between the new state & the old, & not to the absolute change, which does not come within the scope of our senses. Thus, whether the stars move round the Earth, or the Earth & ourselves move in the opposite direction round them, the ideas are the same, & there is the same sensation. We can never perceive absolute changes; we can only perceive the difference from the former configuration that has arisen. Further, when there is nothing at hand to warn us as to the change of our organs, then indeed we shall count ourselves to have been unmoved, owing to a general prejudice for counting as nothing those things that are nothing in our mind; for we cannot know of this change, & we attribute the whole of the change to objects situated outside of ourselves. In such manner any one would be mistaken in thinking, when on board ship, that he himself was motionless, while the shore, the hills & even the sea were in motion.”²⁹⁵⁵

In 1881, Johann Bernhard Stallo provided us with a good history which fills in the gaps in the evolution of “Mach’s Principle” between Berkeley and Mach,

“Now, in any discussion of the operations of thought, it is of the utmost importance to bear in mind the following irrefragable truths, some of which—although all of them seem to be obvious—have not been clearly apprehended until very recent times:

1. Thought deals, not with things as they are, or are supposed to be, in themselves, but with our mental representations of them. Its elements are, not pure objects, but their intellectual counterparts. What is present in the mind in the act of thought is never a thing, but always a state or states of consciousness. However much, and in whatever sense, it may be contended that the intellect and its object are both real and distinct entities, it can not for a moment be denied that the object, of which the intellect has cognizance, is a synthesis of objective and subjective elements, and is thus primarily, in the very act of its apprehension and to the full extent of its cognizable existence, affected by the determinations of the cognizing faculty. Whenever, therefore, we speak of a thing, or a property of a thing, it must be understood that we mean a product of two factors neither of which is capable of being apprehended by itself. In this sense all knowledge is said to be relative.

2. Objects are known only through their relations to other objects. They have, and can have, no properties, and their concepts can include no attributes, save these relations, or rather, our mental representations of them. Indeed, an object can not be known or conceived otherwise than as a complex of such relations. In mathematical phrase: things and their properties are known only as functions of other things and properties. In this

sense, also, relativity is a necessary predicate of all objects of cognition.

3. A particular operation of thought never involves the entire complement of the known or knowable properties of a given object, but only such of them as belong to a definite class of relations. In mechanics, for instance, a body is considered simply as a mass of determinate weight and volume (and in some cases figure), without reference to its other physical or chemical properties. In like manner each of the several other departments of knowledge effects a classification of objects upon its own peculiar principles, thereby giving rise to different series of concepts in which each concept represents that attribute or group of attributes—that aspect of the object—which it is necessary, in view of the question in hand, to bring into view. Our thoughts of things are thus, in the language of Leibnitz, adopted by Sir William Hamilton, and after him by Herbert Spencer, *symbolical*, not (or, at least, not only) because a complete mental representation of the properties of an object is precluded by their number and the incapacity of the mind to hold them in simultaneous grasp, but because many (and in most cases the greater part) of them are irrelevant to the mental operation in progress.

CHARACTER AND ORIGIN OF THE MECHANICAL THEORY
(CONTINUED).—ITS EXEMPLIFICATION OF THE FOURTH RADICAL
ERROR OF METAPHYSICS.

THE reality of all things which are, or can be, objects of cognition, is founded upon, or, rather, consists in, their mutual relations. A thing in and by itself can be neither apprehended nor conceived; its existence is no more a presentation of sense than a deliverance of thought. Things are known to us solely through their properties; and the properties of things are nothing else than their interactions and mutual relations. ‘Every property or quality of a thing,’ says Helmholtz [*Footnote*: Die neueren Fortschritte in der Theorie des Sehens. Pop. Wiss. Vortraege, ii, 55 *seq.*] (speaking of the inveterate prejudice according to which the qualities of things must be analogous to, or identical with, our perceptions of them), ‘is in reality nothing but its capability of producing certain effects on other things. The effect occurs either between like parts of the same body so as to produce differences of aggregation, or it proceeds from one body to another, as in the case of chemical reactions; or the effects are upon our organs of sense and manifest themselves as sensations such as those with which we are here concerned (the sensations of sight). Such an effect we call a ‘property,’ its reagent being understood without being expressly mentioned. Thus we speak of the ‘solubility’ of a substance, meaning its behavior toward water; we speak of its ‘weight,’ meaning its attraction to the earth; and we may justly call a substance ‘blue’ under the tacit assumption that we are only speaking of its action upon a normal eye. But, if what we call a property always implies a relation between two things, then a property or quality can never depend upon the nature of one agent alone, but exists only in relation to and dependence on the nature of some second object acted upon. Hence, there is

really no sense in talking of properties of light which belong to it absolutely, independently of all other objects, and which are supposed to be representable in the sensations of the human eye. The notion of such properties is a contradiction in itself. They can not possibly exist, and therefore we can not expect to find any coincidence of our sensations of color with qualities of light.'

The truth which underlies these sentences is of such transcendent importance that it is hardly possible to be too emphatic in its statement, or too profuse in its illustration. The real existence of things is coextensive with their qualitative and quantitative determinations. And both are in their nature relations, quality resulting from mutual action, and quantity being simply a ratio between terms neither of which is absolute. Every objectively real thing is thus a term in numberless series of mutual implications, and forms of reality beyond these implications are as unknown to experience as to thought. There is no absolute material quality, no absolute material substance, no absolute physical unit, no absolutely simple physical entity, no absolute physical constant, no absolute standard, either of quantity or quality, no absolute motion, no absolute rest, no absolute time, no absolute space. There is no form of material existence which is either its own support or its own measure, and which abides, either quantitatively or qualitatively, otherwise than in perpetual change, in an unceasing flow of mutations. An object is large only as compared with another which, as a term of this comparison, is small, but which, in comparison with a third object, may be indefinitely large; and the comparison which determines the magnitude of objects is between its terms alone, and not between any or all of its terms and an absolute standard. An object is hard as compared with another which is soft, but which, in turn, may be contrasted with a third still softer; and, again, there is no standard object which is either absolutely hard or absolutely soft. A body is simple as compared with the compound into which it enters as a constituent; but there is and can be no physically real thing which is absolutely simple [*Footnote: One of the most noteworthy specimens of ontological reasoning is the argument which infers the existence of absolutely simple substances from the existence of compound substances. Leibnitz places this argument at the head of his 'Monadology.'* '*Necess est,*' he says, '*dari substantias simplices quia dantur compositæ; neque enim compositum est nisi aggregatum simplicium.*' (Leibnitii, Opera omnia, ed. Dutens, t. ii., p. 21.) But the enthymeme is obviously a vicious paralogism—a fallacy of the class known in logic as fallacies of suppressed relative. The existence of a compound substance certainly proves the existence of component parts which, *relatively to this substance*, are simple. But it proves nothing whatever as to the simplicity of these parts in themselves.]

It may be observed, in this connection, that not only the law of causality, the conservation of energy, and the indestructibility of matter, so called, have their root in the relativity of all objective reality—being, indeed, simply

different aspects of this relativity—but that Newton's first and third laws of motion, as well as all laws of least action in mechanics (including Gauss's law of movement under least constraint), are but corollaries from the same principle. And the fact that everything is, in its manifest existence, but a group of relations and reactions at once accounts for Nature's inherent teleology.

Although the truth that all our knowledge of objective reality depends upon the establishment or recognition of relations is sufficiently evident and has been often proclaimed, it has thus far been almost wholly ignored by men of science as well as by metaphysicians. It is to this day assumed by physicists and mathematicians, no less than by ontologists, that all reality is in its last elements absolute. And this assumption is all the more strenuously insisted on by those whose scientific creed begins with the proposition that all our knowledge of physical things is derived from experience. Thus the mathematician, who fully recognizes the validity of this proposition and at the same time concedes that we have, and can have, no actual knowledge of bodies at rest or in motion, except in relation to other bodies, nevertheless declares that rest and motion are real only in so far as they and their elements, space and time, are absolute. The physicist reminds us at every step that in the field of his investigations there are no *a priori* truths and that nothing is known of the world of matter save what has been ascertained by observation and experiment; he then announces as the uniform result of his observations and experiments, that all forms of material existence are complex and variable; and yet he avers that not merely the laws of their variation are constant, but that the real constituents of the material world are absolutely simple, invariable, individual things.

The assumption that all physical reality is in its last elements absolute—that the material universe is an aggregate of absolutely constant physical units which in themselves are absolutely at rest, but whose motion, however induced, is measurable in terms of absolute space and absolute time—is obviously the true logical basis of the atomo-mechanical theory. And this assumption is identical with that which lies at the root of all metaphysical systems, with the single difference that in some of these systems the physical substratum of motion (termed the “substance” of things) is not specialized into individual atoms.

To show how irrepressibly the ontological prejudice, that nothing is physically real which is not absolute, has asserted itself in science during the last three centuries, I propose briefly to review the doctrines of some of the most eminent mathematicians and physicists respecting space and motion (and, incidentally, time), beginning with those of Descartes.

In the introductory parts of his *Principia*, Descartes states in the most explicit terms that space and motion are essentially relative. ‘In order that the place [of a body] may be determined,’ he says, [*Footnote: Princ. ii, § 18.*] ‘we must refer to other bodies which we may regard as immovable, and accordingly as we refer to different bodies it can be said that the same thing

does, and does not, change its place. Thus, when a ship is carried along at sea, he who sits at the stern remains always at the same place in reference to the parts of the ship among which he retains the same position; but he continually changes his place in reference to the shores. . . . And besides, if we allow that the earth moves and proceeds—precisely as far from west to east as the ship meanwhile is carried from east to west—we shall say again that he who sits at the stern does not move his place, because we determine it with reference to some immovable points in the heavens. But, if finally we concede that no truly immovable points are to be found in the universe, as I shall hereafter show is probable, our conclusion will be that there is nothing which has a fixed place except so far as it is determined in thought.’ [Footnote: The illustration of the relativity of motion by the motion of a ship is of constant recurrence whenever reference is had to the question discussed in the text. Cf. Leibnitz, *Opp.* ed. Erdmann, p. 604; Newton, *Princ.*, Def. viii, Schol. 3; Euler, *Theoria Motûs Corporum Solidorum*, vol. i, 9, 10; Berkeley, *Principles of Human Knowledge*, § 114; Kant, *Metaphysische Aufansgruende der Naturwissenschaft*, Phor. Grundsatz I; Cournot, *De l’Enchainement*, etc., vol. i, p. 56; Herbert Spencer, *First Principles*, chapter iii, § 17, etc., etc.]

Statements to the same effect are found in various other parts of the same book. [Footnote: E. g., *Princ.*, ii, 24, 25, 29, etc.] And of space Descartes does not hesitate to say that is really nothing in itself, and that ‘void space’ is a contradiction in terms—that, as Sir John Herschel puts it, [Footnote: *Familiar Lectures*, p. 445.] ‘if it were not for the foot-rule between them, the two ends of it would be in the same place.’ But, in the further progress of his discussions, having meanwhile declared that God always conserves in the universe the same quantity of motion, he all at once takes it for granted [Footnote: *Princ.*, ii, §§ 37-39.] that motion and space are absolute and therefore real entities.

This inconsistency of Descartes is severely censured by Leibnitz. ‘It follows,’ says Leibnitz, [Footnote: *Leibn.*, *Opp. Math.*, ed. Gerhardt, sect. II, vol. II, p. 247.] ‘that motion is nothing but a change of place, and thus, so far as phenomena are concerned, consists in a mere relation. This Cartesius also acknowledged; but in deducing his consequences he forgot his own definition and framed his laws of motion *as though motion were something real and absolute.*’ As will be noticed, Leibnitz here assumes, as a matter of course, that what is real is also absolute. In view of this it is hardly surprising that he, too, falls into the same inconsistency with which he charges Descartes, and, in his letters to Clarke, speaks of ‘absolutely immovable space’ and an ‘absolutely veritable motion of bodies.’ [Footnote: *Opp. Ed.* Erdmann, pp. 766, 770.]

Newton, in the great Scholium to the last of the ‘Definitions’ prefixed to his *Principia*, sharply distinguishes between absolute and relative time and motion. ‘Absolute and mathematical time,’ he says, [Footnote: *Princ.* (Ed. Le Seur & Jacq.), p. 8.] ‘in itself and in its nature without relation to

anything external, flows equally and is otherwise called duration; relative, apparent and vulgar time is any sensible and extrinsic, accurate or unequal measure of duration by motion which is ordinarily taken for true time. . . . Absolute is distinguished from relative time in astronomy by the equation of vulgar time. For the natural days, which are vulgarly taken in the measurement of time as equal, are unequal. . . . *It may be that there is no equable motion by which time is accurately measured.* [Footnote: *L. c.*, p. 10.]

‘Absolute space, in its nature without relation to anything external, always remains similar and immovable; of this (absolute space) relative space is any movable measure or dimension which is sensibly defined by its place in reference to bodies, and is vulgarly taken for immovable space. . . . [Footnote: *L. c.*, p. 9.] We define all places by the distances of things from some [given] body which we take as immovable. . . . *It may be that there is no body truly at rest to which places and motions are to be referred.*’ [Footnote: *Ib.*, p. 10.]

Absolute motion, according to Newton, is ‘the translation of a body from one absolute place to another,’ and relative motion ‘the translation of a body from one relative place to another. . . . Absolute rest and motion are distinguished from relative rest and motion by their properties and by their causes and effects. It is the property of rest that bodies truly at rest are at rest in respect to each other. Hence, while it is possible that in the regions of the fixed stars, or far beyond them, there is some body absolutely at rest, it is nevertheless impossible to know from the relative places of bodies in our regions, whether any such distant body persists in the given position, and therefore true rest can not be defined from the mutual position of these’ [i. e., the bodies in our regions]. . . . ‘It is the property of motion that the parts which retain their given positions to the wholes participate in their motion. For all the parts of rotating bodies tend to recede from the axis of motion, and the impetus of the moving bodies arises from the impetus of the parts. Hence, when the surrounding bodies move, those which move within them are relatively at rest. *And for this reason true and absolute motion, can not be defined by their translation from the vicinity of bodies which are looked upon as being at rest.* . . . [Footnote: *Ib.*, p. 10, 11.] The causes by which true and relative motions are distinguished from each other are the forces impressed upon bodies for the generation of motion. True motion is generated or changed solely by the forces impressed upon the body moved; but relative motion may be generated and changed without the action of forces upon it. For it is sufficient that forces are impressed upon other bodies to which reference is had, so that by their giving way a change is effected in the relation in which the relative motion or rest of the body consists. . . . [Footnote: *L. c.*, p. 11.] The effects by which absolute and relative motion are mutually distinguished are the forces by which bodies recede from the axis of circular motion. For in purely relative circular motion these forces are null, while in true and absolute motion they are greater or less according to

the quantity of motion.’ [*Footnote: Ib.*]

It is apparent that in all these definitions Newton, like Descartes and Leibnitz, assumes real motion to be absolute, and that he takes the terms *relative motion* and *apparent motion* to be strictly synonymous, notwithstanding his express admission (in the passages which I have italicized) that in fact there may be neither absolute time nor absolute space. That admission naturally leads to the further admission that there may in fact be no absolute motion; but from this Newton recoils, resorting to the expedient of trying to find tenable ground for the distinction between absolute and relative motion, despite the possible nonexistence of absolute time and space, in what he calls their respective causes and effects. But these causes and effects serve to distinguish, not relative from absolute change of position, but simply change of position in one body with reference to another from simultaneous changes of position in both with reference to a third.

Newton’s doctrine is pushed to its last consequences by Leonhard Euler. In the first chapter of his ‘Theory of the Motion of Solid or Rigid Bodies,’ Euler begins with the emphatic declaration that rest and motion, so far as they are known to sensible experience, are purely relative. After referring to the typical case of the navigator in his ship, he proceeds: [*Footnote: Theoria motûs Corp. Sol. etc., cap. i, explic. 2.*] ‘The notion of rest here spoken of, therefore, is one of relations, inasmuch as it is not derived solely from the condition of the point O to which it is attributed, but from a comparison with some other body A And hence it appears at once that the same body which is at rest with respect to the body A is in various motion with respect to other bodies. . . . What has been said of relative rest may be readily applied to relative motion; for when a point O retains its place with respect to a body A, it is said to be relatively at rest, and, when it continually changes that place, it is said to be relatively in motion. . . . [*Footnote: Ib., p. 7.*] *Therefore motion and rest are distinguished merely in name and are not opposed to each other in fact, inasmuch as both may at the same time be attributed to the same point, accordingly as it is referred to different bodies. Nor does motion differ from rest otherwise than as one motion differs from another.*’ [*Footnote: Ib., p. 8.*]

After thus insisting upon the essential relativity of rest and motion, Euler proceeds, in the second chapter. ‘On the Internal Principles of Motion,’ to consider the question whether or not rest and motion are predicable of a body without reference to other bodies. To this question he unhesitatingly gives an affirmative answer, holding it to be axiomatic that ‘every body, even without respect to other bodies, is either at rest or in motion, i. e., is either absolutely at rest or absolutely in motion. . . . [*Footnote: Omne corpus, etiam sine respectu ad alia corpora, vel quiescit vel movetur, hoc est, vel absolute quiescit, vel absolute movetur.*’ *ib.*, p. 30 (cap. ii, axioma 7).] ‘Thus far,’ he explains, ‘following the senses, we have not recognized any other motion or rest than that with respect to other bodies, whence we have called both motion and rest relative. But, if we now mentally take away all bodies but

one, and if thus the relation by which we have hitherto distinguished its rest and motion is withdrawn, it will first be asked whether or not the conclusion respecting the rest or motion of the remaining body still stands. For, if this conclusion can be drawn only from a comparison of the place of the body in question with that of other bodies, it follows that, when these bodies are gone, the conclusion must go with them. *But, albeit we do not know of the rest or motion of a body except from its relation to other bodies, it is nevertheless not to be concluded that these things (rest and motion) are nothing in themselves but a mere relation established by the intellect, and that there is nothing inherent in the bodies themselves which corresponds to our ideas of rest and motion.* For, although we are unable to know quantity otherwise than by comparison, yet, when the things with which we instituted the comparison are gone, there is still left in the body *the fundamentum quantitatis*, as it were; for, if it were extended or contracted, such extension or contraction would have to be taken as a true change. Thus, if but one body existed, we should have to say that it was either in motion or at rest, inasmuch as it could not be taken as being both or neither. *Whence I conclude that rest and motion are not merely ideal things, born from comparison alone, so that there would be nothing inherent in the body corresponding to them,* but that it may be justly asked in respect to a solitary body whether it is in motion or at rest. . . . Inasmuch, therefore, as we can justly ask respecting a single body itself, without reference to other bodies, or under the supposition that they are annihilated, whether it is at rest or in motion, we must necessarily take one or the other alternative. But what this rest or motion will be, in view of the fact that there is here no change of place with respect to other bodies, we can not even think without admitting an absolute space in which our body occupies some given space whence it can pass to other places.’ [Footnote: *Theoria motûs*, etc., p. 31.] Accordingly Euler most strenuously insists on the necessity of postulating an absolute, immovable space. ‘Whoever denies absolute space,’ he says, ‘falls into the gravest perplexities. Since he is constrained to reject absolute rest and motion as empty sounds without sense, he is not only constrained also to reject the laws of motion, but to affirm that there are no laws of motion. For, if the question which has brought us to this point, What will be the condition of a solitary body detached from its connection with other bodies? is absurd, then those things also which are induced in this body by the action of others become uncertain and indeterminable, and thus everything will have to be taken as happening fortuitously and without any reason.’ [Footnote: *Ib.*, p. 32.]

That the basis of all this reasoning is purely ontological is plain. And, when the thinkers of the eighteenth century became alive to the fallacies of ontological speculation, the unsoundness of Euler's “axiom,” that rest and motion are substantial attributive entities independent of all relation, could hardly escape their notice. Nevertheless, they were unable to emancipate themselves wholly from Euler's ontological prepossessions. They did not at

once avoid his dilemma by repudiating it as unfounded—by denying that motion and rest can not be real without being absolute—but they attempted to reconcile the absolute reality of rest and motion with their phenomenal relativity by postulating an absolutely quiescent point or center in space to which the positions of all bodies could be referred. Foremost among those who made this attempt was Kant

[*Footnote:* It is remarkable how many of the scientific discoveries, speculations and fancies of the present day are anticipated or at least foreshadowed in the writings of Kant. Some of them are enumerated by Zoellner (*Natur der Kometen*, p. 455 *seq.*)—among them the constitution and motion of the system of fixed stars; the nebular origin of planetary and stellar systems; the origin, constitution and rotation of Saturn's rings and the conditions of their stability; the non-coincidence of the moon's center of gravity with her center of figure; the physical constitution of the comets; the retarding effect of the tides upon the rotation of the earth; the theory of the winds, and Dove's law. Fritz Schultze has shown (*Kant and Darwin*, Jena, 1875) that Kant was one of the precursors of Darwin. In this connection it is curious to note a coincidence (no doubt wholly accidental) in the example resorted to both by Kant and A. R. Wallace for the purpose of illustrating 'adaptation by general law.' The case put by both is that of the channel of a river which, in the view of the teleologists, as Wallace says (*Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection*, p. 276 *seq.*), 'must have been designed, it answers its purpose so effectually,' or, as Kant expresses it, must have been scooped out by God himself. ('Wenn man die physisch-theologischen Verfasser hoert, so wird man dahin gebracht, sich vorzustellen, ihre Lanfrinnen waeren alle von Gott ausgehoehlt.' *Beweisgrund zu einer Demonstration des Dasein's Gottes*, Kant's Werke, i, p. 232.) Even of the vagaries of modern transcendental geometry there are suggestions in Kant's essays, *Von der wahren Schaetzung der lebendigen Kraefte*, Werke v, p. 5, and *Von dem ersten Grunde des Unterschiedes der Gegenden im Raume*, *ib.*, p. 293—a fact which is not likely to conduce to the edification of those who, like J. K. Becker, Tobias, Weissenborn, Krause, etc., have raised the Kantian standard in defense of Euklidean space. It is probably not without significance that in the second edition of his *Critique of Pure Reason* Kant omits the third paragraph of the first section of the *Transcendental Aesthetics*, in which he had enforced the necessity of assuming the *a priori* character of the idea of space by the argument that without this assumption the propositions of geometry would cease to be true apodictically, and that 'all that could be said of the dimensions of space would be that *thus far* no space had been found which had more than three dimensions.']

In the seventh chapter of his 'Natural History of the Heavens'—the same work in which, nearly fifty years before Laplace, he gave the first outlines of the Nebular Hypothesis—he sought to show that in the universe there is

somewhere a great central body whose center of gravity is the cardinal point of reference for the motions of all bodies whatever. ‘If in the immeasurable space,’ he says, [*Footnote*: *Naturgeschichte des Himmels*, Werke, vol. vi, p. 152.] ‘wherein all the suns of the milky way have been formed, a point is assumed round which, from whatever cause, the first formative action of nature had its play, then at that point a body of the largest mass and of the greatest attractions, must have been formed. This body must have become able to compel all systems which were in process of formation in the enormous surrounding sphere to gravitate toward it as their center, so as to constitute an entire system, similar to the solar and planetary system which was evolved on a small scale out of elementary matter.’

A suggestion similar to that of Kant has recently been made by Professor C. Neumann, who enforces the necessity of assuming the existence, at a definite and permanent point in space, of an absolutely rigid body, to whose center of figure or attraction all motions are to be referred, by physical considerations. The drift of his reasoning appears in the following extracts from his inaugural lecture *On the Principles of the Galileo-Newtonian Theory*: [*Footnote*: *Ueber die Principien der Galileo-Newton’schen Theorie*. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1870.] The principles of the Galileo-Newtonian theories consist in two laws—the law of inertia proclaimed by Galileo, and the law of attraction added by Newton. . . . A material point, when once set in motion, free from the action of an extraneous force, and wholly left to itself, continues to move in a straight line so as to describe equal spaces in equal times. Such is Galileo’s law of inertia. It is impossible that this proposition should stand in its present form as the corner-stone of a scientific edifice, as the starting-point of mathematical deductions. For it is perfectly unintelligible, inasmuch as we do not know what is meant by ‘motion in a straight line,’ or, rather, inasmuch as we do know that the words ‘motion in a straight line’ are susceptible of various interpretations. A motion, for instance, which is rectilinear as seen from the earth, would be curvilinear as seen from the sun, and would be represented by a different curve as often as we change our point of observation to Jupiter, to Saturn, or another celestial body. In short, every motion which is rectilinear with reference to one celestial body will appear curvilinear with reference to another celestial body. . . .

‘The words of Galileo, according to which a material point left to itself proceeds in a straight line, appear to us, therefore, as words without meaning—as expressing a proposition which, to become intelligible, is in need of a definite background. *There must be given in the universe some special body as the basis of our comparison, as the object in reference to which all motions are to be estimated*; and only when such a body is given shall we be able to attach to those words a definite meaning. Now, what body is it which is to occupy this eminent position? Or, are there several such bodies? Are the motions near the earth to be referred to the terrestrial globe, perhaps, and those near the sun to the solar sphere? . . .

‘Unfortunately, neither Galileo nor Newton gives us a definite answer to this question. But, if we carefully examine the theoretical structure which they erected, and which has since been continually enlarged, its foundations can no longer remain hidden. *We readily see that all actual or imaginable motions in the universe must be referred to one and the same body.* Where this body is, and what are the reasons for assigning to it this eminent, and, as it were, sovereign position, these are questions to which there is no answer.

‘It will be necessary, therefore, to establish the proposition, as the first principle of the Galileo-Newtonian theory, that in some unknown place of the universe there is an unknown body—a body absolutely rigid and unchangeable for all time in its figure and dimensions. I may be permitted to call this body ‘THE BODY ALPHA.’ It would then be necessary to add that the motion of a body would import, not its change of place in reference to the earth or sun, but its change of position in reference to the body Alpha.

‘From this point of view the law of Galileo is seen to have a definite meaning. This meaning presents itself as a second principle, which is, that a material point left to itself progresses in a straight line—proceeds, therefore, in a course which is rectilinear in reference to the body Alpha.’

After thus showing, or attempting to show, that the reality of motion necessitates its reference to a rigid body unchangeable in its position in space, Neumann seeks to verify this assumption by asking himself the question, what consequences would ensue, on the hypothesis of the mere relativity of motion, if all bodies but one were annihilated. ‘Let us suppose,’ he says, ‘that among the stars there is one which consists of fluid matter, and which, like our earth, is in rotatory motion round an axis passing through its center. In consequence of this motion, by virtue of the centrifugal forces developed by it, this star will have the form of an ellipsoid. What form, now, I ask, will this star assume if suddenly all other celestial bodies are annihilated?’

‘These centrifugal forces depend solely upon the state of the star itself; they are wholly independent of the other celestial bodies. These forces, therefore, as well as the ellipsoidal form, will persist, irrespective of the continued existence or disappearance of the other bodies. But, if motion is defined as something relative—as a relative change of place of two points—the answer is very different. If, on this assumption, we suppose all other celestial bodies to be annihilated, nothing remains but the material points of which the star in question itself consists. But, then, these points do not change their relative positions, and are therefore at rest. It follows that the star must be at rest at the moment when the annihilation of the other bodies takes place, and therefore must assume the spherical form taken by all bodies in a state of rest. A contradiction so intolerable can be avoided only by abandoning the assumption of the relativity of motion, and conceiving motion as absolute, so that thus we are again led to the principle of the body Alpha.’

Now, what answer can be made to this reasoning of Professor Neumann?

None, if we grant the admissibility of the hypothesis of the annihilation of all bodies in space but one, and the admissibility of the further assumption that an absolutely rigid body with an absolutely fixed place in the universe is possible. But such a concession is forbidden by the universal principle of relativity. In the first place, the annihilation of all bodies but one would not only destroy the *motion* of this one remaining body and bring it to rest, as Professor Neumann sees, but would also destroy its very *existence* and bring it to naught, as he does not see. A body can not survive the system of relations in which alone it has its being; its *presence* or *position* in space is no more possible without reference to other bodies than its *change of position* or *presence* is possible without such reference. As has been abundantly shown, all properties of a body which constitute the elements of its distinguishable presence in space are in their nature relations and imply terms beyond the body itself.

In the second place the absolute fixity in space attributed to the body Alpha is impossible under the known conditions of reality. The fixity of a point in space involves the permanence of its distances from at least four other fixed points not in the same plane. But the fixity of these several points again depends on the constancy of their distances from other fixed points, and so on *ad infinitum*. In short, the fixity of position of any body in space is possible only on the supposition of the absolute finitude of the universe; and this leads to the theory of the essential curvature of space, and the other theories of modern transcendental geometry, which will be discussed hereafter.

There is but one issue from the perplexities of Euler, and that is through the proposition that the reality of rest and motion, far from presupposing that they are absolute, depends upon their relativity. The source of these perplexities is readily discovered. It is to be found in the old metaphysical doctrine, that the Real is not only distinct from, but the exact opposite of, the Phenomenal. Phenomenalities are the deliverances of sense; and these are said to be contradictory of each other, and therefore delusive. Now, the truth is that there is no physical reality which is not phenomenal. The only test of physical reality is sensible experience. And the assertion, that the testimony of the senses is delusive, in the sense in which this assertion is made by the metaphysicians, is groundless. The testimony of the senses is conflicting only because the momentary deliverance of each sense is fragmentary and requires control and rectification, either by other deliverances of the same sense, or by the deliverances of the other senses. When the traveler in the desert sees before him a lake which continually recedes and finally disappears, proving to be the effect of *mirage*, it is said that he is deceived by his senses, inasmuch as the supposed body of water was a mere appearance without reality. But the senses were not deceptive. The lake was as real as the image. The deception lay in the erroneous inferences of the traveler, who did not take into account all the facts, forgetting (or being ignorant of) the refraction of the rays proceeding from the real object, whereby their direction and the

apparent position of the object were changed. The true distinction between the Apparent and the Real is that the former is a partial deliverance of sense which is mistaken for the whole deliverance. The deception or illusion results from the circumstance that the senses are not properly and exhaustively interrogated and that their whole story is not heard.

The coercive power of the prevailing ontological notions of Euler's time over the clear intellect of the great mathematician is most strikingly exhibited in his statement that without the assumption of absolute space and motion there could be no laws of motion, so that all the phenomena of physical action would become uncertain and indeterminable. If this argument were well founded, the same consequence would follow, *a fortiori*, from his repeated admissions in the first chapter of his book, to the effect that we have no actual knowledge of rest and motion, except that derived from bodies at rest or in motion in reference to other bodies. Euler's proposition can have no other meaning than this, that the laws of motion can not be established or verified unless we know its absolute direction and its absolute rate. But such knowledge is by his own showing unattainable. It follows, therefore, that the establishment and verification of the laws of motion are impossible. And yet no one knew better than Euler himself that all experimental ascertainment and verification of dynamical laws *like all acts of cognition*, depend upon the insulation of phenomena; that they can be effected only by disentangling the effects of certain forces from the effects of other forces (determinable *aliunde*, i. e., by their other effects) with which they are complicated—a proceeding which, in many cases, is facilitated by the circumstance that these latter effects are inappreciably small. Surely the verification of the law of inertia by the inhabitants of our planet does not depend upon their knowledge, at any moment, of the exact rate of its angular velocity of motion round the sun! And the validity of the Newtonian theory of celestial motion is not to be drawn in question because its author suggests that the center of gravity of our solar system moves in some elliptic orbit whose elements are not only unknown, but will probably never be discovered! As well might it be contended that the mathematical theorems respecting the properties of the ellipse are of doubtful validity, since no such curve is accurately described by any celestial body or can be exactly traced by a human hand!

Although in particular operations of thought we may be constrained, for the moment, to treat the Complex as simple, the Variable as constant, the Transitory as permanent, and thus in a sense to view phenomena '*sub quadam specie absoluti*,' [Footnote: 'De naturâ rationis est res sub quadam æternitatis specie percipere.' Spinoza, Eth., Pars. ii, Prop. xlv, Coroll. 2.] nevertheless there is no truth in the old ontological maxim that the true nature of things can be discovered only by divesting them of their relations—that to be truly known they must be known as they are in themselves, in their absolute essence. Such knowledge is impossible, all cognition being founded upon a recognition of relations; and this impossibility nowhere stands out in stronger relief than in the exposition, by Newton and Euler, of the reality of

rest and motion under the conditions of their determinability.

It follows, of course, from the essential relativity of rest and motion, that the old ontological disjunction between them falls, and that in a double sense rest differs from motion, in the language of Euler, ‘as one motion differs from another,’ [*Footnote*: ‘Neque motus a quiete aliter differt, atque alius motus ab alio.’ *Theoria motûs*, etc., p. 8.] or, as modern mathematicians and physicists express it, that ‘rest is but a special case of motion.’ [Notation, “Die Ruhe ist nur ein besonderer Fall der Bewegung.” Kirchhoff, *Vorlesungen ueber math. Physik*, p. 32.] And it follows, furthermore, that rest is not the logically or cosmologically *primum*, of material existence—that it is not the natural and original state of the universe which requires no explanation while its motion, or that of its parts, is to be accounted for. What requires, and is susceptible of, explanation is always a change from a given state of relative rest or motion of a finite material system; and the explanation always consists in the exhibition of an equivalent change in another material system. The question respecting the origin of motion in the universe as a whole, therefore, admits of no answer, because it is a question without intelligible meaning.

The same considerations which evince the relativity of motion also attest the relativity of its conceptual elements, space and time. As to space, this is at once apparent. And of time, ‘the great independent variable’ whose supposed constant flow is said to be the ultimate measure of all things, it is sufficient to observe that it is itself measured by the recurrence of certain relative positions of objects or points in space, and that the periods of this recurrence are variable, depending upon variable physical conditions. This is as true of the data of our modern time-keepers, the clock and chronometer, as of those of the clepsydra and hour-glass of the ancients, all of which are subject to variations of friction, temperature, changes in the intensity of gravitation, according to the latitude of the places of observation, and so on. And it is equally true of the records of the great celestial time-keepers, the sun and the stars. After we have reduced our apparent solar day to the mean solar day, and this, again, to the sidereal day, we find that the interval between any two transits of the equinoctial points is not constant, but becomes irregular in consequence of nutation, of the precession of the equinoxes, and of numerous other secular perturbations and variations due to the mutual attraction of the heavenly bodies. The constancy of the efflux of time, like that of the spatial positions which serve as the basis for our determination of the rates and amounts of physical motion, is purely conceptual.

The relativity of mass has repeatedly been adverted to in the preceding chapters. It has been shown that the measure of mass is the reciprocal of the amount of acceleration produced in a body by a given force, while force, in turn, is measured by the acceleration produced in a given mass. It is readily seen that the concept mass might be expanded, so as to assign the measure of mass, not to mechanical motion alone, but to physical action generally,

including heat and chemical affinity. This would lead to an equivalence of masses differing with the nature of the agency selected as the basis of the comparison. Thermally equivalent masses would be the reciprocals of the specific heats of masses as now determined; and chemically equivalent masses would be the atomic weights, so called. It is important to note that the determination of masses on the basis of gravitation, in preference to their valuation on the basis of thermal, chemical or other physical action, is a mere matter of convenience, and is not in any proper sense founded on the nature of things.

But, apart from this, and looking to the ordinary method of determining the mass of a body by its weight, the relativity of mass is equally manifest. The weight of a body is a function, not of its own mass alone, but also of that of the body or bodies by which it is attracted, and of the distance between them. A body whose weight, as ascertained by the spring-balance or pendulum, is a pound on the surface of the earth, would weigh but two ounces on the moon, less than one fourth of an ounce on several of the smaller planets, about six ounces on Mars, two and one half pounds on Jupiter, and more than twenty-seven pounds on the sun. And while the fall of bodies, *in vacuo*, near the surface of the earth amounts to about sixteen feet (more or less, according to the latitude) during the first second, their corresponding fall near the surface of the sun is more than four hundred and thirty-five feet.

The thoughtlessness with which it is assumed by some of the most eminent physicists that matter is composed of particles which have an absolute primordial weight persisting in all positions and under all circumstances, is one of the most remarkable facts in the history of science. ‘The absolute weight of atoms,’ says Professor Redtenbacher, [*Footnote: Dynamidensystem* (Mannheim, Bassermann, 1857), p. 14.] ‘is unknown’—his meaning being, as is evident from the context, and from the whole tenor of his discussion, that our ignorance of this absolute weight is due solely to the practical impossibility of insulating an atom, and of contriving instruments delicate enough to weigh it.

There is nothing absolute or unconditioned in the world of objective reality. As there is no absolute standard of quality, so there is no absolute measure of duration, nor is there an absolute system of coördinates in space to which the positions of bodies and their changes can be referred. A physical *ens per se* and a physical constant are alike impossible, for all physical existence resolves itself into action and reaction, and action imports change.”

Ernst Mach, perhaps in reaction to Carl Neumann’s hypothesis of the “Body Alpha”, and in agreement with Berkeley, Stallo, *et al.*, proclaimed,

“The expression ‘absolute motion of translation’ Streintz correctly pronounces as devoid of meaning and consequently declares certain analytical deductions, to which he refers, superfluous. On the other hand,

with respect to *rotation*, Streintz accepts Newton's position, that absolute rotation can be distinguished from relative rotation. In this point of view, therefore, one can select every body not affected with absolute rotation as a body of reference for the expression of the law of inertia.

I cannot share this view. For me, only relative motions exist (*Erhaltung der Arbeit*, p. 48; *Science of Mechanics*, p. 229), and I can see, in this regard, no distinction between rotation and translation. When a body moves relatively to the fixed stars, centrifugal forces are produced; when it moves relatively to some different body, and not relatively to the fixed stars, no centrifugal forces are produced. I have no objection to calling the first rotation 'absolute' rotation, if it be remembered that nothing is meant by such a designation except *relative rotation with respect to the fixed stars*. Can we fix Newton's bucket of water, rotate the fixed stars, and *then* prove the absence of centrifugal forces?

The experiment is impossible, the idea is meaningless, for the two cases are not, in sense-perception, distinguishable from each other. I accordingly regard these two cases as the *same* case and Newton's distinction as an illusion (*Science of Mechanics*, page 232).²⁹⁵⁶

In 1879, Hermann Lotze, who like Faraday argued for a Boscovichian dynamism of atoms as centers of force, presented a thought experiment regarding the speed of the propagation of forces in 1879,

“**206.** Connected with this question is the other one: Do forces, in order to take effect, require Time? Stated in this form, indeed, as it occasionally is, the question is ambiguous. It is a universally admitted truth that, every effect, in its final result, is formed by the successive and continuous addition of infinitesimal parts which go on accumulating from zero up to the final amount. In this sense succession, in other words, expenditure of Time, is a characteristic of every effect, and this is what distinguishes an effect from a mere consequence, which holds good simultaneously with its condition. Vain, however, would it be—as we saw in our investigation of Time—to seek to go further than this, and to discover the inscrutable process by means of which succession of events in Time comes to pass at all. The question we are considering was proposed on the assumption of the diffusion of force in Space. Supposing it were possible to instance a moment of Time in which a previously non-existent force came into Being, would all the various effects which it was calculated to produce in different places, both near and remote, be at once realised? Or, would a certain interval of Time be required, just as it is in the case of Light, which transmits itself to different objects rapidly, but not instantaneously, and must first come into contact with them before it can be reflected by them.”²⁹⁵⁷

George-Louis Le Sage, Rudolf Mewes, S. Tolver Preston, Hendrik Antoon Lorentz, Henri Poincaré and Paul Gerber, among others, set the speed of the

propagation of gravitational effects at the speed of light long before Einstein. Others opposed this view. Joseph Henry stated,

“According to the view we have given, a portion of matter consists of an assemblage of indivisible and indestructible atoms endowed with attracting and repelling forces, and with the property of obedience to the three laws of motion [viz.: inertia, coexistence of separate motions, and equality of action and reaction]. All the other properties, and indeed all the mechanical phenomena of matter, so far as they have been analyzed, are probably referable to the action of such atoms, arranged in groups of different orders, . . . the distance in all cases between any two atoms being much greater than the diameter of the atoms or molecules. We are obliged to assume the existence of an ethereal medium formed of atoms, which are endowed with precisely the same properties as those we have assigned to common matter; and this assumption leads us to the inference that matter is diffused through all space.

That something exists between us and the sun, possessing the properties of matter, may be inferred from the simple fact that time is required for the transmission of light and heat through the intervening space. . . . That the phenomena of light and heat from the sun are not the effect of the transmission of mere force (without intervening matter), such as that of attraction and repulsion, is evident from the fact that these [latter] actions require no perceptible time for their transmission to the most distant parts of the solar system. If the sun were to be at once annihilated, the planet Neptune would at the same instant begin to move in a tangent to its present orbit.”²⁹⁵⁸

Ernst Mach saw the notion that gravity should propagate at light speed as an indication that the æther is a medium for the propagation of gravitational effects. Gerber’s alleged theory of action at a distance at light speed was seen as untenable. Ernst Brücke wrote, in 1857,

“Let us suppose a portion of the masses which gravitate towards each other to be destroyed; then certainly not only accelerating force, but also, according to circumstances, a portion of the tension or of the *vis viva*, or of both, would be destroyed: but this only confirms us in our way of viewing the subject. The law of the indestructibility of matter has been proved as universally valid as that of the conservation of force. That the destruction of the one should involve that of the other, only shows us that both stand in intimate connexion with each other, and proves that we are right in placing the cause of the notion of gravity in the masses themselves, and not in the space between them.

Thus in all that has been hitherto said, so far as my consciousness reaches, so far as I am capable of distinguishing true from false, and like from unlike, all known facts are brought into complete harmony with our laws of thought when we suppose forces, as the causes of phænomena, to

reside in the masses, the spaces between these masses being traversed by the forces. If the forces could be imagined as existing in space, it must also be conceivable that matter may be annihilated without changing the sum of forces, and this, at least by me, is not conceivable.”²⁹⁵⁹

George Stuart Fullerton wrote in 1901,

“To the question whether the void spaces are real, we may answer: Yes, if we mean by this only that things really stand to each other in such and such relations; or in other words, that they are at such and such distances from one another. No, if we mean that the relation is to be turned into a real thing that is supposed to remain when the things between which it obtains are taken away. The real world which we build up out of our experiences is a world of things of a certain kind; it is a world of extended things separated by distances, and the things influence each other in definite ways which cannot be described if the relations of the things—their distances and directions—be left out of account. It is one thing to recognize the relations between things as real, and it is quite another to turn those relations into things of an unreal and equivocal sort. It is one thing to recognize that things are at a distance from each other, and another to turn the distance itself into the ghost of a thing.

But, it may be objected, when we speak of space we mean *more* than the actual system of relations which obtains between extended things. I answer, we undoubtedly do; we mean, not merely the actual system of relations, but the system of all theoretically possible relations as well. The actual relations of things are constantly changing, and the relations which happen to exist at any moment may be regarded as merely representative of an indefinite number of other relations which might just as well have been actual. We have seen that *real* things are never given in a single intuition, and that what may be thus given can, at best, be regarded as merely representative of an indefinite series of possible experiences which in their totality express the nature of the thing. In the same way we may say that *real* space, which is the whole system of relations of a certain kind between real things, cannot be the object of a single intuition. By real space we never mean only this particular distance given in this particular experience. We mean all the actual and theoretically possible space-relations of real things in the real world.

About time one may reason in precisely the same way. Space and time are, thus, abstractions. They are the *plan* of the real world with its actual and possible changes. But this plan is not a something of which we have a knowledge independent of our knowledge of the world. This ought, I think, to be clear to any one who has followed the reasonings of the paper on the Berkeleyian Doctrine of Space. We certainly do not perceive immediately that space and time are infinitely divisible. Subdivision speedily appears to result in the simple in each case. Why, then, do we assume that they are thus divisible? No conceivable reason can be given save that, in our experience

of the world, such a system of substitutions obtains—a system within which the seemingly indivisible intuitive experience takes its place as the representative of experiences that are divisible, and, magnifying its function, sinks into individual insignificance. The plan stands out; the particular experience is lost sight of so completely that many able writers are capable of wholly misconceiving its nature. The plan is, then, abstracted from our experience of the world of things; but when we have the plan we can work more or less independently of the experiences from which it has been abstracted, and we can satisfy ourselves, by verifying our results from time to time, that we are not wandering in the region of dreams, but are doing something that has a meaning within the realm of nature. But what meaning could a millionth of a millimeter or a thousandth of a second have to one who had never had the complex series of experiences which reveals real things and real events? They are not given in any experience except symbolically, and the only thing that can give significance to our symbol is the series of experiences in which a real world is revealed.

Hence, to the question whether a vacuum can be conceived to exist within the world, I answer: Undoubtedly it can. But please do not substitute for the meaning: ‘exist as a vacuum,’ the very different meaning: ‘exist as some kind of a thing.’ It is easy to slip from the one meaning into the other, and philosophers have done it again and again. Space and time are the *plan* of the world-system. They really exist in the only sense in which such things can exist, *i. e.*, they really are the plan of the system. The difficulties which seem to present themselves when men inquire whether they have real existence arise out of the fact that this truth is not clearly grasped.”²⁹⁶⁰

Duncan M'Laren Young Sommerville wrote in 1914,

“W. K. Clifford [*Footnote: The Common Sense of the Exact Sciences* (London, 1885), chap. iv. § 19.] has gone further than this and imagined that the phenomena of electricity, etc., might be explained by periodic variations in the curvature of space. But we cannot now say that this three-dimensional universe in which we have our experience is *space* in the old sense, for space, as distinct from matter, consists of a changeless set of terms in changeless relations. There are two alternatives. We must either conceive that space is really of four dimensions and our universe is an extended sheet of matter existing in this space; the aether [*Footnote: Cf. W. W. Rouse Ball, ‘A hypothesis relating to the nature of the ether and gravity,’ Messenger of Math., 21* (1891).] if we like; and then, just as a plane surface is to our three-dimensional intelligence a pure abstraction, so our whole universe will become an ideal abstraction existing only in a mind that perceives space of four dimensions—an argument which has been brought to the support of Bishop Berkeley! [*Footnote: C. H. Hinton, Scientific Romances, First Series, p. 31* (London, 1886). For other four-dimensional theories of physical phenomena see Hinton, *The Fourth Dimension* (London, 1904).] Or, we must

resist our innate tendencies to separate out space and bodies as distinct entities, and attempt to build up a monistic theory of the physical world in terms of a single set of entities, material points, conceived as altering their relations with time. [Footnote: Cf. A. N. Whitehead, 'On mathematical concepts of the material world,' *Phil. Trans.*, A **205** (1906)] In either case it is not space that is altering its qualities, but matter which is changing its form or relations with time."²⁹⁶¹

and, quoting C. D. Broad,

"12. The inextricable entanglement of space and matter.

A further point—and this is the 'vicious circle' of which we spoke above—arises in connection with the astronomical attempts to determine the nature of space. These experiments are based upon the received laws of astronomy and optics, which are themselves based upon the euclidean assumption. It might well happen, then, that a discrepancy observed in the sum of the angles of a triangle could admit of an explanation by some modification of these laws, or that even the absence of any such discrepancy might still be compatible with the assumptions of non-euclidean geometry.

'All measurement involves both physical and geometrical assumptions, and the two things, space and matter, are not given separately, but analysed out of a common experience. Subject to the general condition that space is to be changeless and matter to move about in space, we can explain the same observed results in many different ways by making compensatory changes in the qualities that we assign to space and the qualities we assign to matter. Hence it seems theoretically impossible to decide by any experiment what are the qualities of one of them in distinction from the other.'"²⁹⁶²

Einstein made remarks in a letter in 1916 which are derivative of Berkeley's *De Motu*, including among others,

"If I let all things vanish from the Universe, then, according to Newton, Galileo's space of inertia lingers, but in my opinion, *nothing* remains."

"Wenn ich alle Dinge aus der Welt verschwinden lasse, so bleibt nach Newton der Galileische Trägheitsraum, nach meiner Auffassung aber *nichts* übrig."²⁹⁶³

Einstein was quoted in *The Chicago Tribune* on 4 April 1921 on page 6,

"Up to this time the conceptions of time and space have been such that if everything in the universe were taken away, if there was nothing left, there would still be left to man time and space. But under this theory even time and space would cease to exist, because they are unalterably bound up with the conceptions of matter."

Einstein again took his lead from Faraday, Clifford and Brücke. Einstein changed direction from his materialistic Boscovichian misinterpretation of Mach's theory of inertia. Einstein adopted, without any attribution, Clifford's complete reification of abstract geometry, and stated, in 1930,

“We may summarize in symbolical language. Space, brought to light by the corporeal object, made a physical reality by NEWTON, has in the last few decades swallowed ether and time and seems about to swallow also the field and the corpuscles, so that it remains as the sole medium of reality.”²⁹⁶⁴

and,

“The strange conclusion to which we have come is this—that now it appears that space will have to be regarded as a primary thing and that matter is derived from it, so to speak, as a secondary result. Space is now turning around and eating up matter. We have always regarded matter as a primary thing and space as a secondary result. Space is now having its revenge, so to speak, and is eating up matter. But that is still a pious wish.”²⁹⁶⁵

14.6 The Rubber Sheet Analogy

It is interesting to note that William James gave us the “rubber sheet analogy” as a demonstrative space-time tool, in 1890, though in a different sense from the theory of relativity.²⁹⁶⁶ James wrote extensively on the nature of space and time, and on the concept of a block universe and free will. Albert Einstein was quoted in *The London Times*, on 13 June 1921, on page 11,

“‘My own philosophic development,’ he went on, ‘was from Hume to Mach and James.’”

James wrote,

“They are made of the same ‘mind-stuff,’ and form an unbroken stream. [***] We can easily add all these plane sections together to make a solid, one of whose solid dimensions will represent time, whilst a cut across this at right angles will give the thought's content at the moment when the cut is made.

Let it be the thought, ‘I am the same I that I was yesterday.’ If at the fourth moment of time we annihilate the thinker and examine how the last pulsation

of his consciousness was made, we find that it was an awareness of the whole content with *same* most prominent, and the other parts of the thing known relatively less distinct. With each prolongation of the scheme in the time-direction, the summit of the curve of section would come further towards the end of the sentence. If we make a solid wooden frame with the sentence written on its front, and the time-scale on one of its sides, if we spread flatly a sheet of India rubber over its top, on which rectangular co-ordinates are painted, and slide a smooth ball under the rubber in the direction from 0 to 'yesterday,' the bulging of the membrane along this diagonal at successive moments will symbolize the changing of the thought's content in a way plain enough, after what has been said, to call for no more explanation. Or to express it in cerebral terms, it will show the relative intensities, at successive moments, of the several nerve-processes to which the various parts of the thought-object correspond."

14.7 Reference Frames and Covariance

In 1885, Ludwig Lange relativized Newton's kinematic absolutism, by providing it with an experimental dynamic framework and definition, which he dubbed the "inertial system".²⁹⁶⁷ Lange then generalized his theory in 1902.²⁹⁶⁸ After Einstein became famous, Lange sought in vain for widespread recognition of his insights and nomenclature and for his pioneering work against ontological absolutism.²⁹⁶⁹

Einstein often gave descriptions reminiscent of Berkeley's²⁹⁷⁰ and Lange's writings, which work by Lange detailed the work of Mach and Budde, which Einstein repeated virtually verbatim.²⁹⁷¹ Before being pressured to give Mach credit, Einstein spoke as if these ideas were his own. Einstein wrote to Karl Schwarzschild and presented these ideas as if novel.²⁹⁷² Schwarzschild immediately recognized Lange's "Inertialsystem" described by Einstein, as well as Riemann's contributions.²⁹⁷³

For early uses of the term "Inertial System" in the theory of relativity, refer to the endnote.²⁹⁷⁴ Max von Laue had previously called them "justified systems",²⁹⁷⁵ a term which Einstein soon adopted.²⁹⁷⁶ Ernst Gehrcke insisted that Lange's priority be recognized.²⁹⁷⁷

Einstein, in 1905, relied upon absolutist Newtonian kinematics and an axiomatic absolute "resting system" as opposed to "moving systems". Einstein's light postulate refers only to this "resting system" and the principle of relativity, for Einstein, refers only to systems in uniform motion relative to this singular system.²⁹⁷⁸ Of those who pursued Einstein's papers, and ignoring the fact that it was Poincaré who introduced the concept of the inertial system to the special theory of relativity, it was Jakob Laub²⁹⁷⁹ who first came closest to comprehending the import of Lange's "inertial system" in the theory of relativity, in 1907, with Laub's proposed nomenclature of "System I" and "System II", as opposed to the Einsteins' 1905 "resting system" and "moving systems". Laub's nomenclature was used by Hans Strasser in 1924.²⁹⁸⁰

Hermann Minkowski (1905-1909), building upon Henri Poincaré's prior works, eliminated the notion of a privileged frame of space from the Einsteins' theory,

claiming that neither Lorentz nor Einstein made any attack on the concept of absolute space.²⁹⁸¹ Laub failed to fully incorporate the “inertial system” concept into the theory of relativity in at least three ways, though I believe he set the movement in motion. One, while asserting that absolute space “plays no role” in the Einsteins’ theory, Laub still spoke in absolutes, and of rest, and failed to explicitly state that there is no such thing as absolute space. Two, he spoke of absolute empty space as the normal medium of the light wave. Three, had he denied the existence of absolute space, instead of merely asserting that it played no observable role (it plays no such observable role in Lorentz’ system, either), he would have been compelled to refer the “Systems” dynamically to Newton’s laws of inertia, which are kinematically understood when one proceeds from absolute space, to a moving system in uniform rectilinear translation of motion with respect to absolute space, but are by no means understood by simply asserting two arbitrary systems in uniform motion with respect to each other.

The Einsteins assert in their 1905 paper that a clock at the equator runs more slowly than a clock at one of the Earth’s poles. Langevin’s 1911 “paradox of the twins”²⁹⁸² is not a paradox in the Einsteins’ 1905 paper, but rather a prediction of the effects of the absolute motion on moving bodies, for a clock at the equator necessarily has greater absolute velocity than a clock at one of the poles, due to the Earth’s absolute rotation, and the assertion is therefore not a paradox, *per se*, but an express and internal contradiction of the Einsteins’ theoretical requirement that absolute space evince no characteristic properties—that it, and its effects, be indiscernible, or, as the Einsteins euphemistically disguised it, the non-paradox is an “eigentümliche Konsequenz” of absolute motion, which later became an “unabweisbare Konsequenz” in Albert’s 1911 paper. Fritz Müller put this question to Einstein in 1911, and Einstein did not dispute his analysis of the effect of absolute motion on time.²⁹⁸³ The Einsteins’ assertion that absolute velocity results in absolute time dilatation not only discredits Einstein’s claim of priority over Lorentz for calling “Ortszeit” simply “Zeit”, it is fatal to the 1905 paper as if a purely kinematic relativistic theory, as Herbert Dingle proved,

“I now sum up the situation by stating again what must be done to avoid my conclusion. Either my equations (3) and (4) are contradictory or they are not. If they are, at least one must be wrong, and if Einstein’s (3) is right, then a false step must exist in the deduction of (4) from the commonly agreed (1) and (2) which has no repercussions on the deduction of (3): this false step must be pinpointed. If, on the other hand, (3) and (4) are not contradictory, then it must be explained why Einstein’s deductions from (3)—for example, that an equatorial clock goes slower than a polar one—are true, while the similar but opposite deductions from (4)—for example, that an equatorial clock goes faster than a polar one—are not equally true. In each case, therefore, either the necessary physical implications of (3) must be vindicated and those of (4) discredited, or the theory fails. No solution which makes the equations equivalent, whether meaningful or meaningless, has any bearing on the matter.”²⁹⁸⁴

We have Mileva and Albert proclaiming in 1905,

“One immediately sees, that this result is also still valid if the clock moves in an arbitrary polygonal line from A to B , and, of course, if the points A and B coincide.

If one assumes that the result proved for a polygonal line is also valid for a continuously curved line, then one obtains the proposition: If at A there are two synchronously running clocks and one moves one of the clocks in a closed curve with a constant velocity, until it again arrives back at A , which lasts for t seconds, then the latter clock upon its arrival at A runs $\frac{1}{2} t (v/c)^2$ seconds slow in comparison with the unmoved clock. Therefore, one concludes that a balance-clock located at the equator must run more slowly by a very small amount, than a clock of exactly the same construction located at one of the Earth’s poles, *ceteris paribus*.”

The Einsteins expressly state that a clock which is (absolutely) resting records the accurate, absolute time of travel, and that a moving clock runs slow. They propose: the absolute time of the journey, the clock which has remained at rest, and the traveled clock. The Einsteins’ statement quoted above (which was published before Minkowski published his theory of “worldlines”) again proves that the “resting system” referred to in the 1905 paper is one at absolute rest. The Einsteins’ notion that the motion of the equator with respect to a pole is a curved motion refers that motion to absolute space, a privileged frame, as the relative “motion” of equator and pole is one of relative rest. The notion that clocks would show a difference of time between equator and pole is one: that the absolute motion at the equator must, of necessity, be greater than the absolute motion of the pole; and further that time dilatation is an absolute effect, and is not a reciprocal relative effect of a measurement procedure. The Einsteins’ paper is, therefore, a far more primitive understanding of relativistic concepts than Poincaré’s prior work, and the Einsteins’ principle of relativity is shown to be a fallacy, for the concept of absolute rest does indeed, in their theory, correspond to characteristic properties of the phenomena in electrodynamics.

We also know that the Einsteins believed in absolute space, because their 1905 paper is expressly based on Maxwell’s æther theory, and they stated before introducing the Lorentz Transformation that light speed is axiomatically isotropic between points A and B at a distance from each other in the preferred “resting system”. This is only axiomatically true if one assumes a preferred frame of absolute space and an æther at absolute rest, because the assertion depends upon source and observe speed independence of light speed which is only axiomatically true of the æther frame. The Einsteins then asserted in a *non sequitur* that the principle of relativity requires that if the speed of light is absolute and isotropic in absolute space, it must also be absolute and isotropic in “moving reference systems”—and on this fallacious basis they attempt to justify their repetition of Poincaré’s clock synchronization procedure in “moving systems”. The Einsteins fallacy results in a

tautology, not a scientific approach to the problem. Poincaré and Lorentz were the superior theorists, in that they realized that a scientific exposition could not be a tautology, but must proceed on an axiomatic basis from fundamental principles, not empirical observations.

Henri Poincaré knew that a serious and complete Physics required a dynamic as well as kinematic exposition of the Lorentz Transformation. Hendrik Antoon Lorentz understood that the transformations were based on the scalar c^2 in “moving systems of reference” and that light speed anisotropy in “moving systems”, not isotropy, is the actual basis of the special theory of relativity and of the Lorentz Transformation.²⁹⁸⁵ The *æther* is detectable in the special theory of relativity even though its presumed *resting frame of reference* remains undetectable. In addition, the entire structure of the Lorentz Transformation is built upon the presumption of light speed anisotropy in moving frames of references, which fact is revealed by the use of the scalar c^2 . The Einsteins’ assertion of the absolute velocity of light in the “resting system” as a given axiomatic fact is an acknowledgment that the “resting system” is an *æther* at absolute rest, and this is how the Einsteins’ define it in Part I, Section 1 of their paper. If light speed were not anisotropic in moving frames of reference, the Lorentz Transformation would not work, because light speed would not then be measured to be c in a moving frame of reference by observers relatively resting in that moving frame—moving with respect to the *æther*. This has been adequately proven by Guillaume, Jánossy and others.²⁹⁸⁶ Prof. Friedwardt Winterberg wrote,

“According to Einstein, two clocks, A and B , are synchronized if

$$t_B = \frac{1}{2} (t_A^1 + t_A^2) \quad (\text{VII.13})$$

where t_A^1 is the time a light signal is emitted from A to B , reflected at B back to A , arriving at A at the time t_A^2 , and where it is assumed that the time t_B at which the reflection at B takes place is equal the arithmetic average of t_A^1 and t_A^2 . Only by making this assumption does the velocity of light turn out always to be isotropic and equal to c . From an absolute point of view, the following is rather true: If t_R is the absolute reflection time of the light signal at clock B , one has for the out and return journeys of the light signal from A to B and back to A , if measured by an observer in an absolute system at rest in the distinguished reference system:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(t_R - t_A^1) &= d/c_+, \\ \gamma(t_A^2 - t_R) &= d/c_- \end{aligned} \quad (\text{VII.14})$$

where d is the distance between both clocks, and where c_+ and c_- are given by

$$c_+ = \sqrt{c^2 - v^2 \sin^2 \psi} - v \cos \psi$$

$$c_- = \sqrt{c^2 - v^2 \sin^2 \psi} + v \cos \psi$$

Adding the equations (VII.14) one obtains

$$c(t_A^2 - t_A^1) = 2\gamma d \sqrt{1 - (v^2/c^2) \sin^2 \psi} \quad (\text{VII.15})$$

If an observer at rest with the clock wants to measure the distance from A to B , he can measure the time it takes a light signal to go from A to B and back to A . If he assumes that the velocity of light is constant and isotropic in all inertial reference systems, including the one he is in, moving together with A and B with the absolute velocity v , this distance is

$$d' = (c/2)(t_A^2 - t_A^1) \quad (\text{VII.16})$$

and because of (VII.15)

$$d' = \gamma d \sqrt{1 - (v^2/c^2) \sin^2 \psi} \quad (\text{VII.17})$$

Comparing this result with,

$$l' = l \sqrt{1 - (v^2/c^2) \cos^2 \varphi} = \frac{l}{\gamma \sqrt{1 - (v^2/c^2) \sin^2 \psi}}$$

one sees that he would obtain the same distance d' , if he uses a contracted rod as a measuring stick, of Einstein's constant light velocity postulate. The velocity of light between A and B by using a rod to measure the distance and the time it takes a light signal in going from A to B and back to A , of course, will turn out to be equal to c , because according to (VII.16)

$$\frac{2d'}{t_A^2 - t_A^1} = c \quad (\text{VII.18})$$

Rather than using a reflected light signal to measure the distance d' , the observer at A may try to measure the one-way velocity of light by first

synchronizing the clock B with A and then measure the time for a light signal to go from A to B . However, since this synchronization procedure also uses reflected light signals, the result is the same. For the velocity he finds

$$\frac{d}{t_B - t_A^1} = \frac{d'}{(1/2)(t_A^1 + t_A^2) - t_A^1} = \frac{2d'}{t_A^2 - t_A^1} = c \quad (\text{VII.19})$$

By subtracting the equations (VII.14) one finds that

$$t_R = t_B + (\gamma/c^2) v d \cos \psi \quad (\text{VII.20})$$

which shows that from an absolute point of view the ‘true’ reflection time t_R at clock B is only then equal to t_B if $v = 0$. From an absolute point of view the propagation of light is isotropic only in the distinguished reference system, but anisotropic in a reference system in absolute motion against the distinguished reference system. This anisotropy remains hidden due to the impossibility to measure the one way velocity of light. This impossibility is expressed in the Lorentz transformations themselves, containing the scalar c^2 rather than the vector \underline{c} , through which an anisotropic light propagation would have to be expressed.²⁹⁸⁷

The expected anisotropy from which the transformation evolved exhibits itself in the predictions the theory makes for an interferometer constructed and calibrated in an inertial reference system K_0 without rigid attachments, but instead assembled with rockets or automobiles at each of the four relevant surfaces, which after being adjusted are then simultaneously and uniformly accelerated with respect to K_0 then allowed to travel in inertial motion in inertial reference system K_1 , but which do not suffer a Lorentz contraction due to the lack of rigid attachments. The special theory of relativity predicts a shift in the interference fringe pattern on the interferometer, which matches the exact result for which Michelson and Morley originally sought but did not find and which confirms light speed anisotropy in at least one of the two inertial reference systems employed in the experiment.

Lajos Jánossy proved this argument,

“§7. Im vorigen Abschnitt haben wir gezeigt, wie man ein materiales Bezugssystem K_1 konstruieren kann, das eine vollkommene Galileische Transformation des Systems K_0 ist. Das System K_1 ist jedoch ein sehr unbequemes Bezugssystem. Wir finden nämlich, daß 1. das Licht sich in K_1 nicht isotrop ausbreitet, und 2. daß bewegte Uhren Phasenverschiebungen

erleiden, auch wenn sie sehr langsam in K_1 bewegt werden; die Phasenverschiebung verschwindet auch im Grenzfall der verschwindenden Verschiebungsgeschwindigkeit nicht.

Wir zeigen zunächst, daß diese erwähnte, unbequeme Eigenschaft in K_1 tatsächlich auftritt.

1. Daß Licht sich in K_0 isotrop ausbreitet, kann durch den Michelson-Morley-Versuch gezeigt werden. Betrachten wir nun ein Interferometer in K_0 , das aus vier unzusammenhängenden Teilen besteht (s. Abb. 2 [Figure deleted]): Eine halbversilberte Platte P , zwei Spiegel M_1 and M_2 und ein Fernrohr T . Wenn wir das System drehen, so daß die relativen Entfernungen von M_1 , M_2 , P und T unverändert bleiben, dann wird auch das Streifensystem in T unverändert bleiben. Wenn wir nun die vier Teile des Systems unabhängig, aber gleichzeitig beschleunigen, dann bringen wir das Interferometer in des System K_1 . Diese Beschleunigung wird aber das Streifensystem, das man in T sieht, beeinflussen. Diese Beschleunigung würde in der Tat eine Streifenverschiebung hervorrufen, die in Lichtzeit ausgedrückt folgenden Wert besitzt.

$$\Delta T = l \left(\frac{4}{c} - \frac{2}{\sqrt{c^2 - v^2}} - \frac{1}{c - v} - \frac{1}{c + v} \right) = -\frac{lv^2}{c^2} + \dots \quad (13)$$

Der obige wert der Verschiebung ist nämlich genau der, den seinerzeit Michelson und Morley erwartet hatten, aber nicht fanden. Der Unterschied zwischen dem hier beschriebenen Experiment und dem wirklichen Michelson-Morley-Experiment ist nämlich der, daß das wirkliche Interferometer nicht aus unabhängigen Bestandteilen „zusammengesetzt“ ist, sondern ein festes System bildete. Wenn die Teile unseres gedachten Interferometers durch materielle Stäbe verbunden wären, dann würden die einzelnen Teile nach Vollzug der Beschleunigung durch die in den Stäben auftretenden, elastischen Kräfte verschoben werden. Wenn wir also den elastischen Kräften freies Spiel gewähren würden, dann würden sie das Interferometer im Vergleich zum System K_1 in einer solchen Weise verzerren, daß die Verzerrung die Phasenverschiebung (13) genau kompensieren würde.

Um dies ganz klar zu machen, betrachten wir schematisch ein Interferometer, dessen vier Bestandteile auf vier Autos montiert sind. Setzen wir nun voraus, daß diese Autos gleichzeitig in der in §6 beschriebenen Weise losfahren. (Wir setzen voraus, daß die Autos so glatt fahren, daß die Interferenzstreifen während der Fahrt bestehen bleiben.) Das Interferometer, das auf diese Weise in Bewegung gesetzt worden ist, wird sicher eine Phasenverschiebung zeigen. Wir haben in §6/1 darauf hingewiesen, daß

elastische Bänder, die zwischen Autos gespannt sind, in Spannung geraten, wenn die Autos sich in Bewegung setzen, weil nämlich diese Bänder sich zusammenzuziehen versuchen, aber daran verhindert werden durch die Autos. Wenn wir jetzt die Autos sich einander soweit nähern lassen, daß die elastische Spannung aufhört, dann verschieben wir damit die Spiegel genau in der richtigen Weise, um die nach der Beschleunigung aufgetretene Phasenverschiebung rückgängig zu machen. Zusammenfassend sehen wir, daß die Lichtfortpflanzung in K_1 nicht der isotrop erfolgt. Dieses Resultat setzt natürlich voraus, daß wir mit der Methode der Konstruktion von K_1 , wie sie in §6 beschreiben wurde, einverstanden sind.”²⁹⁸⁸

In 1911, Albert Einstein (like Langevin) wrote, referring to a “purely kinematic consequence”—as opposed to a dynamic consequence,

“Were we, for example, to place a living organism in a box and make it perform the same to-and-fro motion as the clock discussed above, it would be possible to have this organism return to its original starting point after an arbitrarily long flight having undergone an arbitrarily small change, while identically constituted organisms that remained at rest at the point of origin have long since given way to new generations. The long time spent on the trip represented only an instant for the moving organism if the motion occurred with approximately the velocity of light! This is an inevitable consequence of our fundamental principles, imposed on us by experience.”²⁹⁸⁹

Albert Einstein told Ernst Gehrcke in 1914 that accelerated movements are absolute,

“The clock B, which was moved, runs more slowly because it has sustained accelerations in contrast to the clock A. Certainly, these accelerations are unimportant for the amount of the time difference of both clocks, however, their existence causes the slow running just of the clock B, and not of the clock A. Accelerated motions are absolute in the theory of relativity.”

“Die Uhr B, welche bewegt wurde, geht deshalb nach, weil sie im Gegensatz zu der Uhr A Beschleunigungen erlitten hat. Diese Beschleunigungen sind zwar für den Betrag der Zeitdifferenz beider Uhren belanglos, ihr Vorhandsein bedingt jedoch das Nachgehen gerade der Uhr B, und nicht der Uhr A. Beschleunigte Bewegungen sind in der Relativitätstheorie absolute.”²⁹⁹⁰

Gehrcke recounted that,

“Mr. Einstein recently admitted to me orally that accelerations are absolute

in Einstein's theory of relativity, up to now, however, he has not acknowledged that speeds in his theory are absolute. It is noteworthy in this context that in Newtonian Mechanics both translation-speeds and accelerations are *relative*, on the other hand rotational-speeds and -accelerations are absolute; I am of course in agreement with Mr. Einstein on this point (regarding Newtonian mechanics) and have proven that the often heard, contrary opinion, according to which all accelerations in Newtonian mechanics are absolute and 'inertial systems' are left to be defined mechanically, is erroneous. [***] Minkowski's theory of relativity places, like Einstein's, the reference system, to which all events are referred (therefore the absolutely resting system), in the subjective standpoint of an observer. Therefore, the theory can be characterized as a subjective theory of absolutism: subjective because the point of view of the *observer* is distinguished, absolute, because all events are referred to this standpoint and no other."

“Daß in der Relativitätstheorie EINSTEINs die Beschleunigungen absolute sind, hat mir Herr EINSTEIN neuerdings auch mündlich zugegeben, er hat jedoch bisher nicht anerkannt, daß die Geschwindigkeiten in seiner Theorie absolute sind. Im Anschluß hieran sei bemerkt, daß in der NEWTONschen Mechanik sowohl Translations-Geschwindigkeiten wie -Beschleunigungen *relative* sind, dagegen sind die Rotations-Geschwindigkeiten und -Beschleunigungen absolute; ich bin in diesem Punkte (hinsichtlich der NEWTONschen Mechanik) wohl in Übereinstimmung mit Herrn EINSTEIN, und habe bewiesen, daß die oft gehörte, gegenteilige Ansicht, nach der alle Beschleunigungen in der NEWTONschen Mechanik absolute seien und sich „Inertialsysteme“ mechanisch definieren ließen, irrtümlich ist. [***] Die Relativitätstheorie von MINKOWSKI legt, wie die von EINSTEIN, das Bezugssystem, auf welches alles Geschehen zu beziehen ist (also das absolut ruhende System), in den subjektiven Standpunkt eines Beobachters. Daher läßt sich die Theorie als *subjektive Absoluttheorie* charakterisieren: subjektiv, weil der Standpunkt des *Beobachters* ausgezeichnet wird, absolut, weil alles Geschehen auf *diesen* Standpunkt und keinen anderen bezogen wird.”²⁹⁹¹

This history has been largely forgotten, with most today mistakenly believing that Einstein had understood the full significance of Lange's inertial systems in 1905, though Einstein had not. Einstein repeatedly described a preferred “resting system” and a particular state of motion relative to it, right up through 1916, in the special theory.

Gehrcke described the “theory of relativity” as subjective absolutism in 1914, and stated that in 1914 Einstein had told him that accelerations are absolute in the theory of relativity. Einstein then obstructed Gehrcke's efforts to publish that fact in *Die Naturwissenschaften*, while conceding that it was true.

Covariance was already raised, as an issue, in the Poincaré-Lorentz theory of relativity.²⁹⁹² Covariance has been a controversial subject.²⁹⁹³ Kretschmann

demonstrated that covariance is a matter of human convention, and not a principle of Nature. Einstein almost immediately stole some of Kretschmann's ideas.²⁹⁹⁴ Dennis Overbye wrote in his book *Einstein in Love: A Scientific Romance*,

“Kretschmann's paper, which appeared in the *Annalen der Physik* on December 21, 1915, apparently struck a chord with Einstein. By now, of course, the hole argument was an embarrassment, and he was eager for an answer. Five days later Albert wrote back to Ehrenfest, who had been pestering him about the hole problem, with an answer almost identical to Kretschmann's. Space-time points, he said, gain their identity not from coordinates but from what happens at them. The phrase he used was ‘space-time coincidences.’⁴⁰

‘The physically real in the world of events (in contrast to that which is dependent upon the choice of a reference system) consists in *spatiotemporal coincidences* . . . and in nothing else!’ he told Ehrenfest. Reality, he repeated to Besso, was nothing less than the sum of such point coincidences, where, say, the tracks of two electrons or a light ray and a photographic grain crossed.⁴¹

In his magnum opus on the new general relativity theory early in March 1916, Albert paralleled Kretschmann almost word for word: ‘All our space-time verifications invariably amount to a determination of space-time coincidences. . . . Moreover, the results of our measurements are nothing but verifications of meetings of the material points of our measuring instruments with other material points, coincidences between the hands of a clock and points on the clock dial, and observed point-events happening at the same place at the same time.’^{42,2995}

The general theory of relativity is another absolutist theory and the general principle of relativity is an absolutist metaphysical convention, not a scientific principle.

Kamerlingh Onnes was another of Einstein's friends who fell victim to Einstein's career of plagiarism. Dirk van Delft wrote,

“Einstein did, however, lecture on superconductivity at Leiden in November 1921. This time he was invited to stay at Kamerlingh Onnes's home. [***] In November 1922, Einstein set out his ideas on superconductivity in an article for the festschrift celebrating the 40th anniversary of Onnes's professorship.¹¹ Following discussions with Ehrenfest, Einstein had arrived at a model of ‘chains of atomic electrons running almost in single file,’ as he explained it in a postcard to his friend. In the superconducting state, he went on, these chains would be ‘stable and undisturbed.’ Einstein suggested testing his theory by measuring the self-induction of a non-superconducting coil placed beneath a short-circuited superconducting coil. His festschrift article does not contain this somewhat vague suggestion, but he did stick to his electron-chain conjecture. However, after Kamerlingh Onnes found superconductivity across a lead-tin interface, Einstein did have to retract his

hypothesis that the electron chains could not consist of different types of atoms. Surprisingly, Einstein's festschrift paper did not cite a contribution by Onnes to the 1921 Solvay conference.¹² In it, Onnes had also come up with the idea—in much greater detail than Einstein—of electrons moving via low 'threads' from atom to atom. But Einstein had not attended the 1921 Solvay conference in Brussels, so he may not have known about Onnes's contribution."²⁹⁹⁶

Onnes was probably aware that Einstein was plagiarist. Onnes stated,

"Einstein was led to his discoveries by building on Lorentz's work in Leiden."²⁹⁹⁷

Abraham Pais tells of Einstein's attempted appropriation of the Kaluza-Klein theory. Pais wrote,

"There is nothing unusual in Einstein's change of opinion about a theory being unnatural at one time and completely satisfactory some months later. What does puzzle me is a note added to the second paper [E20]: 'Herr Mandel points out to me that the results communicated by me are not new. The entire content is found in the paper by O. Klein.' An explicit reference is added to Klein's 1926 paper [K3]. I fail to understand why he published his two notes in the first place."²⁹⁹⁸

Poincaré stressed the importance of Riemannian geometry. Vladimir Varičak employed non-Euclidean geometry in the theory of relativity, before Einstein and Grossmann.²⁹⁹⁹ Harry Bateman asserted his priority over Einstein in the general theory of relativity, in 1918,

"The appearance of Dr. Silberstein's recent article on 'General Relativity without the Equivalence Hypothesis'³⁰⁰⁰ encourages me to restate my own views on the subject. I am perhaps entitled to do this as my work on the subject of General Relativity was published before that of Einstein and Kottler,³⁰⁰¹ and appears to have been overlooked by recent writers."³⁰⁰²

14.8 Conclusion

Kinertia refers many times to Einstein, Lorentz and Poincaré and states that he wrote to scientists around the world, presumably including Einstein. Kinertia's work on gravity and weight preceded Einstein's by many years.

Einstein asserted the primacy of the principle of equivalence in 1916,

"This opinion must be based upon the fact that we both do not denote the same thing as 'the principle of equivalence'; because in my opinion my theory rests exclusively upon this principle."³⁰⁰³

The entire basis of the general theory of relativity was a plagiarized idea.

Einstein's argument in the general theory of relativity is irrational—a fallacy of *Petitio Principii*. By 1916, Einstein had repeatedly acknowledged Eötvös' experimental results of the previous century.³⁰⁰⁴ Therefore, there can be no disputing that Einstein argued an empirical observation, an *a posteriori* problem, as if an *a priori* first principle in order to “deduce” the principle of equivalency” as a conclusion from itself. This results in a fallacy of *Petitio Principii*, in that Einstein assumes the fact in order to prove the same fact, just as Mileva and Albert had assume light speed invariance and the principle of relativity as “postulates” in order to “deduce” light speed invariance and the principle of relativity as conclusions.

Hans Reichenbach stated,

“The principle of the equality of inertial and gravitational mass, which incidently is also the reason for the equality of the velocities of falling bodies [***] has been confirmed to a high degree by experiments. It is mentioned explicitly by Einstein as an empirical principle constituting the basis of his principle of equivalence.”³⁰⁰⁵

Emil Wiechert stated on 26 February 1916, that the inertial-gravitational mass equivalence is an *a posteriori* problem, not an *a priori* first principle.³⁰⁰⁶ Hermann Weyl explained,

“Eötvös has comparatively recently [in 1890] tested the accuracy of this law by actual experiments of the greatest refinement (*vide* note 3). The centrifugal force imparted to a body at the earth's surface by the earth's rotation is proportional to its inertial mass but its weight is proportional to its gravitational mass. The resultant of these two, the *apparent* weight, would have different directions for different bodies if gravitational and inertial mass were not proportional throughout. The absence of this difference of direction was demonstrated by Eötvös by means of the exceedingly sensitive instrument known as the torsion-balance: it enables the inertial mass of a body to be measured to the same degree of accuracy as that to which its weight may be determined by the most sensitive balance.”³⁰⁰⁷

Einstein, himself, stated in 1913,

“[T]he equality (proportionality) of the gravitational and inertial mass has been proved with great accuracy in an investigation of great importance to us by Eötvös [***] *Eötvös's exact experiment concerning the equality of inertial and gravitational mass supports the view that such a criterion does not exist. We see that in this regard Eötvös's experiment plays a role similar to that of the Michelson experiment with respect to the question of whether uniform motion can be detected physically.*”³⁰⁰⁸

Einstein stated in *The New York Times* on 3 April 1921 on pages 1 and 13,

“I first became interested in it through the question of the distribution and expansion of light in space; that is, for the first grade or step. The fact that an iron ball and a wooden ball fall to the ground at the same speed was perhaps the reason which prompted me to take the second step.”

On 13 June 1921, Einstein stated,

“The theory of general relativity owes its origin primarily to the experimental fact of the numerical equality of inertial and gravitational mass of a body, a fundamental fact for which classical mechanics has given no interpretation.”³⁰⁰⁹

Max Born stated on 16 July 1955,

“[The general theory of relativity] began with a paper published as early as December, 1907, which contains the principle of equivalence, the only empirical pillar on which the whole imposing structure of general relativity was built.”³⁰¹⁰

Empirical observations are not *a priori* first principles, but are instead *a posteriori* problems which much be deduced from first principles. The principle of equivalence was a very old idea.

Samuel Clarke wrote, in the early 1700's,

“IF he only affirms bare *Matter* to be Necessary: Then, besides the extreme Folly of attributing *Motion* and the *Form* of the World to *Chance*; (which senseless Opinion I think All Atheists have now given up; and therefore I shall not think my self obliged to take any Notice of it in the Sequel of this Discourse:) it may be demonstrated by many Arguments drawn from the Nature and Affections of the Thing itself, that *Matter* is not a *necessary Being*. For Instance, Thus. *Tangibility* or *Resistance*, (which is what Mathematicians very properly call *Vis inertiae*,) is *essential* to *Matter*. Otherwise the word, *Matter*, will have *no determinate* Signification. *Tangibility* therefore, or *Resistance*, belonging to *All Matter*; it follows evidently, that if *All Space* were filled with *Matter*, the *Resistance* of *All Fluids* (for the *Resistance* of the *Parts* of *Hard Bodies* arises from Another Cause) would necessarily be *Equal*. For greater or less degrees of *Fineness* or *Subtility*, can in this case make no difference: Because the *smaller* or *finer* the parts of the Fluid are, wherewith any particular Space is filled, the *greater* in proportion is the *Number* of the parts; and consequently the *Resistance* still always Equal. But Experience shows on the contrary, that the *Resistance* of *All Fluids* is *not* equal: There being large Spaces, in which no sensible *Resistance* at all is made to the swiftest and most lasting *Motion* of the solidest *Bodies*. Therefore *All Space* is *not* filled with *Matter*; but, of necessary Consequence, there must be a *Vacuum*.

OR Thus. It appears from Experiments of *falling* Bodies, and from Experiments of *Pendulums*, which (being of *equal Lengths* and *unequal Gravities*) vibrate in *equal Times*; that *All Bodies* whatsoever, in Spaces void of sensible Resistance, fall from the same Height with *equal Velocities*. Now 'tis evident, that whatever *Force* causes *unequal Bodies* to move with *equal Velocities*, must be proportional to the *Quantities* of the *Bodies moved*. The Power of *Gravity* therefore in *All Bodies*, is (at equal Distances suppose from the Center of the Earth) proportional to the *Quantity of Matter* contained in each Body. For if in a Pendulum there were any *Matter* that did not *gravitate* proportionally to its *Quantity*, the *Vis Inertiae* of that Matter would retard the Motion of the rest, so as soon to be discovered in Pendulums of equal Lengths and unequal Gravities in Spaces void of sensible Resistance. *Gravity* therefore is in all Bodies [*Footnote: Neutoni Princip. Philosoph. Edit. 1ma, p. 304. Edit. 2da, p. 272. Edit. 3tia p. 294.*] *proportional* to the *Quantity* of their *Matter*. And consequently, all Bodies not being equally heavy, it follows again necessarily, that [*Footnote: Neutoni Princip. Philosoph. Edit. 1ma, p. 411. Edit. 2da, p. 368.*] there must be a *Vacuum*.³⁰¹¹

Isaac Newton wrote in Book II of his *Principia*,

“S E C T I O N VI
*Of the motion and resistance of
funependulous bodies.*

PROPOSITION XXIV. THEOREM XIX.

The quantities of matter in funependulous bodies, whose centres of oscillation are equally distant from the centre of suspension, are in a ratio compounded of the ratio of the weights and the duplicate ratio of the times of the oscillations in vacuo.

For the velocity, which a given force can generate in a given matter in a given time, is as the force and the time directly, and the matter inversely. The greater the force or the time is, or the less the matter, the greater the velocity generated. This is manifest from the second law of motion. Now if pendulums are of the same length, the motive forces in places equally distant from the perpendicular are as the weights: and therefore if two bodies by oscillating describe equal arcs, and those arcs are divided into equal parts; since the times in which the bodies describe each of the correspondent parts of the arcs are as the times of the whole oscillations, the velocities in the correspondent parts of the oscillations will be to each other, as the motive forces and the whole times of the oscillations directly, and the quantities of

matter reciprocally: and therefore the quantities of matter are as the forces and the times of the oscillations directly and the velocities reciprocally. But the velocities reciprocally are as the times, and therefore the times directly and the velocities reciprocally are as the squares of the times; and therefore the quantities of matter are as the motive forces and the squares of the times, that is, as the weights and the squares of the times. *Q.E.D.*

COR. 1. Therefore if the times are equal, the quantities of matter in each of the bodies are as the weights.

COR. 2. If the weights are equal, the quantities of matter will be as the squares of the times.

COR. 3. If the quantities of matter are equal, the weights will be reciprocally as the squares of the times.

COR. 4. Whence since the squares of the times, *cæteris paribus*, are as the lengths of the pendulums; therefore if both the times and the quantities of matter are equal, the weights will be as the lengths of the pendulums.

COR. 5. And universally, the quantity of matter in the pendulous body is as the weight and the square of the time directly, and the length of the pendulum inversely.

COR. 6. But in a non-resisting medium, the quantity of matter in the pendulous body is as the comparative weight and the square of the time directly, and the length of the pendulum inversely. For the comparative weight is the motive force of the body in any heavy medium, as was shewn above; and therefore does the same thing in such a non-resisting medium, as the absolute weight does in a vacuum.

COR. 7. And hence appears a method both of comparing bodies one among another, as to the quantity of matter in each; and of comparing the weights of the same body in different places, to know the variation of its gravity. And by experiments made with the greatest accuracy, I have always found the quantity of matter in bodies to be proportional to their weight.³⁰¹²

In Book III of the *Principia*, Newton wrote,

“PROPOSITION VI. THEOREM VI.

That all bodies gravitate towards every Planet; and that the Weights of bodies towards any the same Planet, at equal distances from the centre of the Planet, are proportional to the quantities of matter which they severally contain.

It has been, now of a long time, observed by others, that all sorts of heavy bodies, (allowance being made for the inequality of retardation, which they suffer from a small power of resistance in the air) descend to the Earth *from equal heights* in equal times: and that equality of times we may distinguish to a great accuracy, by the help of pendulums. I tried the thing in gold, silver,

lead, glass, sand, common salt, wood, water, and wheat. I provided two wooden boxes, round and equal. I filled the one with wood, and suspended an equal weight of gold (as exactly as I could) in the centre of oscillation of the other. The boxes hanging by equal threads of 11 feet, made a couple of pendulums perfectly equal in weight and figure, and equally receiving the resistance of the air. And placing the one by the other, I observed them to play together forward and backward, for a long time, with equal vibrations. And therefore the quantity of matter in the gold (by cor. 1 and 6. prop. 24. book 2.) was to the quantity of matter in the wood, as the action of the motive force (or *vis motrix*) upon all the gold, to the action of the same upon all the wood; that is, as the weight of the one to the weight of the other. And the like happened in the other bodies. By these experiments, in bodies of the same weight, I could manifestly have discovered a difference of matter less than the thousandth part of the whole, had any such been. But, without all doubt, the nature of gravity towards the Planets, is the same as towards the Earth. For, should we imagine our terrestrial bodies removed to the orb of the Moon, and there, together with the Moon, deprived of all motion, to be let go, so as to fall together towards the Earth: it is certain, from what we have demonstrated before, that, in equal times, they would describe equal spaces with the Moon, and of consequence are to the Moon, in quantity of matter, as their weights to its weight. Moreover, since the satellites of Jupiter perform their revolutions in times which observe the sesquuplicate proportion of their distances from Jupiter's centre, their accelerative gravities towards Jupiter will be reciprocally as the squares of their distances from Jupiter's centre; that is, equal, at equal distances. And, therefore, these satellites, if supposed to fall *towards Jupiter* from equal heights, would describe equal spaces in equal times, in like manner as heavy bodies do on our Earth. And by the same argument, if the circumsolar Planets were supposed to be let fall at equal distances from the Sun, they would, in their descent towards the Sun, describe equal spaces in equal times. But forces, which equally accelerate unequal bodies, must be as those bodies; that is to say, the weights of the Planets *towards the Sun* must be as their quantities of matter. Further, that the weights of Jupiter and of his satellites towards the Sun are proportional to the several quantities of their matter, appears from the exceedingly regular motions of the satellites (by cor. 3. prop. 65, Book 1.) For if some of those bodies were more strongly attracted to the Sun in proportion to their quantity of matter, than others; the motions of the satellites would be disturbed by that inequality of attraction (by cor. 2. prop. 65. Book 1.) If, at equal distances from the Sun, any satellite in proportion to the quantity of its matter, did gravitate towards the Sun, with a force greater than Jupiter in proportion to his, according to any given proportion, suppose of d to e ; then the distance between the centres of the Sun and of the satellite's orbit would be always greater than the distance between the centres of the Sun and of Jupiter, nearly in the subduplicate of that proportion; as by some computations I have found. And if the satellite did gravitate towards the Sun with a force, lesser in the

proportion of e to d , the distance of the centre of the satellite's orb from the Sun, would be less than the distance of the centre of Jupiter from the Sun, in the subduplicate of the same proportion. Therefore if, at equal distances from the Sun, the accelerative gravity of any satellite towards the Sun were greater or less than the accelerative gravity of Jupiter towards the Sun, but by one $\frac{1}{1000}$ part of the whole gravity; the distance of the centre of the satellite's orbit from the Sun would be greater or less than the distance of Jupiter from the Sun, by one $\frac{1}{2000}$ part of the whole distance; that is, by a fifth part of the distance of the utmost satellite from the centre of Jupiter; an excentricity of the orbit, which would be very sensible. But the orbits of the satellites are concentric to Jupiter, and therefore the accelerative gravities of Jupiter, and of all its satellites towards the Sun, are equal among themselves. And by the same argument, the weights of Saturn and of his satellites towards the Sun, at equal distances from the Sun, are as their several quantities of matter: and the weights of the Moon and of the Earth towards the Sun, are either none, or accurately proportional to the masses of matter which they contain. But some they are by cor. 1. and 3. prop. 5.

But further, the weights of all the parts of every Planet towards any other Planet, are one to another as the matter in the several parts. For if some parts did gravitate more, others less, than for the quantity of their matter; then the whole Planet, according to the sort of parts with which it most abounds, would gravitate more or less, than in proportion to the quantity of matter in the whole. Nor is it of any moment, whether these parts are external or internal. For, if, for example, we should imagine the terrestrial bodies with us to be raised up to the orb of the Moon, to be there compared with its body: If the weights of such bodies were to the weights of the external parts of the Moon, as the quantities of matter in the one and in the other respectively; but to the weights of the internal parts, in a greater or less proportion, then likewise the weights of those bodies would be to the weight of the whole Moon, in a greater or less proportion; against what we have shewed above.

COR. 1. Hence the weights of bodies do not depend upon their forms and textures. For if the weights could be altered with the forms, they would be greater or less, according to the variety of forms, in equal matter; altogether against experience.

COR. 2. Universally, all bodies about the Earth gravitate towards the Earth; and the weights of all, at equal distances from the Earth's centre, are as the quantities of matter which they severally contain. This is the quality of all bodies within the reach of our experiments; and therefore, (by rule 3.) to be affirmed of all bodies whatsoever. If the *æther*, or any other body, were either altogether void of gravity, or were to gravitate less in proportion to its quantity of matter; then, because (according to *Aristotle*, *Des Cartes*, and others) there is no difference betwixt that and other bodies, but in *mere* form of matter, by a successive change from form to form, it might be changed at

last into a body of the same condition with those which gravitate most in proportion to their quantity of matter; and, on the other hand, the heaviest bodies, acquiring the first form of that body, might by degrees, quite lose their gravity. And therefore the weights would depend upon the forms of bodies, and with those forms might be changed, contrary to what was proved in the preceding corollary.

COR. 3. All spaces are not equally Full; for if all spaces were equally full, then the specific gravity of the fluid which fills the region of the air, on account of the extreme density of the matter, would fall nothing short of the specific gravity of quick-silver, or gold, or any other the most dense body; and therefore, neither gold, nor any other body, could descend in air. For bodies do not descend in fluids, unless they are specifically heavier than the fluids. And if the quantity of matter in a given space, can, by any rarefaction, be diminished, what should hinder a diminution to infinity?

COR. 4. If all the solid particles of all bodies are of the same density, nor can be rarefied without pores a void space or vacuum must be granted. By bodies of the same density, I mean those whose *vires inertiae* are in the proportion of their bulks.

COR. 5. The power of gravity is of a different nature from the power of magnetism. For the magnetic attraction is not as the matter attracted. Some bodies are attracted more by the magnet, others less; most bodies not at all. The power of magnetism, in one and the same body, may be and increased and diminished; and is sometimes far stronger, for the quantity of matter, than the power of gravity; and in receding from the magnet, decreases not in the duplicate, but almost in the triplicate proportion of the distance, as nearly as I could judge from some rude observations.”³⁰¹³

In 1921, J. E. Turner said of the happiest thought in Einstein’s life,

“The famous Principle of Equivalence is exactly what it professes to be and nothing more—a principle of equivalence, but not therefore of explanation. That changes in a gravitational field may be equally well expressed in terms of acceleration neither explains gravitation nor explains it away[.]”³⁰¹⁴

G. Burniston Brown believed that he had refuted the principle of equivalence, see: “Gravitational and Inertial Mass”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 28, (1960), pp. 475-483; and “What is Wrong with Relativity?”, *Bulletin of the Institute of Physics and the Physical Society*, Volume 12, (March, 1967), pp.71-77.

Lucretius³⁰¹⁵ argued that motion requires an empty space in which things can move. Galileo found no resistance to the motion of “material bodies” in “empty space” and concluded, in a *non sequitur*, that there is no æthereal medium. As Kinertia noted, Galileo, who was so courageous in most of his researches, perhaps is to blame, even more than Bacon, Newton, Hume, Mach or Einstein, for the pernicious attitude prevalent today that we need not seek the physical cause of gravitation, because we can just pretend that circularly defined geometrical laws of

its workings constitute an exposition on the effect. In his dialogues, at 202, Galileo states,

“SALV. The present does not seem to be the proper time to investigate the cause of the acceleration of natural motion concerning which various opinions have been expressed by various philosophers, some explaining it by attraction to the center, others to repulsion between the very small parts of the body, while still others attribute it to a certain stress in the surrounding medium which closes in behind the falling body and drives it from one of its positions to another. Now, all these fantasies, and others too, ought to be examined; but it is not really worth while. At present it is the purpose of our Author merely to investigate and to demonstrate some of the properties of accelerated motion (whatever the cause of this acceleration may be)—meaning thereby a motion, such that the momentum of its velocity [*i momenti della sua velocita*] goes on increasing after departure from rest, in simple proportionality to the time, which is the same as saying that in equal time-intervals the body receives equal increments of velocity; and if we find the properties [of accelerated motion] which will be demonstrated later are realized in freely falling and accelerated bodies, we may conclude that the assumed definition includes such a motion of falling bodies and that their speed [*accelerazione*] goes on increasing as the time and the duration of the motion.”³⁰¹⁶

In 1908, Sir Arthur Schuster spoke out against the emerging logical positivism which prevailed during the period of the development of the theory of relativity, and the negative impact of its intellectual cowardice and ontological solipsism on science. Note that Schuster correctly identifies the mathematics employed in the theory of relativity as metaphysical ontology, not science. Schuster stated,

“I have during these lectures contrasted on several occasions the former tendency to base our technical explanations of natural phenomena on definite models which we can visualise and even construct, with the modern spirit which is satisfied with a mathematical formula, and symbols which frequently have no strictly definable meaning. I ought to explain the distinction between the two points of view which represent two attitudes of mind, and I can do so most shortly by referring to the history of the electro-dynamic theory of light, the main landmarks of which I have already pointed out in the second lecture. The undulatory theory—as it left the hands of Thomas Young, Fresnel and Stokes—was based on the idea that the æther possessed the properties of an elastic solid. Maxwell’s medium being quite different in its behaviour, its author at first considered it to be necessary to justify the possibility of its existence, by showing how, by means of fly wheels and a peculiar cellular construction, we might produce a composite body having the required properties. Although later Maxwell laid no further stress on the ultimate construction of the medium, his ideas remained definite

and to him the displacements which constituted the motion of light possessed a concrete reality. In estimating the importance of the support which Maxwell's views have received from experiment, we must distinguish between the fundamental assumptions on which Maxwell based his investigations and the mathematical formulæ which were the outcome of these investigations. It is clearly the mathematical formulæ only which are confirmed and the same formulæ might have been derived from quite different premises. It has always been necessary, as a second step of great discovery, to clear away the immaterial portions which are almost invariable accessories of the first pioneer work, and Heinrich Hertz, who besides being an experimental investigator was a philosopher of great perspicacity, performed this part of the work thoroughly. The mathematical formula instead of being the result embodying the concrete ideas, now became the only thing which really mattered. To use an acute and celebrated expression of Gustav Kirchhoff, it is the object of science to *describe* natural phenomena, not to *explain* them. When we have expressed by an equation the correct relationship between different natural phenomena we have gone as far as we safely can, and if we go beyond we are entering on purely speculative ground. I have nothing to say against this as a philosophic doctrine, and I shall adopt it myself when lying on my death-bed, if I have then sufficient strength to philosophise on the limitations of our intellect. But while I accept the point of view as a correct death-bed doctrine, I believe it to be fatal to a healthy development of science. Granting the impossibility of penetrating beyond the most superficial layers of observed phenomena, I would put the distinction between the two attitudes of mind in this way: One glorifies our ignorance, while the other accepts it as a regrettable necessity. The practical impediment to the progress of physics, of what may reluctantly be admitted as correct metaphysics, is both real and substantial and might be illustrated almost from any recent volume of scientific periodicals. Everyone who has ever tried to add his mite to advancing knowledge must know that vagueness of ideas is his greatest stumbling-block. But this vagueness which used to be recognised as our great enemy is now being enshrined as an idol to be worshipped. We may never know what constitutes atoms or what is the real structure of the æther, why trouble therefore, it is said, to find out more about them. Is it not safer, on the contrary, to confine ourselves to a general talk on entropy, luminiferous vectors and undefined symbols expressing vaguely certain physical relationships? What really lies at the bottom of the great fascination which these new doctrines exert on the present generation is sheer cowardice: the fear of having its errors brought home to it. As one who believes that metaphysics is a study apart from physics, not to be mixed up with it, and who considers that the main object of the physicist is to add to our knowledge, without troubling himself much as to how that knowledge may ultimately be interpreted, I must warn you against the temptation of sheltering yourself behind an illusive rampart of safety. We all prefer being right to being wrong, but it is better to be wrong than to be neither right nor

wrong.”³⁰¹⁷

Einstein wrote to Max Born on 7 September 1944,

“[. . .]I [believe] in complete law and order in a world which objectively exists, and which I, in a wildly speculative way, am trying to capture. I firmly *believe*, but I hope that someone will discover a more realistic way, or rather a more tangible basis than it has been my lot to find.”³⁰¹⁸

Einstein wrote to Solovine, in 1949,

“You imagine that I look back on my life’s work with calm satisfaction. But from nearby it looks quite different. There is not a single concept of which I am convinced that it will stand firm, and I feel uncertain whether I am in general on the right track.”³⁰¹⁹

Einstein confessed shortly before his death,

“I consider it quite possible that physics cannot be based on the field concept, i. e., on continuous structures. In that case, *nothing* remains of my entire castle in the air, gravitation theory included, [and of] the rest of modern physics.”³⁰²⁰

Einstein had told the general public that only twelve persons in the world were capable of understanding the theory of relativity.³⁰²¹ After that proclamation, any person who dared contest Einstein’s priority was susceptible to being labeled as outside the 12 and incapable of understanding the theory. This *ad hominem* retort to challenges to the theory continues today, when pseudorelativists avoid addressing the substance of arguments against the theory and avoid addressing the facts, but instead attempt an *ad hominem* argument against those who question their beliefs, in an effort to discredit the critic, instead of addressing his or her complaints. There are many fatal flaws in the theory of relativity. When pressed for a substantial response, the response is too often, “What you say is true, but so what?”

When it was realized that Einstein repeated what others had written far earlier, some regarded it as an amazing coincidence that someone had already written what Einstein and others would later publish. For instance,

“[Boscovich’s] theory also suggests curious—almost uncanny—intimations of general relativity and quantum mechanics.”³⁰²²

The lack of footnotes in Einstein’s writings was not seen as an attempt at plagiarism, but as evidence that Einstein conceived the whole soup from scratch, even though the factual record proves that the principle of relativity via the “Lorentz Transformation” was a traditional, well-known recipe. The absurdity of assuming that a lack of references indicates the absence of a knowledge of an other’s works

degenerates into mysticism, and we are asked to accept that Einstein did not read what was famously in print in his pet field, but was inspired,

“if not [by] God, [then by] some otherworldly source”.³⁰²³

Is it not clear that Einstein’s silly and childish “Eureka!” stories of divine, or “otherworldly” inspiration, are fabrications meant to establish a record of priority, where no record in fact exists? For the first originators (a redundancy compelled by the subject matter) of relativity theory, the development was slow, progressive and well documented. It was an evolution, not a holy revelation.

Of course, the indoctrinated habit of scientists is to research the scientific literature before developing a theory. Why wouldn’t Einstein have done so? The history of science was, after all, Einstein’s passion.

Could Einstein have researched the literature on the electrodynamics of moving bodies, the relative motion of bodies and the failure to detect the motion of the Earth relative to the æther and missed the relevant works of Michelson, Larmor, Cohn, Langevin, Poincaré and Lorentz? Did God really tap Einstein on the shoulder and whisper these men’s thoughts to Einstein, but didn’t let Einstein in on the poorly kept *secret* that these men had already published “God’s thoughts”?

Einstein is known to have extensively read Poincaré’s work,³⁰²⁴ and dedicated himself to reading everything Lorentz wrote,³⁰²⁵ but denied knowledge of the so-called “Lorentz Transformation”. Is it plausible to believe that Einstein, a supposed genius and master scientist, was completely unaware of Poincaré’s, Lorentz’ and Larmor’s works containing the so-called “Lorentz Transformation”, and the principle of relativity, which were the talk of the physics community,³⁰²⁶ and the then current literature on the subject of Poincaré’s “principle of relativity”, and that it is coincidental that Einstein repeated much of what they wrote virtually verbatim? Is it a coincidence that Einstein repeated the same formulæ, in the same context, based on the same explanations, and experiments? Is it a coincidence that the relativity well largely ran dry after Poincaré’s untimely death?

Why did Albert’s supposed genius appear only after his marriage to Mileva, and why did he not accomplish major breakthroughs, on the level of the special and general theories of relativity, after he divorced her?

David Hilbert, on whom Einstein went calling for help, published the generally covariant field equations of gravitation of the general theory of relativity, before Einstein.³⁰²⁷ Why, after many years of failure, did Einstein suddenly realize, within a few days after David Hilbert’s work was public, the equations which Hilbert published before him, and then submit his, Einstein’s, identical formulations, inductively analyzing what Hilbert had already deduced?

Should we believe that Einstein came up with the same equations independently of Hilbert, after Einstein’s long and tortuous, fruitless years of struggling in vain, after asking Hilbert for help, within days of Hilbert’s public release? Who was the better mathematician of the two? Who presented the theory first? Who had the better understanding of the principle of least action?³⁰²⁸ Who went calling on whom for help, after years of failure? And why is it that both Hilbert and Einstein publicly

acknowledged that Hilbert had the equations first?

Which one of the two had evinced a pattern of repeating the work of others, supposedly independently, later, again and again and again? What was Poincaré's contribution to the general theory of relativity, was it not in large part his conception?³⁰²⁹ And what of the non-Euclidean geometry of al-Khayyāmī (Omar Khayyam),³⁰³⁰ al-Tūsī (Naṣīr al-Dīn),³⁰³¹ Saccheri,³⁰³² Gauss,³⁰³³ Bolyai,³⁰³⁴ Lobatschewsky,³⁰³⁵ Riemann,³⁰³⁶ Becker,³⁰³⁷ Beltrami,³⁰³⁸ Betti,³⁰³⁹ Flye-Ste. Marie,³⁰⁴⁰ Genocchi,³⁰⁴¹ Helmholtz,³⁰⁴² Lie,³⁰⁴³ Lipschitz,³⁰⁴⁴ Schläefli,³⁰⁴⁵ etc.? Albert Einstein wrote to Felix Klein, on 26 March 1917, and confessed that,

“As I have never done non-Euclidean geometry, the more obvious elliptic geometry had escaped me when I was writing my last paper.”³⁰⁴⁶

And what of the contributions toward the general theory of relativity of Abraham,³⁰⁴⁷ Anderssohn,³⁰⁴⁸ Anding,³⁰⁴⁹ Avenarius,³⁰⁵⁰ Backlund,³⁰⁵¹ Robert Stawell Ball,³⁰⁵² W. W. Rouse Ball,³⁰⁵³ Baltzer,³⁰⁵⁴ Bateman,³⁰⁵⁵ Battaglini,³⁰⁵⁶ Baumann,³⁰⁵⁷ Bauschinger,³⁰⁵⁸ Beez,³⁰⁵⁹ Behacker,³⁰⁶⁰ Bentham,³⁰⁶¹ Berkeley,³⁰⁶² Bertrand,³⁰⁶³ Bessel,³⁰⁶⁴ Boisbaudran,³⁰⁶⁵ Boisson,³⁰⁶⁶ Du Bois-Reymond,³⁰⁶⁷ Bolliger,³⁰⁶⁸ Le Bon,³⁰⁶⁹ Boscovich,³⁰⁷⁰ Bottlinger,³⁰⁷¹ Boucheporn,³⁰⁷² Bresch,³⁰⁷³ Brill,³⁰⁷⁴ Brillouin,³⁰⁷⁵ Brown,³⁰⁷⁶ Brücke,³⁰⁷⁷ Brückner,³⁰⁷⁸ Bruns,³⁰⁷⁹ Bucherer,³⁰⁸⁰ Buchheim,³⁰⁸¹ Budde,³⁰⁸² Burton,³⁰⁸³ Caldonazzo,³⁰⁸⁴ Camille,³⁰⁸⁵ Cantor,³⁰⁸⁶ Cayley,³⁰⁸⁷ Challis,³⁰⁸⁸ Chapin,³⁰⁸⁹ Charlier,³⁰⁹⁰ Chase,³⁰⁹¹ Christoffel,³⁰⁹² Clausius,³⁰⁹³ Clifford,³⁰⁹⁴ Cohn,³⁰⁹⁵ Cox,³⁰⁹⁶ Couturat and Delboeuf,³⁰⁹⁷ Croll,³⁰⁹⁸ Crookes,³⁰⁹⁹ Conway,³¹⁰⁰ Cranz,³¹⁰¹ Cunningham,³¹⁰² De Donder,³¹⁰³ Droste,³¹⁰⁴ Drude,³¹⁰⁵ Duhem,³¹⁰⁶ Dühring,³¹⁰⁷ Ehrenfest,³¹⁰⁸ Engelmeyer,³¹⁰⁹ Eötvös,³¹¹⁰ Epstein,³¹¹¹ Erdmann,³¹¹² Escherich,³¹¹³ Evershed,³¹¹⁴ Faraday,³¹¹⁵ Fechner,³¹¹⁶ Fessenden,³¹¹⁷ Fiedler,³¹¹⁸ FitzGerald,³¹¹⁹ Fokker,[Co-authored with Einstein paper in early 1914] Föppl,³¹²⁰ Frahm,³¹²¹ de Francesco³¹²² Frank,³¹²³ Frankland,³¹²⁴ Frege,³¹²⁵ Freundlich,³¹²⁶ Fricke,³¹²⁷ Benedict and Immanuel Friedlaender,³¹²⁸ Fritsch,³¹²⁹ Funcke,³¹³⁰ Gans,³¹³¹ Gehrcke,³¹³² Geissler,³¹³³ Gerber,³¹³⁴ Glennie,³¹³⁵ Glydén,³¹³⁶ Grassmann,³¹³⁷ Green,³¹³⁸ Grossmann,³¹³⁹ Günther,³¹⁴⁰ Guthrie,³¹⁴¹ Guyot,³¹⁴² Gyllenberg,³¹⁴³ Haeckel,³¹⁴⁴ Hall,³¹⁴⁵ Halphen,³¹⁴⁶ Härdtl,³¹⁴⁷ Hargreaves,³¹⁴⁸ Harkness,³¹⁴⁹ Harzer,³¹⁵⁰ Hasenöhr,³¹⁵¹ Hayford and Bowie,³¹⁵² Heath,³¹⁵³ Heaviside,³¹⁵⁴ Hecker,³¹⁵⁵ Helmholtz,³¹⁵⁶ Hepperger,³¹⁵⁷ Herapath,³¹⁵⁸ Herbart,³¹⁵⁹ Herglotz,³¹⁶⁰ Hertz,³¹⁶¹ Hoffmann,³¹⁶² Höfler,³¹⁶³ Hofmann,³¹⁶⁴ Holzmüller,³¹⁶⁵ Humboldt,³¹⁶⁶ Hume,³¹⁶⁷ Hundhausen,³¹⁶⁸ Huntington,³¹⁶⁹ Hupka,³¹⁷⁰ Ignatowsky,³¹⁷¹ Isenkrahe,³¹⁷² Ishiwara,³¹⁷³ Jacobi,³¹⁷⁴ James,³¹⁷⁵ Jaumann,³¹⁷⁶ Jewell,³¹⁷⁷ Johannesson,³¹⁷⁸ Julius,³¹⁷⁹ Kant,³¹⁸⁰ Killing,³¹⁸¹ “Kinertia” (Pseudonym for Robert Stevenson),³¹⁸² Kirchhoff,³¹⁸³ Klein,³¹⁸⁴ Kleinpeter,³¹⁸⁵ Kober,³¹⁸⁶ König,³¹⁸⁷ Kottler³¹⁸⁸ (father of the “Relativitätstheorie” in 1903), Kretschmann,³¹⁸⁹ Kronecker,³¹⁹⁰ Lamé,³¹⁹¹ Lamla,³¹⁹² F. Lange,³¹⁹³ L. Lange,³¹⁹⁴ Laplace,³¹⁹⁵ Larmor,³¹⁹⁶ Lehmann,³¹⁹⁷ Lehmann-Filhés,³¹⁹⁸ Lense,³¹⁹⁹ Leray,³²⁰⁰ Le Roy,³²⁰¹ Levi-Civita,³²⁰² Lévy,³²⁰³ Lewes,³²⁰⁴ Liebmann,³²⁰⁵ Liénard,³²⁰⁶ Liman,³²⁰⁷ Lindemann,³²⁰⁸ Locke,³²⁰⁹ Lorentz,³²¹⁰ Lotze,³²¹¹ Love,³²¹² MacGregor,³²¹³ Mach,³²¹⁴ Maupertuis, Mayer,³²¹⁵ Mehler,³²¹⁶ Mehmke,³²¹⁷ Mewes,³²¹⁸ Mie,³²¹⁹ Minkowski,³²²⁰ Mossotti,³²²¹ Most,³²²² Mosengeil,³²²³

Müller,³²²⁴ Nagy,³²²⁵ Neumann,³²²⁶ Newcomb,³²²⁷ E. Noble,³²²⁸ E. Noether,³²²⁹ F. Noether,³²³⁰ M. Noether,³²³¹ Nordström,³²³² Oppenheim,³²³³ Oppolzer,³²³⁴ D'Ovidio,³²³⁵ Pavanini,³²³⁶ Pasley,³²³⁷ Pearson,³²³⁸ Petzoldt,³²³⁹ Planck,³²⁴⁰ Poe,³²⁴¹ Poynting,³²⁴² Preston,³²⁴³ Pringsheim,³²⁴⁴ Reich,³²⁴⁵ Reissner,³²⁴⁶ Ricci, Ritz,³²⁴⁷ Rosenberger,³²⁴⁸ Rysának,³²⁴⁹ Le Sage,³²⁵⁰ Saigey,³²⁵¹ St. John,³²⁵² Saleta,³²⁵³ Salmon,³²⁵⁴ Scheibner,³²⁵⁵ Schering,³²⁵⁶ Schlegel,³²⁵⁷ Schott,³²⁵⁸ Schramm,³²⁵⁹ Schulhof,³²⁶⁰ Schuster,³²⁶¹ Schütz,³²⁶² Schwarzschild,³²⁶³ de Schweydar,³²⁶⁴ Secchi,³²⁶⁵ See,³²⁶⁶ Seegers,³²⁶⁷ Seeliger,³²⁶⁸ Seguin,³²⁶⁹ Servus,³²⁷⁰ Silberstein,³²⁷¹ de Sitter,³²⁷² Soldner,³²⁷³ Sommerfeld,³²⁷⁴ Somoff,³²⁷⁵ Souchon,³²⁷⁶ Spiller,³²⁷⁷ Spottiswoode,³²⁷⁸ Stahl,³²⁷⁹ Stallo,³²⁸⁰ Stolz,³²⁸¹ Streintz,³²⁸² Stroh,³²⁸³ Thirring,³²⁸⁴ de Tilly,³²⁸⁵ Tisserand,³²⁸⁶ Tunzelmann,³²⁸⁷ Vaihinger,³²⁸⁸ Varičak,³²⁸⁹ Le Verrier,³²⁹⁰ argumentation between Vicaire and Mansion,³²⁹¹ Vogt,³²⁹² Voigt,³²⁹³ Volkmann,³²⁹⁴ Volterra,³²⁹⁵ Voss,³²⁹⁶ Wacker,³²⁹⁷ Waterston,³²⁹⁸ H. Weber,³²⁹⁹ L. Weber,³³⁰⁰ Wilhelm Weber,³³⁰¹ Weissenborn,³³⁰² Whewell,[Dingler p. 149] Wiechert,³³⁰³ Wilkens,³³⁰⁴ Wilson, Tolman and Lewis,³³⁰⁵ Wulf,³³⁰⁶ Wundt,³³⁰⁷ Zalewski,³³⁰⁸ Zehnder,³³⁰⁹ Zenneck,³³¹⁰ Ziegler,³³¹¹ Zöllner,³³¹² [Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Des Cartes, Huyghens, Newton, Leibnitz, Lagrange, Poisson, Hamilton, etc.]?

For histories on, discussions of, and references for, the general theory of relativity, see: Wolfgang Pauli, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, 5, 2, 19, pp. 539-775, English translation by G. Field, *Theory of Relativity*; Oppenheim and Kottler, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, 6, 2, 22 and 22a, pp. 81-237; Sir Edmund Whittaker's *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2; Mehra's *Einstein, Hilbert, and the Theory of Gravitation*; Roseveare's *Mercury's Perihelion, from Le Verrier to Einstein*; and Prof. A. A. Logunov's *The Theory of Gravity*.

One may rightly ask, what, exactly, did Einstein contribute to the theory? Where, in the historic record, do we find Einstein's contribution with established priority? Is the priority Einstein's, merely because he claimed it, in spite of the dates of publication? Given the above list of names, which, while long, is by no means complete, why did Einstein pretend that he created the general theory of relativity? Why didn't Einstein provide references to at least a handful of the above authors and their works? Your author intends to publish a properly referenced version of the Einsteins' major papers on the theory of relativity. There is very little that is novel in their efforts—certainly *nothing* revolutionary.

Why did Einstein submit a nonsensical paper after his divorce, which confused renowned scientists?³³¹³ Was he not a great independent thinker? Is it possible that Einstein wasn't a genius and became so full of himself that he attempted to go it alone, and failed miserably?

Of course, the "great man", as he once called himself,³³¹⁴ was never short of material to steal when he choose to plagiarize. People from around the world wrote to him with their ideas.³³¹⁵ The thief held the keys to the vault!

Einstein evinced a career long pattern of publishing "novel" theories and formulæ after others had already published similar words, then claimed priority for himself. He did it with $E = mc^2$. He did it with the so-called special theory of relativity and he did it with the general theory of relativity. Einstein often simply

changed the names for terms, then claimed that he had created a new theory, as if Einstein had called red, “blue”, and claimed to have discovered a new color. Harris A. Houghton wrote in the *New York Times* on 21 April 1923,

“[T]hat the time is still not yet ripe either to conclude that Einstein’s theory is correct or that Professor Einstein should receive much credit for calling something by a different name from that by which it has been previously designated.”³³¹⁶

Einstein built a career out of hype and plagiarism. Arvid Reuterdaahl called him, “the Barnum of science.”

Einstein became a hero to many and in their minds a demi-god, seemingly the Holy Ghost incarnate, communicating God’s thoughts to man. The scientific community and the media promote Einstein as the genius who figured it all out. Do we need such heroes? Einstein is seemingly awarded credit for every scientific advancement and theory from the time of Newton up until Einstein’s death. Does Einstein deserve that credit? Is Einstein’s image more important than the progress of science, the natural rights of scientists to question his theories and the history behind them without being smeared, and the right of the public to know the truth?

15 “THEORY OF RELATIVITY” OR “PSEUDORELATIVISM”?

The Theory of Relativity is in fact a theory of absolutism based on the absolute speed of light, the absolute laws of Physics, and an absolute “space-time”. The relativity of space, time and motion was known thousands of years before Einstein was born. Einstein forever failed to grasp the real meaning of relativism.

“Einstein’s theory of relativity is a misnomer, it should be called a theory of absolutivity.”—WALLACE KANTOR

15.1 Introduction

It is not surprising that advocates of the “theory of relativity” often exhibit adolescent behavior. The theory attracts people who are prone to hero worship, and who are willing to accept authority over logic, and cartoon-style Metaphysics over rigorous science. The theory of relativity contains numerous fallacies of *Petitio Principii*. It is difficult for many people to learn, because they realize that they are being taught unproven assertions, as if facts which compel a change in fundamental beliefs. Those who overcome these hurdles by deluding themselves believe that they have joined an elite club of initiates, who have the right and the duty to ridicule non-believers.

Consciously or subconsciously a large proportion of these zealot believers realize that they have been duped and are perpetuating a mythology. They relieve their sense of insecurity by condescendingly and cowardly lecturing those who disagree with them, knowing that rebuttals to their attacks will likely be censored from publication. One of their favorite methods of self-glorification is to pretend that Albert Einstein created the notion of relativism and removed absolutism from Physics.

They are wrong on both counts. There were many ancient relativistic theories. The “theory of relativity” is in fact an absolutist theory, and it is more absolutist than most of the theories of absolutism which preceded it.

15.2 The “Theory of Relativity” is an Absolutist Theory

In one sense, the so-called relativists’—they aren’t truly “relativists”, as Minkowski noted,

“This hypothesis [length contraction resulting in light speed invariance] sounds extremely fantastical, for the contraction is not to be looked upon as a consequence of resistances [*sic*] in the ether, or anything of that kind, but simply as a gift from above [***] [T]he word *relativity-postulate* for the requirement of an invariance with the group G_c seems to me very feeble. [***] I prefer to call it the *postulate of the absolute world*. [***] Thus the essence of this postulate may be clothed mathematically in a very pregnant

manner in the mystic formula $3 \cdot 10^5 \text{ km} = \sqrt{-1} \text{ secs.}$ ”³³¹⁷

Samuel Alexander held that,

“[I]t is clear that Space-Time takes for us the place of what is called the Absolute in idealistic systems. It is an experiential absolute.”³³¹⁸

Max Planck stated,

“Einstein’s recognition of the fact that our Newtonian-Kantian conception of space and time possesses in a certain sense only a relative value because of the arbitrary choice of the system of correlation and methods of measuring, affects the very root of our physical thought. But if space and time have been deprived of their absolute qualities, the absolute has not been disposed of finally, but has only been moved back a step to the measurement of four-dimensional multiplicity which results from the fact that space and time have been fused into one coherent continuum by means of the speed of light. This system of measurement represents something totally independent of any kind of arbitrariness and hence something absolute.”³³¹⁹

and

“For everything that is relative presupposes the existence of something that is absolute, and is meaningful only when juxtaposed to something absolute. The often heard phrase, ‘Everything is relative,’ is both misleading and thoughtless. The Theory of Relativity, too, is based on something absolute, namely, the determination of the matrix of the space-time continuum; and it is an especially stimulating undertaking to discover the absolute which alone makes meaningful something given as relative. [***] Our task is to find in all these factors and data, the absolute, the universally valid, the invariant, that is hidden in them, [*sic*] This applies to the Theory of Relativity, too. I was attracted by the problem of deducing from its fundamental propositions that which served as their absolute immutable foundation. [***] [T]he Theory of Relativity confers an absolute meaning on a magnitude which in classical theory has only a relative significance: the velocity of light. The velocity of light is to the Theory of Relativity [***] its absolute core. The absolute showed itself to be even more deeply rooted in the order of natural laws than had been assumed for a long time.”³³²⁰

Bertrand Russell wrote in his book *The ABC of Relativity*,

“In fact, though few physicists in modern times have believed in absolute motion, the [*special* theory of relativity] still embodied Newton’s belief in [absolute motion], and a revolution in method was required to obtain a technique free from this assumption. This revolution was accomplished in

Einstein’s *general* theory of relativity [1916]. [—*redacted, emphasis added*]³³²¹

Ebenezer Cunningham averred,

“[I]t will be seen, the old philosophical difficulty as to *absolute direction* or *angular velocity* remains. [***] Thus we do not appear to be brought any nearer to the removal of the old-time difficulty that the physical laws which seem best to describe the phenomena of motion postulate an absolute standard of direction though not of position, while apart from the physical phenomena there is no independent means of identifying such a direction.”³³²²

Charles Nordmann recognized that,

“Up to this point the theory of Relativity well deserves its name. But now, in spite of it and its very name, there arises something which seems to have an independent and determined existence in the external world, an objectivity, an *absolute* reality. This is the ‘Interval’ of events, which remains constant and invariable through all the fluctuations of things, however infinitely varied may be the points of view and standards of reference. From this datum, which, speaking philosophically, strangely shares the intrinsic qualities with which the older absolute time and absolute space were so much reproached, the whole constructive part of Relativity, the part which leads to the splendid verifications we described, is derived. Thus the theory of Relativity seems to deny its origin, even its very name, in all that makes it a useful monument of science, a constructive tool, an instrument of discovery. It is a theory of a new absolute: the interval represented by the geodetics of the quadri-dimensional universe. It is a new absolute theory.”³³²³

Melchior Palágyi, from whom Minkowski took much, stated,

“The term introduced by Einstein: ‘theory of relativity’ is, of course, a most unfortunate choice; we retain it, however, like any arbitrary standard designation, which you can’t get rid of, because people have grown accustomed to using it. We restrict the meaning of the theory of relativity to: the new system of the world that arises from the monotheism of space and time and from the unification of mechanics and electrodynamics.”

“Die durch Einstein eingeführte Benennung: ‘Relativitätstheorie’ ist zwar höchst unglücklich gewählt; wir behalten sie aber bei wie irgendeinen beliebigen Eigennamen, den man nicht abändern mag, weil man sich an ihn gewöhnt hat. Relativitätstheorie bedeutet uns immer nur so viel als: das neue Weltsystem, das aus der Einheitslehre von Raum und Zeit und das der Vereinheitlichung von Mechanik und Elektrodynamik entspringt.”³³²⁴

Albert Einstein told Ernst Gehrcke in 1914 that accelerated movements are absolute,

“The clock B, which was moved, runs more slowly because it has sustained accelerations in contrast to the clock A. Certainly, these accelerations are unimportant for the amount of the time difference of both clocks, however, their existence causes the slow running just of the clock B, and not of the clock A. Accelerated movements are absolute in the theory of relativity.”

“Die Uhr B, welche bewegt wurde, geht deshalb nach, weil sie im Gegensatz zu der Uhr A Beschleunigungen erlitten hat. Diese Beschleunigungen sind zwar für den Betrag der Zeitdifferenz beider Uhren belanglos, ihr Vorhandsein bedingt jedoch das Nachgehen gerade der Uhr B, und nicht der Uhr A. Beschleunigte Bewegungen sind in der Relativitätstheorie absolute.”³³²⁵

Gehrcke recounted that,

“Mr. Einstein recently admitted to me orally that accelerations are absolute in Einstein’s theory of relativity, up to now, however, he has not acknowledged that speeds in his theory are absolute. It is noteworthy in this context that in Newtonian Mechanics both translation-speeds and accelerations are *relative*, on the other hand rotational-speeds and -accelerations are absolute; I am of course in agreement with Mr. Einstein on this point (regarding Newtonian mechanics) and have proven that the often heard, contrary opinion, according to which all accelerations in Newtonian mechanics are absolute and ‘inertial systems’ are left to be defined mechanically, is erroneous. [***] Minkowski’s theory of relativity places, like Einstein’s, the reference system, to which all events are referred (therefore the absolutely resting system), in the subjective standpoint of an observer. Therefore, the theory can be characterized as a subjective theory of absolutism: subjective because the point of view of the *observer* is distinguished, absolute, because all events are referred to this standpoint and no other.”

“Daß in der Relativitätstheorie EINSTEINs die Beschleunigungen absolute sind, hat mir Herr EINSTEIN neuerdings auch mündlich zugegeben, er hat jedoch bisher nicht anerkannt, daß die Geschwindigkeiten in seiner Theorie absolute sind. Im Anschluß hieran sei bemerkt, daß in der NEWTONschen Mechanik sowohl Translations-Geschwindigkeiten wie -Beschleunigungen *relative* sind, dagegen sind die Rotations-Geschwindigkeiten und -Beschleunigungen absolute; ich bin in diesem Punkte (hinsichtlich der NEWTONschen Mechanik) wohl in Übereinstimmung mit Herrn EINSTEIN, und habe bewiesen, daß die oft gehörte, gegenteilige Ansicht, nach der alle Beschleunigungen in der NEWTONschen Mechanik absolute seien und sich „Inertialsysteme“ mechanisch definieren ließen, irrtümlich ist. [***] Die

Relativitätstheorie von MINKOWSKI legt, wie die von EINSTEIN, das Bezugssystem, auf welches alles Geschehen zu beziehen ist (also das absolut ruhende System), in den subjektiven Standpunkt eines Beobachters. Daher läßt sich die Theorie als *subjektive Absoluttheorie* charakterisieren: subjektiv, weil der Standpunkt des *Beobachters* ausgezeichnet wird, absolut, weil alles Geschehen auf *diesen* Standpunkt und keinen anderen bezogen wird.”³³²⁶

Einstein professed, after the general theory was established, that,

“There is no absolute (independent of the space of reference) relation in space, and no absolute relation in time between two events, but there is an absolute (independent of the space of reference) relation in space and time”³³²⁷

and,

“The four-dimensional space of the special theory of relativity is just as rigid and absolute as Newton’s space.”³³²⁸

and,

“The space-time phenomenon of the special theory of relativity was something absolute in itself, inasmuch as it was independent of the particular state of motions considered in that theory.”³³²⁹

Einstein gave a lecture at King’s College in June of 1921. *The London Times* quoted Einstein, on 14 June 1921, on page 8,

“The theory of relativity endeavours to define more concisely the relationship between general scientific conceptions and facts experienced. In the realm of the special theory of relativity the space coordinates and time are still of an absolute nature in so far as they appear to be measurable by rigid bodies, rods, and by clocks. They are, however, relative in so far as they are dependent upon the motion peculiar to the inertial system that happens to have been chosen. According to the special theory of relativity the four-dimensional *continuum*, formed by the amalgamation of time and space, retains that absolute character which, according to the previous theories, was attributed to space as well as to time, each individually. The interpretation of the spatial coordinates and of time as the result of measurements then leads to the following conclusions: motion (relative to the system of coordinates) influences the shape of bodies and the working of clocks; energy and inertial mass are equivalent.”

In accord with Gehrcke, Wiechert and Kretschmann,³³³⁰ Stjepan Mohorovičić averred,

“By its very nature, Einstein’s theory of relativity is a spatiotemporal theory of absolutism, which requires a four-dimensional space-time manifold for the description of natural phenomena.”

“Ihrem Wesen nach ist die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie eine raumzeitliche Absoluttheorie, welche bei der Beschreibung der Naturerscheinungen eine vierdimensionale Raumzeitmannigfaltigkeit nötig hat.”³³³¹

J. E. Turner stated in 1921,

“Indeed, the principle, in spite of its name, does not even imply that we are wholly deprived of absolute standards; it merely means that we are free to determine these as we please, provided we accept *all* the results of our choice; it follows further that a proper selection will greatly simplify argument and calculation. Thus the ‘proper time’ (*Eigenzeit*) of a system with reference to which a body is ‘at rest,’ as measured by observers moving with the body,⁷ is unvarying and in that sense absolute; and Professor Eddington maintains that ‘One part of the World differs from another—an intrinsic absolute difference . . . [The *vanishing* of a tensor does actually denote an intrinsic condition quite independent of time and space, and] the equality of two tensors in the same region is [also] an absolute relation . . . the vanishing of the left-hand side denotes a definite and absolute condition of the World.’⁸ Just as sight would discover an ‘absolute’ to our supposed blind observers, so thought may attain an absolute which is truly such for normal experience.

Nor again does the manner in which the theory treats simultaneity and other space and time attributes justify the contention that space is ‘warped,’ or afford the slightest fresh ground for the view that it and time are subjective.”³³³²

Wallace Kantor noted,

“Einstein’s absolutivity postulate requires that $c' = c = C'$ for any real values of v and V . In a very real sense Einstein’s theory of relativity is a misnomer, it should be called a theory of absolutivity.”³³³³

The Encyclopedia of Philosophy discloses,

“The physical theories of Einstein, and the variants developed by others, which have each been called the ‘theory of relativity’ are so named because they have relativized some of the attributes and relations (spatial distance, time interval, mass) which the Newtonian theory had asserted to be invariant (absolute). But the theory of relativity has *not* relativized all of the Newtonian invariants; indeed, it has ‘absolutized’ the counterparts of some of the attributes and relations which its Newtonian precursor had affirmed to

be relative.”³³³⁴

Claude Kacser affirmed,

“What is absolute is stated in Einstein’s *first relativity postulate*: The basic laws of physics are identical for two observers who have a constant relative velocity with respect to each other.”³³³⁵

Joshua N. Goldberg informs us that,

“Minkowski space is an *absolute space-time*.”³³³⁶

Prof. Anatoly A. Logunov contends,

“Application of [the principle of relativity] to electromagnetic phenomena led Poincaré, and then Minkowski, to the discovery of the pseudo-Euclidean geometry of space-time and thus even more reinforced the hypothesis of inertial reference systems existing throughout the entire space. Such reference systems are physically singled out, and therefore acceleration relative to them has an absolute sense.”³³³⁷

Robert Resnick concluded that,

“The theory of relativity could have been called the theory of absolutism with some justification. [***] there *are* absolute lengths and times in relativity. [***] Where relativity theory is clearly ‘more absolute’ than classical physics is in the relativity principle itself: the *laws of physics* are absolute.”³³³⁸

It is some strange “relativity theory”, which is more *absolutist* than classical *absolutism!* . . . In one sense the *pseudorelativists’* caution with respect to the æther is commendable. However, it is unscientific to refuse to speculate based on the pseudorelativists’ pretentious grounds that measurement and mathematical abstraction are the only tools of the scientist, and that their pseudorelativistic subjective comparisons and absolutist arguments by analogy are somehow “objective” and “relativistic”.

By comparing abstract space with bodily extension, and quantifying it, the “relativists” have reified that which they qualify as “void”—they have reified concepts and are brokers of Metaphysics, not science. By insisting upon the physically contradicted notion that inertial motion, rigid rods, clocks, and light waves, each map congruent spaces; they deny the dynamic and relational physical world and substitute in its place arbitrary absolutist definitions of space and time, and a “space-time”, in which these conceptions have a supposed reality beyond the observed relations of which they are physically composed. Boscovich argued against such absolutist beliefs centuries ago.³³³⁹

The list of true relativists is long. To name but a few: Des Cartes, Huyghens,

Locke, Leibnitz, Berkeley, Hume, Comte, Spencer, Stallo, Hamilton, Mach, Anderssohn, Avenarius, Petzoldt, etc. A real relativist, like Stallo, would never have embraced the absolutist “special theory of relativity”, with its codified absolute space and time, and absolutist “space-time” and the ontological “universal constant” speed of light and absolute laws of Nature. Stallo wrote,

“There is nothing absolute or unconditioned in the world of objective reality. As there is no absolute standard of quality, so there is no absolute measure of duration, nor is there an absolute system of coördinates in space to which the positions of bodies and their changes can be referred. A physical *ens per se* and a physical constant are alike impossible, for all physical existence resolves itself into action and reaction, and action imports change.”³³⁴⁰

Mach proclaimed, in his *Science of Mechanics*,

“The expression ‘absolute motion of translation’ Streintz correctly pronounces as devoid of meaning and consequently declares certain analytical deductions, to which he refers, superfluous. On the other hand, with respect to *rotation*, Streintz accepts Newton’s position, that absolute rotation can be distinguished from relative rotation. In this point of view, therefore, one can select every body not affected with absolute rotation as a body of reference for the expression of the law of inertia.

I cannot share this view. For me, only relative motions exist (*Erhaltung der Arbeit*, p. 48; *Science of Mechanics*, p. 229), and I can see, in this regard, no distinction between rotation and translation. When a body moves relatively to the fixed stars, centrifugal forces are produced; when it moves relatively to some different body, and not relatively to the fixed stars, no centrifugal forces are produced. I have no objection to calling the first rotation ‘absolute’ rotation, if it be remembered that nothing is meant by such a designation except *relative rotation with respect to the fixed stars*. Can we fix Newton’s bucket of water, rotate the fixed stars, and *then* prove the absence of centrifugal forces?

The experiment is impossible, the idea is meaningless, for the two cases are not, in sense-perception, distinguishable from each other. I accordingly regard these two cases as the *same* case and Newton’s distinction as an illusion (*Science of Mechanics*, page 232).³³⁴¹

It is interesting to note that was Michele Besso and Friedrich Adler who persuaded Einstein to adopt Mach’s principle and to extend the principle of relativity to rotations.³³⁴² Einstein had studied Mach’s work early on in 1902.³³⁴³

Herbert Spencer declared,

“THE RELATIVITY OF ALL KNOWLEDGE. [***] The conviction, so reached, that human intelligence is incapable of absolute knowledge, is one that has slowly been gaining ground as civilization has advanced. Each new

ontological theory, from time to time propounded in lieu of previous ones shown to be untenable, has been followed by a new criticism leading to a new skepticism.”³³⁴⁴

Comte famously avowed,

“Everything is relative, that’s the only thing absolute”

Leibnitz argued against the Newtonian religious absolutism of the reification of ontological space and time,

“As for my Own Opinion, I have said more than once, that I hold *Space* to be something *merely relative*, as *Time* is; that I hold it to be of an *Order of Coexistences*, as *Time* is an *Order of Successions*. For *Space* denotes, in Terms of Possibility, an *Order of Things* which exist at the same time, considered as existing *together*; without enquiring into their Manner of Existing. And when many Things are seen *together*, one perceives *That Order of Things among themselves*.”³³⁴⁵

It is wrong to attribute to Einstein the assertions that time, space and motion are relative for two reasons: One, Einstein was an absolutist, who could not comprehend relativism. Two, others argued that time, space and motion are purely relative long before Einstein was born.³³⁴⁶

Galileo, Newton and Einstein were absolutists. Though Galileo is popularly credited as the father of the “principle of relativity”; the “principle of relativity” of Galileo, Newton and the Einsteins, is an absolutist corollary to the metaphysical and ontological notions of the absolute laws of Nature, absolute space, absolute time, absolute rectilinear inertial uniform translations of absolute space, and, in Einstein’s case, the æthereal absolute speed of light, which, for Einstein, defines the absolute character of space, time and motion. However, Einstein is not alone to blame for these mythologies, because he was simply repeating the absolutist mythologies of Hendrik Antoon Lorentz and Henri Poincaré.

Speculations not yet physically contradicted can often be tested and should not be frowned upon. In insisting that any definition of the æther beyond “physical space” is taboo, the pseudorelativists are taking the hypocritical and political stance that the refusal to think is preferable to employing one’s imagination where conditions do yet allow us direct observation of those things we wish to see, but cannot; while they claim the privilege of *a priori* ontological principles and purely abstract dimensions, which have already been physically contradicted. There are no “inertial reference frames” in “uniform motion” such as would define a congruent time dimension. There is no observable “rectilinear uniform motion” in Nature, other than by abstract and arbitrary absolutist definition, and no arbitrarily selected “rectilinear uniform motion” maps spaces congruent to any other “rectilinear uniform motion” we have yet to observe, such that flat “space-time” is a known absolutist fallacy based upon circular definitions.

Speculations can and should be criticized, and their value is often best weighed in hindsight. Wrong ideas often inspire right ones, which insights would not likely arise other than as opposition to myth, which is to say that no subjects ought to be taboo in science, for no one can say where they might lead. It is not wise to close out wonder from science and substitute dogma in its place, which dogma says nothing substantial, on the false premise that it is wisdom to assert nothing and foolishness to propose ideas which have a physical basis. In sum, it is healthy that one dogmatic view of that which constitutes the “æther” was subjected to criticism, but it is most unhealthy that said criticisms were employed to close the subject and substitute meaningless words for otherwise scientific images.

Definitions of the æther oftentimes are somewhat archaic. Thinkers resort to false analogies based on outmoded beliefs, largely because the subject of the æther has so long been taboo, that one feels compelled to resort to those assertions made long ago. The atomists of the Nineteenth Century asserted that the elements are composed of immutable lifeless particles. This left in doubt the nature of force, and the conservation of motion. As Fechner stated,

“All that is given is what can be seen and felt, movement and the laws of movement. How then can we speak of force here? For physics, force is nothing but an auxiliary expression for presenting the laws of equilibrium and of motion; and every clear interpretation of physical force brings us back to this. We speak of laws of force; but when we look at the matter more closely, we find that they are merely laws of equilibrium and movement which hold for matter in the presence of matter. To say that the sun and the earth exercise an attraction upon one another, simply means that the sun and earth behave in relation to one another in accordance with definite laws. To the physicist, force is but a law, and in no other way does he know how to describe it. . . All that the physicist deduces from his forces is merely an inference from laws, through the instrumentality of the auxiliary word ‘force’.”³³⁴⁷

Leibnitz accused Newton of religiously supposing that the universe is a watch, which God winds. As many have noted, Newton, who was far more pantheistic than even Leibnitz suspected, did not conceive of the universe as a watch, for that implied a largely self-sustaining mechanism which only required intermittent divine intervention. Newton saw God as directly active in every action and reaction of bodies. However, many, among them the Newtonians, asserted that God set these bodies in motion and then imparted motion to them as the need arose—in order to keep the watch work universe of Newton all wound up.³³⁴⁸ They further asserted that bodies act upon each other “at a distance”, as in the case of gravity or magnetism, by God’s will, whether they openly admitted this mystical exposition, or not. This group believed that motion compelled an absolute empty space in which things could move, and in which motion would have an absolute meaning, and, hence, force, too, would be an absolute quantity.

As a reaction to this belief system, others accepted the misbegotten notion that

“atoms” are immutable structures and concluded that force arose from a pressure in the æther. What, then, is the æther, and what, then, pressurized *it*? A false analogy was often then made to the false understanding of fluids prevalent at the time, that they are supposedly composed of identical and immutable particles. It is a good thing that these highly speculative and somewhat religious notions are today taken as dubious by many. Everything, which we have yet observed, changes. Perhaps, the æther, too, is change. In order to argue for an unchanging and fundamental æther by analogy, analogy should probably be had to something tangible, and to the best of your author’s knowledge and belief, no such analogy is yet to be had, other than in our sense of what our own existence, as a religious belief, means to us, *as we change!*³³⁴⁹

That “empty space” is not “vacuum”, is obvious. That it is *not* made of unchanging particles, seems an equally rational conclusion, unless I have missed some known phenomenon, which remains immutable. Perhaps, we have no means to perceive that which does not change. Perhaps, everything changes. Our ears cannot taste, and our tongues cannot see, and if change compels relations, it is rational to expect that the unchanging cannot affect the changing, and, therefore, cannot be perceived; but it seems more probable that we don’t yet have the ability to sense the qualities of ephemeral space, directly, than that space is a permanent entity, which exists outside of our consciousness.

In the search for (in the psychological need to resolve some illusory image of) the *Urstoff* of the universe, we seem too often to resort to the notion of “adamantine atoms” rearranging themselves into ever different forms in time and to too quickly give the same name to different things as if one *Ding an sich*. The pseudorelativists ought to abandon the notion of “World-lines” and acknowledge the multiplicity fundamental to their absolutist view. We, probably due to our *sense* of our own permanent *Self*, conceive of a set of particles as an “apple” ripe and perfect today, rearranged as the same set of particles tomorrow. However, Hume had already recognized the impossibility of this. Hume stated,

“I know there are some who pretend, that the idea of duration is applicable in a proper sense to objects, which are perfectly unchangeable; and this I take to be the common opinion of philosophers as well as of the vulgar. But to be convinc’d of its falsehood we need but reflect on the foregoing conclusion, that the idea of duration is always deriv’d from a succession of changeable objects, and can never be convey’d to the mind by any thing stedfast and unchangeable. For it inevitably follows from thence, that since the idea of duration cannot be deriv’d from such an object, it can never-in any propriety or exactness be apply’d to it, nor can any thing unchangeable be ever said to have duration. Ideas always represent the Objects or impressions, from which they are deriv’d, and can never without a fiction represent or be apply’d to any other. By what fiction we apply the idea of time, even to what is unchangeable, and suppose, as is common, that duration is a measure of rest as well as of motion, we shall consider afterwards.”³³⁵⁰

In a four-dimensional world there is no evidence that an object can have duration, *nor can it change or have a history*. Instead, in an absolute block universe, there is absolute multiplicity, and the apple we pick today is a different set of “particles” from the “same” apple tomorrow, just as our consciousness of each is composed of a different set of “particles” comprising our awareness. This may afford a metaphysical exposition for memory, immediate awareness *and precognition*, each being the composition of *Self*-awareness in a quadri-dimensional substratum—memory, imagination, sensation, and precognition being the gift of existence without temporal cause, but perhaps with an interconnected extension in multiplicity, one thing the outgrowth of another, but as the limb branches from the root, not in time, but in structure.³³⁵¹ Our minds as physical realms different at each “moment” or conscious phase of that which we recognize as the *Self* in a lifetime, may contain memory objects, sense objects and precognition objects of which *Self*-awareness is composed. And in this sense, it is possible to view the universe as extending from any of its “parts”, and it is a function of our human dignity to perceive ourselves as arising from ourselves, but this does not diminish the individuality of each moment, taken in a four-dimensional sense, of our existence as completely distinct and in no way displacing, replacing or creating any other experience we call *Self*. In the Eleatic system, nothing moves, rather motion is a delusion of consciousness resulting from the confusion of memory objects with sensual objects and with objects of precognition, or expectancies all of which coexist not only with each other but with that which they symbolize to consciousness. We have in our thoughts memories of a ball, sight of a “moving ball” and the precognition of it further on in its motion. However, to the Eleatics there is no one ball in the noumenal world, but rather a series of distinct objects confused in phenomenal language and images of memory objects, sensual object and objects of precognition as if one object moving.³³⁵² To the Eleatics, the conscious images of memories of the ball, sight of the ball, and precognition of the continued flight of the ball coexist with infinite distinct objects one calls the ball in motion and these are linked not in time, but simply are the structure of things which never changes and always exists. A super-consciousness linked to all things “past”, “present” and “future”—all of which coexist—would have the power of absolute cognition and “precognition”, though would seemingly be powerless to affect change or have freedom of will, a deficiency all creatures suffer in this belief system.

The Cabalistic Jews who spread their message to influential persons across Europe kept this Eleatic belief system alive to this day. In a somewhat different sense from the above, God being presumed omnipresent, Archbishop John Tillotson stated in his Sermons,

“God sees and knows future things by the presentiality and coexistence of all things in eternity[.]”³³⁵³

Samuel Clarke stated in a sermon in 1704,

“V. *Though the Substance or Essence of the Self-Existent Being, is it self*

absolutely Incomprehensible to us; yet many of the Essential Attributes of his Nature, are strictly Demonstrable, as well as his Existence. {Margin note: That the Self-existent Being must be Eternal.} Thus, in the first place, *the Self-Existent Being must of Necessity be Eternal.* The Idea’s of Eternity and Self-Existence are so closely connected, that because Something must of necessity be Eternal *Independently and without any outward Cause of its Being*, therefore it must necessarily be Self-existent; and because ’tis impossible but Something must be Self-existent, therefore ’tis necessary that it must likewise be Eternal. To be Self-existent, is (as has been already {pag. 527, 528.} shown) to Exist by an Absolute Necessity in the Nature of the Thing it self. Now this Necessity being Absolute, and not depending upon any thing External, must be always unalterably the same; Nothing being alterable but what is capable of being affected by somewhat without itself. That Being therefore, which has no other Cause of its Existence, but the absolute Necessity of its own Nature; must of necessity have existed from everlasting, without Beginning; and must of necessity exist to everlasting without End.

As to the *Manner* of this Eternal Existence; ’tis manifest, it herein infinitely transcends the Manner of the Existence of all Created Beings, even of such as shall exist for ever; that whereas ’tis not possible for Their finite Minds to comprehend all that is past, or to understand perfectly all things that are at present, much less to know all that is future, or to have entirely in their Power any thing that is to come; but their Thoughts, and Knowledge, and Power, must of necessity have degrees and periods, and be successive and transient as the Things Themselves: The Eternal, Supreme Cause, on the contrary, (supposing him to be an *Intelligent Being*, which will hereafter be proved in the Sequel of this Discourse,) must of necessity have such a perfect, independent and unchangeable Comprehension of all Things, that there can be no One Point or Instant of his Eternal Duration, wherein all Things that are past, present, or to come, will not be *as* entirely known and represented to him in one single Thought or View; and all Things present and future, be equally entirely in his Power and Direction; *as if* there was really no Succession at all, but all things were actually present at once. Thus far we can speak Intelligibly concerning the Eternal Duration of the Self-existent Being; And no *Atheist* can say this is an Impossible, Absurd, or Insufficient Account. {*Of the Manner of our Conceiving the Eternity of God.*} It is, in the most proper and Intelligible Sense of the Words, to all the purposes of Excellency and Perfection, *Interminabilis vitæ tota simul & perfecta possessio*: the *Entire and Perfect Possession of an endless Life.*

OTHERS have supposed that the Difference between the *Manner* of the Eternal Existence of the Supreme Cause, and that of the Existence of created Beings, is this: That, whereas the latter is a continual transient *Succession* of Duration; the former in *one Point* or *Instant* comprehending Eternity, and wherein all Things are really co-existent. {*With respect to Succession.*} But this Distinction I shall not now insist upon, as being of *no Use* in the present

Dispute; because 'tis impossible to *prove* and *explain* it in such a manner, as ever to convince an Atheist that there is any thing in it. And besides: As, on the one hand, the *Schoolmen* have indeed generally chosen to defend it: so on the other hand there

[*Footnote*: Crucem ingenio figere, ut rem capiat fugientem Captum. — Tam fieri non potest, ut instans [*Temporis*] coexistat rei successivæ, quam impossibile est punctum coexistere [*coextendi*] lineæ. — Lusus merus non intellectorum verborum. *Gassend. Physic. lib. I.*

I shall not trouble you with the inconsistent and unintelligible Notions of the Schoolmen; that it [*the Eternity of God*] is *duratio tota simul*, in which we are not to conceive any Succession, but to imagine it an Instant. We may as well conceive the *Immensity* of God to be a *Point*, as his *Eternity* to be an *Instant*. — And how That can be together, which must necessarily be imagined to be co-existent to Successions; let them that can, conceive. *Archbishop Tillotson*, Vol. VII. Sermon. 13.

Others say, God sees and knows future Things by the presentiality and co-existence of all Things in Eternity; For they say, that future Things are actually present and existing to God, though not *in mensura propria*, yet *in mensura aliena*. The Schoolmen have much more of this Jargon and canting Language. I envy no Man the understanding these Phrases: But to me they seem to signify nothing, but to have been Words invented by idle and conceited Men; which a great many ever since, lest they should seem to be ignorant, would seem to understand. But I wonder most, that Men, when they have amused and puzzled themselves and others with hard Words, should call this *Explaining* Things. *Archbishop Tillotson*, Vol. VI. Sermon. 6.]

are many Learned Men, of far better *Understanding* and *Judgment*, who have rejected and opposed it.”³³⁵⁴

Continuing the Eleatic-Cabalistic themes of Isaac Newton through Samuel Clarke, David Hartley wrote, *inter alia*, in 1749,

“For all Time, whether past, present, or future, is present Time in the Eye of God, and all Ideas coalesce into one to him; and this one is infinite Happiness, without and Mixture of Misery, *viz.* by the infinite Prepollence of Happiness above Misery, so as to annihilate it; and this merely by considering Time as it ought to be considered in Strictness, *i. e.* as a relative Thing, belonging to Beings of finite Capacities, and varying with them, but which is infinitely absorbed in the pure Eternity of God.”³³⁵⁵

Adopting the notion of “space-time”, the question of how this awareness incorporating memory, immediate awareness and precognition “came to be” ceases to have meaning. The investigation shifts to the interconnectedness of these diverse things we call through an illusion of words the same thing at different times and

implies a direct connection generating consciousness of past, present and future as sense experience. Under such a system we can sense future and past objects with the same facility by which we sense present objects, in that if we correctly conceive of them then nature has as a matter of course linked us to them as our fate, which is ever present and unchanging.

This exposes far greater interconnectivity, and yet diversity, between the phenomenal and the noumenal, than the Materialists and the Idealists were able to imagine. According to Eleatic space-time theories, when I throw a baseball from here to there, one set of particles does not move from here to there through space and time. Rather, time and space are conceptualized in consciousness to order the human image of the “motion” of “the baseball”, which is instead one set of particles here, and a completely distinct set of particles, or body, there, both of which exist “forever”. Motion does not exist. What we conceptualize as a baseball in flight is instead a series of distinct objects (no two ever exactly alike), which we imagine to be the same baseball in motion through an illusion of consciousness—and our awareness of these things is not drawn from memory nor rationalized, but is our *Self* at that moment as a timeless construct of images—just as my hand at this “moment” is not composed of memories but is a timeless structure in itself. This Teichmüller-like³³⁵⁶ world precludes the possibility of Minkowski’s “world-lines”, because the rail holding together the point-like ties on this railroad is supplied by consciousness, which incorrectly denies the individuality of each point in an invalid Gestalt linkage.

In 1895, Edmund Montgomery wrote,

“WHAT we perceive, all, in fact, we are in any way aware of, has only momentary existence. This not, as may perhaps be thought, in the sense that the next moment it has become transformed into something else; but in the unambiguous sense that it ceases to be anything whatever.

This utter evanescence of all that appears to us in time and space contradicts flagrantly the fundamental maxim, that nothing in existence can ever be brought wholly to naught, that complete extinction of what was once in existence is inconceivable. Yet no fact in nature is more certain, or of more frequent occurrence. Total annihilation from moment to moment is what actually takes place in the world we are conscious of.

All through life the conscious awareness of ourselves and of things in general fills only that single moment of duration we designate as ‘the present.’ Whatever has made up consciousness the moment before has, as such, for ever vanished out of being. And whatever content may rise into conscious existence the following moment is evidently as yet non-existent. What we are conscious of as existing, our own selves and the world perceived by us, is in verity, all in all, a constant creation fashioned out of precisely such stuff as dreams are made of. And who will seriously maintain that dream-pageantry has any sort of permanent existence?

Of course, something inside and outside of us seems, nevertheless, in some way identically to endure. But this is certainly not something ever forming part of what is consciously present to us. At present, for instance, I

perceive a window through the interstices of whose shutters sunlight is streaming into the room. Closing my eyes the very same perceived window—technically called an after-image—remains distinctly visible. Soon, however, it fades, and, at last, vanishes altogether. Who can deny that this special perceptual object has dwindled for ever into nothingness? Reopening my eyes, what is generally taken to be the same window is again perceived. But, surely, the window I now perceive, the window now forming part of my conscious content, cannot possibly be the same window that had completely faded away as a conscious existent after I had closed my eyes a little while ago.

In exactly the same manner the entire content, which makes up consciousness at any given moment, vanishes the next instant, irreparably, into non-existence.

Should at any future moment some apparently identical constituent of consciousness rise again into present awareness, it can nevertheless in nowise be the identical constituent that was present before, but must of necessity be newly produced. The apparently identical window consciously present to me on reopening my eyes was in reality an altogether newly produced perceptual object.

How produced?—This exactly is the burning question the widely disparate answers to which are dividing thinkers into essentially opposed schools of thought. That much, at least, is certain: our entire life-experience, all we have ever felt and seen, is never otherwise consciously present to us than only as an ever-renewed creation, condensed into transitory moments of simultaneous awareness.

To conceive, as is often done, the succession of such moments of awareness in the likeness of a thread, a stream, a series of conscious states, is to overlook completely their evanescent nature. A strange thread this, having next to no length, the one end of which vanishes the moment after it has been spun from out some invisible source of supply, and the other end of which has to be made out of material not yet in existence.

Our moment of conscious awareness, never identical, but constantly reproduced, if it adequately contained the totality of possible experience, instead of consisting merely of its most partial and remotely symbolical representation; and if it unremittingly endured, instead of emerging in casual and fitful glimpses; then such permanent totality of conscious content would indeed constitute what philosophers have conceived as the ‘eternal now,’ the all-comprising ‘*punctum stans*’ of being.

Even then, enjoying such phenomenal omniscience, we should feel compelled to enquire after the hidden source of emanation which was creatively underlying this ever renewed totality of conscious awareness¹. Pure philosophical Phenomenism proves itself all too shadowy to its own votaries. They likewise assume some kind of noumenal matrix.”

The Eleatics resolved the dilemmas posed by Montgomery, but they did so

through absolute multiplicity, not through the rearrangement of permanent particles of Minkowski space. The many windows Montgomery proposes each exist and are *not* annihilated nor displaced, rather *he* is a multiplicity of consciousnesses each with its own objects; its own *sense* of past, present and future; each never created nor destroyed; but each *feeling* that it is changing. This is how we are formed in the Universe of being, to *feel* as if we are fleeting spirits, when we are rather multiplicity, distinct from ourselves from “moment” to “moment” not only in form, but in substance, if any distinction is to be had between the two. Are there then observable connections to the memories and premonitions which make up these individual existences? Can one detach from one course and couple to another? Surely the link to the “past” can be severed in the multiplicity—one can forget—and it is a radical view to hold that prophesy is as much a physical manifestation as memory, but these are the logical conclusions of this belief system. It affords much food for thought.

Fechner saw his immortality in this quadri-dimensional vision, because he saw each moment of his life as permanent and coexistent. Venn, Wells, and Welby saw in it the possibility of “time travel”. Though the Universe is a block for them, they should fear no contradiction that Nature might not permit in one of its aspects a clever soul to formulate a means to *become* aware of another set of images. But they must abandon the notion of a permanent *Urstoff* rearranging itself in new forms in a time dimension, and a permanent soul as one witness of its life, other than in name alone; and realize the multiplicity which composes the substratum and the *Self*.

In most æther theories recourse is again had to a permanent æther, our bodies are moving through this æther as a series of wave forms, substance and form left behind in time to become the wave at the shore which was once the wave far off at sea, the water comprising the wave left behind as the mere carrier of the changing form which walks as “energy” through the medium, the way the winds shows its face in a rippling flag. Hendrik Antoon Lorentz stated in 1906,

“We shall add the hypothesis that, though the particles may move, *the ether always remains at rest*. We can reconcile ourselves with this, at first sight, somewhat startling idea, by thinking of the particles of matter as of some local modifications in the state of the ether. These modifications may of course very well travel onward while the volume-elements of the medium in which they exist remain at rest.”³³⁵⁷

There are inadequacies in all these fictions. Edmund Montgomery wrote in 1885,

“No natural fact could be more plain and immediately certain than that you see a friend bowing to you. But is not the human form you perceive undeniably your own percept, and the movement of its head but one of those changes in the percept called vital functions? And are not these perceptual data the only manifestations present to you as percipient subject. Where then is the veritable person who recognised you and expressed this recognition by a friendly bow? Materialism and Idealism are equally far from being able to

account for the veritable nature of this necessarily assumed existent. How infantile our little attempts at world-explanation must still be considered, may come home to us if we remember that our most prominent scientists still look upon the perceptual representations of their own consciousness as the veritable foreign existents whose intimate nature they are investigating; endeavouring to express it in terms of imagined world-stuff can be truly nothing but shifting points of evanescent feeling, by them however hypostatized in permanency as adamantine atoms with eternal motion.”³³⁵⁸

If there is an æther, it has environmentalist implications, as well as metaphysical implications. Changing the environment creates new entities, potentially so very unlike what existed *before* (or need one say “what exists *elsewhere*”?) as to make us other than what we consider to be human. The illusory surety of *Self* and the pretense of a permanent substratum are perhaps a dangerous form of complacency. Can not the waves within the “æther” be damaged, and with the sea so polluted, what will become of us?

As to the falsifiability of “space-time” theories, Lotze wrote,

“157. I should not be surprised if the view which I thus put forward met with an invincible resistance from the imagination. The unconquerable habit, which will see nothing wonderful in the primary grounds of things but insists on explaining them after the pattern of the latest effects which they alone render possible, must here at last confess to being confronted by a riddle which cannot be thought out. What exactly happens—such is the question which this habit will prompt—when the operation is at work or when the succession takes place, which is said to be characteristic of the operative process? How does it come to pass—what makes it come to pass—that the reality of one state of things ceases, and that of another begins? What process is it that constitutes what we call perishing, or transition into not-being, and in what other different process consists origin or becoming?

That these questions are unanswerable—that they arise out of the wish to supply a *præteritum* to what is first in the world—this I need not now repeat: but in this connexion they have a much more serious background than elsewhere, for here they are ever anew excited by the obscure pressure of an unintelligibility, which in ordinary thinking we are apt somewhat carelessly to overlook. We lightly repeat the words ‘bygones are bygones’; are we quite conscious of their gravity? The teeming Past, has it really ceased to be at all? Is it quite broken off from connexion with the world and in no way preserved for it? The history of the world, is it reduced to the infinitely thin, for ever changing, strip of light which forms the Present, wavering between a darkness of the Past, which is done with and no longer anything at all, and a darkness of the Future, which is also nothing? Even in thus expressing these questions, I am ever again yielding to that imaginative tendency, which seeks to soften the ‘monstrum infandum’ which they contain. For these two abysses of obscurity, however formless and empty, would still be there. They

would always form an environment which in its unknown within would still afford a kind of local habitation for the not-being, into which it might have disappeared or from which it might come forth. But let any one try to dispense with these images and to banish from thought even the two voids, which limit being: he will then feel how impossible it is to get along with the naked antithesis of being and not-being, and how unconquerable is the demand to be able to think even of that which is not as some unaccountable constituent of the real.

Therefore it is that we speak of distances of the Past and of the Future, covering under this spatial image the need of letting nothing slip completely from the larger whole of reality, though it belong not to the more limited reality of the Present. For the same reason even those unanswerable questions as to the origin of Becoming had their meaning. So long as the abyss from which reality draws its continuation, and that other abyss into which it lets the precedent pass away, shut in that which is on each side, so long there may still be a certain law, valid for the whole realm of this heterogeneous system, according to the determinations of which that change takes place, which on the other hand becomes unthinkable to us, if it is a change from nothing to being and from being to nothing. Therefore, though we were obliged to give up the hopeless attempt to regard the course of events in Time merely as an appearance, which forms itself within a system of timeless reality, we yet understand the motives of the efforts which are ever being renewed to include the real process of becoming within the compass of an abiding reality. They will not, however, attain their object, unless the reality, which is greater than our thought, vouchsafes us a Perception, which, by showing us the mode of solution, at the same time persuades us of the solubility of this riddle. I abstain at present from saying more on the subject. The ground afforded by the philosophy of religion, on which efforts of this kind have commonly begun, is also that on which alone it is possible for them to be continued.”³³⁵⁹

16 $E = m c^2$

Mileva Einstein-Marity and Albert Einstein published a paper in 1905, in which they unsuccessfully attempted to derive the world famous equation $E = m c^2$ by fallacy of Petitio Principii. The Einsteins did not realize the full significance of this equation, were not the first to publish it, and learned of it from Henri Poincaré's and Fritz Hasenöhr's published works. Albert Einstein was repeatedly confronted with accusations of his plagiarism of this formula throughout his career.

“The relation $E = m_M c^2$ not derived by Einstein.”—HERBERT IVES

16.1 Introduction

Contrary to popular myth, Einstein did not usher in the atomic age. In fact, he found the idea of atomic energy to be silly.³³⁶⁰ Einstein was not the first person to state the mass-energy equivalence, or $E = m c^2$.³³⁶¹ Myths such as Einstein's supposed discoveries are not uncommon. Newton did not discover gravity, nor did he offer a viable explanation for it, nor did he believe that matter attracted other matter. Consider that few in his time knew that President Roosevelt was severely handicapped, being limited to a wheel chair, and the press cooperated in keeping Roosevelt's disability a secret. Is it difficult to believe that this same press presented Albert Einstein as a super-hero of science, when he was in fact less than that, much less? It was a good story for them to sell. Einstein wrote to Sommerfeld,

“It is a bad thing that every utterance of mine is made use of by journalists as a matter of business.”³³⁶²

Einstein *rarely* gave filmed interviews, but when he did, he came across as something considerably less than a “genius”. Einstein's public appearances were scripted as were his lectures. His public appearances were most often repetitions of his lectures. He appeared oblivious to the distinction between an academic lecture and a media event. He appeared rehearsed and incapable of adapting to his audience. *The New York Times* reported on 17 June 1930 on page 3 that Einstein spoke at the Kroll Opera House to 4,000 delegates of the World Power Conference. Einstein lectured them on Physics, as if it were a class he was hosting. In an article titled, “4,000 Bewildered as Einstein Speaks,” the *New York Times* reported,

“It was the first time Dr. Einstein had ever consented to speak on Einstein, and it was the first serious public utterance he ever made without recourse to gigantic equations and mystifying mathematics. [***] He gestured sometimes with his hands, indicating how clear and obvious his reasoning was, and occasionally he looked up from his paper to smile upon his intent

hearers who, he seemed to assume, were grasping everything.”

Einstein appeared to be an actor giving a performance.

The physics community and the media invented a comic book figure, “Einstein”, with “ $E = mc^2$ ” stenciled across his chest. The media and educational institutions portray this surreal and farcical image as a benevolent god to watch over us. Some modern portraits depict the man with a godly glow and all the other visual cues inspiring reverence, which paintings of Jesus have long exploited. Physics, as an institution, fostered the myth, and countless people in all walks of life have since molded themselves in the comic book image of “Einstein”, replete with the Flammarion hairdo and the Twainesque mustachio. “More Einsteinisch than he,” they pretend to the great “Einstein’s” supposed supernatural powers, and imitate his comic book persona. For some, Einstein (often together with Marx and Freud) is seen as a source of tremendous ethnic pride.

To question “Einstein”, the god, either “his” theories, or the priority of the thoughts he repeated, has become the sin of heresy. “His” writings are synonymous with truth, the undecipherable truth of a god hung on the wall as a symbol of ultimate truth, which truth is elusive to mortal man. No one is to understand or to question the arcana of “Einstein”, but must let the shepherd lead his flock, without objection. Do not bother the believers with the facts!

R. S. Shankland stated,

“About publicity Einstein told me that he had been *given* a publicity value which he did not *earn*. Since he had it he would use it if it would do good; otherwise not.”³³⁶³

Albert Einstein stated on 27 April 1948,

“In the course of my long life I have received from my fellow-men far more recognition than I deserve, and I confess that my sense of shame has always outweighed my pleasure therein.”³³⁶⁴

Albert Einstein told Peter A. Bucky,

“Peter, I fully realize that many people listen to me not because they agree with me or because they like me particularly, but because I am Einstein. If a man has this rare capacity to have such esteem with his fellow men, then it is his obligation and duty to use this power to do good for his fellow men.”³³⁶⁵

Einstein “had been *given* a publicity value which he did not *earn*” so that he could promote political Zionism among Jews. Political Zionism is a racist movement among Jews meant to segregate Jews in Palestine in order to end the assimilation of Jews into other cultures and “races”. In 1919, most Jews opposed this racist movement and the Zionists needed a famous spokesman to help overcome this

resistance to Zionism among Jews.

Albert Einstein confided to his old friend and confidant Michele Besso, on 12 December 1919, that he planned to attend a Zionist conference dedicated to founding a Hebrew university in Palestine. Einstein wrote,

“The reason I am going to attend is not that I think I am especially well qualified, but because my name, in high favor since the English solar eclipse expeditions, can be of benefit to the cause by encouraging the lukewarm kinsmen.”³³⁶⁶

16.2 The “Quantity of Motion”—Momentum, *Vis Viva* and Kinetic Energy

Consider briefly the mass-energy equivalence. Huyghens and Leibnitz³³⁶⁷ presented the quantity of motion, *vis viva*, energy, $E = m v^2$, as opposed to the Aristotelian-Cartesian-Newtonian quantity of motion,³³⁶⁸ momentum, $p = m v$. This mathematical identity between energy³³⁶⁹ and mass, $E = m v^2$, is the mass-energy equivalence, stated as a circle function, and “*celeritas*”, “*c*”, is simply one state of relative velocity—a particular case of “*velocity*”, “*v*”.

16.3 The Atom as a Source of Energy and Explosive Force

Isaac Newton asked if mass is convertible into light, and wondered if light might be subject to gravity. From Newton’s *Opticks*,

“QUERY 1. Do not bodies act upon light at a distance, and by their action bend its rays; and is not this action (*cæteris paribus*) strongest at the least distance?”

and,

“QUERY 30. Are not gross bodies and light convertible into one another, and may not bodies receive much of their activity from the particles of light which enter their composition? [***] The changing of bodies into light, and light into bodies, is very conformable to the course of Nature, which seems delighted with transmutations. [***] why may not Nature change bodies into light, and light into bodies?”

S. Tolver Preston answered Newton’s queries with a loud, “Yes!” In anticipation of Thomson, De Pretto and the Einsteins, S. Tolver Preston formulated atomic energy, the atomic bomb and superconductivity back in the 1870’s, based on the formula for *vis viva* $E = m c^2$, and the formula for *kinetic*³³⁷⁰ energy $E = \frac{1}{2} m c^2$, where *celeritas*, “*c*”, signifies the speed of light. Pursuing George-Louis Le Sage’s theory, Preston believed that if mass could be attenuated into æther and acquire the normal velocity of æther particles, it would represent a tremendous store of energy;

since æther particles move at light speed—a limiting velocity, the *vis viva* is equal to mass times the square of the speed of light and the kinetic energy is equal to one half of the mass times the square of the speed of light.

In the 1700's, George-Louis Le Sage proposed that gravity may propagate at light speed, in anticipation of the general theory of relativity,

“How much less therefore would they be perceived if we assume for the [gravitational] corpuscles the velocity of light, which is nine hundred thousand times as great as that of sound.”³³⁷¹

The *vis viva* of these corpuscles is $E = m c^2$.

As but one example of Preston's amazing anticipation of 20th Century technology, and the powerful heuristic value of the æther-matter-energy hypothesis, Preston calculated the kinetic energy of masses moving at light speed:

“165. To give an idea, first, of the enormous intensity of the store of energy attainable by means of that extensive state of subdivision of matter which renders a high normal speed practicable, it may be computed that a quantity of matter representing a total mass of only one grain, and possessing the normal velocity of the ether particles (that of a wave of light), encloses a store of energy represented by upwards of one thousand millions of foot-tons, or the mass of one single grain contains an energy not less than that possessed by a mass of forty thousand tons, moving at the speed of a cannon ball (1200 feet per second); or other wise, a quantity of matter representing a mass of one grain endued with the velocity of the ether particles, encloses an amount of energy which, if entirely utilized, would be competent to project a weight of one hundred thousand tons to a height of nearly two miles (1.9 miles).”³³⁷²

Preston stated in 1883,

“Let us not deviate from the well-tried ground of the atomic constitution of matter, already won with so much labour, unless we are forced to do so, and let us work towards the great generalisation of the Unity of Matter and of Energy.”³³⁷³

Einstein stated on 21 September 1909,

“The theory of relativity has thus changed our views on the nature of light insofar as it does not conceive of light as a sequence of states of a hypothetical medium, but rather as something having an independent existence just like matter. Furthermore, this theory shares with the corpuscular theory of light the characteristic feature of a transfer of inertial mass from the emitting to the absorbing body. Regarding our conception of the structure of light, in particular of the distribution of energy in the

irradiated space, the theory of relativity did not change anything.”³³⁷⁴

The mathematical and metaphysical identity of matter and energy is the product of an ancient search for an *Urstoff*, the fundamental stuff of the universe, a search critically analyzed by John E. Boodin.³³⁷⁵ What is that something which we call “matter”? From at least the time of Thales onward this fundamental stuff of the Universe was seen by some as æther with our minds construing form from the motions in this hypothetical æther. Energy was an attribute of æther, the continuity of its motions. This evolved in the Monistic philosophy popular in the 1800's into the notion of the multiplicity of the Universe, with one identity, energy and matter as the conscious image of motion, which exist in the human mind as illusion drawn from multiplicity. A baseball “in motion” is not one thing which flies from place to place, but is a multiplicity of things we call “a baseball”, but which is not the same stuff from place to place, all things being coexistent forever. J. J. Thomson reawoke an interest in atomism, and defined the identity he proposed between energy and matter, as the motion of the æther, leading many to the conclusion (Einstein sometimes supported, sometimes opposed) that, as John E. Boodin stated in 1908,

“The atom is no longer regarded as eternal and indifferent, but is the storehouse of pent-up energy of enormous quantity, though, as in the case of radium, it may be in a very unstable equilibrium.”³³⁷⁶

Albert and Mileva also agreed with Newton’s corpuscular hypothesis, but without realizing its implications,

“When a body emits the energy L in the form of radiation, it thereby reduces its mass by L/c^2 .”

“Gibt ein Körper die Energie L in Form von Strahlung ab, so verkleinert sich seine Masse um L/V^2 .”³³⁷⁷

On 15 December 1919, *The New York Times* wrote on page 14:

“Obviously a Rash Prophecy.

As it was before the Royal Society that Sir OLIVER LODGE last week discussed atomic energies and the possibilities they offer, it is to be presumed that he spoke with some care. Yet, when he prophesied that within a century the power now derived from burning 1,000 tons of coal would be obtained by setting free the force latent in two ounces of some unnamed substance, one cannot help remembering that Sir OLIVER has two personalities—that he is an eminent scientist and a credulous listener to ‘mediums.’

That the atoms, instead of being mere ultimate divisions of dead matter, are alive with force nobody now doubts, but it seems hardly scientific to emphasize as Sir OLIVER did the astonishing velocity at which move the

missiles which some atoms shoot out without at the same time calling attention to the size of the missiles. He knows, of course, the formulae relating to speed, mass, and momentum, and that to get any appreciable amount of ‘work’ done by the radium particles he described it would seem that they would have to move far more rapidly than they do. And a way to harness them is hardly imaginable, as yet.”

As opposed to Lodge, Albert Einstein believed that atomic energy could not be harnessed. Moszkowski, who wrongfully attributes priority for first formulating $E = m c^2$ to Einstein, wrote an interesting and historically significant chapter in his book *Einstein: The Searcher*, which I reproduce here in its entirety. Sir Oliver Lodge, Alexander Wilhelm Pflüger,³³⁷⁸ and Alexander Moszkowski had discussed the possibility of using the atom as a source of power, which idea Albert Einstein rejected. Moszkowski’s book is but one of many examples where Einstein tended to discount the possibility of harnessing the power of the atom, contrary to the modern misleading impression one receives from the media and large segments of the Physics community that he was the father of the idea. However, all of these works are derivative of H. G. Wells’ *The World Set Free: A Story of Mankind*, Macmillan, London, (1914); also published in Leipzig, Germany by B. Tauchnitz; and Frederick Soddy’s *The Interpretation of Radium* of 1909 produced from lectures given in 1908. Alexander Moszkowski wrote in 1921,

“CHAPTER II

BEYOND OUR POWER

Useful and Latent Forces.—Connexion between Mass, Energy, and Velocity of Light.—Deriving Power by Combustion—One Gramme of Coal.—Unobtainable Calories—Economics of Coal.—Hopes and Fears.— Dissociated Atoms.

29th March 1920

WE spoke of the forces that are available for man and which he derives from Nature as being necessary for his existence and for the development of life. What forces are at our disposal? What hopes have we of elaborating our supply of these forces?

Einstein first explained the conception of energy, which is intimately connected with the conception of mass itself. Every amount of substance (I am paraphrasing his words), the greatest as well as the smallest, may be regarded as a store of power, indeed, it is essentially identical with energy. All that appears to our senses and our ordinary understanding as the visible, tangible mass, as the objective body corresponding to which we, in virtue of our individual bodies, abstract the conceptual outlines, and become aware of the existence of a definite copy is, from the physical point of view, a complex

of energies. These in part act directly, in part exist in a latent form as strains which, for us, begin to act only when we release them from their state of strain by some mechanical or chemical process, that is, when we succeed in converting the potential energy into kinetic energy. It may be said, indeed, that we have here a physical picture of what Kant called the 'thing in itself.' Things as they appear in ordinary experience are composed of the sum of our direct sensations; each thing acts on us through its outline, colour, tone, pressure, impact, temperature, motion, chemical behaviour, whereas the thing in itself is the sum-total of its energy, in which there is an enormous predominance of those energies which remain latent and are quite inaccessible in practice.

But this 'thing in itself,' to which we shall have occasion to refer often with a certain regard to its metaphysical significance, may be calculated. The fact that it is possible to calculate it takes its origin, like many other things which had in no wise been suspected, in Einstein's Theory of Relativity.

Quite objectively and without betraying in the slightest degree that an astonishing world-problem was being discussed, Einstein expressed himself thus:

'According to the Theory of Relativity there is a calculable relation between mass, energy, and the velocity of light. The velocity of light (denoted by c , as usual) is equal to $3 \cdot 10^{10}$ cm. per second. Accordingly the square of c is equal to 9 times 10^{20} cm. per second, or, in round numbers, 10^{21} cm. per second. This c^2 plays an essential part if we introduce into the calculation the mechanical equivalent of heat, that is, the ratio of a certain amount of energy to the heat theoretically derivable from it; we get for each gramme $20 \cdot 10^{12}$ that is, 20 billion calories.'

We shall have to explain the meaning of this brief physical statement in its bearing on our practical lives. It operates with only a small array of symbols, and yet encloses a whole universe, widening our perspective to a world-wide range!

To simplify the reasoning and make it more evident we shall not think of the conception of substance as an illimitable whole, but shall fix our ideas on a definite substance, say coal.

There seems little that may strike us when we set down the words: 'One Gramme of Coal.'

We shall soon see what this one gramme of coal conveys when we translate the above-mentioned numbers into a language to which a meaning may be attached in ordinary life. I endeavoured to do this during the above conversation, and was grateful to Einstein for agreeing to simplify his argument by confining his attention to the most valuable fuel in our economic life.

Once whilst I was attending a students' meeting, paying homage to Wilhelm Dove, the celebrated discoverer took us aback with the following remark: When a man succeeds in climbing the highest mountain of Europe

he performs a task which, judged from his personal point of view, represents something stupendous. The physicist smiles and says quite simply, 'Two pounds of coal.' He means to say that by burning 2 lb. of coal we gain sufficient energy to lift a man from the sea-level to the summit of Mont Blanc.

It is assumed, of course, that an ideal machine is used, which converts the heat of combustion without loss into work. Such a machine does not exist, but may easily be imagined by supposing the imperfections of machines made by human hands to be eliminated.

Such effective heat is usually expressed in calories. A calorie is the amount of heat that is necessary to raise the temperature of a gramme of water by one degree centigrade. Now the theorem of the Mechanical Equivalent, which is founded on the investigations of Carnot, Robert Mayer, and Clausius, states that from one calorie we may obtain sufficient energy to lift a pound weight about 3 feet. Since 2 lb. of coal may be made to yield 8 million calories, they will enable us to lift a pound weight through 24 million feet, theoretically, or, what comes to the same approximately, to lift a 17-stone man through 100,000 feet, that is, nearly 19 miles: this is nearly seven times the height of Mont Blanc.

At the time when Dove was lecturing, Einstein had not yet been born, and when Einstein was working out his Theory of Relativity, Dove had long passed away, and with him there vanished the idea of the small value of the energy stored in substance to give way to a very much greater value of which we can scarce form an estimate. We should feel dumbfounded if the new calculation were to be a matter of millions, but actually we are to imagine a magnification to the extent of billions. This sounds almost like a fable when expressed in words. But a million is related to a billion in about the same way as a fairly wide city street to the width of the Atlantic Ocean. Our Mont Blanc sinks to insignificance. In the above calculation it would have to be replaced by a mountain 50 million miles high. Since this would lead far out into space, we may say that the energy contained in a kilogramme of coal is sufficient to project a man so far that he will never return, converting him into a human comet. But for the present this is only a theoretical store of energy which cannot yet be utilized in practice.

Nevertheless, we cannot avoid it in our calculations just as we cannot avoid that remarkable quantity c , the velocity of light that plays its part in the tiny portion of substance as it does in everything, asserting itself as a regulative factor in all world phenomena. It is a natural constant that preserves itself unchanged as 180,000 miles per second under all conditions, and which truly represents what appeared to Goethe as 'the immovable rock in the surging sea of phenomena,' as a phantasm beyond the reach of investigators.

It is difficult for one who has not been soaked in all the elements of physical thought to get an idea of what a natural constant means; so much the more when he feels himself impelled to picture the constant, so to speak, as

the rigid axis of a world constructed on relativity. Everything, without exception, is to be subjected not only to continual change (and this was what Heraditus assumed as a fundamental truth in his assertion *panta rhei*, everything flows), but every length-measurement and time-measurement, every motion, every form and figure are dependent on and change with the position of the observer, so that the last vestige of the absolute vanishes from whatever comes into the realm of observation. Nevertheless, there is an absolute despot, who preserves his identity inflexibly among all phenomena—the velocity of light, c , of incalculable influence in practice and yet capable of measurement. Its nature has been characterized in one of the main propositions of Einstein stated in 1905: ‘Every ray of light is propagated in a system at rest with a definite, constant velocity independent of whether the ray is emitted by a body at rest or in motion.’ But this constancy of the omnipotent c is not only in accordance with world relativity: it is actually the main pillar which supports the whole doctrine; the further one penetrates into the theory, the more clearly does one feel that it is just this c which is responsible for the unity, connectivity, and invincibility of Einstein’s world system.

In our example of the coal, from which we started, c occurs as a square, and it is as a result of multiplying 300,000 by itself (that is, forming c^2) that we arrive at the thousands of milliards of energy units which we associated above with such a comparatively insignificant mass. Let us picture this astounding circumstance in another way, although we shall soon see that Einstein clips the wings of our soaring imagination. The huge ocean liner *Imperator*, which can develop a greater horsepower than could the whole of the Prussian cavalry before the war, used to require for one day’s travel the contents of two very long series of coal-trucks (each series being as long as it takes the strongest locomotive to pull). We now know that there is enough energy in two pounds of coal to enable this boat to do the whole trip from Hamburg to New York at its maximum speed.

I quoted this fact, which, although it sounds so incredibly fantastic, is quite true, to Einstein with the intention of justifying the opinion that it contained the key to a development which would initiate a new epoch in history and would be the panacea of all human woe. I drew an enthusiastic picture of a dazzling Utopia, an orgy of hopeful dreams, but immediately noticed that I received no support from Einstein for these visionary aspirations. To my disappointment, indeed, I perceived that Einstein did not even show a special interest in this circumstance which sprang from his own theory, and which promised such bountiful gifts. And to state the conclusion of the story straight away I must confess that his objections were strong enough not only to weaken my rising hopes, but to annihilate them completely.

Einstein commenced by saying: ‘At present there is not the slightest indication of when this energy will be obtainable, or whether it will be obtainable at all. For it would presuppose a disintegration of the atom

effected at will—a shattering of the atom. And up to the present there is scarcely a sign that this will be possible. We observe atomic disintegration only where Nature herself presents it, as in the case of radium, the activity of which depends upon the continual explosive decomposition of its atom. Nevertheless, we can only establish the presence of this process, but cannot produce it; science in its present state makes it appear almost impossible that we shall ever succeed in so doing.’

The fact that we are able to abstract a certain number of calories from coal and put them to practical use comes about owing to the circumstance that combustion is only a molecular process, a change of configuration, which leaves fully intact the atoms of which the molecules are composed. When carbon and oxygen combine, the elementary constituent, the atom, remains quite unimpaired. The above calculation, ‘mass multiplied by the square of the velocity of light,’ would have a technical significance only if we were able to attack the interior of the atom; and of this there seems, as I remarked, not the remotest hope.

Out of the history of technical science it might seem possible to draw on examples contradictory to this first argument which is soon to be followed by others equally important. As a matter of fact, rigorous science has often declared to be impossible what was later discovered to be within the reach of technical attainment—things that seem to us nowadays to be ordinary and self-evident. Werner Siemens considered it impossible to fly by means of machines heavier than air, and Helmholtz proved mathematically that it was impossible. Antecedent to the discovery of the locomotive the ‘impossible’ of the academicians played an important part; Stephenson as well as Riggensbach (the inventors of the locomotive) had no easy task to establish their inventions in the face of the general reproach of craziness hurled at them. The eminent physicist Babinet applied his mathematical artillery to demolish the ideas of the advocates of a telegraphic cable between Europe and America. Philipp Reis, the forerunner of the telephone, failed only as a result of the ‘impossible’ of the learned physicist Poggendorff; and even when the practical telephone of Graham Bell (1876) had been found to work in Boston, on this side of the Atlantic there was still a hubbub of ‘impossible’ owing to scientific reasons. To these illustrations is to be added Robert Mayer’s mechanical equivalent of heat, a determining factor in our above calculations of billions; it likewise had to overcome very strong opposition on the part of leading scientists.

Let us imagine the state of mankind before the advent of machines and before coal had been made available as a source of power. Even at that time a far-seeing investigator would have been able to discover from theoretical grounds the 8000 calories mentioned earlier and also their transformation into useful forces. He would have expressed it in another way and would have got different figures, but he would have arrived at the conclusion: Here is a virtual possibility which must unfortunately remain virtual, as we have no machine in which it can be used. And however far-sighted he may have

been, the idea of, say, a modern dynamo or a turbine-steamer would have been utterly inconceivable to him. He would not have dreamed such a thing. Nay, we may even imagine a human being of the misty dawn of prehistoric ages, of the diluvial period, who had suddenly had a presentiment of the connexion between a log of wood and the sun's heat, but who was yet unaware of the uses of fire; he would argue from his primordial logic that it was not possible and never would be possible to derive from the piece of wood something which sends out warmth like the sun.

I believe now, indeed, that we have grounds for considering ourselves able to mark off the limits of possibility more clearly than the present position of science would seem to warrant. There is the same relation between such possibilities and absolute impossibilities as there is between Leibniz's *vérités de fait* and the *vérités éternelles*. The fact that we shall never succeed in constructing a plane isosceles triangle with unequal base angles is a *vérité éternelle*. On the other hand, it is only a *vérité de fait* that science is precluded from giving mortal man eternal life. This is only improbable in the highest degree, for the fact that, up to the present, all our ancestors have died is only a finite proof. The well-known Cajus of our logic books need not die; the chances of his dying are only $\frac{n}{n+1}$, where we

denote the total of all persons that have passed away up to this moment by n . If I ask a present-day authority in biology or medicine what evidence there is that it will be possible to preserve an individual person permanently from death, he would confess: not the slightest. Nevertheless, Helmholtz declared: 'To a person who tells me that by using certain means the life of a person may be prolonged indefinitely I can oppose my extreme disbelief, *but I cannot contradict him absolutely.*'

Einstein himself once pointed out to me such very remote possibilities; it was in connexion with the following circumstance. It is quite impossible for a moving body ever to attain a velocity greater than that of light, because it is scientifically inconceivable. On the other hand, it is conceivable, and therefore within the range of possibility, that man may yet fly to the most distant constellations.

There is, therefore, no absolute contradiction to the notion of making available for technical purposes the billions of calories that occurred in our problem. As soon as we admit it as possible for discussion, we find ourselves inquiring what the solution of the problem could signify. In our intercourse we actually arrived at this question, and discovered the most radical answer in a dissertation which Friedrich Siemens has written about coal in general without touching in the slightest on these possibilities of the future. I imagine that this dissertation was a big trump in my hand, but had soon to learn from the reasoned contradiction of Einstein that the point at issue was not to be decided in this way.

Nevertheless, it will repay us to consider these arguments for a moment.

Friedrich Siemens starts from two premises which he seemingly bases on

scientific reasoning, thus claiming their validity generally. They are: Coal is the measure of all things. The price of every product represents, directly or indirectly, the value of the coal contained in it.

As all economic values in over-populated countries are the result of work, and as work presupposes coal, capital is synonymous with coal. The economic value of each object is the sum-total of the coal that had to be used to manufacture the object in question. In over-populated states each wage is the value of the coal that is necessary to make this extra life possible. If there is a scarcity of coal, the wages go down in value; if there is no coal, the wages are of no value at all, no matter how much paper money be issued.

As soon as agriculture requires coal (this occurs when it is practised intensively and necessitates the use of railways, machines, artificial manures), coal becomes involved with food-stuffs. Thanks to industrialism, coal is involved in clothing and housing, too.

Since money is equivalent to coal, proper administration of finance is equivalent to a proper administration of coal resources, and our standard of currency is in the last instance a coal-currency. Gold as money is now concentrated coal.

The most advanced people is that which derives from one kilogramme of coal the greatest possibilities conducive to life. Wise statesmanship must resolve itself into wise administration of coal. Or, as it has been expressed in other words elsewhere: 'We must think in terms of coal.'

These fundamental ideas were discussed, and the result was that Einstein admitted the premises in the main, but failed to see the conclusiveness of the inferences. He proved to me, step by step, that Siemens' line of thought followed a vicious circle, and, by begging the question, arrived at a false conclusion. The essential factor, he said, is man-power, and so it will remain; it is this that we have to regard as the primary factor. Just so much can be saved to advantage as there is man-power available for purposes other than for the production of coal from which they are now released. If we succeed in getting greater use out of a kilogramme of coal by better management, then this is measurable in man-power, with which one may dispense for the mining of coal, and which may be applied to other purposes.

If the assertion: 'Coal is the measure of all things,' were generally valid, it should stand every test. We need only try it in a few instances to see that the thesis does not apply. For example, said Einstein: However much coal we may use, and however cleverly we may dispose of it, it will not produce cotton. Certainly the freightage of cotton-wool could be reduced in price, but the value-factor represented by man-power can never disappear from the price of the cotton.

The most that can be admitted is that an increase of the amount of power obtained from coal would make it possible for more people to exist than is possible at present, that is, that the margin of over-population would become extended. But we must not conclude that this would be a boon to mankind. 'A maximum is not an optimum.'

He who proclaims the maximum without qualification as the greatest measure of good is like one who studies the various gases in the atmosphere to ascertain their good or bad effect on our breathing, and arrives at the conclusion: the nitrogen in the air is harmful, so we must double the proportion of oxygen to counteract it; this will confer a great benefit on humanity!

[Footnote: *The parts included between * . . . * are to be regarded as supplementary portions intended to elucidate the arguments involved in the dialogue. In many points they are founded on utterances of Einstein, but also contain reflections drawn from other sources, as well as opinions and inferences which fall to the account of the author, as already remarked in the preface. One will not get far by judging these statements as right or wrong, for even the debatable view may prove itself to be expeditious and suggestive in the perspective of these conversations. Wherever it was possible, without the connexion being broken, I have called attention to the parts which Einstein corrected or disapproved of. In other places I refrained from this, particularly when the subject under discussion demanded an even flow of argument. It would have disturbed the exposition if I had made mention of every counter-argument of the opposing side in all such cases while the explanation was proceeding along broad lines.]

*Armed with this striking analogy, we can now subject the foundation of Siemens' theory to a new scrutiny, and we shall then discover that even the premises contain a trace of the *petitio principii* that finally receives expression in the radical and one-sided expression: 'Coal is everything.'

As if built on solid foundations this first statement looms before us: Coal is solar energy. This is so far indisputable. For all the coal deposits that are still slumbering in the earth were once stately plants, dense woods of fern, which, bearing the burden of millions of years, have saved up for us what they had once extracted as nutrition from the sun's rays. We may let the parallel idea pass without contention: In the beginning was not the Word, nor the Deed, but, in the beginning was the Sun. The energy sent out by the sun to the earth for mankind is the only necessary and inevitable condition for deeds. Deeds mean work, and work necessitates life. But we immediately become involved in an unjustifiable subdivision of the idea, for the propounder of the theory says next: '. . . Coal is solar energy, therefore coal is necessary if we are to work . . .' and this has already thrust us from the paths of logic; the prematurely victorious ergo breaks down. For, apart from the solar energy converted into coal, the warmth of our mother planet radiates on us, and furnishes us with the possibility of work. Siemens' conclusion, from the point of view of logic, is tantamount to: Graphite is solar energy; hence graphite is necessary, if we are to be able to work. The true expression of the state of affairs is: Coal is, for our present conditions of life, the most important, if not the exclusive, preliminary for human work.

And when we learn from political economy that 'in a social state only the necessary human labour and the demand for power-installations which

require coal, and hence again labour for their production, come into question,' this in no way implies the assertion, as Siemens appears to assume, that coal can be made out of labour. But it does signify that work founded on the sun's energy need not necessarily be reducible to coal. And this probably coincides with Einstein's opinion, which is so much the more significant, as his own doctrine points to the highest measure of effect in forces, even if only theoretically.*

Nevertheless, it is a fact that every increase in the quantity of power derived, when expressed per kilo, denotes a mitigation of life's burdens; it is only a question of the limits involved.

Firstly, is technical science with its possibilities, as far as they can be judged at present, still able to guarantee the future for us? Can it spread out the effective work so far that we may rely peacefully on the treasures of coal slumbering in the interior of the earth?

Evidently not. For in this case we are dealing with quantities that may be approximately estimated. And even if we get three times, nay ten times, as many useful calories as before, there is a parallel calculation of evil omen that informs us: there will be an end to this feast of energy.

In spite of all the embarrassments due to the present shortage of coal we have still always been able to console ourselves with the thought that there is really a sufficiency, and that it is only a question of overcoming stoppages. It is a matter of fact that from the time of the foundation of the German Empire to the beginning of the World War coal production had been rising steadily, and it was possible to calculate that in spite of the stupendous quantities that were being removed from the black caves of Germany, there remained at least 2000 milliards of marks in value (taken at the nominal rate, that is, £100,000,000,000). Nevertheless, geologists and mining experts tell us that our whole supply will not last longer than 2000 years, in the case of England 500 years, and in that of France 200 years. Even if we allow amply for the opening up of new coal-fields in other continents, we cannot get over the fact that in the prehistoric fern forests the sun has stored up only a finite, exhaustible amount of energy, and that within a few hundred years humanity will be faced with a coal famine.

Now, if coal were really the measure of all things, and if the possibility of life depended only on the coal supply, then our distant descendants would not only relapse into barbarity, but they would have to expect the absolute zero of existence. We should not need to worry at all about the entropy death of the universe, as our own extinction on this earthly planet beckons to us from an incomparably nearer point of time.

At this stage of the discussion Einstein revealed prospects which were entirely in accordance with his conviction that the whole argument based on the coal assumption was untenable. He stated that it was by no means a Utopian idea that technical science will yet discover totally new ways of setting free forces, such as using the sun's radiation, or water power, or the movement of the tides, or power reservoirs of Nature, among which the

present coal supply denotes only one branch. Since the beginning of coal extraction we have lived only on the remains of a prehistoric capital that has lain in the treasure-chests of the earth. It is to be conjectured that the interest on the actual capital of force will be very much in excess of what we can fetch out of the depositories of former ages.

To form an estimate of this actual capital, entirely independent of coal, we may present some figures. Let us consider a tiny water canal, a mere nothing in the watery network of the earth, the Rhine-falls at Schaffhausen, that may appear mighty to the beholder, but only because he applies his tourist's measure instead of a planetary one. But even this bagatelle in the household of Nature represents very considerable effectual values for us: 200 cubic metres spread over a terrace 20 metres high yield 67,000 horse-power, equivalent to 50,000 kilowatts. This cascade alone would suffice to keep illuminated to their full intensity 1,000,000 glow-lamps, each of 50 candle-power, and according to our present tariff we should have to pay at least 70,000 marks (£3500 nominally) per hour. The coal-worshipper will be more impressed by a different calculation. The Rhine-falls at Schaffhausen is equivalent in value to a mine that yields every day 145 tons of the finest brown coal. If we took the Niagara Falls as an illustration, these figures would have to be multiplied by about 80.

And by what factor would we have to multiply them, if we wished to get only an approximate estimate of the energy that the breathing earth rolls about in the form of the tides? The astronomer Bessel and the philosopher-physicist Fechner once endeavoured to get at some comparative picture of these events. It required 360,000 men twenty years to build the greatest Egyptian pyramid, and yet its cubical contents are only about the millionth of a cubic mile, and perhaps if we sum up everything that men and machinery have moved since the time of the Flood till now, a cubic mile would not yet have been completed. In contrast with this, the earth in its tidal motion moves 200 cubic miles of water from one quadrant of the earth's circumference to another *in every quarter of a day*. From this we see at once that all the coal-mines in the world would mean nothing to us if we could once succeed in making even a fraction of the pulse-beat of the earth available for purposes of industry.

If, however, we should be compelled to depend on coal, our imaginations cling so much more closely to that enormous quantity given by the expression mc^2 , which was derived from the theory of relativity.

The 20 billion calories that are contained in each gramme of coal exercise a fascination on our minds. And although Einstein states that there is not the slightest indication that we shall get at this supply, we get carried along by an irresistible impulse to picture what it would mean if we should actually succeed in tapping it. The transition from the golden to the iron age, as pictured in Hesiod, Aratus, and Ovid, takes shape before our eyes, and following our bent of continuing this cyclically, we take pleasure in fancying ourselves being rescued from the serfdom of the iron and of the coal age to

a new golden age. A supply, such as is piled up in an average city storing-place, would be sufficient to supply the whole world with energy for an immeasurable time. All the troubles and miseries arising from the running of machines, the mechanical production of wares, house-fires would vanish, and all the human labour at present occupied in mining coal would become free to cultivate the land, all railways and boats would run almost without expense, an inconceivable wave of happiness would sweep over mankind. It would mean an end of coal-, freight-, and food-shortage! We should at last be able to escape out of the hardships of the day, which is broken up by strenuous work, and soar upwards to brighter spheres where we would be welcomed by the true values of life. How alluring is the song of Sirens chanted by our physics with its high 'C,' the velocity of light to the second power, which we have got to know as a factor in this secret store of energy.

But these dreams are futile. For Einstein, to whom we owe this formula so promising of wonders, not only denies that it can be applied practically, but also brings forward another argument that casts us down to earth again. Supposing, he explained, it were possible to set free this enormous store of energy, then we should only arrive at an age, compared with which the present coal age would have to be called golden.

And, unfortunately, we find ourselves obliged to fall in with this view, which is based in the wise old saw $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\nu$, *ne quid nimis*, nothing in excess. Applied to our case, this means that when such a measure of power is set free, it does not serve a useful purpose, but leads to destruction. The process of burning, which we used as an illustration, calls up the picture of an oven in which we can imagine this wholesale production of energy, and experience tells us that we should not heat an oven with dynamite.

If technical developments of this kind were to come about, the energy supply would probably not be capable of regulation at all. It makes no difference if we say that we only want a part of those 20 billion calories, and that we should be glad to be able to multiply the 8000 calories required to-day by 100. That is not possible, for if we should succeed in disintegrating the atom, it seems that we should have the billions of calories rushing unchecked on us, and we should find ourselves unable to cope with them, nay, perhaps even the solid ground, on which we move, could not withstand them.

No discovery remains a monopoly of only a few people. If a very careful scientist should really succeed in producing a practical heating or driving effect from the atom, then any untrained person would be able to blow up a whole town by means of only a minute quantity of substance. And any suicidal maniac who hated his fellows and wished to pulverize all habitations within a wide range would only have to conceive the plan to carry it out at a moment's notice. All the bombardments that have taken place ever since fire-arms were invented would be mere child's play compared with the destruction that could be caused by two buckets of coal.

At intervals we see stars light up in the heavens, and then become

extinguished again; from these we infer that world catastrophes have occurred. We do not know whether it is due to the explosion of hydrogen with other gases, or to collisions between two stellar bodies. There is still room for the assumption that, immeasurably far away in yonder regions of celestial space, something is happening which a malevolent inhabitant of our earth, who has discovered the secret of smashing the atom, might here repeat. And even if our imaginations can be stretched to paint the blessings of this release of energy, they certainly fail to conjure up visions of the disastrous effects which would result.

Einstein turned to a page in a learned work of the mathematical physicist Weyl of Zürich, and pointed out a part that dealt with such an appalling liberation of energy. It seemed to me to be of the nature of a fervent prayer that Heaven preserve us from such explosive forces ever being let loose on mankind!

Subject to present impossibility, it is possible to weave many parallel instances. It is conceivable that by some yet undiscovered process alcohol may be prepared as plentifully and as cheaply as ordinary water. This would end the shortage of alcohol, and would assure delirium tremens for hundreds of thousands. The evil would far outweigh the good, although it might be avoidable, for one can, even if with great difficulty, imagine precautionary measures.

War technique might lead to the use of weapons of great range, which would enable a small number of adventurers to conquer a Great power. It will be objected: this will hold vice versa, too. Nevertheless, this would not alter the fact that such long-range weapons would probably lead to the destruction of civilization. Our last hope of an escape would be in a superior moral outlook of future generations, which the optimist may imagine to himself as the *force majeure*.

There are apparently only two inventions, in themselves triumphs of intellect, against which one would have no defence. The first would be thought-reading made applicable to all, and with which Kant has dealt under the term 'thinking aloud.' What is nowadays a rare and very imperfect telepathic 'turn' may yet be generalized and perfected in a manner which Kant supposed not impossible on some distant planet. The association and converse of man with his fellows would not stand the test of this invention, and we should have to be angels to survive it even for a day.

The second invention would be the solution of this mc^2 -problem, which I call a problem only because I fail to discover a proper term, whereas so far was it from being a problem for Einstein that it was only in my presence he began to reckon it out in figures from the symbolic formula. To us average beings a Utopia may disclose itself, a short frenzy of joy followed by a cold douche: Einstein stands above it as the pure searcher, who is interested only in the scientific fact, and who, even at the first knowledge of it, preserves its essentially theoretical importance from attempts to apply it practically. If, then, another wishes to hammer out into a fantastic gold-leaf what he has

produced as a little particle of gold in his physical investigations, he offers no opposition to such thought-experiments, for one of the deepest traits of his nature is tolerance.

A. Pflüger, one of the best qualified heralds of the new doctrine, has touched on the above matter in his essay, *The Principle of Relativity*. Einstein praised this pamphlet; I mentioned that the author took a view different from that of Einstein, of the possibility of making accessible the mc^2 . In discussing the practical significance of this eventuality, Pflüger says: 'It will be time to talk of this point again a hundred years hence.' This seems a short time-limit, even if none of us will live to be present at the discussion. Einstein smiled at this pause of a hundred years, and merely repeated, 'A very good essay!' It is not for me to offer contradictions; and, as far as the implied prognostication is concerned, it will be best for mankind if it should prove to be false. If the optimum is unattainable, at least we shall be spared the worst, which is what the realization of this prophecy would inflict on us.

Some months after the above discussion had first been put to paper, the world was confronted by a new scientific event. The English physicist Rutherford had, with deliberate intention, actually succeeded in splitting up the atom. When I questioned Einstein on the possible consequences of this experimental achievement, he declared with his usual frankness, one of the treasures of his character, that he had now occasion to modify somewhat the opinion he had shortly before expressed. This is not to mean that he now considered the practical goal of getting unlimited supply of energy as having been brought within the realm of possibility. He gave it as his view that we are now entering on a new stage of development, which may perhaps disclose fresh openings for technical science. The scientific importance of these new experiments with the atom was certainly to be considered very great.

In Rutherford's operations the atom is treated as if he were dealing with a fortress: he subjects it to a bombardment and then seeks to fire into the breach. The fortress is still certainly far from capitulating, but signs of disruption have become observable. A hail of bullets caused holes, tears, and splinterings.

The projectiles hurled by Rutherford are alpha-particles shot out by radium, and their velocity approaches two-thirds that of light. Owing to the extreme violence of the impact, they succeeded in doing damage to certain atoms enclosed in evacuated glass tubes. It was shown that atoms of nitrogen had been disrupted. It is still unknown what quantities of energy are released in this process. This splitting up of the atom carried out with intention can, indeed, be detected only by the most careful investigations.

As far as practical applications are concerned, then, we have got no further, although we have renewed grounds for hope. The unit of measure, as it were, is still out of proportion to the material to be cut. For the forces which Rutherford had to use to attain this result are relatively very considerable. He derived them from a gramme of radium, which is able to

liberate several milliard calories, whereas the net practical result in Rutherford's experiment is still immeasurably small. Nevertheless, it is scientifically established that it is possible to split up atoms of one's own free will, and thus the fundamental objection raised above falls to the ground.

There is also another reason for increased hope. It seems feasible that, under certain conditions, Nature would automatically continue the disruption of the atom, after a human being had intentionally started it, as in the analogous case of a conflagration which extends, although it may have started from a mere spark.

A by-product of future research might lead to the transmutation of lead into gold. The possibility of this transformation of elements is subject to the same arguments as those above about the splitting up of the atom and the release of great quantities of energy. The path of decay from radium to lead lies clearly exposed even now, but it is very questionable whether mankind will finally have cause to offer up hymns of thanksgiving if this line from lead on to the precious metals should be continued, for it would cause our conception of the latter to be shattered. Gold made from lead would not give rise to an increase in the value of the meaner metal, but to the utter depreciation of gold, and hence the loss of the standard of value that has been valid since the beginning of our civilization. No economist would be possessed of a sufficiently far-sighted vision to be able to measure the consequences on the world's market of such a revolution in values.

The chief product would, of course, be the gain in energy, and we must bear this in mind when we give ourselves up to our speculations, however optimistic or catastrophic they may be. The impenetrable barrier 'impossible' no longer exists. Einstein's wonderful 'Open Sesame,' mass times the square of the velocity of light, is thundering at the portals.

And mankind finds a new meaning in the old saw: One should never say *never!*"

Moszkowski cites the work of Alexander Wilhelm Pflüger. Pflüger stated,

"Daraus folgt aber nicht, daß das RP [Relativitätsprinzip] keine praktische Bedeutung für die Technik hätte. Nach hundert Jahren wollen wir wieder darüber sprechen. Einstweilen nur dies: aus dem RP folgt, daß die Masse eines Körpers vergrößert wird, wenn man ihm Energie (etwa strahlende Wärme) zuführt. Man kann daher die Masse als Energie auffassen, und der alte Satz der Chemiker von der Erhaltung der Masse schmilzt dadurch mit dem Satz von der Erhaltung der Energie zusammen. Man findet ferner, daß jeder Körper, welcher in einem System ruht, von diesem aus beurteilt, die ungeheure Menge mc^2 „latente“ Energie enthält, d. h. gleich seiner Masse, gemessen in Grammen, multipliziert mit dem Quadrat der Lichtgeschwindigkeit, gemessen in cm sec. Da $c = 3 \cdot 10^{10}$ cm/sec ist, so enthält also ein Kilogramm eines beliebigen Körpers, z. B. der Kohle

1000 · 9 · 10²⁰ Erg = 23 Billionen Kalorien. Diese Energie steckt unzweifelhaft zum weitaus größten Teil in seinen Atomen. Von ihrer ungeheuren Größe gibt folgende Überlegung einen Begriff. Unser bisheriges Verfahren, Energie aus der Kohle zu gewinnen, beruht auf einem Molekularprozeß, der Vereinigung der intakt bleibenden Atome Kohlenstoff und Sauerstoff zu Kohlensäure, der sogenannten Verbrennung. Er liefert die lächerlich geringe Zahl von etwa 7000 Kalorien pro Kilo Kohle. Gelänge es, die Kohleatome zu zerbrechen und ihnen ihre latente Energie zu entreissen, so vermöchte ein Ozeandampfer von **50 000** Pferdekräften mit einem Kilogramm Kohle zehn Jahre lang ununterbrochen zu fahren. Bei den heutigen Energiepreisen wäre die in diesem Kilogramm steckende Energie mehrere hundert Millionen Mark wert. Daß das keine Phantasie ist, lehrt das Beispiel des Radiums. Dieses erzeugt, indem das Radiumatom freiwillig auseinanderbricht, ungeheure Wärmemengen, für deren Quelle man früher keine Erklärung wußte. Das RP gibt diese Erklärung: es ist ein Teil der latenten Energie, die hier frei wird. Mit dieser kleinen Auswahl aus den Folgerungen des RP wollen wir diese Betrachtungen schließen.³³⁷⁹

Moszkowski's pontificating, which would otherwise might have been profound, appears to have been pretentiously and pompously plagiarized. It is difficult to believe that Moszkowski did not read H. G. Wells' book *The World Set Free: A Story of Mankind*, Macmillan, London, (1914), though Moszkowski does not mention it.

H. G. Wells wrote, *inter alia*, in 1913, in light of the Balkan Wars and in anticipation of the First World War and the Second World War,

“‘And so,’ said the professor, ‘we see that this Radium, which seemed at first a fantastic exception, a mad inversion of all that was most established and fundamental in the constitution of matter, is really at one with the rest of the elements. It does noticeably and forcibly what probably all the other elements are doing with an imperceptible slowness. It is like the single voice crying aloud that betrays the silent breathing multitude in the darkness. Radium is an element that is breaking up and flying to pieces. But perhaps all elements are doing that at less perceptible rates. Uranium certainly is; thorium—the stuff of this incandescent gas mantle—certainly is; actinium. I feel that we are but beginning the list. And we know now that the atom, that once we thought hard and impenetrable, and indivisible and final and—lifeless—lifeless, is really a reservoir of immense energy. That is the most wonderful thing about all this work. A little while ago we thought of the atoms as we thought of bricks, as solid building material, as substantial matter, as unit masses of lifeless stuff, and behold! these bricks are boxes, treasure boxes, boxes full of the intensest force. This little bottle contains about a pint of uranium oxide; that is to say, about fourteen ounces of the element uranium. It is worth about a pound. And in this bottle, ladies and gentlemen, in the atoms in this bottle there slumbers at least as much energy

as we could get by burning a hundred and sixty tons of coal. If at a word, in one instant I could suddenly release that energy here and now it would blow us and everything about us to fragments; if I could turn it into the machinery that lights this city, it could keep Edinburgh brightly lit for a week. But at present no man knows, no man has an inkling of how this little lump of stuff can be made to hasten the release of its store. It does release it, as a burn trickles. Slowly the uranium changes into radium, the radium changes into a gas called the radium emanation, and that again to what we call radium A, and so the process goes on, giving out energy at every stage, until at last we reach the last stage of all, which is, so far as we can tell at present, lead. But we cannot hasten it.'

'I take ye, man,' whispered the chuckle-headed lad, with his red hands tightening like a vice upon his knee. 'I take ye, man. Go on! Oh, go on!'

The professor went on after a little pause. 'Why is the change gradual?' he asked. 'Why does only a minute fraction of the radium disintegrate in any particular second? Why does it dole itself out so slowly and so exactly? Why does not all the uranium change to radium and all the radium change to the next lowest thing at once? Why this decay by dribbles; why not a decay *en masse*? . . . Suppose presently we find it is possible to quicken that decay?'

The chuckle-headed lad nodded rapidly. The wonderful inevitable idea was coming. He drew his knee up towards his chin and swayed in his seat with excitement. 'Why not?' he echoed, 'why not?'

The professor lifted his forefinger. 'Given that knowledge,' he said, 'mark what we should be able to do! We should not only be able to use this uranium and thorium; not only should we have a source of power so potent that a man might carry in his hand the energy to light a city for a year, fight a fleet of battleships, or drive one of our giant liners across the Atlantic; but we should also have a clue that would enable us at last to quicken the process of disintegration in all the other elements, where decay is still so slow as to escape our finest measurements. Every scrap of solid matter in the world would become an available reservoir of concentrated force. Do you realise, ladies and gentlemen, what these things would mean for us?'

The scrub head nodded. 'Oh! go on. Go on.'

'It would mean a change in human conditions that I can only compare to the discovery of fire, that first discovery that lifted man above the brute. We stand to-day towards radio-activity as our ancestor stood towards fire before he had learnt to make it. He knew it then only as a strange thing utterly beyond his control, a flare on the crest of the volcano, a red destruction that poured through the forest. So it is that we know radio-activity to-day. This—this is the dawn of a new day in human living. At the climax of that civilisation which had its beginning in the hammered flint and the fire-stick of the savage, just when it is becoming apparent that our ever-increasing needs cannot be borne indefinitely by our present sources of energy, we discover suddenly the possibility of an entirely new civilisation. The energy we need for our very existence, and with which Nature supplies us still so

grudgingly, is in reality locked up in inconceivable quantities all about us. We cannot pick that lock at present, but——’

He paused. His voice sank so that everybody strained a little to hear him. ‘——we will.’

He put up that lean finger again, his solitary gesture.

‘And then,’ he said. . . .

‘Then that perpetual struggle for existence, that perpetual struggle to live on the bare surplus of Nature’s energies will cease to be the lot of Man. Man will step from the pinnacle of this civilisation to the beginning of the next. I have no eloquence, ladies and gentlemen, to express the vision of man’s material destiny that opens out before me. I see the desert continents transformed, the poles no longer wildernesses of ice, the whole world once more Eden. I see the power of man reach out among the stars. . . .’

[***]

Holsten, before he died, was destined to see atomic energy dominating every other source of power, but for some years yet a vast network of difficulties in detail and application kept the new discovery from any effective invasion of ordinary life. The path from the laboratory to the workshop is sometimes a tortuous one; electro-magnetic radiations were known and demonstrated for twenty years before Marconi made them practically available, and in the same way it was twenty years before induced radio-activity could be brought to practical utilisation. The thing, of course, was discussed very much, more perhaps at the time of its discovery than during the interval of technical adaptation, but with very little realisation of the huge economic revolution that impended. What chiefly impressed the journalists of 1933 was the production of gold from bismuth and the realisation albeit upon unprofitable lines of the alchemist’s dreams; there was a considerable amount of discussion and expectation in that more intelligent section of the educated publics of the various civilised countries which followed scientific development; but for the most part the world went about its business—as the inhabitants of those Swiss villages which live under the perpetual threat of overhanging rocks and mountains go about their business—just as though the possible was impossible, as though the inevitable was postponed for ever because it was delayed.

It was in 1953 that the first Holsten-Roberts engine brought induced radio-activity into the sphere of industrial production, and its first general use was to replace the steam-engine in electrical generating stations. Hard upon the appearance of this came the Dass-Tata engine—the invention of two among the brilliant galaxy of Bengali inventors the modernisation of Indian thought was producing at this time—which was used chiefly for automobiles, aeroplanes, waterplanes, and such-like, mobile purposes. The American Kemp engine, differing widely in principle but equally practicable, and the Krupp-Erlanger came hard upon the heels of this, and by the autumn of 1954 a gigantic replacement of industrial methods and machinery was in progress all about the habitable globe. Small wonder was this when the cost, even of

these earliest and clumsiest of atomic engines, is compared with that of the power they superseded. Allowing for lubrication the Dass-Tata engine, once it was started cost a penny to run thirty-seven miles, and added only nine and quarter pounds to the weight of the carriage it drove. It made the heavy alcohol-driven automobile of the time ridiculous in appearance as well as preposterously costly. For many years the price of coal and every form of liquid fuel had been clambering to levels that made even the revival of the draft horse seem a practicable possibility, and now with the abrupt relaxation of this stringency, the change in appearance of the traffic upon the world's roads was instantaneous. In three years the frightful armoured monsters that had hooted and smoked and thundered about the world for four awful decades were swept away to the dealers in old metal, and the highways thronged with light and clean and shimmering shapes of silvered steel. At the same time a new impetus was given to aviation by the relatively enormous power for weight of the atomic engine, it was at last possible to add Redmayne's ingenious helicopter ascent and descent engine to the vertical propeller that had hitherto been the sole driving force of the aeroplane without overweighting the machine, and men found themselves possessed of an instrument of flight that could hover or ascend or descend vertically and gently as well as rush wildly through the air. The last dread of flying vanished. As the journalists of the time phrased it, this was the epoch of the Leap into the Air. The new atomic aeroplane became indeed a mania; every one of means was frantic to possess a thing so controllable, so secure and so free from the dust and danger of the road, and in France alone in the year 1943 thirty thousand of these new aeroplanes were manufactured and licensed, and soared humming softly into the sky.

And with an equal speed atomic engines of various types invaded industrialism. The railways paid enormous premiums for priority in the delivery of atomic traction engines, atomic smelting was embarked upon so eagerly as to lead to a number of disastrous explosions due to inexperienced handling of the new power, and the revolutionary cheapening of both materials and electricity made the entire reconstruction of domestic buildings a matter merely dependent upon a reorganisation of the methods of the builder and the house-furnisher. Viewed from the side of the new power and from the point of view of those who financed and manufactured the new engines and material it required, the age of the Leap into the Air was one of astonishing prosperity. Patent-holding companies were presently paying dividends of five or six hundred per cent, and enormous fortunes were made and fantastic wages earned by all who were concerned in the new developments. This prosperity was not a little enhanced by the fact that in both the Dass-Tata and Holsten-Roberts engines one of the recoverable waste products was gold—the former disintegrated dust of bismuth and the latter dust of lead—and that this new supply of gold led quite naturally to a rise in prices throughout the world.

This spectacle of feverish enterprise was productivity, this crowding

flight of happy and fortunate rich people—every great city was as if a crawling ant-hill had suddenly taken wing—was the bright side of the opening phase of the new epoch in human history. Beneath that brightness was a gathering darkness, a deepening dismay. If there was a vast development of production there was also a huge destruction of values. These glaring factories working night and day, these glittering new vehicles swinging noiselessly along the roads, these flights of dragon-flies that swooped and soared and circled in the air, were indeed no more than the brightnesses of lamps and fires that gleam out when the world sinks towards twilight and the night. Between these high lights accumulated disaster, social catastrophe. The coal mines were manifestly doomed to closure at no very distant date, the vast amount of capital invested in oil was becoming unsaleable, millions of coal miners, steel workers upon the old lines, vast swarms of unskilled or under-skilled labourers in innumerable occupations, were being flung out of employment by the superior efficiency of the new machinery, the rapid fall in the cost of transit was destroying high land values at every centre of population, the value of existing house property had become problematical, gold was undergoing headlong depreciation, all the securities upon which the credit of the world rested were slipping and sliding, banks were tottering, the stock exchanges were scenes of feverish panic;—this was the reverse of the spectacle, these were the black and monstrous under-consequences of the Leap into the Air.

There is a story of a demented London stockbroker running out into Threadneedle Street and tearing off his clothes as he ran. ‘The Steel Trust is scrapping the whole of its plant,’ he shouted. ‘The State Railways are going to scrap all their engines. Everything’s going to be scrapped—everything. Come and scrap the mint, you fellows, come and scrap the mint!’

In the year 1955 the suicide rate for the United States of America quadrupled any previous record.

[***]

Viewed from the standpoint of a sane and ambitious social order, it is difficult to understand, and it would be tedious to follow, the motives that plunged mankind into the war that fills the histories of the middle decades of the twentieth century.

[***]

The sky above the indistinct horizons of this cloud sea was at first starry and then paler with a light that crept from north to east as the dawn came on. The Milky Way was invisible in the blue, and the lesser stars vanished. The face of the adventurer at the steering-wheel, darkly visible ever and again by the oval greenish glow of the compass face, had something of that firm beauty which all concentrated purpose gives, and something of the happiness of an idiot child that has at last got hold of the matches. His companion, a less imaginative type, sat with his legs spread wide over the long, coffin-shaped box which contained in its compartments the three atomic bombs, the new bombs that would continue to explode indefinitely and which no one so far

had ever seen in action. Hitherto Carolinum, their essential substance, had been tested only in almost infinitesimal quantities within steel chambers embedded in lead. Beyond the thought of great destruction slumbering in the black spheres between his legs, and a keen resolve to follow out very exactly the instructions that had been given him, the man's mind was a blank. His aquiline profile against the starlight expressed nothing but a profound gloom.

[***]

The gaunt face hardened to grimness, and with both hands the bomb-thrower lifted the big atomic bomb from the box and steadied it against the side. It was a black sphere two feet in diameter. Between its handles was a little celluloid stud, and to this he bent his head until his lips touched it. Then he had to bite in order to let the air in upon the inducive. Sure of its accessibility, he craned his neck over the side of the aeroplane and judged his pace and distance. Then very quickly he bent forward, bit the stud, and hoisted the bomb over the side.

'Round,' he whispered inaudibly.

The bomb flashed blinding scarlet in mid-air, and fell, a descending column of blaze eddying spirally in the midst of a whirlwind. Both the aeroplanes were tossed like shuttlecocks, hurled high and sideways and the steersman, with gleaming eyes and set teeth, fought in great banking curves for a balance. The gaunt man clung tight with hand and knees; his nostrils dilated, his teeth biting his lips. He was firmly strapped. . . .

When he could look down again it was like looking down upon the crater of a small volcano. In the open garden before the Imperial castle a shuddering star of evil splendour spurted and poured up smoke and flame towards them like an accusation. They were too high to distinguish people clearly, or mark the bomb's effect upon the building until suddenly the façade tottered and crumbled before the flare as sugar dissolves in water. The man stared for a moment, showed all his long teeth, and then staggered into the cramped standing position his straps permitted, hoisted out and bit another bomb, and sent it down after its fellow.

The explosion came this time more directly underneath the aeroplane and shot it upward edgewise. The bomb box tipped to the point of disgorgement, and the bomb-thrower was pitched forward upon the third bomb with his face close to its celluloid stud. He clutched its handles, and with a sudden gust of determination that the thing should not escape him, bit its stud. Before he could hurl it over, the monoplane was slipping sideways. Everything was falling sideways. Instinctively he gave himself up to gripping, his body holding the bomb in its place.

Then that bomb had exploded also, and steersman, thrower, and aeroplane were just flying rags and splinters of metal and drops of moisture in the air, and a third column of fire rushed eddying down upon the doomed buildings below. . . .

§ 4.

Never before in the history of warfare had there been a continuing explosive;

indeed, up to the middle of the twentieth century the only explosives known were combustibles whose explosiveness was due entirely to their instantaneousness; and these atomic bombs which science burst upon the world that night were strange even to the men who used them. Those used by the Allies were lumps of pure Carolinum, painted on the outside with unoxidised cydonator inducive enclosed hermetically in a case of membranum. A little celluloid stud between the handles by which the bomb was lifted was arranged so as to be easily torn off and admit air to the inducive, which at once became active and set up radio-activity in the outer layer of the Carolinum sphere. This liberated fresh inducive, and so in a few minutes the whole bomb was a blazing continual explosion. The Central European bombs were the same, except that they were larger and had a more complicated arrangement for animating the inducive.

Always before in the development of warfare the shells and rockets fired had been but momentarily explosive, they had gone off in an instant once for all, and if there was nothing living or valuable within reach of the concussion and the flying fragments, then they were spent and over. But Carolinum, which belonged to the β -group of Hyslop's so-called 'suspended degenerator' elements, once its degenerative process had been induced, continued a furious radiation of energy and nothing could arrest it. Of all Hyslop's artificial elements, Carolinum was the most heavily stored with energy and the most dangerous to make and handle. To this day it remains the most potent degenerator known. What the earlier twentieth-century chemists called its half period was seventeen days; that is to say, it poured out half of the huge store of energy in its great molecules in the space of seventeen days, the next seventeen days' emission was a half of that first period's outpouring, and so on. As with all radio-active substances this Carolinum, though every seventeen days its power is halved, though constantly it diminishes towards the imperceptible, is never entirely exhausted, and to this day the battle-fields and bomb fields of that frantic time in human history are sprinkled with radiant matter, and so centres of inconvenient rays.

What happened when the celluloid stud was opened was that the inducive oxidised and became active. Then the surface of the Carolinum began to degenerate. This degeneration passed only slowly into the substance of the bomb. A moment or so after its explosion began it was still mainly an inert sphere exploding superficially, a big, inanimate nucleus wrapped in flame and thunder. Those that were thrown from aeroplanes fell in this state, they reached the ground still mainly solid, and, melting soil and rock in their progress, bored into the earth. There, as more and more of the Carolinum became active, the bomb spread itself out into a monstrous cavern of fiery energy at the base of what became very speedily a miniature active volcano. The Carolinum, unable to disperse, freely drove into and mixed up with a boiling confusion of molten soil and superheated steam, and so remained spinning furiously and maintaining an eruption that lasted for years or

months or weeks according to the size of the bomb employed and the chances of its dispersal. Once launched, the bomb was absolutely unapproachable and uncontrollable until its forces were nearly exhausted, and from the crater that burst open above it, puffs of heavy incandescent vapour and fragments of viciously punitive rock and mud, saturated with Carolinum, and each a centre of scorching and blistering energy, were flung high and far.

Such was the crowning triumph of military science, the ultimate explosive that was to give the 'decisive touch' to war. . . .

§ 5.

A recent historical writer has described the world of that time as one that 'believed in established words and was invincibly blind to the obvious in things.' Certainly it seems now that nothing could have been more obvious to the people of the earlier twentieth century than the rapidity with which war was becoming impossible. And as certainly they did not see it. They did not see it until the atomic bombs burst in their fumbling hands. Yet the broad facts must have glared upon any intelligent mind. All through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the amount of energy that men were able to command was continually increasing. Applied to warfare that meant that the power to inflict a blow, the power to destroy, was continually increasing. There was no increase whatever in the ability to escape. Every sort of passive defence, armour, fortifications, and so forth, was being outmastered by this tremendous increase on the destructive side. Destruction was becoming so facile that any little body of malcontents could use it; it was revolutionising the problems of police and internal rule. Before the last war began it was a matter of common knowledge that a man could carry about in a handbag an amount of latent energy sufficient to wreck half a city. These facts were before the minds of everybody; the children in the streets knew them. And yet the world still, as the Americans used to phrase it, 'fooled around' with the paraphernalia and pretensions of war.

It is only by realising this profound, this fantastic divorce between the scientific and intellectual movement on the one hand, and the world of the lawyer-politician on the other, that the men of a later time can hope to understand this preposterous state of affairs. Social organisation was still in the barbaric stage. There were already great numbers of actively intelligent men and much private and commercial civilisation, but the community, as a whole, was aimless, untrained and unorganised to the pitch of imbecility. Collective civilisation, the 'Modern State,' was still in the womb of the future. . . .

[***]

The enemy began sniping the rifle pits from shelters they made for themselves in the woods below. A man was hit in the pit next to Barnet, and began cursing and crying out in a violent rage. Barnet crawled along the ditch to him and found him in great pain, covered with blood, frantic with indignation, and with the half of his right hand smashed to a pulp. 'Look at

this,' he kept repeating, hugging it and then extending it. 'Damned foolery! Damned foolery! My right hand, sir! My right hand!'

For some time Barnet could do nothing with him. The man was consumed by his tortured realisation of the evil silliness of war, the realisation which had come upon him in a flash with the bullet that had destroyed his skill and use as an artificer for ever. He was looking at the vestiges with a horror that made him impenetrable to any other idea. At last the poor wretch let Barnet tie up his bleeding stump and help him along the ditch that conducted him deviously out of range. . . .

When Barnet returned his men were already calling out for water, and all day long the line of pits suffered greatly from thirst. For food they had chocolate and bread. 'At first,' he says, 'I was extraordinarily excited by my baptism of fire. Then as the heat of the day came on I experienced an enormous tedium and discomfort. The flies became extremely troublesome, and my little grave of a rifle pit was invaded by ants. I could not get up or move about, for some one in the trees had got a mark on me. I kept thinking of the dead Prussian down among the corn, and of the bitter outcries of my own man. Damned foolery! It *was* damned foolery. But who was to blame? How had we got to this? . . .

'Early in the afternoon an aeroplane tried to dislodge us with dynamite bombs, but she was hit by bullets once or twice, and suddenly dived down over beyond the trees.

'From Holland to the Alps this day,' I thought, 'there must be crouching and lying between half and a million of men, trying to inflict irreparable damage upon one another. The thing is idiotic to the pitch of impossibility. It is a dream. Presently I shall wake up. . . .'

'Then the phrase changed itself in my mind. 'Presently mankind will wake up.'

'I lay speculating just how many thousands of men there were among these hundreds of thousands, whose spirits were in rebellion against all these ancient traditions of flag and empire. Weren't we, perhaps, already in the throes of the last crisis, in that darkest moment of a nightmare's horror before the sleeper will endure no more of it—and wakes?

'I don't know how my speculations ended. I think they were not so much ended as distracted by the distant thudding of the guns that were opening fire at long range upon Namur.'

[***]

'And then, while I still peered and tried to shade these flames from my eyes with my hand, and while the men about me were beginning to stir, the atomic bombs were thrown at the dykes. They made a mighty thunder in the air, and fell like Lucifer in the picture, leaving a flaring trail in the sky. The night, which had been pellucid and detailed and eventful, seemed to vanish, to be replaced abruptly by a black background to these tremendous pillars of fire. . . .

'Hard upon the sound of them came a roaring wind, and the sky was

filled with flickering lightnings and rushing clouds. . . .

‘There was something discontinuous in this impact. At one moment I was a lonely watcher in a sleeping world; the next saw every one about me afoot, the whole world awake and amazed. . . .

‘And then the wind had struck me a buffet, taken my helmet and swept aside the summerhouse of *Vreugde bij Vrede*, as a scythe sweeps away grass. I saw the bombs fall, and then watched a great crimson flare leap responsive to each impact, and mountainous masses of red-lit steam and flying fragments clamber up towards the zenith. Against the glare I saw the country-side for miles standing black and clear, churches, trees, chimneys. And suddenly I understood. The Central Europeans had burst the dykes. Those flares meant the bursting of the dykes, and in a little while the sea-water would be upon us. . . .’

[***]

‘I do not think any of us felt we belonged to a defeated army, nor had we any strong sense of the war as the dominating fact about us. Our mental setting had far more of the effect of a huge natural catastrophe. The atomic bombs had dwarfed the international issues to complete insignificance. When our minds wandered from the preoccupations of our immediate needs, we speculated upon the possibility of stopping the use of these frightful explosives before the world was utterly destroyed. For to us it seemed quite plain that these bombs and the still greater power of destruction of which they were the precursors might quite easily shatter every relationship and institution of mankind.

[***]

For a time in western Europe at least it was indeed as if civilisation had come to a final collapse. These crowning buds upon the tradition that Napoleon planted and Bismarck watered, opened and flared ‘like waterlilies of flame’ over nations destroyed, over churches smashed or submerged, towns ruined, fields lost to mankind for ever, and a million weltering bodies. Was this lesson enough for mankind, or would the flames of war still burn amidst the ruins?

[***]

Leblanc was one of those ingenuous men whose lot would have been insignificant in any period of security, but who have been caught up to an immortal rôle in history by the sudden simplification of human affairs through some tragical crisis, to the measure of their simplicity. Such a man was Abraham Lincoln, and such was Garibaldi. And Leblanc, with his transparent childish innocence, his entire self-forgetfulness, came into this confusion of distrust and intricate disaster with an invincible appeal for the manifest sanities of the situation. His voice, when he spoke, was ‘full of remonstrance.’ He was a little, bald, spectacled man, inspired by that intellectual idealism which has been one of the peculiar gifts of France to humanity. He was possessed of one clear persuasion, that war must end, and that the only way to end war was to have but one government for mankind.

He brushed aside all other considerations. At the very outbreak of the war, so soon as the two capitals of the belligerents had been wrecked, he went to the president in the White House with this proposal. He made it as if it was a matter of course. He was fortunate to be in Washington and in touch with that gigantic childishness which was the characteristic of the American imagination. For the Americans also were among the simple peoples by whom the world was saved. He won over the American president and the American government to his general ideas; at any rate they supported him sufficiently to give him a standing with the more sceptical European governments, and with this backing he set to work—it seemed the most fantastic of enterprises—to bring together all the rulers of the world and unify them. He wrote innumerable letters, he sent messages, he went desperate journeys, he enlisted whatever support he could find; no one was too humble for an ally or too obstinate for his advances; through the terrible autumn of the last wars this persistent little visionary in spectacles must have seemed rather like a hopeful canary twittering during a thunderstorm. And no accumulation of disasters daunted his conviction that they could be ended.

[***]

‘Do you really think, Firmin, that I am here as—as an infernal politician to put my crown and my flag and my claims and so forth in the way of peace? That little Frenchman is right. You know he is right as well as I do. Those things are over. We—we kings and rulers and representatives have been at the very heart of the mischief. Of course we imply separation, and of course separation means the threat of war, and of course the threat of war means the accumulation of more and more atomic bombs. The old game’s up. But, I say, we mustn’t stand here, you know. The world waits. Don’t you think the old game’s up, Firmin?’

Firmin adjusted a strap, passed a hand over his wet forehead, and followed earnestly. ‘I admit, sir,’ he said to a receding back, ‘that there has to be some sort of hegemony, some sort of Amphictyonic council——’

‘There’s got to be one simple government for all the world,’ said the king over his shoulder.

[***]

‘Manifestly war has to stop for ever, Firmin. Manifestly this can only be done by putting all the world under one government. Our crowns and flags are in the way. Manifestly they must go.’

‘Yes, sir,’ interrupted Firmin, ‘but *what* government? I don’t see what government you get by a universal abdication!’

‘Well,’ said the king, with his hands about his knees, ‘*We* shall be the government.’

‘The conference?’ exclaimed Firmin.

‘Who else?’ asked the king simply.

‘It’s perfectly simple,’ he added to Firmin’s tremendous silence.

‘But,’ cried Firmin, ‘you must have sanctions! Will there be no form of election, for example?’

‘Why should there be?’ asked the king, with intelligent curiosity.

‘The consent of the governed.’

‘Firmin, we are just going to lay down our differences and take over government. Without any election at all. Without any sanction. The governed will show their consent by silence. If any effective opposition arises, we shall ask it to come in and help. The true sanction of kingship is the grip upon the sceptre. We aren’t going to worry people to vote for us. I’m certain the mass of men does not want to be bothered with such things. . . . We’ll contrive a way for any one interested to join in. That’s quite enough in the way of democracy. Perhaps later—when things don’t matter. . . . We shall govern all right, Firmin. Government only becomes difficult when the lawyers get hold of it, and since these troubles began the lawyers are shy. Indeed, come to think of it, I wonder where all the lawyers are. . . . Where are they? A lot, of course, were bagged, some of the worst ones, when they blew up my legislature. You never knew the late Lord Chancellor. . . .

‘Necessities bury rights. And create them. Lawyers live on dead rights disinterred. . . . We’ve done with that way of living. We won’t have more law than a code can cover and beyond that government will be free. . . .

‘Before the sun sets to-day, Firmin, trust me, we shall have made our abdications, all of us, and declared the World Republic, supreme and indivisible. I wonder what my august grandmother would have made of it! All my rights! . . . And then we shall go on governing. What else is there to do? All over the world we shall declare that there is no longer mine or thine, but ours. China, the United States, two-thirds of Europe, will certainly fall in and obey. They will have to do so. What else can they do? Their official rulers are here with us. They won’t be able to get together any sort of idea of not obeying us. . . . Then we shall declare that every sort of property is held in trust for the Republic. . . .’

[***]

The members of the new world government dined at three long tables on trestles, and down the middle of these tables Leblanc, in spite of the barrenness of his menu, had contrived to have a great multitude of beautiful roses.

[***]

On this first evening of all the council’s gatherings, after King Egbert had talked for a long time and drunken and praised very abundantly the simple red wine of the country that Leblanc had procured for them, he fathered about him a group of congenial spirits and fell into a discourse upon simplicity, praising it above all things and declaring that the ultimate aim of art, religion, philosophy, and science alike was to simplify. He instanced himself as a devotee to simplicity. And Leblanc he instanced as a crowning instance of the splendour of this quality. Upon that they all agreed.

[***]

They arranged with a certain informality. No Balkan aeroplane was to adventure into the air until the search was concluded, and meanwhile the

fleets of the world government would soar and circle in the sky. The towns were to be placarded with offers of reward to any one who would help in the discovery of atomic bombs. . . .

[***]

The task that lay before the Assembly of Brissago, viewed as we may view it now from the clarifying standpoint of things accomplished, was in its broad issues a simple one. Essentially it was to place social organisation upon the new footing that the swift, accelerated advance of human knowledge had rendered necessary. The council was gathered together with the haste of a salvage expedition, and it was confronted with wreckage; but the wreckage was irreparable wreckage, and the only possibilities of the case were either the relapse of mankind to the agricultural barbarism from which it had emerged so painfully or the acceptance of achieved science as the basis of a new social order. The old tendencies of human nature, suspicion, jealousy, particularism, and belligerency, were incompatible with the monstrous destructive power of the new appliances the inhuman logic of science had produced. The equilibrium could be restored only by civilisation destroying itself down to a level at which modern apparatus could no longer be produced, or by human nature adapting itself in its institutions to the new conditions. It was for the latter alternative that the assembly existed.

Sooner or later this choice would have confronted mankind. The sudden development of atomic science did but precipitate and render rapid and dramatic a clash between the new and the customary that had been gathering since ever the first flint was chipped or the first fire built together. From the day when man contrived himself a tool and suffered another male to draw near him, he ceased to be altogether a thing of instinct and untroubled convictions. From that day forth a widening breach can be traced between his egotistical passions and the social need. Slowly he adapted himself to the life of the homestead, and his passionate impulses widened out to the demands of the clan and the tribe. But widen though his impulses might, the latent hunter and wanderer and wonderer in his imagination outstripped their development. He was never quite subdued to the soil nor quite tamed to the home. Everywhere it needed teaching and the priest to keep him within the bounds of the plough-life and the beast-tending. Slowly a vast system of traditional imperatives superposed itself upon his instincts, imperatives that were admirably fitted to make him that cultivator, that cattle-mincer, who was for twice ten thousand years the normal man.

And, unpremeditated, undesired, out of the accumulations of his tilling came civilisation. Civilisation was the agricultural surplus. It appeared as trade and tracks and roads, it pushed boats out upon the rivers and presently invaded the seas, and within its primitive courts, within temples grown rich and leisurely and amidst the gathering medley of the seaport towns rose speculation and philosophy and science, and the beginning of the new order that has at last established itself as human life. Slowly at first, as we traced it, and then with an accumulating velocity, the new powers were fabricated.

Man as a whole did not seek them nor desire them; they were thrust into his hand. For a time men took up and used these new things and the new powers inadvertently as they came to him, recking nothing of the consequences. For endless generations change led him very gently. But when he had been led far enough, change quickened the pace. It was with a series of shocks that he realised at last that he was living the old life less and less and a new life more and more.

Already before the release of atomic energy the tensions between the old way of living and the new were intense. They were far intenser than they had been even at the collapse of the Roman imperial system. On the one hand was the ancient life of the family and the small community and the petty industry, on the other was a new life on a larger scale, with remoter horizons and a strange sense of purpose. Already it was growing clear that men must live on one side or the other. One could not have little tradespeople and syndicated businesses in the same market, sleeping carters and motor trolleys on the same road, bows and arrows and aeroplane sharpshooters in the same army, or illiterate peasant industries and power-driven factories in the same world. And still less it was possible that one could have the ideas and ambitions and greed and jealousy of peasants equipped with the vast appliances of the new age. If there had been no atomic bombs to bring together most of the directing intelligence of the world to that hasty conference at Brissago, there would still have been, extended over great areas and a considerable space of time perhaps, a less formal conference of responsible and understanding people upon the perplexities of this world-wide opposition. If the work of Holsten had been spread over centuries and imparted to the world by imperceptible degrees, it would nevertheless have made it necessary for men to take counsel upon and set a plan for the future. Indeed already there had been accumulating for a hundred years before the crisis a literature of foresight; there was a whole mass of 'Modern State' scheming available for the conference to go upon. These bombs did but accentuate and dramatise an already developing problem.

[***]

Coming in still closer, the investigator would have reached the police cordon, which was trying to check the desperate enterprise of those who would return to their homes or rescue their more valuable possessions within the 'zone of imminent danger.'

That zone was rather arbitrarily defined. If our spectator could have got permission to enter it, he would have entered also a zone of uproar, a zone of perpetual thunderings, lit by a strange purplish-red light, and quivering and swaying with the incessant explosion of the radio-active substance. Whole blocks of buildings were alight and burning fiercely, the trembling, ragged flames looking pale and ghastly and attenuated in comparison with the full-bodied crimson glare beyond. The shells of other edifices already burnt rose, pierced by rows of window sockets against the red-lit mist.

Every step farther would have been as dangerous as a descent within the

crater of an active volcano. These spinning, boiling bomb centres would shift or break unexpectedly into new regions, great fragments of earth or drain or masonry suddenly caught by a jet of disruptive force might come flying by the explorer's head, or the ground yawn a fiery grave beneath his feet. Few who adventured into these areas of destruction and survived attempted any repetition of their experiences. There are stories of puffs of luminous, radio-active vapour drifting sometimes scores of miles from the bomb centre and killing and scorching all they overtook. And the first conflagrations from the Paris centre spread westward half-way to the sea.

Moreover, the air in this infernal inner circle of red-lit ruins had a peculiar dryness and a blistering quality, so that it set up a soreness of the skin and lungs that was very difficult to heal. . . .

Such was the last state of Paris, and such on a larger scale was the condition of affairs in Chicago, and the same fate had overtaken Berlin, Moscow, Tokio, the eastern half of London, Toulon, Kiel, and two hundred and eighteen other centres of population or armament. Each was a flaming centre of radiant destruction that only time could quench, that indeed in many instances time has still to quench. To this day, though indeed with a constantly diminishing uproar and vigour, these explosions continue. In the map of nearly every country of the world three or four or more red circles, a score of miles in diameter, mark the position of the dying atomic bombs and the death areas that men have been forced to abandon around them. Within these areas perished museums, cathedrals, palaces, libraries, galleries of masterpieces, and a vast accumulation of human achievement, whose charred remains lie buried, a legacy of curious material that only future generations may hope to examine. . . .

[***]

Thence he must have assisted in the transmission of the endless cipher messages that preceded the gathering at Brissago, and there it was that the Brissago proclamation of the end of the war and the establishment of a world government came under his hands.

[***]

And now it was that the social possibilities of the atomic energy began to appear. The new machinery that had come into existence before the last wars increased and multiplied, and the council found itself not only with millions of hands at its disposal, but with power and apparatus that made its first conceptions of the work it had to do seem pitifully timid. The camps that were planned in iron and deal were built in stone and brass; the roads that were to have been mere iron tracks became spacious ways that insisted upon architecture; the cultivations of foodstuffs that were to have supplied emergency rations, were presently, with synthesisers, fertilisers, actinic light, and scientific direction, in excess of every human need.

The government had begun with the idea of temporarily reconstituting the social and economic system that had prevailed before the first coming of the atomic engine, because it was to this system that the ideas and habits of the

great mass of the world's dispossessed population was adapted. Subsequent rearrangement it had hoped to leave to its successors—whoever they might be. But this, it became more and more manifest, was absolutely impossible. As well might the council have proposed a revival of slavery. The capitalist system had already been smashed beyond repair by the onset of limitless gold and energy; it fell to pieces at the first endeavour to stand it up again. Already before the war half of the industrial class had been out of work, the attempt to put them back into wages employment on the old lines was futile from the outset—the absolute shattering of the currency system alone would have been sufficient to prevent that, and it was necessary therefore to take over the housing, feeding, and clothing of this worldwide multitude without exacting any return in labour whatever. In a little while the mere absence of occupation for so great a multitude of people everywhere became an evident social danger, and the government was obliged to resort to such devices as simple decorative work in wood and stone, the manufacture of hand-woven textiles, fruit-growing, flower-growing, and landscape gardening on a grand scale to keep the less adaptable out of mischief, and of paying wages to the younger adults for attendance at schools that would equip them to use the new atomic machinery. . . . So quite insensibly the council drifted into a complete reorganisation of urban and industrial life, and indeed of the entire social system.

[***]

The world had already been put upon one universal monetary basis. For some months after the accession of the council, the world's affairs had been carried on without any sound currency at all. Over great regions money was still in use, but with the most extravagant variations in price and the most disconcerting fluctuations of public confidence. The ancient rarity of gold upon which the entire system rested was gone. Gold was now a waste product in the release of atomic energy, and it was plain that no metal could be the basis of the monetary system again. Henceforth all coins must be token coins. Yet the whole world was accustomed to metallic money, and a vast proportion of existing human relationships had grown up upon a cash basis, and were almost inconceivable without that convenient liquidating factor. It seemed absolutely necessary to the life of the social organisation to have some sort of currency, and the council had therefore to discover some real value upon which to rest it. Various such apparently stable values as land and hours of work were considered. Ultimately the government, which was now in possession of most of the supplies of energy-releasing material, fixed a certain number of units of energy as the value of a gold sovereign, declared a sovereign to be worth exactly twenty marks, twenty-five francs, five dollars, and so forth, with the other current units of the world, and undertook, under various qualifications and conditions, to deliver energy upon demand as payment for every sovereign presented. On the whole, this worked satisfactorily. They saved the face of the pound sterling. Coin was rehabilitated, and after a phase of price fluctuations began to settle down to

definite equivalents and uses again, with names and everyday values familiar to the common run of people. . . .

[***]

‘You know, sir, I’ve a fancy—it is hard to prove such things—that civilisation was very near disaster when the atomic bombs came banging into it, that if there had been no Holsten and no induced radio-activity, the world would have—smashed—much as it did. Only instead of its being a smash that opened a way to better things, it might have been a smash without a recovery. It is part of my business to understand economics, and from that point of view the century before Holsten was just a hundred years’ crescendo of waste. Only the extreme individualism of that period, only its utter want of any collective understanding or purpose can explain that waste. Mankind used up material—insanely. They had got through three-quarters of all the coal in the planet, they had used up most of the oil, they had swept away their forests, and they were running short of tin and copper. Their wheat areas were getting weary and populous, and many of the big towns had so lowered the water level of their available hills that they suffered a drought every summer. The whole system was rushing towards bankruptcy. And they were spending every year vaster and vaster amounts of power and energy upon military preparations, and continually expanding the debt of industry to capital. The system was already staggering when Holsten began his researches. So far as the world in general went, there was no sense of danger and no desire for inquiry. They had no belief that science could save them, nor any idea that there was a need to be saved. They could not, they would not, see the gulf beneath their feet. It was pure good luck for mankind at large that any research at all was in progress. And as I say, sir, if that line of escape hadn’t opened, before now there might have been a crash, revolution, panic, social disintegration, famine, and—it is conceivable—complete disorder. . . . The rails might have rusted on the disused railways by now, the telephone poles have rotted and fallen, the big liners dropped into sheet-iron in the ports; the burnt, deserted cities become the ruinous hiding-places of gangs of robbers. We might have been brigands in a shattered and attenuated world. Ah, you may smile, but that had happened before in human history. The world is still studded with the ruins of broken-down civilisations. Barbaric bands made their fastness upon the Acropolis, and the tomb of Hadrian became a fortress that warred across the ruins of Rome against the Colosseum. . . . Had all that possibility of reaction ended so certainly in 1940? Is it all so very far away even now?’

‘It seems far enough away now,’ said Edith Haydon.

‘But forty years ago?’

‘No,’ said Karenin with his eyes upon the mountains, ‘I think you underrate the available intelligence in those early decades of the twentieth century. Officially, I know, politically, that intelligence didn’t tell—but it was there. And I question your hypothesis. I doubt if that discovery could have been delayed. There is a kind of inevitable logic now in the progress of

research. For a hundred years and more thought and science have been going their own way regardless of the common events of life. You see—*they have got loose*. If there had been no Holsten there would have been some similar man. If atomic energy had not come in one year it would have come in another. In decadent Rome the march of science had scarcely begun. . . . Nineveh, Babylon, Athens, Syracuse, Alexandria, these were the first rough experiments in association that made a security, a breathing-space, in which inquiry was born. Man had to experiment before he found out the way to begin. But already two hundred years ago he had fairly begun. . . . The politics and dignities and wars of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were only the last phoenix blaze of the former civilisation flaring up about the beginnings of the new. Which we serve. . . .

‘Man lives in the dawn for ever,’ said Karenin. ‘Life is beginning and nothing else but beginning. It begins everlastingly. Each step seems vaster than the last, and does but gather us together for the next. This Modern State of ours, which would have been a Utopian marvel a hundred years ago, is already the commonplace of life. But as I sit here and dream of the possibilities in the mind of man that now gather to a head beneath the shelter of its peace, these great mountains here seem but little things. . . .’”

While undoubtedly visionary, Wells’ book was more of a road map to the future, than a prophecy. It led Leo Szilard and Werner Heisenberg toward the development of an “atomic bomb”, as Wells called it, after Otto Hahn discovered nuclear fission.³³⁸⁰ Wells was very much aware of the impact his work might have on the future. He wrote,

“Man began to think. There were times when he was fed, when his lusts and his fears were all appeased, when the sun shone upon the squatting-place and dim stirrings of speculation lit his eyes. He scratched upon a bone and found resemblance and pursued it and began pictorial art, moulded the soft, warm clay of the river brink between his fingers, and found a pleasure in its patternings and repetitions, shaped it into the form of vessels, and found that it would hold water. He watched the streaming river, and wondered from what bountiful breast this incessant water came; he blinked at the sun and dreamt that perhaps he might snare it and spear it as it went down to its resting-place amidst the distant hills. Then he was roused to convey to his brother that once indeed he had done so—at least that some one had done so—he mixed that perhaps with another dream almost as daring, that one day a mammoth had been beset; and therewith began fiction—pointing a way to achievement—and the august prophetic procession of tales.”

Much of what Wells proposed on the scientific front was eventually fulfilled, and much of what he predicted may yet take place. Albert Einstein, picking up the theme from Emory Reves’ *The Anatomy of Peace* of 1945, took his script as the protagonist “Leblanc” in the atomic age from Wells’ *A World Set Free* of 1913, and stated, *inter*

alia,

“The release of atomic energy has not created a new problem. It has merely made more urgent the necessity of solving an existing one. One could say that it has affected us quantitatively, not qualitatively. So long as there are sovereign nations possessing great power, war is inevitable. That is not an attempt to say when it will come, but only that it is sure to come. That was true before the atomic bomb was made. What has been changed is the destructiveness of war. [***] The secret of the bomb should be committed to a world government, and the United States should immediately announce its readiness to give it to a world government.”³³⁸¹

Both Wells’ and Einstein’s call for a world government matched Judaic Messianic prophecies. Einstein promoted the two most fundamental goals of Jewish prophecy, the “restoration of the Jews to Palestine” and the formation of a world government after an apocalyptic war to end all wars.

Wells dedicated his book of 1913 not to Albert Einstein, but,

“TO FREDERICK SODDY’S ‘INTERPRETATION OF RADIUM’ THIS STORY, WHICH OWES LONG PASSAGES TO THE ELEVENTH CHAPTER OF THAT BOOK, ACKNOWLEDGES AND INSCRIBES ITSELF”

Frederick Soddy opposed Einstein and the theory of relativity. Soddy stated at the fourth gathering of Nobel Prize winners in Lindau on 30 June 1954 that the theory of relativity is a “swindle”—“an orgy of amateurish metaphysics” (Soddy’s lecture criticizing Einstein and the theory of relativity was “revised” before publication).³³⁸² Soddy stated in 1908:

“CHAPTER XI.

Why is radium unique among the elements?—Its rate of change only makes it remarkable—Uranium is more wonderful than radium— The energy stored up in a pound of uranium—Transmutation is the key to the internal energy of matter—The futility of ancient alchemy—The consequences if transmutation were possible— Primitive man and the art of kindling fire—Modern man and the problem of transmutation—Cosmical evolution and its sinews of war—Atomic disintegration a sufficient, if not the actual primary source of natural energy—Radioactivity and geology—Quantity of radium in the earth’s crust—The earth probably not a cooling globe—Mountain formation by means of radium—The temperature of the moon and planets—Ancient mythology and radioactivity—The serpent ‘Ouroboros’—The ‘Philosopher’s Stone’ and the ‘Elixir of Life’—The ‘Fall of Man’ and the ‘Ascent of Man’—The great extension in the possible duration of past time—Speculations on possible forgotten races of men—Radium and the struggle for existence—Existence as a struggle for physical energy—The new prospect.

THIS interpretation of radium is drawing to a close, but perhaps the more generally interesting part of it remains to be dealt with. We have steadily followed out the idea of atomic disintegration to its logical conclusions, so far as they can at present be drawn, and we have found it able to account for all the surprising discoveries that have been made in radioactivity, and capable of predicting many, and perhaps even more unexpected, new ones. Let us from the point of vantage we have gained return to the starting point of our inquiries and see what a profound change has come over it since the riddle has been read. Radium, a new element, giving out light and heat like Aladdin's lamp, apparently defying the law of the conservation of energy, and raising questions in physical science which seemed unanswerable, is no longer the radium we know. But although its mystery has vanished, its significance and importance have vastly gained. At first we were compelled to regard it as unique, dowered with potentialities and exhibiting peculiarities which raised it far above the ordinary run of common matter. The matter was the mere vehicle of ultra-material powers. If we now ask, why is radium so unique among the elements, the answer is not because it is dowered with any exceptional potentialities or because it contains any abnormal store of internal energy which other elements do not possess, but simply and solely because it is changing comparatively rapidly, whereas the elements before known are either changing not at all or so slowly that the change has been unperceived. At first sight this might seem an anti-climax. Yet it is not so. The truer view is that this one element has clothed with its own dignity the whole empire of common matter. The aspect which matter has presented to us in the past is but a consummate disguise, concealing latent energies and hidden activities beneath an hitherto impenetrable mask. The ultra-material potentialities of radium are the common possession of all that world to which in our ignorance we used to refer as mere inanimate matter. This is the weightiest lesson the existence of radium has taught us, and it remains to consider the easy but remorseless reasoning by which the conclusion is arrived at.

Two considerations will make the matter clear. In the first place, the radioactivity of radium at any moment is, strictly speaking, not a property of the mass of the radium at all, although it is proportional to the mass. The whole of the new set of properties is contributed by a very small fraction of the whole, namely, the part which is actually disintegrating at the moment of observation. The whole of the rest of the radium is as quiescent and inactive as any other non-radioactive element. In its whole chemical nature it is an ordinary element. The new properties are not contributed at all by the main part of the matter, but only by the minute fraction actually at the moment disintegrating.

Let us next compare and contrast radium with its first product, the emanation, and with its original parent, uranium. Uranium on the one hand, and the emanation on the other, represent, compared with radium, diametrically opposed extremes. Uranium is changing so slowly that it will

last for thousands of millions of years, the emanation so rapidly that it lasts only a few weeks, while radium is intermediate with a period of average life of two thousand five hundred years.

We have seen that in many ways the emanation is far more wonderful than radium, as the rate its energy is given out is relatively far greater. But this is compensated for by the far shorter time its activity lasts. Also, if we compared uranium with radium, we should say at once that radium is far more wonderful than the uranium, whereas in reality it is not so, as the uranium, changing almost infinitely more slowly, lasts almost infinitely longer.

The arresting character of radium is to be ascribed solely to the rate at which it happens to be disintegrating. The common element uranium, well known to chemists for a century before its radioactivity was suspected, is in reality even more wonderful. It is only very feebly radioactive, and therefore is changing excessively slowly, but it changes, we believe, into radium, expelling several α -particles and so evolving large amounts of energy in the process. Uranium is a heavier element than radium, and the relative weights of the two atoms, which is a measure of their complexity, is as 238 is to 226. This bottle contains about a pound of an oxide of uranium which contains about seven-eighths of its weight of the element uranium. In the course of the next few thousand million years, so far as we can tell, it will change, producing over thirteen ounces of radium, and, in that change into radium alone, energy is given out, as radioactive energy, aggregating of itself an enormous total, while the radium produced will also change, giving out a further enormous aggregate quantity of energy.

So that uranium, since it produces radium, contains all the energy contained in a but slightly smaller quantity of radium and more. It may be estimated that uranium evolves during complete disintegration at least some fourteen per cent more energy than is evolved from the same weight of radium. But what are we to say about the other heavy elements — lead, bismuth, mercury, gold, platinum, etc.—although their atoms are not quite so heavy as uranium or radium, and although none of them, so far as we yet know, are disintegrating at all? Is this enormous internal store of energy confined to the radioactive elements, that is to the few which, however slowly, are actually changing? Not at all, in all probability. Regarded merely as chemical elements between radioactive elements and non-radioactive elements, there exists so complete a parallelism that we cannot regard the radioactive elements as peculiar in possessing this internal store of energy, but only as peculiar in evolving it at a perceptible rate. Radium especially is so completely analogous in its whole chemical nature, and even in the character of its spectrum, to the non-radioactive elements, barium, strontium, and calcium, that chemists at once placed radium in the same family as these latter, and the value of its atomic weight confirms the arrangement in the manner required by the Periodic Law. It appears rather that this internal store of energy we learned of for the first time in connection with radium is

possessed to greater or lesser degree by all elements in common and is part and parcel of their internal structure.

Let us, however, for the sake of conciseness, leave out of account altogether the non-radioactive elements, of which as yet we know nothing certainly. At least we cannot escape from the conclusion that the particular element uranium has relatively more energy stored up within it even than radium. Uranium is a comparatively common element. The mines of Cornwall last year produced, I believe, over ten tons of uranium.

I have already referred to the total amount of energy evolved by radium during the course of its complete change. It is about a quarter of a million times as much energy as is evolved from the same weight of coal in burning. The energy evolved from uranium would be some fourteen per cent greater than from the same weight of radium. This bottle contains about one pound of uranium oxide, and therefore about fourteen ounces of uranium. Its value is about £1. Is it not wonderful to reflect that in this little bottle there lies asleep and waiting to be evolved the energy of at least one hundred and fifty tons of coal? The energy in a ton of uranium would be sufficient to light London for a year. The store of energy in uranium would be worth a thousand times as much as the uranium itself, if only it were under our control and could be harnessed to do the world's work in the same way as the stored energy in coal has been harnessed and controlled.

There is, it is true, plenty of energy in the world which is practically valueless. The energy of the tides and of the waste heat from steam fall into this category as useless and low-grade energy. But the internal energy of uranium is not of this kind. The difficulty is of quite another character. As we have seen, we cannot yet artificially accelerate or influence the rate of disintegration of an element, and therefore the energy in uranium, which requires a thousand million years to be evolved, is practically valueless. On the other hand, to increase the natural rate, and to break down uranium or any other element artificially, is simply transmutation. If we could accomplish the one so we could the other. These two great problems, at once the oldest and the newest in science, are one. Transmutation of the elements carries with it the power to unlock the internal energy of matter, and the unlocking of the internal stores of energy in matter would, strangely enough, be infinitely the most important and valuable consequence of transmutation.

Let us consider in the light of present knowledge the problem of transmutation, and see what the attempt of the alchemist involved. To build up an ounce of a heavy element like gold from a lighter element like silver would require in all probability the expenditure of the energy of some hundreds of tons of coal, so that the ounce of gold would be dearly bought. On the other hand, if it were possible artificially to disintegrate an element with a heavier atom than gold and produce gold from it, so great an amount of energy would probably be evolved that the gold in comparison would be of little account. The energy would be far more valuable than the gold. Although we are as ignorant as ever of how to set about transmutation, it

cannot be denied that the knowledge recently gained constitutes a very great help towards a proper understanding of the problem and its ultimate accomplishment. We see clearly the magnitude of the task and the insufficiency of even the most powerful of the forces at our disposal in a way not before appreciated, and we have now a clear perception of the tremendous issues at stake. Looking backwards at the great things science has already accomplished, and at the steady growth in power and fruitfulness of scientific method, it can scarcely be doubted that one day we shall come to break down and build up elements in the laboratory as we now break down and build up compounds, and the pulses of the world will then throb with a new force, of a strength as immeasurably removed from any we at present control as they in turn are from the natural resources of the human savage.

It is, indeed, a strange situation we are confronted with. The first step in the long, upward journey out of barbarism to civilisation which man has accomplished appears to have been the art of kindling fire. Those savage races who remain ignorant of this art are regarded as on the very lowest plane. The art of kindling fire is the first step towards the control and utilisation of those natural stores of energy on which civilisation even now absolutely depends. Primitive man existed entirely on the day-to-day supply of sunlight for his vital energy, before he learned how to kindle fire for himself. One can imagine before this occurred that he became acquainted with fire and its properties from naturally occurring conflagrations.

With reference to the newly recognised internal stores of energy in matter we stand to-day where primitive man first stood with regard to the energy liberated by fire. We are aware of its existence solely from the naturally occurring manifestations in radioactivity. At the climax of that civilisation the first step of which was taken in forgotten ages by primitive man, and just when it is becoming apparent that its ever-increasing needs cannot indefinitely be borne by the existing supplies of energy, possibilities of an entirely new material civilisation are dawning with respect to which we find ourselves still on the lowest plane—that of onlookers with no power to interfere. The energy which we require for our very existence, and which Nature supplies us with but grudgingly and in none too generous measure for our needs, is in reality locked up in immense stores in the matter all around us, but the power to control and use it is not yet ours. What sources of energy we can and do use and control, we now regard as but the merest leavings of Nature's primary supplies. The very existence of the latter till now have remained unknown and unsuspected. When we have learned how to transmute the elements at will the one into the other, then, and not till then, will the key to this hidden treasure-house of Nature be in our hands. At present we have no hint of how even to begin the quest.

The question has frequently been discussed whether transmutation, so impossible to us, is not actually going on under the transcendental conditions obtaining in the sun and the stars. We have seen that it is actually going on in the world under our eyes in a few special cases and at a very slow rate.

The possibility now under consideration, however, is rather that it may be going on universally or at least much more generally, and at much more rapid rate under celestial than under terrestrial conditions. From the new point of view it may be said at once that if it were so, many of the difficulties previously experienced in accounting for the enormous and incessant dissipation of energy throughout the universe would disappear.

Last century has wrought a great change in scientific thought as to the nature of the gigantic forces which have moulded the world to its present form and which regulated the march of events throughout the universe. At one time it was customary to regard the evolution of the globe as the result of a succession in the past times of mighty cataclysms and catastrophes beside which the eruptions of a Krakatoa or Peke would be insignificant. Now, however, we regard the main process of moulding as due rather to ever-present, continuous, and irresistible actions, which, though operating so slowly that over short periods of time their effect is imperceptible, yet in the epochs of the cosmical calendar effected changes so great and complete that the present features of the globe are but a passing incident of a continually shifting scene. Into the arena of these silent world-creating and destroying influences and processes has entered a new-corner—‘Radioactivity’—and it has not required long before it has come to be recognised that in the discovery of radioactivity, or rather of the sub-atomic powers and processes of which radioactivity is merely the outward and visible manifestation, we have penetrated one of Nature’s innermost secrets.

Whether or no the processes of continuous atomic disintegration bulk largely in the scheme of cosmical evolution, at least it cannot be gainsaid that these processes are at once powerful enough and slow enough to furnish a sufficient and satisfactory explanation of the origin of those perennial outpourings of energy by virtue of which the universe to-day is a going concern rather than a cold, lifeless collocation of extinct worlds. Slow, irresistible, incessant, unalterable, so apparently feeble that it has been reserved to the generation in which we live to discover, the processes of radioactivity, when translated in terms of a more extended scale of space and time, appear already as though they well may be the ultimate controlling factors of physical evolution. For slow processes of this kind do the effective work of Nature, and the occasional intermittent displays of Plutonic activity correspond merely to the creaking now and again of an otherwise silent mechanism that never stops.

It is one of the most pleasing features of this new work that geologists have been among the very first to recognise the applicability and importance of it in their science. I am not competent to deal adequately with or discuss the geological problems that it has raised. But this story would be incomplete if I did not refer, though it must be but briefly, to the labours of Professor Strutt who initiated the movement and to those of Professor Joly who has carried it on. These workers carried out careful analyses of the representative rocks in the earth’s crust for the amount of radium they contained.

Absolutely, the quantity of radium in common rocks is of course very small, although with the refined methods now at the disposal of investigators it is quite measurable. The important fact which has transpired, however, is that the rocks examined contain on the average much larger quantities of radium, and therefore necessarily of its original parent uranium, than might be expected. The amount of heat which finds its way in a given time from the interior of the globe to the surface and thence outwards into external space has long been accurately known. Strutt concluded that if there existed only a comparatively thin crust of rocks less than fifty miles thick of the same composition, as regards the content of radium, as the average of those he examined, the radium in them would supply the whole of the heat lost by the globe to outer space. He concluded that the surface rocks must form such a thin crust, and that the interior of the globe must be an entirely different kind of material, free from the presence of radium. Otherwise the world would be much hotter inside than is known to be the case. So far then as the earth is concerned, a quantity of radium less than in all probability actually exists would supply all the heat lost to outer space. So that there is no difficulty in accounting for the necessary source of heat to maintain the existing conditions of temperature on the earth over a period of past time as long as the uranium which produces the radium lasts, that is to say, for a period of thousands of millions of years.

Professor Joly in his Presidential Address to the Geology section of the British Association at Dublin in 1908 has considered in detail the effect of the radium in the rocks of the Simplon Tunnel in producing the unexpectedly high temperatures there encountered, and has come to the conclusion that without undue assumptions it is possible to explain the differences in the temperature of the rocks by the differences in their radium content. He went on to propound a new theory of mountain formation on the lines that local concentrations of radium, brought about by sedimentation, cause local increases of temperature in the earth's crust. At these places the strength of the crust to stress is weakened, conditioning its upheaval and folding and even over-thrusting for many miles, with the formation of mountain ranges. The rhythmic succession of periods of sedimentation followed by upheaval many times repeated is the common theory of mountain formation. In the concentration of radium in the sedimentary deposit Joly finds a sufficient explanation of and cause for the next subsequent upheaval.

Leaving this globe and taking a survey of the solar system, it has always struck me as remarkable that the temperature of the constituent worlds so far as we know them seems to be roughly in proportion to their size. The moon we regard as quite cold. The Earth and Mars have similar temperatures, while Jupiter and Saturn are probably nearly red-hot. Of course this agrees well enough with the old idea that these bodies were steadily cooling, the process being the slower the greater the mass. But it agrees also with the newer idea that the temperature is probably more or less constant, as the result of an equilibrium in which the heat lost by radiation is counterbalanced by new

internal sources of heat provided by slow atomic disintegrations.

With regard to the sun itself, it is certain that the loss of heat cannot be supplied by the presence of radium. For this to be the case a very large part of the sun's mass must consist of uranium, and this we know from the spectroscopy is very improbable. Still it is by no means to be concluded that the heat of the sun and stars is not in the first place of internal rather than, as has been the custom to regard it, of external origin. Obviously we are only at the beginning of our knowledge of the internal stores of energy in matter, and the mere fact that these stores existed, and in a few actual cases within our knowledge were slowly evolved and became available for the purposes of cosmical evolution, justified us in regarding them as the probable, as they were certainly the sufficient, first source from which the available energy of all Nature was derived.

There is one other sphere in which these discoveries touch human life strangely into which I cannot forbear altogether from entering, although I am all unfitted to act as guide. Radioactivity has accustomed us in the laboratory to the matter-of-fact investigation of processes which require for their completion thousands of millions of years. In one sense the existence of such processes may be said largely to have annihilated time. That is to say, at one bound the limits of the possible extent of past and future time have been enormously extended. We are no longer merely the dying inhabitants of a world itself slowly dying, for the world, as we have seen, has in itself, in the internal energy of its own material constituents, the means, if not the ability, to rejuvenate itself perennially. It is, of course, true, *upon present existing knowledge*, that the extent of the possible duration of time is merely increased and that on the new scale exactly the same principles apply as before. Yet the increase is so extensive that it practically constitutes a reversal of the older views. At the same time, it will be admitted that physical science can no longer, as at one time she felt justified in doing, impose a definite limit to the continuance of the existing conditions of things. The idea that evolution is proceeding in continuous cycles, without beginning and without end, in which the waste energy of one part of the cycle is transformed in another part of the cycle back into available forms, is at least as possible and conceivable in the present state of knowledge as the older idea, which was based on a too wide application of those laws of the availability of energy we have found to hold within our own experience. It remains for the future to decide whether what happens to be at present our sole experience of the laws of energy does apply, as has hitherto been quite definitely assumed, to the universe as a whole, and to all the conditions therein within which it is impossible for us to perform our experiments. This reservation is one legitimate consequence of the recent ideas, for we have learnt from them how easy it is to give to the generalisations of physical science a universal application they do not in fact possess.

If, then, the world is no longer slowly dying from exhaustion, but bears within itself its own means of regeneration, so that it may continue to exist

in much the same physical condition as at present for thousands of millions of years, what about Man? The revelations of radioactivity have removed the physical difficulties connected with the sufficiency of the supply of natural energy, which previously had been supposed to limit the duration of man's existence on this planet, but it adds of itself nothing new to our knowledge as to whether man has shared with the world its more remote history. Here again it is interesting and harmless to indulge in a little speculation, and I may mention one rather striking point.

It is curious how strangely some of the old myths and legends about matter and man appear in the light of the recent knowledge. Consider, for example, the ancient mystic symbol of matter, known as Ouroboros—'the tail devourer'—which was a serpent, coiled into a circle with the head devouring the tail, and bearing the central motto 'The whole is one.' This symbolises evolution, moreover it is evolution in cycle—the latest possibility—and stranger still it is evolution of matter—again the very latest aspect of evolution—the existence of which was strenuously denied by Clerk Maxwell and others of only last century. The idea which arises in one's mind as the most attractive and consistent explanation of the universe in light of present knowledge, is perhaps that matter is breaking down and its energy being evolved and degraded in one part of a cycle of evolution, and in another part still unknown to us, the matter is being again built up with the utilisation of the waste energy. The consequence would be that, in spite of the incessant changes, an equilibrium condition would result, and continue indefinitely. If one wished to symbolise such an idea, in what better way could it be done than by the ancient tail-devouring serpent?

Some of the beliefs and legends which have come down to us from antiquity are so universal and deep-rooted that we are accustomed to consider them almost as old as the race itself. One is tempted to inquire how far the unsuspected aptness of some of these beliefs and sayings to the point of view so recently disclosed is the result of mere chance or coincidence, and how far it may be evidence of a wholly unknown and unsuspected ancient civilisation of which all other relic has disappeared. It is curious to reflect, for example, upon the remarkable legend of the philosopher's stone, one of the oldest and most universal beliefs, the origin of which, however far back we penetrate into the records of the past, we do not seem to be able to trace to its source. The philosopher's stone was accredited the power not only of transmuting the metals, but of acting *as the elixir of life*. Now, whatever the origin of this apparently meaningless jumble of ideas may have been, it is really a perfect and but very slightly allegorical expression of the actual present views we hold to-day. It does not require much effort of the imagination to see in energy the life of the physical universe, and the key to the primary fountains of the physical life of the universe to-day is known to be transmutation. Is then this old association of the power of transmutation with the elixir of life merely a coincidence? I prefer to believe it may be an echo from one of many previous epochs in the unrecorded history of the world, of an age of men

which have trod before the road we are treading to-day, in a past possibly so remote that even the very atoms of its civilisation literally have had time to disintegrate.

Let us give the imagination a moment's further free scope in this direction, however, before closing. What if this point of view that has now suggested itself is true, and we may trust ourselves to the slender foundation afforded by the traditions and superstitions which have been handed down to us from a prehistoric time? Can we not read into them some justification for the belief that some former forgotten race of men attained not only to the knowledge we have so recently won, but also to the power that is not yet ours? Science has reconstructed the story of the past as one of a continuous Ascent of Man to the present-day level of his powers. In face of the circumstantial evidence existing of this steady upward progress of the race, the traditional view of the Fall of Man from a higher former state has come to be more and more difficult to understand. From our new standpoint the two points of view are by no means so irreconcilable as they appeared. A race which could transmute matter would have little need to earn its bread by the sweat of its brow. If we can judge from what our engineers accomplish with their comparatively restricted supplies of energy, such a race could transform a desert continent, thaw the frozen poles, and make the whole world one smiling Garden of Eden. Possibly they could explore the outer realms of space, emigrating to more favourable worlds as the superfluous to-day emigrate to more favourable continents. One can see also that such dominance may well have been short-lived. By a single mistake, the relative positions of Nature and man as servant and master would, as now, become reversed, but with infinitely more disastrous consequences, so that even the whole world might be plunged back again under the undisputed sway of Nature, to begin once more its upward toilsome journey through the ages. The legend of the Fall of Man possibly may indeed be the story of such a past calamity.

I cannot fittingly conclude this series of lectures without, however inadequately, directing attention to one further outstanding feature of general interest, which this interpretation of radium will in the course of time bring home to all thoughtful minds.

The vistas of new thought which have opened out in all directions in the physical sciences, to which man is merely incidental and external, have in turn reacted powerfully upon those departments of thought in which man is central and supreme. I am aware that in this field, concerned with the most profound of all questions — the relation of man to his external environment — it has lately been the custom for the physicist not to intrude. This phase of opinion is perhaps somewhat of the nature of a reaction from the other extreme of an earlier generation, in which science arrogated to itself the right to pronounce the final judgment upon the questions in dispute. At least it will be admitted that if the progress of physical science completely transforms, as it has recently so transformed, our notions of the outer world in which we

live, its claim to be heard upon the relations of this world to its inhabitants cannot be resisted. Another reason why perhaps the physicist has hesitated to encroach too directly upon the eternal problems of life has been that he could contribute little of hope or comfort for the race from his philosophy. In the past his conclusions concerning physical evolution and destiny have intensified rather than lightened the existing gloom. To what purpose is the incessant upward struggle of civilisation which history and the biological sciences has made us aware of, if its arena is a slowly dying world, destined to carry ultimately all it bears to one inevitable doom? At least this reason for silence no longer exists. We find ourselves in consequence of the progress of physical science at the pinnacle of one ascent of civilisation, taking the first step upwards out on to the lowest plane of the next. Above us still rises indefinitely the ascent to physical power—far beyond the dreams of mortals in any previous system of philosophy. These possibilities of a newer order of things, of a more exalted material destiny than any which have been foretold, are not the promise of another world. They exist in this, to be fought and struggled for in the old familiar way, to be wrung from the grip of Nature, as all our achievements and civilisation have, in the past, been wrung by the labour of the collective brain of mankind guiding, directing, and multiplying the individual's puny power. This is the message of hope and inspiration to the race which radium has contributed to the great problems of existence. No attempt at presentation of this new subject could be considered complete which did not, however imperfectly, suggest something of this side.

Released as physical science now is from the feeling of hopelessness in dealing with such matters, and at the same time in possession of vast generalisations concerning matter and energy of more than mere abstract significance to the race, it is fitting to attempt to see how far purely physical considerations will take us in delimiting the major controlling influences which regulate our existence.

It is possible, without breaking any of the new ground, to go a long way. Just as you must feed a child at school before it can be educated, as you must provide a man with the possibility of something more than a brute struggle for life before he can be civilised, so generally in the same sense the physical conditions which encircle existence of necessity take precedence over every other consideration. Whatever other aspect of life is considered, and they are many and as yet but little dealt with by science for the most part, the physical aspect comes first, in the sense that if the physical conditions of life are unfavourable, nothing can be expected of any higher aspect.

Surveying the long chequered, but on the whole continuous, ascent of man from primeval conditions to the summit of his present-day powers, what has it all been at bottom but a fight with Nature for energy—for that ordinary physical energy of which we have said so much? Physical science sums up accurately in that one generalisation the most fundamental aspect of life in the sense already defined.

Of course life depends also on a continual supply of matter as well as on

a continual supply of energy, but the struggle or physical energy is probably the more fundamental and general aspect of existence in all its forms. The same matter, the same chemical elements, serve the purposes of life over and over again, but the supply of fresh energy must be continuous. By the law of the availability of energy, which, whether universal or not, applies universally within our own experience, the transformations of energy which occur in Nature are invariably in the one direction, the more available forms passing into the waste and useless unavailable kind, and this process, so far as we yet know, is never reversed. The same energy is available but once. The struggle for existence is at the bottom a continuous struggle for fresh physical energy.

This is as far as the knowledge available last century went. What is now the case? The aboriginal savage, ignorant of agriculture and of the means of kindling fire, perished from cold and hunger unless he subsisted as a beast of prey and succeeded in plundering and devouring other animals. Although the potentialities of warmth and food existed all round him, and must have been known to him from natural processes, he knew not yet how to use them for his own purposes. It is much the same to-day. With all our civilisation, we still subsist, struggling among ourselves for a sufficiency of the limited supply of physical energy available, while all around are vast potentialities of the means of sustenance, we know of from naturally occurring processes, but do not yet know how to use or control. Radium has taught us that there is no limit to the amount of energy in the world available to support life, save only the limit imposed by the boundaries of knowledge.

It cannot be denied that, so far as the future is concerned, an entirely new prospect has been opened up. By these achievements of experimental science Man's inheritance has increased, his aspirations have been uplifted, and his destiny has been ennobled to an extent beyond our present power to foretell. The real wealth of the world is its energy, and by these discoveries it, for the first time, transpires that the hard struggle for existence on the bare leavings of natural energy in which the race has evolved is no longer the only possible or enduring lot of Man. It is a legitimate aspiration to believe that one day he will attain the power to regulate for his own purposes the primary fountains of energy which Nature now so jealously conserves for the future. The fulfilment of this aspiration is, no doubt, far off, but the possibility alters somewhat the relation of Man to his environment, and adds a dignity of its own to the actualities of existence.³³⁸³

16.4 The Inertia of Energy

Maxwell's equations implicitly contain the formula $E = mc^2$. Simon Newcomb pioneered the concept of relativistic energy in 1889.³³⁸⁴ Preston, J. J. Thomson,³³⁸⁵ Poincaré,³³⁸⁶ Olinto De Pretto,³³⁸⁷ Fritz Hasenöhr,³³⁸⁸ [etc. etc. etc.] each effectively (Albert Einstein, himself, did not expressly state it in 1905), or directly, presented

the formula $E = m c^2$, before 1905, and Max Planck³³⁸⁹ refined the concept in 1906-1908, including Galileo's,³³⁹⁰ Huyghens',³³⁹¹ Newton's,³³⁹² Boscovich's,³³⁹³ Schopenhauer's,³³⁹⁴ Mach's,³³⁹⁵ Bolliger's,³³⁹⁶ Geissler's,³³⁹⁷ Bessel's,³³⁹⁸ Stas',³³⁹⁹ Eötvös',³⁴⁰⁰ Kreichgauer's,³⁴⁰¹ Landolt's,³⁴⁰² Heydweiller's³⁴⁰³ and Hecker's implications that inertial mass and gravitational mass are equivalent—before Albert Einstein.³⁴⁰⁴ Einstein was familiar with Poincaré's 1900 paper, which implicitly contained the formula $E = m c^2$, and which presented the method for synchronizing clocks with light signals that Einstein copied without an attribution.³⁴⁰⁵

With respect to Planck's equation,³⁴⁰⁶ G. N. Lewis gave us relativistic mass in 1908,³⁴⁰⁷ and in 1909,

“drew attention to the formula for the kinetic energy

$$\frac{m_0 c^2}{(1 - v^2 / c^2)^{1/2}} - m_0 c^2$$

and suggested that the last term should be interpreted as the energy of the particle at rest.”³⁴⁰⁸

Louis Rougier's *Philosophy and the New Physics*³⁴⁰⁹ contains much useful information on this subject. Max Jammer's *Concepts of Mass in Classical and Modern Physics*³⁴¹⁰ is yet more detailed, and Whittaker's *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity* in two volumes is phenomenal.

Poincaré, merely reiterating a common conception at the time, stated in 1904,

“The calculations of Abraham and the experiments of Kaufmann have then shown that the mechanical mass, properly so called, is null, and that the mass of the electrons, or, at least, of the negative electrons, is of exclusively electro-dynamic origin. This forces us to change the definition of mass; we cannot any longer distinguish mechanical mass and electrodynamic mass, since then the first would vanish; there is no mass other than electrodynamic inertia. But, in this case the mass can no longer be constant, it augments with the velocity, and it even depends on the direction, and a body animated by a notable velocity will not oppose the same inertia to the forces which tend to deflect it from its route, as to those which tend to accelerate or to retard its progress.”³⁴¹¹

Alexander Bain expressly stated in 1870 that,

“matter, force, and inertia, are three names for substantially the same fact”

and,

“force and matter are not two things, but one thing”

and,

“force, inertia, momentum, matter, are all but one fact”.³⁴¹²

For Oliver Heaviside, in 1889, this fact was electromagnetism, the “electric force of inertia.”³⁴¹³

Schopenhauer stated the mass energy equivalence in 1819 in his book *The World as Will and Representation*,

“Force and substance are inseparable, because at bottom they are one; for, as Kant has shown, matter itself is given to us only as the union of forces, that of expansion and that of attraction. Therefore there exists no opposition between force and substance; on the contrary, they are precisely one.”³⁴¹⁴

While discussing Schopenhauer’s system, William Caldwell stated in 1893,

“But some physicists have maintained that matter itself may be reduced to force, and modern psycho-physics has suggested that consciousness may be regarded as only psychical force—a higher kind of force doubtless than the various forms of energy with which we are familiar, but still a force which may be determined both qualitatively and quantitatively.”³⁴¹⁵

Stephen Moulton Babcock stated that the mass of a body was a function of its energy content in 1903, though he claimed that as a body absorbed energy its mass decreased,

“PROFESSOR Stephen Moulton Babcock, who recently gave the world a new scientific truth in proving, after twenty years of research, that objects vary in weight according to their temperature, thus capped a long career of successful invention and discovery. [***] Scientists, however, have of late been concerned more with Doctor Babcock’s recent discovery involving the origin and nature of matter. Always observing and with a mind ‘budding and sprouting’ with new ideas, Doctor Babcock more than twenty years ago took issue with that feature of the atomic theory which assumes that the atoms of a given element are all precisely alike. His doubts led him into a series of experiments which finally brought him to the surprising conclusion that when a chemical change takes place within a hermetically sealed flask the substances within lose in weight if heat is absorbed in the process and increase in weight if heat is given off.

To test this result on a larger scale and with greater accuracy than had hitherto been possible, Doctor Babcock invented a form of hydrostatic balance which makes it possible to detect a difference of weight in a given substance amounting to only one unit in a hundred million. With such a

balance he found a perceptible difference between the weight of a piece of ice and that of the water resulting from the melting of the same ice.

This change of weight appears to depend solely upon the increase or decrease in the quantity of heat, or, in other words, in the energy inherent in the substance tested, and Doctor Babcock, therefore, summarizes his results in this far-reaching formula: ‘The weight of a body is an inverse function of its inherent energy.’ In other words, elements in combining or in changing their physical condition change in weight as they change in heat—they grow lighter as they grow hotter, and heavier as they cool. By implication this theory may be extended to include all matter, and if further experiments justify such a daring generalization we may go a step further and assume that, by a sufficient increase in the inherent energy of what we call matter, its weight, and therefore its mass—for weight is but a measure of mass—will entirely disappear.

If these revolutionary views can maintain themselves against the criticism which they are certain to arouse they may be justly said to constitute one of the greatest of scientific generalizations. It is an interpretation of the law of gravitation and, indeed, stands next to it in importance. The physical theory that all interstellar space is filled with ether, to which is attributed the properties of infinite energy and of absolute lack of weight, is corroborated by Doctor Babcock’s theory: ‘Since, when the energy stored upon any given atom is increased, its weight is thereby diminished, and infinite energy means of necessity zero weight.’³⁴¹⁶

Frederick Soddy stated in 1904,

“The work of Kaufmann may be taken as an experimental proof of the increase of apparent mass of the electron when its speed approaches that of light. Since during disintegration electrons are expelled at speeds very near that of light, which, after expulsion, experience resistance and suffer diminution of velocity, the total mass must be less after disintegration than before. On this view atomic mass must be regarded as a function of the internal energy, and the dissipation of the latter in radio-activity occurs at the expense, to some extent at least, of the mass of the system”³⁴¹⁷

Thomson defined the inertia of his vortex atom based on its energy content. A. E. Dolbear wrote in this context that,

“Hence, inertia, too, must be looked upon as probably due to motion”,

and,

“It is not *simply* an amount of material, but the *energy* the material has, which gives it its characteristic properties.”³⁴¹⁸

Sir Oliver Lodge wrote,

“[The theory of relativity] attributes inertia to energy (not for the first time).”³⁴¹⁹

Boscovich claimed that inertia is a relative quantity, and is not absolute.³⁴²⁰ The pantheist John Toland argued that energy is essential to matter in his *Letters to Serena* in 1704.³⁴²¹ These same concepts are to be found in Heraclitus and in Aristotle, for example,

“Wherefore, it is evident, that substance and form are each of them a certain energy. And therefore, according to this reasoning, it is evident that in substance energy is prior to potentiality. And, as we have stated, one energy invariably is antecedent to another in time, up to that which is primarily and eternally the moving cause.”³⁴²²

16.5 The Einsteins’ Energy Fudge

Herbert Ives published a paper in 1952, which argued that Einstein employed the irrational method of *Petitio Principii* in “deriving” the mass-energy equivalence in 1905. This evinces a repeated pattern of Einstein’s irrationality, on top of his pattern of unoriginality, each signifying one goal—plagiarism,

“In 1905 Einstein published a paper with the interrogatory title ‘Does the Inertia of a Body Depend upon its Energy Content?’, [A. Einstein, *Ann. Physik* **18**, 639 (1905).] a question already answered in the affirmative by Hasenöhrl. This paper, which has been widely cited as being the first proof of the ‘inertia of energy as such,’ describes an emission process by two sets of observations, in different units, the resulting equations being then subtracted from each other. It should be obvious *a priori* that the only proper result of such a procedure is to give $0 = 0$, that is, no information about the process can be so obtained. However the fallacy of Einstein’s argument not having been heretofore explicitly pointed out, the following analysis is presented: [***] What Einstein did by setting down these equations (as ‘clear’) was to *introduce* the relation

$$L / (m - m') c^2 = 1.$$

Now this is the very relation the derivation was supposed to yield. It emerges from Einstein’s manipulation of observations by two observers because it has been slipped in by the assumption which Planck questioned. The relation $E = m_M c^2$ was not derived by Einstein.”³⁴²³

Following Ives, Max Jammer wrote that,

“the mass of the body relative to S , before and after the emission,

$$T'_0 = m_0 c^2 \left[\frac{1}{(1 - v^2/c^2)^{1/2}} - 1 \right] \tag{7}$$

and

$$T'_1 = m_1 c^2 \left[\frac{1}{(1 - v^2/c^2)^{1/2}} - 1 \right]. \tag{8}$$

Einstein now mistakenly put $E_0' - E_0$ equal to $T_0' + C$ (C is a constant) and $E_1' - E_1$ equal to $T_1' + C$, and thus obtained by subtraction and in virtue of Eq. (6),

$$T'_0 - T'_1 = E \left[\frac{1}{(1 - v^2/c^2)^{1/2}} - 1 \right] \tag{9}$$

[. . .]whereas, in view of Eqs. (7) and (8) he should have obtained

$$T'_0 - T'_1 = (m_0 - m_1) c^2 \left[\frac{1}{(1 - v^2/c^2)^{1/2}} - 1 \right], \tag{11}$$

[. . .]we see that Einstein unwittingly assumed that

$$\frac{E}{(m_0 - m_1) c^2} = 1, \tag{14}$$

which is exactly the contention to be proved.³⁴²⁴

Lloyd S. Swenson, Jr. wrote,

“Curiously, Einstein’s own first derivation of the famous formula $E = m c^2$ was incorrect in the sense of begging the question of what was to be proved. Growing out of Einstein’s subliminal obsession with the operational meaning of the constancy of the velocity of light, the mass-energy equivalence

$$m = \frac{E}{c^2}$$

had been assumed in interior calculations as

$$\frac{E}{m c^2} = 1$$

and thus the equivalences

$$E = m c^2$$

$$\frac{E}{c^2} = m$$

and

$$\sqrt{E/m} = c$$

were embedded in the premises, therefore predetermined in the conclusion. Though right for the wrong reasons at first, Einstein caught his mistakes and redressed his deductions in further publications in 1906 and 1907.³⁴²⁵

16.6 Hero Worship

Webster's New World Dictionary defines "relativity" as, *inter alia*,

"4. *Physics* the fact, principle, or theory of the relative [***] as developed and mathematically formulated by Albert Einstein and H. A. Lorentz in the **special (or restricted) theory of relativity**".³⁴²⁶

Grolier's *Encyclopedia International*, states, under "Relativity, Theory of", as follows,

"To explain this paradoxical result, G. F. FitzGerald and, independently, H. A. Lorentz suggested that the effect of the ether flow on the speed of light was masked by a contraction of the measuring apparatus caused by its motion through the ether. But J. H. Poincaré and Einstein independently realized that, since all efforts to detect the earth's absolute motion had failed, the principle of relativity must somehow be valid after all, despite the ether."³⁴²⁷

Subsequent to learning of FitzGerald's prior work, Lorentz never failed to acknowledge that FitzGerald had anticipated him, unlike Albert Einstein, who failed to cite Poincaré's work, which we know Einstein had read before 1905, in the Einsteins' 1905 paper, or in any of the expositions on the subject which Einstein later published in 1907, 1910, 1911, 1912 or 1916. Poincaré published his conclusions in 1895, ten years before Einstein, and repeated them often in widely read books and journals.

We know, from Solovine's accounts,³⁴²⁸ that Einstein had extensively read

Poincaré. Poincaré first stated the principle of relativity ten years before Mileva and Albert, who then parroted one version of Poincaré's principle in almost identical form in 1905, and certainly not "independently". The Einsteins copied Poincaré's clock synchronization with lights signals procedure virtually verbatim, as well as his exposition on relative simultaneity and we know that Albert had read Poincaré's explanations before copying them without an attribution.

Why is Albert Einstein's name associated with the "principle of relativity", and not Poincaré's? Poincaré stated it first, ten years before the Einsteins, and the Einsteins copied it from him.

Who is to blame for this injustice? What could possibly motivate them, other than ethnic bias, ethnic guilt, self-doubt and/or hero worship? The facts are clear to all who are willing to look. Albert Einstein did not originate the special theory of relativity. That is clear.

Grolier's *Encyclopedia International* states under "Poincaré, Jules Henri",

"In 1905 Poincaré showed that Maxwell's equations suggested a theory different from classical Newtonian mechanics. He thus anticipated an aspect of the theory of relativity derived independently by Einstein in the same year."³⁴²⁹

Poincaré, Lorentz, Larmor, Langevin, FitzGerald, Lange and Voigt anticipated Einstein on all important aspects of the theory.

Grolier's *Encyclopedia International* states in its article "Lorentz, Hendrik Antoon",

"By extending Maxwell's electromagnetic theory of light, [Lorentz] incorporated many phenomena that it so far had failed to explain—in particular, the optical and electrical phenomena associated with moving bodies. His name is most widely known for the Lorentz contraction (or the Lorentz-Fitzgerald contraction), which says that a body moving with a velocity near that of light contracts in the direction of its motion. This forms an important part of the special theory of relativity."³⁴³⁰

The facts stated together record that, as Whittaker stated,

"Einstein published a paper which set forth the relativity theory of Poincaré and Lorentz with some amplifications, and which attracted much attention. He asserted as a fundamental principle the *constancy of the velocity of light*, i.e. that the velocity of light *in vacuo* is the same in all systems of reference which are moving relatively to each other: an assertion which at the time was widely accepted, but has been severally criticized by later writers."

Instead of proving that Einstein was a pioneer, the facts indicate that, as Max Born stated,

“[Einstein’s] paper ‘Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper’ in *Annalen der Physik* [***] contains not a single reference to previous literature. It gives you the impression of quite a new venture. But that is, of course, [***] not true.”

Since Poincaré and Lorentz developed the theory, why aren’t their names not only linked to the theory, but universally linked together? What makes the image of “Einstein” so sacrosanct, that it is today virtually a crime to tell the truth about the history of the special theory of relativity? Why, in the majority of the histories of the special theory of relativity, isn’t Einstein, with his minor contribution of the relativistic equations for aberration and the Doppler-Fizeau effect (together with his many blunders), the curious footnote of a persistent copycat, and not the central theme? Certainly, it is more convenient to briefly credit Einstein with everything, but, since the ideas are considered so significant, one would think the originators deserve their due credit.

Many people knew that Einstein did not hold priority for much of what he wrote. Einstein, himself, was keenly aware of it. R. S. Shankland stated,

“About publicity Einstein told me that he had been *given* a publicity value which he did not *earn*. Since he had it he would use it if it would do good; otherwise not.”³⁴³¹

Einstein stated on 27 April 1948,

“In the course of my long life I have received from my fellow-men far more recognition than I deserve, and I confess that my sense of shame has always outweighed my pleasure therein.”³⁴³²

Einstein told Peter A. Bucky,

“Peter, I fully realize that many people listen to me not because they agree with me or because they like me particularly, but because I am Einstein. If a man has this rare capacity to have such esteem with his fellow men, then it is his obligation and duty to use this power to do good for his fellow men.”³⁴³³

It is not uncommon for grandiose myths to accrue to overly idealized popular figures, including Albert Einstein. Theoretical Physics, as a field, was small, and not well known in the period from 1905-1919. Theoretical physicists were not well known, and, since those in the field knew that Einstein was a plagiarist, they largely ignored him.

In 1919, (on dubious grounds³⁴³⁴) Dyson, Davidson and Eddington, made Einstein internationally famous by affirming that experiment had confirmed, without an attribution to Soldner, Soldner’s 1801 hypothesis, that the gravitational field of the sun should curve the path of light from the stars.³⁴³⁵ Shortly after that, Einstein

won the Nobel Prize, though it is unclear why he won it, other than as a reward for his new-found fame for reiterating Soldner's ideas, and for his pacifist stance during the First World War.

Einstein did not invent the atomic bomb. In fact, he was ignorant of the concepts behind the bomb. However, with the help of Alexander Sachs, Einstein was asked to sign a letter to President Roosevelt urging him to instigate what would eventually become the "Manhattan Project", the effort to develop an atomic bomb before the Nazis. Due to his ignorance, Leo Szilard and Eugene Wigner had to explain the concepts of the atomic bomb to Einstein, before he would sign the letter.³⁴³⁶

Einstein stated on 20 September 1952,

"My part in producing the atomic bomb consisted in a single act: I signed a letter to President Roosevelt, pressing the need for experiments on a large scale in order to explore the possibilities for the production of an atomic bomb."³⁴³⁷

Note that Einstein signed, but did not write, the letter; and that his only contribution to the development of the bomb was his signature.

Given Einstein's rôle as a spokesperson for those who knew of the concept of the bomb, one may wonder, did Einstein frequently become the political toy of others? Consider Joffe's description of the man,

"Einstein's thoughts were far away from political problems and this is why many of Einstein's speeches in this field were poorly thought out. For example: Once in the late twenties, a group of German scientists published an anti-Soviet appeal at the end of which I found Einstein's signature. When I showed this to him, and asked why he did it, he answered that he did not think about it, but he signed it because Planck telephoned him. I asked Einstein if he is on the side of Prussian capitalism in this fight for the new socialistic state against the old. And he replied, 'Of course not, I would not have signed it if I knew about the consequences. In the future, I will not participate in any political movements without consulting you.' And also, in my opinion, Einstein's support of Zionism was ill-conceived. His wife even convinced him to participate in a concert, which Zionists had organized in a synagogue. And one more example is Einstein's fascination with the American idea of a 'single state', which idea in essence was created in order to discredit each nation's movement toward independence, and to make it easier for big and rich countries to take over and exploit small ones. And Einstein, in the beginning, would only look at the façade of things and not look deeper into their true meaning."³⁴³⁸

Einstein, according to Joffe, was political "play dough".

On 15 March 1921, Kurt Blumenfeld warned Chaim Weizmann that it would be unwise to let Einstein make speeches during his trip to America on behalf of the Zionists,

“Einstein is a poor speaker and often says things out of naiveté that are unwelcome to us[.]”³⁴³⁹

In December of 1930, the National German-Jewish Union told Einstein to stop prostituting science for his political agenda and to stop stereotyping Jewish people with his bigoted segregationist Zionist nationalism.³⁴⁴⁰ Einstein was forced to defend himself after World War II from the charges of Jewish anti-Zionists that his Zionism was destructive nationalism.³⁴⁴¹

Why was Einstein, who had not known of, or understood, the concept of an atomic bomb, chosen to write to the President of the United States in an effort to persuade him to pursue research to make one? Was the popular image of the man far more potent than his mind?

When said program to develop an atomic bomb began, Einstein was not asked to participate, but rather was excluded from the research team. Why was Einstein, supposedly the most brilliant human being of all time, not a member of the team which developed the bomb, and upon whose work the fate of all of humanity might rest? Did Oppenheimer know that Einstein lacked the abilities needed to contribute to the research? It was apparently enough that Einstein’s celebrity was exploited to draw attention to the need for research. That was Einstein’s only rôle in the development of the atomic bomb. His ideas were not welcomed.

Einstein stated in 1945,

“I do not consider myself the father of the release of atomic energy. My part in it was quite indirect. I did not, in fact, foresee that it would be released in my time. I believed only that it was theoretically possible. It became practical through the accidental discovery of chain reaction, and this was not something I could have predicted. It was discovered by Hahn in Berlin, and he himself misinterpreted what he discovered. It was Lise Meitner who provided the correct interpretation, and escaped from Germany to place the information in the hands of Niels Bohr. [***] I am not able to speak from any firsthand knowledge about the development of the atomic bomb, since I do not work in this field.”³⁴⁴²

Otto Hahn’s work was the critical factor in the development of the atomic bomb. Hahn considered Lise Meitner a minor figure—though she and Niels Bohr did work against Germany and assisted the Allies to develop the bomb, not so much as scientists, but rather as spies who betrayed Otto Hahn and Werner Heisenberg. In 1944, Otto Hahn won the Nobel Prize “for his discovery of the fission of heavy nuclei”. It was a chemist, not a physicist, who let the genie out of the bottle.

16.7 Conclusion

How has the popular history become so corrupted as to ignore these facts? Why do we feel the need to perpetuate the comic book legend of “Einstein”, as if he were the great discoverer of all physical truths? Einstein did not invent, nor predict the atomic

bomb. Einstein did not derive or originate the formula $E = m c^2$. The awesome image of a thermonuclear explosion is spuriously used to promote Einstein as the god who supposedly unlocked the secrets of the atom, which he did not do. This is well known in the Physics community and yet the media continue to misinform the public about these facts just as they continue to that Einstein created the theory of relativity and was the first person to propose the idea of space-time. What motivates them to misinform the public? Why are the voices of those who tell the truth generally suppressed?

17 EINSTEIN'S MODUS OPERANDI

Einstein and his followers promoted and promote the theory of relativity as if it were perfectly logical. The theory is demonstrably irrational. In his efforts to hide his plagiarism, Einstein confused induction with deduction; and, like many of his predecessors, Einstein made too hasty of generalizations out of specific experimental results.

“Die Relativitätstheorie ist aus einigen mißverstandenen Anregungen des philosophischen Physikers MACH und aus Gedanken des mathematischen Physikers LORENTZ entstanden, die ins Groteske weitergesponnen wurden.”—ERNST GEHRCKE³⁴⁴³

“I don't find Einstein's Relativity agrees with me. It is the most unnatural and difficult to understand way of representing facts that could be thought of. [***] And I really think that Einstein is a practical joker, pulling the legs of his enthusiastic followers, more Einsteinisch than he.”—OLIVER HEAVISIDE

“Einstein simply postulates what we have deduced, with some difficulty and not altogether satisfactorily, from the fundamental equations of the electromagnetic field. [***] I have not availed myself of his substitutions, only because the formulae are rather complicated and look somewhat artificial”.—HENDRIK ANTOON LORENTZ³⁴⁴⁴

17.1 Introduction

Logic forbids a theorist from asserting as a premise that which she wishes to deduce as a conclusion. Such is the fallacy of “begging the question” or *Petitio Principii*. One cannot logically assert that light speed is invariant as a premise in order to deduce from that premise the conclusion that light speed is invariant. One cannot logically assert that the laws of physics are invariant in inertial systems in order to deduce from that premise that the laws of physics are invariant in inertial systems.

One cannot assume that $\frac{E}{(m_0 - m_1)c^2} = 1$, in order to prove that

$\frac{E}{(m_0 - m_1)c^2} = 1$. One cannot logically assert a gravitational and inertial mass

equivalence in order to deduce from that premise the conclusion that gravitational and inertial mass are equivalent. However, Albert Einstein committed all of these sins against reason, and more.

A logical synthesis proceeds from the most general and simple (as opposed to complex—singular as opposed to compound) *a priori* statements made in the theory, to the specific conclusions of the theory, which are empirically observable. The supposed empirical fact that light speed is invariant cannot logically be taken as an *a priori* principle. Speed is composed of the more fundamental elements of space and time; and a physical observation is the point of departure for an *a posteriori* analysis, not an *a priori* synthesis. The more fundamental elements of the Lorentz Transformation deduce all velocity comparisons, and are more general and fundamental than the specific speed of light. Likewise, the principle of relativity is an alleged empirical observation, which depends upon the more general and fundamental elements of that which defines an inertial system, the laws of Physics, the definitions of measurement procedures, etc.; and it is a corollary to these, not an *a priori* principle.

17.2 “Mach’s” Principle of Logical Economy

Following David Hume,³⁴⁴⁵ Ernst Mach argued from the 1860’s on that,

“There is no cause nor effect in nature; nature has but an individual existence; nature simply *is*.”

Mach, who was not a materialist, a point Einstein missed, wrote,

“Nature is composed of sensations as its elements. [***] In nature there is no *law* of refraction, only different cases of refraction. [***] We must admit, therefore, that there is no result of science which in point of principle could not have been arrived at wholly without methods. But, as a matter of fact, within the short span of a human life and with man’s limited powers of memory, any stock of knowledge worthy of the name is unattainable except by the *greatest* mental economy. Science itself, therefore, may be regarded as a minimal problem, consisting of the completest possible presentment of facts with the *least possible expenditure of thought*.”³⁴⁴⁶

In 1853, Sir William Hamilton called this the “law of parsimony”, and phrased it as follows,

“Neither more, nor more onerous, causes are to be assumed, than are necessary to account for the phenomena.”³⁴⁴⁷

Albert Einstein liked to appear wise. One of his ploys was to repeat the principle of logical economy as if it were his own. Here are but a few examples of many to be found in his writings and the accounts of others:

“The aim of science is, on the one hand, a comprehension, as *complete* as possible, of the connection between the sense experiences in their totality,

and, on the other hand, the accomplishment of this aim *by the use of a minimum of primary concepts and relations*. (Seeking, as far as possible, logical unity in the world picture, i.e., paucity in logical elements).³⁴⁴⁸

and,

“The grand aim of all science is to cover the greatest number of empirical facts by logical deduction from the smallest number of hypotheses or axioms.”³⁴⁴⁹

and,

“A theory is the more impressive the greater the simplicity of its premises, the more different kinds of things it relates, and the more extended its area of applicability.”³⁴⁵⁰

As Abram Joffe noted, Albert Einstein held no priority for the principle of logical economy, could not comprehend it, and certainly did not fulfill it,

“As regards Einstein’s philosophical views, in my judgement, they were as inconsistent as his political positions. Obviously [Einstein] was raised in the period of Mach and so [Einstein] accepted [Mach’s] concept of physics, but on the other hand, ideas on the economy of thought such as the justification of theoretical physics, were foreign to [Einstein]. The reality of the outside world and understanding the outside world were the real truths, which called for this need of a single picture of the outside world [Unified Theory of an absolute universe]. It seemed to me that when we touched upon these questions, and that was very rarely and without any interest from Einstein’s side, in Einstein one found both a materialist and an admirer of Mach, whose system seemed nicely built to Einstein.”³⁴⁵¹

Though Einstein cited Mach as a source of ideas,³⁴⁵² Mach rejected Einstein’s relativity theory and asked not to be associated with the “dogmatic” and “paradoxical” “nonsense”, in spite of the fact that Joseph Petzoldt sought to give Mach his due credit for major elements of the theory of relativity.³⁴⁵³ Traugott Konstantin Oesterreich wrote in the fourth volume of *Friedrich Ueberwegs Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* published in Berlin in 1923,

“Zur Relativitätstheorie verhielt sich Mach (im Gegensatz zu der von Petzoldt (s. S. 394f.) gegebenen Interpretation seiner Lehren persönlich ablehnend.”³⁴⁵⁴

Einstein initially adored Mach, and asked for his guidance and help.³⁴⁵⁵ When it became known, after Mach’s death, that Mach rejected Einstein and his views, Einstein ridiculed Mach.³⁴⁵⁶

Einstein was interviewed in *The London Times*, on 13 June 1921, pages 11 and 12, and expressed the principle of logical economy; but Einstein failed in his theories to distinguish what was assumed from what was empirical, and stated empirical facts as if assumptions, to then introduce very complicated geometries without acknowledging that these complications were the fundamental assumptions of his theories and violated the principle of logical economy,

“‘My own philosophic development,’ [Einstein] went on, ‘was from Hume to Mach and James.’

This was illuminating. James, I reflected, is the philosopher who held that we take to be true what we find it most convenient to believe. This had always struck me as a very sensible philosophy, and accordingly I asked Einstein whether he considered Relativity to be true in the sense that it leads to a more convenient set of mathematical expressions for natural phenomena, or whether he held that it actually penetrated deeper into reality.

He smiled broadly at this question, and then gave a little chuckle. ‘That is very complicated,’ he said, with evident enjoyment, and sat thinking. At these moments his eyes have a still, but very living expression, reminding one of Carlyle’s description of the eyes of Herr Teufelsdröck, which had the deceptive peace of a ‘sleeping’ top, spinning so rapidly as to appear immobile. There is no look of strain in the face, as there is with so many scientific men, and a little smile comes and goes perpetually at the corners of his mouth, as one implication after another opens before him.

When he did answer the question his answer was rather technical, dealing with the assumptions which lie at the base of Euclidean geometry. He gave me to understand, however, that his general attitude towards this question of convenience or deeper reality was the same as that of the late Henri Poincaré, the great French mathematician, who regarded the fundamental assumptions of geometry as *conventions*, but not as arbitrary conventions.

‘An infinite number of theories can always be devised,’ said Einstein, ‘which will serve to describe natural phenomena. We can invent as many different theories as we like, and any one can be made to fit the facts.’

‘Then perhaps the essentials of the old Newtonian assumptions could still be preserved,’ I said, ‘by endowing the ether with a sufficient number of extraordinary properties. Why do you prefer your theory of Relativity to one which assumes a very complicated ether?’

His answer was emphatic. ‘That theory is always to be preferred,’ he said, ‘which makes the fewest number of assumptions. Amongst the innumerable theories which can be constructed to fit the facts of science we choose the theory which starts off with the fewest assumptions. That is the criterion of theories.’”

Newton’s gravitational inverse square law of universal attraction is considered by many to be the epitome of “universality and simplicity” in Natural Philosophy.³⁴⁵⁷ Einstein sought in vain for a similar law of such universality and simplicity. H. A.

Lorentz wrote in *The New York Times* on 21 December 1919 page 20,

“For centuries Newton’s doctrine of the attraction of gravitation has been the most prominent example of a theory of natural science. Through the simplicity of its basic idea, an attraction between two bodies proportionate to their mass and also proportionate to the square of the distance; through the completeness with which it explained so many of the peculiarities in the movement of the bodies making up the solar system; and, finally, through its universal validity, even in the case of the far-distant planetary systems, it compelled the admiration of all.”

Encapsulating Aristotle’s beliefs, Newton wrote in his *Principia*, Book III, “The Rules of Reasoning in Philosophy”,

“R U L E I.

We are to admit no more causes of natural things, than such as are both true and sufficient to explain their appearances.

To this purpose the philosophers say, that Nature do’s nothing in vain, and more is in vain, when less will serve; For Nature is pleas’d with simplicity, and affects not the pomp of superfluous causes.

R U L E II.

Therefore to the same natural effects we must, as far as possible, assign the same causes.

As to respiration in a man, and in a beast; the descent of stones in *Europe* and in *America*; the light of our culinary fire and of the Sun; the reflection of light in the Earth, and in the Planets.

R U L E III.

The qualities of bodies, which admit neither intension nor remission of degrees, and which are found to belong to all bodies within the reach of our experiments, are to be esteemed the universal qualities of all bodies whatsoever.

For since the qualities of bodies are only known to us by experiments, we are to hold for universal, all such as universally agree with experiments; and such as are not liable to diminution, can never be quite taken away. We are certainly not to relinquish the evidence of experiments for the sake of dreams and vain fictions of our own devising; nor are we to recede from the analogy of Nature, which uses to be simple, and always consonant to itself. We no other ways know the extension of bodies, than by our senses, nor do these reach it in all bodies; but because we perceive extension in all that are sensible, therefore we ascribe it universally to all others also. That abundance of bodies are hard we learn by experience. And because the hardness of the whole arises from the hardness of the parts, we therefore justly infer the hardness of the undivided particles not only of the bodies we feel but of all

others. That all bodies are impenetrable, we gather not from reason, but from sensation. The bodies which we handle we find impenetrable, and thence conclude impenetrability to be an universal property of all bodies whatsoever. That all bodies are moveable, and endow'd with certain powers (which we call the *vires inertiae*) of persevering in their motion or in their rest we only infer from the like properties observ'd in the bodies which we have seen. The extension, hardness, impenetrability, mobility, and *vis inertiae* of the whole, result from the extension, hardness, impenetrability, mobility, and *vires inertiae* of the parts: and thence we conclude the least particles of all bodies to be also all extended, and hard, and impenetrable, and moveable, and endow'd with their proper *vires inertiae*. And this is the foundation of all philosophy. Moreover, that the divided but contiguous particles of bodies may be separated from one another, is matter of observation; and, in the particles that remain undivided, our minds are able to distinguish yet lesser parts, as is mathematically demonstrated. But whether the parts so distinguish'd, and not yet divided, may, by the powers of nature, be actually divided and separated from one another, we cannot certainly determine. Yet had we the proof of but one experiment, that any undivided particle, in breaking a hard and solid body, suffer'd a division, we might by virtue of this rule, conclude, that the undivided as well as the divided particles, may be divided and actually separated to infinity.

Lastly, If it universally appears, by experiments and astronomical observations, that all bodies about the Earth, gravitate towards the Earth; and that in proportion to the quantity of matter which they severally contain; that the Moon likewise, according to the quantity of its matter, gravitates towards the Earth; that on the other hand our Sea gravitates towards the Moon; and all the Planets mutually one towards another; and the Comets in like manner towards the Sun; we must, in consequence of this rule, universally allow, that all bodies whatsoever are endow'd with a principle of mutual gravitation. For the argument from the appearances concludes with more force for the universal gravitation of all bodies, than for their impenetrability; of which among those in the celestial regions, we have no experiments, nor any manner of observation. Not that I affirm gravity to be essential to bodies. By their *vis insita* I mean nothing but their *vis inertiae*. This is immutable. Their gravity is diminished as they recede from the Earth.

R U L E I V .

In experimental philosophy we are to look upon propositions collected by general induction from phænomena as accurately or very nearly true, notwithstanding any contrary hypotheses that may be imagined, till such time as other phænomena occur, by which they may either be made more accurate, or liable to exceptions.

This rule we must follow that the argument of induction may not be evaded by hypotheses.³⁴⁵⁸

Newton wrote, in his *Opticks*,

“As in Mathematicks, so in Natural Philosophy, the Investigation of difficult Things by the Method of Analysis, ought ever to precede the Method of Composition. This Analysis consists in making Experiments and Observations, and in drawing general Conclusions from them by Induction, and admitting of no Objections against the Conclusions, but such as are taken from Experiments, or other certain Truths. For Hypotheses are not to be regarded in experimental Philosophy. And although the arguing from Experiments and Observations by Induction be no Demonstration of general Conclusions; yet it is the best way of arguing which the Nature of Things admits of, and may be looked upon as so much the stronger, by how much the Induction is more general.”

William of Occam (ca. 1285-1348) iterated “Occam’s Razor”,

“Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem.”

“Pluralitas non est ponenda sine neccesitate.”

“Frustra fit per plura quod potest fieri per pauciora.”

And from the Scholasticism of the medieval period, we have,

“Principia non sunt cumulanda.”

“Natura horret superfluum.”

Today, we simply say, “Keep it simple, stupid!”

Einstein was fond of copying William Kingdon Clifford, Karl Pearson and Henri Poincaré, when Einstein wished to play the rôle of savant. Karl Pearson wrote long before Einstein, and Einstein had read him,

“The laws of science are, as we have seen, products of the creative imagination. They are the mental interpretations—the formulæ under which we resume wide ranges of phenomena, the results of observation on the part of ourselves or of our fellow men.”³⁴⁵⁹

Henri Poincaré averred,

“This principle of physical relativity can serve to define space; it provides us, so to speak, with a new measuring instrument. [***] Moreover, the new convention not only defines space, it also defines time. It teaches us what two simultaneous instants are, what two equal intervals of time are or what double an interval of time is of another. [***] Only then does the principle

present itself as a convention, and this removes it from the attacks of experience. [The principle of physical relativity] is a convention which is suggested to us by experience, but which we freely adopt."³⁴⁶⁰

and,

"We are, therefore, forced to conclude that this notion has been created entirely by the mind, but that experience has given the occasion."³⁴⁶¹

Einstein was quite familiar with Poincaré's views on the rôle of experience in science and knew that Poincaré stated the principle of relativity and the relativity of simultaneity, which appear in *Science and Hypothesis*,³⁴⁶² before him. Contrary to Stanley Goldberg's assertions that Einstein's views differed from Poincaré's,³⁴⁶³ Einstein stated,

"We now come to our conceptions and judgements of space. It is essential here also to pay strict attention to the relation of experience to our concepts. It seems to me Poincaré clearly recognized the truth in the account he gave in his book, 'La Science et l'Hypothèse.' Among all the changes which we can perceive in a rigid body those which can be cancelled by a voluntary motion of our body are marked by their simplicity; Poincaré calls these, changes in position."³⁴⁶⁴

Einstein was interviewed in *The London Times*, on 13 June 1921, pages 11 and 12,

"'My own philosophic development,' [Einstein] went on, 'was from Hume to Mach and James.'

This was illuminating. James, I reflected, is the philosopher who held that we take to be true what we find it most convenient to believe. This had always struck me as a very sensible philosophy, and accordingly I asked Einstein whether he considered Relativity to be true in the sense that it leads to a more convenient set of mathematical expressions for natural phenomena, or whether he held that it actually penetrated deeper into reality.

He smiled broadly at this question, and then gave a little chuckle. 'That is very complicated,' he said, with evident enjoyment, and sat thinking. At these moments his eyes have a still, but very living expression, reminding one of Carlyle's description of the eyes of Herr Teufelsdröck, which had the deceptive peace of a 'sleeping' top, spinning so rapidly as to appear immobile. There is no look of strain in the face, as there is with so many scientific men, and a little smile comes and goes perpetually at the corners of his mouth, as one implication after another opens before him.

When he did answer the question his answer was rather technical, dealing with the assumptions which lie at the base of Euclidean geometry. He gave me to understand, however, that his general attitude towards this question of

convenience or deeper reality was the same as that of the late Henri Poincaré, the great French mathematician, who regarded the fundamental assumptions of geometry as *conventions*, but not as arbitrary conventions.

‘An infinite number of theories can always be devised,’ said Einstein, ‘which will serve to describe natural phenomena. We can invent as many different theories as we like, and any one can be made to fit the facts.’

‘Then perhaps the essentials of the old Newtonian assumptions could still be preserved,’ I said, ‘by endowing the ether with a sufficient number of extraordinary properties. Why do you prefer your theory of Relativity to one which assumes a very complicated ether?’

His answer was emphatic. ‘That theory is always to be preferred,’ he said, ‘which makes the fewest number of assumptions. Amongst the innumerable theories which can be constructed to fit the facts of science we choose the theory which starts off with the fewest assumptions. That is the criterion of theories.’”

William Kingdon Clifford, who died in 1879, held that,

“§ 19. *On the Bending of Space*

The peculiar topic of this chapter has been position, position namely of a point P relative to a point A. This relative position led naturally to a consideration of the geometry of steps. I proceeded on the hypothesis that all position is relative, and therefore to be determined only by a stepping process. The relativity of position was a postulate deduced from the customary methods of determining position, such methods in fact always giving relative position. *Relativity of position is thus a postulate derived from experience.* The late Professor Clerk-Maxwell fully expressed the weight of this postulate in the following words:—

All our knowledge, both of time and place, is essentially relative. When a man has acquired the habit of putting words together, without troubling himself to form the thoughts which ought to correspond to them, it is easy for him to frame an antithesis between this relative knowledge and a so-called absolute knowledge, and to point out our ignorance of the absolute position of a point as an instance of the limitation of our faculties. Any one, however, who will try to imagine the state of a mind conscious of knowing the absolute position of a point will ever after be content with our relative knowledge.³⁴⁶⁵

It is of such great value to ascertain how far we can be certain of the truth of our postulates in the exact sciences that I shall ask the reader to return to our conception of position albeit from a somewhat different standpoint. I shall even ask him to attempt an examination of that state of mind which Professor Clerk-Maxwell hinted at in his last sentence.³⁴⁶⁶

In typical fashion Einstein would later repeat these ideas without citation to Maxwell, Clifford or Poincaré,

“In the previous paragraphs we have attempted to describe how the concepts of space, time and event can be put psychologically into relation with experiences. Considered logically, they are free creations of the human intelligence”³⁴⁶⁷.

and,

“The most satisfactory situation is evidently to be found in cases where the new fundamental hypotheses are suggested by the world of experience itself.”³⁴⁶⁸

and Einstein stated together with Infeld,

“Physical concepts are free creations of the human mind, and are not, however it may seem, uniquely determined by the external world.”³⁴⁶⁹

Einstein stated, in 1911,

“The principle [of relativity] is logically not necessary: it would be necessary only if it would be made such by experience. But it is made only probable by experience.”³⁴⁷⁰

17.3 Einstein's Fallacies of *Petito Principii*

Einstein's arguments were almost always fallacies of *Petito Principii*. Einstein avowed that,

“[A]ll knowledge of reality starts from experience and ends in it. [***]
[E]xperience is the alpha and omega of all our knowledge of reality.”³⁴⁷¹

In order to mask his plagiarism, Einstein would irrationally state the experimental results others had obtained before him—the phenomena, *per se*, as his “first principles” or “postulates”. He would then conduct an analysis of the problem, as if he were proposing a synthesis of the solution—he knowingly confused induction with deduction, and analysis with synthesis. Then he would slip in the hypotheses of others in the middle of his theories, as if “derivations”, or “natural consequences”, of the phenomena, which he had also proposed as “postulates”, in order to deduce the same “postulates/phenomena” as conclusions, in an *Argumentum in Circulo*. Friedrich Paschen described Einstein as, “the theoretician who conceived the novel ideas of relativity theory from the finest analysis of empirical facts[.]”³⁴⁷² However, Einstein pretended that analysis was synthesis and induction, deduction. The ideas had already been published before Einstein copied them.

Einstein was accused of plagiarism from 1905 onward throughout his career. His friends leveled the same charges against him as those who opposed him. His closest

friends knew that he had re-derived Gerber's solution, working inductively from Gerber's solution. Gerber's work was common knowledge and the plagiarism was obvious. Einstein wrote in his private correspondence that his theory of the bending of the path of light around the Sun was an exact repetition of the Newtonian prediction made long before he copied it without an attribution—this long before the accusations of plagiarism were made against Einstein in public. And, of course, Einstein is proven to have plagiarized the generally covariant field equations of gravitation from David Hilbert by taking Hilbert's finalized equations as a point of departure for a pseudo-inductive analysis, whereby he merely asserted Hilbert's equations without an attribution, and showed that they solved many problems.

Einstein wanted it to appear that he was following Newton's fourth rule, but Einstein was really simply disguising his piracy of the hypotheses of others through illogical fallacies. In so doing, Einstein would claim the priority that he had "derived" what his predecessors were forced to "hypothesize". Einstein turned the synthetic scientific theories of his predecessors on their heads rendering them bizarre metaphysical delusions in order to steal credit for them. Einstein avowed that all scientists should abandon induction, state phenomena as premises, and use his method of divine inspiration, instead of induction. Even here Einstein plagiarized the thoughts of others.

In a work somewhat reminiscent of Duhem's *The Aim and Structure of Physical Theory*, Einstein disclosed his *modus operandi* for manipulating credit for the synthetic theories of others, when he stated in 1936,

"There is no inductive method which could lead to the fundamental concepts of physics. Failure to understand this fact constituted the basic philosophical error of so many investigators of the nineteenth century. [***] Logical thinking is necessarily deductive; it is based upon hypothetical concepts and axioms. How can we expect to choose the latter so that we might hope for a confirmation of the consequences derived from them? The most satisfactory situation is evidently to be found in cases where the new fundamental hypotheses are suggested by the world of experience itself."³⁴⁷³

Einstein wanted people to believe that it is irrelevant that his predecessors induced the theories he later copied, because Einstein just invented them, *sua sponte*, irrationally, after he had read them, and therefore deserved credit for them,

"Invention is not the product of logical thought, even though the final product is tied to a logical structure."³⁴⁷⁴

Many philosophers have stressed the importance of "experience" and an *Experimentum Crucis*, which excludes an unsuccessful theory in science. Bacon wrote about it in his *Novum Organum*.³⁴⁷⁵ Robert Boyle explained it in his work *Some Considerations Touching the Usefulness of Experimental Natural Philosophy. Propos'd in a Familiar Discourse to a Friend, by Way of Invitation to the Study of It*.³⁴⁷⁶ Sir John F. W. Herschel explained it in his *A Preliminary Discourse on the*

Study of Natural Philosophy.³⁴⁷⁷ Lord Kelvin and Peter Guthrie Tait had their *Elements of Natural Philosophy*.³⁴⁷⁸ David Hume wrote a great deal about induction and its validity.³⁴⁷⁹ Jevons, in the Nineteenth Century, in response to Mill's admiration for induction, provided us with a more lucid and prior statement than Einstein's regarding the deductive aspect of induction, and keep in mind that Jevons was busying himself with the invention of the computer, a machine without creative reasoning powers,

“In a certain sense all knowledge is inductive. We can only learn the laws and relations of things in nature by observing those things. But the knowledge gained from the senses is knowledge only of particular facts, and we require some process of reasoning by which we may collect out of the facts the laws obeyed by them. Experience gives us the materials of knowledge: induction digests those materials, and yields us general knowledge. When we possess such knowledge, in the form of general propositions and natural laws, we can usefully apply the reverse process of deduction to ascertain the exact information required at any moment. In its ultimate foundation, then, all knowledge is inductive—in the sense that it is derived by a certain inductive reasoning from the facts of experience. It is nevertheless true,—and this is a point to which insufficient attention has been paid, that all reasoning is founded on the principles of deduction. I call in question the existence of any method of reasoning which can be carried on without a knowledge of deductive processes. I shall endeavor to show that *induction is really the inverse process of deduction*. There is no mode of ascertaining the laws which are obeyed in certain phenomena, unless we have the power of determining what results would follow from a given law. Just as the process of division necessitates a prior knowledge of multiplication, or the integral calculus rests upon the observation and remembrance of the results of the differential calculus, so induction requires a prior knowledge of deduction. An inverse process is the undoing of the direct process. A person who enters a maze must either trust to chance to lead him out again, or he must carefully notice the road by which he entered. The facts furnished to us by experience are a maze of particular results; we might by chance observe in them the fulfilment of a law, but this is scarcely possible, unless we thoroughly learn the effects which would attach to any particular law. Accordingly, the importance of deductive reasoning is doubly supreme. Even when we gain the results of induction they would be of no use unless we could deductively apply them. But before we can gain them at all we must understand deduction, since it is the inversion of deduction which constitutes induction. Our first task in this work, then, must be to trace out fully the nature of identity in all its forms of occurrence. Having given any series of propositions we must be prepared to develop deductively the whole meaning embodied in them, and the whole of the consequences which flow from them.”³⁴⁸⁰

Jevons asserts that, “An inverse process is the undoing of the direct process. [***] The facts furnished to us by experience are a maze of particular results; we might by chance observe in them the fulfilment of a law, but this is scarcely possible, unless we thoroughly learn the effects which would attach to any particular law.”

The particular results cited in the 1905 paper on the “principle of relativity” are the failure of experiments to detect the æther wind on Earth, viz. the Michelson experiments, and the symmetry of phenomena in alleged violation of Maxwell’s equations. In other words, the alleged particular results are the phenomenon of invariant light speed, and the phenomena of the identity of inertial systems.

These phenomena are automatically taken to be general in science, because,

“from a series of similar events we may infer the recurrence of like events under identical conditions [***] all science implies generalization.”³⁴⁸¹

There is an ancient occult belief, which asserts, “as above, so below”, meaning that the laws of nature are universal and uniform, and that the microscopic world mirrors the macroscopic world. The *Hekaloth* in the *Zohar* states,

“**S**AID Rabbi Simeon: It is a tradition from the most ancient times that when the Holy One created the world he engraved and impressed on it in letters of brilliant light, the law by which it is sustained and governed. Above, below and on every side of it, it is engraved on every atom that man, by research and discovery, might become wise and conform himself to it as the rule of his life. The world below is, in shape and form, the reflection and copy of the world on high, so that there may be no discontinuity between them, but reciprocally act and react upon each other. This being so, we purpose to show that the same principle or law that operated in the creation of the physical world, operated also in the origin of man, and that both alike are manifestations of one and the same law. That this great fact may be more fully perceived, let us first consider the esoteric meaning of the words, ‘But they, like Adam, have transgressed the covenant, there have they dealt treacherously against me’ (Hos. vi. 7).”³⁴⁸²

In the tradition of Plato’s call for a search for the one among the many, the identities of Nature, Jevons asserted,

“The general principle of inference, that what we know of one case must be true of similar cases, so far as they are similar, prevents our asserting anything which we cannot apply time after time under the same circumstances.”³⁴⁸³

Ernst Mach wrote,

“Very clearly, Fechner [*Footnote: Berichte der sächs. Ges. zu Leipzig*, Vol. II, 1850.] formulated the law of causality: ‘Everywhere and at all times, if the

same circumstances occur again, the same consequence occurs again; if the same circumstances do not occur again, the same consequence does not.' By this means, as Fechner remarked further on, 'a relation is set up between the things which happen in all parts of space and at all times.'"³⁴⁸⁴

The so-called "Principle of Relativity" is just this "law of causality", this primary generalization upon which all science is founded. However, it has no meaning in the special theory of relativity, unless and until the "same circumstances" are defined in an experimentally meaningful way.³⁴⁸⁵ This is why the Einsteins required *two* postulates. One to establish *a resting system* of æther in which the velocity of light is axiomatically constant and a vector, and a second postulate to assert that the speed of light must also be constant in *a second, moving, system*—though this is a *non sequitur*. The generalization is already present in the *resting system* and does not logically lead to the conclusion that the speed of light must also be the same constant in a *moving system*. That broader generalization does not result from logic or from the principle of relativity, but instead from a too hasty generalization of experience based on the false premise that the Michelson experiments contain two reference systems in relative motion to each other in which light speed is measured to be invariant, when it has not been proven that they do. That interpretation of the Michelson experiment presumes an æther at absolute rest in which light speed is axiomatically constant. Robert A. Millikan wrote in 1949,

"The special theory of relativity may be looked upon as starting essentially in a generalization from Michelson's experiment. And here is where Einstein's characteristic boldness of approach came in, for the distinguishing feature of modern scientific thought lies in the fact that it begins by discarding all *a priori* conceptions about the nature of reality—or about the ultimate nature of the universe—such as had characterized practically all Greek philosophy and all medieval thinking as well, and takes instead, as its starting point, well-authenticated, carefully tested *experimental* facts, no matter whether these facts seem at the moment to be reasonable or not. In a word, modern science is essentially empirical, and no one has done more to make it so than the theoretical physicist, Albert Einstein. [***] Then Einstein called out to us all, 'Let us merely accept this as an established experimental fact and from there proceed to work out its inevitable consequences[.]'"³⁴⁸⁶

Again, the Einsteins, Lorentz and Poincaré were irrational to so generalize the Michelson results in the way that they did, and even if it had been rational to generalize the empirical result in the way that they did those empirical results would not have been *a priori* principles, but *a posteriori* problems. The only revolution that took place was the Einsteins' and their followers misuse of terms.

Robertson points out (though, as Millikan made clear, Robertson mistakenly asserts that Einstein deduced what he clearly induced, in that the Einsteins "starting point" was empirical not *a priori*; and the operational interpretation asserted by Poincaré and parroted by the Einsteins without an attribution is dynamic not

kinematic, in that it depends upon dynamic light signals for measurement, dynamic clocks, dynamic measuring rods, dynamic observers in a dynamic inertial reference system, etc.),

“The kinematical background for this theory, an operational interpretation of the Lorentz transformation, was obtained deductively by Einstein from a general postulate of concerning the relativity of motion and a more specific postulate concerning the velocity of light. At the time this work was done an inductive approach could not have led unambiguously to the theory proposed, for the principal relevant observations of Michelson and Morley [*Footnote*: A. A. Michelson and E. H. Morley, *Am. J. Sci.* **34**, 333 (1887).] (1886), could be accounted for in other, although less appealing, ways.”³⁴⁸⁷

Michelson would likely have said “less appalling!” The Lorentz transformation was obtained inductively, not deductively, from the empirical results of Michelson’s experiments, which results were not postulates, but rather they were physical observations.

One must first establish the definition of an “inertial system”, the means of finding it in Nature and of measuring it. This “principle” of relativity thereby becomes a corollary to these *prior* definitions, one that states that light speed is invariant and the laws of physics are covariant in these dynamic “inertial systems”. The “principle of relativity” is in no sense a postulate in the theory, for it is deducible from the light postulate, which is deducible from the hypotheses of the Lorentz transformations and Lange’s theoretical “inertial systems”. Therefore, neither of the Einsteins’ “postulates” is in fact a postulate, because both are deducible from more fundamental terms and both are summations of supposed physical facts.

It is irrational to assert the phenomena as causes of the same phenomena. There is no inverse process in “postulating” that light speed is invariant, and that under like conditions like results ensue; in order to “deduce” that those assumptions that light speed is invariant and that under like conditions like results ensue, for such is a redundancy, not a deduction. In a truly scientific approach to the problem, one must induce the postulates which then deduce the phenomenon of invariant light speed and deduce the like conditions and like results, from these same postulates of length contraction, time dilatation, relative simultaneity, inertial motion, etc. Jevons is not telling us to abandon induction, but to realize that it has an eye toward deduction, *i. e.* that it must be rational, and that our minds draw from experience. In Einstein’s case, the experience of reading the writings of his predecessors and then restating them in irrational terms, without citation to the prior works.

Jevons,

“It cannot be said that the Inductive process is of greater importance than the Deductive process already considered, because the latter process is absolutely essential to the existence of the former. Each is the compliment and counterpart of the other. The principles of thought and existence which underlie them are at bottom the same, just as subtraction of numbers

necessarily rests upon the same principles as addition [both deduction and induction must be rational]. Induction is, in fact, the inverse operation of deduction [Jevons contradicts himself again with his wavering analogies. Both induction and deduction rely upon the same principles of rationality. They are really convertible. Induction is not, in practice, the inverse process undoing prior direct deduction. Induction is a method in science of discovering more general truths from particular ones, which, if the more general truths were already known, it would not be necessary to induce them. Of course, when presenting a theory *after it has been created*, it is not necessary to demonstrate the induction, but simply the deduction to phenomena from first principles.], and cannot be conceived to exist without the corresponding operation, so that the question of relative importance cannot arise [Jevons' conclusion is a *non sequitur*. Induction is of greater importance, because it delves into the unknown, developing rational inferences, *a posteriori*. Deduction truly is the inverse process undoing prior direct induction, and should not proceed *a priori*, without prior induction. However, should deduction predict as yet unobserved, but observable, phenomena, it then becomes quite significant, though yet relying on the induction which preceded it.]. Who thinks of asking whether addition or subtraction is the more important process in arithmetic? But at the same time much difference in difficulty may exist between a direct and inverse operation; the integral calculus, for instance, is infinitely more difficult than the differential calculus of which it is the inverse. Similarly, it must be allowed that inductive investigations are of a far higher degree of difficulty and complexity than any questions of deduction".³⁴⁸⁸

Einstein lacked the insight and reasoning skills needed to induce hypotheses, so he condemned the practice. He was forced, due to his inability to cope with the "higher degree of difficulty and complexity" needed to induce hypotheses, to copy hypotheses from others, but sought to disguise the fact. Einstein insisted that empirical results be argued as first principles in order to *deduce* the same phenomena as results, which are argued as first principles, in a fallacy of *Petitio Principii*. This is the method he used in his "theories" in order to assume credit for the induced hypotheses of others, which he then slipped into the theories somewhere in the middle, without rational justification, calling them "derivations".

Einstein wrote in the *London Times* of 28 November 1919, on page 13,

"There are several kinds of theory in Physics. Most of them are constructive. These attempt to build a picture of complex phenomena out of some relatively simple proposition. The kinetic theory of gases, for instance, attempts to refer to molecular movement the mechanical, thermal, and diffusional properties of gases. When we say that we understand a group of natural phenomena, we mean that we have found a constructive theory which embraces them.

THEORIES OF PRINCIPLE

But in addition to this most weighty group of theories, there is another group consisting of what I call theories of principle. These employ the analytic, not the synthetic method. Their starting-point and foundation are not hypothetical constituents, but empirically observed general properties of phenomena, principles from which mathematical formulæ are deduced of such a kind that they apply to every case which presents itself.”

Note that while Einstein correctly stated that his arguments were analytic, not synthetic, Einstein confused *induction*, working from specific known facts to general principles and hypotheses which account for all facts, with *deduction*, working from the general principles and hypotheses to account for all known specifics and perhaps to predict others. Einstein calls “induction”, “deduction”. Note that Einstein acknowledges that it is the plagiarized mathematical *hypotheses* he employed, which *generally* account for *all specific cases* and it is these fundamental hypotheses which build the synthetic and deductive theory, as opposed to the inductive analysis he deliberately confuses with deduction. Einstein continued,

“Thermodynamics, for instance, starting from the fact that perpetual motion never occurs in ordinary experience, attempts to deduce from this, by analytical process, a theory which will apply in every case. The merit of constructive theories is their comprehensiveness, adaptability, and clarity, that of the theories of principle, their logical perfection, and the security of their foundation. The theory of relativity is a theory of principle.”

Note that Einstein admits that his theories analytically (not synthetically) argue from specific known facts to the general hypotheses, which fundamental hypotheses then deduce these same specific facts, which were fallaciously argued as if first principles to in order begin the analysis in the first place. Einstein styles fallacies of *Petitio Principii* as “logical perfection” and admits that the same dreaded *ad hoc* hypotheses are found in his theory as in Lorentz’ theory, though Lorentz follows proper scientific procedure in constructing a synthetic theory which deduces the observed phenomena from the *ad hoc* hypotheses, while Einstein merely analyzes Lorentz’ theory after the fact to arrive at Lorentz’ same *ad hoc* hypotheses, and then Einstein restates Lorentz’ synthetic theory proceeding from the same *ad hoc* hypotheses to deduce the phenomena in a merry-go-round whirl in which Einstein pretends to have eliminated hypotheses which he has not eliminated. All Einstein has done is provide an analysis to show how Lorentz arrived at his *ad hoc* hypotheses, and then Einstein repeats Lorentz’ theory and uses these *ad hoc* to deduce the phenomena. Mileva and Albert were expositors at best and not rational theoreticians.

Einstein professed in his article “Induction and Deduction in Physics” in the *Berliner Tageblatt* of 25 December 1919,

“So, while the researcher always starts out from facts, whose mutual connections are his aim, he does not find his system of ideas in a methodical, inductive way; rather, he adapts to the facts by intuitive selection among the

conceivable theories that are based upon axioms.”³⁴⁸⁹

But Einstein's axioms are those facts and his method is, therefore, *inductive*, not deductive, *analytical*, not synthetic. Since Einstein was not clever at induction, he simply chose among extant synthetic theories and turned them on their heads in order to manipulate credit for them. The only way Einstein's method can be successful as an approach to formulating a theory is to plagiarize the inductive ideas of others, so it does not appear likely that Einstein could have created much, if anything, on his own. Since he was clever at theft, Einstein would often simply repeat the known facts as if “axioms”, then induce the plagiarized hypotheses of his predecessors from these well known facts, then deduce the known facts from these hypotheses. Is this guile a form of genius? Perhaps, but it seems Einstein always had someone behind the scenes, or as coauthor, doing the work for him. First it was Mileva Marić, then Jacob Laub, then Marcel Grossmann, then Erwin Freundlich, then Walther Mayer, etc.

It was necessary for Einstein to discourage scientists from using proper method, lest they discover the irrationality of his unoriginal works. In so doing, he converted the scientific method into a method of redundancy, whereby an empirical fact is deduced from itself. Carmichael, then later Moritz Schlick, took up the challenge of untangling Einstein's fallacies and were always forced to confront Einstein's confusion of induction with deduction.

The Michelson experimental result of invariant light speed was irrationally taken as a postulate to “derive” (in fact, induce) the Lorentz Transformation *hypotheses*, which general *a priori* hypotheses then deduce *all* velocity comparisons, not just invariant light speed. The Einsteins irrationally argued that invariant light speed deduces invariant light speed, in order to disguise the Lorentz Transformation *hypotheses* as “derivations”, which general hypotheses are, in truth, induced *a posteriori*, not deduced *a priori*, from the specific speed of invariant light speed. Albert Einstein was well aware of the confusion he had caused, and he wrote to Paul Ehrenfest, who was having a difficult time explaining the theory of relativity,

“It simply comes from your wanting to base the innovation of 1905 on *epistemological* reasons (nonexistence of the ether at rest) instead of on *empirical* ones (equivalence of all inertial systems against light). The epistemological requirement starts only in 1907.”³⁴⁹⁰

Franz Kleinschrod wrote in 1920,

“Aber auch das RP [Relativitätsprinzip] erscheint uns dadurch in einer neuen Beleuchtung, nicht als ein allgemeingiltiges Naturgesetz, wie Einstein und seine Anhänger glauben, sondern als die erkenntnistheoretische induktive Formel der Erforschung der Naturgesetze der leblosen Natur in Raum und Zeit, im Gegensatz zur Erforschung der Naturgesetze der lebendigen Natur in Zeit und Raum.—
[***] In dem Additionstheorem der Geschwindigkeit rechnet er die

Selbstbewegung des im Eisenbahnzug gehenden Mannes zur mechanischen Geschwindigkeit des Eisenbahnzuges, und setzt dann die mechanische Lichtausbreitung, relativ zum bewegten Eisenbahnzug betrachtet, wieder an die Stelle der Selbstbewegung des Mannes, und kommt dadurch zu zwei sich widersprechenden Formeln und zur Annahme der scheinbaren Unvereinbarkeit des Ausbreitungsgesetzes des Lichtes mit dem RP. (Einstein, l. c. Seite 10-13.[*Über die spezielle und die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie*]) Eine *petitio principii in optima forma*.”³⁴⁹¹

Herbert Ives published a paper in 1952, which argued that Einstein employed the same irrational method of *Petitio Principii* in “deriving” the mass-energy equivalence. This evinces a repeated pattern of Einstein’s irrationality, on top of his pattern of unoriginality, each signifying one goal—plagiarism,

“In 1905 Einstein published a paper with the interrogatory title ‘Does the Inertia of a Body Depend upon its Energy Content?’, [A. Einstein, Ann. Physik **18**, 639 (1905).] a question already answered in the affirmative by Hasenöhl. This paper, which has been widely cited as being the first proof of the ‘inertia of energy as such,’ describes an emission process by two sets of observations, in different units, the resulting equations being then subtracted from each other. It should be obvious *a priori* that the only proper result of such a procedure is to give $0 = 0$, that is, no information about the process can be so obtained. However the fallacy of Einstein’s argument not having been heretofore explicitly pointed out, the following analysis is presented: [***] What Einstein did by setting down these equations (as ‘clear’) was to *introduce* the relation

$$L / (m - m') c^2 = 1.$$

Now this is the very relation the derivation was supposed to yield. It emerges from Einstein’s manipulation of observations by two observers because it has been slipped in by the assumption which Planck questioned. The relation $E = m_M c^2$ was not derived by Einstein.”³⁴⁹²

Again in the “general theory of relativity” we find Einstein claiming priority based on his quasi-positivistic, and irrational, metaphysical analysis of others’ earlier synthetic scientific theories, while acknowledging that others had enunciated the scientific theories before him. Here again, as with the special theory, all the relevant theories make the same *scientific* predictions, and differ only ontologically. Ironically, though not coincidentally, the ontology of the general theory returns to the æther the special theory had allegedly dismissed.

Einstein avowed, with respect to the equivalence of inertial and gravitational mass, which Newton and Planck had defined and generalized into laws, and which Galileo,³⁴⁹³ Huyghens,³⁴⁹⁴ Newton,³⁴⁹⁵ Bessel,³⁴⁹⁶ Stas,³⁴⁹⁷ Eötvös,³⁴⁹⁸ Kreichgauer,³⁴⁹⁹

Landolt,³⁵⁰⁰ Heydweiller³⁵⁰¹ and Hecker had experimentally demonstrated before him,³⁵⁰²

“I was in the highest degree amazed at its existence and guessed that in it must lie the key to a deeper understanding of inertia and gravitation. I had no serious doubts about its strict validity even without knowing the results of the admirable experiments of Eötvös, which—if my memory is right—I only came to know later.”³⁵⁰³

This experimental fact, generalized into a universal law by Planck, became Einstein's sole first principle for the general theory of relativity,

“This opinion must be based upon the fact that we both do not denote the same thing as ‘the principle of equivalence’; because in my opinion my theory rests exclusively upon this principle.”³⁵⁰⁴

Einstein stated in 1913,

“[T]he equality (proportionality) of the gravitational and inertial mass has been proved with great accuracy in an investigation of great importance to us by Eötvös [***] *Eötvös's exact experiment concerning the equality of inertial and gravitational mass supports the view that such a criterion does not exist.* We see that in this regard Eötvös's experiment plays a role similar to that of the Michelson experiment with respect to the question of whether *uniform* motion can be detected physically.”³⁵⁰⁵

Einstein gave a lecture at King's College in June of 1921. *The London Times* reported on 14 June 1921, on page 8,

“PROFESSOR EINSTEIN said it gave him special pleasure to lecture in the capital of that country from which the most important and fundamental ideas of theoretical physics had spread throughout the world—the theories of motion and gravitation of Newton and the proposition of the electro-magnetic field on which Faraday and Maxwell built up the theories of modern physics. It might well be said that the theory of relativity formed the finishing stone of the elaborate edifice of the ideas of Maxwell and Lorentz by endeavouring to apply physics of ‘fields’ to all physical phenomena, including the phenomena of gravitation.

Professor Einstein pointed out that the theory of relativity was not of any speculative origin, but had its origin solely in the endeavour to adapt the theory of physics to facts observed. It must not be considered as an arbitrary act, but rather as the result of the observations of facts, that the conceptions of space, time, and motion, hitherto held as fundamental, had now been abandoned.

Two main factors, continued Professor Einstein, have led modern science

to regard time as a relative conception in so far as each inertial system had to be coupled with its own peculiar time: the law of constancy of the velocity of light in vacuo, sanctioned by the development of the sciences of electrodynamics and optics, and in connexion therewith the equivalence of all inertial systems (special principle of relativity) as clearly shown by Michelson's famous experiment. In developing this idea it appeared that hitherto the interconnexion between direct events on the one hand, and the space coordinates and time on the other, had not been thought out with the necessary accuracy.

The theory of relativity endeavours to define more concisely the relationship between general scientific conceptions and facts experienced. In the realm of the special theory of relativity the space coordinates and time are still of an absolute nature in so far as they appear to be measurable by rigid bodies, rods, and by clocks. They are, however, relative in so far as they are dependent upon the motion peculiar to the inertial system that happens to have been chosen. According to the special theory of relativity the four-dimensional *continuum*, formed by the amalgamation of time and space, retains that absolute character which, according to the previous theories, was attributed to space as well as to time, each individually. The interpretation of the spatial coordinates and of time as the result of measurements then leads to the following conclusions: motion (relative to the system of coordinates) influences the shape of bodies and the working of clocks; energy and inertial mass are equivalent.

GRAVITATIONAL FIELDS.

The general theory of relativity owes its origin, continued Professor Einstein, primarily to the experimental fact of the numerical equivalence of the inertial and gravitational mass of a body; a fundamental fact for which the classical science of mechanics offered no interpretation. Such an interpretation is arrived at by extending the application of the principle of relativity to systems of coordinates accelerated with reference to one another. The introduction of systems of co-ordinates accelerated with reference to inertial systems causes the appearance of gravitational fields relative to the systems of coordinates. That is how the general theory of relativity, based on the equality of inertia and gravity, offers a theory of the gravitational field.

Now that systems of co-ordinates, accelerated with reference to one another, have been introduced as equivalent systems of co-ordinates, based on the identity of inertia and gravity, it follows that the laws governing the position of rigid bodies in the presence of gravitational fields do not conform to the rules of Euclidean geometry. The results as regards the working of clocks is analogous. These conclusions lead to the necessity of once more generalizing the theories of space and time, because it is no longer possible directly to interpret the co-ordinates of space and time by measurements with measuring rods and clocks. This generalization of metrics, which in the sphere of pure mathematics dates back to Gauss and Riemann, is based largely on the fact that the metrics of the special theory of relativity may be

considered to apply in certain cases also to the general theory of relativity. In consequence, the co-ordinate system of space and time is no longer a reality in itself. Only by connecting the space and time co-ordinates with those mathematical figures which define the gravitational field can the objects which may be measured by measuring rods and by clocks be determined.

The idea of the general theory of relativity has yet another basis. As Ernst Mach has already emphasized, the Newtonian theory of motion is unsatisfactory in the following point:—if motion is regarded not from the casual but from the purely description point of view it will be found that there exists a relative motion of bodies with reference to each other. But the conception of relative motion does not of itself suffice to formulate the factor of acceleration to be found in Newton's equations of motion. Newton was forced to introduce a fictitious physical space with reference to which an acceleration was supposed to exist. This conception of absolute space introduced by Newton *ad hoc* is unsatisfactory, although it is logically correct. Mach, therefore, endeavoured so to alter the mechanical equations that the inertia of bodies is attributed to their relative motion with reference not to absolute space but with reference to the sum total of all other measurable bodies. Mach was bound to fail considering the state of knowledge at his time. But it is quite reasonable to put the problem as he did. In view of the general theory of relativity this line of thought comes more and more to the fore, because according to the theory of relativity the physical properties of space are influenced by matter.

Professor Einstein said he was of the opinion that the general theory of relativity could only solve this problem satisfactorily by regarding the universe as spatially finite and closed. The mathematical results of the theory of relativity forced scientists to this view, if they assumed that the average density of matter within the universe was of finite, if ever so small a value.”

On 13 June 1921, Einstein had stated,

“Turning to the subject of the theory of relativity, I want to emphasize that this theory has no speculative origin, it rather owes its discovery only to the desire to adapt theoretical physics to observable facts as closely as possible. [***] The law of the constancy of the speed of light, corroborated through the development of electrodynamics and optics, combined with Michelson's famous experiment that decisively demonstrated the equality of all inertial systems (principle of special relativity), relativized the concept of time, where every inertial system had to be given its own special time. [***] The theory of general relativity owes its origin primarily to the experimental fact of the numerical equality of inertial and gravitational mass of a body, a fundamental fact for which classical mechanics has given no interpretation.”³⁵⁰⁶

Einstein irrationally argued known empirical results as first principles to “prove” phenomena by themselves, slipping in the “derivations” (induced hypotheses) in the middle, *Petitio Principii*. Of course, the principle of equivalence cannot be a fundamental *a priori* simple principle, simply because it is complex in its structure, containing more than one element, and it is deducible from more fundamental principles. It is a deduction, not a first principle, and it is irrationally the conclusion of the general theory of relativity, as well as its “premise”; just as the Michelson result of alleged invariant light speed is an alleged empirical fact, not an *a priori* principle, and signifies both the “premise” and the conclusion of the special theory of relativity.

Paul Gerber established an axiomatic scientific theory which predicted the perihelion of Mercury in 1898, a feat Einstein was never able to accomplish even after having the benefit of Gerber’s equations. David Hilbert deduced the field equations of general relativity in an axiomatic synthesis, a feat Einstein was never able to accomplish even after having the benefit of Hilbert’s equations.³⁵⁰⁷

Einstein published a childish, sophistic, arrogant and evasive polemic against his critics in 1918 and elected to completely hide from the accusations of plagiarism that Ernst Gehrcke had leveled against him for years, and instead relied upon self-contradictory Metaphysics to obfuscate the issues.³⁵⁰⁸ In this polemic, Einstein copied Galileo’s satiric style of speaking for his critics in a mock dialogue which bitterly degraded them, without acknowledging that he was copying Galileo.³⁵⁰⁹ After Ernst Gehrcke had publicly confronted Einstein in the Berlin Philharmonic in 1920 with the fact that Gerber had published Gerber’s formula first, Einstein again sought priority, based on his absurd Metaphysics,³⁵¹⁰ not on the science, in a frantic and arrogant hand-waving attack,

“ . . .Gerber, who has given the correct formula for the perihelion motion of Mercury before I did. The experts are not only in agreement that Gerber’s derivation is wrong through and through, but the formula cannot be obtained as a consequence of the main assumption made by Gerber. Mr. Gerber’s work is therefore completely useless, an unsuccessful and erroneous theoretical attempt. I maintain that the theory of general relativity has provided the first real explanation of the perihelion motion of mercury. I have not mentioned the work by Gerber originally, because I did not know it when I wrote my work on the perihelion motion of Mercury; even if I had been aware of it, I would not have had any reason to mention it.”³⁵¹¹

Einstein’s standards for awarding priority came back to haunt him. The 1905 paper on relativity, and the 1905 paper on the inertia of energy, were both fallacies of *Petitio Principii*,³⁵¹² and the paper on relativity contains numerous acknowledged errors. Einstein’s 1915 paper on the motion of the planet Mercury is a flawed and obsolete derivation. His theory prior to plagiarizing David Hilbert’s generally covariant field equations of gravitation is untenable. There is an ongoing controversy as to whether or not Gerber’s derivation is justifiable, but the charge of plagiarism is the accusation that Einstein took over Gerber’s solution without acknowledgment,

and used it *inductively* to develop a different “derivation” of the identical solution.

As Hubert Goenner has noted,³⁵¹³ Gehrcke had pointed out that the eclipse observations did not establish the general theory of relativity as sound, and Einstein launched a condescending and accusatorial attack against Gehrcke on this point, though at other times Einstein himself admitted that the eclipse observations were not conclusive. It is widely known today that Gehrcke was absolutely correct. The eclipse observations which propelled Einstein to international fame in 1919 were a sham.

The theory of relativity is internally inconsistent in its ontology. Einstein stated,

“With *Lorentz* [the ether] was rigid and it embodied the ‘resting’ coordinate system, a preferred state of motion in the world. According to the special theory of relativity there was no longer any preferred state of motion; this meant denial of the ether in the sense of the previous theories. For if an ether existed, it would have to have at every space-time point a definite state of motion, which would have to play a role in optics. But such a preferred state of motion does not exist, as shown by the special theory of relativity and therefore there also does not exist any ether in the old sense. The general theory of relativity, as well, knows of no preferred state of motion of a point, which one could possibly interpret as the velocity of an ether. But while according to the special theory of relativity, a portion of space without matter and without an electromagnetic field appears as simply empty, i.e., characterized by no physical quantities whatever, according to the general theory of relativity space that is empty in this sense also has physical qualities, which are characterized mathematically by the components of the gravitational potential, which determine the metric behavior of this portion of space, as well as its gravitational field. One can very well conceive this state of affairs by speaking of an ether, whose state varies continuously from point to point. But one must be on one’s guard not to attribute to this ‘ether’ matter-like properties (e.g., a definite velocity at every place).”³⁵¹⁴

The special theory of relativity requires that masses in inertial motion relative to each other map, by their mutual motion, Galileo’s equal spaces in equal times—spaces and times congruent to distance and times mapped by rigid rods and clocks. According to the general theory of relativity, this is a condition which cannot be met.

The theory of relativity is self-contradictory in many other ways. The theory of relativity depends upon “resting clocks”. A clock must move in order to be a clock, and, therefore, cannot be a “resting clock”. The theory of relativity depends upon “resting rigid rods”. A “rod” is a mental abstraction of moving particles. No rod is rigid or resting. The theory of relativity pretends to be “kinematic”, but requires that “inertial systems” be those in which Newton’s laws attain their simplest form. Newton’s laws are dynamic, not kinematic. In order to define an “inertial motion”, *masses* must be *dynamically* set into motion—there is no kinematics in the theory of relativity, lest it be Newtonian absolutism with absolute space and absolute time as

a substratum and uniform translations of absolute space as a kinematic *absolutist* definition.³⁵¹⁵ While the general theory compels an æther, the special theory is allegedly incompatible with the concept. The theory requires that light signal clock synchronization procedures be performed, which cannot be performed. The theory irrationally requires that *dynamic* measurement procedures, which do not, and cannot take place, cause rigid rods, which do not exist, to “kinematically” contract, and relatively resting clocks, which cannot relatively rest, to “kinematically” desynchronize and dilate. In order for light speed to be a *measured* unit, length and time must first be *measured*, because light speed is a derived unit; but, in the theory, length and time cannot be *measured* until light speed is known—totally unworkable method, which precludes *measurement*.³⁵¹⁶

Just as the pseudorelativists pretend that the dynamics of moving and accelerated masses signifies “relativistic kinematics”, they confound unilateral dynamic effects, with pretend “reciprocal” “kinematic” effects. There is yet to be an experiment which tests, let alone establishes, *reciprocal or kinematic* length contraction, *reciprocal or kinematic* time dilatation, or *reciprocal or kinematic* relative simultaneity.

17.4 Conclusion

Historians all too often look to the conclusions of previous historians, rather than to the *complete* historic record, itself.³⁵¹⁷ Historians record their impressions and not history itself. They are politically motivated. Later historians all too often record the works of earlier historians, and the truth is lost in the process.

Bias is a double-edged sword, which cuts both ways. Many who are aware that Einstein was not an original thinker wrongfully attribute the special theory of relativity to Hendrik Antoon Lorentz, often believing that Minkowski first set in cement the notion of the uniform translation of space and the concept of four-dimensional being. Many worship Hendrik Antoon as a hero, just as many worship Einstein as a hero. However, Lorentz and Minkowski deserve little more credit than does Albert Einstein.

The real “credit” for the relativistic notions of space and time substantially belongs to Roger Joseph Bosovich, Ludwig Lange, Woldemar Voigt, George Francis FitzGerald, Heinrich Hertz, Joseph Larmor, Henri Poincaré, Emil Cohn³⁵¹⁸ and Jakob Laub, who are, with the possible exceptions of FitzGerald and Poincaré, almost never cited in the popular literature as contributors to the theory. And, of course, the theory would not exist without James Clerk Maxwell.

The so-called “Lorentz Transformation” is by no means proprietary to Lorentz. The much touted modern “Principle of Relativity”—the belief that an æther in absolute space is, in principle, undetectable—was nothing more than one very common interpretation of the negative result of Michelson’s experiment, though not the conclusion Michelson, himself, reached. He believed his experiment discredited the then standard explanation of aberration via a resting æther. Einstein said that Michelson regretted that his experiment began the “monster” of the special theory of relativity.³⁵¹⁹

Michelson turned to Stokes' theory of aberration³⁵²⁰ and a "dragged æther" to explain the negative result of his experiments.³⁵²¹ Michelson was disciplined enough to realize that $c' = c$ amongst the two pencils of light passing through his interferometer on Earth was a particular case of velocity comparison in a unique system, not an inductively arrived at, synthetic general principle.

We observe a phenomenon and try to come up with rational possibilities as to how it occurs. This is an analysis of the problem which induces our first principles, which are better the more general and fundamental they are. This methodical analytical process is not a theory, but is an inductive analysis. The synthesis comes in forming the theory and arguing from the principles, which were arrived at through induction, deductively to the known phenomenon, such as the supposed phenomenon of the supposed observation that light speed is invariant.

If the Einsteins' 1905 relativity paper, as it is popularly interpreted to be a deduction of the Lorentz Transformation, truly were a synthetic theory, we would have to assume that it was the Lorentz Transformation which was observed, and not invariant light speed. We would have to assume that observed Lorentz Transformations led us through analysis to the unobserved, but induced, "principle of the invariance of light speed."

That is not what occurred. We supposedly observed invariant light speed, and given that science assumes Nature is predictable and universal, and since no experiment was taken to contradict the supposed observation of invariant light speed, this observed *phenomenon* was analyzed; and the analysis induced, as one approach, the *ad hoc* Lorentz Transformation, the elements of which are the true postulates of the synthetic Poincaré-Lorentz theory of relativity. The Einsteins simply disguised this synthetic theory as a quasi-positivistic analysis, using Poincaré's dynamics and nomenclature, which they called "kinematics".

In Einstein's famous lecture of 1922 in Japan,³⁵²² he recounts that he derived inspiration from "Michelson's experiment". On 21 September 1909, Einstein stated,

"Michelson's experiment suggested the assumption that, relative to a coordinate system moving along with the earth, and, more generally, relative to any system in nonaccelerated motion, all phenomena proceed according to exactly identical laws. Henceforth, we will call this assumption in brief 'the principle of relativity.'"³⁵²³

R. S. Shankland recorded a letter Einstein had sent him in 1952, in which Einstein stated,

"I learned of [the Michelson-Morley experiment] through H. A. Lorentz' decisive investigation of the electrodynamics of moving bodies, with which I was acquainted before developing the special theory of relativity."³⁵²⁴

However, on other occasions, Einstein denied having known of the experiment before the 1905 paper appeared.³⁵²⁵

He may have had grounds to lie. Einstein rarely cited papers which appeared

before the 1905 paper, and which presented the image of “relativity”, as did Michelson’s papers, *The Relative Motion of the Earth and the Luminiferous Ether*, and, *On the Relative Motion of the Earth and the Luminiferous Ether*. Einstein pretended that he invented the concept of relative motion, and by this I mean $c' = c$. But that, on its own, is a trivial matter.

Significantly, admitting to a knowledge of Michelson’s work was an admission that Mileva and Albert based their supposedly deductive theory, which tacitly and incorrectly takes $c' = c$ as a general principle, on a particular case, the Michelson result, thereby admitting that their theory was in truth an inductive argument for Lorentz’ deductive synthesis of 1904, and that $c' = c$ was a particular case of a given velocity comparison in a given static system, not a general principle; the actually held general principles being the hypotheses of the Lorentz Transformation, which deductively result in the particular case of Michelson’s $c' = c$, whether there is relative motion in Michelson’s experiments, or not. Furthermore, there is a tenuous connection between Michelson’s experiments and the special theory of relativity, for pointing to said experiments as evidence in support of the theory admits of absolute space, for without absolute space, and given the supposedly superfluous nature of the æther, there is no relative motion in the Michelson experiments. Where is the “resting system” in the experiment? Where is the “moving system” in the experiment?

The Michelson-Morley experiment only signifies relative motion in Lorentz’ theory, despite the fact that it has long been cited as supporting the Einsteins’ theory.³⁵²⁶ Of course, Albert’s expressed policy was, “If the facts don’t fit the theory, change the facts.” Einstein told R. S. Shankland not to perform an experiment which might falsify the special theory of relativity,

“[Einstein] again said that more experiments were not necessary, and results such as Synge might find would be ‘irrelevant.’ [Einstein] told me not to do any experiments of this kind.”³⁵²⁷

After more than one hundred years, noted experts in the field are still in a quandary to establish any relative motion in the Michelson experiments, such as would place the same events in two systems in relative motion to each other *in the same experiment* in order to justify Poincaré’s notion of relative simultaneity. Others take a different approach. The book *Spacetime Physics*,³⁵²⁸ by Edwin F. Taylor and John Archibald Wheeler, which is perhaps the most respected introductory text to the field, argues for at least two separate experiments, but such is not a test of the special theory of relativity, *per se*, but is, in fact, more likely to detect or disprove any relative motion between the æther and the Earth.

From *Spacetime Physics*:

“The Michelson-Morley experiment and its modern improvements tell us that in every inertial frame the round-trip speed of light is the same in every direction—the speed of light is *isotropic* in both laboratory and rocket frames

as predicted by the principle of relativity.”

How can such a limited set of experiments, which can be explained in so many other ways with greater logical economy, tell us what happens at all times in all places in the universe? This is clearly “too hasty a generalization”. Where is the “laboratory frame” and the “rocket frame” in the Michelson-Morley experiment? Unless one supposes a resting æther, as did Lorentz; or an absolute space filled with a resting æther, as did Mileva and Albert (they called the light medium “superfluous” while using it as the basis of their theory); there is only the effectively static frame of the laboratory.

From *Spacetime Physics*:

“(1) The round-trip speed of light measured on earth is the same in every direction—the speed of light is isotropic. (2) The speed of light is isotropic not only when Earth moves in one direction around Sun in, say, January (call Earth with this motion the ‘laboratory frame’), but also when Earth moves in the opposite direction around Sun six months later, in July (call Earth with this motion the ‘rocket frame’).”

Are we to assume that we have the “resting system” in one experiment, and the “moving frame” in an entirely different experiment? Where is the “resting frame” and where is the “moving frame” in any given experiment, such that there is a transformation of coordinates, which would compel or give evidence of the Lorentz Transformation and relative simultaneity? Where are the observers positioning events, the clocks, and the relatively moving rods? For that matter, where are the inertial reference systems?

From *Spacetime Physics*:

“(3) The generalization of this result to any pair of inertial frames in relative motion. . .”

How are the lab and rocket frames, which are not inertial frames if they rest on the Earth, in relative motion, when they are the same laboratory at two distinct periods of time? The “frame” is composed of the laboratory equipment, not translations of absolute space, through absolute time. Not only is their argument a fallacy of “too hasty a generalization”; the premises, themselves, are false. There is no “pair of inertial frames in relative motion” in the experiment, from a relativistic perspective, which perspective denies the æther. A train leaving Chicago is not moving relative to the same train arriving in Denver.

From *Spacetime Physics*:

“. . .in relative motion is contained in the statement, The round-trip speed of light is isotropic both in the laboratory frame and in the rocket frame.”

Which are the same laboratory with two names at two different times.

From *Spacetime Physics*:

“An experiment to test the assumption of the equality of the round-trip speed of light in two inertial frames in relative motion was conducted in 1932 by Roy J. Kennedy and Edward M. Thordike.”

This experiment, likewise, contains no “resting system” and no “moving system” without the assumption of an absolute space, or a “resting” æther, or an æther resting in absolute space.

Einstein’s fame is built upon fantasies, not facts. The events which led to Einstein’s rise to fame are a fascinating story of hero worship and historic revisionism. The ongoing disclosure of documents related to Einstein’s life raise many new questions. Was the man we are led to envision, with the Mark Twain persona and charisma, in fact a stumbling sadistic brute, who wrested his fame from his wife Mileva’s misery?³⁵²⁹

18 MILEVA EINSTEIN-MARITY

Mileva Marić and Albert Einstein married in 1903. They had already spent many years working together on Lorentz' theory of relativity. In 1905, the Einsteins published their first paper on the Poincaré-Lorentz theory of relativity.

“We have recently completed a very important work, which will make my husband world-famous.”—MILEVA EINSTEIN-MARITY

“The author of these articles—an unknown person at that time, was a bureaucrat at the Patent Office in Bern, Einstein-Marity (Marity—the maiden name of his wife, which by Swiss custom is added to the husband's family name).”—ABRAM JOFFE

“How happy and proud I will be, when we two together have victoriously led our work on relative motion to an end!”—ALBERT EINSTEIN

18.1 Introduction

There is abundant evidence that Mileva Marić, Albert Einstein's first wife, collaborated with Albert on the production and publication of their most famous papers of 1905, and may even have been the sole author of those works.

18.2 Witness Accounts and the Evidence

In 1905, several articles bearing the name of Albert Einstein appeared in a German physics journal, *Annalen der Physik*. The most fateful among these was a paper entitled “*Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper; von A. Einstein*”, Einstein's supposedly breakthrough paper on the “principle of relativity”. Though it was perhaps submitted as coauthored by Mileva Einstein-Marity and Albert Einstein, or solely by Mileva Einstein-Marity, as some scholars believe,³⁵³⁰ Albert's name appeared in the journal as the exclusive author of their works.³⁵³¹

Abram Fedorovich Joffe (Ioffe) recounts that the papers were signed “Einstein-Marity”. “Marity” is a variant of the Serbian “Marić”, Mileva's maiden name. Joffe, who had seen the original 1905 manuscript, is on record as stating,

“For Physics, and especially for the Physics of my generation—that of Einstein's contemporaries, Einstein's entrance into the arena of science is unforgettable. In 1905, three articles appeared in the ‘Annalen der Physik’,

which began three very important branches of 20th Century Physics. Those were the theory of Brownian movement, the theory of the photoelectric effect and the theory of relativity. The author of these articles—an unknown person at that time, was a bureaucrat at the Patent Office in Bern, Einstein-Marity (Marity—the maiden name of his wife, which by Swiss custom is added to the husband’s family name).”

“Для физиков же, и в особенности для физиков моего поколения — современников Эйнштейна, незабываемо появление Эйнштейна на арене науки. В 1905 г. в «Анналах физики» появилось три статьи, положившие начало трём наиболее актуальным направлениям физики XX века. Это были: теория броуновского движения, фотонная теория света и теория относительности. Автор их — неизвестный до тех пор чиновник патентного бюро в Берне Эйнштейн-Марити (Марити — фамилия его жены, которая по швейцарскому обычаю прибавляется к фамилии мужа).”³⁵³²

There is an obvious contradiction between Joffe’s statement that the author of three famous papers in *Annalen der Physik* in 1905 was an unknown patent clerk, and Joffe’s statement that the author of these works was “Einstein-Marity”. Albert Einstein is not known to have ever gone by the *Allianzname* “Einstein-Marity”. Mileva Marić did go by the *Allianzname* “Einstein-Marity”³⁵³³ and Abram Joffe was aware of this fact. Abram Fedorovich Joffe did not title his obituary “In Remembrance of Albert Einstein-Marity”, but rather “In Remembrance of Albert Einstein” and Joffe is not known to have ever referred to Albert Einstein as “Einstein-Marity”, nor is he ever known to have used the *Allianzname* “Einstein-Marity” other than to identify the author of the 1905 papers.

We cannot examine Joffe’s statements in a vacuum, but rather we must take into account the well-known and vicious attacks that have been made against Einstein’s critics, which have had a chilling effect on criticism of Einstein and the exposure of facts which are detrimental to Albert Einstein’s image. Joffe may have felt inhibited from more openly stating that Mileva Marić was the true author of the 1905 papers published in *Annalen der Physik* under Albert Einstein’s name. No one has yet offered an explanation as to why Joffe identified the author of the papers as “Einstein-Marity” other than as attempt to identify the true author of the papers as Mileva Marić. We must also take into account the fact that the Einsteins themselves often referred to their working collaboration, as did many others. The Einsteins’ private correspondence was not available to Joffe and it proves that Mileva and Albert were collaborators. The fact that these various independent accounts point to the same conclusion is not coincidental. Therefore, barring the appearance of conclusive evidence to the contrary, it is safe to say that Joffe meant to disclose the fact that Mileva was the true author of the papers, when Joffe stated that the author of the works was “Einstein-Marity”.

Joffe knew that Mileva went by the *Allianzname* Einstein-Marity and that he, Joffe, could subtly disclose the fact that she was the true author, or a co-author, of

the paper, without risking the fanatical wrath and retaliation which has so often followed the disclosure of facts unfavorable to Einstein's image. Such subtleties were common practice in the Soviet Union, where the government imposed harsh penalties on dissidents. Fanatics in the Physics community and the international press have viciously attacked Einstein's critics. The situation has been described as the "Einstein terror",³⁵³⁴ which terrorism was openly acknowledged by Einstein's advocates.³⁵³⁵ Stjepan Mohorovičić received anonymous threats when he criticized Einstein, and the progress of his career was impeded.³⁵³⁶ Ernst Gehrcke's career advancement was also impeded after he called attention to Albert Einstein's plagiarism and irrationality.³⁵³⁷ Albert Einstein publicly defamed Gehrcke, Lenard and others.³⁵³⁸ The international press and press agencies echoed Einstein's lies around the world, and refused to publish Gehrcke's and Lenard's responses.³⁵³⁹ The terrorist and censorship tactics used against Einstein's critics are typical Zionist behavior. Zionists have perpetrated countless assassinations, both character and bodily assassinations. The State of Israel officially sanctions and commits murder. Numerous Jewish organizations regularly defame their opponents. Zionists and Jewish organizations have criminalized speech, which refutes their lies, in several nations. They seek universal criminal statutes proscribing speech that would contradict their mandated official opinions on historical, religious and political matters.

One must assume that the submitted works were signed. Since Joffe stated that the author was "Einstein-Marity", it is logical to conclude that the papers were signed "Einstein-Marity". Daniil Semenovich Danin explicitly stated that the papers were "signed Einstein-Marity". Prof. Dr. Margarete Maurer has argued that Danin may well have discussed the matter with Joffe.³⁵⁴⁰

In 1962, Daniil Semenovich Danin expressly stated,

"The unsuccessful teacher, who, in search of a reasonable income, had become a third class engineering expert in the Swiss Patent Office, this yet completely unknown theoretician in 1905 published three articles in the same volume of the famous 'Annalen der Physik' signed 'Einstein-Marity' (or Marić—which was his first wife's family name)."

"Невезучий школьный учитель, в поисках сносного заработка ставший инженером-экспертом третьего класса в Швейцарском бюро патентов, еще никому не ведомый теоретик опубликовал в 1905 году в одном и том же томе знаменитых «Анналов физики» три статьи за подписью Эйнштейн-Марити (или Марич—это была фамилия его первой жены)."³⁵⁴¹

If "Einstein-Marity" refers to a sole person, that person is Mileva Einstein-Marić, not Albert Einstein.

Desanka Trbuhović-Gjurić's interpretation of the facts are found in her book, *Im Schatten Albert Einsteins, Das tragische Leben der Mileva Einstein-Marić, (In the Shadow of Albert Einstein, The Tragic Life of Mileva Einstein-Marić)*, in which she

discusses Mileva's rôle in the development of the special theory of relativity, and states, *inter alia*,

“The distinguished Russian physicist [***] Abraham F. Joffe (1880-1960), pointed out in his ‘In Remembrance of Albert Einstein’, that Einstein’s three epochal articles in Volume 17 of ‘Annalen der Physik’ of 1905 were originally signed ‘Einstein-Marić’. Joffe had seen the originals as assistant to Röntgen, who belonged to the Board of the ‘Annalen’, which had examined submitted contributions for editorial purposes. Röntgen showed his *summa cum laude* student this work, and Joffe thereby came face to face with the manuscripts, which are no longer available today.”

“Der hervorragende russische Physiker [***] Abraham F. Joffe (1880-1960), machte in seinen «Erinnerung an Albert Einstein» darauf aufmerksam, dass die drei epochemachenden Artikel Einsteins im Band XVII der «Annalen der Physik» von 1905 im Original mit «Einstein-Marić» gezeichnet waren. Joffe hatte die Originale als Assistent von Röntgen gesehen, der dem Kuratorium der «Annalen» angehörte, das die bei der Redaktion eingereichten Beiträge zu begutachten hatte. Zu dieser Arbeit zog Röntgen seinen *summa cum laude*-Schüler Joffe bei, der auf diese Weise die heute nicht mehr greifbaren Manuskripte zu Gesicht bekam.”³⁵⁴²

Wilhelm Conrad Röntgen was one of the referees of the Einsteins’ 1905 paper on the electrodynamics of moving bodies, which reiterate Lorentz’ equations and FitzGerald’s contraction hypothesis, as if unprecedented ideas. Abram Joffe was Röntgen’s assistant until 1906. Joffe wrote in 1960,

“Therefore Röntgen suggested to me that when I defended my doctoral dissertation in May of 1905, that I ought to discuss what one could now look upon as the prehistory of the theory of relativity: the Lorentz-equations and the hypothesis of FitzGerald. And then he asked me a question, ‘Do you believe that there are spheres which are flattened when they move? Can you confirm the fact that such electrons will forever remain a part of Physics?’—I answered, ‘Yes, I am convinced that they exist, only we don’t yet know everything about them. Consequently, we must study them further.’

When I defended my dissertation, something remarkable happened. The dean gave the welcoming address in Latin, which I did not understand. The only thing I could fathom was that my defense had gone well, because the speech ended with a handshake. But when I met Röntgen in the laboratory, he was indignant at the cold response I had given to the dean’s speech. It turned out that the faculty had awarded me the degree of ‘*summa cum laude*’—‘with the highest praise possible’—for the first time in 20 years. This degree awarded me the right to give lectures. It was to be expected that I would have been overwhelmed with joy—and I did not know at that time that there were four levels of evaluation and I had received the highest. For

a long time Röntgen refused to believe that I had not known of the rankings of the evaluation levels when I was presenting my defense. Afterwards, he reminded me of this incident, ‘You are really a ridiculous person.’

In August of 1906, I traveled to Russia and witnessed the intelligentsia leaving the revolution with my own eyes. Given my Marxist convictions, I felt that at such a time I did not have the right to only concern myself with Physics far away from my homeland in Munich. I wrote Röntgen that I would not return and that my conscience would not allow me to leave the homeland while the reactionaries triumphed.³⁵⁴³

Given that Joffe was familiar with Lorentz’ work and the Lorentz transformation at least as early as May of 1905, he must have known that the Einsteins were plagiarists. The Einsteins’ paper was not submitted until at least 30 June 1905 (perhaps much later), and was not published until 26 September 1905, and it is possible that substantial changes were made after the paper was submitted. Joffe, like Röntgen, also must have had an intense interest in the Poincaré-Lorentz special theory of relativity and would have been eager to have studied the Einsteins’ paper. Röntgen also must have known that the Einsteins were plagiarists, and as a referee of their paper, he was guilty of complicity in their plagiarism, as were Paul Drude and Max Planck—one wonders if these men even participated in the fraud from the beginning.

Joffe knew that his statement that the papers were authored by Einstein-Marity would be noticed. Though Joffe’s statement superficially indicates that it was Albert who went by the name of “Einstein-Marity”, such a claim, and the parenthetical explanation it compelled, were extraordinary—an express contradiction—and are belied by the fact that Mileva, not Albert, went by the name of “Einstein-Marity” and Joffe knew it. Joffe was probably, as imperceptibly as his conscience would allow, disclosing to the world that Albert was not the author; or, not the sole author of the works in question.

Joffe’s statements appeared fifty years after he had read the 1905 papers. It stuck with him all those many years that the papers were indelibly signed “Einstein-Marity”—the manuscripts have long ago disappeared. Joffe titled his obituary “In Remembrance of Albert Einstein”, not “In Remembrance of Albert Einstein-Marity” and Joffe does not refer to “Einstein-Marity” other than in the context of the 1905 papers. The contradiction between Joffe’s claim that the author of the works was Einstein-Marity, which was Mileva’s name, and Joffe’s claim that the author was a male patent clerk have not been explained other than by the fact that Mileva was the author, or coauthor of the papers.

Though some try to examine Joffe’s statement, and all the other specific facts, individually and in a vacuum, Joffe’s statement must be examined in light of the many facts which prove that Mileva and Albert worked together on the theory of relativity. There is no coincidence in the fact that, unbeknownst to Joffe, Mileva and Albert had discussed their working collaboration on Lorentz’ theory in their private correspondence. It is not a coincidence, nor an irrelevant fact, that Albert discussed his collaboration with Mileva with Alexander Moszkowski. It cannot be ignored that

these isolated facts are consistent, and prove individually and collectively that Mileva was at least the coauthor of the 1905 papers the Einsteins published in *Annalen der Physik*.

How could Joffe have known that Mileva Marić went by the name of Einstein-Marity, if the name had not appeared on the 1905 papers and why would he tie that name to the 1905 papers? Joffe could not have known that Albert went by the name of “Einstein-Marity”, because Albert Einstein never did. Perhaps, Mileva introduced herself to Joffe as the “Einstein-Marity” who had written and signed the papers. Joffe recorded his attempts to discuss the 1905 papers with their author—a fact I pointed out in 2002, which others have since adopted,

“I did not come to know Albert Einstein, until I met him in Berlin. [***] I wanted very much to talk to Einstein [***] and visited him in Zurich together with my friend Wagner. But we did not find him home, so we did not have a chance to talk, and his wife told us that, according to his own words, he is only a civil servant in the patent office, and he has no serious thoughts about science, much less about experiments.”³⁵⁴⁴

Joffe states that he wanted to visit Albert in Zurich, but met with Mileva and gave up on meeting Albert; but did he, in fact, travel to Zurich to meet Mileva? Why would Joffe, upon meeting with Mileva, simply have abandoned his quest to meet Albert? After all, Joffe and Wagner went out of their way to visit him in Zurich. Why not make any further effort to find him? Would it have been so difficult to have found Albert at the patent office, or the local bar? Joffe does not state that Albert was “out of town”, but was merely “not home”.

Why weren’t Joffe and Wagner shocked by Mileva’s comments? Did Mileva have all the answers to their questions? Why, after having read the original papers of 1905, and likely other published articles, would Joffe have accepted Mileva’s account that Albert was a nothing? Was Mileva really something? Would not the natural reaction to Mileva’s statements have been, “Then, who wrote the papers?” Or, did Joffe already know? Perhaps, Joffe wanted to confront both Mileva and Albert with the fact that their papers were unoriginal. He knew Lorentz’ theory and FitzGerald’s hypothesis and was pursuing Lorentz’ theory before the Einsteins’ plagiarized Lorentz’ work. Perhaps, Albert was hiding from Joffe and Wagner. The only thing certain is that Joffe’s story, as he told it, makes no sense, other than as odd images, which stuck with Joffe for many, many years and were fundamental to his vision of Einstein and Marić.

There is no Swiss custom by which the husband automatically adds his wife’s maiden name to his, and even if there were, neither Albert nor Mileva were Swiss. Albert Einstein never signed his name “Einstein-Marity”. Swiss law permits the male, the female, or both, to use a double last name, but this must be declared before the marriage, and it was Mileva, not Albert, who opted for the last name “Einstein-Marity”. A married person may use the hyphenated *Allianzname* in everyday use, but it was Mileva who went by “Einstein-Marity”, not Albert. Albert signed his marriage records simply “Einstein”. Mileva’s death notice reads “Einstein-Marity”.

Joffe, who had handled the original manuscripts, recounts that,

“The author of these articles [***] was [***] Einstein-Marity”.

It was perhaps subtly amusing to Joffe to point out that Albert’s wife had written, or coauthored, the *Annalen* papers. There is apparently no other plausible reason for Joffe to have made this allusion. Even if Joffe had encountered Mileva’s name “Einstein-Marity” elsewhere, perhaps when they first met, there is no grounds for his associating it with the author of the work of 1905 and only with the work of 1905, other than the name’s having appeared on the work.

Why did Albert’s name appear in the published papers, but not Mileva’s? Did Mileva lose her nerve in the end and ask not to be named as the author of the unoriginal works? Did Mileva have moral objections to the plagiarism? Were the works submitted as coauthored works, but the couple was persuaded that it would be better to have a male name in print? Was there a printing error? Why, after fifty years, would Joffe come out with the disclosure that the papers were submitted by “Einstein-Marity”? Why did that fact nag him for fifty years, and why did he feel compelled to publicly express it, after Albert Einstein had died?

An early Einstein biographer, Alexander Moszkowski, wrote in 1921,

“[Einstein] found consolation in the fact that he preserved a certain independence, which meant the more to him as his instinct for freedom led him to discover the essential things in himself. Thus, earlier, too, during his studies at Zürich he had carried on his work in theoretical physics at home, almost entirely apart from the lectures at the Polytechnic plunging himself into the writings of Kirchhoff, Helmholtz, Hertz, Boltzmann, and Drude. Disregarding chronological order, we must here mention that he found a partner in these studies who was working in a similar direction, a Southern Slavonic student, whom he married in the year 1903. This union was dissolved after a number of years. Later he found the ideal of domestic happiness at the side of a woman whose grace is matched by her intelligence, Else Einstein, his cousin, whom he married in Berlin.”³⁵⁴⁵

“Ihm verblieb als Trost die Wahrung einer gewissen Selbständigkeit, wie ihn ja sein Freiheitsinstinkt durchweg dazu anhielt, das Wesentliche in sich selbst zu suchen. So hatte er auch zuvor während seiner Züricher Studien die theoretische Physik fast durchweg nicht im Anschluß an die Vorlesungen im Polytechnikum, sondern in häuslicher Arbeit betrieben, mit Versenkung in die Werke von Kirchhoff, Helmholtz, Hertz, Boltzmann und Drude. Außerhalb der chronologischen Ordnung erwähnen wir, daß er für diese Studien eine in gleicher Linie strebende Partnerin fand, eine südslawische Studentin, die er im Jahre 1903 heiratete. Diese Ehe wurde nach einer Reihe von Jahren getrennt. Er fand später an der Seite seiner ebenso anmutigen wie intelligenten Kusine Else Einstein, mit der er sich in Berlin vermählte, das Ideal häuslichen Glückes.”³⁵⁴⁶

On 3 April 1921, *The New York Times* quoted Chaim Weizmann,

“When [Einstein] was called ‘a poet in science’ the definition was a good one. He seems more an intuitive physicist, however. He is not an experimental physicist, and although he is able to detect fallacies in the conceptions of physical science, he must turn his general outlines of theory over to some one else to work out.”³⁵⁴⁷

Einstein told Leopold Infeld, “I am really more of a philosopher than a physicist.”³⁵⁴⁸ It is well-established that Einstein had relied upon collaborators to accomplish the mathematical work for which he would sometimes take sole credit. Einstein admitted to Peter A. Bucky that he relied upon experts to do his mathematical work,

“[E]ven after I became well-known I many times made use of experts to assist me in complicated calculations in order to prove certain physics problems. Also, I have always strongly believed that one should not burden his mind with formulae when one can go to a textbook and look them up. I have done that, too, on many occasions.”³⁵⁴⁹

Einstein collaborated with Mileva Marić, Jacob Laub, Walter Ritz, Ludwig Hopf, Otto Stern, Marcel Grossmann, Michele Besso, Adriaan Fokker, and Wander de Haas. He had copied the formulae of Lorentz, Poincaré, Wien, Gerber, and countless others, without an attribution.

Einstein biographer Peter Micheltore interviewed the Einsteins’ son Hans Albert Einstein and wrote that,

“[Mileva Maric] was as good at mathematics as Marcel [Grossmann] and she, too, helped in the weekend coaching sessions. [***] She tried to bring a sense of order into Albert’s life, too. The mathematics instruction was only part of it. [***] Mileva helped him solve certain mathematical problems, but nobody could assist with the creative work, the flow of fresh ideas. [***] Mileva checked the article again and again, then mailed it. [***] Einstein’s mathematics failed him. The problem was too complex for Mileva. He called on Marcel Grossmann [***] It was a year later, when Einstein hit a snag in his research, that he went to Switzerland to visit Mileva and the boys.”³⁵⁵⁰

There is an apparent contradiction in Micheltore’s statement, in that he stated that Mileva Marić was as good a mathematician as Marcel Grossmann, then claimed that Grossmann was able to solve a problem Marić could not. This related not to ability, but to training. Grossmann had specialized in non-Euclidean geometry, and Marić had not. Einstein plagiarized the work of both his wife Mileva Marić and his friend Marcel Grossmann.

Albert Einstein was not a mathematically minded person. Einstein confessed to Abraham Pais,

“I am not a mathematician.”³⁵⁵¹

Albert Einstein also stated,

“Since the mathematicians have attacked the relativity theory, I myself no longer understand it anymore.”³⁵⁵²

Anton Reiser (Rudolf Kayser) records that, while Albert Einstein was studying,

“He showed very little love for [the] study [of mathematics], which seemed to him rather limitless in relation to other sciences. No one could stir him to visit the mathematical seminars.”³⁵⁵³

While still a child, Albert’s parents and teachers suspected that he was mentally retarded.³⁵⁵⁴ Abraham Pais tells a revealing story of one of Albert Einstein’s blunders.³⁵⁵⁵

We have direct evidence from Albert’s own pen that the work on relativity theory was a collaboration between Mileva and him,

“How happy and proud I will be, when we two together have victoriously led our work on relative motion to an end!”

“Wie glücklich und stolz werde ich sein, wenn wir beide zusammen unsere Arbeit über die Relativbewegung siegreich zu Ende geführt haben!”³⁵⁵⁶

This letter from Albert to Mileva came between two relevant others; one *circa* 10 August 1899, in which Albert discusses the electrodynamics of moving bodies in “empty space”; and another dated 28 December 1901, in which Albert pleads with Mileva to agree to a collaboration in marriage on their scientific work.

Albert’s plea of 1901 is made in the express context of Lorentz’ and Drude’s writings on the “electrodynamics of moving bodies”—which is the very title of the Einsteins’ 1905 paper on the theory of relativity. After the publication of the 1905 article, Albert Einstein repeatedly stated that he had taken the light postulate of special relativity from Lorentz’ theory,³⁵⁵⁷ and professed that the Lorentz transformation is the “real basis” of the special theory of relativity.³⁵⁵⁸ Lorentz³⁵⁵⁹ had published the Lorentz transformation in near modern form in 1899 (Joseph Larmor published the modern transformation in 1900³⁵⁶⁰). Albert Einstein had studied Lorentz’ work from the age of 16 as a student in 1895.³⁵⁶¹ Drude featured Lorentz’ theories in Drude’s famous book of 1900 *Lehrbuch der Optik*. Albert Einstein owned a copy of Drude’s book, which featured Lorentz’ theories.³⁵⁶² Albert wrote to Mileva in this context,

“As my dear wife, we will want to engage in a quite diligent scientific collaboration, so that we don’t become old Philistines, isn’t it so?”

“Bis Du mein liebe Weiberl bist, wollen wir recht eifrig zusammen wissenschaftlich arbeiten, daß wir keine alten Philistersleut werden, gellst.”³⁵⁶³

This letter referred directly to a collaboration that would ultimately lead to the publication of the Einsteins’ paper on the special theory of relativity in 1905.

Evan Harris Walker, who argued that Mileva was co-author, or sole author, of the 1905 papers, quoted some of Albert’s statements as found in the *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, and bear in mind that the vast majority of Mileva’s letters to Albert were destroyed long ago, with there being no more likely reasons for their destruction than to hide her contributions to their works and the fact that the works were largely unoriginal,

“I find statements in 13 of [Albert’s] 43 letters to [Mileva] that refer to her research or to an ongoing collaborative effort—for example, in document 74, ‘another method which has similarities with yours.’

In document 75, Albert writes: ‘I am also looking forward very much to our new work. You must now continue with your investigation.’ In document 79, he says, ‘we will send it to Wiedermann’s *Annalen*.’ In document 96, he refers to ‘our investigations’; in document 101, to ‘our theory of molecular forces.’ In document 107, he tells her: ‘Prof. Weber is very nice to me. . . . I gave him our paper.’”³⁵⁶⁴

Though some have suggested that Albert was condescending to Mileva by referring to the works as “theirs”; it is far more likely, from a sociological point of view, that the opposite occurred, and Albert was Mileva’s lackey, fetching notes for her. In order to spare Albert’s male ego, and in order to further Albert’s career, Mileva perhaps referred to the work as “theirs”—just as female nurses have been observed to instruct male doctors on the diagnosis and viable treatment for a patient, only to have the male doctor then pretend to that patient, and in front of the nurse, that the ideas were his—even to lecture the female nurse with her own words. It does not seem plausible, most especially not in that era, that Albert would call the work joint if it were not—and it was absolutely against Albert’s nature to award due credit to others, unless forced to do so. Albert professed,

“Man usually avoids attributing cleverness to somebody else—unless it is an enemy.”

Albert lacked the mathematical skills and intellectual abilities needed to have written the 1905 paper alone. Mileva was exceptionally bright, and all indications are that those who knew her throughout her life found her the more intelligent one of the pair. She had the needed intellectual prowess to have written the 1905 paper on the principle of relativity. Given the many blunders in the paper, it is safe to assume that neither one of them was a superlative mathematician, nor logician. It also appears that publication of the paper may have been rushed—perhaps the couple had

corresponded with Poincaré and he had informed them of his results, and when he would publish them.

Mileva and Albert had coauthored papers before³⁵⁶⁵ and Albert had assumed credit for that which Mileva had accomplished without him.³⁵⁶⁶ Senta Troemel-Ploetz presented a thorough account of Albert's appropriation of Mileva's work and of Mileva's acquiescence.³⁵⁶⁷ Troemel-Ploetz' insights into the cultural barriers Marić faced, and the reasons for Marić's lack of success at the ETH, form a persuasive argument that Mileva was discriminated against, and faced other enormous challenges, which must be taken into account when comparing Mileva's accomplishments with those of her *fellow* students.

Mileva Marić was the more likely one of the couple to have reviewed the English language literature for the reviews published under Albert's name in the *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik* and *Fortschritte der Physik*. Einstein published 21 reviews in the *Beiblätter* in 1905.³⁵⁶⁸ Mileva could speak English and Albert could not. R. S. Shankland recounts that,

“[Albert Einstein] told me that when he came to the United States that year [1921], he did not know a word of English. On the trip he picked up some by ear. He told me, ‘I am the acoustic type; I learn by ear and give by word. When I read I hear the words. Writing is difficult, and I communicate this way very badly.’ He added that he never really felt sure of the spelling of any English word. He told me that he even hated to write his *Autobiographical Notes* in German.”³⁵⁶⁹

The Chicago Tribune reported on 3 April 1921 on page 6 that,

“[Albert Einstein] does not speak English and answered through an interpreter.”

The New York Times Book Review and Magazine on 1 May 1921 published an interview with Albert Einstein and his second wife, and Dan Arnauld recorded that Einstein's second wife interrupted the interview and was concerned by Albert's inability to speak English,

“‘Maybe I can help you,’ she said kindly. ‘I speak English, and I can interpret for him.’ The interview up to that point had been in German.”

Albert Einstein wrote to Michele Besso in 1914,

“I am studying English (with Wohlend), slowly but thoroughly.”³⁵⁷⁰

Apparently, the lessons did not take. Mileva had the ability to have read the important English and Slavic works of Gibbs, Larmor, Smoluchowski, Varičak, etc., which the couple copied.

Albert would often simply agree with whomever he had last spoken,³⁵⁷¹ and it is

likely that he was little more than a mere parrot. Upon meeting with colleagues, he would often grill them for information on their theories, seemingly soaking it all in to repeat it later as if the ideas were his own.

Numerous eyewitnesses (literally) described Albert Einstein's vacant childlike eyes and childlike behavior and naïveté.³⁵⁷² For example, when Albert Einstein arrived in America in 1921, *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), described Einstein on the front page:

“Under a high, broad forehead are large and luminous eyes, almost childlike in their simplicity and unworldliness.”

Charles Nordmann, who chauffeured Albert Einstein around France, sarcastically described him as a vacant-eyed simian clod.³⁵⁷³ Nordmann sarcastically ranked him with Newton, Des Cartes or *Henri Poincaré*—from whom Einstein had copied the principle of relativity.³⁵⁷⁴ Like Rabelais and Voltaire before him, Nordmann lavished sarcastic praise on the new hero and derided him in ways which would elude the unsophisticated, but which were clear to those knowledgeable of the facts. Nordmann was careful not to be too blunt, for he wished to advocate the theory of relativity, and it was politically expedient for him to ride on Einstein's coat tails, but Nordmann never failed to get his digs in. Charles Nordmann wrote,

“Einstein is big (he is about 1 m 76), with large shoulders and the back only very slightly bent. His head, the head where the world of science has been re-created, immediately attracts and fixes the attention. His skull is clearly, and to an extraordinary degree, brachycephalic, great in breadth and receding towards the nape of the neck without exceeding the vertical. Here is an illustration which brings to nought the old assurances of the phrenologists and of certain biologists, according to which genius is the prerogative of the dolichocephales. The skull of Einstein reminds me, above all else, of that of Renan, who was also a brachycephale. As with Renan the forehead is huge; its breadth exceptional, its spherical form striking one more than its height. A few horizontal folds cross this moving face which is sometimes cut, at moments of concentration or thought, by two deep vertical furrows which raise his eyebrows.

His complexion is smooth, unpolished, of a certain duskiess, bright. A small moustache, dark and very short, decorates a sensual mouth, very red, fairly large, whose corners gradually rise in a smooth and permanent smile. The nose, of simple shape, is slightly aquiline.

Under his eyebrows, whose lines seem to converge towards the middle of his forehead, appear two very deep eyes whose grave and melancholy expression contrast with the smile of this pagan mouth. The expression is usually distant, as though fixed on infinity, at times slightly clouded over. This gives his general expression a touch of inspiration and of sadness which accentuates once again the creases produced by reflection and which, almost linking with his eyelids, lengthen his eyes, as though with a touch of *kohl*.

Very black hair, flecked with silver, unkempt, falls in curls towards the nape of his neck and his ears, after having been brought straight up, like a frozen wave, above his forehead.

Above all, the impression is one of disconcerting youth, strongly romantic, and at certain moments evoking in me the irrepressible idea of a young Beethoven, on which meditation had already left its mark, and who had once been beautiful. And then, suddenly, laughter breaks out and one sees a student. Thus appeared to us the man who has plumbed with his mind, deeper than any before him, the astonishing depths of the mysterious universe.”³⁵⁷⁵

Certain anecdotal accounts paint Albert Einstein in a bad light. Upon refusing to brush his teeth, Einstein allegedly proclaimed that, “pigs’ bristles can drill through diamond, so how should my teeth stand up to them?”³⁵⁷⁶ Explaining why he didn’t wear a hat in the rain, he asserted that hair dries faster than hats, and irritably asserted that such was obvious. It apparently eluded him that the objective was, in the first place, to keep the hair dry. Explaining why he didn’t wear socks, Einstein commented, “When I was young I found out that the big toe always ends up by making a hole in the sock. So I stopped wearing socks”³⁵⁷⁷ and “What use are socks? They only produce holes.”³⁵⁷⁸ Felix Klein told Wolfgang Pauli that Einstein wrote to him that Klein’s paper³⁵⁷⁹ delighted him like a child given a bar of chocolate by his mommy.³⁵⁸⁰ *The New York Times* reported on 6 November 1927 on page 22 that Einstein forgot his bags in the waiting room when boarding a train in Gare de l’Est. *The New York Times* reported on 13 July 1924 on page 22 in an article entitled, “Einstein Counted Wrong”, that Einstein counted the change a street car conductor had given him:

“After counting it hurriedly, Einstein insisted that the conductor had made a mistake. The latter recounted the change deliberately, explaining to Herr Einstein that it was correct, and then turned to the next passenger with a shrug of his shoulders and the remark:

‘His arithmetic is weak.’”

Einstein’s private physician Prof. Janos Plesch wrote,

“Einstein never took any exercise beyond a short walk when he felt like it (which wasn’t often, because he has no sense of direction, and therefore would seldom venture far afield), and whatever he got sailing his boat, though that was sometimes quite arduous—not the sailing exactly, but the rowing home of the heavy yacht in the evening calm when there wasn’t a breath of air to stretch the sails.”³⁵⁸¹

Peter A. Bucky recounted many such anecdotes and told of how Albert Einstein had decided to live in one room as opposed to four so that the next time he lost a button from his shirt it would be easier to find.³⁵⁸²

Albert Einstein was taken in by a con man named Otto Reiman, who convinced Einstein that he could describe a person after blindly touching a sample of his or her handwriting.³⁵⁸³ Many physicists including Albert Einstein, A. E. Dolbear and Sir Oliver Lodge, believed in telepathy; but Einstein was perhaps the only one to find proof of it in the fact that we humans do not have skins as thick as an elephant's hide.³⁵⁸⁴ Albert Einstein was taken in by the psychic Roman Ostoja and attended a séance with Upton Sinclair.³⁵⁸⁵ Einstein wrote a preface for the Thomas edition of Upton Sinclair's book on telepathy, *Mental Radio*,³⁵⁸⁶ in which Einstein—"the greatest mind in the world"³⁵⁸⁷—asked that psychologists seriously consider Sinclair's findings.

Elsa Einstein was Albert Einstein's second wife and his cousin and they were related by blood through both her mother and father. The inbred Einsteins were as arrogant as they were ridiculous. Denis Brian wrote in his book *Einstein: A Life*,

"The Sinclairs arranged for Einstein to meet some of their distinguished writer friends for dinner at the exclusive Town House in Los Angeles. When Einstein arrived, he somehow missed the cloakroom and appeared in the dining room wearing a 'humble' black overcoat and a much-worn hat. In what might have been a scene from a Chaplin film, he removed his overcoat, 'folded it neatly, and laid it on the floor in a vacant corner and set the hat on top of it. Then he was ready to meet the literary elite of Southern California.' There was even something Chaplinesque in the way Einstein flirted with the attractive women, while Elsa—"my old lady" he called her—was at his elbow.

Elsa confirmed Mrs. Sinclair's view of her as a dutiful and utterly devoted German hausfrau during a discussion about God. Einstein had stated his belief in God, but not a personal God—a distinction which Mrs. Sinclair didn't get. She replied, 'Surely the personality of God must include all other personalities.' Afterwards, Elsa gently admonished Mrs. Sinclair for arguing with Albert, adding, 'You know, my husband has the greatest mind in the world.' 'Yes, I know,' said Mrs. Sinclair, 'but surely he doesn't know everything!'"³⁵⁸⁸

Though Roman Ostoja was unable to conjure up a ghost for Albert Einstein, the media were able to put America into a trance-like state of adulation. Brian continued,

"Back in his gift-strewn cottage Einstein found tangible evidence that 'America was prepared to go mad over him.' A millionairess gave Caltech \$10,000 for the privilege of meeting him."³⁵⁸⁹

Peter Michelmore tells a story of how Einstein dropped his saliva saturated cigar butt into the dust, then unashamedly picked up the gritty stub and shoved it back into his mouth defiantly declaring, "I don't care a straw for germs."³⁵⁹⁰ R. S. Shankland records that Einstein,

“apparently put his cigarette into his coat pocket, and as we took off our coats he had a small conflagration in his.”³⁵⁹¹

Einstein wasn't too handy around the house,³⁵⁹² and seemingly had a difficult time conceptualizing geometric problems. In a joke perhaps first told of Ampère, it was said that Einstein insisted that two holes be bored through his front door, one larger than the other, so that both the large cat, *and the small cat*, could pass through the door.³⁵⁹³ This anecdote is significant, because it is a historical indication of the low esteem in which some of the people who had met Einstein held his intelligence.

After meeting Einstein, Max von Laue found it difficult to believe that Einstein had written the 1905 paper,

“[T]he young man who met me made such an unexpected impression on me, that I did not believe him to be capable of being the father of the theory of relativity.”

“[D]er junge Mann, der mir entgegen kam, machte mir einen so unerwarteten Eindruck, daß ich nicht glaubte, er könne der Vater der Relativitätstheorie sein.”³⁵⁹⁴

Minkowski, who had been Einstein's professor, found it difficult to believe that “lazy” Einstein had written the 1905 paper. Minkowski did not think Einstein capable of it.³⁵⁹⁵ Minkowski thought that Einstein was a poor mathematician.³⁵⁹⁶ According to both Heaviside and Born, Minkowski anticipated Einstein.³⁵⁹⁷ Max Born wrote in his autobiography,

“I went to Cologne, met Minkowski and heard his celebrated lecture ‘Space and Time’, delivered on 21 September 1908. Outside the circle of physicists and mathematicians, Minkowski's contribution to relativity is hardly known. Yet it is upon his work that the imposing structures of modern field theories have been built. He discovered the formal equivalence of the three space coordinates and the time variable, and developed the transformation theory in this four-dimensional universe. He told me later that it came to him as a great shock when Einstein published his paper in which the equivalence of the different local times of observers moving relative to each other was pronounced; for he had reached the same conclusions independently but did not publish them because he wished first to work out the mathematical structure in all its splendour. He never made a priority claim and always gave Einstein his full share in the great discovery. After having heard Minkowski speak about his ideas, my mind was made up at once. I would go to Göttingen and to help him in his work.”³⁵⁹⁸

On 2 February 1920, Albert Einstein wrote a letter to Paul Ehrenfest in which Einstein made obvious blunders in his arithmetic,

“I have received the 10000 marks.^[1] The accounting now looks like this: 16500 marks is what the grand piano costs, 239 marks is the cost of packing, delivery to the train station, and export permit. Remainder is 111 marks,^[2] which is consequently being applied toward the violins.^{[3]»³⁵⁹⁹}

Ehrenfests response to Einstein of 8 February 1920 is telling and hints that he knew that Einstein was incompetent beyond mere questions of finances,

“We had a great laugh today about your brilliant miscalculation. You write the following, verbatim:

‘I have received the 10000 marks. The acct. looks like this: 16500 marks is what the grand piano costs, 239 marks is the cost of packing, delivery —. Remainder is 111 marks, which is consequently being applied toward the violins’^[4] —

God said, ‘Let Einstein be’ and all was skew!—A nice non-Euclidity in the series of numbers!!—After this exercise, I understand perfectly why destitution [*Dallessicität*] is your normal state!^{[5]»³⁶⁰⁰}

Einstein, himself, described his goals, strengths and limitations in an essay dated 18 September 1896,

“They are, most of all, my individual inclination for abstract and mathematical thinking, lack of imagination and of practical sense.”³⁶⁰¹

Einstein later found himself in deeper waters and wrote to Paul Hertz on 22 August 1915,

“You do not have the faintest idea what I had to go through as a mathematical ignoramus before coming into this harbor.”³⁶⁰²

Albert Einstein wrote to Felix Klein, on 26 March 1917, and confessed that,

“As I have never done non-Euclidean geometry, the more obvious elliptic geometry had escaped me when I was writing my last paper.”³⁶⁰³

Einstein often tried to justify his enormous difficulties in school³⁶⁰⁴ and his ignorance by admitting that he had thought mathematics unimportant and thought that formulas and facts need not be memorized because one can simply look them up in text books.³⁶⁰⁵

Dr. Tilman Sauer stated,

“[Hilbert] would soon [. . .] pinpoint flaws in Einstein’s rather pedestrian way of dealing with the mathematics of his gravitation theory.”³⁶⁰⁶

It is well-established that Einstein had relied upon collaborators to accomplish

the mathematical work for which he would sometimes take sole credit. Einstein admitted to Peter A. Bucky that he relied upon experts to do his mathematical work,

“[E]ven after I became well-known I many times made use of experts to assist me in complicated calculations in order to prove certain physics problems. Also, I have always strongly believed that one should not burden his mind with formulae when one can go to a textbook and look them up. I have done that, too, on many occasions.”³⁶⁰⁷

Einstein hid from the many accusations that his theory was metaphysical nonsense—an inconsistent jumble of fallacies of *Petitio Principii*—nothing but an excuse to plagiarize. A meeting had been arranged to discuss Vaihinger’s theory of fictions in 1920, and Einstein pledged that he would attend this meeting. Knowing that Einstein would be devoured in a debate over his mathematical fictions, which confused induction with deduction, Wertheimer and Ehrenfest helped Einstein fabricate an excuse to miss the meeting he had agreed to attend. Einstein was proven a liar.³⁶⁰⁸ He also hid from many other criticisms, and Einstein refused to answer T. J. J. See’s many charges of plagiarism,³⁶⁰⁹ and refused to debate Reuter Dahl or to answer his many charges of plagiarism.³⁶¹⁰ Einstein hid from the French Academy of Sciences.³⁶¹¹ Einstein hid from Cardinal O’Connell.³⁶¹² Einstein hid from Dayton C. Miller’s falsification of the special theory of relativity.³⁶¹³ Einstein hid from Cartmel.³⁶¹⁴ Miller hammered Einstein in the press over the course of many years. *The New York Times Index* list several articles in which Miller’s and William B. Cartmels’ falsifications of the special theory of relativity are discussed. Einstein and Lorentz were very worried by Miller’s results and could not find fault with them.³⁶¹⁵ Einstein told R. S. Shankland not to perform an experiment which might falsify the special theory of relativity,

“[Einstein] again said that more experiments were not necessary, and results such as Synge might find would be ‘irrelevant.’ [Einstein] told me not to do any experiments of this kind.”³⁶¹⁶

Einstein knew he was caught at the Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Naturforscher meeting in the Berlin Philharmonic, and wanted to run away from Germany. Einstein desired to hide from the Bad Nauheim debate at which he had threatened to devour his opponents,³⁶¹⁷ then Einstein—after being talked into appearing and after much hype promoting the event which attracted thousand of visitors—then Einstein, when losing the debate, ran away during the lunch break and again wanted to run away from Germany. Einstein prospered from hype and had no legitimacy as a supposed “genius”. The press rescued him again and again, while he hid. Einstein was unable to defend his theories in the light of strict scrutiny.

18.3 Prophets of the Prize

Is there any evidence that Albert Einstein wrote unoriginal works as a pattern? By

1905, before the appearance of the Einsteins' first paper on the principle of relativity, Albert Einstein had already exhibited a penchant for plagiarism.³⁶¹⁸ His early papers were thoroughly unoriginal. Einstein derived these papers from the works of Gibbs and Boltzmann, without giving them their due credit.

The Einsteins' "miraculous year" of 1905 is most notable for three papers on the photo-electric effect, Brownian motion and special relativity. However, the Einsteins' plagiarized their 1905 paper on the theory of Brownian motion from Gouy, Nernst, Smoluchowski, Sutherland and Bachelier, among others.³⁶¹⁹ The Einsteins' 1905 paper on the photo-electric effect was derived from the works of Newton, Maxwell, Boltzmann, Hertz, Hallwachs, Wien, Planck, Lenard, Rayleigh, Stark, and many others.³⁶²⁰ And the Einsteins plagiarized their paper on the principle of relativity chiefly from Poincaré and Lorentz.

Though the law of the photo-electric effect was mentioned as grounds for the award of Albert Einstein's Nobel Prize, Nobel Prizes were meant to be awarded for scientific discoveries and the Nobel Prize was also awarded to the *experimentalists* Lenard and Millikan—as was more appropriate than the award to Einstein for deriving a law, which award violated many of the fundamental rules of the prize.

The Einsteins' 1905 paper on the photo-electric effect was better referenced than were their papers on Brownian motion and the electrodynamics of moving bodies. This may have been at Max Planck's insistence, because he had accomplished much of the work which led to the Einsteins' paper, and Max Planck had considerable influence at *Annalen der Physik*. The 1905 paper on the principle of relativity wanted for a single reference. The Einsteins simply copied the then famous papers of noted scientists. They acted like a teenager, who opens an encyclopedia article, changes a few words and copies the rest, then submits the finished forgery as his own term paper.

But was it Albert who was fitting the formulæ others had published before him into a new dress to call his own, or was it his brilliant wife Mileva? Albert's supposed genius diminished after his divorce from Mileva in 1919. Why would that be so? He died in 1955, and produced nothing extraordinarily significant after his divorce, in my opinion, and who were closest to Albert have agreed.

After winning the Nobel Prize in 1922, Albert paid his former wife the money which he had won in the prize, but why? Why pay Mileva the winnings? Albert was not overly generous in the support of his family. Peter Michelmores argues that Albert paid Mileva the monies in order to protect the funds from his reckless second wife, but Michelmores notes that in the exchange from one currency to another *half of the value of the prize was lost*—hardly an action taken to preserve value.³⁶²¹ Evan Harris Walker stresses this fact and notes the pains Albert took to conceal the transfer of the winnings to Mileva.³⁶²²

Why did the Nobel Committee not award Einstein the Nobel Prize for his work on relativity theory? It is supposedly unclear, but many parts of the puzzle present an image of political motivation, and not merit, being the impetus behind Einstein's award. All who were familiar with the facts knew that Einstein did not originate the major concepts behind relativity theory. Nobel Prize judge Sven Hedin told Irving Wallace that Nobel Prize laureate Phillip Lenard had informed the Nobel Prize

judges that the theory of relativity,

“was not actually a discovery, had never been proved, and was valueless.”³⁶²³

Professor Oskar Edvard Westin, of Stockholm, informed the Nobel Foundation Directorate of the unoriginality of Einstein’s work, its metaphysical delusions, and of the accusations of plagiarism outstanding against Einstein, some of which Einstein never denied. Prof. Westin published a very important article in the *Nya Dagligt Allehanda* on 22 October 1922 leveling these charges at Einstein and calling him a dishonest investigator and a plagiarist, undeserving of the Nobel Prize premium.³⁶²⁴

Some ten years prior to the award, Wilhelm Wien had recommended that the Nobel Prize be given to both Hendrik Antoon Lorentz and Albert Einstein in 1912, on the grounds that,

“While Lorentz must be considered as the first to have found the mathematical content of the relativity principle, Einstein succeeded in reducing it to a simple principle. One should therefore assess the merits of both investigators as being comparable.”³⁶²⁵

However, Einstein’s share by all rights belonged to Poincaré, who died in 1912, and it would have been in exceedingly bad taste to have exploited his death in order to award the Nobel Prize to Einstein; and Boscovich, Voigt, FitzGerald and Larmor had rights to Lorentz’ share. Wien knew Poincaré’s work well, and, thus, knew that Einstein had done little but parrot Poincaré.³⁶²⁶

Wien, in recommending Lorentz and Einstein for the special theory, effectively disclosed that Einstein held no priority for it, as everyone knew that Poincaré stated the principle of relativity long before Einstein, and Lorentz had published the mathematical formalisms of the theory before the Einsteins copied them without an attribution. Ernst Gehrcke³⁶²⁷ demonstrated that Paul Gerber had anticipated the general theory of relativity, as had Johann Georg von Soldner, making a Nobel Prize for that theory impossible. It is clear that the Nobel Committee simply manufactured an excuse to award the then celebrity, Albert Einstein, a prize, merely mentioning the photo-electric effect, for which Einstein held no priority, as a possible excuse.

Robert A. Millikan had argued that Einstein’s formulation of the law of the photo-electric effect was untenable. Millikan changed his position when Einstein’s Nobel Prize award was attacked on this basis, but cited no experimental basis for his change of view. Millikan was then himself awarded the Nobel Prize in 1923. Millikan’s integrity has been questioned by numerous sources.³⁶²⁸

Could the Nobel Prize monies Albert paid to Mileva have been “hush money”? Though the payment was made pursuant to a divorce agreement, would not a divorce agreement typically stipulate that the male was indebted to the female and must pay her regardless of the means by which the money was obtained? Mileva had children to feed, Albert’s children. When the divorce agreement was reached, it was far from certain that Albert would ever win the Nobel Prize. Why would Mileva risk the future of her children?

Why would they reach an agreement which stipulated that the monies be paid if and only if Albert might someday win the Nobel Prize?³⁶²⁹ Could the agreement have related not to the responsibilities of marriage, but to potential monetary gain derived from Mileva's efforts? Is it possible that if it were Mileva's work, and that work paid off, Albert would pay her off, and then only to keep her silent? Could it have been Mileva's way of saying, "Hey, if you ever get any serious money out of my work, I deserve the money, because it was my work!"

Mileva once hinted to Albert that she was contemplating publishing her memoirs. Albert told her to stay silent, and may have intimated that he, an innocent idiot, would suffer less than she, the incorrigible plagiarist, from any public disclosures. That is but one of many plausible interpretations of Albert's words, which were nebulous in the sense that threats often are.³⁶³⁰ Albert believed,

"If A equals success, then the formula is A equals X plus Y plus Z. X is work. Y is play. Z is keep your mouth shut."³⁶³¹

Why didn't Mileva come forward with the fact that she was the one who had written the work, if in fact she had? Did Albert buy Mileva's silence? Even if he had, was there more to hold Mileva back from exposing Albert than the desperate need for monies?

Albert would have been able to prove to the world that the theory was largely unoriginal when *Annalen der Physik* first published the 1905 paper, which merely condensed the works of Lange, Voigt, Hertz, FitzGerald, Larmor, Cohn, Langevin, Lorentz and Poincaré. What would Mileva have stood to gain by revealing that Albert had taken credit for her work, when she herself had merely repeated what others had already published? Neither of the Einsteins, not Albert, not Mileva, "thought God thought's", as popular myth now holds. They read scientists' papers and books, rewrote them, and attached their name to what was not theirs.

Had anyone ever repeated what Albert Einstein had earlier published, and then claimed priority for thoughts which Albert had first published? Would Albert have tolerated such misbehavior? He was aggressive in response to challenges to his priority and the issue of priority was very important to him.³⁶³² Albert stated that it is wrong not to give credit where credit is due,

"That, alas, is vanity. You find it in so many scientists. You know, it has always hurt me to think that Galileo did not acknowledge the work of Kepler."³⁶³³

When one thief steals a stolen purse from another thief, then offers to split the purse, what option does either thief have but to keep silent and spend the money? Mileva knew that she had written the work for which Albert took credit. Albert knew that Mileva had copied the ideas, examples, explanations, equations and phrases, from Lange, Voigt, Hertz, FitzGerald, Larmor, Cohn, Langevin, Lorentz and Poincaré. In such a scenario, what else could Mileva have done? What else would have been in her self-interest, other than to keep silent and collect the Nobel Prize

winnings?

Mileva had hoped that Albert would rise to fame and she would lead a charmed life with her famous husband,

“We have recently completed a very important work, which will make my husband world-famous.”

“Vor kurzem haben wir ein sehr bedeutendes Werk vollendet, das meinen Mann weltberühmt machen wird.”³⁶³⁴

Serbian women had little chance at fame in those times, other than as ornaments attached to their husbands' arms. Nikola Tesla, a Serbian genius born in Croatia, was unfairly treated in the West. What chance did Mileva stand?

Albert was cruel to Mileva. He may have destroyed her self-confidence. Albert once demanded in writing that Mileva obey his cruel and degrading orders in a letter which can only be described as shocking and revolting.³⁶³⁵ If Mileva had hoped that Albert would someday acknowledge her, she was mistaken. Albert, a misogynist, degraded her in a letter to Michele Besso,

“We men are deplorable, dependent creatures. But compared with these women, every one of us is king, for he stands more or less on his own two feet, not constantly waiting for something outside of himself to cling to. They, however, always wait for someone to come along who will use them as he sees fit. If this does not happen, they simply fall to pieces.”³⁶³⁶

It is probable that Marić believed that her only hope for fame and fortune was to build up Albert and use him for her ends. Albert did not have strong morals. Albert was certainly fit for the rôle as cohort to plagiarism.

There are allegations that Albert Einstein may have beaten his first wife Mileva Marić and their children.³⁶³⁷ Einstein's son, Hans Albert Einstein, stated,

“Oh, he beat me up, just like anyone else would do.”³⁶³⁸

Albert Einstein cruelly abandoned Mileva Marić during her pregnancy with their first child Lieserl. The fate of this poor child, who vanished from the record early in life, is to this day a mystery.³⁶³⁹

Brutality was nothing new to Albert Einstein. As a child, Albert Einstein physically abused his sister Maja, and physically attacked his violin instructor. Maja Winteler-Einstein wrote in her biography of her brother Albert,

“The usually calm small boy had inherited from grandfather Koch a tendency toward violent temper tantrums. At such moments his face would turn completely yellow, the tip of his nose snow-white, and he was no longer in control of himself. On one such occasion he grabbed a chair and struck at his teacher, who was so frightened that she ran away terrified and was never seen

again. Another time he threw a large bowling ball at his little sister's head; a third time he used a child's hoe to knock a hole in her head."³⁶⁴⁰

There are many accounts which portray Einstein as incontinent. According to some accounts, Einstein was perhaps even a foul-mouthed³⁶⁴¹ syphilitic, who contracted the disease from his many encounters with prostitutes³⁶⁴²—he was by his own admission on 23 December 1918 an incestuous adulterer. Einstein stated,

"It is correct that I committed adultery. I have been living together with my cousin, Elsa Einstein, divorced Löwenthal, for about 4 1/2 years and have been continuing these intimate relations since then."³⁶⁴³

Albert Einstein was a blood relative with his second wife Elsa Einstein through both his mother and his father.³⁶⁴⁴ Einstein felt that he had the option to choose between a marriage with his cousin Elsa, or one of her young daughters, whom he also aggressively pursued, much to her disgust.³⁶⁴⁵ Dismayed, Ilse Einstein wrote to Georg Nicolai about Albert Einstein's sexual advances toward her,

"I have never wished nor felt the least desire to be close to [Albert Einstein] physically. This is otherwise in his case—recently at least.—He himself even admitted to me once how difficult it is for him to keep himself in check."³⁶⁴⁶

Dennis Overbye tells the story of Ilse Einstein's letter to Georg Nicolai of 22 May 1918 in which she complains of Albert Einstein's sexual advances towards her. Albert Einstein was conducting an incestuous and adulterous relationship with her mother Elsa Einstein at the time. Overbye states that Wolf Zuelzer preserved the letter,

"despite pressure from Margot Einstein, Helen Dukas, and lawyers representing the Einstein estate to surrender it or destroy it. The tale, an example of the difficulties scholars have faced in telling the Einstein story, is preserved in Zuelzer's correspondence in the American Heritage archive at the University of Wyoming."³⁶⁴⁷

Marrying his cousin Else Einstein enabled Albert Einstein to have her and her daughters. Albert Einstein referred to his wife and cousin Elsa Einstein and her two daughters as his "small harem". Einstein wrote to Max Born, in an undated letter thought to have been written sometime between 24 June 1918 and 2 August 1918,

"We are well, and the small harem eat well and are thriving."³⁶⁴⁸

Philipp Frank wrote,

"Einstein's wife Elsa died in 1936. [***] Of Einstein's two stepdaughters, one died after leaving Germany; the other, Margot, a talented sculptress, was

divorced from her husband and now lives mostly with Einstein in Princeton.”³⁶⁴⁹

Even this might not have been enough for Albert Einstein. There are reasons to believe he had an affair with Elsa Einstein’s sister, Paula, another of Albert Einstein’s cousins.³⁶⁵⁰ Einstein’s son, Hans Albert Einstein, believed that his father was also having an affair with his secretary Helen Dukas.³⁶⁵¹

The facts present Einstein as an odd being who was sadistically cruel to his family. Should his perversions be considered the benefit of his genius, and a sacrifice he made for the good of mankind? Was their suppression from public view an indication that the popular image of the “great man” is a well-nurtured myth? Might there be other myths about the man, or truths which have been covered up?

18.4 Conclusion

Did Albert Einstein have no choice but to copy what others had published before him? Was he of sub-average intelligence?³⁶⁵² Given that this issue is controversial, I’ll give Albert the benefit of the doubt and regard the 1905 paper on the principle of relativity as a coauthored work. However, that which was new in the paper, the “relativistic” equations for aberration and the Doppler-Fizeau Effect, were likely derived by Mileva Marić, the superior mathematician of the two.³⁶⁵³ If the Einsteins had properly referenced their work, and claimed priority only for that which was new in the paper, one wonders if Mileva, who had far more character than Albert—she cared for their children while he abandoned them—would have insisted that her rôle be acknowledged.

19 ALBERT EINSTEIN'S NOBEL PRIZE

At a time when the Zionist movement was falling apart and Albert Einstein's fame was diminishing, Albert Einstein was awarded the Nobel Prize. The decision to award Einstein the prize came first, and then an excuse was manufactured to justify the unjustified award. The entire process was artificial. Far from celebrating a specific discovery Einstein had made—he had made none—those who decided that Einstein would be given a prize attempted to present a non-controversial excuse for awarding the prize. They failed and it was obvious that Einstein was given the prize not because he deserved it, but because influential persons had insisted that he be given it.

“Recently the Nobel Foundation Directorate awarded the Nobel premium for distinguished achievement in physical science to Albert Einstein. Uninformed and uncritical opinion will, undoubtedly, concur with the directorate in this choice. Biased opinion, created by world-wide propaganda, will heartily agree with the directorate in its decision. In this instance, however, the directorate has deliberately conferred a unique distinction and set its seal of approval upon a man who has been definitely and publicly charged with plagiarism through the medium of the international press and in such scientific journals as still retain their freedom of expression. It may be thought that the award to Einstein was based upon ignorance of the actually involved facts and that the directorate may be exonerated on the plea of lack of information. It must be admitted, however, that in this case ignorance of facts should not and cannot be accepted as a defense of the award. The plea of ignorance cannot be allowed because of the all-important reason that the directorate's attention had been definitely called both to the charges made against Einstein and also to the unbiased appraisal of his alleged achievements.”—ARVID REUTERDAHL³⁶⁵⁴

19.1 Introduction

Albert Einstein had accomplished nothing which merited a Nobel Prize. Influential persons who wanted to give him the prize were forced to manufacture an excuse so as to justify the unjustified award. They eventually settled upon the nebulous declaration that Einstein deserved the Nobel Prize merely because he deserved it, and that the law of the photo-electric effect was perhaps one reason why, or as the Nobel Committee phrased it, Einstein won the prize,

“for his services to Theoretical Physics, and especially for his discovery of the law of the photoelectric effect”³⁶⁵⁵

This excuse posed a difficulty for those who first determined that Einstein would be given a prize and then attempted to manufacture a reason why. Nobel Prizes could only be awarded for physical discoveries. The law of the photo-electric effect did not constitute an experimental discovery. The experimental discovery was allegedly made by Robert Andrews Millikan and he was slated to receive a Nobel Prize for it before Einstein.

19.2 The Nobel Foundation Directorate Learns that Einstein is a Plagiarist

Ernst Gehrcke³⁶⁵⁶ demonstrated that Paul Gerber had anticipated the general theory of relativity, as had Johann Georg von Soldner, making a Nobel Prize for the general theory of relativity impossible. Gehrcke and others also proved that the special theory of relativity was published by Lorentz and Poincaré, before Einstein, which made it impossible for the Nobel Committee to award Einstein a prize for the special theory of relativity.

Gösta Mittag-Leffler was the founding editor of the journal *Acta Mathematica* published in Sweden. On 7 July 1909, Mittag-Leffler wrote to Poincaré that Ivar Fredholm recognized Poincaré's priority for the theory of relativity over that of Lorentz, Einstein and Minkowski.³⁶⁵⁷ In 1914, Mittag-Leffler arranged for a special volume of the *Acta Mathematica* (Volume 38) devoted to honoring Henri Poincaré and his achievements with articles by his peers. Lorentz, Wien, Planck, and others, contributed articles, which acknowledged the fact that Poincaré had anticipated Einstein and Minkowski. Mittag-Leffler delayed publication of the tribute until after the French and their allies had won the war. He wrote to Albert Einstein on 16 December 1919, soon after Einstein had become internationally famous, and asked Einstein to contribute an article for the memorial volume—an article on Poincaré's contributions to the theory of relativity. Mittag-Leffler also told Max Planck that he would like Einstein to contribute such an article. Einstein delayed answering Mittag-Leffler until Einstein believed it would be too late for him to publish an article, and then stated that he would be happy to write such an article if there was still an opportunity to see it published.

As with his 1907 review article on the theory of relativity in the *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, and as with the republication of the Einsteins' 1905 paper on special relativity in the book *Das Relativitätsprinzip: eine Sammlung von Abhandlungen* in 1913, Albert Einstein had a golden opportunity to redeem himself for his lies and his theft of Poincaré's ideas. When Mittag-Leffler informed Einstein that there was still time left for him to make a contribution, Einstein reneged on his promise and did not submit an article to honor Poincaré, whose ideas had given him his career.³⁶⁵⁸

Einstein would have been forced to have acknowledged that Poincaré was the father of the theory of relativity. Volume 38 of the *Acta Mathematica* was published in 1921 and it undoubtedly had an impact on the decision of the Nobel Prize

Committee *not* to award Einstein a prize for the theory of relativity. Wolfgang Pauli's article "The Theory of Relativity" in the *Enzyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen* in 1921 must also have made it clear to all that Einstein could *not* be awarded a prize for the theory of relativity.³⁶⁵⁹

Professor Oskar Edvard Westin, of Stockholm, informed the Nobel Foundation Directorate of the unoriginality of Einstein's work, its alleged metaphysical delusions, and of the accusations of plagiarism outstanding against Einstein, some of which Einstein never denied. Westin published a very important article in the *Nya Dagligt Allehanda* on 22 October 1922 leveling these charges against Einstein and Westin called Einstein a dishonest investigator, undeserving of the Nobel Prize premium.³⁶⁶⁰ Westin's article stated:

(Unfortunately, my photocopy of this article is taken from a low-quality microfilm, which is very difficult to read and contains many gaps in the text. Therefore, the attempted reproduction here is only an approximation and the original must be consulted for an absolutely accurate and complete knowledge of Westin's words.—My apologies to the reader.)

“Einstein blifvande Nobelpristagare?”

Kan A. Einstein med fog betecknas som en vetenskapsman af rang? — Och har han visat sig ärlig i sin forskning?

För N. D. A. af professor **O. E. Westin.**

Herr redaktör!

Enar den tid nu stundar, då inom k. vetenskapsakademien erforderliga förberedelser skola vidtagas i fråga om utdelandet af nobelpriset i fysik, och enär vissa tecken tyda därpå, att man på visat håll egendomligt nog vill försöka förmå akademien att tilldela Einstein detta pris, så torde det måhända kunna vara af gagn att göra några erinringar om denne mans vetenskapliga författarverksamhet. Därigenom kunde kanske förebyggas ett förhastande, som, om det komme att ske, sedan medförde mindre behagliga följder. Med edert benägna medgifvande vill jag därför här i största korthet beröra dels några elementära detaljer af Einsteins så mycket omtalade och för honom karaktäristiska s. k. 'relativitetsteori' och dels vissa andra omständigheter.

Einstein framträder i bemälda teori med betydande anspråk, och han och hans anhängare söka nedrifva verkligt värdefulla och bepröfvade vetenskapliga rön och i stället sätta fantastiska funderingar, stridande mot

sunda förnuftet; de göra sig stundom skyldiga till vantolkningar än i ett hänseende än i ett annat.

Den 'klassiska mekaniken' säges vara störtad, men giltiga skäl för detta påstående äro icke anförda. Einstein, som anser sig ha skapat en ny rörelselära bättre än den äldre, har tydligen icke en klar föreställning om innebörden af begreppet rörelse, hvarken den enskilda eller den sammansatta; detsamma gäller äfven andra mekaniska grundbegrepp. Hans skrifter visa detta och f. ö. äfven att han saknar erforderlig förmåga af självkritik och att han icke kan med erforderlig objektivitet bedöma hithörande förhållanden.

Einstein har upptäckt, att det icke finnes någon absolut rörelse. Han kan emellertid icke tillerkännas prioritet i det afseendet, ty den upptäckten var gjord före hans tid; han har icke fört den frågan ens ett tuffjät framåt.

En annan af Einsteins upptäckter är, att tiden är relativ, men äfven det rönet var gammalt. Han har emellertid[?] försökt få folk att tro, det tiden är imaginär, och därvid litat på en med honom andligen besläktad förf. H. Minkowski, som genom att i en matematisk formel göra det förnuftsvidriga utbytet af en reel storhet mot en imaginär, menade sig därmed ha visat, att tiden är imaginär. Sådant är relativitetsmatematik, men på så sätt befrämjas icke den vetenskapliga forskningen.

Minkowski kom ock på grund af nämnda matematiska otillbörlighet till det resultatet, att rymden är fyrdimensionell. Einstein antog visserligen, att det förhöll sig så, men var icke mera fast i sin ståndpunkt, än att han, anført afven en annan mening, enligt hvilken rymddimensionernas antal är — endast två! Han anser, att världen i geometriskt hänseende förhåller sig ungefär som den svagt krusade vattenytan af en sjö. Befintligbeten af de oändliga vidderna där ofvan fattar han icke. Han har kommit till det underbara resultatet, att kvadraten på 'världsradien' är = jordklotets volym, uttryckt i kbcm. [??] dividerad med materiens medeltäthet et angifven i gram. Detta [??] är ju förbluffande, dels därut[??]an att rymden anses vara en yta — en yta, som har en radie och förmodligen afven en medelpunkt, men förf. är blygsam nog att icke omtala hvar denna punkt är belägen — och dels däri, att en ytas storlek, uppges bestämd af kvoten af en v o l y m och en v i k t. Här ser man ett nytt [??] på r e l a t i v i t e t s m a t e m a t i k. Det torde vara tillåtet fråga pur kan en man, som besitter någon insikt i hithorande förhållanden, komma fram med något sådant, om hare har sitt förnuft i behåll? Det är f. ö. mer än lofligt naivt att vilja söka uttrycka världsrymdens utsträckning i c e n t i m e t e r då afstånden i n o m densamma i åtskilliga fall lämpligen anges i l j u s å r eller t. o. m. i ännu större längdenhet.

Den hastighet, 300,000km. i sek., hvarmed ljuset utgår från en lysande kropp, anser Einstein, stödjande sig dels på H. A. Lorentz' hypotes om maximivärdet för allt hvad hastigheter heter och dels på den s. k. lorentztransformationen, vara den största i världsrymden förekommande, men han beaktar icke, att den hastighet ljuset har relativt det belysta föremålet i vissa viktiga fall är ofantligt mycket större än den det har rel. ljuskällan. Stjärnljusets i initialhastighet rel. jorden t. ex., dess resulterande

hastighet, är sammansatt af två komponenter, nämligen dess hastighet rel. stjärnan och stjärnans hastighet rel. jorden. Enär den senare komponenten är tusentals gånger så stor som den förra, så är den resulterande hastigheten praktiskt taget oändlig. Det ligger icke något obegripligt däri, att en stjärna, som under en ändlig tid — ett dygn — genomlöper en snart sagdt oändlig våglängd — ett hvarf af vägen rel. jorden —, har en snart sagdt oändlig hastighet. Märk, att det är fråga om verklig rörelse och verklig hastighet!

Stjärnljusets bana rel. stjärnan är rätlinjig så länge den går genom ett medium af koncentriskt lager, hvart och ett med konstant eller t. o. m. försvinnande täthet, men ljusbanan rel. jorden har samtidigt, vid konstant stjärnafstånd från polaraxeln och banplan vinkelrätt mot densamma, formen af en archimedes' spiral, som är lindad hundratals hvarf omkring jorden, i viss mån likt tråden i ett nystan och hastigheten i denna resulterande bana aftar därvid mer och mer, så att den vid ankomsten hit har sjunkit ned till det nämnda jämförelsevis obetydliga beloppet 300,000 km. i sek. — Jämförelsevis obetydliga? frågar någon. Ja, allting är relativt. — Då strålen i sned riktning genomtränger ett medium af variabel täthet såsom sol-atmotfären, böjas de båda ljusbannorna och få hvar sin puckel.

Lorentztransformationen gäller rörelsen för elektroner i vacuumrör. Lorentz' antagande, att deras hastigheter där icke kunna uppgå till mer än högst 300,000 km. i sek. och att de undergå en med hastigheten växande afplattning, så att dimensionen i rörelseriktningen närmar sig värdet noll, må gälla för dem, men det gäller ingalunda kroppars rörelse i allmänhet; det nyss anförda beträffande storleken af de i världsrymden förekommande långt större hastigheterna visar detta. Afplattningen, som för hvarje kropp skulle vid den nämnda hastigheten bli så stor, att kroppens volym blefve försvinnande, öfverensstämmer icke med verkligheten, den visar sig icke å himlakroppar, som ha en långt större hastighet rel. jorden än den nämnda. Och då de f. ö. liksom alla andra föremål ha oändligt många samtida verkliga hastigheter i olika riktningar, så skulle det af dem icke bli någonting kvar, men verkligheten upplyser oss om, att det icke förhåller sig så. Hypotesen, hvarpå hela den ifrågavarande såsom allmänt gällande antagna afplattningsteorien hvilar, är ohållbar, och med den faller Einsteins af en del okritiska beundrare nästan gränslöst lofprisade relativitetsteori. Einstein anser sig visserligen ha matematiskt bevisat lorentztransformationens allmängiltighet, men han har kommit med ett cirkelbevis, och det bevisar ingenting.

Einstein tror tydligen, att en kroklinjig rörelse icke är förenlig med tröghetslagen, men det är ett misstag. Häller man sig endast till den ena eller den andra af de två äldre endast speciella fall gällande formuleringarna, så tyckes det visserligen förhålla sig så, men beaktas innehållet af dess allmänt gällande form, blir resultatet ett annat. Det ges ett stort antal rörelsen med till storlek och riktning föränderliga hastigheter, som äro förenliga med tröghetslagen.

Einstein anser sig, afven nu med stöd af lorentztransformationen, ha visit,

att hvarje materiell kropps kinetiska energi skulle bli oändlig, om dess hastighet närmade sig 300,000 km. i sek., men han uppger icke, hvilken hastighet det är fråga om, och han har tydligen ingen aning om, att det för hvarje kropp vid hvarje tillfälle finns många hastigheter att välja på. Han dekreterar helt enkelt, att hvarje hastighet måste vara mindre än den nämnda, och skälet är helt enkelt det, af honom dock ej nämnda, att eljest håller hans teori icke streck, men det är tydligen icke ett giltigt skäl.

Hans ifriga utopare och förespråkare A. Pflüger ordar i sin skrift om relativitetsteorien värtaligt om bl. a den i materien magasinerade energien. Han berättar, att hvarje kropp, som befinner sig i hvila i ett system — i hvila i ett system ! . . . — äger en latent energi af: 23,000,000,000,000 v. e. pr kg.

Detta belopp är ju visserligen icke oändligt stort men betydande nog ändå. Om det därvid är fråga om ett kg. afskräde på en sophög eller något annat, der är enligt den anförda förf. likgiltigt ! . . resultatet skulle ju gälla hvarje kropp. Att våga tvifla härpå vore väl hädiskt, då han låter oss veta, att ett kg. prima stenkolk, som förut ej utvecklade mer än [???] 7,000 v. e. vid fullständig förbränning, nu är tillräckligt för att drifva [???] atlanterångare om 50,000 khr. oafbrutet under en tid af tio år ! ! Frågan är emellertid den: hur skall denna energi frigöras? Ombudet i nobelkommittén kommer förmodligen att där lämna upplysning i detta afseende.

Pflüger ger anvisning på, huru relativitetsteorien skall tolkas. Det lönar sig mycket litet, säger han, att försöka komma till klarhet i saken genom logiskt tänkande, och däri har han rätt, ty att genom logiskt tänkande komma till insikt beträffande Einsteins fantasier, därtill finnes ingen utsikt. Pflüger varnar på det enträgnaste för sådana försök, men rekommenderar i stället användningen af den ofelbara tänkemaskinen matematiken, som, enligt hans uppgift, med en förbluffande snabbhet öfvervinner svårigheterna: den behöfver endast matas med problemen i form af ekvationer, och de bli lösta, försäkrar han. Exempel på i relativitetsteorien använd matematik äro ju lämnade i det föregående. Kommer sådan matematik till användning, ja, då går det väl med största lätthet att utreda spörsmålen ! ! . . .

Koordinataxlar, d. v. a. geometriska linjer, hvilka i saknad af hvarje spår af materia äro osynliga, dem menar sig Einstein kunna se; han ser dem ringla sig som ormarna på ett Medusahufvud. Pflüger upplyser, att dessa linjer äro synliga, om de betraktas — på afstånd ! ! . . .

Rymden är enligt einsteinärnas uppfattning krokig. Pflüger är uppriktig nog att erkänna, att den krokiga rymden icke kan uppfattas förnuftsensligt, den måste behandlas matematiskt, säger han. Rätta linjer och plan finnas där icke. Användningen af dem är förmodligen för einsteinarna en öfvervunnen ståndpunkt.

Mycket kunde vara att tillägga såsom bidrag till belysningen af beskaffenheten af Einsteins relativitetsteori, men jag fruktar, att jag, genom att komma med mera än det anförda, skulle inkräkta alltför mycket på tidningens utrymme. Mina i Nya Dagligt Allehanda den 17 sistlidne aug.

intagna anmärkningar beträffande C. W. Oseens afhandling 'Om kring relativitetsteorien', tillsända denne förf. och af honom emottagna men ej besvarade, kunna ock i visa mån bidra till den föreliggande frågans belysning, och jag hänvisar till desamma.

Denne Einstein-lofsångare, som förklarar, att man kan ersätta de vanliga naturlagarna med andra lagar efter behag, har visserlingen blifvit insatt i vetenskapsakademiens nobelkommitté, men äfven om han där kan göra proselyter, så är det lyckligtvis så, att naturföreteelserna förlöpa på samma från all godtycklighet fria sätt nu som förr, oberoende af det nonsens relativisterna bjudit på.

Jag inskränker mig nu f. ö. att till det redan anförda påpeka ett faktum, som är belysande för ärligheten i Einsteins forskning. I The Minneapolis Journal for den 10 sistlidne sept. lämnar A. Reuter Dahl ett meddelande, enligt hvilket P. Lenard har funnit, att Einsteins så högt beprisade formel för beräkning af stjärnljusets böjning vid gången förbi solen endast är ett plagiat af en af J. Soldner för mer än hundra år sedan för samma ändamål härledd formel. Nu har i N. D. A. prof. E. Gehrcke i Berlin vittnat om att formlerna äro identiska. En i Soldners formel förekommande numerisk felaktighet har äfven gått igen i kopian. En olikhet förefinnes emellertid: för beteckningarna äro, enligt hvad Reuter Dahl uppgifver, andra bokstäfver använda af Einstein än de Soldner betjänade sig af. Fusket skulle alltså på sådant sätt döljas. En i sanning snygg historia!

Af det anförda synes mig med fog kunna dragas den slutsatsen, dels att Einstein icke är en vetenskapsman af rang och dels att han icke heller är en ärlig forskare samt att giltig anledning saknas att förorda honom till erhållande af nobelpriset.

Ännu en sak anser jag mig böra omnämna. Från ett håll, hvars trovärdighet jag icke har anledning betvifla, har jag erfarit, att Einsteins formel för bestämning af Mercurius' perihelflyttning också den är ett plagiat, nämligen af en af Gerber för detta ändamål härledd formel. Den af Oseen i Kosmos för i år högt lofprisade formel, som han kallat 'Den Einsteinska lagen', lär icke kunna helt tillerkännas Einstein. För den händelse denne nu föreslås som nobelpriskandidat, har vetenskapsakademien gifvetvis att låta med erforderlig sorgfällighet pröfva, huruvida påståendena, att han är en plagiator, kunna anses befogade eller icke.

Åmål den 20 okt. 1922.

O. E. Westin.
Professor."

The *Hamburger Fremdenblatt* mentioned Westin's article the next day on 23 October 1922, in an article entitled "Einstein Nobel-Preisträger?" It reported that Prof. Westin had stated that Einstein was a plagiarist, not a scientist of note, and not an honest researcher.

Nobel Prize judge Sven Hedin told Irving Wallace that Nobel Prize laureate

Philipp Lenard had informed the Nobel Prize judges that the theory of relativity,

“was not actually a discovery, had never been proved, and was valueless.”³⁶⁶¹

The *Hannover Kurier* of 4 February 1923 in article entitled “Lenard gegen Einstein” confirms that Lenard sent such a letter to the Nobel Prize Committee. This article was followed by another in the *Hannover Kurier*, “Einstein und der Nobelpreis” on 5 May 1923, which mentioned Westin’s article in the *Nya Dagligt Allehanda*.

On 29 April 1922, Westin published an article in the *Svenska Dagbladet* calling attention to Reuterdahl’s work. The Norwegian *Aftenposten*³⁶⁶² interviewed Einstein and detailed Reuterdahl’s work on relativity theory, on 18 June 1920, while Einstein was in Oslo. Reuterdahl accused Einstein of plagiarizing Reuterdahl’s theory of a “space-time potential”, a copy of which theory was in the possession of Mittag-Leffler, who corresponded extensively with Einstein. Arvid Reuterdahl’s accusations also received attention in Sweden, his native land. The *Stockholms-Tidningen* featured Reuterdahl’s accusations against Einstein on 27 April 1922, and the *Svenska Dagbladet* lampooned Einstein in a cartoon on 30 April 1922. Nobel Prize laureate Philipp Lenard informed the broader scientific community that Einstein was a career plagiarist.

The judges could not have missed the public humiliation Einstein faced in the period from 1920 to 1922. They simply could not award Einstein the prize for the theory of relativity, but some of them were determined that Einstein would be given a prize whether he deserved one or not. Though the judges wanted to give Millikan the prize for the photo-electric effect, they fabricated an excuse to give Einstein a prize by awarding a Nobel Prize to him, in part, for the law of the photo-electric effect. In 1923, the Committee then gave Millikan the Nobel Prize for the photo-electric effect in 1923, as they phrased it,

“for his work on the elementary charge of electricity and on the photoelectric effect”³⁶⁶³

The bogus award given to Einstein was outrageous. Arvid Reuterdahl wrote in early 1923,

“Recently the Nobel Foundation Directorate awarded the Nobel premium for distinguished achievement in physical science to Albert Einstein. Uninformed and uncritical opinion will, undoubtedly, concur with the directorate in this choice. Biased opinion, created by world-wide propaganda, will heartily agree with the directorate in its decision. In this instance, however, the directorate has deliberately conferred a unique distinction and set its seal of approval upon a man who has been definitely and publicly charged with plagiarism through the medium of the international press and in such scientific journals as still retain their freedom of expression.

It may be thought that the award to Einstein was based upon ignorance

of the actually involved facts and that the directorate may be exonerated on the plea of lack of information. It must be admitted, however, that in this case ignorance of facts should not and cannot be accepted as a defense of the award. The plea of ignorance cannot be allowed because of the all-important reason that the directorate’s attention had been definitely called both to the charges made against Einstein and also to the unbiased appraisal of his alleged achievements.”³⁶⁶⁴

19.3 “The Thomson-Einstein Theory” Makes a Convenient Excuse

Robert Andrews Millikan argued that Einstein’s formulation of the law of the photoelectric effect was “untenable”. Millikan was himself awarded the Nobel Prize in 1923 for his work on the photo-electric effect. Whether or not Millikan achieved the results he claimed to have achieved is an open question. Millikan’s integrity has been questioned, and his “confirmation” of the law of the photoelectric effect is suspect.³⁶⁶⁵ This, however, is a separate question from Millikan’s well-founded on Albert Einstein’s work. Millikan was an outspoken critic of Einstein and opposed the hype surrounding the eclipse observations of 1919 and wrote in 1917 (Figures and tables have been omitted. One must bear in mind that the alleged confirmation of “Einstein’s equation” brought Millikan international fame.),

“III. EINSTEIN’S QUANTUM THEORY OF RADIATION

Yet the boldness and the difficulties of Thomson’s ‘ether-string’ theory did not deter Einstein [*Footnote: Ann. d. Phys.* (4), XVII (1905), 132; XX (1906), 199.] in 1905 from making it even more radical. In order to connect it up with some results to which Planck of Berlin had been led in studying the facts of black-body radiation, Einstein assumed that the energy emitted by any radiator not only kept together in bunches or quanta as it traveled through space, as Thomson had assumed it to do, but that a given source could emit and absorb radiant energy only in units which are all exactly equal to $h\nu$, ν being the natural frequency of the emitter and h a constant which is the same for all emitters.

I shall not attempt to present the basis for such an assumption, for, as a matter of fact, it had almost none at the time. But whatever its basis, it enabled Einstein to predict at once that the energy of emission of corpuscles under the influence of light would be governed by the equation

$$\frac{1}{2}mv^2 = Ve = h\nu - p \dots \dots \dots (41)$$

in which $h\nu$ is the energy absorbed by the electron from the light wave or light quantum, for, according to the assumption it was the whole energy contained in that quantum, p is the work necessary to get the electron out of

the metal, and $\frac{1}{2}m\mathbf{v}^2$ is the energy with which it leaves the surface—an energy evidently measured by the product of its charge e by the potential difference V against which it is just able to drive itself before being brought to rest.

At the time at which it was made this prediction was as bold as the hypothesis which suggested it, for at that time there were available no experiments whatever for determining anything about how the positive potential V necessary to apply to the illuminated electrode to stop the discharge of negative electrons from it under the influence of monochromatic light varied with the frequency ν of the light, or whether the quantity h to which Planck had already assigned a numerical value appeared at all in connection with photo-electric discharge. We are confronted, however, by the astonishing situation that after ten years of work at the Ryerson Laboratory and elsewhere upon the discharge of electrons by light this equation of Einstein's seems to us to predict accurately all of the facts which have been observed.

IV. THE TESTING OF EINSTEIN'S EQUATION

The method which has been adopted in the Ryerson Laboratory for testing the correctness of Einstein's equation has involved the performance of so many operations upon the highly inflammable alkali metals in a vessel which was freed from the presence of all gases that it is not inappropriate to describe the present experimental arrangement as a machine-shop *in vacuo*. Fig. 27 shows a photograph of the apparatus, and Fig. 28 is a drawing of a section which should make the necessary operations intelligible.

One of the most vital assertions made in Einstein's theory is that the kinetic energy with which monochromatic light ejects electrons from any metal is proportional to the frequency of the light, i.e., if violet light is of half the wave-length of red light, then the violet light should throw out the electron with twice the energy imparted to it by the red light. In order to test whether any such linear relation exists between the energy of the escaping electron and the light which throws it out it was necessary to use as wide a range of frequencies as possible. This made it necessary to use the alkali metals, sodium, potassium, and lithium, for electrons are thrown from the ordinary metals only by ultra-violet light, while the alkali metals respond in this way to any waves shorter than those of the red, that is, they respond throughout practically the whole visible spectrum as well as the ultra-violet spectrum. Cast cylinders of these metals were therefore placed on the wheel W (Fig. 28) and fresh clean surfaces were obtained by cutting shavings from each metal in an excellent vacuum with the aid of the knife K , which was operated by an electromagnet F outside the tube. After this the freshly cut surface was turned around by another electromagnet until it was opposite the point O of Fig. 28 and a beam of monochromatic light from a spectrometer

was let in through O and allowed to fall on the new surface. The energy of the electrons ejected by it was measured by applying to the surface a positive potential just strong enough to prevent any of the discharged electrons from reaching the gauze cylinder opposite (shown in dotted lines) and thus communicating an observable negative charge to the quadrant electrometer which was attached to this gauze cylinder. For a complete test of the equation it was necessary also to measure the contact-electromotive force between the new surface and a test plate S . This was done by another electromagnetic device shown in Fig. 27, but for further details the original paper may be consulted. [*Footnote: Phys. Rev.*, VII (1916), 362.] Suffice it here to say that Einstein's equation demands a linear relation between the applied positive volts and the frequency of the light, and it also demands that the slope of this line should be exactly equal to $\frac{h}{e}$. Hence from this slope, since e is known, it should be possible to obtain h . How perfect a linear relation is found may be seen from Fig. 29, which also shows that from the slope of this line h is found to be 6.26×10^{-27} , which is as close to the value obtained by Planck from the radiation laws as is to be expected from the accuracy with which the experiments in radiation can be made. The most reliable value of h obtained from a consideration of the whole of this work is

$$h = 6.56 \times 10^{-27}.$$

In the original paper will be found other tests of the Einstein equation, but the net result of all this work is to confirm in a very complete way the equation which Einstein first set up on the basis of his semi-corpuseular theory of radiant energy. And if this equation is of general validity it must certainly be regarded as one of the most fundamental and far-reaching of the equations of physics, and one which is destined to play in the future a scarcely less important rôle than Maxwell's equations have played in the past, for it must govern the transformation of all short-wave-length electromagnetic energy into heat energy.

V. OBJECTIONS TO AN ETHER-STRING THEORY

In spite of the credentials which have just been presented for Einstein's equation, we are confronted with the extraordinary situation that the semi-corpuseular theory out of which Einstein got his equation seems to be wholly untenable and has in fact been pretty generally abandoned, though Sir J. J. Thomson [*Footnote: Proc. Phys. Soc. of London*, XXVII (December 15, 1914), 105.] and a few others [*Footnote: Modern Electrical Theory*, Cambridge, University Press, 1913, p. 248.] seem still to adhere to some form of ether-string theory, that is, to some form of theory in which the energy remains localized in space instead of spreading over the entire wave

front.

Two very potent objections, however, may be urged against all forms of ether-string theory, of which Einstein's is a particular modification. The first is that no one has ever yet been able to show that such a theory can predict any one of the facts of interference. The second is that there is direct positive evidence against the view that the ether possesses a fibrous structure. For if a static electrical field has a fibrous structure, as postulated by any form of ether-string theory, 'each unit of positive electricity being the origin and each unit of negative electricity the termination of a Faraday tube,' [*Footnote*: J. J. Thomson, *Electricity and Matter*, p. 9.] then the force acting on one single electron between the plates of an air condenser cannot possibly vary *continuously* with the potential difference between the plates. Now in the oil-drop experiments [*Footnote*: *Phys. Rev.*, II (1913), 109.] we actually study the behavior in such an electric field of one single, isolated electron and we find, over the widest limits, exact proportionality between the field strength and the force acting on the electron as measured by the velocity with which the oil drop to which it is attached is dragged through the air.

When we maintain the field constant and vary the charge on the drop, the granular structure of electricity is proved by the discontinuous changes in the velocity, but when we maintain the charge constant and vary the field the lack of discontinuous change in the velocity disproves the contention of a fibrous structure in the field, unless the assumption be made that there are an enormous number of ether strings ending in one electron. Such an assumption takes all the virtue out of an ether-string theory.

Despite then the apparently complete success of the Einstein equation, the physical theory of which it was designed to be the symbolic expression is found so untenable that Einstein himself, I believe, no longer holds to it, and we are in the position of having built a very perfect structure and then knocked out entirely the underpinning without causing the building to fall. It stands complete and apparently well tested, but without any visible means of support. These supports must obviously exist, and the most fascinating problem of modern physics is to find them. Experiment has outrun theory, or, better, guided by erroneous theory, it has discovered relationships which seem to be of the greatest interest and importance, but the reasons for them are as yet not at all understood.

VI. ATTEMPTS TOWARD A SOLUTION

It is possible, however, to go a certain distance toward a solution and to indicate some conditions which must be satisfied by the solution when it is found. For the energy $h\nu$ with which the electron is found by experiment to escape from the atom must have come either from the energy stored up inside of the atom or else from the light. There is no third possibility. Now the fact that the energy of emission is the same, whether the body from which it is emitted is held within an inch of the source, where the light is very intense,

or a mile away, where it is very weak, would seem to indicate that the light simply pulls a trigger in the atom which itself furnishes all the energy with which the electron escapes, as was originally suggested by Lenard in 1902, [*Footnote: Ann. d. Phys.* (4), VIII (1902), 149.] or else, if the light furnishes the energy, that light itself must consist of bundles of energy which keep together as they travel through space, as suggested in the Thomson-Einstein theory.

Yet the fact that the energy of emission is directly proportional to the frequency ν of the incident light spoils Lenard's form of trigger theory, since, if the atom furnishes the energy, it ought to make no difference what kind of a wave-length pulls the trigger, while it ought to make a difference what kind of a gun, that is, what kind of an atom, is shot off. But both of these expectations are the exact opposite of the observed facts. *The energy of the escaping corpuscle must come then, in some way or other, from the incident light.*

When, however, we attempt to compute on the basis of a spreading-wave theory how much energy a corpuscle can receive from a given source of light, we find it difficult to find anything more than a very minute fraction of the amount which the corpuscle actually acquires.

Thus, the total luminous energy falling per second from a standard candle on a square centimeter at a distance of 3 m. is 1 erg. [*Footnote: Drude, Lehrbuch der Optik*, 1906, p. 472.] Hence the amount falling per second on a body of the size of an atom, i.e., of cross-section 10^{-15} cm., is 10^{-15} ergs, but the energy $h\nu$ with which a corpuscle is ejected by light of wave-length $500 \mu\mu$ (millionths millimeter) is 4×10^{-12} ergs, or 4,000 times as much. Since not a third of the incident energy is in wave-lengths shorter than $500 \mu\mu$, a surface of sodium or lithium which is sensitive up to $500 \mu\mu$ should require, even if all this energy were in one wave-length, which it is not, at least 12,000 seconds or 4 hours of illumination by a candle 3 m. away before any of its atoms could have received, all told, enough energy to discharge a corpuscle. Yet the corpuscle is observed to shoot out the instant the light is turned on. It is true that Lord Rayleigh has recently shown [*Footnote: Phil. Mag.* XXXII (1916), 188.] that an atom may conceivably absorb wave-energy from a region of the order of magnitude of the square of a wave-length of the incident light rather than of the order of its own cross-section. This in no way weakens, however, the cogency of the type of argument just presented, for it is only necessary to apply the same sort of analysis to the case of γ -rays, the wave-length of which is of the order of magnitude of an atomic diameter (10^{-8} cm.), and the difficulty is found still more pronounced. Thus Rutherford [*Footnote: Radioactive Substances and the Radiations*, p. 288.] estimates that the total γ -ray energy radiated per second by one gram of radium cannot possibly be more than 4.7×10^4 ergs. Hence at a distance of 100 meters, where the γ -rays from a gram of radium would

be easily detectable, the total γ -ray energy falling per second on a square millimeter of surface, the area of which is ten-thousand billion times greater than that either of an atom or of a disk whose radius is a wave-length, would be $4\pi \times 10^{10} = 4 \times 10^{-7}$ ergs. This is very close to the energy with which β -rays are actually observed to be ejected by these γ -rays, the velocity of ejection being about nine-tenths that of light. Although, then, it should take ten thousand billion seconds for the atom to gather in this much energy from the γ -rays, on the basis of classical theory, the β -ray is observed to be ejected with this energy as soon as the radium is put in place. This shows that if we are going to abandon the Thomson-Einstein hypothesis of localized energy, which is of course competent to satisfy these energy relations, there is no alternative but to assume that at some previous time the corpuscle had absorbed and stored up from light of this or other wave-length enough energy so that it needed but a minute addition at the time of the experiment to be able to be ejected from the atom with the energy $h\nu$.

Now the corpuscle which is thus ejected by the light cannot possibly be one of the free corpuscles of the metal, for such a corpuscle, when set in motion within a metal, constitutes an electric current, and we know that such a current at once dissipates its energy into heat. In other words, a *free* corpuscle can have no mechanism for storing up energy and then *jerking* itself up 'by its boot straps' until it has the huge speed of emission observed.

The ejected corpuscle must then have come *from the inside of the atom*, in which case it is necessary to assume, if the Thomson-Einstein theory is rejected, that within the atom there exists some mechanism which will permit a corpuscle continually to absorb and load itself up with energy of a given frequency until a value at least as large as $h\nu$ is reached. What sort of a mechanism this is we have at present no idea. Further, if the absorption is due to resonance—and we have as yet no other way in which to conceive it—it is difficult to see how there can be, in the atoms of a solid body, corpuscles having all kinds of natural frequencies so that some are always found to absorb and ultimately be ejected by impressed light of any particular frequency. But apart from these difficulties, the thing itself is impossible if these absorbing corpuscles, when not exposed to radiation, are emitting any energy at all; for if they did so, they would in time lose all their store and we should be able, by keeping bodies in the dark, to put them into a condition in which they should show no emission of corpuscles whatever until after hours or years of illumination with a given wave-length. Since this is contrary to experiment, we are forced, even when we discard the Thomson-Einstein theory of localized energy, to postulate electronic absorbers which, during the process of absorbing, do not radiate at all until the absorbed energy has reached a certain critical value when explosive emission occurs.

However, then, we may interpret the phenomenon of the emission of corpuscles under the influence of ether waves, whether upon the basis of the Thomson-Einstein assumption of bundles of localized energy traveling

through the ether, or upon the basis of a peculiar property of the inside of an atom which enables it to absorb continuously incident energy and emit only explosively, *the observed characteristics of the effect seem to furnish proof that the emission of energy by an atom is a discontinuous or explosive process*. This was the fundamental assumption of Planck's so-called quantum theory of radiation. The Thomson-Einstein theory makes both the absorption and the emission sudden or explosive, while the loading theory first suggested by Planck, though from another view-point, makes the absorption continuous and only the emission explosive.

The h determined above with not more than one-half of 1 per cent of uncertainty is the explosive constant, i.e., it is the unchanging ratio between the energy of emission and the frequency of the incident light. It is a constant the existence of which was first discovered by Planck by an analysis of the facts of black-body radiation, though the physical assumptions underlying Planck's analysis do not seem to be longer tenable. For the American physicists Duane and Hunt [*Footnote: Phys. Rev.*, VI (1915), 166.] and Hull [*Ibid.*, VII (1916), 157.] have recently shown that the same quantity h appears in connection with the impact of corpuscles against any kind of a target, the observation here being that the highest frequency in the general or white-light X-radiation emitted when corpuscles impinge upon a target is found by dividing the kinetic energy of the impinging corpuscle by h . Since black-body radiation is presumably due to the impact of the free corpuscles within a metal upon the atoms, it is probable that the appearance of h in black-body radiation and in general X-radiation is due to the same cause, so that, contrary to Planck's assumption, there need not be, in either of these cases, any coincidence between natural and impressed periods at all. The $h\nu$ which here appears is not a characteristic of the atom, but merely a property of the ether pulse which is generated by the stopping of a moving electron. Why this ether pulse should be resolvable into a continuous, or white-light spectrum which, however, has the peculiar property of being chopped off sharply at a particular limiting frequency given by $h\nu = PD \times e$ is thus far a complete mystery. All that we can say is that experiment seems to demand a sufficient modification of the ether-pulse theory of white-light and of general X-radiation to take this experimental fact into account.

On the other hand, the appearance of h in connection with the absorption and emission of *monochromatic* light (photo-electric effect and Bohr atom) seems to demand some hitherto unknown type of absorbing and emitting mechanism within the atom. This demand is strikingly emphasized by the remarkable absorbing property of matter for X-rays, discovered by Barkla [*Footnote: Phil. Mag.*, XVII (1909), 749.] and beautifully exhibited in De Brogue's photographs opposite p. 197. It will be seen from these photographs *that the atoms of each particular substance transmit the general X-radiation up to a certain critical frequency and then absorbs all radiations of higher frequency than this critical value*. The extraordinary significance of this

discovery lies in the fact that it indicates that there is a type of absorption which is not due either to resonance or to free electrons. But these are the only types of absorption which are recognized in the structure of modern optics. We have as yet no way of conceiving of this new type of absorption in terms of a mechanical model.

There is one result, however, which seems to be definitely established by all of this experimental work. Whether the radiation is produced by the stopping of a free electron, as in Duane and Hunt's experiments, and presumably also in black-body experiments, or by the absorption and re-emission of energy by bound electrons, as in photo-electric and spectroscopic work, Planck's h seems to be always tied up in some way with the emission and absorption of energy by the electron. *h may therefore be considered as one of the properties of the electron.*

The new facts in the field of radiation which have been discovered through the study of the properties of the electron seem, then, to require in any case a very fundamental revision or extension of classical theories of absorption and emission of radiant energy. The Thomson-Einstein theory throws the whole burden of accounting for the new facts upon the unknown nature of the ether and makes radical assumptions about its structure. The loading theory leaves the ether as it was and puts the burden of an explanation upon the unknown conditions and laws which exist inside the atom, and have to do with the nature of the electron. I have already given reasons for discrediting the first type of theory. The second type, though as yet very incomplete, seems to me to be the only possible one, and it has already met with some notable successes, as in the case of the Bohr atom. Yet the theory is at present woefully incomplete and hazy. About all that we can say now is that we seem to be driven by newly discovered relations in the field of radiation either to the Thomson-Einstein semi-corpuscular theory, or else to a theory which is equally subversive of the established order of things in physics. For either one of these alternatives brings us to a very revolutionary quantum theory of radiation. To be living in a period which faces such a complete reconstruction of our notions as to the way in which ether waves are absorbed and emitted by matter is an inspiring prospect. The atomic and electronic worlds have revealed themselves with beautiful definiteness and wonderful consistency to the eye of the modern physicist, but their relation to the world of ether waves is still to him a profound mystery for which the coming generation has the incomparable opportunity of finding a solution.

In conclusion there is given a summary of the most important physical constants the values of which it has become possible to fix, [*Footnote: See Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, III (1917), 236; also *Phil. Mag.*, July, 1917.] within about the limits indicated, through the isolation and measurement of the electron.”³⁶⁶

Arvid Reuterdaahl noted that Millikan changed his stance in an international radio

broadcast in 1924, after Millikan had won the Nobel Prize. Reuterdaahl also noted that Millikan did not reveal what had occurred in the interim that rendered Einstein's previously untenable theory, tenable. Reuterdaahl pointed out that the Nobel Committee irrationally used Millikan's original declaration as if it were a justification for the reward of an "untenable" Thomson-Einstein theory, instead of excluding Einstein from consideration, as would have been appropriate.

Millikan stated in 1949,

"Einstein's third 1905 paper reveals more strikingly than either of the foregoing his boldness in breaking with tradition and setting up a photoelectric stopping potential $PD \cdot e = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 = h\nu - p$ which at the time seemed completely unreasonable because it *apparently* ignored and indeed seemed to contradict all the manifold facts of interference and thus to be a straight return to the corpuscular theory of light which had been completely abandoned since the times of Young and Fresnel around 1800 A.D. [***] These contradictions have now partially disappeared, however, through the development of the so-called 'wave mechanics' by the work of Louis De Broglie, Schroedinger, Heisenberg, and Dirac."³⁶⁶⁷

It appears that Einstein's Nobel Prize was the product not of merit, but of politics and of the Einstein mania which followed the eclipse observations of 1919 that had made Einstein an international celebrity. They insisted on giving Einstein a prize not because of his alleged achievements, but because it would increase the prestige of the Committee and further the cause of rapprochement among the post-war nations, as well as promote Einstein's friends, like Max Planck, as well as promote Einstein's political cause of Zionism.

Carl Wilhelm Oseen joined the Nobel Committee in 1922 in order to see to it that Albert Einstein was awarded a prize. Oseen was a corrupting influence on the Nobel Prize Committee.³⁶⁶⁸ He attempted to base the prizes on political considerations, personal friendships and other corrupt motivations. He ridiculously parsed words and sophistically contradicted himself, while applying double standards to award the prizes to those who did not deserve them, or withhold them from those who did. Given that it was impossible to award Einstein the prize for his plagiarism of the theory of relativity, Oseen manufactured the excuse of giving Einstein the Nobel Prize for the law of the photo-electric effect. However, the prize for the photo-electric was rightfully owed to Millikan, the experimentalist—as opposed to theorist, because the express purpose of the prize was to reward physical discoveries, not theories; and it was Millikan, not Einstein, who had allegedly made the physical discovery. In addition, it was well-known that the Einsteins' contribution to the ultimate form of the law was not revolutionary but evolutionary, and their derivation was flawed and based upon an "untenable" theory—as Millikan had stated.

[19.4 The Origins of the Law of the Photo-Electric Effect](#)

Even if the Einsteins' work on the photo-electric effect had met the requirements for the awarding of a prize, it did not merit a Noble Prize. It was for the most part unoriginal. All of the foundational work had been accomplished by others, and the Einsteins forced their derivations in order to achieve a known result.

The Einsteins had many predecessors and there is a great deal of literature on the subject. Isaac Newton presented a corpuscular theory of light two centuries before the Einsteins. The Einsteins' predecessors also include: E. Becquerel, *La Lumière: Ses Causes et Ses Effets: 2 : Effets de la Lumière*, Volume 2, Librairie de Firmin Didot frères, Paris, (1868), p. 122. **See also:** G. R. Kirchhoff, "Ueber das Verhältniss zwischen dem Emissionsvermögen und dem Absorptionsvermögen der Körper für Wärme und Licht", *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 109, (1860), pp. 275-301; republished in: *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1882), pp. 571-598. **See also:** L. Boltzmann, "Analytischer Beweis des 2. Hauptsatzes der mechanischen Wärmetheorie aus den Sätzen über das Gleichgewicht der lebendigen Kraft", *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Zweite Abtheilung*, Volume 63, (1871), pp. 712-732; republished in: *Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen*, Volume 1, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1909), pp. 288-308; **and** "Über die Beziehung zwischen dem zweiten Hauptsatz der mechanischen Wärmetheorie und der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung, respective den Sätzen über das Wärmegleichgewicht", *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Zweite Abtheilung*, Volume 76, (1877), pp. 373-435; republished in: *Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen*, Volume 2, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1909), pp. 164-223; **and** *Vorlesungen über Gastheorie*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1896). **See also:** H. F. Weber, "Die specifischen Wärmen der Elemente Kohlenstoff, Bor und Silicium", *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 4, (1875), pp. 367-423, 553-582; **and** "Die Entwicklung der Lichtemission glühender fester Körper", *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1887), pp. 491-504; **and** "Untersuchungen über die Strahlung fester Körper", *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1888), pp. 933-957. **See also:** H. R. Hertz, "Über sehr schnelle electriche Schwingungen", *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 31, (1887), pp. 421-449; English translation in: *Electric Waves, Being Researches on the Propagation of Electric Action with Finite Velocity Through Space*, London, New York, Macmillan, (1893), p. 29ff.; **and** "Über einen Einfluß des ultravioletten Lichtes auf die electriche Entladung", *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 31, (1887), pp. 983-1000; English translation in: *Electric Waves, Being Researches on the Propagation of Electric Action with Finite Velocity Through Space*, London, New York, Macmillan, (1893), p. 63ff.; **and** *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1887), pp. 487ff.; **and** "Über die Einwirkung einer geradlinigen electriche Schwingung auf eine benachbarte Strombahn", *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 34, (1888), pp. 155-171; **and** "Über die Ausbreitungsgeschwindigkeit der electro-dynamischen Wirkungen", *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 34, (1888), pp. 551-569; **and** "Über electro-dynamische Wellen im Luftraume und deren Reflexion", *Annalen der Physik*

und Chemie, Volume 34, (1888), pp. 609-623; **and** “Ueber die Grundgleichungen der Elektrodynamik für ruhende Körper”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1890), pp. 106-149; reprinted *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 40, (1890), pp. 577-624; reprinted *Untersuchung über die Ausbreitung der Elektrischen Kraft*, Johann Ambrosius Barth, Leipzig, (1892), pp. 208-255; translated into English by D. E. Jones, as: “On the Fundamental Equations of Electromagnetics for Bodies at Rest”, *Electric Waves, Being Researches on the Propagation of Electric Action with Finite Velocity Through Space*, London, New York, Macmillan, (1893), pp. 195-239; and “Ueber die Grundgleichungen der Elektrodynamik für bewegte Körper”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 41, (1890), pp. 369-399; reprinted *Untersuchung über die Ausbreitung der Elektrischen Kraft*, Johann Ambrosius Barth, Leipzig, (1892), pp. 256-285; translated into English by D. E. Jones, as: “On the Fundamental Equations of Electromagnetics for Bodies in Motion”, *Electric Waves, Being Researches on the Propagation of Electric Action with Finite Velocity Through Space*, London, New York, Macmillan, (1893), pp. 241-268.; **and** “Über den Durchgang der Kathodenstrahlen durch dünne Metallschichten”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 45, (1892), pp. 28-32. **See also:** J. H. Van’t Hoff, “Die Rolle des osmotischen Druckes in der Analogie zwischen Lösungen und Gasen”, *Zeitschrift für physikalische Chemie, Stöchiometrie und Verwandtschaftslehre*, Volume 1, (1887), pp. 481-508. **See also:** W. Hallwachs, “Über den Einfluss des Lichtes auf electrostatisch geladene Körper”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 33, (1888), pp. 301-312. **See also:** H. Ebert and E. Wiedemann, “Über den Einfluss des Lichtes auf die electricen Entladungen”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 33, (1888), pp. 241-264. **See also:** A. Righi, “Di alcuni nuovi fenomeni elettrici provocati dalle radiazioni — Nota V”, *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei*, Volume 4, Number 2, (1888), pp. 16-19. **See also:** M. A. Stoletow, “Suite des Recherches Actino-Électriques”, *Comptes Rendus Hebdomadaires des Séances de L’Académie des Sciences*, Volume 107, (1888), pp. 91-92. **See also:** P. Lenard and M. Wolf, “Zerstäuben der Körper durch das ultraviolette Licht”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 37, (1889), pp. 443-456. **See also:** J. Elster and H. Geitel, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 38, (1889), pp. 40, 497; **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 39, (1890), p. 332; **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 41, (1890), p. 161; **and** “Über den hemmenden Einfluss des Magnetismus auf lichtelectrische Entladungen in verdünntenn Gasen”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 41, (1890), pp. 166-176; **and** “Über die durch Sonnenlicht bewirkte electriche Zerstreuung von mineralischen Oberflächen”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 44, (1891), pp. 722-736; **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 52, (1894), p. 433; **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 55, (1895), p. 684; **and** “Über die angebliche Zerstreuung positiver Electricität der Licht”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 57, (1895), pp. 24-33. **See also:** W. Wien, “Eine neue Beziehung der Strahlung schwarzer Körper zum zweiten Hauptsatz der Wärmetheorie”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1893), pp. 55-62; **and** “Temperatur und Entropie der Strahlung”, *Annalen*

der Physik und Chemie, Volume 52, (1894), pp. 132-165; **and** "Ueber die Energievertheilung im Emissionsspectrum eines schwarzen Körpers", *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 58, (1896), pp. 662-669. **See also:** E. Branly, "Déperdition des Deux Électricités par les Rayons très Réfringibles", *Comptes Rendus Hebdomadaires des Séances de L'Académie des Sciences*, Volume 114, (1892), pp. 68-70. **See also:** O. E. Meyer, *Die kinetische Theorie der Gase*, Multiple Editions. **See also:** O. Knoblauch, "Ueber die Fluorescenz von Lösungen", *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 54, (1895), pp. 193-220. **See also:** J. J. Thomson, "On Cathode Rays", *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 44, (1897), pp. 293-316; **and** "On the Charge of Electricity Carried by the Ions Produced by Roentgen Rays", *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 46, (1898), pp. 528-545; **and** "On the Masses of the Ions in a Gas at Low Pressure", *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 48, (1899), pp. 547-567; **and** *Les Discharges Électriques dans les Gaz*, Paris, (1900), p. 56; **and** *Electricity and Matter*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, (1904); translated into German, *Elektrizität und Materie*, F. Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1904); **and** "On the Emission of Negative Corpuscles by the Alkali Metals", *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 10, (1905), pp. 584-590. **See also:** E. Rutherford, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Volume 9, (1898), p. 401. **See also:** O. Lummer and E. Pringsheim, "Die Vertheilung der Energie im Spectrum des schwarzen Körpers und des blanken Platins", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 1, (1899), pp. 215-230. **See also:** M. Planck, "Über irreversible Strahlungsvorgänge. Vierte Mittheilung", *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1898), pp. 449-476; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 532-559; **and** "Über irreversible Strahlungsvorgänge. Fünfte Mittheilung", *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1899), pp. 440-480; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 560-600; **and** "Ueber irreversible Strahlungsvorgänge", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 1, (1900), pp. 69-122; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 614-667; **and** "Entropie und Temperatur strahlender Wärme", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 1, (1900), pp. 719-737; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 668-686; **and** "Ueber eine Verbesserung der Wien'schen Spectralgleichung", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 2, (1900), pp. 202-204; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 687-689; **and** "Kritik zweier Sätze des Hrn. W. Wien", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 3, (1900), pp. 764-766; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 695-697; **and** "Zur Theorie des Gesetzes der Energieverteilung im Normalspectrum", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 2, (1900), pp. 237-245; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn,

Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 698-706; **and** “Ueber das Gesetz der Energieverteilung im Normalspectrum”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 4, (1901), pp. 553-563; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 717-727; **and** “Ueber die Elementarquanta der Materie und der Elektrizität”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 4, (1901), pp. 564-566; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 728-730. **See also:** E. Merritt and O. M. Stewart, “The Development of Cathode Rays by Ultraviolet Light”, *Physical Review*, Volume 11, (1900), pp. 230-250. **See also:** P. Drude, *Lehrbuch der Optik*, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1900); translated into English *The Theory of Optics*, Longmans, Green and Co., London, New York, Toronto, (1902); **and** “Zur Elektronentheorie der Metalle. I & II”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 1, (1900), pp. 566-613; Volume 3, (1900), pp. 369-402; **and** “Optische Eigenschaften und Elektronentheorie, I & II”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 14, (1904), pp. 677-725, 936-961; **and** “Die Natur des Lichtes” in A. Winkelmann, *Handbuch der Optik*, Volume 6, Second Edition, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1906), pp. 1120-1387; **and** *Physik des Aethers auf elektromagnetischer Grundlage*, F. Enke, Stuttgart, (1894), Posthumous Second Revised Edition, W. König, (1912). **See also:** Lord Rayleigh, “Remarks upon the Law of Complete Radiation”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 49, (1900), pp. 539-540; republished in: *Scientific Papers*, Volume 4, Dover, New York, (1964), pp. 483-485; **and** “The Dynamical Theory of Gases and of Radiation”, *Nature*, Volume 72, (1905), pp. 54-55; republished in: *Scientific Papers*, Volume 5, Dover, New York, (1964), pp. 248-252; **and** “The Constant of Radiation as Calculated from Molecular Data”, *Nature*, Volume 72, (1905), pp. 243-244; republished in: *Scientific Papers*, Volume 5, Dover, New York, (1964), p. 253. **See also:** P. Lenard, “Ueber Wirkungen des ultravioletten Lichtes auf gasförmige Körper”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 1, (1900), pp. 486-507; **and** “Erzeugung von Kathodenstrahlen durch ultraviolettes Licht”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 2, (1900), pp. 359-375; **and** “Ueber die Elektrizitätszerstreuung in ultraviolet durchstrahlter Luft”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 3, (1900), pp. 298-319; **and** “Ueber die lichtelektrische Wirkung”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 8, (1902), pp. 149-198; **and** “Über die Beobachtung langsamer Kathodenstrahlen mit Hilfe der Phosphoreszenz und über Sekundärentstehung von Kathodenstrahlen”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 12, (1903), pp. 449-490. **See also:** F. Paschen, “Ueber das Strahlungsgesetz des schwarzen Körpers”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 4, (1901), pp. 277-298; **and** “Ueber das Strahlungsgesetz des schwarzen Körpers. Entgegnung auf Ausführungen der Herren O. Lummer und E. Pringsheim”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 6, (1901), pp. 646-658. **See also:** H. Rubens and F. Kurlbaum, “Anwendung der Methode der Reststrahlen zur Prüfung des Strahlungsgesetzes”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 4, (1901), pp. 649-666. **See also:** J. Stark, *Die Elektrizität in Gasen*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1902). **See also:** E. R. Ladenburg, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 12, (1903), pp. 558. **See also:** E. v. Schweidler, “Die lichtelektrischen Erscheinungen”, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 1, (1904), pp. 358-400. **See also:** J. H. Jeans, “On the Partition

of Energy between Matter and Aether”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 10, (1905), pp. 91-98; **and** “The Dynamical Theory of Gases and of Radiation”, *Nature*, Volume 72, (1905), pp. 101-102; **and** “A Comparison between Two Theories of Radiation”, *Nature*, (1905), pp. 293-294.

On the history of the origin and derivation of the formulas and concepts, *see*: P. Ehrenfest, “Welche Züge der Lichtquantenhypothese spielen in der Theorie der Wärmestrahlung eine wesentliche Rolle?”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 36, Number 11, (1911), pp. 91-118. **See also**: A. Joffé, “Zur Theorie der Strahlungserscheinungen”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 36, Number 13, (1911), pp. 534-552. **See also**: L. Natanson, “Über die statistische Theorie der Strahlung. (On the Statistical Theory of Radiation.)”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 12, Number 16, (15 August 1911), pp. 659-666. **See also**: G. Krutkow, “Aus der Annahme unabhängiger Lichtquanten folgt die W i e n s c h e Strahlungsformel”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 15, Number 3, (1 February 1914), pp. 133-136. **See also**: F. Hund, “Die Strahlung heisse Körper”, *Einführung in die theoretische Physik*, Volume 4 “Theorie der Wärme”, *Especially* Sections 66 and 67, Bibliographisches Institut, Leipzig, (1950), pp. 309-315; **and** F. Hund, “Die Strahlung heisse Körper”, *Einführung in die theoretische Physik*, Volume 4, “Theorie der Wärme”, *Especially* Sections 66 and 67, Bibliographisches Institut, Leipzig, (1950), pp. 309-315; **and** “Lichtteichen”, *Einführung in die theoretische Physik*, Volume 5 “Atom- und Quantentheorie”, Section 36, Bibliographisches Institut, Leipzig, (1950), pp. 166-169; **and** F. Hund, *The History of Quantum Theory*, Barnes & Noble Books, New York, (1974). **See also**: E. T. Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 1, Chapter 11, pp. 356-357; Volume 2, Chapter 3, Thomas Nelson and Sons, London, (1951/1953). **See also**: A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Chapter 19, Oxford University Press, (1982), pp. 364-388. **See also**: *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Document 14, Princeton University Press, (1989), pp. 134-169. **See also**: S. Galdabini, G. Giuliani and N. Robotti, *Photoelectricity Within Classical Physics: from the Photocurrents of Edmond Becquerel to the First Measure of the Electron Charge*, URL:

<<http://fiscavolta.unipv.it/percorsi/pdf/napesi.pdf>>

19.5 Einstein's Nobel Prize was Undeserved

Why did the Nobel Committee not award Einstein the Nobel Prize for his work on relativity theory? All who were familiar with the facts knew that Einstein did not originate the major concepts behind relativity theory. Political motives, and not merit, were the impetus behind Einstein's award. Max Planck, who had selfish interests in the award, placed heavy pressure on the Committee to award Einstein the prize.

Some ten years prior, Wilhelm Wien had recommended that the Nobel Prize for Physics be given to both Hendrik Antoon Lorentz and Albert Einstein in 1912, on the grounds that,

“While Lorentz must be considered as the first to have found the mathematical content of the relativity principle, Einstein succeeded in reducing it to a simple principle. One should therefore assess the merits of both investigators as being comparable.”³⁶⁶⁹

However, Einstein’s half of the relativity pie by all rights belonged to Poincaré, who died in 1912. It would have been in exceedingly bad taste to have exploited Poincaré’s death in order to award the Nobel Prize to Einstein; and Boscovich, Voigt, FitzGerald and Larmor held rights to Lorentz’ share. Wien knew Poincaré’s work well, and, thus, knew that Einstein had done little other than copy Poincaré’s principle of relativity.³⁶⁷⁰ Wien’s recommendation of Lorentz and Einstein for the special theory of relativity could not be seriously considered. Too many knew that Poincaré stated the principle of relativity long before Einstein, and many others had published the theory’s fundamental mathematical formalisms long before Einstein or Lorentz.

Since Einstein was ineligible for a Nobel Prize for the theory of relativity on account of his well-known plagiarism of the theory, and since influential persons compelled the Committee to award him a prize, Carl Wilhelm Oseen nominated Einstein for a prize for the photo-electric effect. This also presented the Committee with several dilemmas, and one notes that the photo-electric effect was merely mentioned as an aside, an aside to the otherwise completely nebulous statement that the award was made “for his services to Theoretical Physics”.³⁶⁷¹

Einstein’s equations were not sufficient to merit a prize, in that the prizes were intended only for inventions and experimental discoveries, and the formal mathematical expression of a law was not appropriate grounds for a prize. Einstein had also had many predecessors who had worked out the formalisms before him, and Millikan had stated that the theory behind Einstein’s equations was “untenable”. Theoretical work was also not a valid basis for the awarding of a prize. In addition, the Nobel Committee sought to award Millikan the prize for his experimental work on the photo-electric effect, which was the appropriate award. Ultimately, Nobel Prizes were awarded to both Einstein (1921), “for his services to Theoretical Physics, and especially for his discovery of the law of the photoelectric effect”;³⁶⁷² and Millikan (1923), “for his work on the elementary charge of electricity and on the photoelectric effect”.³⁶⁷³

The question naturally arises, did the Einsteins’ work on the photo-electric effect merit an award of the magnitude of a Nobel Prize? And should any such award have been awarded exclusively to the Einsteins’; or, instead, to a group of physicists, including the Einsteins, who developed the theory over the course of many years?

Professor Friedwardt Winterberg, theoretical physicist at the University of Nevada, Reno, argues in a private communication that Planck, not Einstein, was the founder of quantum mechanics—contrary to the opinions of Kragh, Kuhn and Hermann.³⁶⁷⁴ Prof. Winterberg, who has permitted me to reproduce some of his arguments here, calls attention to the fact that one of the fundamental elements of quantum theory is the assertion that there is a smallest action. Neither Planck (1900), nor Einstein (1905), had yet incorporated this fundamental property of quantum

mechanics into their work. According to Prof. Winterberg, the principle of a smallest action first appeared in quantum theory in Planck's,

“1911 paper, where he replaced,

$$\epsilon_n = nh\nu, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

for the discrete energy steps of a harmonic oscillator, with,

$$\epsilon_n = \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) h\nu$$

with the zero point energy $\epsilon_0 = \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) h\nu$ for $n = 0$, which was later shown to be a consequence of Heisenberg's uncertainty principle.”

The postulation of discrete energy levels leads to the conclusion that light must be emitted, or absorbed, through a discrete change in the energy of the oscillator,

“for example, from $n + 1$ to n with $\Delta\epsilon = h\nu$ the energy of the emitted radiation.”

Prof. Winterberg concludes,

“Planck's black body radiation formula is the interpolation between wave-like (Rayleigh-Jeans) and particle-like (Wien) behavior for the long-wave and short-wave limit and thus a direct expression of the wave-particle duality of quantum mechanics. Wien, in arriving at his 1896 radiation law, was guided by the similarity of the high frequency tail of the black body radiation with the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution of a gas, and Wien found that the energy of the corresponding particles would have to be proportional to ν , in different notation, equal to $h\nu$. Therefore, a case can be made that the photon concept should be shared by Wien and Planck, with Einstein having made the connection between the two.”

Prof. Winterberg raises three points, which justify his contentions:

“1. We begin with Wien's displacement law of black body radiation for the distribution of the energy $u(\nu)$ over the frequency ν ,

$$u(\nu) = \nu^3 f\left(\frac{\nu}{T}\right), \quad (1)$$

where T is the absolute temperature and f a universal function which is yet to be determined. Equation (1) is an exact statement for black body radiation.

2. Experimentally, it was found that for large frequencies,

$$u \sim \nu^3 e^{-\frac{h\nu}{kT}}, \quad (2)$$

where h is a constant, which is today called ‘Planck’s constant’.

3. Wien then compares (2) with the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution for the kinetic energy of gas molecules, setting,

$$\begin{aligned} u &\sim \nu^2 e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{kT}} d\nu \\ &\sim \epsilon e^{-\frac{\epsilon}{kT}} d\nu \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where ν is the velocity and ϵ the kinetic energy of the gas molecules. He then conjectures that the molecules emit a radiation of the intensity $j = j(\epsilon)$ and a frequency $\nu = \nu(\epsilon)$, whereby, one has,

$$u \sim j(\nu) \epsilon(\nu) \frac{d\nu(\nu)}{d\nu} e^{-\frac{\epsilon(\nu)}{kT}} d\nu. \quad (4)$$

However, this is compatible with (1) if, and only if,

$$\begin{aligned} u &\sim \nu^3 e^{-\frac{h\nu}{kT}} \\ \epsilon &= h\nu. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Therefore, the radiation behaves like the energy from a gas with the molecules having the energy $h\nu$, as in Einstein’s theory.”

19.6 Einstein Breaks the Rules

In late 1922, the Nobel Prize Committee awarded Albert Einstein the Nobel Prize for 1921. The award was mired in controversy. Einstein’s Nobel Prize was not awarded for the theory of relativity, because everyone involved knew that Einstein had plagiarized the theory. Einstein, the nature of his prize, and the method by which his prize was awarded, broke many of the rules the Nobel Committee was duty bound to uphold.

Einstein was touring the globe when his award was announced. Confusion arose from Einstein’s self-declared status as a citizen of the world. The Nobel Committee

asked the German ambassador to accept the prize on Einstein's behalf. The Committee determined that Einstein was both a Swiss and a German citizen, and the German Ambassador made mention of Switzerland when accepting the prize for Einstein, who was traveling abroad. Einstein maintained that he was a Swiss citizen and not a German citizen.

The Committee violated the rules by awarding Einstein a prize for a non-discovery. Alfred Nobel did not create a Nobel Prize for Mathematics and was not interested in theoretical work, but instead intended his prizes to be given out for inventions and experimental discoveries that benefitted humanity. Nobel did this to deliberately encourage the development of inventions and experimental discoveries.

Einstein violated the rules by giving an acceptance speech on the theory of relativity, instead of the photo-electric effect; which unwarranted speech gave the public the false and misleading impression that Einstein had won the Nobel Prize for the theory of relativity. Einstein had not won a Nobel Prize for the theory of relativity, though his speech made it appear to the world that he had. The award specifically stated that it was awarded, "irrespective of such value which, after eventual substantiation, may be assigned to his relativity and gravitational theories".³⁶⁷⁵ Einstein also broke the rules by giving his speech in Göteborg. The Constitution of the Nobel Directorate required that Einstein must give a lecture in Stockholm on the subject for which the award was made. He never did.

Arvid Reuter Dahl protested in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* on 6 January 1923,

"Recently the Nobel Foundation Directorate awarded the Nobel premium for distinguished achievement in physical science to Albert Einstein. Uninformed and uncritical opinion will, undoubtedly, concur with the directorate in this choice. Biased opinion, created by world-wide propaganda, will heartily agree with the directorate in its decision. In this instance, however, the directorate has deliberately conferred a unique distinction and set its seal of approval upon a man who has been definitely and publicly charged with plagiarism through the medium of the international press and in such scientific journals as still retain their freedom of expression.

It may be thought that the award to Einstein was based upon ignorance of the actually involved facts and that the directorate may be exonerated on the plea of lack of information. It must be admitted, however, that in this case ignorance of facts should not and cannot be accepted as a defense of the award. The plea of ignorance cannot be allowed because of the all-important reason that the directorate's attention had been definitely called [by Prof. O. E. Westin] both to the charges made against Einstein and also to the unbiased appraisal of his alleged achievements.

[***]

Was Einstein brought before this tribunal to defend himself against these charges of plagiarism? We understand that he was far away from Sweden at the time the award was made. Has Einstein ever flatly denied the charges made against him and has he ever tried to show that they are not true? If he had, the world would have known it by every means under the control of his

supporters.

It would seem the same sinister influence which forced Einsteinism upon the world has controlled the decision of the Nobel directorate in its recent award. In view of the timely warning of the fearless and honest savant, Professor O. E. Westin, it is difficult to find any justification for the directorate in bestowing the Nobel premium in physics upon Albert Einstein.”

Peter A. Bucky stated that Einstein later showed no interest in his Nobel Prize, which his wife kept in cabinet.³⁶⁷⁶

19.7 Conclusion

Personality cults are common in the history of Physics. This hero worship has a deleterious effect on the progress of science. Galileo Galilei nearly lost his life for opposing the many myths of the beloved Aristotle, who was considered a divine philosopher by the Church. Had the Church succeeded in its promotion of Aristotle and its suppression of the truth, teachers would to this day be teaching students that the Earth did not orbit the Sun. John Toland complained in 1704 that the cult of personality which had grown up around Spinoza’s dogma was as destructive to rational thought, as it was distasteful to free-thinking philosophers.³⁶⁷⁷ Eugen Karl Dühring registered the same complaint and attributed it to shameless ethnically-biased advertising and was himself ethnically-biased.³⁶⁷⁸ Spinoza plagiarized his philosophy from better minds such as David of Dinant,³⁶⁷⁹ Amalric of Chartres and the Amalricians, John Scotus Eriugena, “Alexander a disciple of Xenophanes”, Archdeacon Gundisalvi of Segovia, Avicbron, Giordano Bruno and René Des Cartes. George Berkeley (followed by Colin Maclaurin, and the less religiously inclined T. H. Pasley, Ernst Mach, and many others) opposed the myths of Sir Isaac Newton, and fought hard to free Physics from the authority of Newton’s Cabalistic religious beliefs, which had inspired a fervent following, which group of tacit pantheists attributed physical phenomena to the active governance of God and declared all contrary beliefs to be heresy, thereby forbidding the search for the causal mechanism behind gravitation. Hermann Boltzmann predicted in 1904 that the authority of Newton and others would someday fall, but that it had ruined his attempts to interject more science into Physics. Boltzmann then took his own life. Newton, in order to achieve his cult status, had to overcome the fame of Des Cartes, who is today, outside of France, known almost exclusively for his Mathematics and Philosophy, not his Physics, though at the time, he was world-renowned for his Physics.

One hero gives way to another, often based upon arguments which have little or nothing to do with science. The success of a theory sometimes depends more upon its widespread publication and promotion in several languages, particularly in the *Lingua Franca* of the day, than it does upon the merits of the theory. Voltaire played no small role in the promotion of Newton by bringing him to France and ridiculing Des Cartes, who was then the leading authority in Physics. Voltaire also lampooned

Newton's staunchest critic, Leibnitz.

Knowing this history, and knowing how to manufacture and destroy heroes in science, and knowing how to hide the achievements of their predecessors, Albert Einstein, Max Planck, Max Born, Erwin Freundlich, Arnold Sommerfeld, Max von Laue, Alexander Moszkowski, and others, deliberately set out to create a "star cult" around Albert Einstein and the "theory of relativity". We know this from their words and from their deeds. Moszkowski, for example, wrote to Einstein that he had made it his life's goal to promote Einstein, and was good to his word in his book *Einstein: The Searcher* of 1921, which presented Einstein as an arrogant demi-god with the full right to pass judgement on all things and the just power to censor out opposition, as a matter of course, while denying that he was doing so. Freundlich and Born gave credence to the myths of Moszkowski, and they each profited financially from the Einstein name.

Einstein and Moszkowski discussed the "Valhalla" of great thinkers, and who it was that St. Einstein, like St. Peter before him, would allow into the hall, and who it was that he would exclude. Moszkowski coolly calculated that eclipse observations of starlight could be used in comic book fashion to hype Einstein as a super-human hero, who had deduced God's secrets through pure thought. Even as early as 1916, Moszkowski uttered the prophecy that Einstein would someday be referred to as Abertus Maximus, and called him the Galileo of the Twentieth Century—a "prophecy" Moszkowski, himself, set out to fulfill. Moszkowski kicked off his campaign to make Einstein a superstar with an article in the *Berliner Tageblatt* on 8 October 1919, "Die Sonne bracht' es an den Tag!" and set the stage for all the shameless promotion of Einstein that soon followed. Just as Theodor Herzl took his racist plans from Dühring,³⁶⁸⁰ Einstein's promoters, who sought to make pro-Zionist propaganda with Einstein, took their promotional plans from Dühring, who believed that ethnic bias led to the shameless promotion of Lessing. Dühring wrote in 1881,

"One needs only to consider the advertisements with which the Jews seek at present, at any cost, to raise their Lessing up to a god after they have for a century raised his fame ten times more than what he is worth with all the arts of false praise. The business which the Jewish press and Jewish literature have always systematically made out of bringing a powerful overvaluation of Lessing into the public has recently been carried out indeed to the point of disgust. The Jewish newspaper writers have raised the author of that flat Jewish piece which is entitled *Nathan der Weise* over the greatest authors and poets and declared him to be, for example, the greatest German, to say something against whom would be a *lèse Majesté*."³⁶⁸¹

Indeed, such talk may have caused Paul Ehrenfest doubts. He wrote to Einstein,

"I just read a few novellas by Zangwill (Tauchnitz Edition). Artistically worthless ghetto scenes. Where is the literature concerning Jews that, if only on a reduced scale, does to *some extent* what *Dostoyevsky* has done for

Russians, or at least Tolstoy, or Turgenev, or Gorky or at the very least Herzen?"³⁶²

The weariness of the world after the dreariness of World War I made fertile ground for the publicity stunts used to promote Einstein as the new Newton—the new heroic cult figure of science. As Arvid Reuterdaahl aptly phrased it, Einstein was the P. T. Barnum of the scientific world and basked in the circus limelight he focused narrowly on himself—Valhalla ultimately only had room for one. Never before had a hero in the world of science been so quickly and cleverly manufactured from plagiarism, false data and sophistry, and never before had intellectual opposition to the absurd been so effectively suppressed by race-baiting and brow-beating, as was done by Einstein and his cronies, deliberately and in the knowledge of the historical forces at play and how they might be manipulated to fit the purpose.

Accounts from Einstein's contemporaries disclose that many were aware that Einstein was not the genius he was made out to be, and that his world-wide fame resulted from media hype, not merit. Gertrude Besse King wrote in the early 1920's of the immoderate promotion of Einstein in the popular press in America and of the untruths that Einstein's promoters told the public. Felix Klein also wrote of the awful hype wasted on Einstein, and how it failed to capture his true persona, which was in reality that of a silly child—and many who had met him described Einstein as childlike.

Ernst Gehrcke and Paul Weyland gave public lectures in the 1920's informing the world that Einstein was a fraud and a plagiarist, and that his ill begotten fame was the product of a marketing campaign based on public ignorance of the facts—a mass-suggestion to accept the absurd, because it was unintelligible, and therefore somehow worthy of worship. While privately agreeing with these accusations, Einstein largely hid from them in public. Einstein sometimes quietly conceded that he was overrated as a physicist, and the cult of personality surrounding him was unjustified. The press claimed that Einstein was the greatest and most original thinker the world had ever seen. However, Albert Einstein wrote to Hendrik Antoon Lorentz on 19 January 1920,

“Nevertheless, unlike you, nature has not bestowed me with the ability to deliver lectures and dispense original ideas virtually effortlessly as meets your refined and versatile mind. [***] This awareness of my limitations pervades me all the more keenly in recent times since I see that my faculties are being quite particularly overrated after a few consequences of the general theory stood the test.”³⁶³

Oskar Edvard Westin, of Stockholm, published important newspaper articles informing the Nobel Prize Committee of Einstein's plagiarism, and thereby prevented him from receiving the Nobel Prize for the theory of relativity. In the 1920's and 1930's, Arvid Reuterdaahl, Charles Lane Poor and Thomas Jefferson Jackson See informed the American public that Einstein was a sophist, a plagiarist and a self-promoter. It is amazing that during his lifetime, Einstein's fame was

always attended by widespread accusations among leading authorities that he was a plagiarist, a sophist and a con man, yet few today know this important history.

Einstein has become a cartoon hero, which is reflective of the increasingly anti-intellectual trends of the Twentieth Century—trends sponsored by the same people who sponsored Einstein. Awestruck and fawning students are attracted to a comic book type of Physics, where they expect to learn the divine truths of the fuzzy-haired messiah and are indoctrinated to refuse to respect disagreements. Our brightest and best, those who have the ability to think independently, creatively and skeptically, those who would most likely succeed as our innovators and discoverers, suffer under a religious horde, who have fallen for the myth, and will do everything in their power to perpetuate it. The rich history of Physics is being stolen from us as the lineage is broken off in the popular press, and now in the text books, at St. Einstein, who is simplistically portrayed as our comic book hero—a legend and approach to science and history that does not appeal to sophisticated and creative minds.

Einstein's papers were not only not original, they are not the best work on the subjects he addressed. Our rich legacy is stolen from us and the insights and expositions of Poincaré, Hilbert, Riemann, Mach, Berkeley, Locke, Hume, Parmenides, Fechner, etc., which are vastly superior to anything Einstein ever produced, are less likely to be read and cited. The long and involved history, which has led to the many difficulties facing modern Physics, has lost its context, making it more difficult for us to discover where we have erred and how to fix Physics and free it from the ontology of hyperspace. We are not likely to accomplish this most desirable result in a climate of hero worship, censorship and a comic book level understanding of the history of science.

In addition, a terrible injustice is being perpetrated against the legacies of many scientists, philosophers and mathematicians of the past. Our children are being lied to and asked to believe in a Santa Claus scientist, who understood the truth that they never can. Science and history are degraded into hero worship and the many wonderful and educational facts and stories of history are distilled into an infantile comic strip featuring only one character. Our children deserve to be told the truth. Science must progress and be treated in a dignified and worthy manner. We cannot expect great things from our children if we teach them from comic books and insist that they believe in a myth. On the other side of Einstein await many wonderful stories in the history of Physics and promising analog models of gravity and electromagnetism which offer tangible explanations of the phenomena.

NOTES:

1. T. J. J. See, "EINSTEIN A TRICKSTER?", *The San Francisco Journal*, (27 May 1923).
2. J. Stachel, "Einstein's Jewish Identity", *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (2002), pp. 57-83, at 68.
3. A. Moszkowski to A. Einstein, translated by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 292, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 281.
4. Letter from A. Einstein to H. Zangger of 15 or 22 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 217, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 185-186, at 186.
5. Letter from A. Einstein to H. Zangger of 24 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 233, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 197-198.
6. Letter from A. Einstein to H. Zangger of 3 January 1920, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of ALbert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 242, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 204-205, at 204.
7. Letter from A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz of 19 January 1920, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 265, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 220.
8. Adelbert von Chamisso:

Die Sonne bringt es an den Tag

Gemächlich in der Werkstatt saß
Zum Frühtrunk Meister Nikolas,
Die junge Hausfrau schenkt' ihm ein,
Es war im heitern Sonnenschein. —
Die Sonne bringt es an den Tag.

Die Sonne blinkt von der Schale Rand,
Malt zitternde Kringeln an die Wand,
Und wie den Schein er ins Auge faßt,
So spricht er für sich, indem er erblickt :
"Du bringst es doch nicht an den Tag" —

"Wer nicht? was nicht?'. die Frau fragt gleich,
"Was stierst du so an? was wirst du so bleich?"
Und er darauf: "Sei still, nur still !
Ich's doch nicht sagen kann noch will.
Die Sonne bringt's nicht an den Tag."

Die Frau nur dringender forschet und fragt,
Mit Schmeicheln ihn und Hadern plagt,
Mit süßem und mit bitterm Wort;
Sie fragt und plagt ihn Ort und Ort :
"Was bringt die Sonne nicht an den Tag?"

"Nein nimmermehr!" — "Du sagst es mir noch."

“Ich sag es nicht.” — “Du sagst es mir doch.”
Da ward zuletzt er müd und schwach
Und gab der Ungestümen nach. —
Die Sonne bringt es an den Tag.

“Auf der Wanderschaft, ’s sind zwanzig Jahr,
Da traf es mich einst gar sonderbar.
Ich hatt nicht Geld, nicht Ranzen, noch Schuh,
War hungrig und durstig und zornig dazu. —
Die Sonne bringt’s nicht an den Tag.

Da kam mir just ein Jud in die Quer,
Ringsher war’s still und menschenleer,
‘Du hilfst mir, Hund, aus meiner Not!
Den Beutel her, sonst schlag ich dich tot!’
Die Sonne bringt’s nicht an den Tag.

Und er: ‘Vergieße nicht mein Blut,
Acht Pfennige sind mein ganzes Gut!’
Ich glaubt ihm nicht und fiel ihn an ;
Er war ein alter, schwacher Mann —
Die Sonne bringt’s nicht an den Tag.

So rücklings lag er blutend da;
Sein brechendes Aug in die Sonne sah;
Noch hob er zuckend die Hand empor,
Noch schrie er röchelnd mir ins Ohr.
‘Die Sonne bringt es an den Tag!’

Ich macht ihn schnell noch vollends stumm
Und kehrt ihm die Taschen um und um:
Acht Pfenn’ge, das war das ganze Geld.
Ich scharrt ihn ein auf selbigem Feld —
Die Sonne bringt’s nicht an den Tag.

Dann zog ich weit und weiter hinaus,
Kam hier ins Land, bin jetzt zu Haus. —
Du weißt nun meine Heimlichkeit,
So halte den Mund und sei gescheit!
Die Sonne bringt’s nicht an den Tag.

Wann aber sie so flimmernd scheint,
Ich merk es wohl, was sie da meint,
Wie sie sich müht und sich erbot, —
Du, schau nicht hin und sei getrost :
Sie bringt es doch nicht an den Tag.”

So hatte die Sonn eine Zunge nun,
Der Frauen Zungen ja nimmer ruhn. —

“Gevatterin, um Jesus Christ!
Laßt Euch nicht merken, was Ihr nun wißt!” —
Nun bringt’s die Sonne an den Tag.

Die Raben ziehen krächzend zumal
Nach dem Hochgericht, zu halten ihr Mahl.
Wen flechten sie aufs Rad zur Stund?
Was hat er getan? wie ward es kund?
Die Sonne bracht es an den Tag.

9. E. Halley, in Newton’s *Principia* in the translation by A. Motte, revised and annotated by F. Cajori, “Ode to Newton”, *Principia*, Volume 1, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, (1962), pp. XIII-XV.

10. Racist political Zionist Theodor Herzl wrote on 12 June 1895, “Jewish papers! I will induce the publishers of the biggest Jewish papers (*Neue Freie Presse*, *Berliner Tageblatt*, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, etc.) to publish editions over there, as the *New York Herald* does in Paris.”—T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 84. **See also:** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 35, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 296-297, note 8.

11. Letter from H. Zangger to A. Einstein of 22 October 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 148, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 126-128, at 127.

12. F. K. Wiebe, *Deutschland und die Judenfrage*, M. Müller & Sohn, Hrsg. im Auftrage des Instituts zum Studium der Judenfrage, Berlin, (1939); **English** translation, *Germany and the Jewish Problem*, Published on behalf of the Institute for the Study of the Jewish Problem, Berlin, (1939); **French** translation, *L’Allemagne et la Question Juive*, Berlin, Edité sous les auspices de l’Institut pour l’étude de la question juive, (1939); **Spanish** translation, *Alemania y la Cuestión Judía*, Publicado por encargo del Instituto para el Estudio de la Cuestión Judía, Berlín, (1939).

13. Political Zionist Theodor Herzl wrote on 12 June 1895, “Jewish papers! I will induce the publishers of the biggest Jewish papers (*Neue Freie Presse*, *Berliner Tageblatt*, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, etc.) to publish editions over there, as the *New York Herald* does in Paris.”—T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 84.

14. J. Spargo, “Why I Am No Longer a Socialist”, *Nation’s Business*, Volume 17, (February, 1929), pp. 15-17, 96, 98, 100; (March, 1929), pp. 29-31, 168, 170; at pages 96 and 98 of the February issue. Reprinted: *Why I Am No Longer a Socialist*, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C., (1929).

15. A. Myerson and I. Goldberg, *The German Jew: His Share in Modern Culture*, A. A. Knopf, New York, (1933), pp. 140-142.

16. Letter from H. K. Onnes to A. Einstein of 8 February 1920, A. Hentschel, translator, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 304, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 254-255, at 255.

17. E. Gehrcke, *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie: Kulturhistorisch-psychologische Dokumente*, Berlin, Hermann Meusser, (1924), pp. 19-22, 25, 56.

18. English translation by I. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), pp. 34-52.

19. M. Born, *Die Relativitätstheorie Einsteins und ihre physikalischen Grundlagen: gemeinverständlich dargestellt*, J. Springer, Berlin, (1920).

-
- 20.** P. Rogers, “Another *Annus Mirabilis?*”, *Physics World*, (August, 2004); posted on *Physics Web*, <<http://physicsweb.org/articles/world/17/8/1>>
- 21.** P. Rogers, “History Revisited”, *Physics World*, (September, 2003); posted on *Physics Web*, <<http://physicsweb.org/articles/world/16/9/1>>
- 22.** P. Rogers, “Do’s and don’ts [*sic*] for authors”, *Physics World*, (November, 2003); posted on *Physics Web*, <<http://physicsweb.org/articles/world/16/11/1>>
- 23.** Letter from A. Eliasberg to A. Einstein of 27 January 1920, A. Hentschel, translator, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 286, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 238-239, at 239.
- 24.** Letter from P. Epstein to A. Einstein of 31 January 1920, A. Hentschel, translator, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 290, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 240-241.
- 25.** Letter from A. Einstein to H. and M. Born of 27 January 1920, A. Hentschel, translator, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 284, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 235-238, at 236.
- 26.** Letter from V. G. Ehrenberg to A. Einstein of 23 November 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 173, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 145.
- 27.** Letter from P. Oppenheim to A. Einstein of 27 November 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 179, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 153-154, at 153. **See also:** Editor’s note 3 in the German ed.
- 28.** P. L. Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner*, Princeton University Press, (1990).
- 29.** E. K. Dühring, *Die Judenfrage als Racen-, Sitten- und Culturfrage: mit einer weltgeschichtlichen Antwort*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, (1881); English translation by A. Jacob, *Eugen Dühring on the Jews*, Nineteen Eighty Four Press, Brighton, England, (1997), pp. 133-134, 138-139, 178-179.
- 30.** B. Disraeli, *Coningsby; or, The New Generation*, H. Colburn, London, (1844), here quoted from The Century Co. edition of 1904, New York, pp. 231-232.
- 31.** M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 16. A. Einstein, *The World As I See It*, Citadel Press, New York, (1993), p. 89.
- 32.** H. Dukas and B. Hoffmann, *Albert Einstein: The Human Side*, Princeton University Press, (1979), p. 55.
- 33.** M. Janssen, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Note 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 124-125.
- 34.** M. Born, *My Life: Recollections of a Nobel Laureate*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1975), p. 185.
- 35.** *See, for example: The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 44 and 64, Princeton University Press, (2004).
- 36.** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 273-275, *see also: 275-280, especially points 2 and 16*, at pp. 277-279.
- 37.** “Consul Investigated Charge”, *The New York Times*, (6 December 1933), p. 6.
- 38.** J. Stachel, *Einstein from ‘B’ to ‘Z’*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 71.
- 39.** A. Einstein, “Why Socialism?”, *Monthly Review*, (May, 1949); reprinted in *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), pp. 151-158.
- 40.** M. Janssen, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, Volume 7, Note 7 (2002), pp. 124-145.
- 41.** Letter from A. Einstein to the Borns of 27 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 284, Princeton University Press, (2004).

- 42.** “Socialists at the Albert Hall”, *The London Times*, (10 February 1919), p. 10.
- 43.** “The Rothschilds”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (27 December 1875), p. 8.
- 44.** Cf. N. De Manhar, *Zohar: Bereshith—Genesis: An Expository Translation from Hebrew*, Third Revised Edition, Wizards Bookshelf, San Diego, (1995), p. 177.
- 45.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 1, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), pp. 108-110.
- 46.** N. De Manhar, *Zohar: Bereshith—Genesis: An Expository Translation from Hebrew*, Third Revised Edition, Wizards Bookshelf, San Diego, (1995), p. 203.
- 47.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 2, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), p. 311.
- 48.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 3, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), p. 63.
- 49.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 3, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), p. 132.
- 50.** G. Dalman, *Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar, and the Liturgy of the Synagogue*, Deighton Bell, Cambridge, (1893), p. 40. Though work is given an ancient attribution by its “discoverer”, the Muhammadans are also mentioned in *Zohar*, II, 32a. Some consider the author to have been divinely inspired, some say the work evolved over time, some say the work is a fabrication—in any event, it is an now a very old writing and was very influential in Jewish political movements like the Frankists.
- 51.** C. A. Lindbergh, *Banking and Currency and The Money Trust*, National Capital Press, Washington, D.C., (1913), pp. 92-98.
- 52.** T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), pp. 5-6, 25, 68, 93.
- 53.** M. Luther, *Von den Juden und ihren Lügen*, Hans Lufft, Wittenberg, (1543); Reprinted, Ludendorffs, München, (1932); English translation by Martin H. Bertram, “On the Jews and Their Lies”, *Luther’s Works*, Volume 47, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, (1971), pp. 123-306, at 264.
- 54.**
<<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/lindbergh/filmmore/reference/primary/desmoinesspeech.html>>
- 55.** W. Wilson, “War Message”, Sixty-Fifth Congress, First Session, Senate Document Number 5, Serial Number 7264, Washington, D.C., (1917) pp. 3-8.
- 56.** Lord Beaverbrook, “A Military Alliance With England”, *American Mercury*; as quoted in: *Congressional Record: Proceedings and Debates of the 76th Congress: Second Session*, Volume 85, Part 1, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., (21 September 1939- 31 October 1939), pp. 302-304, at 303.
- 57.** A. Dosch-Fleurot, “The Red Terror in Russia”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 37, Number 5, (March, 1919), pp. 566-569.
- 58.** *Congressional Record: Proceedings and Debates of the 76th Congress: Second Session*, Volume 85, Part 1, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., (1939), p. 1068.
- 59.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 1, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), p. 108.
- 60.** A. Ha-Am, “The Law of the Heart”, in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 251-255.
- 61.** H. N. Bialik, “Bialik on the Hebrew University”, in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 281-288, at 282-283.

- 62.** D. Ben-Gurion, *Ba-Maarachah*, Volume 3, Tel-Aviv, (1948), pp. 200-211, English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 606-619, at 618.
- 63.** A. Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), p. 181.
- 64.** “Prof. Einstein Here, Explains Relativity”, *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), pp. 1, 13, at 1.
- 65.** A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *Israel chez les nations: Les Juifs et l’antisémitisme*, C. Lévy, Paris, (1893); English translation by F. Hellman, *Israel among the Nations: A Study of the Jews and Antisemitism*, G. P. Putnam’s Sons, New York, W. Heinemann, London, (1895), pp. 60-61.
- 66.** P. Findley, *They Dare to Speak Out: People and Institutions Confront Israel’s Lobby*, Lawrence Hill, Westport, Connecticut, (1985); **and** *Deliberate Deceptions: Facing the Facts about the U.S.-Israeli Relationship*, Lawrence Hill Books, Chicago, (1993); **and** *Silent No More: Confronting America’s False Images of Islam*, D : Amana Publications, Beltsville, Maryland, (2001). **See also:** R. I. Friedman, “Selling Israel in America: The Hasbara Project Targets the U.S. Media”, *Mother Jones*, (February/March, 1987), pp. 1-9; reprinted “Selling Israel to America”, *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 16, Number 4, (Summer, 1987) , pp. 169-179.
- 67.** P. Michelmore, *Einstein: Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, New York, (1962), p. 3.
- 68.** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Zürcher of 15 April 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 23, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 19.
- 69.** P. Frank, *Einstein: His Life and Times*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1967), p. 145.
- 70.** A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *Israel chez les nations: Les Juifs et l’antisémitisme*, C. Lévy, Paris, (1893); English translation by F. Hellman, *Israel among the Nations: A Study of the Jews and Antisemitism*, G. P. Putnam’s Sons, New York, W. Heinemann, London, (1895), pp. 246-247.
- 71.** On the myth among Einstein supporters, *see:* D. E. Rowe, “‘Jewish Mathematics’ at Göttingen in the Era of Felix Klein”, *Isis*, Volume 77, Number 3, (September, 1986), pp. 422-449; **and** “Science in Germany: The Intersection of Institutional and Intellectual Issues”, *Osiris*, Series 2, Volume 5, (1989), pp. 186-213. *See also:* A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein: A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), p. 203. On the myth among Einstein’s adversaries, *see:* K. Hentschel, *Physics and National Socialism: An Anthology of Primary Sources*, Basel, Boston, Birkhäuser, (1996). On Einstein’s anti-intuition / anti-induction stance, *see:* A. Moszkowski, *Einstein: The Searcher*, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1921), pp. 179-182. *See also:* A. Einstein, “Antrittsreden des Hrn. Einstein”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1914), pp. 739-742; English translation by A. Engel, “Inaugural Lecture of Mr. Einstein”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 3, Princeton University Press, (1997), pp. 16-18; **and** “Motive des Forschers”, *Zu Max Plancks sechzigstem Geburtstag. Ansprachen, gehalten am 26. April 1918 in der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft von E. Warburg, M. v. Laue, A. Sommerfeld und A. Einstein*, C. F. Müllersche Hofbuchhandlung, (1918), pp. 29-32; English translation by A. Engel, “Motives for Research”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 41-45; **and** “Time, Space, and Gravitation / Theories of Principle”, *London Times*, (28 November 1919), p. 13-14, English translation corrected: “Einstein on His Theory”, *London Times*, (2 December 1919), p. 17; **and** “Induktion und Deduktion in der Physik”, *Berliner Tageblatt*, Morning Edition, 4. Beiblatt, (25 December 1919), p. 1; English translation by A. Engel, “Induction and Deduction”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 28, (2002),

pp. 108-109; "Physics and Reality", *The Journal of the Franklin Institute*, Volume 221, Number 3, (March, 1936), reprinted: A. Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown Publishers, Inc., New York, (1954), pp. 290-323, *see especially*: Section 4, "The Theory of Relativity", p. 307. Maurice Solovine quotes Einstein as supporting intuition, "Physics," he said, 'is essentially an intuitive and concrete science. Mathematics is only a means for expressing the laws that govern phenomena.'" Quoted in, *Einstein: A Centenary Volume*, International Commission on Physics Education, U. S. A., (1979), p. 9. *The New York Times* reported on 3 April 1921 on the front page, "One of his traveling companions described him as an 'intuitive physicist' whose speculative imagination is so vast that it senses great natural laws long before the reasoning faculty grasps and defines them."

72. *La Vieille* (Paris), Number 272, (20 April 1922), p. 15.

73. "Prof. Einstein Here, Explains Relativity", *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), pp. 1, 13, at 1.

74. "Prof. Einstein Here, Explains Relativity", *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), pp. 1, 13, at 1.

75. "Prof. Einstein Here, Explains Relativity", *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), pp. 1, 13.

76. Letter from A. Einstein to P. Nathan of 3 April 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 366, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 492. Also: *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987), p. lx, note 44. J. Stachel, "Einstein's Jewish Identity", *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (2002), pp. 57-83, at 69. **See also**: P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), pp. 83, 86.

77. H. Goenner, "The Reaction to Relativity Theory. I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920", *Science in Context*, Volume 6, Number 1, (1993), pp. 107-133, at 112. "Kleinert (1979, 501-6) and Elton (1986, 95)" refers to: A. Kleinert, in H. Nelkowski, et. al. Editors, *Einstein Symposium Berlin 1979*, pp. 501-506; **and** L. Elton, "Einstein, General Relativity and the German Press", *Isis*, Volume 79, (1986), p. 95.

78. P. Micheltore, *Einstein: Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, (1962), p. 87.

79. H. Dukas and B. Hoffmann, *Albert Einstein: The Human Side*, Princeton University Press, (1979), pp. 55-56.

80. A. Einstein quoted in A. Fölsing, English translation by E. Osers, *Albert Einstein, a Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), p. 494; which cites speech to the *Central-Verein Deutscher Staatsbürger Jüdischen Glaubens*, in Berlin on 5 April 1920, in D. Reichenstein, *Albert Einstein. Sein Lebensbild und seine Weltanschauung*, Berlin, (1932). This letter from Einstein to the Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith of 5 April 1920 is reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 368, Princeton University Press, (2004).

81. T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 196.

82. A. Einstein, "Our Debt to Zionism", *Out of My Later Years*, Carol Publishing Group, New York, (1995), pp. 262-264, at 262.

83. R. P. Boas, "The Problem of American Judaism", *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 119, Number 2, (February, 1917), pp. 145-152.

84. "The Modern Jews", *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 348.

85. B. J. Hendrick, "The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286, at 282.

- 86.** R. I. Friedman, *The False Prophet: Rabbi Meir Kahane: from FBI Informant to Knesset Member*, Lawrence Hill Books, Brooklyn, New York, (1990), p. 38.
- 87.** Cf. “Gentile”, *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York, (1903), pp. 615-626, at 618.
- 88.** H. Dukas and B. Hoffmann, *Albert Einstein: The Human Side*, Princeton University Press, (1979), p. 55.
- 89.** Letter from A. Einstein to “Berlin-Schöneberg Office of Taxation” of 10 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 306, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 256-257, at 257.
- 90.** D. Overbye, *Einstein in Love: A Scientific Romance*, Viking, New York, (2000), pp. 343, 404, note 22. See: A. Einstein to Ilse Einstein, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 536, Princeton University Press, (1998); and Ilse Einstein to Georg Nikolai, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 545, Princeton University Press, (1998).
- 91.** B. Thüring, “Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen”, *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, Volume 4, (1940), pp. 134-162, at 142. Republished as: *Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen*, Dr. Georg Lüttke Verlag, Berlin, (1941).
- 92.** H. Dukas and B. Hoffmann, *Albert Einstein: The Human Side*, Princeton University Press, (1979), p. 55.
- 93.** Quoted in B. Thüring, “Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen”, *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, Volume 4, (1940), pp. 134-162, at 156-157. Republished as: *Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen*, Dr. Georg Lüttke Verlag, Berlin, (1941).
- 94.** P. Frank, *Einstein, His Life and Times*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1947), pp. 182-183.
- 95.** C. Weizmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1949), p. 266.
- 96.** Compare, for example: Letter from A. Einstein to the League of German Scholars and Artists of 13 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 258, Princeton University Press, (2004); to: A. Einstein, *The World As I See It*, Citadel Press, New York, (1993), p. 89. See also: G. J. Whitrow, Editor, *Einstein: The Man and his Achievement*, Dover, New York, (1967), pp. 17-18. H. Dukas and B. Hoffmann, *Albert Einstein: The Human Side*, Princeton University Press, (1979), pp. 6-11. A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein: A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), pp. 30, 39-41, 52, 58, 80-82, 83, 273, 327, 334-335, 346, 394, 426, 502, 515, 539-541, 643, 661, 667, 687, 714. A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, (1982), p.504. R. Schulmann, et al., Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Note 3, Princeton University Press, (1998), pp. 166-167. Letter from A. Einstein to A. S. Eddington of 2 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 293, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 245. Letter from A. Einstein to “Berlin-Schöneberg Office of Taxation” of 10 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 306, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 256-257, at 256.
- 97.** J. Stachel, *Einstein from ‘B’ to ‘Z’*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), pp. 60-61.
- 98.** N. Syrkin, under the nom de plume “Ben Elieser”, *Die Judenfrage und der sozialistische Judenstaat*, Steiger, Bern, (1898); English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 333-350, at 347.
- 99.** “Dr. Nordau’s Review of the Zionist Movement”, *Supplement to the Jewish Chronicle*, (28 August 1903), pp. xi-xii, at xi.

100. “Text of Untermeyer’s Address”, *The New York Times*, (7 August 1933), p. 4. **See also:** “Untermeyer Back, Greeted in Harbor”, *The New York Times*, (7 August 1933), p. 4.

101. “Motion Pictures”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 12 MIN-O, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), cols. 446-476. **See also:** “Television and Radio”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 15 SM-UN, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), cols. 927-931. **See also:** N. Gabler, *An Empire of Their Own: How the Jews Invented Hollywood*, Crown Publishers, New York, (1988). **See also:** M. Medved, “Jews Run Hollywood, So What?”, *Moment*, (August, 1996). **See also:** *Hollywood: An Empire of Their Own*, Video Documentary by A&E, Directed by Simcha Jacobovici, Originally Aired as *Hollywoodism: Jews, Movies and the American Dream*, (1997).

102. J. J. Goldberg, *Jewish Power: Inside the American Jewish Establishment*, Addison-Wesley, New York, (1996), pp. 327-328.

103. P. S. Mowrer, “The Assimilation of Israel”, *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 128, Number 1, (July, 1921), pp. 101-110, at 106.

104. “Hylan Takes a Stand on National Issues”, *The New York Times*, (27 March 1922), p. 3.

105. R. P. Boas, “Jew-Baiting in America”, *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 127, Number 5, (May, 1921), pp. 658-665, at 662-664.

106. “The Jews and the Colleges”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 4, (August, 1922), pp. 351-352.

107. I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judean Publishing Company, New York, (1914), p. 7.

108. P. S. Mowrer, “The Assimilation of Israel”, *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 128, Number 1, (July, 1921), pp. 101-110, at 104.

109. B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: III The ‘Menace’ of the Polish Jew”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 4, (February, 1923), pp. 366-377, at 368.

110. B. J. Hendrick, “Radicalism among the Polish Jews”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 6, (April, 1923), pp. 591-601, at 593.

111. J. Drohojowski, *Brief Outline of the Jewish Problem in Poland*, Polish National Alliance of Brooklyn, U.S.A. (Zjednoczenie Polsko Narodowe), Brooklyn, New York, (1937), p. 22.

112. A. Eichmann, “Eichmann Tells His Own Damning Story”, *Life Magazine*, Volume 49, Number 22, (28 November 1960), pp. 19-25, 101-112; at 106; *see also:* “Eichmann’s Own Story: Part II”, *Life Magazine*, (5 December 1960), pp. 146-161.

113. P. S. Mowrer, “The Assimilation of Israel”, *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 128, Number 1, (July, 1921), pp. 101-110, at 103-105, 108-109.

114. T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 172.

115. “Mr. Wilson and Zionism”, *The London Times*, (7 September 1918), p. 5.

116. H. Morgenthau, “The Jews in Poland”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 43, Number 5, (April, 1922), pp. 617-630, at 618, 622, 626-627.

117. H. Morgenthau, “Zionism a Surrender, Not a Solution”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 42, Number 3, (July, 1921), pp. i-viii, at i-ii.

118. G. E. Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), p. 208.

119. “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 336, 350.

120. “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 351-353.

- 121.** H. N. Casson, “The Jew in America”, *Munsey’s Magazine*, Volume 34, Number 4, (January, 1906), pp. 381-395, at 386.
- 122.** “The Jews in the United States”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 11, Number 3, (January, 1906), pp. 7030-7031.
- 123.** H. N. Casson, “The Jew in America”, *Munsey’s Magazine*, Volume 34, Number 4, (January, 1906), pp. 381-395, at 386.
- 124.** “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 361-365.
- 125.** P. S. Mowrer, “The Assimilation of Israel”, *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 128, Number 1, (July, 1921), pp. 101-110, at 107.
- 126.** G. E. Griffin, “The Rothschild Formula”, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Chapter 11, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), pp. 217-234.
- 127.** “Salluste”, “Henri Heine et Karl Marx. Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme”, *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 11, (1 June 1928), pp. 567-589; **and** “Henri Heine et Karl Marx II. Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme”, *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 12, (15 June 1928), pp. 900-923; **and** “Henri Heine et Karl Marx III. Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme”, *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 13, (1 July 1928), pp. 153-175; **and** “Henri Heine et Karl Marx IV. Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme”, *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 14, (15 July 1928), pp. 426-445. **See also, Rabbi Liber’s Response:** “Judaïsm et Socialisme”, *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 15, (1 August 1928), pp. 607-628; **To which “Salluste” Replied:** “Autour d’une Polémique: Marxism et Judaïsm”, *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 16, (15 August 1928), pp. 795-834. **See also:** “Salluste”, *Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme: Henri Heine et Karl Marx*, Jules Tallandier, Paris, (1930). **See also:** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935). **See also:** R. H. Williams, *The Ultimate World Order—As Pictured in “The Jewish Utopia”*, CPA Book Publisher, Boring, Oregon, (1957?).
- 128.** M. Higger, *The Jewish Utopia*, Lord Baltimore Press, Baltimore, (1932), pp. 12-13, 57.
- 129.** “Gentile”, *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York, (1903), pp. 615-626, at 619-620.
- 130.** Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein, Editor, *The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Nezikin: Baba Kamma*, Volume 23, The Soncino Press, London, (1935), pp. 213-216, at 213-214.
- 131.** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 74-77, 82, 84, 86-87, 92-93, 98-102.
- 132.** The article cites: “*Lecture on the Restoration of the Jews*. By M. M. NOAH. Delivered October 28th, 1844, in the Tabernacle, New York City.”
- 133.** I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), pp. 9, 11. J. Prinz, *The Secret Jews*, Random House, New York, (1973), pp. 111-112.
- 134.** I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), pp. 9, 11. J. Prinz, *The Secret Jews*, Random House, New York, (1973), pp. 111-112.
- 135.** “Mr. Zangwill on Zionism”, *The London Times*, (16 October 1923), p. 11. I. Zangwill, “Is Political Zionism Dead? Yes”, *The Nation*, Volume 118, Number 3062, (12 March 1924), pp. 276-278.
- 136.** “Peace, War—and Bolshevism”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (4 April 1919), p. 7. “1918 Peace Views of Lloyd George”, *The New York Times*, (26 March 1922), Editorial Section, p. 33.
- 137.** “The Turkish Situation by One Born in Turkey”, *The American Monthly Review of Reviews*, Volume 25, Number 2, (February, 1902), pp. 182-191, at 186-188. “Zionism”,

Encyclopædia Britannica, Eleventh Edition, (1911).

138. “How Zangwill Fought His Way”, *Current Literature*, Volume 27, Number 2, (February, 1900), p. 107.

139. See also: “World Mischief”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (21 June 1920), p. 8.

140. B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: I How They Came to This Country”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 2, (December, 1922), pp. 144-161.

141. J. Neusner and R. S. Sarason, Editors, “Berakhot 6:18”, *The Tosefta: Translated from the Hebrew*, Volume 1, Ktav Publishing House Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey, (1986), pp. 40-41, at 40.

142. Rabbi E. Herzka and Rabbi M. Weiner, Elucidators, “Tractate Menachos 43b”, *Talmud Bavli: The Schottenstein Edition*, Volume 59, Mesorah Publications, Ltd., Brooklyn, New York, (2002), 43b⁵.

143. E. Kaye, *The Hole in the Sheet: A Modern Woman Looks at Orthodox and Hasidic Judaism*, L. Stuart Inc., Secaucus, New Jersey, (1987), p. 89.

144. B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: III The ‘Menace’ of the Polish Jew”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 4, (February, 1923), pp. 366-377, at 366-368, 377.

145. “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 346.

146. A. Einstein, “Jewish Nationalism and Anti-Semitism”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (17 June 1921), p. 16.

147. A. Einstein, A. Engel translator, “How I became a Zionist”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 57, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 234-235, at 235.

148. M. Samuel, “Diaries of Theodor Herzl”, in: M. W. Weisgal, *Theodor Herzl: A Memorial*, The New Palestine, New York, (1929), pp. 125-180, at 129. T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), pp. 4, 111.

149. P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), pp. 311-312.

150. R. H. Fife, Jr., *The German Empire Between Two Wars: A Study of the Political and Social Development of the Nation Between 1871 and 1914*, Macmillan, New York, (1916), pp. 177-199 and 359-388:

“CHAPTER IX

THE PROLETARIAN IN POLITICS

If we were obliged to cover with one word the development of Germany in the four decades between the two great wars, that word would certainly be “socialism.” It is not merely that in philosophy, literature and art the welfare of the masses is the leading motif running through the eighties and nineties until it became lost after 1900 in the swelling music of national ambition. In the field of political economy also socialistic ideas marked the age. They began by conquering the professorial chairs in the universities in the seventies, where such “socialists of the chair” as Adolf Wagner of the university of Berlin set their stamp on the generation of political economists which followed the war with France, and they found expression in the compulsory insurance measures and similar legislation of the following decade. Such ideas were indeed nothing new in Germany since the sixteenth century, when cities such as Augsburg and Strasburg were models of a hard and fast organization, in which capital played a small part and the workers formed the commonwealth on the principle of a closed shop, where communal undertakings largely supplanted private enterprise and every detail of life, including the details of food and dress, was fixed by law. The paternalism of the petty despotisms which preceded German unity had disciplined the Germans to live

under efficient supervision, and the ideals of the Manchester school of British economists did not take lasting hold on German economic life.

Socialism then grew in Germany on well-prepared soil. State ownership of railroad and telegraph had come naturally soon after the coming of these utilities, and municipal control of many forms of enterprise descended as a tradition from the later middle ages. That the individual should look to the government to provide for his welfare and that state and communal funds should supplant private capital in many undertakings had long been the case when Bismarck undertook his compulsory insurance policy in the eighties. This program was, as we have seen, an effort to strike the ground from beneath the Social Democrats by removing some of the causes of proletarian dissatisfaction. Here and there Bismarck's successors went further on the road, with such measures as the purchase of the *Hercynia* potash mine (cf. page 166). That they did not go still further in this and other fields of state socialism was due in large measure to the existence of the Social Democratic party. This Ishmael in Germany's political life by its very advocacy of measures made them impossible for the government.

What is it that has made the Socialist unfitted to be an ally and unwelcome as a coworker with nearly all other parties? What is there in the advocacy by the Social Democrats of any reform that has caused not only the East Elbian *Junker* and the Westphalian manufacturer, but even the National Liberal physician and shopkeeper to look askance at it? The answer is to be found both in the doctrinaire character of the party and in the violence of Socialist editors and orators. Karl Lamprecht has shown that all German political parties are antiquated in that all cling to formulas and doctrines that have outlived their applicability to present-day affairs. In this sense the Social Democratic party is the most antiquated and the least opportunist. In this has lain its strength as a class party and its weakness in electoral and parliamentary strategy. Beginning with the removal of the coercive laws in 1890, it cast at all national elections the largest vote of any party, and after 1903 held under its discipline nearly one-third of all the electors to the national parliament, more than all the other Liberal fractions combined. Nevertheless it exercised less influence on legislation than any other of the major groups in the empire. To understand the reason for this one must glance at the development of socialism as a political force.

When in 1867 Friedrich Liebknecht and August Bebel were elected to the first *Reichstag* of the new-born North German Confederation, they found ready at hand both the gospel of socialism in the works of Karl Marx and the needed fighting force in the German Workingmen's Party (*Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiter-Verein*), which had been founded four years earlier by Ferdinand Lassalle. Two years later at the famous Eisenach Convention Liebknecht and Bebel called the Social Democratic Workingmen's Party into existence, on a platform built of Marx' theory of the destructive rule of capital and his call to the workingmen of all lands to unite, and finally in 1875 the followers of Lassalle forsook their nationalistic ideals and were won over to the internationalism of the Marxists. Immediately the triumphal march of the Social Democrats began, a march which has continued with few halts since. Aided by the hardships brought on by the financial crises of the seventies, the Marxian theories of the misery caused by the capitalistic state and the exploitation of the working class through the capitalistic organization of society found eager acceptance in all quarters of industrial Germany. Already in 1876 there were twenty-four papers and journals published in the interest of the party with nearly one hundred thousand subscribers: by the next year the number of party periodicals had increased to forty-one, and that year the party cast nearly half a million votes and elected twelve members to the national legislature. From that time the Social Democracy kept pace closely with the forward movement of industrial Germany. Wherever factories sprang up and workmen came to live together, the theories of

Marx took root. The workingmen were organized into Socialist unions, which became at once fighting units in the industries and the elections; with the capacity for organization so characteristic of an industrial age and of German society in particular, the Social Democracy was solidified by the establishment of central bureaus under the control of secretaries. These latter quickly developed into a class of experienced leaders, at once clever agitators in the industries and skillful strategists in political campaigns.

Bismarck watched the rise of the party and its often unscrupulous means of agitation with growing distrust. He put no confidence in the alleged peaceful program of socialism: for him the party bore nothing but red revolution on its banners. In 1878 two attempts were made on the life of Emperor William which were unjustly ascribed to the effect of socialist agitation; and the Chancellor took advantage of the popular outcry to dissolve the Liberal *Reichstag* and appeal to the electors on an anti-socialist program. The result was the enactment of rigid laws forbidding Socialist propaganda. The following ten years, 1880 to 1890, were for the party a period of almost subterranean existence. Clubs were suppressed, newspapers and journals confiscated, many of the leaders, Liebknecht and Bebel among them, went to prison. In spite of prosecution and imprisonment, however, the propaganda went straight ahead. Political clubs were reorganized as singing societies and bowling clubs and the party organization was perpetuated by these and by the trade unions, which continued to spread like a vast network throughout industrial Germany. During the ten years of the anti-socialist laws the total vote of the party increased, a larger number of deputies was chosen to the *Reichstag*, and more important still, the inner organization and solidity of the party gained tremendously under persecution. This was shown immediately on the expiration of the anti-socialist laws in 1890. In that year the party cast nearly one and one-half million votes in the national elections, and became thereby the strongest party in the empire. In 1898 the Social Democratic vote had risen to two millions, in 1907 to three and one quarter millions, in 1912 to more than four and one-quarter millions, more than one-third of all votes cast in the imperial elections of that year.

The great Chancellor was, however, too far-seeing a statesman to think that the mere forbidding of socialist propaganda would stop the growth of socialism, which to his mind was only revolution in disguise. He set out, as we have seen, to cut the ground from beneath the feet of the proletarian agitators by a system of legislation which should ban from the empire the direst poverty by insuring to the working class compensation in case of injury and care in sickness and old age. These needs, which were outlined in an imperial message of 1881, formed the basis of debate and experiment through the following eight years and were finally met in the various compulsory insurance measures which, so to speak, set their stamp upon Germany's internal politics in the eighties. In the Workingmen's Compensation or Accident Insurance Act of 1884, the burden of insurance was laid entirely upon the employer; the cost of the Sick Insurance Act of 1883 fell upon both employer and employee; for carrying out the provisions of the Old Age Pension Act of 1889, the empire joined with both capital and labor in providing for the veterans of labor. By this legislation, which though several times amended in minor parts, has remained essentially the same, Germany took a long step in the direction of state socialism and assumed the first place among nations in the protection of its army of labor. Both Radical and Socialist have found much to criticize in the laws, and the amendments which reformers suggested should long ago have received attention at the hands of the government; nevertheless, with all of their imperfections, the compulsory insurance acts have been a guiding star for the social legislation of other lands and one of the brightest decorations on the bosom of modern Germania. They are no less a superb monument to the liberal view and modern spirit of Bismarck in social legislation.

But they did not win over the Socialists. The representatives of the fourth estate

accepted the socialistic laws of the eighties not as a gift from the hands of benevolent capital, but as a right conceded through the fear of the rising strength of the proletariat. There is evidence that the old Chancellor had wearied of the struggle to win the working classes to a national and patriotic spirit and that at the expiration of the anti-socialist laws in 1890 he was preparing a stroke against the constitution, which by the abolition of manhood suffrage should undo the work of 1866 and exclude the non-propertied classes from a share in government (cf. page 127). However, young Emperor William thought otherwise, and with the fall of Bismarck, legislation against the Social Democracy was dropped and the Emperor sought to accomplish by conciliation what suppressive laws had failed to do. He summoned an international congress in Berlin to consider measures for the further welfare of the working classes, and outlined for adoption various propositions, such as a complete Sunday holiday, which had been advocated in the Socialist platform. But the effort to win the workingmen to fealty to monarch and Fatherland by kindness broke against the hard class consciousness of the fourth estate. No royal enticements could prevail against the teachings of Marx, ably and speciously interpreted by Socialist speakers, no words of the sovereign could make progress against the class feeling which had been bred in the industrial proletariat for two decades in trade union, tavern debating club and Socialist journal. From that day on the crown and indeed all of the upper classes and a large part of the middle classes in Germany parted company with the proletariat. Henceforth every representative of the existing organization of society from the sovereign to the Rhenish crockery dealer denounced the Social Democrats as enemies of the Fatherland. But whether ridiculed as a "transitory phase" or threatened with a holy war of extermination by "all lovers of God and Fatherland," the Socialist forces marched on in ever increasing numbers, a solid phalanx of industrial workers, soaked with the doctrines of Marx and Engel and ably led by labor secretary and editor.

In his opposition to the monarchy and the entire capitalistic state, the Social Democrat included of course the army, under feudal and capitalistic leadership. Nowhere, however, has the German military spirit found better expression than in the organization and discipline of the Social Democratic party. Who could watch the orderly, shoulder to shoulder march of tens of thousands of workingmen through the streets of Berlin on the occasion of the burial of a leader or on the anniversary of the "victims of March," the revolutionists who fell in the street fighting of March 1848, without seeing in imagination these same men clad in the blue and red or khaki of active soldiers? And who could see the eyes-to-the-front, fingers-on-the-trouser-seam carriage with which the individual workman follows his leader in strike or electoral campaign without recalling the Prussian military discipline? In August 1911 at Treptow, a suburb of Berlin, a mighty Socialist demonstration was made against the threatened war with France and England over the Morocco affair. A vast crowd of men and women, estimated at eighty thousand, gathered on a Sunday afternoon about a tribune to hear their leaders denounce war as a diabolical game at which the capitalist must win and the proletarian lose. Only a few of the mighty audience could hear a word of the orators, but all stood at respectful attention in the intense heat until the speeches were over and then at a given signal waved their arms in a mighty storm wave, voting affirmatively on a resolution which protested in the name of labor against the threatened war. And throughout the day not one case of disorder, scarcely even a chance hard word at an over-officious policeman, among the tens of thousands of workingmen and working women who spent the hot Sunday journeying back and forth from their homes in almost all parts of Greater Berlin!

The same iron discipline that has taught moulder and stoker and street paver that he owes it to his class to suppress even a natural outburst of resentment, because it may give the representatives of feudalism and capitalism an advantage, holds sway over leader and editor.

The annual party convention, the *Parteitag*, is the court of last resort, before which even those highest in the councils of the party must appear and justify their actions. Prominent Socialists, including some of the leading parliamentarians of the party and the editors of such journals as *Vorwärts* and the *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, have been called upon to defend the orthodoxy of their faith, and prominent leaders have been unceremoniously thrust out of the party. It became an accepted canon that when a man found that his position, reached after scientific inquiry, was no longer that of the party, and when he could not persuade the party to accept his position, he was by that very fact no longer a Social Democrat. This tyranny of the majority was due not merely to a democratic intolerance of strong individualities, it proceeded also from the extreme doctrinarianism of the party.

This doctrinarianism is the very bone of the Social Democracy. No orthodox theologian of years ago ever clung to the verbal inspiration of Holy Writ with greater zeal than Socialist orator and editor and private soldier have held to every jot and tittle of the Erfurt Platform. This declaration of faith was adopted in 1891, soon after the expiration of the anti-socialist laws, and has had no official revision since. It could not be expected, however, that the Marxian theories, as enunciated in that instrument, would stand unimpaired by the experience of the passing years, and even the most devout Socialist must acknowledge that some planks in the Erfurt Platform have been shown to be fallacies by the industrial history of the past few decades in Germany. Of none is this more strikingly true than of the so-called "iron law of wages," according to which the condition of the workingman under the capitalistic system must constantly grow worse. This dogma has been absolutely contradicted by the facts. The general condition of industrial labor in Germany has constantly grown better, and as the years have passed not a few of the proletariat have become themselves members of the capitalistic class.

These conditions were recognized quite early by Social Democrats of more liberal training. The first bold reformer to attempt to bring socialism down from the domain of dreams to economic reality was Edward Bernstein in a memorable brochure published in 1899 (*Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie*). [Footnote: *The Basis of Socialism and the Task of the Social Democracy*.] The author, who had suffered in his own person for his adherence to the Marxian faith in the days of the anti-Socialist laws, proposed a revision of the old Marxian theories in the light of present day economic and social life, "the development of the theory and practice of the Social Democracy in an evolutionistic sense." The first point of his attack was the time-honored premise of the "iron law of wages." The condition of the working classes, he contended, is not growing worse but better. Furthermore, not all means of production are to be socialized, as is demanded in the Erfurt Platform, but only land and the larger means of production, and as a very important reservation, one must avoid anything which would injure the nation in its competition for trade with foreign countries. This attack on the major premise of the Erfurt Platform and this modification of its first article instantly called into the ring a host of defenders of socialistic orthodoxy. August Bebel, the parliamentary generalissimo, Karl Kautsky, the learned dogmatist, and others rushed to arms in defense of the Marxian theories and the battle was on between "Radicals" and "Revisionists," the former ably led by Kautsky in the *Neue Zeit*, the latter by Bernstein in the *Sozialistische Monatshefte*. The struggle reached its culmination in the Dresden convention of 1903, a convention which will long be remembered in German political annals as the highwater mark of violence and "rough-house" tactics. The result was a defeat for the "Revisionists," less on scientific than on tactical grounds, the "Radicals" claiming that any concession to the "middle-class parties," whether in theory or practice, would result in weakening the feeling of class consciousness upon which the Social Democracy is built.

In the meantime, however, practice ran away with theory. The exigencies of electoral and parliamentary struggles drew the party more and more into coöperation with the Liberal Left, and tended more and more to transform the revolutionary Socialists, despite themselves, into political democrats. Liebknecht, the founder, with truly doctrinaire consistency, had held that the party existed as a protest against the capitalistic organization of society and should therefore take no part in parliamentary affairs, except in protest. In the days of the anti-socialist laws, the Social Democratic members of the *Reichstag* refused to accept membership on committees. The first break in this policy of simple negation came from South Germany, where as a result of more democratic constitutions, the working classes had been accustomed to a share in governmental responsibilities. A Bavarian deputy, Vollmar, as early as 1891, came out strongly against the attitude of sulking, and demanded that the party, deferring its ultimate aim, the socialization of industry, should coöperate with the middle-class parties in winning immediate advantages for the working class. In spite of the bitter opposition of the Prussian irreconcilables, a revision of the party's program in this respect actually took place. With the growth of Socialist representation in the *Reichstag*, their work on the committees became more and more important, and at the beginning of the session of 1912 a Socialist presided for a time over the national parliament. While the fraction continued to vote steadily against all military and naval supplies and against the prosecution of colonial development, signs multiplied that the opposition to these national undertakings had lost its ferocity, and Socialist votes in committee repeatedly brought about modifications in military and naval bills.

When finally under the shadow of a great national danger in May 1913 the Social Democrats accepted the national Defense Bill, which in its system of direct property taxation coincided with their theories, it was plain that a considerable breach had at last been made in the doctrinarian internationalism of the party and that it had at last begun to catch the national spirit. That this was true found complete confirmation at the outbreak of the war, when disappointment came to those who had counted upon socialism as a weakness in Germany's hour of trial. The Social Democratic workman threw down his tools and rushed to obey the order of mobilization with the same patriotic enthusiasm as inspired shopkeeper and reserve officer. The party leaders, speaking through their papers, reaffirmed the faith of the Socialists in the ideals of peace and international brotherhood among workers, but put the defense of German culture from Russian barbarism as a first life-consideration; and the Socialist members of the *Reichstag* followed the direction of the party councils in voting with practical unanimity for the government war measures. The same hail which had resounded so often with attacks on the spirit of militarism, and Prussian militarism in particular, now heard from the Social Democratic leaders words of patriotic devotion scarcely less ardent than those which came from Conservative and Liberal benches. That there were still elements of dissent and that the hatred of feudalism and capitalism still burned brightly could not be doubted, but for the present these were lost to view in the national enthusiasm which made many Socialist leaders answer the first call for volunteers.

In South Germany, indeed, even before the "revision" crusade the Socialists had become to all intents and purposes a national party. In Würtemberg, Baden and Bavaria they repeatedly voted for the budget, including the supplies for the royal family, a proceeding which stirred the radical Socialists to the bitterest attacks. In Baden in 1906 the leader of the party in the Chamber paid a visit of respect to the Grand Duke on the birth of a prince; in the Grand Duchy of Hesse in 1907 the fraction voted an address to the sovereign. In the diminutive principality of Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt the Socialists had in 1912 a majority of the Chamber and elected one of their number president. In the same year in nineteen states of the empire one hundred and eighty-eight Socialist deputies sat in the legislative chambers.

The increasing participation in government which such a large number of representatives must bring with it on more than one occasion excited the Prussian radicals to the boiling point and more than one national party convention resounded with wild scenes of disorder over the struggle as to how far a Social Democrat might participate in government. Under the sting of the radical lash the South German delegates revolted at the Nuremberg Convention of 1908 and announced their intention of proceeding independently of the party in state affairs, submitting themselves to the national convention only in matters of national issue.

That the process of *Mauserung* of the Social Democrats, that is, a gradual conversion to the practical cowering with other liberal groups, did not go further and faster was chiefly due to conditions in Prussia. It is not an accident that most of the radicals among the Social Democratic leaders have been Prussians and that the worship of an idea among the serried thousands of followers has gone further and the collisions between the proletarian and propertied classes have been more numerous in Prussia than elsewhere in the empire. It is true that the Prussian, whether capitalist or proletarian, has a real gift for discipline, whether it be the discipline of the drill sergeant, of the manufacturers' association, or the Social Democratic party leader. But the existence of a sharp and obdurate class feeling in Prussia is to be explained most of all by the constitution of the kingdom. Under the provisions of this constitution, as we have seen, a property qualification for the vote exists, and the working classes are almost entirely excluded from participation in government, whether it be the government of parish, province or kingdom. Of the three classes (cf. page 143) which by indirect means choose the representatives in local and municipal council, in provincial assembly and national *Landtag*, the first class has included in the elections since 1903 from three to five per cent of the total vote, the second class from ten to fourteen per cent, the third class from eightyone to eighty-seven per cent. Since the Socialists from the nature of things fall almost entirely in the third class, it will be seen what a small chance they have of securing adequate representation in any elective body. The industrial workers are placed at a further disadvantage in elections to the *Landtag* by a system of electoral districts which has remained, with minor alterations, that of sixty years ago. Thus while in the agrarian districts of East Prussia in 1908, 63,000 persons elected a deputy, in Berlin the average was one deputy to 170,000. It is not surprising that the Conservative agrarians, who are most bitterly opposed to the interests of the industrial workers, have a far greater number of seats than their vote entitles them to. In 1903 the Conservatives, polling 19.4 per cent of the vote, elected 33 per cent of the deputies in the *Landtag*.

It is not to be wondered at that when in 1908 for the first time Social Democrats, seven in number, found their way into the lower house of the Prussian parliament, they were received with scant courtesy. The Conservative *Kreuzzeitung* protested against their being assigned to any committees, and in fact something very like a boycott was exercised against them. The election of 1913 brought only a slight increase in numbers; but the Socialist deputies made up in noise what they lacked in voting strength, and in spite of the iron rod of Conservative presiding officers, they made themselves as obnoxious as ever did the Irish Nationalists at Westminster in the palmy days of Parnell and Healy. Thus in the spring of 1912 a scandalous scene was precipitated on the floor of the *Landtag*, during which the presiding officer was obliged to send for the police. The minions of the law forcibly removed a refractory Herr Borchardt and played hide-and-seek a while with him in the corridors, a comical scene which found its epilogue in the law courts, where the liberties of the house were finally vindicated by Herr Borchardt paying a small fine. During the same session a Socialist was called to order for saying that "war is a mockery against God" on the ground that this was "an insult to the memory of Emperor William the Great, who waged three

wars, and to the chivalrous and patriotic spirit of the German people.” The Socialist members are obliged to hear from the ministerial benches that the government regards all Socialists as enemies of God and Fatherland, and that any official, civil or military, breaks his oath to the sovereign when he affiliates himself in any way with the anti-monarchical party.

It was the same bitter impatience against the Prussian constitution that accounted for many of the violent outbreaks of representatives of the fourth estate in the *Reichstag*. Here, backed by crowded benches of applauding colleagues, the fiery champions of the proletariat have reaped a harvest of calls to order in every session for their attacks on the sovereign, the ministry, the army, the Prussian constitution and the entire Prussian system. Some of the party manifestations have been even less excusable, and their childishness can only be explained by political immaturity or demagogery run mad, as the habit which the Socialist members have had of leaving the hall of parliament when the obligato *Hoch!* is given in honor of the Kaiser at the close of the session. When with the Liberal-Radical-Socialist victory of 1912 the Clerical party was obliged to resign to Radical hands the presidency of the *Reichstag*, attacks on the Emperor himself became less restrained than ever. Each public speech of the monarch found its echo in some choice epigram from the Socialist benches. Thus in the debate on the Kaiser’s threat against the constitution of Alsace-Lorraine the printer Scheidemann, erstwhile president of the assembly, aroused an uproar by characterizing the Emperor as a “crowned dilettante,” and the intellectual free lance Ledebour earned a call to order by declaring that if the king of England had spoken as Kaiser Wilhelm did, he would be straightway shut up in Balmoral, like the crazy king of Bavaria or Abdul Hamid of Turkey. It was not merely by their attacks on the monarch and by their unceasing diatribes against army and bureaucracy that Social Democratic editors and orators won applause in tavern and workshop or wherever their eager constituents gathered to read the party press. Were a stupid recruit in Jüterbog or Gumbinnen overdrilled by a zealous sergeant until he fell from exhaustion, then one might be certain that the case would be illuminated down to its furthest cranny in the next issue of *Vorwärts* or by a vitriol-tongued Liebknecht or Ledebour in the *Reichstag*. Did a Conservative government official in some remote Silesian district snort at Social Democratic voters at a bye-election, the party press and the *Reichstag* hall would ring with denunciation. Every case of judicial error had a merciless searchlight turned upon it, every instance of official discrimination against those suspected of being Socialists became the theme for attacks in which coarseness and brutality of language often crossed the limits prescribed by the German libel law. Whatever political errors may be charged to the Socialists, the weakness of turning the other cheek to the smiter is something of which the party’s representatives cannot be accused. While one must credit Social Democratic representatives in press and parliament with sincerity of motive in the defense of the politically and socially weak and defenseless, it cannot be overlooked that it is mainly due to them that a spirit of undisciplined coarseness and vituperation has found its way into German public life.

There is no denying that they have had bad provocation enough. The government from the sovereign down has always made no secret of its determination to fight the Socialists as a foreign enemy in the Fatherland. As believers in “internationalism” and enemies of the existing state, they have been as a matter of course ineligible to any office in the government, whether in the army, navy or in the civil service, although they represent more than one-third of the voting strength of the nation. At the elections all government officials have been expected to exert every legitimate influence against the Social Democratic candidate. Recruits who attended Socialist gatherings or frequented taverns known to be Socialist rendezvous were liable to severe punishment. Especially in Prussia, although the basic ideas of socialism had for years been freely taught in the universities, any teacher in an elementary

school who was suspected of Socialist sympathies exposed himself to loss of promotion or might even be removed from the service. The same fate awaited any postal or customs employee who identified himself in any way with the Socialist cause; and it has often been charged by the Socialists and never disproved that the workmen on public works have been practically forced to enroll their children in clubs where a sort of "hurra-patriotism" was taught and where the youngsters were trained to regard the Social Democrats as the most dangerous enemies of God and native land. Naturally a state of affairs like this leads to deceit, to cringing, tale-bearing and denunciation. Unfortunately also, while the German courts are usually models of fairness and inaccessible to political, social or financial influences, the Social Democrat has not always had an impartial hearing. The Jena students demonstrated against the Socialist convention held in that little Athens on the Saale in 1911, and the Weimar *Volkszeitung* was fined for calling one of the student leaders a *Mistfink*, a somewhat intensified equivalent of "mucker." A laborer in the Kiel district in 1912 gave his daughter the euphonious name of Lassalline. When the registrar refused to record a name so full of danger to the Fatherland, the magistrate's court finally ordered him to do so, but attached to this confirmation of the parent's right to denominate his offspring a long oration against socialism.

The Socialist workman replied to this boycott by exercising in his way a terrorism which the government, aided by all the conservative forces in the state, has striven in vain to suppress. He has vented on the non-socialist worker his dissatisfaction with the government, and, as might be expected, often with brutality and violence. That during a political strike, such as the coal strike in the Ruhr district in 1912 (cf. page 167), the Catholic labor unions should suffer bloody attacks from the striking miners is not surprising: even the non-political Hirsch-Duncker unionists have more than one tale to tell of similar mistreatment during labor troubles. But it is not merely the strike breakers in strike times who have suffered. Every non-Socialist brick mason or carpenter must look for a continuous hazing. If he were so unfortunate as to be obliged to work with a Socialist unionist, he might consider himself lucky if he got off with the occasional loss of tools or dinner bucket or an accidental fall into a horse-pond and did not have his hand permanently maimed by the slip of a chisel or his head cracked by the premature topple of a hod of bricks. Against such petty cases of tyranny of course both government and employer have been helpless. In past years the government has eagerly sought from the *Reichstag* sharper weapons for the suppression of strike violence and the protection of strike breakers; but in spite of the personal influence of the Emperor in their favor, no one of these special measures for the protection of the workers has been able to find a majority in parliament. The fear that they might be used as a weapon for further strengthening the great industrialists has always frightened off enough Clericals to cause their defeat.

It must not be supposed that the feeling against the Socialists has been confined to feudal squires and factory owners. It pervades the entire middle class in Germany, for except the extreme Radicals, all Germans, whether they thrive by land, trade or manufacture, have been taught to regard the Social Democrat as an enemy of the Fatherland. The Rhenish shopkeeper, the Black Forest clockmaker, the Pomeranian peasant farmer, — all have shuddered alike at the growing power and influence of the Social Democracy and regarded almost any means as holy that would tend to defeat its ultimate success. It was only when the excessive demands of agrarian and clerical interests aroused the alarm of those who live by commerce and industry that these classes considered the possibility of a league, and the cowering of Radicals and Social Democrats at the polls in 1912 broke ground in that direction. The Socialist leaders, however, have been well aware that any modification of their extreme radical attitude toward the middle classes would not only endanger their hold

on the working class, with its sharp class feeling, but that a large number of the discontented from all classes would fall away from them. For the growth of socialism's vote in Germany has been due by no means merely to the rising demands of the industrial workers. It has been distinctly the party of discontent and protest. Every discontented and disappointed man is liable at any time to express his dissatisfaction with society in general by voting the Social Democratic ticket. Has the young medical student failed of an appointment, has the citizen soldier been given a verbal castigation by the officer during his drill with the reserve, has a postal clerk been docked in his pay, has the grocer's wife had a snub from the factory owner's, — each sufferer can give vent to his private grievance against society by voting for the Social Democrat and thus making trouble for the powers that be. None of these persons has the slightest sympathy with the ultimate socialist program, and none of them would think of overthrowing the present state of society, except in a moment of ill humor. This habit of "voting to the Left" has attacked large classes of democratically inclined persons of the lower middle class following such a period of reaction as that which ended with the election of the *Reichstag* of 1912.

It is indeed unfortunate that this is so, and the lovers of Germany have often asked themselves what the end would be, if so strangely constituted a party continued to grow in voting strength. Largely through its own choice the Social Democracy, although representing one-third of the voters in the empire, has been deprived of any considerable share in government and remained in an attitude of sullen hostility to the state. So well have the class organizers of past decades done their work that they have developed among the industrial workers who make up the Social Democratic party a class feeling that is nothing more nor less than an independent class culture. It is not merely a political gulf which the Socialist leaders have fixed between the workman and every other class in Germany. Through constant teaching in young men's clubs, trade unions and political societies the industrial worker has become to a certain extent a different creature from his middle class neighbor, a member of a nation within the German nation. A striking characteristic of the German the world over is the love of Fatherland. The Socialist workman has claimed to be an international and to feel as one, and in program at least he has professed to be more strongly drawn to his fellow proletarian in France and England than to the shopkeepers and peasant proprietors of his native district. The North German is by tradition strongly monarchical; the Socialist frankly detests monarchy and monarch. While the German, north and south, may not approve of all the methods of the Evangelical and Roman Catholic churches, he is held by mighty roots to a deep religiosity; the Socialist claims to regard religion as a private matter, nevertheless he cannot forget that the church has been the handmaid of reaction and oppression, and the attitude of intellectual leader and proletarian follower is frankly and openly anti-religious. Many of the most brilliant Social Democratic leaders with tongue and pen are Jews, it need hardly be said, unorthodox Jews, who have cut loose entirely from the religion of Moses and the prophets. Anyone who is at all familiar with the anti-Semitic feeling among the upper and middle classes in Germany can understand how much the prejudice against the Socialists is deepened by this Jewish alliance. Furthermore, in spite of the casehardening of the modern struggle for existence, the average German has remained a romanticist, full of hero-worship and with a deep enthusiasm for the poetry of the nation's past; the Social Democrat has been taught to view the past under the hard light of Marx' theory as a battle-ground of economic forces, where without mercy the strong has preyed upon the weak.

When the war came the attitude of the Social Democracy toward it showed at once that much of the so-called "internationalism" of the German industrial worker is purely academic. All the doctrinarianism of the tavern benches and the nobler enthusiasm of such

demonstrations as that of Treptow could not affect the age-old roots which bind him to the Fatherland. It is improbable that the Socialists, were they to command a majority in Germany's parliament and so succeed in changing Germany's constitution as to have a free hand in legislation, would do anything to weaken the nation's defenses, either by a change in the military system or a destruction of protective duties. It seemed, indeed, as if even old-line leaders, like the late August Bebel, had caught something of the enthusiasm for Germany's world-empire. After the so-called "Hottentot election" of 1907, when Socialists and Clericals alike suffered severely at the hands of the voters for their opposition to colonial expansion, there began to show itself in the Social Democratic press a tendency toward increasing patriotic expression with regard to the national honor and defenses. Here again South Germany led the way, for here the "revisionists" were stronger. Among the first prominent men to fall in the invasion of France in August 1914 was Dr. Frank of Mannheim, a widely known Social Democratic leader; and indeed the blood of Socialist patriots has reddened every battlefield where German armies have fought. Under these the attitude of the party towards the nation's inner life cannot fail to undergo a change. In later years indeed the Social Democrats had already accomplished much that was positive. By their constant and searching criticisms they held a searchlight constantly fixed on the weak spots and the sore spots in the courts and the army. In the field of social legislation, such as the extension of compulsory insurance, the fixing of a shorter working day, and the protection of women and children in the industries, they kept high ideals before the country. In their work for universal peace, in their opposition to immoderate military expenditures and to duels and other manifestations of the feudal spirit in the army, they offered a valuable counterbalance to the militarism-run-mad spirit. In their pleas for a judiciary free from influence of every kind, schools free from religious bigotry, for a system of taxation which should fall directly upon the propertied classes, for a strong central control of great industries and for woman's suffrage, they accomplished much toward the inner upbuilding of the state. These affirmative policies have been pushed by a class of leaders who are very different from those who led the serried thousands of the fourth estate in the nineties or even at the beginning of the present century. The really advanced men in the Social Democratic party are no longer the narrow Marxian enthusiasts or class fanatics who grew up under the anti-socialist laws or when the party was still in the fledgling period of political strategy. They are often men of the highest university training, occasionally with inherited wealth and culture, who know the history of the party and are filled with the optimism of success. They have shown an increasing power to lead the party farther away from a sterile doctrinarianism toward a really practical democracy.

[***]

CHAPTER XVII

THE PRESS AND PUBLIC OPINION

SINCE the day when the bankrupt Mayence genius invented movable types, Germany has with few interruptions held the first place among printing and publishing nations. Her annual output in books surpasses the combined production of France, England and the United States; and even if we subtract pamphlets, which in German statistics are rated as books, and which bring into the world many things that appear in other countries in magazines, the Fatherland exceeds in its contribution to this "paper age" any two other nations. The explanation is to be found not merely in the high culture of the nation, but also in the methodical spirit, which drives the German to analyze, correlate and formulate, seeking not merely apostles for his patiently won ideas but often clearness for the writer through the very formulation of his ideas. In no land is access to the press so cheap and easy, in no land are the rewards for the author proportionately so large. Unfortunately also in no

land are there so many worthless books brought into the world, from the machine-made doctor dissertation with its pathetic testimony to years of youthful vigor wasted in counting the hairs in Homer's beard down to the penny manuals on "How to learn French in Three Weeks." The Germans pay the penalty of a nation which produces each year a mass of creative scholarly research with the by-products of boneless pedantry and speculative dilettanteism.

Besides the book press, the periodical press rolls up each month and each day its vast flood. Every science, art and industry, every branch of commerce, every political faction has its press; every handicraft, yes, almost every forceful personality in the country has its periodical exponent. The press directory of 1913 mentions 11 periodicals devoted to the continuation school system alone. The *Schornsteinfeger*, published monthly in Berlin, ministers to the literary needs of chimney sweeps; the *Allgemeine deutsche Käseblatt* to those of the cheese workers: a specialization in the printed representatives of Germany's multifarious industries confronts us as hairsplit and bewildering as in the industrial branches themselves. Only indeed in a land where the division of industry and the organization of commerce are carried as far as in Germany could this vast array of trade periodicals live and flourish.

On the other hand the number of popular periodicals dealing with history, political science and geography is small: the *Deutsche Rundschau*, founded by the late Julius Rodenberg, the *Süddeutsche Monatshefte* and the *Deutsche Revue* are the only ones which deserve to be put beside half a dozen or more great British reviews. In the field of artistic and literary criticism there is none which in the variety and brilliance of its contents appeals to so large a public as the *Revue des deux Mondes*. Nor do the more popular *Westermanns* or *Velhagen und Klasings Monatshefte*, *Nord und Süd* or the time-honored *Gartenlaube* attain to the vivid contemporary interest of a few of the best American illustrated magazines. The out-of-door element, so attractive a part of British and American magazines, has only recently made its appearance in German periodicals and is to be found mainly in publications devoted to Alpine, automobile and aviation clubs or other special sports. If, however, the German press has something less to offer to the leisure hours of the man of general culture than that of the western nations, to the specialist and scholar, whether he be a specialist in Sanscrit, stamp collecting or soap boiling, it brings each year a wealth of material which serves later on as a reservoir for the writers of other nations.

The spirit of the German press is then that of German scholarship. It shows the same enthusiasm for truth, the same conscientiousness in the search for it and the same honesty in proclaiming it as have set their stamp on German scholarship everywhere. The reverse of this in pedantry of manner and boring tediousness of portrayal is not lacking. The daily press, to which this chapter is chiefly devoted, shows these characteristics in an even greater degree. The most popular child of the printing press, the newspaper, had also its birth in Germany, and so far as numbers are concerned, Germany is still above all its home. Exact statistics are lacking, but in 1908 the number of daily papers was estimated by competent authorities at four thousand, of which Dr. Robert Brunhuber, [Footnote: *Das deutsche Zeitungswesen*.] an expert in this field, counts about four hundred organs of considerable importance. Of these perhaps 35 are papers of great influence of which over one-half appear in Berlin and less than half a dozen outside of Prussia. In the aggregate the German daily press rises then to tremendous figures. The post-office department acts as the agent of the press, receiving subscriptions at all offices and distributing the papers, and reckoning by post-office statistics, German observers set the distribution of papers in the year 1906 at between twelve and twenty million copies per day. This mighty flood, which pours itself daily over all parts of Germany, rippling to the most distant dune villages of the Baltic coast

and the eeriest nests of the Bavarian highlands, flows most densely in the Rhine valley. Here the Cologne, Düsseldorf and Dortmund papers find their way into every hamlet and in the industrial centres into every house. In the Rhine Palatinate the average is one daily newspaper to every fifteen thousand inhabitants in the entire district.

Through this great flood, from the Berlin and Frankfurt journals down to the provincial "*General Anzeiger*" ("Official Gazette") is a long journey past all sorts of newspaper undertakings. Most of the larger papers maintain correspondence bureaus in the greater German cities, and the largest also in foreign capitals, but as in the case of other lands, by far the greater part of the news comes to them through press associations. The great German press association is Wolff's Telegraphic Bureau, which differs from international bureaus like Reuter's and the Agence Havas in that it is mainly national in its scope, and differs from the American press agencies in being directly under government control. Wolff's Bureau counts among its subscribers practically all the important papers in Germany, its despatches are forwarded over the imperial telegraph system toll free and have a certain precedence over private messages, and it is used, as we shall see, to disseminate governmentally edited news. Besides Wolff's, there are in Berlin and other larger capitals other news agencies which send out information, — telegraphed, printed, mimeographed, — flooding the newspaper world with official, semi-official, political or colorless news items, which play a great part in the make-up of the provincial press. The pirating of news from the larger journals is carried on by the provincial papers in Germany in a way that is absolutely conscienceless, possibly because, as will be shown below, the reading public seems less eager for news than for editorial comments thereon.

This borrowing of news items is not, however, confined to the provincial press. As we have seen, the larger papers maintain correspondents in foreign capitals; but only in a few cases is this correspondence forwarded by telegraph, since the papers, apparently following the desires of the reading public, prefer to spend their money on literary essays and scientific treatises rather than on telegraph and cable tolls. For their daily news from abroad they depend on Wolff's Bureau, which has a limited staff abroad, but derives most of its information through the great international agencies like Reuter's. The cheapest and readiest source of information is the French and British dailies, whose news columns even the largest Berlin papers do not hesitate to use, reproducing with a generous hand news items from the *Times*, the *Daily Chronicle* and the *Standard* forty-eight hours after publication in London.

The effect on Germany's relations with the outside world of this dependence on British-influenced news agencies has already been noted (cf. page 73 ff.). Even more important for the development of public sentiment at home is the lack of an adequate, independent system of telegraphic correspondence from foreign countries. The greater metropolitan papers which do maintain foreign correspondents have not succeeded in placing in the foreign capitals men who are able to give a true picture of foreign feeling or through personal influence and adroitness to fill the semi-diplomatic mission of their office, with the result that the readers of even such high-class journals as the *Kölnische* or *Frankfurter Zeitung* or the *Berliner Tageblatt* are often uninformed as to the real condition of public affairs and public feeling in France, England and America. The result has been that each succeeding international crisis has found the German reading public living in a fool's paradise of misinformation with regard to the mighty forces of public sentiment which sway cabinet decisions in London, Paris, Washington and to some extent Rome. Some of the greater German dailies, like the *Kölnische*, have spent vast sums in sending experts to spy out the highlands of Thibet or the savage stretches of the upper Congo and spread before their readers a wealth of information regarding the economic possibilities of southern Brazil or the valleys of Mesopotamia or the fauna and flora of the strangest islands of the southern

seas. Of everything that has a scientific interest they render account with characteristic German enthusiasm for truth: in political matters their information is usually neither complete nor accurate and their correspondence from neighboring French and Italian cities or even from Alsace or the Prussian East is often but valorous vapping of the tap-room sort.

The weakness of the German papers as international newsgatherers is partly to be explained through the personnel of the German newspaper office. This seldom has at its command men of the standing of those who represent the great London papers in foreign capitals, a lack that is directly traceable to the inferior standing of the journalist in Germany as compared with Western lands. In the Fatherland, as elsewhere, the newspaper man does not as a rule freely elect the profession which he practises, but gravitates into it as a result of circumstances. Here, however, the result is worse than elsewhere, not only for the training of the journalist, but for the social status of the profession. In this land of specialization every aspirant for a professional career selects or is supposed to select, or have his parents select for him, his life career before he goes to the university, and he is expected to follow it up with all his force and enthusiasm from that time forth forevermore. Few, very few, select journalism, for while the financial rewards of the successful journalist are not inconsiderable, the social prestige belonging to the profession is still almost as lacking and the professional pride among journalists as undeveloped as half a century ago, when Gustav Freytag wrote his charming comedy *Die Journalisten* to prove that German editors could be men of honor.

The editorial chairs of Germany contain some brilliant men, who, feeling an inner call to journalism, have deserted the teacher's chair or even the lawyer's desk or surgeon's case. Besides these and others, whose lives have been given to a special training for the periodical press, there are a very great number who have found their way into the newspaper office simply because they have failed as lawyers or as teachers or in some other calling where success means *official* position. Hard-and-fast conditions of society in Germany admit a fall in the social scale, but seldom a rise. There is no such thing as working for a while in a minor or menial position and then entering one of the learned professions: the educational system forbids it. The dark side of German efficiency is that those who have through temperament or other causes made a failure in the profession for which they have prepared, have thereafter small chance of success in any calling of equal social rank or even in the close in-fighting of business competition. To a good many such journalism offers the only field where they can still hope for a remunerative activity without entire loss of social position.

In addition to the lack of preparation for their profession under which so many German newspaper men suffer, they are not permitted, as in France, to sign their articles. Not a few leading articles and summaries are signed by the chief editor; but as a rule the German newspaper man is hidden behind the same impenetrable veil of anonymity that shrouds his colleagues in England and America. His work, be it ever so faithfully done, brings him no personal advertisement. On the other hand, the lack of liberal institutions condemns the editor to something like political impotence; and except among the Social Democrats, where newspaper editors are frequently elected to legislative office, he rarely gets anything in the way of political reward. The positions in the consular and even the diplomatic service that now and then recompense the American editor for faithful service to the party cause and the titles and distinctions which successful British journalists receive have no counterpart in Germany. With the exception of the two groups with the best developed political sense, the Conservatives and the Social Democrats, the journalist plays but a small part in the active life of the party and is practically never rewarded by the gift of political office. The effect of this upon the ambition of newspaper men can well be imagined. Thus cut off from adequate preparation, shut in behind a paralyzing anonymity, ineligible for political rewards,

the German journalist cannot, save in the case of a few great papers, lay claim to an enviable social or political position. As a rule he does his duty faithfully within the limits allowed him by the laws and by the business considerations of his office.

These considerations play a no more important part in Germany than in more democratic lands, where the cashier's office is too often permitted to dominate the editorial rooms. Absolute independence of the advertising columns and similar considerations is an ideal rather than a fact in every part of the newspaper world, though here the German publisher may be said to be less exposed to temptation because of the rigid laws which govern business competition and because by education the German is opposed to unfair play in business life. The treatment of the editor as a hireling who must echo the policy of the publisher and guard the latter's political and financial interests is a sacrifice which the editorial profession makes everywhere to the capitalistic organization of society, and it is no more common in Germany than abroad, although it must be said that anything that in any way diminishes the importance and standing of the press as a tribune of the people must increase the temptation of publisher and editor to sell their influence to the highest bidder.

The dignity of the press is then directly dependent upon the liberty allowed it, and this liberty in turn upon the habit of free institutions. It follows that those statesmen who have shown themselves most hostile to these institutions have in the history of present-day Germany done the most to prostitute the press. Bismarck, according to his press secretary, Moritz Busch, frequently expressed himself with cynical contempt on the subject of the honesty of the German press and its value as a representative of the people. "German papers," he declared in 1876, "are bound to be amusing reading, for they are meant to be glanced over while drinking a mug of beer and to furnish topics of lively conversation, usually about something which has taken place a long way off in foreign parts." The Iron Chancellor, however, himself made constant use of the newspapers to influence public opinion both at home and abroad, maintaining at the foreign office, in addition to the official literary bureau, a private bureau under the adroit management first of Busch and later of Professor Aegidi. Through these men he played upon public opinion by means of articles inspired by himself and often prepared under his dictation, which were published not only in the semi-official *Norddeutsche Zeitung*, the *Kölnische Zeitung* or the *Kreuzzeitung*, but in papers issued in remote cities of the provinces, whose connection with the government would not be guessed. Sometimes under the direction of their wily chief his lieutenants would put the Chancellor's ideas in the form of a letter from a German long resident in Paris or a Prussian close to Vatican circles in Rome, playing upon the various keys and stops of prejudice and sentiment as the national or international situation demanded. By his Press Ordinances of 1863 Bismarck had shown himself quite willing to throttle a free press, later on he assured himself of adequate newspaper support by means of a cleverness and an insincerity a little more than diplomatic. That these means were at times highly immoral, no one who reads Busch's biography of the Chancellor can deny. From the income of the sequestered property of the King of Hanover and the Landgrave of Hesse, who had been deposed on the annexation of these countries by Prussia in 1866, the Chancellor drew the so-called "reptile funds," by which the imperial government maintained an influence over the press which extended into the remotest corners of Germany and made itself felt in London, Paris and Rome.

All of this was justified by Bismarck and his apologists as a measure of war. It is certain that the Iron Chancellor had to face all of his life the bitterest opposition on the part of a few independent newspapers, the most relentless from the *Kreuzzeitung*, which under its brilliant editor Hammerstein forced the fighting in the most violent manner whenever Bismarck showed the slightest inclination toward liberal ideas. Confronted by bitter enemies

not only in the Liberal and Clerical ranks but among his own class, the conservative aristocracy, as well, Bismarck did not hesitate to assure himself of press support by means which were sometimes, as has been pointed out, of doubtful morality. He believed that his enemies were poisoning the wells of public opinion; he himself disdained no weapons of deceit and bribery in his newspaper campaigns, furnishing false information to draw the fire of his opponents, or introducing misleading articles into the trusted organs of the opposition. The success of this policy for the Chancellor's aims cannot be denied; its final result was to weaken for decades the political influence of the German press at home and abroad.

Bismarck's successors in the home and foreign offices inherited something of his cynical contempt for the press without the great Chancellor's skill in using it for his purposes. Indeed the attitude of the government officials in Germany toward the representatives of the fourth estate has been one of arrogance, not unmixed with fear. Often the feeling seems to be that the press represents an improper curiosity on the part of the masses about government doings, a curiosity which must be checked if possible, and if that is not possible, satisfied with such meagre news as the government may find fit for popular consumption. The result is, that the same feeling is cultivated in the German newspapers that one finds often among German citizens toward public affairs: they have been told so often that the governing classes can manage things without their help that they have grown to believe it, and the press thus frequently accepts without hesitation government leadership and voluntarily resigns its rights as a tribune of the people. Two instances will illustrate this, both taken from the exciting days at the end of July, 1914, just before Germany declared war against Russia. On July 30 the air was full of rumors and the Berlin *Lokalanzeiger* published an extra announcing that war had been declared against Russia. This was followed immediately by a governmental denial and a disavowal and the withdrawal of its issue by the offending paper. The premature news reached Munich, where it was published in various extra issues and caused the greatest excitement. At the height of this the newspapers, which were unable to communicate with Berlin on account of the overloading of the wires, applied to the Bavarian government to know the truth of the situation. For hours they were kept waiting, and finally with the greatest reluctance the Bavarian officials gave the information that they had not been advised of a declaration of war, which as a matter of fact did not take place till two days later. As showing how dependence on the government has become a matter of habit in crises, on the same day on which the press representatives were treated so superciliously by the Bavarian government when making inquiries regarding a matter of the highest public concern, the Munich *Zeitung*, a Radical paper, called urgently upon the imperial officials, in view of the disturbed state of the public mind, to "take charge of public opinion!"

As a rule the papers have no right to find fault with the government for not attempting to mould public opinion. Since Bismarck's day, however, with the growth of healthfulness in German political life, ministerial efforts to control the public view have become less insidious, although they are not yet always sincere and devoid of trickery. At the present time governmental influence finds its way to the public mind through papers which are directly "official" and papers whose utterances are known as "semi-official" and also by means of articles in journals where government influences are least suspected. The directly and openly "official" papers, such as the *Reichsanzeiger* and the organs of the army and navy and the various *Anzeiger* to be found in the Prussian provincial capitals and the capitals of the other German states, are merely organs of governmental announcement, and have no more influence on public opinion than departmental announcements in Washington. Aside from these organs of the imperial and state governments, the various departments of the federal government contain officials whose duty it is to furnish information to the press,

the most important bureau of that kind being found in the Foreign Office. The organization of these bureaus is as efficient as the German bureaucracy always is, and their work includes not only the furnishing of information to the press, but the preparation of editorial leaders and all sorts of articles intended to work upon public sentiment, which find publication in some of the "semi-official" papers.

As has been noted, the most important agency for disseminating news throughout Germany is Wolff's Telegraphic Bureau, an institution which may be called a governmentally owned press association. It antedates the foundation of the new German empire, having been organized in 1865 as a joint stock company, with the Prussian government in control of a majority of the stock. Like Reuter's Bureau, the Agence Havas and other national news agencies, the Wolff Bureau claims an international character. It maintains correspondents in foreign capitals and has in peace times affiliations with other great news agencies. It practically controls the news field in Germany, although its known governmental character causes German readers to discount its despatches to some extent, less because there is any possibility of Wolff's Bureau falsifying the actual facts furnished from the world outside of Germany than from the feeling that other facts may be suppressed. To the American in Germany the tone of the Wolff messages, when they concern royalty, smacks not a little of unctuous servility. Good or bad, it forms the first means by which the German reader learns his foreign news: that it has not developed further in past years as a real newsgatherer is due less to governmental control than to the traditional lack of interest among Germans in international affairs.

Next to Wolff's Bureau come the information bureaus of the government offices, referred to above, and that brings up the question of "semi-official" papers. Just which papers deserve this title is hard to say, the German press itself being often in the dark as to how far government influence extends over certain papers. Universally recognized as the government mouthpiece is the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* of Berlin, which has been in the service of the Prussian and the imperial government since the sixties. Bismarck used it from the early days of his chancellorship, and since that time it has published the government's views, particularly on foreign affairs, prepared in the government offices and under the direction of the imperial chancellor and occasionally of the emperor himself. The statements of the rather old-fashioned *Norddeutsche* are recognized as having the highest authority. At the other end of the scale stands the rural daily which champions the government program and especially at election time rages against the Social Democrats with eager zeal in return for the local government advertising given by the all-powerful local administrator, the *Landrat*. Between the two there extends a whole line of papers, whose articles are regularly or occasionally inspired by the federal or state officials. Certain journals, like the *Kölnische Zeitung*, the *Tägliche Rundschau* of Berlin and the *Hannoverische Courier*, have been regularly used to express government opinion on domestic or foreign affairs, the actual subject-matter or the general ideas being furnished from the Home or Foreign Office. Frequently the reading public is hard put to it to know whether articles in these papers represent the ideas of the government or not, for even the staid *Norddeutsche* occasionally kicks over the traces and treats the topics of the day in a manner which is quite opposed to all theories of feudal-conservative administration. In proportion, however, as the news matter concerns the person or entourage of the Emperor or one of the rulers of the major states or a foreign crisis the articles in the papers in question are apt to reflect the feeling in government circles, for the value of the proper public treatment of such subjects is well understood by the governing class. The public and semi-public utterances of the Emperor are regularly reported by an official stenographer and carefully edited by the Foreign Office before publication.

“One cannot carry on international politics without a press.” This statement of the late Marschall von Bieberstein, formerly German foreign minister, is undoubtedly confirmed by the practice of every civilized land. But there is considerable difference between the information furnished the national press in London, Paris and Washington and the press articles which find their way into the German “semi-official” papers, a difference peculiar to the German government. In the more democratic countries the press is taken sufficiently into the government’s confidence as to facts to enable it to fulfil its mission as the mouthpiece of the nation. In Germany the imperial and Prussian government by the use of its system of anonymous inspiration has been accustomed to play upon the various organs in which the government’s views are wont to appear so as to control public opinion, fanning or restraining the fires of national enthusiasm as the foreign situation demands. This was illustrated in the careful management of the press in the Morocco crisis of 1911, when the anti-French and anti-British feeling was alternately stimulated and checked; incontestably also in the days preceding the outbreak of war in 1914, when a series of “hands off!” articles following Austria’s ultimatum to Serbia was well adapted to steel and inspire the national spirit for the approaching crisis.

Occasionally, however, public opinion in Germany gets very much out of hand. This was the case during the Boer War, when the waves of enthusiasm for the South African republics rolled high in spite of all efforts of the governmentally inspired press to pour oil upon them, and in 1906 when through the Kaiser’s interview with the *Daily Telegraph* correspondent the last phases of the pro-British attitude of the imperial government at the time of the struggle with the Boers were laid bare. On such occasions as this, when German ideals are strongly touched, the press arrays itself with force and remarkable unanimity on the popular side and leads an outbreak of Teutonic fury that echoes in every home and hall of the Fatherland. Such unanimity is, however, rare. Some of the strongest papers are handicapped in their influence on public opinion by the suspicion of government inspiration. All tend to suffer, so far as they are not the mouthpieces of the Foreign Office, from a lack of a feeling of responsibility, passing in their leading articles from an unmotivated exultation over Germany’s present and future situation to an equally unfounded despair.

Much more than in foreign matters has the system of governmental influence been harmful to the German press in matters of domestic policy. While the ministry no longer poisons the wells of public opinion as in Bismarck’s day, it does greatly impair the influence of a great section of the press. During crises like that before the *Reichstag* election of 1907 or the discussions preceding the passage of the Defense Bill in 1913, the imperial ministry constantly played upon the keys and stops of the press. Here, however, there has grown up in the great National Liberal and Radical papers, not to speak of the vast network of Socialist organs, led by the Berlin *Vorwärts*, an array of popular tribunes, who guard jealously the interests of the economic groups which they represent and are themselves free from all suspicion of unfair government influence.

Almost all of the great papers of Germany are in fact strict party organs, only a few like the *Lokalanzeiger* of Berlin professing to be impartial in matters political. Political interests have, as we have seen, combined with economic interests in Germany, so that journals represent not merely a party, but an economic group as well. Thus the *Kreuzzeitung*, the old organ of the Conservative party, is likewise the most influential representative of agrarian interests, while Radical organs like the *Frankfurter Zeitung* have their constituency among the financial and commercial classes of the cities and the great National Liberal papers, like the *Kölnische Zeitung*, the *Tägliche Rundschau* of Berlin and the *Hamburger Nachrichten*, represent the industrial interests and those of the upper middle class. It is but natural that those political parties which are most closely identified with economic groups

should be represented by the most aggressive press. Thus the two groups which occupy opposite ends of the political scale, the Conservatives and the Socialists, whose organizations rest on a strong community of economic interest, have an aggressive and well-disciplined press; and as a result it is chiefly among the Conservative and Socialist editors that one finds men of strong personal influence on the counsels of the party. Next to them comes the press of the Centre party, led by the powerful *Germania* in Berlin, a journal which was founded in 1870 with the first leap into power of the ultramontane party and which has valiantly led the firing line in defense of Roman Catholic interests ever since. Between these extremes stands a long line of papers with liberal and radical leanings. It is remarkable indeed that by far the greater number of journals of national and international standing in Germany are National Liberal in faith or tendency, just as this party, with all of its trimming and irresolution in program, contains a vastly greater proportion of the brains of the empire than its electoral figures would lead one to suppose. Papers like the *Kölnische Zeitung*, the *Münchener Neueste Nachrichten*, the *Schwäbische Merkur* of Stuttgart, the *Hannoverische Courier* or the *Tägliche Rundschau* of Berlin, with their Radical contemporaries, the *Berliner Tageblatt*, the *Vossische Zeitung* of Berlin and the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, represent the very best that German journalism has to offer, both as newsgatherers and in the national-patriotic tone of their policies. In Germany as elsewhere the more narrow the political attitude of a paper, the less its importance as a gatherer of news.

Every political, social and economic direction then has its own press, which watches jealously over the interests of its group and presents them with more or less passion and narrowness. From the wild chauvinism of the Berlin *Deutsche Tageszeitung* or *Post* to the bitter class appeals of the Socialistic *Vorwärts*, each strikes its own peculiar note and plays the pipe for its party's dancing. It seldom happens indeed that a newspaper ties itself completely to the fortunes of a political leader, as in France, nevertheless the party press reflects in striking fashion the individualism and separatism of German politics as well as the pettiness and narrowness which is a part of factional strife. The fulminations of the agrarian aristocrat against the inheritance tax, those of the manufacturer against the income tax or the radical against the tariff on food-stuffs and the appeals of the Social Democrat to class feeling echo and reecho harshly and shrilly according as the acoustic space furnished by the individual sheet is large or small.

The German, whether country squire, townsman or peasant-farmer, demands that the paper which he reads beside the family lamp or the restaurant table shall support first of all Germany's claims abroad and secondly, the program of his particular party, with loyalty, which is the trait which he most reveres. In no country is a newspaper more clearly tagged with its party name, and in no country does the reader insist more strongly that it shall remain true to its colors. Through thick and thin, right or wrong, in disaster or success, the paper must be the defender, apologist and conservator of the party's traditions. Every act of the party's leaders must be championed, every move of the party's opponents must be attacked or given an unflattering interpretation. Characteristic of this is the attitude of the papers in reporting political debates. "I always took care that the Whig dogs should not get the best of it," said Dr. Johnson in speaking of his parliamentary reporting, and something like this has become the motto of the German press. Even journals of the highest standing almost always have their party's representative emerge from a political discussion covered with honor "for his clear and practical demonstration of the facts," while his opponent invariably "seeks to confuse the matter and takes refuge in excuses and hedging."

The result of this attitude on public opinion is still further to narrow and to embitter political life. The unfortunate side of this life, already pointed out, is that it splits the nation into factions and creates among these factions the feeling that the government is a hostile

force with which in various crises the best terms possible are to be made. The result is that the German citizen gets very little help from the press in laying aside the swaddling clothes of political separatism. He swears by his *Frankfurter* or *Magdeburger* or *Kölnische* and avoids other papers like the pest. This attitude toward the newspapers is characteristic of the narrow partisan in every country. An especially unfortunate result in Germany, however, is the weakening of liberalism through the dissipation of its energies in factional controversies. Radical and National Liberal papers have found it as impossible to make common cause against feudal pressure and agrarian demands in the press as in parliament, and the Social Democratic papers attack the middle-class Berlin *Tageblatt* as fiercely as they do the feudal *Kreuzzeitung*.

Unfortunately then political factionalism and blind subserviency to the party program harm the independence of the press and damage its influence as an organizer of public opinion. On the other hand it seems that the sources of public opinion are kept purer from strictly financial and business contamination in Germany than elsewhere. Such bribery as there is, is usually backed in some way by government influence, which dominates many a petty provincial or rural sheet. In the various "districts" and "circles" into which Prussia is divided some one of the local newspapers enjoys the official advertising and is regarded as the governmental mouthpiece. This provincial sheet, which assumes the proud title of "Official Gazette" (*Amtsund Kreisblatt*), is a private undertaking, of course, but is strongly under the influence of the local crown official, the *Landrat*, who has the privilege of withdrawing at any time the official titles and official advertising. Naturally the paper is expected to support the government, and particularly the policies of the Conservative party, with all vigor, and the *Landrat* sees to it that it goes for the Social Democrats without gloves and he permits nothing to pass uncensored that might be construed as a reflection on the ruler or the monarchy. During electoral campaigns the editor of such a paper must do his utmost to prevent any increase in the Radical or the Socialist vote in his district, if he would avoid a vigorous bullying from the all-powerful *Landrat*, who is nearly always a member of the feudal class.

Aside from such instances of official terrorism, it is not usual to find German journals listening to financial seduction. Certain papers, it is true, represent particular business interests, as the *Rheinwestfälische Zeitung* of Düsseldorf those of the Westphalian mine operators and iron and steel manufacturers. The big business interests, indeed, have their own press, which is in great measure independent of party, although supporting of course Conservative or National Liberal policies. Thus the Krupps and iron and steel interests are said to own the Berlin *Neueste Nachrichten*, which represents most adequately those industries and the financiers behind them, while individuals identified with the Agrarian League own the Berlin *Tageszeitung*. It is, however, extremely rare when a newspaper modifies its understood political policy as a result of financial considerations. Especially in the case of the Social Democratic press is the influence of the advertising columns on the papers' policy negligible.

Of all the influences then which work upon the press, the government through its various open and subterranean agencies is far and away the strongest. Even in peace times the Berlin ministry may hold a heavy hand on public information through its control of the only great news agency, Wolff's Bureau, to which every German paper is in a sense tributary, from the metropolitan journal with its four editions daily to the "patent outside" of the East Prussian or Bavarian village. The result is a marked lack of enterprise in seeking news on the part of the individual journals, greatly in contrast with the papers of western Europe and America. To begin with, in the very arrangement of the greater number of German papers the news plays a much less important part than the editorial and essay, for

the telegraphic news is usually relegated to the inside pages, the first page being given over to discursive articles, which in the greater journals may concern the most recent news, but in the smaller papers usually limp twenty-four hours behind it. More often the first columns in the morning or evening editions are devoted to an essay on some political or sociological subject or to a résumé, such as would be found in the Sunday issue of an American paper. Even some of the best German newspapers put the latest news in the last columns of the inside of the last page, the place which seems to foreign readers the least conspicuous in the whole paper. News is indeed furnished with startling frequency by the greater German papers, such journals as the *Kölnische Zeitung* putting out four editions daily, with a specialization that is characteristic of other sides of German industry, one edition containing general news, another especially market reports, etc. The wealth of material which such a daily offers, including social and political philosophy, fiction, poetry, travel, biography and literary criticism, much of it of considerable scientific and literary value, is confusing to the American, who seeks first of all the news in his daily paper.

There are other confusing sides in the German attitude towards the day's news when approached with British or American prejudices. One of the most striking is the habit of even the best papers of interlarding news despatches with editorial comment. Provincial sheet and metropolitan daily alike are apt to introduce telegraphic news which is favorable to the cause which they represent with salvos of editorial applause, while unfavorable items are emasculated by constant interlinear comments signed "D.R." (*Der Redakteur*, the editor), such as, "We doubt that!" "Well, we shall wait and see!" or even "This is an open falsehood!" or "Such a campaign of lies!" and similar remarks. Or passages of crucial importance in the text may be interrupted by a bracketed row of question marks or points of exclamation. This confusing mixture of editorial opinion with the day's news is not countenanced by some prominent publishers, like Louis Ullstein, the owner of the Berlin *Morgenpost* and other publications, who have tried to make head against it. Like most newspaper sins, this is also to be laid at the door of the reader, for it must be said that the German reader likes to have his news served up in a way which shall spice the attractiveness of welcome announcements and soften the bitterness of unwelcome things. The German, it must never be forgotten, embraces a cause with his whole soul, whether it be the cause of the whole Fatherland, or that of his economic class or political party, or even his side in the teapot tempest of local politics. He is a devoted champion and good fighter, but also a hard loser, and his tendency to romanticism often permits him to revel in a paradise of dreams even when the enemy is at the gate. This characteristic of the great body of Germans is not of course a weakness of the politically trained classes nor of those aggressive men who guided Germany's industry to the front. But it must not be forgotten that the great majority of German citizens are just emerging from a state of political immaturity. They devote themselves with patient conscientiousness and enthusiasm to the daily duties of home and family, handiwork or profession, and leave political leadership to those who make a profession of ruling, quite willing to accept their orders so long as their patriotism seems trustworthy.

If the liking for news flavored with the sauce of editorial comment indicates a weakness in German public opinion, the distaste for a directly sensational treatment of news is a strength. Germany has, to be sure, its political press of a sensational sort. The wild chauvinism of some of the Berlin and provincial journals is not to be outdone in Paris or Petrograd; but in all that does not concern politics, the most sensational of German journals is as mild when compared with certain French or American dailies as the poems of Felicia Hemans with the early effusions of Swinburne. In the whole field of personalities and in the matter of crime especially, the German papers show a decency and reserve all the more

refreshing in view of the flood of impure books which has risen to such a height in Germany. There are, to be sure, yellow journals in Berlin and Munich, and especially certain comic weeklies, the clever *Simplicissimiss* at their head, show a coarseness of tone which has on more than one occasion shut them out from the mails in those countries where puritanism is still a strong tradition; but the German demands that the news columns of his daily paper shall be clean, and the law backs him up in it. For here as elsewhere in German life, the correction of abuses is not left simply to the force of public opinion. Court proceedings must be reported in such a way that they cannot possibly educate to crime; certain classes of cases are entirely shut out of the papers, and it may be said in general that the atmosphere of the German court room does not lend itself to yellow journalism. Offenders against the press laws are invariably punished, often with a severity which seems really out of proportion to the offense.

Especially does the German journalist have to walk carefully to avoid conflict with the rigid libel laws. Even the most innocent remark about the behavior of some public servant or a news item which permits of a construction placing some private individual in an unflattering light may call forth a demand for a public retraction or provoke an expensive libel suit. The German law, indeed, goes very far in protecting the individual in all the rights of personality, especially in the right of avoiding publicity. The retractions published from time to time in German papers are one of the most enlightening chapters in a study of the German press, illustrating as they do how fully the rights of the individual are guarded. The feeling seems to prevail that the doings of no person or group of persons shall be dragged before the public without the consent of those concerned. It goes without saying that the interviewer plays no considerable rôle in the German newspaper world, and that the position of the reporter is much less important than in those countries where an unrestricted license of the press prevails. Indeed the German law goes so far that in many ways the importance of the press as a sanitary agent is taken away. A newspaper is sometimes forced by threats or legal sentence to retract a statement when the retraction is practically a falsehood, for the mere fact that a news item is true does not by any means serve as a defense against a libel suit, if the item may be construed as a reflection on the behavior of any person or group of persons. Thus a case is recorded where an editor was convicted for publishing a statement reflecting on a hospital, although it was shown in the court proceedings that the statement had been made in a public medical gathering. In this case the law guaranteed to the physician the right of criticism, but denied to the editor the right of publicity.

The libel laws are the constant burden of editorial complaint in Germany. Especially the Social Democratic press has had to suffer under their administration at the hands of their political opponents. The German bench is far above any suspicion of bias except that which comes with the belief held in official circles that the Socialists are public enemies, combined with a reverence for those in authority which degenerates at times into servility. This, the Socialist press has contended, was hardly the right source from which it might expect a square deal. In the nineties and the earliest years of the present century heavy sentences, often from three to five years in prison, were pronounced against Social Democratic editors for *lèse majesté*. The modification of the law in 1908 (cf. page 108) did much to soften the tone of the Socialist and Radical press towards royalty in Prussia; but prosecutions for libel still occur when the press of these parties breaks the bounds prescribed by conservative feeling in its criticism of some municipal official or even of a minister of state. Such cases are usually fought bitterly up through the various courts and usually result in a conviction. With the increase of the number and influence of the Socialist press — the party had by 1910 established daily newspapers in more than 68 cities — the watchfulness of prosecuting officers under the inspiration of the higher provincial officials is kept constantly alert. All

of this has not tended to soften the tone of the Socialist editor, who never turns the other cheek to the smiter. This unfortunate state of affairs has done much to lower the tone of political discussion in Germany to a bitterness and brutality, which, especially in electoral campaigns, swells into a crescendo of billingsgate and presents a most unattractive side of the German press. No stronger evidence could be presented that the cure for the shrill outbreaks of political immaturity is to be found in liberty and not in constant paternal correction.

In spite of these false notes, the lack of sensationalism in the treatment of news is one of the most refreshing characteristics of the German press. The fact that in Prussia and in some other German states every issue must show the names of the persons responsible for the news and editorial portions and for the advertising columns is a guarantee; and the innate German love of truth and hatred of sham hangs heavy on the success of those metropolitan sheets which show a dangerous tendency to rival the yellow papers of France and America. That these tendencies are manifest in some of the Berlin papers is not to be denied, and it is to be expected that they will continue to grow in proportion as the Americanization of the imperial capital emancipates the individual spirit from the traditions of the past. But the whole spirit of German public opinion is opposed to this hectic demoralization of the press. A few years ago, when an enterprising Berlin firm established an illustrated weekly on the model of those British and American papers which have a maximum of the personal in pictures and articles and a minimum of news and literature, the undertaking was received with a shaking of heads everywhere. "This personal advertisement is against the genius of our people," remarked a prominent Leipsic business man concerning it. "It is an importation from America and is fostering a spirit which Germany has never known." It must be said in defense of America, however, that the German press admits without hesitation advertisements and a sort of humor which in America would be impossible in any paper using the mails.

The reformation of the libel laws cannot long be delayed in Germany, and the result will almost certainly be an improvement in the tone of political and public discussion. It is, however, very improbable that the tone of the German daily papers will be much brightened thereby. The staring headlines which form such a feature of the foreign press the German newspaper reader knows only in a mild form: he demands that he be given that which is true or at least that which is in accord with his ideas of the truth, and wants no trifling with his news in order to make it sensational. The interesting "write-up" of the American or English reporter cannot therefore find a place in a paper which takes itself and its functions so seriously. The editor may himself destroy the effect of the news by critical interpolations, but these spring in most cases from soul convictions which are those of the reader himself. The latter disdains any attempt to make either news or editorial matter interesting, and this paired with the German lack of feeling for literary form makes the German press dull reading for those who seek in it anything like the sparkle and crisply classical presentation of the Paris journals. The dull and formal narration of the news, fortified usually by editorial comment, political résumés, rhodomontades of doubtful inspiration, accurate but colorless police and market reports, with here and there an outburst of Teutonic rage against foreign competitors or political opponents, — these make up the current parts of the newspapers, and certainly do not appeal to those who read the journals for the froth of life or expect from them models of literary excellence.

Since Schopenhauer's day, indeed, "newspaper German" has been a term of contempt. "Pig German, — I beg pardon, — newspaper German!" exclaimed the celebrated pessimist more than half a century ago in a memorable essay on "The Butchery of the German Language." "The linguistic debauch," he exclaimed in his customary gentle style,

“to which no other nation can show a parallel, seems to proceed in the main from the political newspapers, the lowest form of literature, and go from them into the literary journals and finally into books.” It is certain that newspaper German has done nothing to remove this reproach since Schopenhauer’s day; indeed, the style of German prose, which seems to grow more cumbersome and unwieldy every year, can charge much of its degeneracy to the daily and weekly press. An illustrated journal of the highest standing introduces to its readers a series of pictures “from the by-the-Russians-temporarily-occupied-and-by-the German-army-under-the brilliant leadership-of-General-von-Hindenburg-gloriously-reconquered province of East Prussia,” and similar sins against all of the muses may be found in the best journals. Of recent years a reaction has been observable, led by papers like the *Vossische Zeitung* of Berlin, “Auntie Voss,” as it is humorously called by its contemporaries, which looks back on a century and three-quarters of literary history since no less a stylist than young Gotthold Ephraim Lessing contributed to its early numbers, or the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, which commands some very able pens.

Such criticisms of the German newspaper as literature, however, apply only to its news and editorial columns. Besides these transient expressions of the popular spirit which are written day by day and exist only for a day, the German journals, provincial and metropolitan alike, offer each day a mass of material, which is not merely literature in the strict sense of the word, but which for richness and variety of literary and scientific material has no equal anywhere in the world’s press. It is the custom for most papers to maintain a *feuilleton*, separated from news and editorial matter by a type-bar, which reserves the lower half of the page for matters of more lasting content, non-contemporaneous or quasi-contemporaneous in their interest. This essay was a French invention developed in Germany early in the nineteenth century by the Jewish prose virtuoso Heinrich Heine, and it has cultivated a lightness and gracefulness of style which is strikingly in contrast to the soggy editorial or news paragraph. In light essays on science, literature or art, the whole field of modern culture is laid under tribute with a style which recalls the conversational tone of the drawing room or club. The *feuilleton* writers of Germany lack the grace which marks the best salon literateurs of the French press; but they count among them some of the most brilliant stylists of the nation and maintain a high standard in the wealth and variety of their scientific material.

To these articles of critical and conversational tone are to be added literary works, such as novels by the best authors of Germany, published serially in the daily papers. Gerhart Hauptmann’s *Atlantis* first appeared in the daily edition of the Berlin *Tageblatt*, and other names scarcely less well known on the German Parnassus are to be found in the daily press of the larger cities. Articles of more solid import appear in special supplements, forming a weekly or semi-weekly part of the larger papers. Some of these command the ablest pens in Germany in the field of literature, art and science, and become an indispensable reference material for investigators and critics. Indeed, the literary criticism of such papers as the Berlin *Tag* and the *Vossische Zeitung* or the Cologne *Volkszeitung* is among the best that appears anywhere in Germany. The well-nigh inexhaustible wealth of material offered in this way may be shown by a résumé of the various supplements issued within one week to accompany the morning and afternoon news and editorial matter and market reports of a large Berlin newspaper: a technical supplement of eight pages; a supplement containing essays on legal subjects, four pages; a literary review, two pages; an illustrated supplement, six pages; a comical supplement, six pages; a household supplement, six pages; and a page each for women’s affairs, for art and drama criticism and for tourists. In addition the regular issues contained a letter from China on politico-economic subjects, a sketch of the Hungarian drama, and essays on the teaching of pedagogics in the universities and on the sleeping

sickness in the African colonies, and one page daily devoted to a review of sports, mostly horse racing and aeronautics.

It is evident that while the German newspaper does not as a newsgatherer satisfy western demands, it brings to its readers each day a wealth of material which in other lands would find its way into the “heavier” magazines or into scientific periodicals. It is evident also that while the German who reads his chosen newspaper may be insufficiently informed or biased regarding that which is called in press parlance “live news,” he is schooled in scientific methods of observation and inquiry and in accuracy of reporting regarding those things which can be divorced from the ephemeral passions of the day. He finds in his daily or weekly journal not so much a raconteur of the day’s doings as a pedagogue and staid mentor, who delights to lead him into the devious paths of science or the romantic world of ideas and ideals. The pedagogical instinct and the enthusiasm for knowledge for its own sake, the love of truth and the careful accuracy in method, narrowness of political view and passionate insistence on the personal standpoint: these ingredients of German character are nowhere more clearly exemplified than in the nation’s press.”

151. F. S. Meyer, *The Moulding of Communists: The Training of the Communist Cadre*, Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, (1961). **See also:** W. Chambers, *Witness*, Random House, New York, (1952). **See also:** D. A. Hyde, *Dedication and Leadership Techniques*, Mission Secretariat, Washington, (1963); **and** *Dedication and Leadership: Learning from the Communists*, University of Notre Dame Press, (1966).

152. E. Bernstein, “Jews and German Social Democracy”, *Die Zukunft* (New York), Volume 26, (March, 1921), pp. 145ff.; English translation in: P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), pp. 322-330. **See also:** H. Hirsch, “The Ugly Marx: Analysis of an ‘Outspoken Anti-Semite’”, *Philosophical Forum*, Volume 8, (1978), pp.150-162. **See also:** P. L. Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner*, Princeton University Press, (1990), pp. 296-305. **See also:** R. Grooms, “The Racism of Marx and Engels”, *The Barnes Review*, Volume 2, Number 10, (October, 1996), pp. 3-8.

153. Quoted in V. I. Lenin, “What is to be Done?”, *V. I. Lenin: Collected Works*, Volume 5, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, (1961), pp. 347-530, at 347; **and** *What is to be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement*, International Publishers, New York, (1969), p. 5.

154. “Hope Strong Man Will Rule Russia”, *The New York Times*, (9 November 1917), pp. 1-2. **See also:** “Jews Against Bolsheviki”, *The New York Times* reported on (19 November 1917), p. 2. **See also:** C. Weizmann, *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*, Volume 1, Series B, August 1898-July 1931, Transaction Books, Rutgers University, (1983), pp. 241-242. **See also:** “Bolshevism and the Jews”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (28 March 1919), p. 11. **See also:** X, “Flight from Bolshevism”, *The London Times*, (14 October 1919), p. 14; **and** “The Horrors of Bolshevism”, *The London Times*, (14 November 1919), pp. 13-14. **See also:** I. Cohen, “Jews and Bolshevism”, *The London Times*, (21 November 1919), p. 8; **and** “Jews and Bolshevism”, *The London Times*, (25 November 1919), p. 8; **and** “Jews and Bolshevism: The Mosaic Law in Politics: Racial Temperament”, *The London Times*, (27 November 1919), p. 15; **and** “Jews and Bolshevism: A Further Rejoinder”, *The London Times*, (1 December 1919), p. 10. **See also:** Philojudaeus, “Jews and Bolshevism: The Group Round Lenin”, *The London Times*, (22 November 1919), p. 8. **See also:** Janus, “Jews and Bolshevism: Revolutionary Elements”, *The London Times*, (26 November 1919), p. 8. **See also:** Judaeus, *The London Times*, (26 November 1919), p. 8; **and** “Jews and Bolshevism: A Reply to ‘Verax.’”, *The London Times*, (28 November 1919), p. 8. Verax, “Jews and Bolshevism: The Mosaic Law in Politics: Racial Temperament”, *The London Times*, (27

November 1919), p. 15; **and** “Bolshevism and the Jews: A Larger Issue: The Danger in Russia”, *The London Times*, (2 December 1919), p. 10. **See also:** J. H. Hertz, Chief Rabbi, “Jews and Bolshevism: The Chief Rabbi’s Reply”, *The London Times*, (29 November 1919), p. 8. **See also:** Pro-Denikin, “A Witness from Russia”, *The London Times*, (29 November 1919), p. 8. **See also:** An English-Born Jew, *The London Times*, (1 December 1919), p. 10. **See also:** Ivan Ivanovich, “The Jews and Bolshevism”, *The London Times*, (6 December 1919), p. 10. **“Epatism” defined in *The London Times*:** “Epatism”, *The London Times*, (10 December 1919), p. 15. **See also:** I. Zangwill, “Is Political Zionism Dead?”, *The Nation*, Volume 118, Number 3062, (12 March 1924), pp. 276-278, at 276.

155. **See also:** “World Mischief”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (21 June 1920), p. 8.

156. S. Kahan, “Preface”, *The Wolf of the Kremlin*, William Morrow and Company, Inc., New York, (1987).

157. V. I. Lenin, “What is to be Done?”, *V. I. Lenin: Collected Works*, Volume 5, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, (1961), pp. 347-530,; **and** *What is to be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement*, International Publishers, New York, (1969).

158. “Communists Closed Play”, *The New York Times*, (6 February 1948), p.29.

159. “Jazz in Scientific World”, *The New York Times*, (16 November 1919), p. X8.

160. B. Bauer, *Die Judenfrage*, Friedrich Otto, Braunschweig, 1843; English translation, H. Lederer, *The Jewish Problem*, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, (1958); **and** “Die Fähigkeit der heutigen Juden und Christen, frei zu werden”, *Einundzwanzig Bogen aus der Schweiz*, Herausgegeben von Georg Herwegh, Zürich und Winterthur, (1843), pp. 56-71 **See also:** B. Bauer, “Die Judenfrage”, *Deutsche Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Kunst*, Numbers 274-282, (17-26 November 1842), pp. 1093-1126; **and** “Neueste Schriften über die Judenfrage”, *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, Volume 1, (December, 1843), pp. 1-17; **and** “Neueste Schriften über die Judenfrage”, *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, Volume 4, (March, 1844), pp. 10-19.

161. K. Marx, “Zur Judenfrage. 1) Bruno Bauer: Die Judenfrage. Braunschweig 1843. — 2) Bruno Bauer: Die Fähigkeit der heutigen Juden und Christen frei zu werden. Ein und zwanzig Bogen aus der Schweiz. Herausgegeben von Georg Herwegh. Zürich und Winterthur. 1843. S. 56-71”, *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, Herausgegeben von Arnold Ruge und Karl Marx, 1ste und 2te Lieferung, Paris, (1844), pp. 182-214, at 214.

162. M. Hess, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English: *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918).

163. H. Koehler, *Inside the Gestapo: Hitler’s Shadow Over the World*, Pallas Pub. Co. Ltd., London, (1940). **See also:** H. Frank, *Im Angesicht des Galgens; Deutung Hitlers und seiner Zeit auf Grund eigener Erlebnisse und Erkenntnisse. Geschrieben im Nürnberger Justizgefängnis*, F. A. Beck, München-Gräfelfing, (1953), pp. 330-331. **See also:** D. Bronder, *Bevor Hitler kam: Eine historische Studie*, Hans Pfeiffer Verlag, Hannover, (1964), p. 204 (p. 211 in the 1974 edition). **See also:** H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974); English translation *Adolf Hitler: Founder of Israel*, Modjeskis’ Society Dedicated to Preservation of Cultures, San Diego, (1997).

164. M. Samuel, *You Gentiles*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, (1924), pp. 144-145, 150-151, 154-155, 174-176.

165. Provisional Government of Israel, “The Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel”, *Official Gazette*, Number 1, Tel Aviv, (14 May 1948), p. 1.

166. *Sefer Ha-Chukkim*, Number 51, (5 July 1950), p. 159.

167. “Text of Ben-Gurion’s Address Before the World Zionist Congress in Jerusalem”, *The New York Times*, (8 January 1961), pp. 52-53.

- 168.** D. Ben-Gurion, *Memoirs*, The World Publishing Company, New York, Cleveland, (1970), pp. 122, 162.
- 169.** “Zerubbabel, Book of”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 16 UR-Z, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), col. 1002.
- 170.** P. S. Mowrer, “The Assimilation of Israel”, *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 128, Number 1, (July, 1921), pp. 101-110, at 104. **See also:** B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: III The ‘Menace’ of the Polish Jew”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 4, (February, 1923), pp. 366-377, at 368; **and** “Radicalism among the Polish Jews”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 6, (April, 1923), pp. 591-601, at 593. **See also:** J. Drohojowski, *Brief Outline of the Jewish Problem in Poland*, Polish National Alliance of Brooklyn, U.S.A. (Zjednoczenie Polsko Narodowe), Brooklyn, New York, (1937), p. 22. **See also:** A. Eichmann, “Eichmann Tells His Own Damning Story”, *Life Magazine*, Volume 49, Number 22, (28 November 1960), pp. 19-25, 101-112; at 106; *see also:* “Eichmann’s Own Story: Part II”, *Life Magazine*, (5 December 1960), pp. 146-161.
- 171.** “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 331-332.
- 172.** “Messiah”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), cols. 1407-1417, at 1413.
- 173.** “Messianic Movements”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 1417-1427, at 1419.
- 174.** “Messianic Movements”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 1417-1427, at 1418.
- 175.** D. Ben-Gurion, quoted in: N. Goldmann, *The Jewish Paradox*, Grosset & Dunlap, New York, (1978), p. 99.
- 176.** “Carmichael, in Washington, Terms Arab Struggle Just”, *The New York Times*, (10 April 1970), p. 22.
- 177.** S. Delacourt, “Iranian President Denies Holocaust, Sparks Outrage”, *The Toronto Star*, (15 December 2005), p. A1.
- 178.** A. Einstein, “Unpublished Preface to a Blackbook”, *Out of My Later Years*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1950), pp. 258-259, at 259.
- 179.** D. Ben-Gurion, *Memoirs*, The World Publishing Company, New York, Cleveland, (1970), pp. 163-164.
- 180.** M. Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: The Armed Prophet*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, (1967), p. 69.
- 181.** M. Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: The Armed Prophet*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, (1967), p. 68.
- 182.** D. Ben-Gurion, quoted in: Y. Gelber, “Zionist Policy and the Fate of European Jewry (1939-1942)”, *Yad Vashem Studies*, Volume 13, Martyrs’ and Heroes Remembrance Authority, Jerusalem, (1979), pp. 169-210, at 199.
- 183.** D. Ben-Gurion, *Ba-Maarachah*, Volume 3, Tel-Aviv, (1948), pp. 200-211, English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 606-619, at 616.
- 184.** D. Ben-Gurion, *Ba-Maarachah*, Volume 3, Tel-Aviv, (1948), pp. 200-211, English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 606-619, at 607-608.
- 185.** K. Polkehn, “The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941”, *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 58; citing C. Sykes, *Crossroads to Israel*, London, (1965); *Kreuzwege nach Israel; die Vorgeschichte des jüdischen Staates*, C. H. Beck, München, (1967), p. 151.

- 186.** C. Weizmann, “The Key to Immigration”, *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), p. 41.
- 187.** T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and Wang, New York, (1993), p. 98.
- 188.** T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and Wang, New York, (1993), p. 129.
- 189.** D. Ben-Gurion, “On Ways of Our Policy”, *Report of the Congress of the World Council of Poaley Zion*, (Zurich, July 27-August 1937), Tel-Aviv, (1938), pp. 206-207. Cf. I. Shahak, “The ‘Historical Right’ and the Other Holocaust”, *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 10, Number 3, (Spring, 1981), pp. 27-34, at 30. N. Chomsky, *Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*, Second Revised Edition, South End Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (1999), p. 161.
- 190.** N. Chomsky, *Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*, Second Updated Edition, South End Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (1999), p. 161.
- 191.** D. Ben-Gurion, quoted in: M. Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: A Biography*, Delacorte Press, New York, (1978), p. 166.
- 192.** L. Rokach, *Israel’s Sacred Terrorism*, Third Edition, AAUG Press, Belmont Massachusetts, p. 41.
- 193.** N. Chomsky, *Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*, Second Updated Edition, South End Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (1999), p. 161.
- 194.** H. Sperl and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 1, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), p. 108.
- 195.** W. Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice*, Act 1, Scene 3, “Yes, to smell pork; to eat of the habitation which your prophet, the Nazarite, conjured the devil into! I will buy with you, sell with you, talk with you, walk with you, and so following; but I will not eat with you, drink with you, nor pray with you.”
- 196.** H. E. Barnes, *The Genesis of the World War: An Introduction to the Problem of War Guilt*, A.A. Knopf, New York, London, (1927), pp. 590-653; **and** *In Quest of Truth and Justice: De-bunking the War Guilt Myth*, National Historical Society, Chicago, (1928), pp. 30-34, 98-105. **See also:** A. Ponsonby, *Falsehood in War-Time, Containing an Assortment of Lies Circulated Throughout the Nations During the Great War*, G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd. London, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1928). A. J. Dawe, Letter to the Editor, “The Crime Of Louvain. Vivid Account By An Eye-Witness. **See also:** A Ruthless Holocaust. The Real Horrors Of War”, *The London Times*, (3 September 1914), p. 4. **See also:** J. Bryce, *Report of the Committee on alleged German outrages appointed by His Britannic Majesty's Government and presided over by the Right Hon. Viscount Bryce. Evidence and Documents laid before the Committee on alleged German outrages: (appendix to the Report).*, Printed Under the Authority of His Majesty’s Stationery Office, London, (1915); **French** *Rapport de la Commission d’Enquête sur les Atrocités Allemandes*, Darling & Son, London, (1915); **Italian** *Relazione della Commissione d’Inchiesta sulle Atrocità Tedesche*, Vincenzo Bartelli, Perugia, (1915), **Portuguese** *Relatorio da Comissão sobre as Barbaridades Atribuidas aos Alemães, nomeada pelo Governo de Sua Magestade Britannica presidida pelo Visconde Bryce*, Thomas Nelson & Sons, Paris, Edimburgo, (1915); **Spanish** *Informe Acerca de los Atentados Atribuidos á los Alemanes, Emitido por la Comisión Nombrada por el Gobierno de su Majéstad Británica y Presidida por el muy Honorable Vizconde Bryce*, Thomas Nelson & Sons, Paris, Edimburgo, (1915).
- 197.** G. Parker, “The United States and the War”, *Harper’s Magazine*, Volume 136, Number 814, (March, 1918), pp. 521-531, at 521-522.

198. Letter from M. Planck to A. Einstein of 4 October 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 121, Princeton University Press, (2004). Letter from H. Zangger to A. Einstein of 22 October 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 148, Princeton University Press, (2004).

199. A. Moszkowski, *Einstein: The Searcher*, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1921), pp. 12-15.

200. A. Moszkowski, *Einstein: The Searcher*, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1921), p. 19.

201. *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 110, 112, 113, 117, 121, 124, 127, 149, 151, 164, 165, etc., Princeton University Press, (2004). R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, World Publishing, New York, (1971), pp. 230-231.

202. A. Einstein, "Vom Relativitäts-Prinzip", *Vossische Zeitung*, Morning Edition, (26 April 1914), pp. 1-2; reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 1, Princeton University Press, (1996), pp. 3-5.

203. The published lecture was: A. Einstein, "Motive des Forschens", *Zu Max Plancks sechzigstem Geburtstag. Ansprachen, gehalten am 26. April 1918 in der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft von E. Warburg, M. v. Laue, A. Sommerfeld und A. Einstein*, C. F. Hofbuchhandlung, Karlsruhe, (1918), pp. 29-32; reprinted in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 54-59.

204. *See:* Letter from A. Einstein to A. Sommerfeld of 2 February 1916, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 186, Princeton University Press, (1998).

205. E. Freundlich, *Die Grundlagen der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie*, J. Springer, Berlin, (1916); English translation: *The Foundations of Einstein's Theory of Gravitation*, Cambridge University Press, (1920). **See also:** M. Schlick, *Raum und Zeit in der gegenwärtigen Physik. Zur Einführung in das Verständnis der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie*, Springer, Berlin, (1917); English translation: *Space and Time in Contemporary Physics: An Introduction to the Theory of Relativity and Gravitation*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1920). **See also:** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 105, 119, 222, 228, 234, 240, 249, 275, 285, 392, 393, Princeton University Press, (2004).

206. Letter from E. Freundlich to A. Einstein of 15 September 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 105, Princeton University Press, (2004).

207. Letter from A. Einstein to E. Freundlich of 19 September 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 106, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 89-90, at 89. Freundlich's fortunes changed after Einstein began to spread word of Lorentz's news that the English confirmed that a deflection of light at the limb of the sun had been measured. *See: The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 119, 168 and 194, Princeton University Press, (2004).

208. A. Einstein quoted in "Einstein, Too, Is Puzzled; It's at Public Interest", *The Chicago Tribune*, (4 April 1921), p. 6.

209. R. S. Shankland, "Conversations with Albert Einstein", *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 56. Also see Einstein's letters to Zangger of late December, 1919, and of January, 1920, in which he discusses the cult surrounding him.

210. A. Einstein, "On Receiving the One World Award", *Out of My Later Years*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1950); here quoted from: *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), pp. 146-147.

211. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 32, *see also:* pp. 110, 116-117.

212. Letter from A. Einstein to M. Besso of 12 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 207, Princeton

University Press, (2004), pp. 178-179, at 178.

213. “The Zionist Congress: Full Report of the Proceedings”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (3 September 1897), pp. 10-15, at 11.

214. Letter from P. Ehrenfest to A. Einstein of 9 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 203, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 173-175, at 174.

215. *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 227, 238, and 283, Princeton University Press, (2004).

216. *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 186, 187 and 216, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 5, Documents 492 and 506, Princeton University Press, (1993). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to P. Ehrenfest of 19 August 1914, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 34, Princeton University Press, (1998), pp. 56-57, especially p. 57, note 4. **See also:** E. Freundlich, “Über einen Versuch, die von A. Einstein vermutete Ablenkung des Lichtes in Gravitationsfeldern zu prüfen”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 193, (1913), cols. 369-372; **and** “Zur Frage der Konstanz der Lichtgeschwindigkeit”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 14, (1913), pp. 835-838; **and** “Über die Verschiebung der Sonnenlinien nach dem roten Ende auf Grund der Hypothesen von Einstein und Nordström”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 15, (1914), pp. 369-371; **and** “Über die Verschiebung der Sonnenlinien nach dem roten Ende des Spektrums auf Grund der Äquivalenzhypothese von Einstein”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 198, (1914), cols. 265-270; **and** *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 199, (1915), cols. 363-365; **and** “Über die Gravitationsverschiebung der Spektrallinien bei Fixsternen”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 16, (1915), pp. 115-117; **and** *Beobachtungs-Ergebnisse der Königlichen Sternwarte zu Berlin*, Number 15, (1915), p. 77; **and** “Über die Erklärung der Anomalien im Planetensystem durch die Gravitationswirkung interplanetarer Massen”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 201, (1915), cols. 49-56; **and** “Über die Gravitationsverschiebung der Spektrallinien bei Fixsternen”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 202, (1915), cols. 17-24; **and** “Über die Gravitationsverschiebung der Spektrallinien bei Fixsternen”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 202, (1916), cols. 17-24; **and** *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 202, (1916), col. 147; **and** “Die Grundlagen der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 4, (1916), pp. 363-372, 386-392; **and** *Die Grundlagen der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie*, Multiple Revised and Enlarged Editions; **and** “Über die singulären Stellen der Lösungen des n -Körper-Problems”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1918), pp. 168-188; **and** “Zur Prüfung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 7, (1919), pp. 629-636, 696; **and** “Über die Gravitationsverschiebung der Spektrallinien bei Fixsternen. II. Mitteilung”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 20, (1919), pp. 561-570.

217. Letter from M. Born to D. Hilbert of 23 November 1915, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, Cod. Ms. D. Hilbert 40 A: Nr. 11; the relevant part of which is reproduced in D. Wuensch, „zwei wirkliche Kerle“: *Neues zur Entdeckung der Gravitationsgleichungen der Allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie durch Albert Einstein und David Hilbert*, Termessos, Göttingen, (2005), pp. 73-74.

218. A. Einstein, “Die Feldgleichungen der Gravitation”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (1915), pp. 844-847.

219. H. A. Lorentz, “Electromagnetische Verschijselen in een Stelsel dat Zich met Willekeurige Snelheid, Kleiner dan die van Het Licht, Beweegt”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone*

Vergaderingen, Volume 12, (23 April 1904), pp. 986-1009; translated into English, “Electromagnetic Phenomena in a System Moving with any Velocity Smaller than that of Light”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam (Noninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam)*, 6, (May 27, 1904), pp. 809-831; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 5, pp. 172-197; a redacted and shortened version appears in *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), pp. 11-34; a German translation from the English, “Elektromagnetische Erscheinung in einem System, das sich mit beliebiger, die des Lichtes nicht erreichender Geschwindigkeit bewegt,” appears in *Das Relativitätsprinzip: eine Sammlung von Abhandlungen*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1913), pp. 6-26.

220. H. Poincaré, “Sur la Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Rendiconti del Circolo matimatico di Palermo*, Volume 21, (1906, submitted July 23rd, 1905), pp. 129-176; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 18-76; reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume IX, pp. 494-550; redacted English translation by H. M. Schwartz with modern notation, “Poincaré’s Rendiconti Paper on Relativity”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 39, (November, 1971), pp. 1287-1294; Volume 40, (June, 1972), pp. 862-872; Volume 40, (September, 1972), pp. 1282-1287; English translation by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov with modern notation, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 15-78.

221. W. de Sitter, “On the Bearing of the Principle of Relativity on Gravitational Astronomy”, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 71, (March, 1911), pp. 388-415.

222. Letter from A. Einstein to H. and M. Born of 27 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 284, Princeton University Press, (2004).

223. L. Pyenson, *The Young Einstein: The Advent of Relativity*, Adam Hilger, Boston, (1985), p. 82.

224. Political Zionist Theodor Herzl wrote on 12 June 1895, “Jewish papers! I will induce the publishers of the biggest Jewish papers (*Neue Freie Presse*, *Berliner Tageblatt*, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, etc.) to publish editions over there, as the *New York Herald* does in Paris.”—T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 84.

225. R. D. Carmichael, *The Theory of Relativity*, Mathematical Monographs No. 12, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, Chapman & Hall, Limited, London, (1920).

226. M. Schlick, *Space and Time in Contemporary Physics*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1920).

227. R. Drill, “Die Kultur der Haeckel-Zeit”, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, (18 August 1919); **and** “Nachwort”, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, (2 September 1919); **and** “Ordnung und Chaos. Ein Beitrag zum Gesetz von der Erhaltung der Kraft. I-II”, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, (30 November 1919 / 2 December 1919).

228. F. Kleinschrod, “Das Lebensproblem und das Positivitätsprinzip in Zeit und Raum und das Einsteinsche Relativitätsprinzip in Raum und Zeit”, *Frankfurter Zeitgemäße Broschuren*, Volume 40, Number 1-3, Breer & Thiemann, Hamm, Westphalen, (October-December, 1920), pp. 17, 47.

229. H. Dingler, *Die Grundlagen der Physik; synthetische Prinzipien der mathematischen Naturphilosophie*, Second Edition, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, (1923); **and** *Physik und Hypothese Versuch einer induktiven Wissenschaftslehre nebst einer kritischen Analyse der Fundamente der Relativitätstheorie*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1921); **and**

“Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Grundlagen der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 21, (1920), pp. 668-669.

230. F. A. Hayek, edited by S. Kresge and L. Wenar, *Hayek on Hayek: An Autobiographical Dialogue*, University of Chicago Press, (1994), pp. 48-49, 50-51.

231. J. Leveugle, *La Relativité, Poincaré et Einstein, Planck, Hilbert: Histoire véridique de la Théorie de la Relativité*, L’Harmattan, Paris, (2004).

232. M. Born, *My Life: Recollections of a Nobel Laureate*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1975), pp. 98, 130; **and** *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 1; **and** “Physics and Relativity”, *Physics in my Generation*, second revised edition, Springer, New York, (1969), p. 101. **See also:** J. Leveugle, “Hilbert et Poincaré”, *Poincaré et la Relativité : Question sur la Science*, Chapter 10, (2002), ISBN: 2-9518876-1-2, pp.147-230; **and** *La Relativité, Poincaré et Einstein, Planck, Hilbert: Histoire véridique de la Théorie de la Relativité*, L’Harmattan, Paris, (2004). **See also:** L. Pyenson, *The Young Einstein and the Advent of Relativity*, Bristol, Adam Hilger, (1985), pp. 103-104. **See also:** C. Reid, *Hilbert*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, (1970), pp. 100, 105.

233. *See, for example:* M. Born, “Zur Kinematik des starren Körpers im System des Relativitätsprinzips”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1910), pp. 161-179, at 161.

234. *See, for example:* M. Born, “Eine Ableitung der Grundgleichungen für die elektromagnetischen Vorgänge in bewegten Körpern vom Standpunkte der Elektronentheorie. Aus dem Nachlaß von Hermann Minkowski”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 68, (1910), pp. 526-551; **and** “Zur Kinematik des starren Körpers im System des Relativitätsprinzips”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1910), pp. 161-179.

235. Letter from M. Born to D. Hilbert of 23 November 1915, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, Cod. Ms. D. Hilbert 40 A: Nr. 11; the relevant part of which is reproduced in D. Wuensch, „zwei wirkliche Kerle“: *Neues zur Entdeckung der Gravitationsgleichungen der Allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie durch Albert Einstein und David Hilbert*, Termessos, Göttingen, (2005), pp. 73-74.

236. M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 5.

237. *See:* Letter from P. Lenard to J. Stark 8 September 1920 in A. Kleinert and C. Schönbeck, “Lenard und Einstein. Ihr Briefwechsel und ihr Verhältnis vor der Nauheimer Diskussion von 1920”, *Gesnerus*, Volume 35, Number 3/4, (1978), pp. 318-333, at 328-329.

238. D. Bronder, *Bevor Hitler kam: Eine historische Studie*, Hans Pfeiffer Verlag, Hannover, (1964), p. 204 (p. 211 in the 1974 edition). H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974); English translation *Adolf Hitler: Founder of Israel*, Modjeskis’ Society Dedicated to Preservation of Cultures, San Diego, (1997), pp. 4, 73.

239. “Personal-Glimpses: Einstein Finds the World Narrow”, *The Literary Digest*, (16 April 1921), pp. 33-34.

240. M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 41.

241. Letter from A. Einstein to Cambridge University Press of 27 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 285, Princeton University Press, (2004).

242. M. Born, *Die Relativitätstheorie Einsteins und ihre physikalischen Grundlagen: gemeinverständlich dargestellt*, J. Springer, Berlin, (1920).

243. M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), pp. 39-40.

244. M. Born, “Preface”, *Einstein’s Theory of Relativity*, Revised and Enlarged Edition, Dover, New York, (1962/1965).

245. “Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie” *Frankfurter Zeitung*, Number 46, (18 January 1920), p. 2; Number 61, (23 January 1920), p. 2; Number 82, (31 January 1920), p. 2.

246. M. Born, *Einstein’s Theory of Relativity*, Revised and Enlarged Edition, Dover, New York, (1962/1965), p. 246.

247. M. Born, *My Life: Recollections of a Nobel Laureate*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1975), pp. 195-196.

248. Letter from F. Ehrenhaft to A. Einstein of 6 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 196, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 166-167, at 166. Einstein rejected the offer *ibid.* Document 211; and expressed reservations about Ehrenhaft’s personality, *ibid.* Documents 269 and 270.

249. J. Crelinsten, “Einstein, Relativity, and the Press”, *The Physics Teacher*, (February, 1980), pp. 115-122; **and** “Physicists Receive Relativity: Revolution and Reaction”, *The Physics Teacher*, (March, 1980), pp. 187-193. On the reaction of the British to the idea that Newton had been defeated, see A. F. Lindemann’s letter to A. Einstein of 23 November 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 174, Princeton University Press, (2004).

250. “Introduction to the Abridged Edition”, in A. Einstein, *The World As I See It*, translated by A. Harris, Citadel, New York, (1993), p. vii.

251. O. Lodge, “The New Theory of Gravity”, *Nineteenth Century*, (December, 1919); and “The Ether Versus Relativity”, *Fortnightly Review*, (January, 1920). Cf. “A New Physics Based on Einstein”, *The New York Times*, (25 November 1919), p. 17. *The London Times*, (8 November 1919), p. 12, col. *d*; (25 November 1919), p.16, col. *d*; (29 November 1919), p. 9, col. *d*; (13 December 1919), p. 13, col. *a*. Lodge also published an article in *Nature*, Volume 106, (17 February 1921). Confer: J. Crelinsten, “Physicists Receive Relativity: Revolution and Reaction”, *The Physics Teacher*, (March, 1980), pp. 187-193.

252. Letter from A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz of 21 September 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 108, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 92-93, at 93.

253. Letter from A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz of 21 September 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 108, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 92-93, at 93.

254. D. K. Buchwald, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 106.

255. A. Einstein quoted in M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 8.

256. Ilse Einstein to Georg Nikolai, English translation by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 545, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 565. See also: D. Overbye, *Einstein in Love: A Scientific Romance*, Viking, New York, (2000), pp. 343, 404, note 22. See also: A. Einstein to Ilse Einstein, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 536, Princeton University Press, (1998).

257. Letter from P. Ehrenfest to A. Einstein of 2 September 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 98, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 81-82, at 82.

258. Letter from A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz of 19 January 1920, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 265, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 220.

259. Letter from A. S. Eddington to A. Einstein, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 271, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 224-225, at 224.

- 260.** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 146 and 177, Princeton University Press, (2004).
- 261.** B. Russell, *The A B C of Relativity*, Harper & Brothers, New York, London, (1925).
- 262.** Letter from A. Einstein to H. Delbrück of 26 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 235.
- 263.** Menyhért (Melchior) Palágyi, *Neue Theorie des Raumes und der Zeit*, Engelmanns, Leipzig, (1901); reprinted in *Zur Weltmechanik, Beiträge zur Metaphysik der Physik von Melchior Palágyi, mit einem Geleitwort von Ernst Gehrcke*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1925).
- 264.** V. Varičak, “Primjedbe o jednoj interpretaciji geometrije Lobačevskoga”, *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, Volume 154, (1903), pp. 81-131; **and** “O transformacijama u ravnini Lobačevskoga” *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, Volume 165, (1906), pp. 50-80; **and** “Opcéna jednadzba pravca u hiperbolnoj ravnini”, *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, Volume 167, (1906), pp. 167-188; **and** “Bemerkung zu einem Punkte in der Festrede L. Schlesingers über Johann Bolyai”, *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 16, (1907), pp. 320-321; **and** “Prvi osnivači neeuklidske geometrije”, *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, Volume 169, (1908), pp. 110-194; **and** “Beiträge zur nichteuclidischen Geometrie”, *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 17, (1908), pp. 70-83; **and** “Anwendung der Lobatschefskijschen Geometrie in der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 93-96; **and** “Die Relativtheorie und die Lobatschefskijsche Geometrie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 287-294; **and** “Die Reflexion des Lichtes an bewegten Spiegeln”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 586-587; **and** “Zum Ehrenfestschen Paradoxon”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 12, (1911), pp. 169-170; **and** “Интерпретација теорије релативности у геометрији Лобачевскова”, *Glas, Srpska Kraljevska Akademija*, Volume 83, (1911), pp. 211-255; **and** *Glas, Srpska Kraljevska Akademija*, Volume 88, (1911); **and** “Über die nichteuclidische Interpretation der Relativitätstheorie”, *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 21, (1912), pp. 103-127; **and** *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, (1914), p. 46; (1915), pp. 86, 101; (1916), p. 79; (1918), p. 1; (1919), p. 100.
- 265.** Cf. J. Stachel, Ed., *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Princeton University Press, (1989), p. 110.
- 266.** Letter from A. Einstein to H. Zangger of 24 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 233, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 197-198.
- 267.** A. Kleinert and C. Schönbeck, “Lenard und Einstein. Ihr Briefwechsel und ihr Verhältnis vor der Nauheimer Diskussion von 1920”, *Gesnerus*, Volume 35, Number 3/4, (1978), pp. 318-333.
- 268.** D. K. Buchwald, et al. Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 110.
- 269.** A. Hermann, *Briefwechsel. Sechzig Briefe aus dem goldenen Zeitalter der modernen Physik*, Schwabe & Co., Basel, Stuttgart, (1968), p. 65.
- 270.** Letter from A. Einstein to A. Stodola of 31 March 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 16, Princeton University Press, (2004).
- 271.** A. Einstein quoted in R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, The World Publishing Company, (1971), p. 261; referencing A. Einstein to A. Sommerfeld, in A. Hermann. *Briefwechsel. 60 Briefe aus dem goldenen Zeitalter der modernen Physik*, Schwabe & Co., Basel, Stuttgart, (1968), p. 69.

272. A. v. Brunn, quoted in: K. Hentschel, Ed., A. Hentschel, Ed. Ass. and Trans., *Physics and National Socialism: An Anthology of Primary Sources*, Birkhäuser, Basel, Boston, Berlin, (1996), p. 11.

273. From the preface of *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein* translated by: H. Goenner, “The Reaction to Relativity Theory in Germany, III: ‘A Hundred Authors against Einstein’”, J. Earman, M. Janssen, J. D. Norton, Eds., *The Attraction of Gravitation: New Studies in the History of General Relativity*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (1993), p. 251.

274. A. v. Brunn, quoted in: K. Hentschel, Ed., A. Hentschel, Ed. Ass. and Trans., *Physics and National Socialism: An Anthology of Primary Sources*, Birkhäuser, Basel, Boston, Berlin, (1996), p. 14.

275. C. J. Bjerknes, *Albert Einstein: The Incurable Plagiarist*, XTX Inc., Downer Grove, Illinois, (2002). **See also:** P. Langevin, “Le Physicien”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 20, Number 5, (September, 1913), pp. 675-718. **See also:** H. A. Lorentz, “Deux mémoires de Henri Poincaré sur la physique mathématique”, *Acta Mathematica*, Volume 38, (1921), pp. 293-308; reprinted in *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 683-695; and Volume 11, (1956), pp. 247-261. **See also:** W. Pauli, “Relativitätstheorie”, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen*, Volume 5, Part 2, Chapter 19, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1921), pp. 539-775; English translation by G. Field, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, London, Edinburgh, New York, Toronto, Sydney, Paris, Braunschweig, (1958). **See also:** H. Thirring, “Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper und spezielle Relativitätstheorie”, *Handbuch der Physik*, Volume 12 (“Theorien der Elektrizität Elektrostatik”), Springer, Berlin, (1927), pp. 245-348, especially 264, 270, 275, 283. **See also:** S. Guggenheimer, *The Einstein Theory Explained and Analyzed*, Macmillan, New York, (1929). **See also:** J. Mackaye, *The Dynamic Universe*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1931). **See also:** J. Le Roux, “Le Problème de la Relativité d’Après les Idées de Poincaré”, *Bulletin de la Société Scientifique de Bretagne*, Volume 14, (1937), pp. 3-10. **See also:** Sir Edmund Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume II, Philosophical Library Inc., New York, (1954), especially pp. 27-77; and “Albert Einstein”, *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the Royal Society*, Volume 1, (1955), pp. 37-67. **See also:** G. H. Keswani, “Origin and Concept of Relativity, Parts I, II & III”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 15, Number 60, (February, 1965), pp. 286-306; Volume 16, Number 61, (May, 1965), pp. 19-32; Volume 16, Number 64, (February, 1966), pp. 273-294; and Volume 17, Number 2, (August, 1966), pp. 149- 152; Volume 17, Number 3, (November, 1966), pp. 234-236. **See also:** G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, “Intimations of Relativity before Einstein”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (December, 1983), pp. 343-354. **See also:** G. B. Brown, “What is Wrong with Relativity?”, *Bulletin of the Institute of Physics and the Physical Society*, Volume 18, Number 3, (March, 1967), pp. 71-77. **See also:** C. Cuvaj, “Henri Poincaré’s Mathematical Contributions to Relativity and the Poincaré Stresses”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 36, (1968), pp. 1109-1111. **See also:** C. Giannoni, “Einstein and the Lorentz-Poincaré Theory of Relativity”, *PSA: Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*, Volume 1970, (1970), pp. 575-589. JSTOR link:

<<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0270-8647%281970%291970%3C575%3AEATLTO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Z>>

See also: J. Mehra, *Einstein, Hilbert, and the Theory of Gravitation*, Reidel, Dordrecht, Netherlands, (1974). **See also:** W. Kantor, *Relativistic Propagation of Light*, Coronado

Press, Lawrence, Kansas, (1976). **See also:** R. McCormach, "Editor's Forward", *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences*, Volume 7, (1976), pp. xi-xxxv. **See also:** H. Ives, D. Turner, J. J. Callahan, R. Hazelett, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers*, Devin-Adair Co., Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979). **See also:** J. Leveugle, "Henri Poincaré et la Relativité", *La Jaune et la Rouge*, Volume 494, (April, 1994), pp. 29-51; **and** *La Relativité, Poincaré et Einstein, Planck, Hilbert: Histoire véridique de la Théorie de la Relativité*, L'Harmattan, Paris, (2004). **See also:** A. A. Logunov, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995); **and** *The Theory of Gravity*, Nauka, Moscow, (2001); **and** Анри Пуанкаре и ТЕОРИЯ ОТНОСИТЕЛЬНОСТИ, Наука, Москва, (2004). An English translation of this book will soon appear as: *Henri Poincaré and the Theory of Relativity*. **See also:** E. Gianetto, "The Rise of Special Relativity: Henri Poincaré's Works before Einstein", *ATTI DEL XVIII CONGRESSO DI STORIA DELLA FISICA E DELL'ASTRONOMICA*, pp. 172-207; URL:

<<http://www.brera.unimi.it/Atti-Como-98/Giannetto.pdf>>

See also: S. G. Bernatosian, *Vorovstvo i obman v nauke*, Erudit, St. Petersburg, (1998), ISBN: 5749800059. **See also:** U. Bartocci, *Albert Einstein e Olinto De Pretto: La vera storia della formula piu famosa del mondo*, Societa Editrice Andromeda, Bologna, (1999). **See also:** Jean-Paul Auffray, *Einstein et Poincaré: sur les Traces de la Relativité*, Le Pommier, Paris, (1999). Y. Brovko, "Einshteinianstvo—agenturnaya set mirovovo kapitala", *Molodaia Gvardiia*, Number 8, (1995), pp. 66-74, at 70. Юрий Бровко, "Эйнштейнианство — агентурная сеть Мирового капитала", *Молодая гвардия*, № 8, (1995), сс. 66-74; **and** Y. Brovko, "Razгром einshteinianstvo", *Priroda i Chelovek. Svet*, Number 7, (2002), pp. 8-10. Юрий Бровко, "Разгром эйнштейнианства", *Природа и Человек. Свет*, № 7, (2002), сс. 8-10. URL:

<<http://medograd.narod.ru/einstein.html>>

276. E. Gehrcke, "Zur Kritik und Geschichte der neueren Gravitationstheorien", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 51, (1916), pp. 119-124; reprinted *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp.40-44.

277. Letter from A. Einstein to W. Wien of 17 October 1916, translated by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 267, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 255.

278. M. Besso letter to Einstein of 5 December 1916, translated by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 283, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 271. F. Adler letter to Einstein of 23 March 1917, translated by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 316, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 308.

279. H. Vaihinger, *Die Philosophie des Als Ob, System der theoretischen, praktischen und religiösen Fiktionen der Menschheit auf Grund eines idealistischen Positivismus. Mit einem Anhang über Kant und Nietzsche*, Reuther & Reichard, Berlin, (1911); English translation by C. K. Ogden, *The Philosophy of 'As If'*, Harcourt, Brace & Company, Inc., New York, (1925); reprinted Routledge & K. Paul, London, (1965). **See also:** C. K. Ogden, *Bentham's Theory of Fictions*, K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., (1932).

280. H. Goenner, "The Reaction to Relativity Theory. I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920", *Science in Context*, Volume 6, Number 1, (1993), pp. 107-133, at 111.

- 281.** “Einstein Ignores Capt. See”, *The New York Times*, (18 October 1924), p. 17.
- 282.** “Challenges Prof. Einstein: St. Paul Professor Asserts Relativity Theory Was Advanced in 1866”, *The New York Times*, (10 April 1921), p. 21. **See also:** “Einstein Charged with Plagiarism”, *New York American*, (11 April 1921). **See also:** “Einstein Refuses to Debate Theory”, *New York American*, (12 April 1921).
- 283.** R. Drill, “Die Kultur der Haeckel-Zeit”, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, (18 August 1919); **and** “Nachwort”, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, (2 September 1919); **and** “Ordnung und Chaos. Ein Beitrag zum Gesetz von der Erhaltung der Kraft. I-II”, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, (30 November 1919 / 2 December 1919).
- 284.** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 198, 199 and 222, Princeton University Press, (2004).
- 285.** *The New York Times*, (4 April 1922), p. 21.
- 286.** “Cardinal Doubts Einstein”, *The New York Times*, (8 April 1929), p. 4. **See also:** “Einstein Ignores Cardinal”, *The New York Times*, (9 April 1929), p. 10. **See also:** “Cardinal Opposes Einstein”, *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, (8 April 1929), p. 33. **See also:** “Cardinal Hits at Einstein Theory”, *The Minneapolis Journal*, (8 April 1929). **See also:** “Cardinal Gives Further Views on Einstein”, *Boston Evening American*, (12 April 1929). **See also:** “Cardinal Warns Against Destructive Theories”, *The Pilot* [Roman Catholic Newspaper, Boston], (13 April 1929), pp. 1-2. **See also:** “Vatican Paper Praises Critic of Dr. Einstein”, *The Minneapolis Morning Journal*, (24 May 1929).
- 287.** *The New York Times*, (24 February 1936), p. 7. **See also:** “Calls Ether Reality; Differs with Einstein; Proof is Submitted”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (23 February 1936).
- 288.** M. Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge*, University of Chicago Press, (1958), p. 13. **See also:** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, (1982), pp. 113-114. **See also:** W. Broad and N. Wade, *Betrayers of the Truth: Fraud and Deceit in the Halls of Science*, Simon & Schuster, New York, (1982), p. 139.
- 289.** **See also:** “Einstein Theory will be Refuted by an American”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (24 October 1929), p. 18. **See also:** “Calls Ether Reality; Differs with Einstein; Proof is Submitted”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (23 February 1936).
- 290.** R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57; **and** “Conversations with Albert Einstein. II”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 41, Number 7, (July, 1973), pp. 895-901.
- 291.** R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 54.
- 292.** A. Einstein quoted in R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, The World Publishing Company, (1971), p. 261; referencing A. Einstein to A. Sommerfeld, in A. Hermann. *Briefwechsel. 60 Briefe aus dem goldenen Zeitalter der modernen Physik*, Schwabe & Co., Basel, Stuttgart, (1968), p. 69.
- 293.** A. Einstein, *Neues Wiener Journal*, (29 September 1920). C. Kirsten and H. J. Treder, *Albert Einstein in Berlin 1913-1933*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, Volume 2, (1979), pp. 139, 205.
- 294.** Quoted in: P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), p. 296.
- 295.** Quoted in: P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), pp. 278-279; *see also:* pp. 304, 314-315.
- 296.** W. Marr, *Der Sieg des Judenthums über das Germanenthum*, Rudolph Costenoble, Bern, (1879); English translation in: R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 76-93, at 85-86.

- 297.** H. Biellohlawek, "Yes, We Want to Annihilate the Jews!" in R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 115-120.
- 298.** P. L. Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner*, Princeton University Press, (1990), p. 267.
- 299.** Cf. "The Modern Jews", *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 347.
- 300.** A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *Israel chez les nations: Les Juifs et l'antisémitisme*, C. Lévy, Paris, (1893); English translation by F. Hellman, *Israel among the Nations: A Study of the Jews and Antisemitism*, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, W. Heinemann, London, (1895), pp. 43-48.
- 301.** B. Lazare, *Antisemitism: Its History and Causes*, (1894); *L'Antisémitisme, son Histoire et ses Causes*, L. Chailley, Paris, (1894); cf. "Salluste", "Autour d'une Polémique: Marxism et Judaïsme", *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 16, (15 August 1928), pp. 795-834, at 825. **See also:** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 76-77.
- 302.** J. Robison, *Proofs of a Conspiracy Against All the Religions and Governments of Europe, Carried on in the Secret Meetings of Free Masons, Illuminati, and Reading Societies, Collected from Good Authorities*, Fourth Edition, Printed and Sold by George Forman, New York, (1798), pp. 6-8.
- 303.** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 69, 79-81, 103, 111-112.
- 304.** G. Goyau, *L'Idée de Patrie et l'Humanitarisme: Essai d'Histoire Française, 1866-1901*, Perrin et Cie., Paris, (1902). **See also:** Abbé Barruel *Mémoires pour Servir à l'Histoire du Jacobinisme*, De l'Imprimerie Française, Chez P. Le Boussonier, Londres, (1797-1798); English translation by R. Clifford: *Memoirs Illustrating the History of Jacobism*, Printed for the translator by T. Burton and co., London, (1798). **See also:** P. Benoit, *La Franc-Maçonnerie*, Société Générale de Librairie Catholique, Palmé, Paris, (1886). **See also:** E. Cahill, *Freemasonry and the Anti-Christian Movement*, M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin, (1929).
- 305.** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 76-77.
- 306.** A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *Israel chez les nations: Les Juifs et l'antisémitisme*, C. Lévy, Paris, (1893); English translation by F. Hellman, "The Jew is the product of His Tradition and His Law", *Israel among the Nations: A Study of the Jews and Antisemitism*, Chapter 6, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, W. Heinemann, London, (1895), pp. 123-147.
- 307.** P. S. Mowrer, "The Assimilation of Israel", *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 128, Number 1, (July, 1921), pp. 101-110, at 107.
- 308.** *See, as but one example:* "Soviet 'Orgies'", *The London Times*, (31 August 1922), p. 7.
- 309.** *Exodus* 34:11-17. *Psalms* 72. *Isaiah* 1:9; 2:1-4; 6:9-13; 9:6-7; 10:20-22; 11:4, 9-12; 17:6; 37:31-33; 41:9; 42; 43; 44; 61:6. *Jeremiah* 3:17; 33:15-16. *Ezekiel* 20:38; 25:14. *Daniel* 12:1, 10. *Amos* 9:8-10. *Obadiah* 1:18. *Micah* 4:2-3; 5:8. *Zechariah* 8:20-23; 14:9. *Romans* 9:27-28; 11:1-5.
- 310.** "The Modern Jews", *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 361-365.
- 311.** "The Modern Jews", *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 342-343.
- 312.** P. S. Mowrer, "The Assimilation of Israel", *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 128, Number 1, (July, 1921), pp. 101-110, at 104.

- 313.** M. Hess, *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918/1943), pp. 35-37, 40.
- 314.** I. Shahak, *Jewish History, Jewish Religion: The Weight of Three Thousand Years*, Pluto Press, London, Boulder, Colorado, (1994).
- 315.** *Scientific American*, Volume 1, Number 42, (9 July 1846), p. 3.
- 316.** “Rothschild”, *The Encyclopædia Britannica*, Volume 21, Ninth Edition, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1886), p. 3.
- 317.** G. E. Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), p. 208.
- 318.** B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286, at 267, 277-278.
- 319.** B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286, at 272, 278.
- 320.** G. E. Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), pp. 222-224. R. McNair Wilson, *Monarchy or Money Power*, Eyre and Spottiswoode Ltd., London, (1933), pp. 81-83.
- 321.** G. E. Griffin, “The Rothschild Formula”, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Chapter 11, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), pp. 217-234.
- 322.** G. E. Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), p. 374. Griffin cites C. Siem, *La Vieille France*, Number 216, (17-24 March 1921), pp. 13-16.
- 323.** “Benjamin, Judah Philip”, *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 2, The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., New York, (1940), pp. 181-184, at 182.
- 324.** “Benjamin, Judah Philip”, *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 2, The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., New York, (1940), pp. 181-184. B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: I How They Came to This Country”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 2, (December, 1922), pp. 144-161, at 153.
- 325.** Refer to the articles in *The Vancouver Sun* on 2 May 1934 and 4? and 5? May 1934 relating to Gerald Grattan McGeer’s speech before the Canadian House of Commons, and the *Vancouver Daily Province* of 2 May 1934. **See also:** G. G. McGeer, *The Conquest of Poverty; or, Money, humanity and Christianity*, Garden City Press, Gardenvale, Quebec, (1935).
- 326.** “Phillips, Isaac”, *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 8, The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., New York, (1942), p. 492.
- 327.** G. E. Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), pp. 209, 213, 457-459.
- 328.** Refer to the articles in *The Vancouver Sun* on 2 May 1934 and 4? and 5? May 1934 relating to Gerald Grattan McGeer’s speech before the Canadian House of Commons, and the *Vancouver Daily Province* of 2 May 1934. **See also:** G. G. McGeer, *The Conquest of Poverty; or, Money, humanity and Christianity*, Garden City Press, Gardenvale, Quebec, (1935).
- 329.** *Congressional Record: Proceedings and Debates of the 76th Congress: Second Session*, Volume 85, Part 1, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., (1939), p. 1068.
- 330.** H. N. Casson, “The Jew in America”, *Munsey’s Magazine*, Volume 34, Number 4, (January, 1906), pp. 381-395, at 393. **See also:** S. Oppenheim, *The Jews and Masonry in the*

United States before 1810, Samuel Oppenheim, New York, (1910); reprinted from: *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, Number 19, (1910). **See also:** “Bush, Solomon”, *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 2, The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., New York, (1940), p. 608. **See also:** *Jewish Calendar for Soldiers and Sailors: 1943-1944: 5704*, National Jewish Welfare Board, New York, (1943), pp. 15-17. **See also:** “Freemasonry”, *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 5 Dreyfus-Brisac—Goat, Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York, (1903), pp. 503-505. **See also:** “Freemasons”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 7 FR-HA, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), cols. 122-125.

331. G. Kisch, *In Search of Freedom: A History of American Jews from Czechoslovakia: 1592-1948*, Edward Goldston, London, (1948). **See also:** M. Rechcigl, Jr., *Early Jewish Immigrants in America from the Czech Historic Lands and Slovakia:*

<http://www.jewishgen.org/BohMor/early_immig.html>

332. “Freemasons”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 7 FR-HA, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), cols. 122-125, at 124.

333. “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 338-339.

334. G. Halsell, *Prophecy and Politics: Militant Evangelists on the Road to Nuclear War*, Lawrence Hill & Co., Westport, Connecticut, (1986); **and** *Prophecy and Politics: The Secret Alliance Between Israel and the U. S. Christian Right*, Lawrence Hill & Co., Westport, Connecticut, (1986); **and** *Forcing God’s Hand: Why Millions Pray for a Quick Rapture—and Destruction of Planet Earth*, Crossroads International Pub., Washington, D.C., (1999), Amana Publications, Beltsville, Maryland, (2003); **Turkish:** M. Acar, H. Özmen, et al. translators, *Tanri’yi kiyamete zorlamak: Armagedon, Hristiyan kiyametçiliği ve İsrail = Forcing God’s Hand : Why Millions Pray for a Quick Rapture: And Destruction of Planet Earth*, Kim, Ankara, (2002).

335. J. Prinz, *The Secret Jews*, Random House, New York, (1973), p. 110.

336. “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 339-340.

337. G. E. Griffin, “The Rothschild Formula”, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Chapter 11, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), pp. 217-234.

338. H. Morgenthau, “The Jews in Poland”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 43, Number 5, (April, 1922), pp. 617-630, at 624.

339. M. Selzer, Editor, “Statement by the Holy Gerer Rebbe, the Sfas Emes, on Zionism (1901)”, *Zionism Reconsidered: The Rejection of Jewish Normalcy*, Macmillan, New York, (1970), pp. 19-22, at 19-20.

340. H. Morgenthau, “The Jews in Poland”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 43, Number 5, (April, 1922), pp. 617-630, at 628.

341. H. Morgenthau, “Zionism a Surrender, Not a Solution”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 42, Number 3, (July, 1921), pp. i-viii, at viii.

342. H. Morgenthau, “The Jews in Poland”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 43, Number 5, (April, 1922), pp. 617-630, at 623, 630.

343. “3379 (XXX). Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination”, General Assembly—Thirtieth Session, Resolutions adopted on the reports of the Third Committee, 2400th Plenary Meeting, (10 November 1975), pp. 83-84. URL:

<http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/30/ares30.htm>

Confer: Zionism & Racism: Proceedings of an International Symposium, International

Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Tripoli, (1977), pp. 249-250. Cf. F. A. Sayegh, *Zionism: A Form of Racism And Racial Discrimination* "Four Statements Made at the U.N. General Assembly, Office of the Permanent Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations, (1976), pp. 40-41. URL:

http://www.ameu.org/uploads/sayegh_march1_03.pdf

After the fall of the Soviet Union, which had long sponsored racial integration (*see*: "Circus" a motion picture released in 1936 directed by Grigori Alexandrov starring Lyubov Orlova), the U. N. withdrew this resolution under great pressure from Zionists.

344. Letter from A. Einstein to P. Ehrenfest of 22 March 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 10, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 9-10, at 10.

345. E. Gehrcke, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 51, (1916), pp. 119-124; **and** "Über den Äther", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 20, (1918), pp. 165-169; **and** "Zur Diskussion über den Äther", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 21, (1919), pp. 67-68; **and** "Was beweisen die Beobachtungen über die Richtigkeit der Relativitätstheorie?", *Zeitschrift für technische Physik*, Volume 1, (1920), p. 123; **and** "Die Relativitätstheorie, eine wissenschaftliche Massensuggestion", Lecture Delivered in the Berlin Philharmonic on August 24th, 1920, published in *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 54-68; **and** "Zur Frage der Relativitätstheorie", *Kosmos*, Special Edition on the Theory of Relativity, (1921), pp. 296-298.

346. A. Einstein to A. Sommerfeld, in A. Hermann, Ed., *Albert Einstein / Arnold Sommerfeld: Briefwechsel: Sechzig Briefe aus dem goldenen Zeitalter der modernen Physik*, Schwabe & Co., Basel, Stuttgart, (1968), p. 69.

347. L. Infeld, *Quest—An Autobiography*, Chelsea, New York, (1980), p. 258.

348. O. Kraus, "Zum Kampf gegen Einstein und die Relativitätstheorie", *Bohemia*, Prag, (2 September 1920); **and** "Zur Lehre vom Raum und Zeit" Nachlaß Brentano, *Kantstudien*, Volume 25, (1920); **and** "Fiktion und Hypothese in der Relativitätstheorie", *Schmidt's Annalen der Philosophie*, Volume 2, Number 3, (1921), pp. 335-396; **and** "Die Verwechslungen von 'Beschreibungsmittel' und 'Beschreibungsobjekt' in der Einsteinschen speziellen und allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie", *Kantstudien, Philosophische Zeitschrift der Kant-Gesellschaft, Berlin*, Volume 26, (1921), pp. 454-486; **and** "Einwendungen gegen Einstein: Philosophische Betrachtungen gegen die Relativitätstheorie", *Neue Freie Presse*, Wien, (11 September (192?)), Number 20130, pp. 2ff.; **and** "Die Unmöglichkeit der Einsteinschen Bewegungslehre", *Die Umschau*, Volume 25, (12 November 1921), pp. 681-684; **and** *Zur Relativitäts Theorie*, Meiner, Leipzig, (1921); **and** *Lotos*, Volume 70, (1922), pp. 333ff.; **and** *Offene Briefe an Albert Einstein und Max von Laue über die gedanklichen Grundlagen der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie*, Braumüller, Wien, (1925); **and** "Zur Relativitätstheorie", *Frankfurter Zeitung*, Number 163, 3, Volume 3, reprinted in *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländers Verlag, Leipzig, (1931), pp. 17-19.

349. A. Einstein quoted in "Einstein on Arrival Braves Limelight for Only 15 Minutes", *The New York Times*, (12 December 1930), pp. 1, 16, at 16.

350. L. Infeld, quoted in R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, World Publishing, New York, (1971), pp. 256-257; Clark cites: L. Infeld, *Die Wahrheit*, (March 15-16, 1969).

351. P. Frank, *Einstein: His Life and Times*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1947), p. 161.

352. P. Frank, *Einstein: His Life and Times*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1947), p. 167.

- 353.** Letter from M. v. Laue to A. Einstein of 18 October 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 145, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 122-124, at 123.
- 354.** A. Sommerfeld to A. Einstein, in A. Hermann, *Briefwechsel. 60 Briefe aus dem goldenen Zeitalter der modernen Physik*, Schwabe & Co., Basel, Stuttgart, (1968), p. 71. Prof. Lewis Elton stresses this point.
- 355.** H. Goenner, "The Reaction to Relativity Theory. I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920", *Science in Context*, Volume 6, Number 1, (1993), pp. 107-133, at 118.
- 356.** H. Goenner, "The Reaction to Relativity Theory. I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920", *Science in Context*, Volume 6, Number 1, (1993), pp. 107-133, at 118-119.
- 357.** P. Frank, *Einstein: His Life and Times*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1967), p. 161.
- 358.** M. Born, "Physics and Relativity", *Physics in my Generation*, second revised edition, Springer, New York, (1969), p. 106.
- 359.** P. Lenard, *England und Deutschland zur Zeit des grossen Krieges*, Heidelberg, (1914).
- 360.** D. Bronder, *Bevor Hitler kam: Eine historische Studie*, Hans Pfeiffer Verlag, Hannover, (1964), p. 204 (p. 211 in the 1974 edition). H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974); English translation *Adolf Hitler: Founder of Israel*, Modjeskis' Society Dedicated to Preservation of Cultures, San Diego, (1997), pp. 4, 73.
- 361.** G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), pp. xi-xiv.
- 362.** F. K. Wiebe, *Deutschland und die Judenfrage*, M. Müller & Sohn, Hrsg. im Auftrage des Instituts zum Studium der Judenfrage, Berlin, (1939); **English** translation, *Germany and the Jewish Problem*, Published on behalf of the Institute for the Study of the Jewish Problem, Berlin, (1939); **French** translation, *L'Allemagne et la Question Juive*, Berlin, Edité sous les auspices de l'Institut pour l'étude de la question juive, (1939); **Spanish** translation, *Alemania y la Cuestión Judía*, Publicado por encargo del Instituto para el Estudio de la Cuestión Judía, Berlín, (1939).
- 363.** W. W. Zuelzer, *The Nicolai Case: A Biography*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit, (1982). Christoph Friedrich Nicolai was a friend of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing and Moses Mendelssohn; and a critic of Kant, Fichte, Goethe and Schiller. I do know if Georg Friedrich Nicolai was a namesake.
- 364.** Letter from Ilse Einstein to Georg Nicolai of 22 May 1918, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 545, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** D. Overbye, *Einstein in Love: A Scientific Romance*, Viking, New York, (2000), pp. 343, 404, note 22. **See also:** A. Einstein to Ilse Einstein, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 536, Princeton University Press, (1998).
- 365.** R. Recouly, "Contrasts Between the French and Russian Revolutions", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 1, (November, 1922), pp. 67-80, at 78-80.
- 366.** G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), pp. xvii-xix.
- 367.** P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), p. 284. **See also:** L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), pp. 30, 98, 101-105.
- 368.** A. Rohling, *Der Talmudjude: zur beherzigung für Juden und Christen aller Stände*, Adolph Russel, Münster, (1871); English translation: *The Jew According to the Talmud*,

Sons of Liberty, Metairie, Louisiana, (1978); **and** *Der Antichrist und das Ende der Welt: Zur Erwägung für alle Christen*, B. Herder, St. Louis, (1875); **and** *Der Katechismus des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, für Juden und Protestanten, den auch Katholiken lesen dürfen*, F. Kirchheim, Mainz, (1877); **and** *Franz Delitzsch und die Judenfrage, Antwortlich beleuchtet. . .*, J.B. Reinitz, Prag, (1881); **and** *Fünf Briefe über den Talmudismus und das Blutritual der Juden*, Prag, (1881); **and** *Die Polemik das Menschenopfer des Rabbinismus; eine wissenschaftliche Antwort ohne Polemik für die Rabbiner und ihre Genossen*, Bonifacius-Druckerei, Paderborn, (1883); **and** *Meine Antworten an die Rabbiner, oder Fünf Briefe über den Talmudismus und das Blut-Ritual der Juden*, Cyrillo-Method'sche Buchdruckerei, Prag, (1883); **and** *Die Ehre Israels: Neue Briefe an die Juden*, Prag, (1889); **and** *Erklärung der Apokalypse des h. Johannes des grossen Propheten von Patmos*, Verlag der Liebfrauen-Druckerei (Dr. W. Wingerth), München, (1895); **and** *Aufnach Zion!: oder die grosse Hoffnung Israels und aller Menschen*, Jos. Kosel'schen Buchhandlung, Kempten, (1901); **and** *Das Judentum nach neurabbinischer Darstellung der Hochfinanz Israels*, G. Schuh, München, (1903). **See also:** A. Rohling and M. de Lamarque, *Le juif-talmudiste*, A. Vromant, Paris, Bruxelles, (1888). **See also:** A. Rohling and E. A. Drumont, *Le juif selon le Talmud*, Albert Savine, Paris, (1889); German translation: *Prof. Dr. Aug. Rohling's Talmud-Jude*, T. Fritsch, Leipzig, (1891). **See also:** J. A. Eisenmenger, A. Rohling and J. Ecker, *Die Sittenlehre des Juden. Auszug aus dem Talmud (Schulchan-Aruch)*, Deutschen Schutz- und Trutz-bund, Landesverein Bayern, Nürnberg, (1920).

Rohling's work is derivative of J. A. Eisenmenger, *Des bey 40. Jahr von der Judenschafft mit Arrest bestrickt gewesene, nunmehr aber durch Autorität eines hohen Reichsvicariats relaxirte Johann Andreä Eismengers. . . Entdecktes Judenthum, oder: Gründlicher und wahrhafter Bericht: welchergestalt die verstockte Juden die hochheilige Dreyeinigkeit, Gott Vater, Sohn und Heiligen Geist, erschrecklicher Weise lästern und verunehren, die heil. Mutter Christi verschmähen, das Neue Testament, die Evangelisten und Aposteln, die christliche Religion spöttlich durchziehen, und die gantze Christenheit auf das äusserste verachten und verfluchen; dabey noch viele andere, bishero unter den Christen entweder gar nicht, oder nur zum Theil bekant-gewesene Dinge und grosse Irrthüme der jüdischen Religion und Theologie, wie auch viel lächerliche und kurzweilige Fabeln und andere ungereimte Sachen an den Tag kommen*, Frankfurt, (1700); **and** *Entdecktes Judenthum oder, Gründlicher und wahrhafter Bericht, welchergestalt die verstockte Juden die hochheilige Drey-einigkeit. . . verunehren, die heil. Mutter Christi verschmähen. . . die christliche Religion spöttisch durchziehen, und die gantze Christenheit. . . verachten und verfluchen; dabey noch viel andere. . . nur zum Theil bekant gewesene Dinge und grosse Irrthüme der jüdischen Religion und Theologie, wie auch viel lächerliche und kurzweilige Fabeln. . . an den Tag kommen. Alles aus ihren eigenen. . . Büchern. . . kräftiglich erwiesen, und in zweyen Theilen verfasset. . . Allen Christen zur treuhertzigen Nachricht verfertiget, und mit vollkommenen Registern versehen*, Königsberg in Preussen, (1711); English translation by J. P. Stehelin, *The Traditions of the Jews: With the Expositions and Doctrines of the Rabbins Contain'd in the Talmud and Other Rabbinical Writings*, Volume 1, Printed for G. Smith, London, (1732); **and** *The Traditions of the Jews: Or the Doctrines and Expositions Contain'd in the Talmud and other Rabbinical Writings*, Printed for G. Smith, London, (1742-1743). **See also:** E. L. Roblik J. A. Eisenmenger, *Jüdische Augen-Gläser, das ist: Ein. . . denen Juden zur Erkannnuss des wahren Glaubens vorgesteltes Buch. Allwo in dem ersten Theil (wider die jüdische irrende Lehr) durch die heil. Schrift des Alten und Neuen Testaments, gantz klar bewiesen wird, dass Jesus Christus seye ein wahrer Sohn des lebendigen Gottes. . . In dem anderten Theil aber, wird aus dem jüdischen Buch (Talmud genannt) bewiesen, dass der jetzige jüdische Glauben, ein falscher und gottslästerlicher*

Glauben seye. . ., Gedruckt bey M.B. Swobodin, Brünn, (1741-1743). **See also:** C. Anton and J. A. Eisenmenger, *Einleitung in die rabbinischen Rechte, dabey insonderheit von einem Judeneide, wie solchen eine christliche Obrigkeit am verbindlichsten abnehmen kann umständlich ist gehandelt worden*, F.W. Meyer, Braunschweig, (1756).

Bloch accused Rohling of forging sources, and Rohling sued Bloch for libel, though the suit was dropped: A. Rohling and J. S. Bloch, *Acten und Gutachten in dem Prozesse Rohling contra Bloch*, Volume 1, M. Breitenstein, Wien, (1890); **and** *Anhang zum ersten Bande der Acten und Gutachten in dem Prozesse Rohling contra Bloch*, W. Breitenstein's Verlagsbuchhandlung, Wien, (1890).

Rohling had numerous critics: J. S. Bloch, *Gegen die Anti-semiten. Eine Streitschrift*, D. Löwy, Wien, (1882); and *Prof. Rohling und das Wiener Rabbinat: oder, "Die arge Schelmerei"*, Im Selbstverlage des Verfassers, Wien, (1882); and *Des k.k. prof. Rohling neueste Fälschungen*, Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung, Wien (1883); and *Einblicke in die Geschichte der Entstehung der talmudischn Literatur*, D. Löwy, Wien, (1884); and *Einblicke in die Geschichte der Entstehung der talmudischen Literatur*, D. Löwy, Wien, (1884); and *Talmud und Judenthum in der Oesterr. Volksvertretung*, Oesterreichische Wochenschrift, Wien, (1900); and *Talmud und Judenthum in der Oesterr Volksvertretung*, Oesterreichische Wochenschrift, Wien, (1900); and *"Kol Nidre" und seine Entstehungsgeschichte*, Löwit, Wien, (1918); and *Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben*, R. Löwit, Wien, Leipzig, (1922); English translation: *My Reminiscences*, Arno Press, New York, (1973). See also: M. L. Rodkinson and J. S. Bloch, *Wahrheit gegen Lüge*, Wien, (1886). **See also:** Rabbiner Dr. Kroner, *Entstelltes Unwahres und Erfundenes in dem „Talmudjuden“ Professor Dr. August Rohling's*, E. Obertüsch, Münster, (1871); which is described in: "Litarischer Wochenbericht", *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, Volume 35, Number 34, (22 August 1871), pp. 673-674, at 674. **See also:** J. E. Fraenkel, P. Mansch, Philipp and A. Rohling, *Erwiderung auf die vom Professor Dr. Aug. Rohling Verfasste Schrift der Talmudjude*, Kugel, Lemberg, (1874). **See also:** P. Bloch, *Prof. Rohling's Falschmünzerei auf talmudischem Gebiet*, L. Merzbach, Posen, (1876). **See also:** F. Delitzsch, *Rohlings Talmudjude beleuchtet*, Dörffling & Franke, Leipzig, (1881); **and** *Schachmatt den Blutlügen Rohling & Justus*, A. Deichert, Erlangen, (1883); **and** *Was d. Aug. Rohling beschworen hat und beschwören will*, Dörffling & Franke, Leipzig, (1883). **See also:** J. Kopp, *Zur Judenfrage nach den Akten des Prozesses Rohling-Bloch*, Leipsic, (1886). **See also:** C. A. Victor, *Prof. Dr. Rohling, die Judenfrage und die öffentliche Meinung*, T. Fritsch, Leipzig, (1887). **See also:** *Acten und Gutachten in dem Prozesse Rohling contra Bloch*, M. Breitenstein, Wien, (1890). **See also:** *Jüdische Presse*, Number 46, (1902).

369. See: D. Kimhi, *Hesronot ha-Shas: ve-hu sefer kevutsat ha-hashmatot: kolel kol ha-devarim ha-haserim be-Talmud Bavli ve-Rashi ve-Tosafot ve Rosh veha-G. a. u-fe. ha-mishnayot leha-Rambam; mini az nidpesu `al yede `Emanu'el Bambashti be-'Amsterdam shenat 410 ve-khen hashlamat ha-hisaron hidushe halakhot. . .*, Jos. Schlesinger, Budapest, (1865). **See also:** G. Dalman, *Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar, and the Liturgy of the Synagogue*, Deighton Bell, Cambridge, (1893). **See also:** W. Popper, *The Censorship of Hebrew Books: Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Columbia University*, Knickerbocker Press, New York, (1899). **See also:** M. A. Hoffman II, *Judaism's Strange Gods*, Independent History and Research, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, (2000), pp. 70-72.

370. P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), p. 326.

371. G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York,

(1918).

372. Letter from A. Einstein to P. Ehrenfest of 22 March 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 10, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 9-10, at 10.

373. Letter from A. Einstein to E. Zürcher of 15 April 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 23, Princeton University Press, (2004).

374. G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), pp. 84-89.

375. "Jews", *Great Soviet Encyclopedia: A Translation of the Third Edition*, Volume 2, Macmillan, New York, (1973), pp. 292-293, at 293.

376. I. Zangwill, "Is Political Zionism Dead? Yes", *The Nation*, Volume 118, Number 3062, (12 March 1924), pp. 276-278, at 276.

377.

<<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/lindbergh/filmmore/reference/primary/desmoinesspeech.html>>

378. <<http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf>>

379. G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), p. 276.

380. J. B. Bishop, *Theodore Roosevelt and His Time Shown in His Own Letters*, Volume 2, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, (1920), pp. 104-110, at 109.

381. B. Wasserstein, *The Secret Lives of Trebitsch Lincoln*, Yale University Press, (1988), pp. 273, 284.

382. I. T. T. Lincoln, *The Autobiography of an Adventurer*, H. Holt and Co., New York, (1932). H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974); English translation *Adolf Hitler: Founder of Israel*, Modjeskis' Society Dedicated to Preservation of Cultures, San Diego, (1997), picture page between pages 35 and 36 and pp. 50-52, 62-63. B. Wasserstein, *The Secret Lives of Trebitsch Lincoln*, Yale University Press, (1988).

383. B. Wasserstein, *The Secret Lives of Trebitsch Lincoln*, Yale University Press, (1988), p. 271.

384. "LURIA, ISAAC BEN SOLOMON, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), cols. 572-578, at 576.

385. "The Modern Jews", *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 356-357.

386. "Ex-Spy Warns World of Buddhist Wrath", *The New York Times*, (20 December 1939), p. 5

387. B. Wasserstein, *The Secret Lives of Trebitsch Lincoln*, Yale University Press, (1988), p. 72. Wasserstein cites: *Parliamentary Debates (Hansard). House of Commons Official Report*, Series 5, Volume 17, H.M.S.O., London, (1910), cols. 1135-1139.

388. B. Wasserstein, *The Secret Lives of Trebitsch Lincoln*, Yale University Press, (1988), p. 245.

389. J. Stern, *Terror in the Name of God: Why Religious Militants Kill*, Ecco, New York, (2003), pp. 85-106.

390. <http://www.haaretzdaily.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo=280279>

391.

<<http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1143498911316&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FPrinter>>

392. W. W. Reade, *The Martyrdom of Man*, Trübner & Co., London, (1872).

- 393.** “Messiah”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), cols. 1407-1417, at 1410.
- 394.** Josephus, “Antiquities of the Jews”, Book XX, Chapter 8, *The Works of Flavius Josephus: Comprising the Antiquities of the Jews; a History of the Jewish Wars; and Life of Flavius Josephus, Written by Himself*, S. S. Scranton Co., Hartford, Connecticut, (1916), pp. 609-613, at 612-613.
- 395.** L. Rapoport, *Stalin’s War Against the Jews: The Doctors’ Plot and the Soviet Solution*, Free Press, New York, (1990), pp. 139, 208-210.
- 396.** S. S. Montefiore, *Stalin: The Court of the Red Star*, Vintage, New York, (2003), p. 267.
- 397.** Epiphanius, translated by F. Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, Volume 1, 26.16.7, E. J. Brill, New York, (1987), p. 97.
- 398.** “Jews, Modern”, *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Volume 13, Ninth Edition, Charles Scribner’s Sons, (1881), p. 680.
- 399.** H. N. Casson, “The Jew in America”, *Munsey’s Magazine*, Volume 34, Number 4, (January, 1906), pp. 381-395, at 394.
- 400.** Cyprian, “The Treatises of Cyprian”, Treatise VI, *The Anti-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*, Volume 5, Christian Literature Publishing Company, New York, (1886), pp. 465-467.
- 401.** D. Ben-Gurion, quoted in: M. Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: A Biography*, Delacorte Press, New York, (1978), p. 166.
- 402.** W. Churchill, “Zionism Versus Bolshevism. A Struggle for the Soul of the Jewish People.”, *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, (8 February 1920), p. 5.
- 403.** C. I. Scofield, Editor, *The Scofield reference Bible. The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments. Authorized version, with a new system of connected topical references to all the greater themes of Scripture, with annotations, revised marginal renderings, summaries, definitions, and index; to which are added helps at hard places, explanations of seeming discrepancies, and a new system of paragraphs*, Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, (1909), p. 25.
- 404.** “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 331.
- 405.** Y. Harkabi, *Israel’s Fateful Hour*, Harper & Row, New York, (1988), pp. 149-150.
- 406.** L. Ginzberg, *The Legend of the Jews*, Volume 3, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1911/1954), pp. 61-63.
- 407.** J. Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica: Das ist Jüden Schul ; Darinnen der gantz Jüdische Glaub und Glaubensubung. . . grundlich erkläret*, Basel, (1603); as translated in the 1657 English edition, *The Jewish Synagogue: Or An Historical Narration of the State of the Jewes, At this Day Dispersed over the Face of the Whole Earth*, Printed by T. Roycroft for H. R. and Thomas Young at the Three Pidgeons in Pauls Church-Yard, London, (1657), p. 323.
- 408.** “Gentile”, *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 5, Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York, (1903), pp. 615-626, at 617. **See also:** A. Cohen, “Soferim 41a”, *The Minor Tractates of the Talmud Massektoth Ketannoth in Two Volumes*, Volume 1, The Socino Press, London, (1965), pp. 287-288, especially note 50.
- 409.** M. Berenbaum, *After Tragedy and Triumph: Essays in Modern Jewish Thought and the American Experience*, Cambridge University Press, (1990), p.7.
- 410.** “Esau” is also referred to as “Edom” *Genesis* 36:8.
- 411.** I. Velikovsky, *Ages in Chaos*, Volume 1, Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, (1952), p. 95.

- 412.** D. B. Ball and G. W. Ball, *The Passionate Attachment: America's Involvement with Israel, 1947 to the Present*, W. W. Norton, New York, (1992), pp. 204-206.
- 413.** A. Ben Isaiah, et al., *The Pentateuch and Rashi's Commentary: A Linear Translation into English*, S. S. & R. Publishing Company, Brooklyn, New York, (1949), pp. 187-188.
- 414.** Y. Harkabi, *Israel's Fateful Hour*, Harper & Row, New York, (1988), p. 149.
- 415.** I Samuel 15:9. Esther 3:1. G. Dalman, *Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar, and the Liturgy of the Synagogue*, Deighton Bell, Cambridge, (1893), pp. 39-40.
- 416.** Marc-Alain Ouaknin, *Symbols of Judaism*, Barnes & Noble Books, New York, (2000), p. 84.
- 417.** J. I. de Medrano, *La Silva curiosa*, Marc Orry, Paris, (1608), pp. 157-157. Cf. L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), pp. 81-82.
- 418.** I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), pp. 9, 11. J. Prinz, *The Secret Jews*, Random House, New York, (1973), pp. 111-112.
- 419.** B. J. Hendrick, "Radicalism among the Polish Jews", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 6, (April, 1923), pp. 591-601, at 597.
- 420.** R. Recouly, "Contrasts Between the French and Russian Revolutions", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 1, (November, 1922), pp. 67-80, at 78.
- 421.** R. Recouly, "Contrasts Between the French and Russian Revolutions", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 1, (November, 1922), pp. 67-80, at 75, 78.
- 422.** S. S. Montefiore, *Stalin: The Court of the Red Star*, Vintage, New York, (2003), pp. 304-306.
- 423.** A. C. Sutton, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, Buccaneer Books, Cutchogue, New York, (1974), pp. 186-187.
- 424.** M. Nordau, *The Interpretation of History*, Willey Book Company, New York, (1910), pp. 290-297; which is an English translation by M. A. Hamilton of *Der Sinn der Geschichte*, C. Duncker, Berlin, (1909).
- 425.** S. S. Montefiore, *Stalin: The Court of the Red Star*, Vintage, New York, (2003), pp. 305-306.
- 426.** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), p. 247.
- 427.** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 247-248, see also: pp. 87-88.
- 428.** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 252-254.
- 429.** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 256-257.
- 430.** M. A. Hoffman II, *Judaism's Strange Gods*, Independent History and Research, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, (2000), pp. 108-109.
- 431.** I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), pp. 9, 11. J. Prinz, *The Secret Jews*, Random House, New York, (1973), pp. 111-112.
- 432.** J. Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica: Das ist Jüden Schul ; Darinnen der gantz Jüdische Glaub und Glaubensbung. . . grundlich erkläret*, Basel, (1603); as translated in the 1657 English edition, *The Jewish Synagogue: Or An Historical Narration of the State of the Jewes, At this Day Dispersed over the Face of the Whole Earth*, Printed by T. Roycroft for H. R. and Thomas Young at the Three Pidgeons in Pauls Church-Yard, London, (1657), pp. 243-245.
- 433.** Y. Harkabi, *Israel's Fateful Hour*, Harper & Row, New York, (1988), pp. 149-150.

- 434.** Voltaire in English translation in R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D.C. Heath, Toronto, (1991), p. 46.
- 435.** Y. Harkabi, *Israel's Fateful Hour*, Harper & Row, New York, (1988), pp. 149-150.
- 436.** S. M. Hersh, *The Samson Option: Israel's Nuclear Arsenal and American Foreign Policy*, Random House, New York, (1991).
- 437.** *Exodus* 34:11-17. *Psalms* 72. *Isaiah* 1:9; 2:1-4; 6:9-13; 9:6-7; 10:20-22; 11:4, 9-12; 17:6; 37:31-33; 41:9; 42; 43; 44; 61:6. *Jeremiah* 3:17; 33:15-16. *Ezekiel* 20:38; 25:14. *Daniel* 12:1, 10. *Amos* 9:8-10. *Obadiah* 1:18. *Micah* 4:2-3; 5:8. *Zechariah* 8:20-23; 14:9. *Romans* 9:27-28; 11:1-5.
- 438.** V. Ostrovsky and C. Hoy, *By Way of Deception*, St. Martin's Paperbacks, New York, (1990), p. 53. **See also:** V. Ostrovsky, *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad's Secret Agenda*, Harper Paperbacks, New York, (1994).
- 439.** *Exodus* 34:11-17. *Psalms* 72. *Isaiah* 1:9; 2:1-4; 6:9-13; 9:6-7; 10:20-22; 11:4, 9-12; 17:6; 37:31-33; 41:9; 42; 43; 44; 61:6. *Jeremiah* 3:17; 33:15-16. *Ezekiel* 20:38; 25:14. *Daniel* 12:1, 10. *Amos* 9:8-10. *Obadiah* 1:18. *Micah* 4:2-3; 5:8. *Zechariah* 8:20-23; 14:9. *Romans* 9:27-28; 11:1-5.
- 440.** M. Higger, *The Jewish Utopia*, Lord Baltimore Press, Baltimore, (1932), pp. 20, 37-39.
- 441.** T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and Wang, New York, (1993), p. 407.
- 442.** H. Sperl and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 1, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), p. 110.
- 443.** *From:* A. Nadler, "Last Exit to Brooklyn: The Lubavitcher's Powerful and Preposterous Messianism", *The New Republic*, (4 May 1992), pp. 27-35, at 33. Nadler appears to quote from: R. A. Foxbrunner, *Habad: The Hasidism of R. Shneur Zalman of Lyady*, University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, (1992).
- 444.** Y. Sheleg, "A dark reminder of the Dark Ages", *Haaretz.com*, (28 June 2005).
- 445.** "Gentile", *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York, (1903), pp. 615-626, at 618 and 621.
- 446.** G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), p. 531.
- 447.** *See also:* J. Kuttub, "West Bank Arabs Foresee Expulsion", *The New York Times*, (1 August 1983), p. A15.
- 448.** D. J. Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*, Knopf, New York, (1996). **See also:** É. Durkheim, "Germany above All" *The German Mental Attitude and the War*, Librairie Armand Colin, Paris, (1915). **See also:** "By a German", *I Accuse! (J'Accuse!)*, Grosset & Dunlap, New York, (1915). **See also:** W. F. Barry, *The World's Debate: An Historical Defence of the Allies*, George H. Doran, New York, (1917). **See also:** W. T. Hornaday, *A Searchlight on Germany: Germany's Blunders, Crimes and Punishment*, American Defense Society, New York, (1917). **See also:** D. W. Johnson, *Plain Words from America: A Letter to a German Professor*, London, New York, Toronto, Hodder & Stoughton, (1917).
- 449.** H. Stern, *KZ-Lügen: Antwort auf Goldhagen*, FZ-Verlag, München, Second Edition, (1998), ISBN: 3924309361; **and** *Jüdische Kriegserklärungen an Deutschland: Wortlaut, Vorgeschichte, Folgen*, FZ-Verlag, München, Second Edition, (2000), ISBN: 3924309507.
- 450.** M. Hess, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English: "Fourth Letter", "Note III" and "Note IV", *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918), pp. 56-57, 240-244.

- 451.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 1, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), p. 100.
- 452.** G. H. Schodde, *The Book of Enoch: Translated from the Ethiopic, with Introduction and Notes*, Warren F. Draper, Andover, (1882), p. 98. Note that *Genesis* 4:17 gives a different lineage for Enoch than *Genesis* 5:18-24, and that in the former, Enoch is the son of Cain!
- 453.** Voltaire in English translation in R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D.C. Heath, Toronto, (1991), p. 46.
- 454.** M. A. Hoffman II, *Judaism's Strange Gods*, Independent History and Research, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, (2000), pp. 110-111.
- 455.** Epiphanius, translated by F. Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, Volume 1, 26.4.1-26.5.6, E. J. Brill, New York, (1987), pp. 85-87.
- 456.** "Albigenses", *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume 1, Robert Appleton Company, (1907), pp. 267-269, at 269.
- 457.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 1, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), pp. 108-110.
- 458.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 2, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), p. 311.
- 459.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 3, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), p. 63.
- 460.** H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 3, The Soncino Press, New York, (1933), p. 132.
- 461.** G. Dalman, *Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar, and the Liturgy of the Synagogue*, Deighton Bell, Cambridge, (1893), p. 40. Though work is given an ancient attribution by its "discoverer", the Muhammadans are also mentioned in *Zohar*, II, 32a. Some consider the author to have been divinely inspired, some say the work evolved over time, some say the work is a fabrication—in any event, it is an now a very old writing and was very influential in Jewish political movements like the Frankists.
- 462.** J. Neusner, *The Tosefta: Translated from the Hebrew: Fourth Division: Neziqin (The Order of Damages)*, Volume 4, Ktav Publishing House Inc., New York, (1981), p. 342. **See also:** *Sanhedrin* 57a. **See also:** *Abodah Zarah* 26b.
- 463.** Selections from these texts are found in: M. G. Reddish, *Apocalyptic Literature: A Reader*, Abingdon Press, Nashville, (1990).
- 464.** Cyprian, Twelfth Treatise, "Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews", First Book, Testimony 19, *The Anti-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*, Volume 5, Christian Literature Publishing Company, New York, (1886), p. 512.
- 465.** *Exodus* 34:11-17. *Psalms* 72. *Isaiah* 1:9; 2:1-4; 6:9-13; 9:6-7; 10:20-22; 11:4, 9-12; 17:6; 37:31-33; 41:9; 42; 43; 44; 61:6. *Jeremiah* 3:17; 33:15-16. *Ezekiel* 20:38; 25:14. *Daniel* 12:1, 10. *Amos* 9:8-10. *Obadiah* 1:18. *Micah* 4:2-3; 5:8. *Zechariah* 8:20-23; 14:9. *Romans* 9:27-28; 11:1-5.
- 466.** R. Mewes, "Geschichtliche Entwicklung der Relativitäts- oder Raumzeitlehre", Chapter 4, "Wissenschaftliche Begründung der Raumzeitlehre oder Relativitätstheorie (1884-1894) mit einem geschichtlichen Anhang", *Gesammelte Arbeiten von Rudolf Mewes*, Volume 1, Rudolf Mewes, Berlin, (1920), pp. 48-78, at 78.
- 467.** *See, for example*, On the occasion of Einstein's 50th birthday, "Die Relativitätstheorie und der dialektische Materialismus", *Arbeiterstimme*, (1929), which is quoted by B. Thüring, "Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen", *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, Volume 4, (1940), pp. 134-162, at 144-145. Republished as: *Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren*

- Möglichkeiten und Ursachen*, Dr. Georg Lüttke Verlag, Berlin, (1941).
- 468.** Cf. C. Weizmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1949).
- 469.** S. Mohorovičić, *Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie und ihr mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Charakter*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1923), pp. 52-53.
- 470.** A. Einstein to P. Ehrenfest, (6 December 1918), *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part B, Document 664, Princeton University Press, (1998), pp. 960-961.
- 471.** A. Einstein to E. Zürcher, (15 April 1919), *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 23, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 35-36, at 36.
- 472.** A. Einstein to H. Born, (31 August 1919), *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 97, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 142-144, at 143.
- 473.** A. Einstein to the *Neue Freie Presse*, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 193, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 273.
- 474.** Letter from A. Einstein to the Borns of 27 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 284, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 386-390, at 387.
- 475.** R. Romain, *La Conscience de l'Europe*, Volume 1, pp. 696ff. English translation from A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein: A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), pp. 365-367. **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to R. Romain of 15 September 1915, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 118, Princeton University Press, (1998); **and** Letter from A. Einstein to R. Romain of 22 August 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 374, Princeton University Press, (1998).
- 476.** Letter from A. Einstein to Paul Ehrenfest of 22 March 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 10, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 9-10, at 10.
- 477.** Letter from A. Einstein to R. W. Lawson of 26 December 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 234, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** A. Einstein, "Welcoming Address to Paul Colin", *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 27, Princeton University Press, (2002). **See also:** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 222, 230, 237, 249, 275, 297 and 331, Princeton University Press, (2004).
- 478.** R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 129-130, at 129.
- 479.** Cf. S. Mohorovičić, *Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie und ihr mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Charakter*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1923), p. 53. Einstein stated in the *Jüdische Pressezentral*, Number 111, (21 September 1920), that it irked him to read that he was a German citizen of Jewish faith. He stated that he was not a German citizen, but was a Jew. Cf. B. Thüring, *Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen*, Dr. Georg Lüttke Verlag, Berlin, (1941), pp. 24-25.
- 480.** D. K. Buchwald, et al., Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 417-419. A. Einstein, "Zuschriften an die Herausgeber: Zur Abwehr", *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 9, (1921), p. 219. **See also:** L. Fabre's response to A. Einstein's objections: L. Fabre, *Une Nouvelle Figure du Monde: Les Théories d'Einstein*, Payot, Paris, (1922), pp. 15-16.
- 481.** D. K. Buchwald, et al., Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 417-419.
- 482.** E. Gehrcke, *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie: Kulturhistorisch-psychologische Dokumente*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), p. 67.

483. “Time, Space, and Gravitation”, *The London Times*, (28 November 1919), pp. 13-14. **See also:** “Meine Antwort”, *Berliner Tageblatt*, Morgen Ausgabe, (27 August 1920), pp. 1-2. **See also:** “Einstein and Newton”, *The London Times*, (14 June 1921), p. 8. **See also:** “Wie ich Zionist wurde”, *Jüdische Rundschau*, (21 June 1921), pp. 351-352; English translation by A. Engel, “How I became a Zionist”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 57, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 234-237. Einstein stated in the *Jüdische Pressezentral*, Number 111, (21 September 1920), that it irked him to read that he was a German citizen of Jewish faith. He stated that he was not a German citizen, but was a Jew. Confer: B. Thüning, *Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen*, Dr. Georg Lüttke Verlag, Berlin, (1941), pp. 24-25.

484. G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), p. 531.

485. A. Einstein, *The World As I See It*, Citadel, New York, (1993), p. 91.

486. R. P. Oliver, “Liberalism”, *America’s Decline: The Education of a Conservative*, Londinium Press, London, (1981).

487. English translation, B. v. Suttner, *Ground Arms!* = “Die Waffen nieder!” *A Romance of European War*, A.C. McClurg & Co., Chicago, (1906). **See also:** B. v. Suttner, *Martha’s Kinder: eine Fortsetzung zu “Die Waffen nieder!”*, E. Pierson, Dresden, (1903).

488. “Time, Space, and Gravitation”, *The London Times*, (28 November 1919), pp. 13-14. **See also:** “Meine Antwort”, *Berliner Tageblatt*, Morgen Ausgabe, (27 August 1920), pp. 1-2. **See also:** L. Fabre, *Une Nouvelle Figure du Monde: Les Théories d’Einstein*, Payot & Cie, Paris, (1921), pp. 15-18. **See also:** “Einstein and Newton”, *The London Times*, (14 June 1921), p. 8. **See also:** “Wie ich Zionist wurde”, *Jüdische Rundschau*, (21 June 1921), pp. 351-352; English translation by A. Engel, “How I became a Zionist”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 57, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 234-237. Einstein stated in the *Jüdische Pressezentral*, Number 111, (21 September 1920), that it irked him to read that he was a German citizen of Jewish faith. He stated that he was not a German citizen, but was a Jew. Confer: B. Thüning, *Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen*, Dr. Georg Lüttke Verlag, Berlin, (1941), pp. 24-25. **See also Einstein’s private correspondence, for example:** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 10, 28, 36, 78, 79, 80, 92, 94, 96 and 108, Princeton University Press, (2004).

489. Letter from A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz of 26 April 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 28, Princeton University Press, (2004). Letter from A. Einstein to W. de Haas of 9 May 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 36, Princeton University Press, (2004).

490. Letter from A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz of 21 September 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 108, Princeton University Press, (2004).

491. P. G. Nutting, “National Prestige in Scientific Achievement”, *Science*, Volume 48, (1918), pp. 605-608.

492. “America and German Science”, *Nature*, Volume 102, (1919), pp. 446-447.

493. Letter from M. Born to A. Einstein of 28 October 1920, M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), pp. 43-45.

494. Letter from A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz of 1 August 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 80, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 67-68, at 68. See also Document 108, the letter from Einstein to Lorentz of 21 September 1919, at pages 92–93.

- 495.** A. Einstein, *Thoughts on Reconciliation*, Deutscher Gesellig-Wissenschaftlicher Verein von New York, New York, (1920), pp. 10-11; facsimile republished in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 47, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 360-364.
- 496.** A. Einstein quoted in: H. Gutfreund, "Albert Einstein and the Hebrew University", J. Renn, Editor, *Albert Einstein Chief Engineer of the Universe: One Hundred Authors for Einstein*, Wiley-VCH, Berlin, (2005), pp. 314-318, at 315.
- 497.** A. Einstein quoted in: H. Gutfreund, "Albert Einstein and the Hebrew University", J. Renn, Editor, *Albert Einstein Chief Engineer of the Universe: One Hundred Authors for Einstein*, Wiley-VCH, Berlin, (2005), pp. 314-318, at 316.
- 498.** A. Einstein quoted in *Vossische Zeitung*, Morning Edition, Supplement 4, (29 August 1920), p. 1. English translation from, D. K. Buchwald, et. al. Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), Note 1, p. 357.
- 499.** A. Einstein quoted in R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, The World Publishing Company, (1971), p. 261; referencing A. Einstein to A. Sommerfeld, in A. Hermann, *Briefwechsel. 60 Briefe aus dem goldenen Zeitalter der modernen Physik*, Schwabe & Co., Basel, Stuttgart, (1968), p. 69.
- 500.** A biased and heavily redacted version of the discussion appeared in: *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 21, (1920), pp. 666-668. That this version is incomplete and biased is proven in: P. Lenard, *Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation*, Third Edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1921); **and** "Zur zweiten Auflage. Ein Mahnwort an deutsche Naturforscher.", *Über Äther und Uräther*, Second Edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1922), pp. 5-10. E. Gehrcke, "Die Relativitätstheorie auf dem Naturforschertage in Nauheim", *Umschau, Wochenschrift über die Fortschritte in Wissenschaften und Technik*, Volume 25, (1921), p. 99; **and** "Zur Relativitätsfrage", *Die Umschau*, Volume 25, (1921), p. 227. *Berliner Tageblatt*, Evening Edition, (24 September 1920), p. 3. *Vossische Zeitung*, Evening Edition, (24 September 1920), p. 1-2.
- 501.** M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 41.
- 502.** J. Riem, "Amerika über Einstein", *Deutsche Zeitung*, Abend Ausgabe, (1 July 1921).
- 503.** From A. Reuter Dahl, *The Minneapolis Sunday Tribune*, (22 May 1921). Reuter Dahl translates parts of "Professor Einsteins „Triumphzug“ durch Amerika", *Luzerner Neueste Nachrichten*, (22 April 1921).
- 504.** Rudolf Peters picked up on the ridiculous title "Albertus Maximus". See: *The Collected papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 388, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 523, note 2.
- 505.** A. Fürst and A. Moszkowski, *Das Buch der 1000 Wunder*, A. Langen, München, (1916), pp. 263-264.
- 506.** E. Gehrcke, *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 16-17.
- 507.** P. Lenard, *Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation*, Third Edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1921), Note 1, p. 39.
- 508.** D. Eckart and A. Hitler, *Der Bolschewismus von Moses bis Lenin: Zwiegespräch zwischen Adolf Hitler und mir*, Hoheneichen-Verlag, München, (1924); English translation by W. L. Pierce, "Bolshevism from Moses to Lenin", *National Socialist World*, (1966). URL: <<http://www.jrbooksonline.com/DOCs/Eckart.doc>> p. 7. J. Klatzkin, *Krisis und Entscheidung im Judentum; der Probleme des modernen Judentums*, Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, (1921). Heinrich Class under the pseudonym Daniel Frymann, *Wenn ich der Kaiser wär': politische Wahrheiten und Notwendigkeiten*, Dieterich, Leipzig, (1912); English translation, R. S. Levy, "If I were the Kaiser / Daniel Freymann", *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, Chapter 14, D.C. Heath, Toronto, (1991).

509. D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), p. 254.

510. R. L. Hartt, "New York and the Real Jew", *Independent* (New York), (25 June 1921). Cf. "Jews Are Silent, the National Voice Is Heard", *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT*, (30 July 1921).

511. *Confer*: A. Unsöld, "Albert Einstein — Ein Jahr danach", *Physikalische Blätter*, Volume 36, (1980), pp.337-339; **and** Volume 37, Number 7, (1981), p. 229. L. R. B. Elton, "Einstein, General Relativity, and the German Press, 1919-1920", *Isis*, Volume 77, Number 1, (March, 1986), pp. 95-103; **and** "Letters: Einstein and Germany", *Physics Today*, Volume 40, Number 7, (July, 1987), pp. 15, 106. W. Krause, "Letters: Einstein and Germany", *Physics Today*, Volume 40, Number 7, (July, 1987), pp. 106, 108. H. Goenner, "The Reaction to Relativity Theory I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920", *Science in Context*, Volume 6, (1993), pp. 107-133. M. Janssen *et al*, Editors, "Einstein's Encounters with German Anti-Relativists", *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7 (Hardbound), Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 101-113.

512. Cf. D. K. Buchwald, et al. Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), p.108.

513. S. Grundmann, "Das moralische Antlitz der Anti-Einstein-Liga", *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Technischen Universität Dresden*, Volume 16, pp. 1623-1626.

514. F. Kleinschrod, "Das Lebensproblem und das Positivitätsprinzip in Zeit und Raum und das Einsteinsche Relativitätsprinzip in Raum und Zeit", *Frankfurter Zeitgemäße Broschuren*, Volume 40, Number 1-3, Breer & Thiemann, Hamm, Westphalen, (October-December, 1920), pp. 1-2, 63-64.

515. *See, for example: The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 26, 52, 59, 189, 207, 216, Princeton University Press, (2004).

516. T. Sauer, "The Relativity of Discovery: Hilbert's First Note on the Foundations of Physics", *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 53, Number 6, (1999), pp. 529-575, at 568, note 156.

517. E. Gehrcke, "Die Relativitätstheorie auf dem Naturforschertage in Nauheim", *Die Umschau*, Volume 25, (1921), p. 99.

518. E. Gehrcke, "Zur Relativitätsfrage", *Die Umschau*, Volume 25, (1921), p. 227.

519. H. Weyl, "Die Relativitätstheorie auf der Naturforscherversammlung in Bad Nauheim", *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 31, (1922), pp. 51-63.

520. B. Thüring, "Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen", *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, Volume 4, (1940), pp. 134-162, at 159. Republished as: *Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen*, Dr. Georg Lüttke Verlag, Berlin, (1941), pp. 59-60.

521. J. Stachel, "Einstein's Jewish Identity", *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (2002), pp. 57-83, at 68.

522. A. Einstein to J. Winteler, English translation by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Document 115, Princeton University Press, (1987), pp. 176-177, at 177.

523. A. Einstein, English translation by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 5, Document 499, Princeton University Press, (1995), pp. 373-374, at 374.

524. R. Romain, *La Conscience de l'Europe*, Volume 1, pp. 696ff. English translation from A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein: A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), pp. 365-367. **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to R. Romain of 15 September 1915, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 118, Princeton University Press, (1998); **and** Letter from A. Einstein to R. Romain of 22 August 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume

- 8, Document 374, Princeton University Press, (1998).
- 525.** J. Bacque, *Other Losses: An Investigation into the Mass Deaths of German Prisoners at the Hands of the French and Americans after World War II*, Stoddart, Toronto, (1989).
- 526.** Letter from A. Einstein to Paul Ehrenfest of 22 March 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 10, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 9-10, at 10.
- 527.** T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), pp. 68, 93.
- 528.** M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 16.
- 529.** English translation in: K. Polkehn, "The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 59.
- 530.** L. S. Dawidowicz, "The Zionist Federation of Germany Addresses the New German State", *A Holocaust Reader*, Behrman House, Inc., West Orange, New Jersey, (1976), pp. 150-155. **See also:** H. Tramer, Editor, S. Moses, *In zwei Welten: Siegfried Moses zum fünfundsiebzigsten Geburtstag*, Verlag Bitauon, Tel-Aviv, (1962), pp. 118. ff; cited in K. Polkehn, "The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 59.
- 531.** English translation quoted from J. Stachel, "Einstein's Jewish Identity", *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (2002), pp. 57-83, at 78. Stachel cites M. Besso, A. Einstein, *Correspondance, 1903-1955*, Hermann, Paris, (1972), p. 238.
- 532.** Letter from A. Einstein to M. Besso of 12 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 207, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 178-179, at 179.
- 533.** D. Brian, *The Unexpected Einstein: The Real Man Behind the Icon*, Wiley, Hoboken, New Jersey, (2005), p. 42.
- 534.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 34, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 153-155, at 153.
- 535.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 34, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 153-155, at 153.
- 536.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 34, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 153-155, at 153-154.
- 537.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 35, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 156-157.
- 538.** A. Einstein quoted in: H. Gutfreund, "Albert Einstein and the Hebrew University", J. Renn, Editor, *Albert Einstein Chief Engineer of the Universe: One Hundred Authors for Einstein*, Wiley-VCH, Berlin, (2005), pp. 314-318, at 316.
- 539.** Letter from A. Einstein to P. Nathan of 3 April 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 366, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 492. Also: *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987), p. lx, note 44.
- 540.** P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), pp. 278-294.
- 541.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 88.
- 542.** A. Einstein, *The World As I See It*, Citadel, New York, (1993), pp. 107-108.
- 543.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 37, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 159.

544. A. Einstein quoted in A. Fölsing, English translation by E. Osers, *Albert Einstein, a Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), p. 494; which cites speech to the *Central-Verein Deutscher Staatsbürger Jüdischen Glaubens*, in Berlin on 5 April 1920, in D. Reichenstein, *Albert Einstein. Sein Lebensbild und seine Weltanschauung*, Berlin, (1932). This letter from Einstein to the Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith of 5 April 1920 is reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 368, Princeton University Press, (2004).

545. “Zeitschau”, *Im deutschen Reich*, Volume 27, Number 3, (March, 1921), pp. 90-97, at 92.

546. D. K. Buchwald, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 37, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 304, note 8.

547. “Professor Einstein erklärt das „Sunday Express“-Interview für gefälscht”, *Central-Verein Zeitung*, Volume 10, Number 37, (11 September 1931), p. 443.

548. A. Einstein, translated by A. Harris, “The Disarmament Conference of 1932. I.” *The World As I See It*, Citadel, New York, (1993), pp. 59-60.

549. “Mr. Balfour on Zionism”, *The London Times*, (12 February 1919), p. 9.

550. Arthur James Balfour, Earl of Balfour, *Decadence: Henry Sidgwick Memorial Lecture*, Cambridge, University Press, (1908).

551. T. G. Dyer, *Theodore Roosevelt and the Idea of Race*, Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, (1992).

552. *The Works of Theodore Roosevelt*, Volume 24, Memorial Edition, C. Scribner's Sons, New York, (1923-1926), p. 122. J. B. Bishop, *Theodore Roosevelt and His Time Shown in His Own Letters*, Volume 2, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, (1920), pp. 104-110, at 105.

553. D. Reed, *Disgrace Abounding*, Jonathan Cape, London, (1939).

554. S. Schechter, *Zionism: A Statement*, Federation of American Zionists, New York, (1906); reprinted in the relevant part in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 507.

555. J. Stachel, *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 79, note 41.

556. A. Einstein, “Jewish Nationalism and Anti-Semitism”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (17 June 1921), p. 16.

557. J. Stachel, “Einstein's Jewish Identity”, *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 65. Stachel cites, *About Zionism: Speeches and Letters*, Macmillan, New York, (1931), pp. 48-49. For Zionist Ha-Am's use of the image of atomisation and dispersion, see: A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 276.

558. A. Einstein, “Jewish Nationalism and Anti-Semitism”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (17 June 1921), p. 16.

559. A. Einstein, A. Engel translator, “How I became a Zionist”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 57, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 234-235, at 235.

560. At the time Einstein made his statement, Jews and Gentiles often referred to Jews as “Orientals”.

561. Einstein repeatedly spoke of the Germans as “greedy” to acquire territory and of the “loss of energy” when different “races” attempted to live together. He have been speaking literally. Georg Friedrich Nicolai wrote of the struggle of life to acquire the energy of the sun and he applied this struggle to humanity. G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), pp. 36-39, 44-53.

- 562.** R. W. Clarck, *Einstein, the Life and Times*, World Publishing Company, USA, (1971), p. 292. Clarck refers to: *Neue Rundschau*, Volume 33, Part 2, pp. 815-816.
- 563.** W. E. Mosse, “Die Niedergang der deutschen Republik und die Juden”, *The Crucial Year 1932*, p. 38; English translation in: K. Polkehn, “The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941”, *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 56-57.
- 564.** English translation by John Stachel in J. Stachel, “Einstein’s Jewish Identity”, *Einstein from ‘B’ to ‘Z’*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 67. Stachel cites, “Botschaft”, *Jüdische Rundschau*, Volume 30, (1925), p. 129; French translation, *La Revue Juive*, Volume 1, (1925), pp. 14-16.
- 565.** J. Stachel, “Einstein’s Jewish Identity”, *Einstein from ‘B’ to ‘Z’*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 65. Stachel cites, *About Zionism: Speeches and Letters*, Macmillan, New York, (1931), pp. 78-79.
- 566.** A. Einstein quoted in “Einstein on Arrival Braves Limelight for Only 15 Minutes”, *The New York Times*, (12 December 1930), pp. 1, 16, at 16.
- 567.** E. A. Ross, *The Old World in the New: The Significance of past and Present Immigration to the American People*, Century Company, New York, (1914), p. 144.
- 568.** Reprinted in the relevant part in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 505.
- 569.** T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), pp. 5-6, 25, 68, 93.
- 570.** A. Einstein, “Our Debt to Zionism”, *Out of My Later Years*, Carol Publishing Group, New York, (1995), pp. 262-264, at 262.
- 571.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 35, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 156-157.
- 572.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 111.
- 573.** A. Unsöld, “Albert Einstein — Ein Jahr danach”, *Physikalische Blätter*, Volume 36, (1980), pp.337-339; **and** Volume 37, Number 7, (1981), p. 229.
- 574.** A. Einstein, “Atomic War or Peace”, *Atlantic Monthly*, (November, 1945, and November 1947); *as reprinted in*: A. Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), p. 125.
- 575.** A. Einstein, “To the Heroes of the Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto”, *Bulletin of the Society of Polish Jews*, New York, (1944), reprinted in *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), pp. 212-213.
- 576.** A. Einstein, quoted in O. Nathan and H. Norton, *Einstein on Peace*, Avenel Books, New York, (1981), p. 331.
- 577.** A. Einstein quoted in A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein: A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), pp. 727-728.
- 578.** M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 189.
- 579.** M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 199.
- 580.** K. MacDonald, *The Culture of Critique*, Praeger, Westport, Connecticut, London, (1998), pp. 113-114; **citing**: E. A. Grollman, *Judaism in Sigmund Freud’s World*, Bloch, New York, (1965); **and** D. B. Klein, *Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytic Movement*, Praeger, New York, (1981); **and** P. Gay, *Freud: A Life for Our Time*, W. W. Norton, New York, (1988); **and** Y. H. Yerushalmi, *Freud’s Moses: Judaism Terminable and Interminable*, Yale University Press, (1991); **and** K. MacDonald, *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism*, Praeger, Westport, Connecticut, (1998).

581. See: Letter from M. Planck to W. Wien of 9 July 1922 in J. L. Heilbron, *Max Planck: Ein Leben für die Wissenschaft 1858-1947. Mit einer Auswahl der allgemeinverständlichen Schriften von Max Planck*, S. Hirzel, Stuttgart, (1988), p. 127.

582. Letter from A. S. Eddington to A. Einstein of 1 December 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 186, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 262-263, at 263.

583. *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 203, 220, 227, 238, 249, 253, Princeton University Press, (2004).

584. See, for example: “Literarische Mitteilungen”, *Jüdische Rundschau*, Volume 25, Number 33, (21 May 1920), p. 254.

585. *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 177, 180, 182, 185, 186 and 194, Princeton University Press, (2004).

586. M. Born, “Physics and Relativity”, *Physics in my Generation*, second revised edition, Springer, New York, (1969), p. 110-111.

587. M. Born, “Physics and Relativity”, *Physics in my Generation*, second revised edition, Springer, New York, (1969), p. 100.

588. J. Stachel, “Einstein’s Jewish Identity”, *Einstein from ‘B’ to ‘Z’*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (2002), pp. 57-83, at 59.

589. M. Born quoted and translated in: D. A. Buchwald, *et al.* Editors, “Einstein’s Encounters with German Anti-Relativists”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 109, footnote 52.

590. M. Born, “Physics and Relativity”, *Physics in my Generation*, second revised edition, Springer, New York, (1969), p. 112.

591. Political Zionist Theodor Herzl wrote on 12 June 1895, “Jewish papers! I will induce the publishers of the biggest Jewish papers (*Neue Freie Presse*, *Berliner Tageblatt*, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, etc.) to publish editions over there, as the *New York Herald* does in Paris.”—T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 84. *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT* which became an anti-Semitic paper, praised the *New York Herald*. “When Editors Were Independent of the Jews”, *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT*, (5 February 1921).

592. “Prof. Einstein Here, Explains Relativity”, *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), pp. 1, 13, at 1.

593. A. Einstein, “Jewish Nationalism and Anti-Semitism”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (17 June 1921), p. 16.

594. M. T. Cicero, *Pro Flaccus*, Chapter 28; translated by C. D. Yonge, *The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero*, Volume 2, George Bell & Sons, London, (1880), pp. 454-455.

595. K. A. Strom, Editor, *The Best of Attack! and National Vanguard Tabloid*, National Alliance, Arlington, Virginia, (1984), p. 66.

596. P. Findley, *They Dare to Speak Out: People and Institutions Confront Israel’s Lobby*, Lawrence Hill, Westport, Connecticut, (1985); **and** *Deliberate Deceptions: Facing the Facts about the U.S.-Israeli Relationship*, Lawrence Hill Books, Chicago, (1993); **and** *Silent No More: Confronting America’s False Images of Islam*, D : Amana Publications, Beltsville, Maryland, (2001).

597. Historical Research Department of the Nation of Islam (Chicago), *The Secret Relationship Between Blacks and Jews*, Chicago, Latimer Associates, (1991). **For counter-argument, see:** H. D. Brackman, *Ministry of Lies: The Truth behind the Nation of Islam’s The Secret Relationship between Blacks and Jews*, Four Walls Eight Windows, New York, (1994); **and** “Jews Had Negligible Role in Slave Trade”, *The New York Times*, (14 February 1994), p. A16. **Contrast these with Brackman’s own statements in his PhD dissertation:**

H. D. Brackman, PhD Dissertation, University of Californian, Los Angeles, *The Ebb and Flow of Conflict—History of Black-Jewish Relations Through 1900*, University Microfilms International (Dissertation Services), Ann Arbor, Michigan, (1977); **and see:** T. Martin, *The Jewish Onslaught: Despatches from the Wellesley Battlefield*, Majority Press, Dover, Massachusetts, (1993). **See also:** L. Brenner, Letter to the Editor, *The New York Times*, (28 February 1994), p. A16; **and** “Harold Brackman Believes in Recycling Garbage”, *New York Amsterdam News*, (11 March 1995). **See also:** M. A. Hoffman II, *Judaism’s Strange Gods*, Independent History and Research, Coeur d’Alene, Idaho, (2000), pp. 66-67.

598. H. D. Brackman, PhD Dissertation, University of Californian, Los Angeles, *The Ebb and Flow of Conflict—History of Black-Jewish Relations Through 1900*, University Microfilms International (Dissertation Services), Ann Arbor, Michigan, (1977), pp. 163-164.

599. H. D. Brackman, PhD Dissertation, University of Californian, Los Angeles, *The Ebb and Flow of Conflict—History of Black-Jewish Relations Through 1900*, University Microfilms International (Dissertation Services), Ann Arbor, Michigan, (1977), pp. 79-81. Cf. T. Martin, *The Jewish Onslaught: Despatches from the Wellesley Battlefield*, Majority Press, Dover, Massachusetts, (1993). L. Brenner, Letter to the Editor, *The New York Times*, (28 February 1994), p. A16; **and** “Harold Brackman Believes in Recycling Garbage”, *New York Amsterdam News*, (11 March 1995). M. A. Hoffman II, *Judaism’s Strange Gods*, Independent History and Research, Coeur d’Alene, Idaho, (2000), pp. 66-67.

600. I. Epstein, Editor, Sanhedrin 70a, *The Babylonian Talmud*, Volume 28 (Sanhedrin II), The Soncino Press, (1935), pp. 477-478.

601. I. Epstein, Editor, Sanhedrin 108b, *The Babylonian Talmud*, Volume 28 (Sanhedrin II), The Soncino Press, (1935), p. 745.

602. H. Freedman and M. Simon, Editors, *Midrash Rabbah*, Volume 1, The Soncino Press, London, (1939), pp. 292-293.

603. M. Maimonides, *The Guide of the Perplexed*, University of Chicago Press, (1963), pp. 618-619.

604. Translated by H. Sperling and M. Simon, *The Zohar*, Volume 1, The Soncino Press, London, New York, (1933), pp. 246-247.

605. P. Wheatly, “On Being Brought from Africa to America”, *Poems on Various Subjects, Religious and Moral*, A. Bell, London, (1773), p. 18.

606. P. Findley, *They Dare to Speak Out: People and Institutions Confront Israel’s Lobby*, Lawrence Hill & Company, Westport, Connecticut, (1985), p. 296.

607. V. Ostrovsky, *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad’s Secret Agenda*, Harper Collins, New York, (1994), p. 32.

608. *See also:* N. G. Finkelstein, *The Holocaust Industry: Reflections on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*, Second Edition, Verso, London, New York, (2003).

609. J. J. Mearsheimer and S. M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U. S. Foreign Policy*, Faculty Research Working Papers Series, Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, (March, 2006), p. 23.

610. D. Duke, *Jewish Supremacism: My Awakening on the Jewish Question*, Free Speech Press, Covington, Louisiana, (2002), pp. 200-205.

611. D. Reed, *Somewhere South of Suez*, Devin-Adair, U. S. A., (1951), pp. 8-10.

612. G. Vidal, *Imperial America*, Nation Books, New York, (2004), pp. 76-77; originally, *The Observer*, London, (15 November 1987), “But written as of March 1987 In *The Nation*.”

613. R. I. Friedman, “Selling Israel in America: The Hasbara Project Targets the U.S. Media”, *Mother Jones*, (February/March, 1987), pp. 1-9; reprinted “Selling Israel to America”, *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 16, Number 4, (Summer, 1987), pp. 169-179, at 170, 178.

614. Courtesy of the Department of Special Collections, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN.

615. S. Mohorovičić, “Raum, Zeit und Welt”, in two parts in K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, (1958/1962), Part 1 in Volume 1, (1958), pp. 168-281, at 277, 279, notes 317, 352, 364, 365; Part 2 in Volume 2, (1962), pp. 219-352, at 273, 317, 319, 329, notes 90, 108, 109, 110, 637.

616. Letter from A. Einstein to H. Bergman of 5 November 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 155, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 132-133, at 132. **See also:** H. N. Bialik, “Bialik on the Hebrew University”, in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 281-288, at 284-285.

617. L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 4, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), pp. 536-537.

618. Letter from V. G. Ehrenberg to A. Einstein of 23 November 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 173, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 145.

619. H. A. Lorentz, “Electromagnetische Verschijnselen in een Stelsel dat Zich met Willekeurige Snelheid, Kleiner dan die van Het Licht, Beweegt”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 12, (23 April 1904), pp. 986-1009; translated into English, “Electromagnetic Phenomena in a System Moving with any Velocity Smaller than that of Light”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam (Noninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam)*, 6, (May 27, 1904), pp. 809-831; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 5, pp. 172-197; a redacted and shortened version appears in *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), pp. 11-34; a German translation from the English, “Elektromagnetische Erscheinung in einem System, das sich mit beliebiger, die des Lichtes nicht erreichender Geschwindigkeit bewegt,” appears in *Das Relativitätsprinzip: eine Sammlung von Abhandlungen*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1913), pp. 6-26.

620. H. Poincaré, “Sur la Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Rendiconti del Circolo matimatico di Palermo*, Volume 21, (1906, submitted July 23rd, 1905), pp. 129-176; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 18-76; reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume IX, pp. 494-550; redacted English translation by H. M. Schwartz with modern notation, “Poincaré’s Rendiconti Paper on Relativity”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 39, (November, 1971), pp. 1287-1294; Volume 40, (June, 1972), pp. 862-872; Volume 40, (September, 1972), pp. 1282-1287; English translation by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov with modern notation, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 15-78.

621. Letter from P. Ehrenfest to A. Einstein of 9 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 203, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 173-175, at 174.

622. “Prof. Einstein Here, Explains Relativity”, *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), pp. 1, 13, at 1.

623. Cf. Schlomo Ginossar, a. k. a. Simon Ginsburg, a. k. a. Salomon Ginzberg, “Early Days”, *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1925-1950*, Universitah ha-’uvrit bi-Yerushalayim, Jerusalem, (1950), pp. 71-74.

- 624.** L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 4, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), p. 555.
- 625.** L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 4, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), p. 556.
- 626.** L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 4, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), p. 556.
- 627.** Cf. Schlomo Ginossar, a. k. a. Simon Ginsburg, a. k. a. Salomon Ginzberg, “Early Days”, *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1925-1950*, Universitah ha-’uvrit bi-Yerushalayim, Jerusalem, (1950), pp. 71-74, at 72.
- 628.** See, for example, J. Goebbels, “Der Führer”, *Aufsätze aus der Kampfzeit*, Zentralverlag der NSDAP, Munich, (1935), pp. 214-216; and “Goldene Worte für einen Diktator und für solche, die es werden wollen”, *Der Angriff*, (1 September 1932); reprinted in: *Wetterleuchten: Aufsätze aus der Kampfzeit*, Zentralverlag der NSDAP., Franz Eher Nachf., München, (1939), pp. 325-327. On the Zionists’ quest to find a “great man” to be their “dictator”, see: N. Goldman, “Zionismus und nationale Bewegung”, *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 4, (1920-1921), pp. 237-242, at 240-242; which was part of a series including: “Zionismus und nationale Bewegung”, *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 1, (1920-1921), pp. 45-47; and “Zionismus und nationale Bewegung”, *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 7, (1920-1921), pp. 423-425.
- 629.** Cf. Schlomo Ginossar, a. k. a. Simon Ginsburg, a. k. a. Salomon Ginzberg, “Early Days”, *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1925-1950*, Universitah ha-’uvrit bi-Yerushalayim, Jerusalem, (1950), pp. 71-74, at 73. **See also:** J. Stachel, *Einstein from ‘B’ to ‘Z’*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 79, note 41.
- 630.** *The New York Times*, (8 July 1921), p. 9.
- 631.** N. Robbins, *Baltimore Evening Sun*, (29 April 1921). “Americans Tremendously Bored, Einstein Says, Explaining ‘Exaggerated Welcome’”, *Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, (8 July 1921). “Einstein Has No Valid Cause to Congratulate Self, Reuter Dahl Says”, *Minneapolis Evening Tribune*, (8 July 1921), p. 10. “The Amused Mr. Einstein”, *Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, (9 July 1921). “Reuter Dahl Sees No Cause for Einstein’s Slurs on Americans”, *The Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, (9 July 1921). “Chicago Women Resent Einstein’s Opinions”, *The New York Times*, (9 July 1921), p. 7. “Probably He Did Say It All”, *The New York Times*, (9 July 1921), p. 8. K. W. Payne, “Einstein on Americans, wherein the Eminent Scientist Failed to Understand Us”, *The New York Times*, Section 2, (10 July 1921), p. 2. Response, “Einsteins amerikanische Eindrücke. Was er wirklich sah”, *Vossische Zeitung*, Morning Edition, Supplement 1, (10 July 1921), Front Page. A transcription is found in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Appendix E, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 628-630. “A Product of His Education”, *The New York Times*, (11 July 1921), p. 10. “Explanation Rather than Denial”, *The New York Times*, (12 July 1921), p. 12. “Prohibition Stays, Says Dr. Einstein”, *The New York Times*, Section 2, (31 July 1921), p. 4. An anti-Semitic article appeared in *The Dearborn Independent*, “Relatively Unimportant, Extremely Typical”, (30 July 1921), p. 14. Einstein had declared America “violently” “anti-German”, which statement also brought criticism. See: “Dr. Einstein Found America Anti-German. Violently So, He Says, Though He Noted That a Reaction Was Setting In”, *The New York Times*, (2 July 1921), p. 3. “A Genius Makes a Mistake”, *The New York Times*, (4 July 1921), p. 8. *New York Herald Magazine*, (26 June 1921). J. Riem, “Amerika über Einstein”, *Deutsche Zeitung*, (Berlin), (1 July 1921); and “Zu Einsteins Amerikafahrt”, *Deutsche Zeitung*, (Berlin), (13 September 1921).
- 632.** J. Stachel, *Einstein from ‘B’ to ‘Z’*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 79, note 41.

633. “Aladdin Einstein”, *The Freeman* (New York), Volume 3, Number 59, (27 April 1921), pp. 153-154.

634. T. J. J. See, “EINSTEIN A TRICKSTER?”, *The San Francisco Journal*, (27 May 1923). Peter A. Bucky recalls that others intimated that Einstein’s disheveled appearance was meant to attract publicity. Bucky discounted the notion, as did Einstein. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 4, 111.

635. P. Frank, *Einstein: His Life and Times*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1947), pp. 163-166.

636. P. Frank, *Einstein: His Life and Times*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1947), p. 163.

637. A. Einstein quoted in “Einstein on Arrival Braves Limelight for Only 15 Minutes”, *The New York Times*, (12 December 1930), pp. 1, 16, at 16

638. Cf. H. Goenner, “The Reaction to Relativity Theory. I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920”, *Science in Context*, Volume 6, Number 1, (1993), pp. 107-133, at 125.

639. A. Reuterdahl, *The Minneapolis Sunday Tribune*, (22 May 1921). Reuterdahl translates parts of “Professor Einsteins „Triumphzug“ durch Amerika”, *Luzerner Neueste Nachrichten*, (22 April 1921).

640.

The Palestine Mandate

The Council of the League of Nations:

July 24, 1922

Whereas the Principal Allied Powers have agreed, for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, to entrust to a Mandatory selected by the said Powers the administration of the territory of Palestine, which formerly belonged to the Turkish Empire, within such boundaries as may be fixed by them; and

Whereas the Principal Allied Powers have also agreed that the Mandatory should be responsible for putting into effect the declaration originally made on November 2nd, 1917, by the Government of His Britannic Majesty, and adopted by the said Powers, in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing should be done which might prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country; and

Whereas recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country; and

Whereas the Principal Allied Powers have selected His Britannic Majesty as the Mandatory for Palestine; and

Whereas the mandate in respect of Palestine has been formulated in the following terms and submitted to the Council of the League for approval; and

Whereas His Britannic Majesty has accepted the mandate in respect of Palestine and undertaken to exercise it on behalf of the League of Nations in conformity with the following provisions; and

Whereas by the afore-mentioned Article 22 (paragraph 8), it is provided that the degree of authority, control or administration to be exercised by the Mandatory, not having been previously agreed upon by the Members of the League, shall be explicitly defined by the Council of the League Of Nations; confirming the said Mandate, defines its terms as follows:

ARTICLE 1. The Mandatory shall have full powers of legislation and of administration, save as they may be limited by the terms of this mandate.

ART. 2. The Mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home, as laid down in the preamble, and the development of self-governing institutions, and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion.

ART. 3. The Mandatory shall, so far as circumstances permit, encourage local autonomy.

ART. 4. An appropriate Jewish agency shall be recognised as a public body for the purpose of advising and co-operating with the Administration of Palestine in such economic, social and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish national home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine, and, subject always to the control of the Administration to assist and take part in the development of the country. The Zionist organization, so long as its organization and constitution are in the opinion of the Mandatory appropriate, shall be recognised as such agency. It shall take steps in consultation with His Britannic Majesty's Government to secure the co-operation of all Jews who are willing to assist in the establishment of the Jewish national home.

ART. 5. The Mandatory shall be responsible for seeing that no Palestine territory shall be ceded or leased to, or in any way placed under the control of the Government of any foreign Power.

ART. 6. The Administration of Palestine, while ensuring that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced, shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions and shall encourage, in co-operation with the Jewish agency referred to in Article 4, close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands not required for public purposes.

ART. 7. The Administration of Palestine shall be responsible for enacting a nationality law. There shall be included in this law provisions framed so as to facilitate the acquisition of Palestinian citizenship by Jews who take up their permanent residence in Palestine.

ART. 8. The privileges and immunities of foreigners, including the benefits of consular jurisdiction and protection as formerly enjoyed by Capitulation or usage in the Ottoman Empire, shall not be applicable in Palestine. Unless the Powers whose nationals enjoyed the afore-mentioned privileges and immunities on August 1st, 1914, shall have previously renounced the right to their re-establishment, or shall have agreed to their non-application for a specified period, these privileges and immunities shall, at the expiration of the mandate, be immediately reestablished in their entirety or with such modifications as may have been agreed upon between the Powers concerned.

ART. 9. The Mandatory shall be responsible for seeing that the judicial system established in Palestine shall assure to foreigners, as well as to natives, a complete guarantee of their rights. Respect for the personal status of the various peoples and communities and for their religious interests shall be fully guaranteed. In particular, the control and administration of Wakfs shall be exercised in accordance with religious law and the dispositions of the founders.

ART. 10. Pending the making of special extradition agreements relating to Palestine, the extradition treaties in force between the Mandatory and other foreign Powers shall apply to Palestine.

ART. 11. The Administration of Palestine shall take all necessary measures to safeguard the interests of the community in connection with the development of the country, and, subject to any international obligations accepted by the Mandatory, shall have full power to provide for public ownership or control of any of the natural resources of the

country or of the public works, services and utilities established or to be established therein. It shall introduce a land system appropriate to the needs of the country, having regard, among other things, to the desirability of promoting the close settlement and intensive cultivation of the land. The Administration may arrange with the Jewish agency mentioned in Article 4 to construct or operate, upon fair and equitable terms, any public works, services and utilities, and to develop any of the natural resources of the country, in so far as these matters are not directly undertaken by the Administration. Any such arrangements shall provide that no profits distributed by such agency, directly or indirectly, shall exceed a reasonable rate of interest on the capital, and any further profits shall be utilised by it for the benefit of the country in a manner approved by the Administration.

ART. 12. The Mandatory shall be entrusted with the control of the foreign relations of Palestine and the right to issue exequaturs to consuls appointed by foreign Powers. He shall also be entitled to afford diplomatic and consular protection to citizens of Palestine when outside its territorial limits.

ART. 13. All responsibility in connection with the Holy Places and religious buildings or sites in Palestine, including that of preserving existing rights and of securing free access to the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites and the free exercise of worship, while ensuring the requirements of public order and decorum, is assumed by the Mandatory, who shall be responsible solely to the League of Nations in all matters connected herewith, provided that nothing in this article shall prevent the Mandatory from entering into such arrangements as he may deem reasonable with the Administration for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this article into effect; and provided also that nothing in this mandate shall be construed as conferring upon the Mandatory authority to interfere with the fabric or the management of purely Moslem sacred shrines, the immunities of which are guaranteed.

ART. 14. A special commission shall be appointed by the Mandatory to study, define and determine the rights and claims in connection with the Holy Places and the rights and claims relating to the different religious communities in Palestine. The method of nomination, the composition and the functions of this Commission shall be submitted to the Council of the League for its approval, and the Commission shall not be appointed or enter upon its functions without the approval of the Council.

ART. 15. The Mandatory shall see that complete freedom of conscience and the free exercise of all forms of worship, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, are ensured to all. No discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants of Palestine on the ground of race, religion or language. No person shall be excluded from Palestine on the sole ground of his religious belief. The right of each community to maintain its own schools for the education of its own members in its own language, while conforming to such educational requirements of a general nature as the Administration may impose, shall not be denied or impaired.

ART. 16. The Mandatory shall be responsible for exercising such supervision over religious or eleemosynary bodies of all faiths in Palestine as may be required for the maintenance of public order and good government. Subject to such supervision, no measures shall be taken in Palestine to obstruct or interfere with the enterprise of such bodies or to discriminate against any representative or member of them on the ground of his religion or nationality.

ART. 17. The Administration of Palestine may organise on a voluntary basis the forces necessary for the preservation of peace and order, and also for the defence of the country, subject, however, to the supervision of the Mandatory, but shall not use them for purposes other than those above specified save with the consent of the Mandatory. Except for such purposes, no military, naval or air forces shall be raised or maintained by the

Administration of Palestine. Nothing in this article shall preclude the Administration of Palestine from contributing to the cost of the maintenance of the forces of the Mandatory in Palestine. The Mandatory shall be entitled at all times to use the roads, railways and ports of Palestine for the movement of armed forces and the carriage of fuel and supplies.

ART. 18. The Mandatory shall see that there is no discrimination in Palestine against the nationals of any State Member of the League of Nations (including companies incorporated under its laws) as compared with those of the Mandatory or of any foreign State in matters concerning taxation, commerce or navigation, the exercise of industries or professions, or in the treatment of merchant vessels or civil aircraft. Similarly, there shall be no discrimination in Palestine against goods originating in or destined for any of the said States, and there shall be freedom of transit under equitable conditions across the mandated area. Subject as aforesaid and to the other provisions of this mandate, the Administration of Palestine may, on the advice of the Mandatory, impose such taxes and customs duties as it may consider necessary, and take such steps as it may think best to promote the development of the natural resources of the country and to safeguard the interests of the population. It may also, on the advice of the Mandatory, conclude a special customs agreement with any State the territory of which in 1914 was wholly included in Asiatic Turkey or Arabia.

ART. 19. The Mandatory shall adhere on behalf of the Administration of Palestine to any general international conventions already existing, or which may be concluded hereafter with the approval of the League of Nations, respecting the slave traffic, the traffic in arms and ammunition, or the traffic in drugs, or relating to commercial equality, freedom of transit and navigation, aerial navigation and postal, telegraphic and wireless communication or literary, artistic or industrial property.

ART. 20. The Mandatory shall co-operate on behalf of the Administration of Palestine, so far as religious, social and other conditions may permit, in the execution of any common policy adopted by the League of Nations for preventing and combating disease, including diseases of plants and animals.

ART. 21. The Mandatory shall secure the enactment within twelve months from this date, and shall ensure the execution of a Law of Antiquities based on the following rules. This law shall ensure equality of treatment in the matter of excavations and archaeological research to the nationals of all States Members of the League of Nations.

(1) "Antiquity" means any construction or any product of human activity earlier than the year 1700 A. D.

(2) The law for the protection of antiquities shall proceed by encouragement rather than by threat. Any person who, having discovered an antiquity without being furnished with the authorization referred to in paragraph 5, reports the same to an official of the competent Department, shall be rewarded according to the value of the discovery.

(3) No antiquity may be disposed of except to the competent Department, unless this Department renounces the acquisition of any such antiquity. No antiquity may leave the country without an export licence from the said Department.

(4) Any person who maliciously or negligently destroys or damages an antiquity shall be liable to a penalty to be fixed.

(5) No clearing of ground or digging with the object of finding antiquities shall be permitted, under penalty of fine, except to persons authorised by the competent Department.

(6) Equitable terms shall be fixed for expropriation, temporary or permanent, of lands which might be of historical or archaeological interest.

(7) Authorization to excavate shall only be granted to persons who show sufficient guarantees of archaeological experience. The Administration of Palestine shall not, in granting these authorizations, act in such a way as to exclude scholars of any nation without

good grounds.

(8) The proceeds of excavations may be divided between the excavator and the competent Department in a proportion fixed by that Department. If division seems impossible for scientific reasons, the excavator shall receive a fair indemnity in lieu of a part of the find.

ART. 22. English, Arabic and Hebrew shall be the official languages of Palestine. Any statement or inscription in Arabic on stamps or money in Palestine shall be repeated in Hebrew and any statement or inscription in Hebrew shall be repeated in Arabic.

ART. 23. The Administration of Palestine shall recognise the holy days of the respective communities in Palestine as legal days of rest for the members of such communities.

ART. 24. The Mandatory shall make to the Council of the League of Nations an annual report to the satisfaction of the Council as to the measures taken during the year to carry out the provisions of the mandate. Copies of all laws and regulations promulgated or issued during the year shall be communicated with the report.

ART. 25. In the territories lying between the Jordan and the eastern boundary of Palestine as ultimately determined, the Mandatory shall be entitled, with the consent of the Council of the League of Nations, to postpone or withhold application of such provisions of this mandate as he may consider inapplicable to the existing local conditions, and to make such provision for the administration of the territories as he may consider suitable to those conditions, provided that no action shall be taken which is inconsistent with the provisions of Articles 15, 16 and 18.

ART. 26. The Mandatory agrees that, if any dispute whatever should arise between the Mandatory and another member of the League of Nations relating to the interpretation or the application of the provisions of the mandate, such dispute, if it cannot be settled by negotiation, shall be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice provided for by Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

ART. 27. The consent of the Council of the League of Nations is required for any modification of the terms of this mandate.

ART. 28. In the event of the termination of the mandate hereby conferred upon the Mandatory, the Council of the League of Nations shall make such arrangements as may be deemed necessary for safeguarding in perpetuity, under guarantee of the League, the rights secured by Articles 13 and 14, and shall use its influence for securing, under the guarantee of the League, that the Government of Palestine will fully honour the financial obligations legitimately incurred by the Administration of Palestine during the period of the mandate, including the rights of public servants to pensions or gratuities.

The present instrument shall be deposited in original in the archives of the League of Nations and certified copies shall be forwarded by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to all members of the League.

Done at London the twenty-fourth day of July, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two.

641. H. Kessler, *Walter Rathenau: His Life and Work*, Harcourt, Brace, New York, (1930).

642. W. Hartenau (W. Rathenau), "Höre, Israel!", *Die Zukunft*, Volume 18, (6 March 1897), pp. 454-462.

643. R. W. Clark, *Einstein, the Life and Times*, World Publishing Company, USA, (1971), p. 292. Clark refers to: *Neue Rundschau*, Volume 33, Part 2, pp. 815-816.

644. C. Weizmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1949), p. 289.

- 645.** T. J. J. See, “EINSTEIN A TRICKSTER?”, *The San Francisco Journal*, (27 May 1923).
- 646.** *Casseler Allgemeine Zeitung*, (12 August 1922), as recorded by Ernst Gehrcke in his book: *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie: Kulturhistorisch-psychologische Dokumente*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), p. 63.
- 647.** H. Morgenthau, “Zionism a Surrender, Not a Solution”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 42, Number 3, (July, 1921), pp. i-viii. “Mr. Zangwill on Zionism”, *The London Times*, (16 October 1923), p. 11. I. Zangwill, “Is Political Zionism Dead? Yes”, *The Nation*, Volume 118, Number 3062, (12 March 1924), pp. 276-278.
- 648.** C. L. Poor, “Planetary Motions and the Einstein Theories”, *Scientific American Monthly*, Volume 3, (June, 1921), pp. 484-486; **and** “Alternative to Einstein: How Dr. Poor Would Save Newton’s Law and the Classical Time and Space Concept”, *Scientific American*, Volume 124, (11 June 1921), p. 468; **and** “Motions of the Planets and the Relativity Theory”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 54, (8 July 1921), pp. 30-34; **and** “Test for Eclipse Plates”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 57, (25 May 1923), pp. 613-614; **and** C. L. Poor and A. Henderson, “Is Einstein Wrong? A Debate”, *Forum*, Volumes 71 & 72, (June/July, 1924), pp. 705-715, 13-21; replies *Forum*, Volume 72, (August 1924), pp. 277-281; **and** C. L. Poor, “Relativity and the Motion of Mercury”, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, Volume 29, (15 July 1925), pp. 285-319; **and** “The Deflection of Light as Observed at Total Solar Eclipses”, *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, Volume 20, (1930), pp. 173-211; **and** “What Einstein Really Did”, *Scribner’s Magazine*, Volume 88, (July-December, 1930), pp. 527-538; discussion follows in *Commonweal*, Volume 13, (24 December 1930, 7 January 1931, 11 February 1931), pp. 203-204, 271-272, 412-413. **See also:** “Alternative to Einstein; How Dr. Poor would Save Newton’s Law and the Classical Time and Space Concept”, *Scientific American*, Volume 124, (11 June 1921), p. 468.
- 649.** C. L. Poor, “What Einstein Really Did”, *Scribner’s Magazine*, Volume 88, (July-December 1930), pp. 527-538, at 538.
- 650.** H. Goenner, “The Reaction to Relativity Theory. I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920”, *Science in Context*, Volume 6, Number 1, (1993), pp. 107-133, at 118.
- 651.** H. Goenner, “The Reaction to Relativity Theory. I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920”, *Science in Context*, Volume 6, Number 1, (1993), pp. 107-133, at 118-119.
- 652.** E. Gehrcke, *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 34-35. Cf. H. Goenner, “The Reaction to Relativity Theory. I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920”, *Science in Context*, Volume 6, Number 1, (1993), pp. 107-133, at 112.
- 653.** A. Einstein, “In Honour of Arnold Berliner’s Seventieth Birthday”, *The World As I See It*, Citadel, New York, (1993), p. 14.
- 654.** A. Einstein, “Zuschriften an die Herausgeber. Zur Abwehr”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 9, Number 13, (1 April 1921), p. 219.
- 655.** *Die Naturwissenschaften* exhibited a long history of personal attack by “book review”. See, for example: *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 11, Number 2, (12 January 1923), pp. 252-256; **and** *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 19, Number 11, (13 March 1931), pp. 252-256.
- 656.** Letter from A. Einstein to W. Dällenbach of 27 September 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 112, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 97-98, at 97.
- 657.** See, as but one of countless examples, the letter from W. Dällenbach to A. Einstein of 19 September 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 107,

Princeton University Press, (2004).

658. A. Reuterdaahl, “The Academy of Nations—Its Aims and Hopes”, *The Dearborn Independent*, (7 January 1922), p. 14.

659. E. Guillaume’s letter, translated by A. Reuterdaahl, “Guillaume, Barred in Move To Debate Einstein, Calls Meeting Political Reunion”, *Minneapolis Journal*, (14 May 1922), p. 14; reprinted with slight modifications, “The Origin of Einsteinism”, *The New York Times*, (12 August 1923), Section 7, p. 8. **See also:** “Einstein Faces in Paris Grave Blow at Theory”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (31 March 1922). **See also:** “Dr. Guillaume’s Proofs of Einstein Theory’s Fallacy Revealed to the Journal”, *Minneapolis Journal*, (9 April 1922). **See also:** E. Guillaume, “Un Résultat des Discussions de la Théorie d’Einstein au Collège de France”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, Number 11, (15 June 1922), pp. 322-324. **See also:** “Les Bases de la Physique moderne”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 43, (1917), pp. 5-21, 89-112, 185-198; **and** “Sur le Possibilité d’Exprimer la Théorie de la Relativité en Fonction du Temps Universel”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 44, (1917), pp. 48-52; **and** “La Théorie de la Relativité en Fonction du Temps Universel”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 46, (1918), pp. 281-325; **and** “Sur la Théorie de la Relativité”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 1, (1919), pp. 246-251; **and** “Représentation et Mesure du Temps”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 2, (1920), pp. 125-146; **and** “La Théorie de la Relativité et sa Signification”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 27, (1920), pp. 423-469; **and** “Relativité et Gravitation”, *Bulletin de la Société Vaudoise des Sciences Naturelles*, Volume 53, (1920), pp. 311-340; **and** “Les Bases de la Théorie de la Relativité”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, (15 April 1920) pp. 200-210; **and** C. Willigens, “Représentation Géométrique du Temps Universel dans la Théorie de la Relativité Restreinte”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 2, (1920), p. 289; **and** E. Guillaume, *La Théorie de la Relativité. Résumé des Conférences Faites à l’Université de Lausanne au Semestre d’été 1920*, Rouge & Co., Lausanne, (1921); **and** E. Guillaume and C. Willigens, “Über die Grundlagen der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 109-114; **and** E. Guillaume, “Graphische Darstellung der Optik bewegter Körper”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 386-388; **and** Guillaume’s Appendix II, “Temps Relatif et Temps Universel”, in L. Fabre, *Une Nouvelle Figure du Monde: les Théories d’Einstein*, Second Edition, Payot, Paris, (1922); **and** E. Guillaume, “Y a-t-il une Erreur dans le Premier Mémoire d’Einstein?”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, (1922), pp. 5-10; **and** “La Question du Temps d’après M. Bergson, à Propos de la Théorie d’Einstein”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, (1922), pp. 573-582; **and** Guillaume’s introduction in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. V-XVI; **and** H. Bergson, *Durée et Simultanéité, à Propos de la Théorie d’Einstein*, English translation by L. Jacobson, *Duration and simultaneity, with Reference to Einstein’s Theory*, The Library of Liberal Arts, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, (1965); which contains a bibliography at pages xliii-xlv. **See also:** P. Painlevé, “La Mécanique Classique et la Théorie de la Relativité”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 173, (1921), pp. 677-680. **See also:** S. Mohorovičić, “Raum, Zeit und Welt. II Teil”, in K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, Volume 2, (1962), pp. 219-352, at 273-275. **See also:** K. Hentschel, *Interpretationen und Fehlinterpretationen der speziellen und der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie durch Zeitgenossen Albert Einsteins*, Birkhäuser, Basel, Boston, Berlin,

(1990). **See also:** A. Genovesi, *Il Carteggio tra Albert Einstein ed Edouard Guillaume. "Tempo Universale" e Teoria della Relatività Ristretta nella Filosofia Francese Contemporanea*, Franco Angeli, Milano, (2000). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 24 September 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 383, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 3 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 385, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 9 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 387, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 17 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 392, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 24 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 394, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 25 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 280, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from M. Grossmann to A. Einstein of 5 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 300, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 9 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 305, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 15 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 316, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to M. Grossmann of 27 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 330, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to P. Oppenheim of 29 April 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 399, Princeton University Press, (2004).

660. L. Jánossy, "Über die physikalische Interpretation der Lorentz-Transformation", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 6, Volume 11, (1953), pp. 293-322; **and** *Theory of Relativity Based on Physical Reality*, Akademiai Kiadó, Budapest, (1971). **See also:** S. J. Prokhorov, *The Logic of Special Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, (1967). **See also:** K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, In Two Volumes, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, Austria, (1958/1962).

661. E. Guillaume's letter, translated by A. Reuterdaahl, "Guillaume, Barred in Move To Debate Einstein, Calls Meeting Political Reunion", *Minneapolis Journal*, (14 May 1922), p. 14; reprinted with slight modifications, "The Origin of Einsteinism", *The New York Times*, (12 August 1923), Section 7, p. 8. **See also:** "Einstein Faces in Paris Grave Blow at Theory", *The Chicago Tribune*, (31 March 1922). **See also:** "Dr. Guillaume's Proofs of Einstein Theory's Fallacy Revealed to the Journal", *Minneapolis Journal*, (9 April 1922). **See also:** E. Guillaume, "Un Résultat des Discussions de la Théorie d'Einstein au Collège de France", *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, Number 11, (15 June 1922), pp. 322-324. **See also:** "Les Bases de la Physique moderne", *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 43, (1917), pp. 5-21, 89-112, 185-198; **and** "Sur la Possibilité d'Exprimer la Théorie de la Relativité en Fonction du Temps Universel", *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 44, (1917), pp. 48-52; **and** "La Théorie de la Relativité en Fonction du Temps Universel", *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 46, (1918), pp. 281-325; **and** "Sur la Théorie de la Relativité", *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 1, (1919), pp. 246-251; **and** "Représentation et Mesure du Temps", *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 2, (1920), pp. 125-146; **and** "La Théorie de la Relativité et sa Signification", *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 27, (1920), pp. 423-469;

and “Relativité et Gravitation”, *Bulletin de la Société Vaudoise des Sciences Naturelles*, Volume 53, (1920), pp. 311-340; **and** “Les Bases de la Théorie de la Relativité”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, (15 April 1920) pp. 200-210; **and** C. Willigens, “Représentation Géométrique du Temps Universel dans la Théorie de la Relativité Restreinte”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 2, (1920), p. 289; **and** E. Guillaume, *La Théorie de la Relativité. Résumé des Conférences Faites à l’Université de Lausanne au Semestre d’été 1920*, Rouge & Co., Lausanne, (1921); **and** E. Guillaume and C. Willigens, “Über die Grundlagen der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 109-114; **and** E. Guillaume, “Graphische Darstellung der Optik bewegter Körper”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 386-388; **and** Guillaume’s Appendix II, “Temps Relatif et Temps Universel”, in L. Fabre, *Une Nouvelle Figure du Monde: les Théories d’Einstein*, Second Edition, Payot, Paris, (1922); **and** E. Guillaume, “Y a-t-il une Erreur dans le Premier Mémoire d’Einstein?”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, (1922), pp. 5-10; **and** “La Question du Temps d’après M. Bergson, à Propos de la Théorie d’Einstein”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, (1922), pp. 573-582; **and** Guillaume’s introduction in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. V-XVI; **and** H. Bergson, *Durée et Simultanéité, à Propos de la Théorie d’Einstein*, English translation by L. Jacobson, *Duration and simultaneity, with Reference to Einstein’s Theory*, The Library of Liberal Arts, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, (1965); which contains a bibliography at pages xliii-xlv. **See also:** P. Painlevé, “La Mécanique Classique et la Théorie de la Relativité”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 173, (1921), pp. 677-680. **See also:** S. Mohorovičić, “Raum, Zeit und Welt. II Teil”, in K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, Volume 2, (1962), pp. 219-352, at 273-275. **See also:** K. Hentschel, *Interpretationen und Fehlinterpretationen der speziellen und der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie durch Zeitgenossen Albert Einsteins*, Birkhäuser, Basel, Boston, Berlin, (1990). **See also:** A. Genovesi, *Il Carteggio tra Albert Einstein ed Edouard Guillaume. “Tempo Universale” e Teoria della Relatività Ristretta nella Filosofia Francese Contemporanea*, Franco Angeli, Milano, (2000). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 24 September 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 383, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 3 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 385, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 9 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 387, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 17 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 392, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 24 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 394, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 25 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 280, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from M. Grossmann to A. Einstein of 5 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 300, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 9 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 305, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 15 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 316, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to M.

Grossmann of 27 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 330, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to P. Oppenheim of 29 April 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 399, Princeton University Press, (2004).

662. “Issue a Protest on Anti-Semitism”, *The New York Times*, (17 January 1921), p. 10.

663. “Reuter Dahl Gives Mathematic Lectures”, *The Daily Cardinal* (University of Wisconsin, Madison), (11 March 1926). “Prof. Reuter Dahl Talks Despite All Faculty Efforts”, *The Daily Cardinal* (University of Wisconsin, Madison), (12 March 1926), Front Page. “St. Paulite Piqued by Badger Faculty”, *The St. Paul Daily News*, Final Page, (12 March 1926), Front Page. “Intolerance”, *The St. Paul Daily News*, (13 March 1926), Front Page or page 2???. “Everything Fine, Reuter Dahl Says of Badger Antics”, *St. Paul Dispatch*, (13 March 1926), Front Page. “Reuter Dahl Says He Had a ‘Bully’ Time in Madison”, *The Minneapolis Sunday Tribune*, (14 March 1926). “Wisconsin U Mathematics Professors ‘Act Like Children’ Says Reuter Dahl; Had a Fine Time”, *The St. Paul Daily News*, (14 March 1926), Front Page. “Reuter Dahl Takes Fling at Madison”, *St. Paul Dispatch*, (19 March 1926), p. 17. “Intellectual Despotism Is Menace to Honest Research in Science, Dr. Reuter Dahl Declares”, *St. Paul Daily News*, (19 March 1926), p. 2.

664. “PROF. REUTER DAHL TALKS DESPITE ALL FACULTY EFFORTS: Instructors Place Auditorium in Darkness in Attempt to Stop Lecture”, *The Daily Cardinal* (University of Wisconsin, Madison), (12 March 1926).

665. Cf. H. Goenner, “The Reaction to Relativity Theory in Germany, III: ‘A Hundred Authors against Einstein’”, *The Attraction of Gravitation: New Studies in the History of General Relativity*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (1993), p. 250. J. Stark, *Die gegenwärtige Krisis in der Deutschen Physik*, Johann Ambrosius Barth, Leipzig, (1922), p. 16.

666. English translation from: P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967). p. 315.

667. “Prof. Einstein Here, Explains Relativity”, *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), pp. 1, 13, at 1.

668. E. Mach, *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, La Salle, Illinois, (1960), p. xxviii.

669. H. Dingler, *Die Grundlagen der Physik; synthetische Prinzipien der mathematischen Naturphilosophie*, Second Edition, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, (1923); **and** *Physik und Hypothese Versuch einer induktiven Wissenschaftslehre nebst einer kritischen Analyse der Fundamente der Relativitätstheorie*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1921); **and** “Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Grundlagen der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 21, (1920), pp. 668-669.

670. “The Anti-Einstein Campaign”, *Scientific American*, (14 May 1921). *See also:* “Getting Back at Einstein”, *The Literary Digest*, (4 June 1921).

671. A. Reuter Dahl, quoted in “The Pro-Truth Campaign”, *The Dearborn Independent*, (18 June 1921).

672. Kennefick cites: Note 9, “G. Beck, *Z. Phys.* **33**, 713 (1925); O. R. Baldwin, G. B. Jeffery, *Proc. Phys. Soc. London, Sect. A.* **111**, 95 (1926)”; **and** Note 5, “L. Infeld, *Quest: An Autobiography*, Chelsea, New York, (1980)”, p. 277.

673. *Scientific American*, Volume 1, Number 42, (9 July 1846), p. 3.

674. A. Reuter Dahl, “The Origin of Einsteinism”, *The New York Times*, Section 7, (12 August 1923), p. 8. Reply to F. D. Bond’s response, “Reuter Dahl and the Einstein Theory”, *The New York Times*, Section 7, (15 July 1923), p. 8. Response to A. Reuter Dahl, “Einstein’s Predecessors”, *The New York Times*, Section 8, (3 June 1923), p. 8. Which was a reply to F. D. Bond, “Relating to Relativity”, *The New York Times*, Section 9, (13 May 1923), p. 8.

Which was a response to H. A. Houghton, "A Newtonian Duplication?", *The New York Times*, Section 1, Part 1, (21 April 1923), p. 10.

675. F. D. Bond, 24 Manhattan Avenue, New York City, letter to A. Reuter Dahl dated 10 July 1923, Department of Special Collections, O'Shaughnessy-Frey Library, University of St. Thomas, Minnesota.

676. L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 4, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), pp. 536-537.

677. H. A. Houghton, "A Newtonian Duplication?", *The New York Times*, Section 1, Part 1, (21 April 1923), p. 10.

678. H. Bernstein, *The Truth about 'The Protocols of Zion'*, Ktav Publishing House, New York, (1971), pp. 43-44.

679. Letters from L. Brandeis to J. W. Mack, *et al.* of 26 November 1918, 22 March 1920, 17 November 1920 and 18 November 1920, L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 4, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), pp. 365, 452-453, 506-508.

680. *The Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion*, Beckwith, New York, (1920). H. Bernstein, *The Truth about 'The Protocols of Zion'*, Ktav Publishing House, New York, (1971), p. 55.

681. L. Marshall to J. Spargo, *Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty; Selected Papers and Addresses*, Volume 1, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1957), pp. 351-353.

682. B. Brasol, *The Protocols and World Revolution, Including a Translation and Analysis of the "Protocols of the Meetings of the Zionist Men of Wisdom"*, Small, Maynard & Company, Boston, (1920); **and** *Socialism Vs. Civilization*, C. Scribner's Sons, New York, (1920); **and** *The World at the Cross Roads*, Small, Maynard & Co., Boston, (1921); **and** *The Balance Sheet of Sovietism*, Duffield, New York, (1922).

683. S. G. Marks, "Destroying the Agents of Modernity: Russian Antisemitism", *How Russia Shaped the Modern World*, Chapter 5, Princeton University Press, (2003), pp. 140-175; notes 354-358.

684. Houghton's letter is found in the Department of Special Collections, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota.

685. A. Reuter Dahl, "'Kinertia' Versus Einstein", *The Dearborn Independent*, 30 April 1921, pp. 2 and 14.

686. Letter from T. Vetter to A. Einstein of 28 January 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 4, Princeton University Press, (2004).

687. D. K. Buchwald, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 312, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 426-427, at 427, note 3.

688. *Deutsche Zeitung*, (17 February 1920), p. 5. *Deutsche Zeitung*, (19 February 1920).

689. E. A. Ross, "The East European Hebrews", *The Old World in the New: The Significance of Past and Present Immigration to the American People*, Chapter 7, The Century Co., New York, (1914), pp. 143-167. **See also:** B. J. Hendrick, "The Jews in America: I How They Came to This Country", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 2, (December, 1922), pp. 144-161; **and** "The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286; **and** "The Jews in America: III The Menace of the Polish Jew", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 4, (February, 1923), pp. 366-377; **and** "Radicalism among the Polish Jews", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 6, (April, 1923), pp. 591-601.

690. D. K. Buchwald, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 311, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 425-426, at 426, note 2.

- 691.** Cf. M. Janssen, *et al*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 284-288.
- 692.** Letter from H. T. Cohn to A. Einstein of 12 February 1920, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 309, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 258-259, at 258.
- 693.** Letter from H. T. Cohn to A. Einstein of 12 February 1920, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 309, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 258-259, at 258.
- 694.** Letter from Eduard Meyer to A. Einstein of 13 February 1920, A. Hentschel, translator, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 312, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 260.
- 695.** C. Kirsten and Hans-Jürgen Treder, Editors, *Albert Einstein in Berlin, 1913-1933 : Teil I, Darstellung und Dokumente*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, (1979), p. 202.
- 696.** C. Kirsten and Hans-Jürgen Treder, Editors, *Albert Einstein in Berlin, 1913-1933 : Teil I, Darstellung und Dokumente*, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, (1979), p. 201.
- 697.** P. Michelmores, *Einstein: Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, New York, (1962), p. 88.
- 698.** M. Janssen, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 348, note 3.
- 699.** M. Janssen, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 348, note 3.
- 700.** H. Goenner, "The Reaction to Relativity Theory. I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920", *Science in Context*, Volume 6, Number 1, (1993), pp. 107-133, at 112.
- 701.** J. Riem, "Amerika über Einstein", *Deutsche Zeitung*, (1 July 1921).
- 702.** J. Jürgenson, "Es lebe die Theorie - oder das Recht auf freie Phantasie", *Die lukrativen Lügen der Wissenschaft*, Ewert, (1998), ISBN: 389478699X.

URL:<<http://www.un glaublichkeiten.info/un glaublichkeiten/htmlphp/erfindungeneslebed ietheorie.html>>

This is likely a reference to: S. Mohorovičić, "Raum, Zeit und Welt. II Teil", in K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, Volume 2, (1962), pp. 219-352.

703. S. Mohorovičić, "Raum, Zeit und Welt", in two parts in K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, (1958/1962), Part 1 in Volume 1, (1958), pp. 168-281; Part 2 in Volume 2, (1962), pp. 219-352, at 317, note 89.

704. S. Mohorovičić, "Raum, Zeit und Welt", in two parts in K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, (1958/1962), Part 1 in Volume 1, (1958), pp. 168-281; Part 2 in Volume 2, (1962), pp. 219-352, at 273.

705. S. Mohorovičić, *Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie und ihr mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Charakter*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1923), pp. 52-53.

706. "Einstein Denies Part in Book on Hitlerism", *The New York Times*, (4 September 1933), p. 2.

707. "Price Declared Put on Einstein's Head", *The New York Times*, (7 September 1933), p. 8. "Wants Only Peace", *The New York Times*, (11 September 1933), p. 9.

708. A. v. Brunn, quoted in: K. Hentschel, Ed., A. Hentschel, Ed. Ass. and Trans., *Physics and National Socialism: An Anthology of Primary Sources*, Birkhäuser, Basel, Boston,

Berlin, (1996), p. 11.

709. From the preface of *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein* translated by: H. Goenner, “The Reaction to Relativity Theory in Germany, III: ‘A Hundred Authors against Einstein’”, J. Earman, M. Janssen, J. D. Norton, Eds., *The Attraction of Gravitation: New Studies in the History of General Relativity*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (1993), p. 251.

710. A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1982), p. 510.

711. H. Dingle, in his introduction to H. Bergson’s, *Duration and Simultaneity*, Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., Indianapolis, New York, Kansas City, (1965), p. xlii. **See also:** H. Dingle, *Science at the Crossroads*, Martin, Brian and O’Keefe Ltd., London, (1972).

712. “The Outsiders: When a scientist challenges dogma, he’s the one who gets mauled”, *The San Diego Union-Tribune*, Lifestyle Section, (2 November 1994), p. E-1. URL: <<http://www.aidsinfobbs.org/articles/rethink/rethink1/434>>

713. Bishop M. Sasse, Eisenach, *Martin Luther and the Jews*, Second Printing, Sons of Liberty, Hollywood, California, (1967), p. 5.

714. *Exodus* 34:11-17. *Psalms* 72. *Isaiah* 1:9; 2:1-4; 6:9-13; 9:6-7; 10:20-22; 11:4, 9-12; 17:6; 37:31-33; 41:9; 42; 43; 44; 61:6. *Jeremiah* 3:17; 33:15-16. *Ezekiel* 20:38; 25:14. *Daniel* 12:1, 10. *Amos* 9:8-10. *Obadiah* 1:18. *Micah* 4:2-3; 5:8. *Zechariah* 8:20-23; 14:9. *Romans* 9:27-28; 11:1-5.

715. M. Higger, *The Jewish Utopia*, Lord Baltimore Press, Baltimore, (1932). Higger’s book is analyzed in: R. H. Williams, *The Ultimate World Order—As Pictured in “The Jewish Utopia”*, CPA Book Publisher, Boring, Oregon, (1957?).

716. R. B. Spence, *Trust No One: The Secret World of Sidney Reilly*, Feral House, Los Angeles, (2002), pp. 65-67.

717. L. Fry, *L’Auteur des Protocols Achad ha-Am et le Sionisme*, Editions de la Vieille-France, Paris, (1921); **Russian** *Akhad-Khem (Asher Geintsberg); Tainyi vozhd’ iudeiskii*, Berlin, (1922); **German**, Th v. Winberg, translator, *Achad Cham (Ascher Hinzberg)*, München, (1923). **See also:** N. D. Zhevakhov, *Il retroscena dei Protocolli di Sion: la vita e le opere del loro editore, Sergio Nilus e del loro autore Ascer Ghinsberg*, Unione editoriale d’Italia, Roma, (1939). **See also:** C. Weizmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1949), pp. 107-108, 266.

718. D. K. Buchwald, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Appendix D, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 623.

719. English: S. Nilus, *The Protocols and World Revolution Including a Translation and Analysis of the “Protocols of the Meetings of the Zionist Men of Wisdom”*, Small, Maynard & Co., Boston, (1920); **and** *Præmonitus præmunitus. The protocols of the Wise Men of Zion*, Beckwith Co., New York, (1920); **and** *The Jewish Peril: Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, (1920); **and** *The Jewish Peril: Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, The Britons, 62 Oxford Street, London, (1920). **Russian:** G. Butmi, *Vragi roda cheloviecheskago, Izd. Soiuza russkago naroda*, S.-Peterburg, Second Edition, ispr. izd., (1906). **German:** Gottfried zur Beek, under the *nom de plume* Ludwig Müller von Hausen, *Die Geheimnisse der Weisen von Zion*, Verlag Auf Vorposten, Charlottenburg, (1919). **French:** *La Conspiration Juive Contre les Peuples; “Protocols”, Procès-verbaux de Reunions Secrètes des Sages d’Israël*, La Vieille-France, Paris, (1920). **Italian:** *I “Protocolli” dei “Savi Anziani” di Sion : Versione Italiana con Appendice e Introduzione*, Third Edition, G. Preziosi, (1938). *L’Internazionale Ebraica: I “Protocolli” dei “Savi Anziani” di Sion*, La Vita italiana, rassegna mensile di politica, Roma, (1938). **Swedish:** *Förlåten Faller—: Det Tillkommande Världssjälvhärskardömet Enligt “Sions vises Hemliga Protokoll”*, Enskilt Förlag, Helsingfors, (1919). **Danish:** S. Nilus translated by L. Carlsen,

Jødefaren. De Verdensberygtede Jødiske Protokoller, Eget Forlag, Kjøbenhavn, (1920). **Hungarian:** *Sion Bölcsenek Jegyzokönyvei; a Bolsevikiék Bibliája*, Az Egyesült keresztény nemzeti liga, Budapest, (1922). **Latvian:** G. A. Kalnins, *Zidu loma cilveces vesture Veca deriba, Talmuds, Brivmurnieki jeb masoni, Cianas gudro protokoli, Ritualas slepkavibas u. c.*, Tautas vairoga, Riga, (1934). **Dutch:** S. Nilus, translated by J. Nijssse, *De Protokollen van de Wijzen van Sion*, Stichting de Misthoorn, Amsterdam, (1941). **Spanish:** *Protocolos de los Jefes de Israel: Un Plan Secreto de los Judios?*, M. Aguilar, Madrid, (1932).

720. “‘Die Geheimnisse der Weisen von Zion’. Der Schwindelbericht eines russischen Spitzels, *Im deutschen Reich*, Volume 16, Number 5, (May, 1920), pp. 146-153. **See also:** L. Wolf, *The Jewish Bogey and the Forged Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, London, The Press Committee of the Jewish Board of Deputies, (1920); **and** *The Myth of the Jewish Menace in World Affairs; or, The Truth about the Forged Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, The Macmillan company, New York, (1921). **See also:** *An Exposure of the Hoax Which is Being Foisted upon the American Public by Henry Ford in His Weekly Newspaper Entitled “The Dearborn Independent”*: and in the Pamphlet which He is Distributing Entitled “The World’s Foremost Problem”, Anti-Defamation League, Chicago, (1920). **See also:** W. Hard, *The Great Jewish Conspiracy*, The American Jewish Book Co., New York, (1920). **See also:** W. H. Taft, *Anti-Semitism in the United States*, Anti-defamation League, Chicago, (1920). **See also:** J. Spargo, *The Jew and American Ideals*, Harper & Brothers, New York, London, (1921). **See also:** H. Bernstein, *The History of a Lie, “The Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion”*; a Study, Ogilvie Pub. Co. New York, (1921); **and** *The Truth About “The Protocols of Zion”*; a Complete Exposure, Covici, Friede, New York, (1935). **See also:** E. B. Samuel, *An Examination of the Book Called “The Jewish Peril,” or “The Protocols of the Elders of Zion.” A Paper Read Before the Prophecy Investigation Society, April, 1921*, C.J. Thynne, London, (1921). **See also:** J. H. Hertz, *The New Anti-semitism: The Official Protests of the British and American Jewish Communities*, Press Committee of the Jewish Board of Deputies, London, (1921). **See also:** C. A. Windle, *The Tyranny of Intolerance*, Iconoclast Pub. Co., Chicago, (1921). **See also:** I. Zangwill, *The Forged Protocols: Complicity of Russian Police*, London, (1921). **See also:** N. Hapgood, “Henry Ford’s Jew-Mania”, *Hearst’s International*, (November, 1922), pp. 106-108. **See also:** S. W. McCall, *Patriotism of the American Jew*, L. Middleditch Company, New York, (1924), pp. 28-41. **See also:** B. W. Segel, *Die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion kritisch beleuchtet; eine Erledigung*, Philo Verlag, Berlin, (1924); **and** *Welt-Krieg, Welt-Revolution, Welt-Verschwörung, Welt-Oberregierung*, Philo Verlag, Berlin, (1926); **and** *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, the Greatest Lie in History*, by Benjamin W. Segel; authorized translation from the German by Sascha Czazckes-Charles, with Ten Letters of Endorsement from Eminent German Non-Jewish Scholars, Bloch publishing co., New York, (1934); **and** *La Mentira mas Grande de la Historia: Los Protocolos de los Sabios de Sion*, D.A.I.A., Buenos Aires, (1936). **See also:** *Die angeblichen “Protokolle der Weisen von Zion” als weltpolitisches Agitationsmittel*, (1930). **See also:** J. B. Rusch, *Protokolle der Weisen von Zion, die grösste Fälschung des Jahrhunderts!*, Ragaz, (1933). **See also:** *The Peril of Racial Prejudice*, Jewish Information Bureau, New York, (1933). **See also:** *Confrontation der “Geheimnisse der Weisen von Zion”. (“Die Zionistischen Protokolle”) mit ihrer Quelle “Dialogue aux enfers entre Machiavel et Montesquieu” der Nachweis der Fälschung. ; Dialogue aux enfers entre Machiavel et Montesquieu*, Rechtsschutzabteilung des Schweizerischen Israelitischen Gemeindebundes, Basel, (1933). **See also:** E. Newman, *The Jewish Peril and the Hidden Hand; The Bogey of Anti-Semitism’s International Conspiracy*, Minneapolis, (1934), **and** *The Conflict or the Falsehood of the Ages, Which?*, Minneapolis, (1934); **and** *The Fundamentalists’ Resuscitation of the Anti-semitic Protocol Forgery*, Minneapolis, (1934).

See also: F. Langer, *Die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion: Rassenhass und Rassenhetze: ein Vortrag*, Saturn-Verlag, Wien, (1934). **See also:** S. Federbusch, *Sions vises hemliga protokoll i sanningens ljus ...*, Tilgmanns tryckeri, Helsingfors, (1934). **See also:** *Di "Protokoln fun Zikney-Tsien": Di greste Provokatsye in der Yidisher Geshikhte*, Groshn-Bibliotek, Varshe, (1934). **See also:** M. Lazarus and A. Levy, *The Challenge*, The Mercantile Press, Port Elizabeth, (1935). **See also:** I. Goldberg, *The So-called "Protocols of the Elders of Zion": A Definitive Exposure of One of the Most Malicious Lies in History*, Haldeman-Julius Co., Girard, Kansas, (1936). **See also:** A. Rubinstein, *Adolf Hitler: Schüler der "Weisen von Zion"*, Verlagsanstalt "Graphia", (1936). **See also:** Pablo Montesinos y Espartero, duque de la Victoria, *Israel manda; Profecias cumplidas*, Publicaciones del Comité Argentino de Defensa Antisemitica, Buenos Aires, (1936). **See also:** *Berner Bilderbuch vom Zionisten-Prozess um die "Protokolle der Weisen von Zion."*, U. Bodung-Verlag, Erfurt, (1936). **See also:** C. A. Loosli, *Die schlimmen Juden!*, Pestalozzi-Fellenberg-Haus, Bern, (1927). **See also:** I. Heilbut, *Les Vrais Sages de Sion*, Denoël, Paris, (1937). **See also:** I. Heilbut and G. Keller, *Die öffentlichen Verleumder die "Protokolle der Weisen von Zion" und ihre Anwendung in der heutigen Weltpolitik*, Europa Verlag, Zürich, (1937). **See also:** R. M. Blank and P. N. Miliukov, *Adolf Hitler: Ses Aspirations, sa Politique, sa Propagande et les "Protocoles des Sages de Sion"*, L. Beresniak, Paris, (1938). **See also:** E. Raas and G. Brunschvig, *Vernichtung einer Fälschung: der Prozess um die erfundenen "Weisen von Zion"*, Verlag "Die Gestaltung", Zürich, (1938). **See also:** J. Gwyer, *Portraits of Mean Men; a Short History of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, Cobden-Sanderson, London, (1938). **See also:** A. Confino, *Les protocoles des Sages de Sion: Conférence*, Editions du comité juif algérien d'études sociales, Alger, (1938). **See also:** G. Feige, *Debunking the Protocols, a Catholic Scholar Replies (An Exchange of Letters by Two Catholic Priests in Which the Protocols of Zion Are Shown to Be a Classic Forgery)*, Holemans, New York, (1939). **See also:** H. Rollin, "L'Apocalypse de Notre Temps; les Dessous de la Propagande Allemande d'Après des Documents Inédits", *Problèmes et Documents*, Eighth Edition, Gallimard, Paris, (1939). **See also:** J. S. Curtiss, *An Appraisal of the Protocols of Zion*, Columbia University Press, New York, (1942). **See also:** *Protocols of the Elders of Zion: A Fabricated "Historic" Document*, United States of America Congressional Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, (1964). **See also:** N. R. C. Cohn, *Warrant for Genocide: The Myth of the Jewish World-Conspiracy and the Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, Harper & Row New York, (1967); **and** *Die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion*, Baden-Baden, (1998), pp. 267-289; **and** "Der Mythos der 'Protokolle der Weisen von Zion'", *Verschwörungstheorien: Anthropologische Konstanten—historische Varianten*, Fibre, Osnabrück, (2001). **See also:** R. Singerman, "American Career of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion", *American Jewish History*, Volume 71, (September, 1981), pp. 48-78. **See also:** M. Hagemester, "Wer war Sergej Nilus?", *Ostkirchliche Studien*, Volume 40, Number 1, (1991), pp. 49-63; **and** "Die 'Protokolle der Weisen von Zion'", *Russland und Europe. Historische und kulturelle Aspekte eines Jahrhundertproblems*, Leipzig, (1995), pp. 195-206; **and** "Sergej Nilus und die 'Protokolle der Weisen von Zion'", *Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung*, Volume 5, (1996), pp. 127-147. **See also:** U. Lüthi, *Der Mythos von der Weltverschwörung: Die Hetze der Schweizer Frontisten gegen Juden und Freimaurer, am Beispiel des Berner Prozesses um die "Protokolle der Weisen von Zion"*, Helbing & Lichtenhahn, Basel, (1992). **See also:** G. Larsson, *Fact or Fraud?: The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, AMI-Jerusalem Center for Biblical Studies and Research, Jerusalem, San Diego, (1994). **See also:** R. S. Levy and B. W. Segel, *A Lie and a Libel: The History of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, (1995). **See also:** C. De Michelis, "Les Protocoles des sages de

sion: Philologie et histoire”, *Cahiers du Monde russe*, Volume 38, Number 3, (1997), pp. 263-306. **See also:** S. E. Bronner, *A Rumor about the Jews: Reflections on Antisemitism and the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, St. Martin’s Press, New York, (2000). **See also:** S. G. Marks, “Destroying the Agents of Modernity: Russian Antisemitism”, *How Russia Shaped the Modern World*, Chapter 5, Princeton University Press, (2003), pp. 140-175; notes 354-358. **See also:** S. L. Jacobs and M. Weitzman, *Dismantling the Big Lie: The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, Simon Wiesenthal Center in Association with KTAV Pub. House, Jersey City, (2003). **See also:** C. G. De Michelis and R. Newhouse, *The Non-Existent Manuscript: A Study of the Protocols of the Sages of Zion*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, (2004).

721. H. G. Wells, *The World Set Free: A Story of Mankind*, Macmillan, London, (1914); also published in Leipzig, Germany by B. Tauchnitz.

722. P. S. Mowrer, “The Assimilation of Israel”, *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 128, Number 1, (July, 1921), pp. 101-110, at 108-109.

723. “A Jewish Revolution”, *The Maccabean*, New York, (November, 1905), p. 250. W. E. Curtis, “The Revolution in Russia”, *National Geographic Magazine*, (May, 1907), p. 313.

724. “President Gives Hope to Zionists”, *The New York Times*, (3 March 1919), pp. 1, 3.

725. S. Nilus, *The Protocols and World Revolution Including a Translation and Analysis of the “Protocols of the Meetings of the Zionist Men of Wisdom”*, Small, Maynard & Co., Boston, (1920), p. 4.

726. S. Nilus, *The Protocols and World Revolution Including a Translation and Analysis of the “Protocols of the Meetings of the Zionist Men of Wisdom”*, Small, Maynard & Co., Boston, (1920), p. 134; which cites: L. de Rothschild, Swaythling, P. Magnus, M. Samuel, H. S. Samuel, L. L. Cohen, I. Gollancz, J. Monash, C. G. Montefiore and I. Spielmann, “To the Editor of the Morning Post”, *London Morning Post*, (23 April 1919).

727. See also: “World Mischief”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (21 June 1920), p. 8.

728. D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 86-93, 99-100.

729. Cover of: S. Nilus, *Protocols of the Meetings of the Learned Elders of Zion*, English translation by V. E. Mardsen, Thunderbolt, Savannah, Georgia, (1960).

730. S. Nilus, *The Protocols and World Revolution Including a Translation and Analysis of the “Protocols of the Meetings of the Zionist Men of Wisdom”*, Small, Maynard & Co., Boston, (1920), p. 74.

731. T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 196.

732. A. Einstein, “Unpublished Preface to a Blackbook”, *Out of My Later Years*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1950), pp. 258-259, at 259.

733. Bishop M. Sasse, Eisenach, *Martin Luther and the Jews*, Second Printing, Sons of Liberty, Hollywood, California, (1967), p. 5.

734. A. Einstein, “Unpublished Preface to a Blackbook”, *Out of My Later Years*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1950), pp. 258-259, at 259.

735. URL:<<http://vho.org/dl/ENG/tfh.pdf>>

736. I. Zangwill, “Is Political Zionism Dead? Yes”, *The Nation*, Volume 118, Number 3062, (12 March 1924), pp. 276-278, at 276.

737. “Reparations, German”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 14, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 72-73.

738. C. Weizmann, “Zionism—Alive and Triumphant”, *The Nation*, Volume 118, Number 3062, (12 March 1924), pp. 279-280.

739. B. D. Wolfe, *Marxism: One Hundred Years in the Life of a Doctrine*, Dial Press, New York, (1965), p. 67. Wolfe cites: “From Engels’s introduction to the reissue of a pamphlet by Sigismund Borkheim. Borkheim’s pamphlet, *Zur Erinnerung fuer die deutschen Mordspatrioten 1806-07* [***] The introduction is reproduced in *Werke*, Vol. XXI, pp. 350-351.”

740. <<http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/687099.html>>

741. A. Einstein, “Unpublished Preface to a Blackbook”, *Out of My Later Years*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1950), pp. 258-259, at 259.

742. A. Einstein, “Unpublished Preface to a Blackbook”, *Out of My Later Years*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1950), pp. 258-259, at 259.

743. D. Ben-Gurion, *Memoirs*, The World Publishing Company, New York, Cleveland, (1970), pp. 163-164.

744. T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 172.

745. Сергей Нилюсь, Великое въ маломъ и Антихристъ, какъ близкая политическая возможность, (1901/1905).

746. English: *The International Jew: The World’s Foremost Problem*, In Four Volumes, (1920-1922); which reproduces articles which first appeared in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT*. **German:** *Der internationale Jude*, Hammer-Verlag, (1922). **Russian:** *Mezhdunarodnoe evreistvo: perevod s angliiskago*, (1925). **Italian:** *L’Internazionale Ebraica. Protocolli dei “Savi Anziani” di Sion*, La Vita Italiana, Rassegna Mensile di Politica, Roma, (1921). **Spanish:** B. Wenzel, *El Judío Internacional: Un Problema del Mundo*, Hammer-Verlag, Leipzig, (1930). **Portuguese:** S. E. Castan and H. Ford, *O Judeu Internacional*, Revisão, Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil, (1989). **See also:** A. Hitler, “The International Jew and the International Stock Exchange—Guilty of the World War”, in R. S. Levy, Editor, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Lexington, Massachusetts, Toronto, (1991), pp. 213-221. **See also:** R. Dmowski, “The Jews and the War”, in R. S. Levy, Editor, J. Kulczycki, translator, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Lexington, Massachusetts, Toronto, (1991), pp. 182-189.

747. “\$200,000 Libel Suit Filed Against Ford”, *The New York Times*, (19 August 1923), p. 2.

748. V. I. Lenin, “Anti-Jewish Pogroms”, *Collected Works*, Volume 29, English translation of the Fourth Russian Edition, Progress Publishers, Moscow, (1972), pp. 252-253. **See also:** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), p. 251. **See also:** G. B. Shaw, *The Jewish Guardian*, (1931). **See also:** *Congress Bulletin*, American Jewish Congress, New York, (5 January 1940). **See also:** *The Jewish Voice*, (January, 1942). **See also:** G. Aronson, *Soviet Russia and the Jews*, American Jewish League against Communism, New York, (1949). **See also:** J. Stalin, “Anti-Semitism: Reply to an Inquiry of the Jewish News Agency in the United States” (12 January 1931), *Works*, Volume 13, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, (1955), p. 30. **See also:** S. S. Montefiore, *Stalin: The Court of the Red Star*, Vintage, New York, (2003), pp. 305-306. **See also:** “Anti-Semitism”, *Great Soviet Encyclopedia: A Translation of the Third Edition*, Volume 2, (1973), pp. 175-177, at 176. **See also:** “Jews”, *Great Soviet Encyclopedia: A Translation of the Third Edition*, Volume 9, Macmillan, New York, (1975), pp. 292-293, at 293. **See also:** N. S. Alent’eva, Editor, *Tseli i metody voinstvuiushchego sionizma*, Izd-vo polit. lit-ry, Moskva, (1971). Н. С. Алентьева, Редактор, Цели и методы воинствующего сионизма, Издательство Политической Литературы, Москва, (1971).

- 749.** C. Weizmann, *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*, Volume 1, Series B, August 1898-July 1931, Transaction Books, Rutgers University, (1983), pp. 241-242.
- 750.** L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), p. 40.
- 751.** W. E. Curtis, "The Revolution in Russia", *The National Geographic Magazine*, Volume 18, Number 5, (May, 1907), pp. 302-316, at 313-314.
- 752.** I. Zangwill, "Is Political Zionism Dead?", *The Nation*, Volume 118, Number 3062, (12 March 1924), pp. 276-278, at 276.
- 753.** *From:* A. Nadler, "Last Exit to Brooklyn: The Lubavitcher's Powerful and Preposterous Messianism", *The New Republic*, (4 May 1992), pp. 27-35, at 34. Nadler appears to quote from: N. Loewenthal, *Communicating the Infinite: The Emergence of the Habad School*, University of Chicago Press, (1990).
- 754.** G. E. Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), p. 208.
- 755.** H. N. Casson, "The Jew in America", *Munsey's Magazine*, Volume 34, Number 4, (January, 1906), pp. 381-395, at 382, 393, 394.
- 756. English:** *The International Jew: The World's Foremost Problem*, In Four Volumes, (1920-1922); which reproduces articles which first appeared in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT*. **German:** *Der internationale Jude*, Hammer-Verlag, (1922). **Russian:** *Mezhdunarodnoe evreistvo: perevod s angliiskago*, (1925). **Italian:** *L'Internazionale Ebraica. Protocolli dei "Savi Anziani" di Sion*, La Vita Italiana, Rassegna Mensile di Politica, Roma, (1921). **Spanish:** B. Wenzel, *El Judío Internacional: Un Problema del Mundo*, Hammer-Verlag, Leipzig, (1930). **Portuguese:** S. E. Castan and H. Ford, *O Judeu Internacional*, Revisão, Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil, (1989).
- 757.** *Schlesische Zeitung* (Breslau), (16 June 1921), quoted in E. Gehrcke, *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie: Kulturhistorisch-psychologische Dokumente*, Hermann Meusser, (1924), p. 35.
- 758.** "The State and Prospect of the Jews", *The London Times*, (24 January 1839), p. 3. "Restoration of the Jews", *The London Times*, (9 March 1840), p. 3. "Syria.—Restoration of the Jews", *The London Times*, (17 August 1840), p. 3. "Restoration of the Jews: Memorandum/Correspondence", *The London Times*, (26 August 1840), pp. 5-6. "Letters to the Editor", *The London Times*, (26 August 1840), p. 6.
- 759.** X, "Flight from Bolshevism", *The London Times*, (14 October 1919), p. 14; **and** "The Horrors of Bolshevism", *The London Times*, (14 November 1919), pp. 13-14. **See also:** I. Cohen, "Jews and Bolshevism", *The London Times*, (21 November 1919), p. 8; **and** "Jews and Bolshevism", *The London Times*, (25 November 1919), p. 8; **and** "Jews and Bolshevism: The Mosaic Law in Politics: Racial Temperament", *The London Times*, (27 November 1919), p. 15; **and** "Jews and Bolshevism: A Further Rejoinder", *The London Times*, (1 December 1919), p. 10. **See also:** Philojudaeus, "Jews and Bolshevism: The Group Round Lenin", *The London Times*, (22 November 1919), p. 8. **See also:** Janus, "Jews and Bolshevism: Revolutionary Elements", *The London Times*, (26 November 1919), p. 8. **See also:** Judaeus, *The London Times*, (26 November 1919), p. 8; **and** "Jews and Bolshevism: A Reply to 'Verax.'", *The London Times*, (28 November 1919), p. 8. Verax, "Jews and Bolshevism: The Mosaic Law in Politics: Racial Temperament", *The London Times*, (27 November 1919), p. 15; **and** "Bolshevism and the Jews: A Larger Issue: The Danger in Russia", *The London Times*, (2 December 1919), p. 10. **See also:** J. H. Hertz, Chief Rabbi, "Jews and Bolshevism: The Chief Rabbi's Reply", *The London Times*, (29 November 1919), p. 8. **See also:** Pro-Denikin, "A Witness from Russia", *The London Times*, (29 November 1919), p. 8. **See also:** An English-Born Jew, *The London Times*, (1 December 1919), p. 10.

See also: Ivan Ivanovich, “The Jews and Bolshevism”, *The London Times*, (6 December 1919), p. 10. “**Epatism**” defined in *The London Times*: “Epatism”, *The London Times*, (10 December 1919), p. 15.

760. URL:<<http://vho.org/dl/ENG/tfh.pdf>>

761. K. A. Strom, Editor, *The Best of Attack! and National Vanguard Tabloid*, National Alliance, Arlington, Virginia, (1984), p. 65.

762. K. A. Strom, Editor, *The Best of Attack! and National Vanguard Tabloid*, National Alliance, Arlington, Virginia, (1984), p. 65.

763. K. A. Strom, Editor, *The Best of Attack! and National Vanguard Tabloid*, National Alliance, Arlington, Virginia, (1984), p. 66.

764. K. A. Strom, Editor, *The Best of Attack! and National Vanguard Tabloid*, National Alliance, Arlington, Virginia, (1984), p. 66.

765. C. Weizmann, *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*, Volume 1, Series B, August 1898-July 1931, Transaction Books, Rutgers University, (1983), pp. 241-242.

766. D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 256-257; *see also*: pp. 93, 101.

767. D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 86-93, 99-100.

768. I. Zangwill, “Is Political Zionism Dead?”, *The Nation*, Volume 118, Number 3062, (12 March 1924), pp. 276-278, at 276.

769. D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935).

770. D. Eckart and A. Hitler, *Der Bolschewismus von Moses bis Lenin: Zwiegespräch zwischen Adolf Hitler und mir*, Hoheneichen-Verlag, München, (1924); English translation by W. L. Pierce, “Bolshevism from Moses to Lenin”, *National Socialist World*, (1966). URL: <<http://www.jrbooksonline.com/DOCs/Eckart.doc>> p. 8.

771. G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918). B. Lazare, *Antisemitism: Its History and Causes*, (1894); *L’Antisémitisme, son Histoire et ses Causes*, L. Chailley, Paris, (1894).

772. R. H. Williams, *The Ultimate World Order—As Pictured in “The Jewish Utopia”*, CPA Book Publisher, Boring, Oregon, (1957?), p. 7.

773. Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein, Editor, *The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Nezikin: Baba Mezia*, Volume 24, The Soncino Press, London, (1935), pp. 619-622, at 619.

774. R. H. Williams, *The Ultimate World Order—As Pictured in “The Jewish Utopia”*, CPA Book Publisher, Boring, Oregon, (1957?), p. 8.

775. Josephus, “Antiquities of the Jews”, Book XX, Chapter 8, *The Works of Flavius Josephus: Comprising the Antiquities of the Jews; a History of the Jewish Wars; and Life of Flavius Josephus, Written by Himself*, S. S. Scranton Co., Hartford, Connecticut, (1916), pp. 609-613, at 612-613.

776. I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), pp. 9, 11. J. Prinz, *The Secret Jews*, Random House, New York, (1973), pp. 111-112.

777. Letter from A. Einstein to E. Zürcher of 15 April 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 23, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 19.

778. R. H. Williams, *The Ultimate World Order—As Pictured in “The Jewish Utopia”*, CPA Book Publisher, Boring, Oregon, (1957?), p. 6.

779. D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 93, 101, 256-257.

- 780.** G. Sorel, *Réflexions sur la Violence*, Librairie de “Pages libres”, Paris, (1908). English translation: *Reflections on Violence*, B.W. Huebsch, New York, (1912).
- 781.** Letter from H. Zangger to A. Einstein circa 17 October 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 143, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 120-121, at 120.
- 782.** D. Eckart, “Wovor uns Kapp behueten wollte”, *Auf gut Deutsch*, D. Eckardt, München, (16 April 1920). A. Rosenberg, *Pest in Russland!: der Bolschewismus, seine Häupter, Handlanger und Opfer*, E. Boepple, München, (1922), p. 78.
- 783.** M. Buber quoted in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 463.
- 784.** D. Reed, “The End of Lord Northcliffe”, *The Controversy of Zion*, Chapter 34, Bloomfield, Sudbury, (1978).
- 785.** “Jüdischnationale Paroxysmen”, *Die Wahrheit* (Wien/Vienna), Volume 38, Number 6, (9 March 1922), pp. 3-4.
- 786.** R. Wagner under the *nom de plume* K. Freigedank, “Das Judentum in der Musik”, *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, (3 and 6 September 1850); Reprinted with revisions and an appendix, R. Wagner, *Das Judentum in der Musik*, J. J. Weber, Leipzig, (1869); the original unrevised 1850 article was reprinted in *Gesammelte Schriften und Dichtungen*, Volume 5; English translation of the 1869 version by E. Evans, *Judaism in Music (Das Judentum in der Musik) Being the Original Essay Together with the Later Supplement*, W. Reeves, London, (1910); Also, “Judaism in Music”, *Richard Wagner’s Prose Works*, Volume 3, Broude Brothers, New York, (1966), pp. 75-122.; which is a reprint of the original “Judaism in Music”, *Richard Wagner’s Prose Works*, Volume 3, Kegan Paul, Trench, and Trübner, London, (1894).
- 787.** English translation from: P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967). p. 315.
- 788.** L. Holst, *Das Judentum in allen dessen Teilen. Aus einem staatswissenschaftlichen Standpunkt betrachtet*, Mainz, (1821).
- 789.** E. K. Dühring, *Die Judenfrage als Racen-, Sitten- und Culturfrage: mit einer weltgeschichtlichen Antwort*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, (1881); English translation by A. Jacob, *Eugen Dühring on the Jews*, Nineteen Eighty Four Press, Brighton, England, (1997), p. 107, 135. Dühring refers to Ludolf Holst, *Das Judentum in allen dessen Teilen. Aus einem staatswissenschaftlichen Standpunkt betrachtet*, Mainz, (1821).
- 790.** N. Syrkin, under the *nom de plume* “Ben Elieser”, *Die Judenfrage und der sozialistische Judenstaat*, Steiger, Bern, (1898); English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 333-350, at 340.
- 791.** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), pp. 250-251.
- 792.** As quoted in: R. H. Williams, *The Ultimate World Order—As Pictured in “The Jewish Utopia”*, CPA Book Publisher, Boring, Oregon, (1957?), p. 14.
- 793.** V. I. Lenin, “Anti-Jewish Pogroms”, *Collected Works*, Volume 29, English translation of the Fourth Russian Edition, Progress Publishers, Moscow, (1972), pp. 252-253. **See also:** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), p. 251. **See also:** G. B. Shaw, *The Jewish Guardian*, (1931). **See also:** *Congress Bulletin*, American Jewish Congress, New York, (5 January 1940). **See also:** *The Jewish Voice*, (January, 1942). **See also:** G. Aronson, *Soviet Russia and the Jews*, American Jewish League against Communism, New York, (1949). **See also:** J. Stalin, “Anti-Semitism: Reply to an Inquiry of the Jewish News Agency in the United States” (12 January 1931), *Works*, Volume 13, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, (1955), p. 30. **See also:**

S. S. Montefiore, *Stalin: The Court of the Red Star*, Vintage, New York, (2003), pp. 305-306. **See also:** “Anti-Semitism”, *Great Soviet Encyclopedia: A Translation of the Third Edition*, Volume 2, (1973), pp. 175-177, at 176. **See also:** “Jews”, *Great Soviet Encyclopedia: A Translation of the Third Edition*, Volume 9, Macmillan, New York, (1975), pp. 292-293, at 293.

794. *Exodus* 34:11-17. *Psalms* 72. *Isaiah* 1:9; 2:1-4; 6:9-13; 9:6-7; 10:20-22; 11:4, 9-12; 17:6; 37:31-33; 41:9; 42; 43; 44; 61:6. *Jeremiah* 3:17; 33:15-16. *Ezekiel* 20:38; 25:14. *Daniel* 12:1, 10. *Amos* 9:8-10. *Obadiah* 1:18. *Micah* 4:2-3; 5:8. *Zechariah* 8:20-23; 14:9. *Romans* 9:27-28; 11:1-5.

795. *Exodus* 34:11-17. *Psalms* 72. *Isaiah* 1:9; 2:1-4; 6:9-13; 9:6-7; 10:20-22; 11:4, 9-12; 17:6; 37:31-33; 41:9; 42; 43; 44; 61:6. *Jeremiah* 3:17; 33:15-16. *Ezekiel* 20:38; 25:14. *Daniel* 12:1, 10. *Amos* 9:8-10. *Obadiah* 1:18. *Micah* 4:2-3; 5:8. *Zechariah* 8:20-23; 14:9. *Romans* 9:27-28; 11:1-5.

796. M. Higger, *The Jewish Utopia*, Lord Baltimore Press, Baltimore, (1932). R. H. Williams, *The Ultimate World Order—As Pictured in “The Jewish Utopia”*, CPA Book Publisher, Boring, Oregon, (1957?).

797. M. Nordau, “Max Nordau on the General Situation of the Jews”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (3 September 1897), pp. 7-9, at 8.

798. Y. Brovko, “Einshteinianstvo—agenturnaya set mirovovo kapitala”, *Molodaia Gvardiia*, Number 8, (1995), pp. 66-74, at 70. Юрий Бровко, “Эйнштейнианство — агентурная сеть Мирового капитала”, *Молодая гвардия*, № 8, (1995), сс. 66-74; **and** Y. Brovko, “Razgrom einshteinianstvo”, *Priroda i Chelovek. Svet*, Number 7, (2002), pp. 8-10. Юрий Бровко, “Разгром эйнштейнианства”, *Природа и Человек. Свет*, № 7, (2002), сс. 8-10. <<http://medograd.narod.ru/einstein.html>>

799. Y. Brovko, “Einshteinianstvo—agenturnaya set mirovovo kapitala”, *Molodaia Gvardiia*, Number 8, (1995), pp. 66-74, at 70. Юрий Бровко, “Эйнштейнианство — агентурная сеть Мирового капитала”, *Молодая гвардия*, № 8, (1995), сс. 66-74. Special thanks to Karim Khaidarov for this citation!

800. В. А. Бронштен. Беседы о космосе и гипотезах. Наука, Москва, (1968), стр. 206. V. A. Bronshten, *Besedy o kosmose i gipotezakh*, Nauka, Moscow, (1968), p. 206. Special thanks to my wife Kristina for her help in the translation!

801. В. А. Бронштен. Беседы о космосе и гипотезах. Наука, Москва, (1968), стр. 198. V. A. Bronshten, *Besedy o kosmose i gipotezakh*, Nauka, Moscow, (1968), p. 198. Special thanks to my wife Kristina for her help in the translation!

802. И. Лифшиц, “Возможно ли ‘невозможное’?” *Литературная газета*, № 24, (14 Июня 1978), стр. 13. E. Lifschitz, “Vozmozhno li ‘Nevozmozhnoe’?”, *Literaturnaia gazeta organ Pravleniia Soiuzs Sovetskikh pisatelei SSSR*, Number 24, (14 June 1978), p. 13. Special thanks to my wife Kristina for her help in the translation!

803. H. Fireside and Z. A. Medvedev, *Soviet Psychoprisons*, W. W. Norton & Company, New York, London, (1979), p. 140.

804. P. Frank, *Einstein, His Life and Times*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1947), pp. 174-175.

805. “Prof. Einstein Here, Explains Relativity”, *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), pp. 1, 13, at 1.

806. K. MacDonald, *The Culture of Critique*, Praeger, Westport, Connecticut, London, (1998), pp. 115-117; **citing:** E. Jones, *Free Associations: Memories of a Psycho-Analyst*, Basic Books, New York, (1959); **and** F. Sulloway, “Freud as Conquistador”, *The New Republic*, (August, 1979), pp. 25-31; **and** D. B. Klein, *Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytic Movement*, Praeger, New York, (1981); **and** P. Gay, *Freud: A Life for Our Time*, W. W.

Norton, New York, (1988); **and** L. Chamberlain, "Freud and the Eros of the Impossible", *Times Literary Supplement*, (25 August 1995), pp. 9-10; **and** K. MacDonald, *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism*, Praeger, Westport, Connecticut, (1998).

807. "Says the Zionists Disturb Palestine", *The New York Times*, (18 January 1914), Section 3, p. 3. D. Reed, *Somewhere South of Suez*, Devin-Adair Company, U. S. A., (1951), pp. 324-327.

808. See: "Bomb for Farran Kills Brother; Sternists Had Threatened Death", *The New York Times*, (4 May 1948), pp. 1, 17. **See also:** "Britons Indignant Over Bomb Outrage", *The New York Times*, (5 May 1948), p. 17:2. **See also:** "British Party Slain", *The New York Times*, (6 May 1948), p. 8. **See also:** "Parcel Bomb Sent to British General", *The New York Times*, (12 May 1948), p. 13. **See also:** "Anti-Zionist Tells of Threats on Life", *The New York Times*, (14 May 1948), p. 6. **See also:** "British Public is Warned", *The New York Times*, (14 May 1948), p. 10. **See also:** "Torture Reports Studied by Israel", *The New York Times*, (9 June 1950), p. 9.

809. D. Yisraeli, *The Palestine Problem in German Politics, 1889-1945* (Hebrew), Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel, (1974), pp. 315-317.

810. R. I. Friedman, *The False Prophet: Rabbi Meir Kahane: from FBI Informant to Knesset Member*, Lawrence Hill Books, Brooklyn, New York, (1990).

811. J. B. Bell, *Terror out of Zion: Irgun Zvai Leumi, LEHI, and the Palestine underground, 1929-1949*, St. Martin's Press, New York, (1977). L. Rokach and M. Sharett, *Israel's Sacred Terrorism: A Study Based on Moshe Sharett's Personal Diary and Other Documents*, Association of Arab-American University Graduates, Belmont, Massachusetts, (1986). B. Hoffman, *The Failure of British Military Strategy within Palestine, 1939-1947*, Bar-Ilan University Press, Ramat-Gan, Israel, (1983). J. Heller, *Stern Gang: Ideology, Politics and Terror, 1940-49*, F. Cass, Portland, Oregon, (1994). T. Segev, *One Palestine, Complete: Jews and Arabs under the British Mandate*, Henry Holt and Co., New York, (2001). B. Morris, *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881-2001*, Vintage Books, New York, (2001). J. Stern, *Terror in the Name of God: Why Religious Militants Kill*, Ecco, New York, (2003), pp. 85-106.

812. P. Day, "Jewish Plot to Kill Bevin in London", *The Sunday Times* (London), (5 March 2006); *TIMES ONLINE*: <<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-2069967,00.html>>

813. "Letter to the Editor", signed by Isidore Abramowitz, Hannah Arendt, Abraham Brick, Rabbi Jessurun Cardozo, Albert Einstein, Herman Eisen, M. D., Hayim Fineman, M. Gallen, M. D., H. H. Harris, Zelig S. Harris, Sidney Hook, Fred Karush, Bruria Kaufman, Irma L. Lindheim, Nachman Majsel, Seymour Melman, Myer D. Mendelson, M. D., Harry M. Orlinsky, Samuel Pitlick, Fritz Rohrlich, Louis P. Rucker, Ruth Sager, Itzhak Sankowsky, I. J. Schoenberg, Samuel Shuman, M. Znger, Irma Wolpe, Stefan Wolpe; dated "New York. Dec. 2, 1948."; published as: "New Palestine Party; Visit of Menachen Begin and Aims of Political Movement Discussed", *The New York Times*, (4 December 1948), p. 12.

814. D. A. Schmidt, "200 ARABS KILLED, STRONGHOLD TAKEN; Irgun and Stern Groups Unite to Win Deir Yasin—Kastel Is Recaptured by Haganah", *The New York Times*, (10 April 1948), p. 6. D. A. Schmidt, "ARABS SAY KASTEL HAS BEEN RETAKEN; JEWS DENY CLAIM; British Confirm That Control of Key Point on Palestine Road Has Shifted Anew MASSACRE IS DENOUNCED Both Sides Decry Killing of 250 by Terrorist Groups at Deir Yassin Friday ARABS SAY KASTEL HAS BEEN RETAKEN PALESTINE FIGHTING CONTINUES IN MANY AREAS", *The New York Times*, (12 April 1948), p. 1.

815. C. Lazar, *Destruction and Resistance*, Shengold Publishers, New York, (1985). R. Cohen, *The Avengers*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (2000).

816. T. Schwarz, *Walking with the Damned: The Shocking Murder of the Man Who Freed 30,000 Prisoners from the Nazis*, Paragon House, New York, (1992). K. Marton, *A Death in Jerusalem*, Pantheon Books, New York, (1994).

817. There was allegedly an Arabic language book published in the 1950's under the title, "Venom of the Zionist Viper", which disclosed these facts. **See also:** N. Giladi, *Ben Gurion's Scandals: How the Haganah & the Mossad Eliminated Jews*, Gllilit Pub. Co., Flushing, New York, (1992).

818. A. Golan, *Operation Susannah*, Harper & Row, New York, (1978). **See also:** D. Raviv, *Every Spy a Prince: The Complete History of Israel's Intelligence Community*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, (1990). **See also:** V. Ostrovsky and C. Hoy, *By Way of Deception: A Devastating Insider's Portrait of the Mossad*, Stoddart, Toronto, (1990). V. Ostrovsky, *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad's Secret Agenda*, Harper Paperbacks, New York, (1994). **See also:** I. Black and B. Morris, *Israel's Secret Wars: A History of Israel's Intelligence Services*, Grove Weidenfeld, New York, (1991). **See also:** S. Teveth, *Ben-Gurion's Spy: The Story of the Political Scandal That Shaped Modern Israel*, Columbia University Press, New York, (1996). **See also:** J. Beinlin, *The Dispersion of Egyptian Jewry: Culture, Politics, and the Formation of a Modern Diaspora*, University of California Press, Berkeley, (1998).

819. W. Beecher, "Israel, in Error, Attacks U. S. Ship; 10 Navy Men Die, 100 Hurt in Raids North of Sinai Israelis, in Error, Attack U.S. Navy Ship 10 Navy Men Die and 100 Are Hurt Communications Vessel Is Raided From Air and Sea North of Sinai Peninsula", *The New York Times*, (9 June 1967), p. 1. N. Sheehan, "Sailors Describe Attack on Vessel; Israelis Struck So Suddenly U. S. Guns Were Unloaded", *The New York Times*, (11 June 1967), p. 27. "Israel Offers Compensation", *The New York Times*, (11 June 1967), p. 27. McClure M. Howland, "Families of Sailors" Letter to the Editor, *The New York Times*, (15 June 1967), p. 46. "Israel Accused at Hearing on U. S. Ship", *The New York Times*, (18 June 1967), p. 20. "U. S. Again Accused", *The New York Times*, (20 June 1967), p. 13. N. Sheehan, "Order Didn't Get to U. S. S. Liberty; Pentagon Reports Message Directing Ship Off Sinai to Move Arrived Late Ship 15.5 Miles Offshore", *The New York Times*, (29 June 1967), p. 1. **See also:** J. M. Ennes, *Assault on the Liberty: The True Story of the Israeli Attack on an American Intelligence Ship*, Random House, New York, (1979). **See also:** BBC Documentary, *Dead in the Water*, (21 August 2004, 7:00-8:10pm; rpt 1:50-3:00am) <http://www.bbc.co.uk/bbcfour/documentaries/features/dead_in_the_water.shtml>

820. L. Rokach, *Israel's Sacred Terrorism*, Third Edition, AAUG Press, Belmont Massachusetts, p. 41.

821. D. Ben-Gurion, quoted in: M. Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: A Biography*, Delacorte Press, New York, (1978), p. 166.

822. D. K. Shipler, "Most West Bank Arabs Blaming U. S. for Impasse", *The New York Times*, (14 April 1983), p. A3; **and** "Israel's Military Chief Retires and Is Replaced by His Deputy", *The New York Times*, (20 April 1983), p. A8; **and** "The Israeli Army Signs a Political Truce", *The New York Times*, Section 4, (15 May 1983), p. 3. **See also:** A. Lewis, "Hope Against Hope", *The New York Times*, Section 4, (17 April 1983), p. 19; **and** "The New Israel; Away from the Early Zionist Dream", *The New York Times*, (30 July 1984), p. A21. **See also:** J. Kuttub, "West Bank Arabs Foresee Expulsion", *The New York Times*, (1 August 1983), p. A15. **See also:** A. Cowell, "Israel Frees More Prisoners, But Arabs Are Not Mollified", *The New York Times*, (4 March 1994), p. A10. **See also:** Y. M. Ibrahim, "Palestinians See a People's Hatred in a Killer's Deed", *The New York Times*, (6 March

1994), p. E16.

823. Y. M. Ibrahim, "Palestinians See a People's Hatred in a Killer's Deed", *The New York Times*, (6 March 1994), p. E16.

824. A. Kizel, *Yediot Ahronot*, (1 March 1994). Y. Harkabi, *Israel's Fateful Hour*, Harper & Row, New York, (1988), p. 157.

825. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/israel/>

826. R. H. Anderson, "30 PUPILS IN U.A.R. SAID TO DIE IN RAID; Teacher Is Also Reported Killed as Israeli Planes Strike a Delta Village Egyptians Report 30 Schoolchildren Killed in Israeli Raid on Village", *The New York Times*, (9 April 1970), p. 1, 14; *see also*: p. 15. R. H. Anderson, "Egypt Terms U.S. Cynical", *The New York Times*, (10 April 1970), p. 3. "Britain Deplores Deaths", *The New York Times*, (10 April 1970), p. 3.

827. T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and Wang, New York, (1993), p. 142.

828. J. B. Agus, *The Meaning of Jewish History*, Volume 2, Abelard-Schuman, New York, (1963), pp. 445-446.

829. M. Berenbaum, *After Tragedy and Triumph: Essays in Modern Jewish Thought and the American Experience*, Cambridge University Press, (1990), p.7.

830. M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 177.

831. M. C. Piper, *Final Judgment: The Missing Link in the JFK Assassination Conspiracy*, Wolfe Press, Washington, D.C., (1993).

832. L. Wolf, *The Jewish Bogy and the Forged Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, London, The Press Committee of the Jewish Board of Deputies, (1920); **and** *The Myth of the Jewish Menace in World Affairs; or, The Truth about the Forged Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, The Macmillan company, New York, (1921). **See also**: *Confrontation der "Geheimnisse der Weisen von Zion". ("Die Zionistischen Protokolle") mit ihrer Quelle "Dialogue aux enfers entre Machiavel et Montesquieu" der Nachweis der Fälschung. ; Dialogue aux enfers entre Machiavel et Montesquieu*, Rechtsschutzabteilung des Schweizerischen Israelitischen Gemeindebundes, Basel, (1933). **See also**: H. Bernstein, *The History of a Lie, "The Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion"; a Study*, Ogilvie Pub. Co. New York, (1921); **and** *The Truth About "The Protocols of Zion"; a Complete Exposure*, Covici, Friede, New York, (1935).

833. T. Herzl, *Der Judenstaat; Versuch einer modernen Lösung der Judenfrage*, M. Breitenstein, Leipzig, Wien, (1896). English translation: *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904).

834. *The Cause of World Unrest*, G. Richards, Ltd., London, G.P. Putnam, New York, (1920); which reproduces articles which first appeared in *The Morning Post* of London. **See also**: *World Conquest through World Government*, Britons Pub. Society, London, (1958/1920). **See also**: K. Paumgarten and L. Müller, *Juda: Kritische Betrachtungen über das Wesen und Wirken des Judentums*, Heimatverlag Leopold Stocker, Graz, (1920). **See also**: *El Peligro Judío*, C.T.S., Santiago de Chile, (1920). **See also**: B. Brasol, *The Protocols and World Revolution, Including a Translation and Analysis of the "Protocols of the Meetings of the Zionist Men of Wisdom"*, Small, Maynard & Company, Boston, (1920); **and** *Socialism Vs. Civilization*, C. Scribner's Sons, New York, (1920); **and** *The World at the Cross Roads*, Small, Maynard & Co., Boston, (1921); **and** *The Balance Sheet of Sovietism*, Duffield, New York, (1922). **See also**: H. L. Strack, *Die Weisen von Zion und ihre Gläubigen*, C.A. Schwetschke & Sohn, Berlin, (1921). **See also**: E. Jouin, *Le Péril Judéo-Maçonnique*, Émile-Paul frères, Paris, (1921). **See also**: George Sydenham Clarke, Baron Sydenham of Combe, *The Jewish World Problem*, (1921). **See also**: L. Fry, *L'Auteur des*

Protocols Achad Ha-Am et le Sionisme, Editions de la Vieille-France, Paris, (1921); **and** *Akhad-Khem (Asher Geintsberg); Tainyi vozhd' iudeiskii*, Tip. Presse, Berlin, (1922); **and** German translation by Th von Winberg, *Achad Cham (Ascher Hinzberg)*, München, (1923). **See also:** E. Jouin, *Le Péril judéo-Maçonnique: Les "Protocols" des Sages de Sion. Coup d'Oeil d'Ensemble*, Revue Internationale des Sociétés Secrètes, Paris, (1921). **See also:** H. Ford and S. Crowther, *My Life and Work*, Doubleday, Page & Company, Garden City, New York, (1922), pp. 250-252. **See also:** C. J. Gohier, *Le Peril Juif Comment le Conjurer*, (1923). **See also:** U. Gohier, *Criminelle Doctrine du Talmud*, Paris, (1923). **See also:** Brother Therapier, T.O.S.F., *The World's Unrest and the Jew (III)* Franciscan Friary, Montreal, (1923). **See also:** T. Fritsch, *Die Zionistischen Protokolle; das Programm der internationalen Geheimregierung. Aus dem Englischen übers. nach dem in Britischen Museum befindlichen Original*, Hammer-Verlag, Leipzig, (1924). **See also:** D. Eckart and A. Hitler, *Der Bolschewismus von Moses bis Lenin: Zwiegespräch zwischen Adolf Hitler und mir*, Hoheneichen-Verlag, München, (1924); English translation by W. Pierce: *Bolshevism from Moses to Lenin: A Dialog Between Adolf Hitler and Me*, Vanguard Books. **See also:** P. Copin-Albancelli, *La Guerre Occulte, les Sociétés Secrètes Contre les Nations*, Perrin, Paris, (1925). **See also:** A. Rosenberg, *Der Weltverschwörerkongress zu Basel*, Verlag F. Eher Nachf., München, (1927). **See also:** E. Jouin, *Le Péril Judéo-Maçonnique*, Revue Internationale des Sociétés Secrètes, Paris, (1927). **See also:** Imperial Fascist League, *The Era of World Ruin! (The Era of Democracy): The Claim of the Jews that They Installed Democracy for the Express Purpose of Ruining the Gentile World*, Imperial Fascist League, London, (1930's). **See also:** E. Cahill, Edward, *Freemasonry and the Anti-Christian Movement*, Second Revised and Enlarged Edition, M.H.Gill, Dublin, (1930). **See also:** *4 Protocols of Zion: (Not the Protocols of Nilus)*, Britons Pub. Society, London, (1931). **See also:** L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward*, Éditions R.I.S.S., Paris, (1931). **See also:** A. Reiterer, *Das Judentum und die Schatten des Antichrist*, Styria, Graz, (1933). **See also:** E. Knauss, *Communism and the Protocols*, E. Knauss, Davenport, Iowa, (1933). **See also:** L. Müller, *Cianas gudro noslepumi ...*, J. Turks, Riga, (1933). **See also:** W. B. Riley, *Protocols and Communism*, Minneapolis, (1934). **See also:** E. N. Sanctuary, *World Alliance against Jewish Aggressiveness, "Are these things so?" Being a Reply to this Question Propounded by a Jewish High Priest of the First Christian Martyr 1900 Years Ago; a Study in Modern Termites of the Homo Sapiens Type*, Community Press, Woodhaven, New York City, (1934). **See also:** W. Creutz, *Les Protocoles des Sages de Sion: Leur Authenticité*, Les Nouvelles Éditions Nationales, Brunoy, (1934); English translation, *New Light on the Protocols: Latest Evidence on the Veracity of this Remarkable Document*, The Right Cause, Chicago, (1935). **See also:** *The Jewish Victory at Berne: Side Lights on the Verdict*, Christian Aryan Protection League, London, (1935). **See also:** U. Fleischhauer, *Die echten Protokolle der Weisen von Zion; Sachverständigengutachten, erstattet im Auftrage des Richteramtes V in Bern*, U. Bodung, Erfurt, (1935). **See also:** *The Berne Trail—Concerning the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion." Fourteenth Session; Tuesday, May 14, 1935—P.M.*, (1935). **See also:** H. Jonak von Freyenwald, *Der Berner Prozess um die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion. Akten und Gutachten*, U. Bodung, Bund Nationalsozialistischer Eidgenossen, Erfurt, (1939). **See also:** G. Schwartz-Bostunitsch, *Jüdischer Imperialismus*, O. Ebersberger, Landsberg am Lech., (1935). **See also:** R. E. Edmondson, *The Damning Parallels of the Protocol "Forgeries" as Adopted and Fulfilled in the United States by Jewish-Radical Leadership: A Diabolical Capitalist-Communist Alliance Unmasked*, New York, (1935). **See also:** S. Vász, *Das Berner Fehlurteil über die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion: eine kritische Betrachtung über das Prozessverfahren*, U. Bodung, Erfurt, (1935). **See also:** G. B. Winrod, *The Hidden Hand: The Protocols and the Coming Superman*, Defender Publishers, Wichita,

Kansas, (1933); **and** *Antichrist and the Tribe of Dan*, Defender Publishers, Wichita, Kansas. **See also:** *A Protocol of 1935: Based on a Careful Study of the Present Day Jewish Activities*, Pan-Aryan Alliance, New York, (1935). **See also:** E. Engelhardt, *Jüdische Weltmachtpläne die Entstehung der sogenannten Zionistischen Protokolle; neue Zusammenhänge zwischen Judentum und Freimaurerei*, Hammer-Verlag, Leipzig, (1936). **See also:** Squire of Krum Elbow H. Spencer, *Our Neighbor and World Unrest*, Newport Historical Association, Newport, Rhode Island, (1936); **and** *Toward Armageddon / y the Squire of Krum Elbow*, Militant Christian Association, Charleston, (1936). **See also:** *Berner Bilderbuch vom Zionisten-Prozess um die "Protokolle der Weisen von Zion."*, U. Bodung-Verlag, Erfurt, (1936). **See also:** *The Ultimate (If): Concerning Something People Do Not Wish to Believe and Which Is So Near*, Zealous Enlightenment League, U.S.A., (1931). **See also:** *A Plot for the World's Conquest*, Britons Pub. Society, London, (1936). **See also:** G. Barroso, *Os Protocolos dos Sábios de Sião; o Imperialismo de Israel, o Plano dos Judeus para o Conquista do Mundo, o Código do Anti-Cristo, Provas de Autenticidade, Documentos*, Agencia Minerva, São Paulo, (1936). **See also:** K. Bergmeister, *Der jüdische Weltverschwörungsplan; die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion vor dem Strafgerichte in Bern*, U. Bodung, Erfurt, (1937); English translation, *The Jewish World Conspiracy; The Protocols of the Elders of Zion before the Court in Berne*, Sons of Liberty, Liberty Bell Publications, Hollywood, California, (1938). **See also:** L. Donoso Zárate, *La Verdad más Grande de la Historia: "Los Protocolos de los Sabios de Sión"*, Imprenta San José, Santiago de Chile, (1937). **See also:** *Out of Their Own Mouths; the Jewish Will for Power and the Authenticity of the "Protocols."*, American Nationalist Press, New York, (1937). **See also:** H. de Vreis de Heekelingen, *Les Protocols des Sages de Sion Constituent-ils un Faux*, Lausanne, (1938). **See also:** *Hidden Empire*, Pelley Publishers, Ashville, North Carolina, (1938). **See also:** J. F. Norris, *Did the Jews Write the Protocols*, Temple Baptist Church, Detroit, Michigan, (1938). **See also:** *The Reign of the Elders*, In Two Volumes, (1938-1939). **See also:** F. Veloso, *Perante o Racismo, Novos Subsídios Acerca dos "Protocols dos Sábios de Sião;"*, Livraria Portugalía, Lisboa, (1939). **See also:** N. D. Zhevakhov, *Il Retroscena dei Protocolli di Sion: La Vita e le Opere del Loro Editore, Sergio Nilus e del Loro Autore Ascer*, Unione editoriale d'Italia, Roma, (1939). **See also:** G. Schwartz-Bostunitsch, *Jüdischer Imperialismus 3000 Jahre hebräischer Schleichwege zur Erlangung der Weltherrschaft*, T. Fritsch, Berlin, (1939). **See also:** H. H. Klein, *A Jew Exposes the Jewish World Conspiracy*, Sons of Liberty, Hollywood, (1970). **See also:** A. Baron, *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion: Organized Jewry's Deadliest Weapon*, Anglo-Hebrew Pub., London, (1995).

835. A. Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, New York, (1971), p. 307.

836. Cf. L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), p. 109.

837. H. Ford and S. Crowther, *My Life and Work*, Doubleday, Page & Company, (1922), pp. 250-252, at 252.

838. B. Brasol, *The Protocols and World Revolution, Including a Translation and Analysis of the "Protocols of the Meetings of the Zionist Men of Wisdom"*, Small, Maynard & Company, Boston, (1920); **and** *Socialism Vs. Civilization*, C. Scribner's Sons, New York, (1920); **and** *The World at the Cross Roads*, Small, Maynard & Co., Boston, (1921); **and** *The Balance Sheet of Sovietism*, Duffield, New York, (1922). **See also:** S. G. Marks, "Destroying the Agents of Modernity: Russian Antisemitism", *How Russia Shaped the Modern World*, Chapter 5, Princeton University Press, (2003), pp. 140-175; notes 354-358. **See also:** R. Singerman, "American Career of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*", *American Jewish History*, Volume 71, (September, 1981), pp. 48-78.

- 839.** C. S. Viar, Editor, R. G. Rocca, *The Trust*, by the Center for Intelligence Studies, (1990). G. Brook-Shepherd, *Iron Maze: The Western Secret Services and the Bolsheviks*, Macmillan, London, (1998). R. B. Spence, *Trust No One: The Secret World of Sidney Reilly*, Feral House, Los Angeles, (2002).
- 840.** R. B. Spence, *Trust No One: The Secret World of Sidney Reilly*, Feral House, Los Angeles, (2002).
- 841.** C. N. Wheeler, "Close-Up View of Henry Ford and His Ideas", *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, (23 May 1916), pp. 1, 12. "Ford a Voice from the Dark", *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, (24 May 1916), p. 8.
- 842.** "Odd Definitions Given by Ford in Libel Suit", *The New York Times*, (27 July 1919), p. 1. Benedict Arnold later became the subject of one of the articles in Ford's newspaper, "Benedict Arnold and Jewish Aid in Shady Deal", *The Dearborn Independent*, (15 October 1921).
- 843.** "Name Ford for President", *The New York Times*, (12 December 1915), p. E3. "Ford Presses Smith in Michigan Primary", *The New York Times*, (4 April 1916), p. 3. "For Hughes after Ford", *The New York Times*, (19 April 1916), p. 9. "Ford's Lead Grows; Bryan Badly Beaten", *The New York Times*, (20 April 1916), p. 7. "Ford Willing to Run If People Call Him", *The New York Times*, (23 April 1916), p. 1, 8. "T.R. Has 1 Jersey Delegate", *The New York Times*, (27 April 1916), p. 4. C. W. Thompson, "Primaries No Clue to Presidential Nominees", *The New York Times*, (30 April 1916), p. SM5. E. O. Jones, "Ellis O. Jones Finds the Movement for Him Very Significant", *The New York Times*, (3 May 1916), p. 12. "Hughes in Lead with 224 Votes", *The New York Times*, (7 June 1916), p. 1.
- 844.** "Want Ford for President", *The New York Times*, (9 July 1916), p. 5.
- 845.** H. Bennett and P. Marcus, *We Never Called Him Henry*, Chapter 7, Gold Medal Books, Fawcett Publications, (1951), p. 7.
- 846.** "Ford Willing to Give Fortune to End War", *The New York Times*, (24 November 1915), p. 1.
- 847.** "'Grotesque,' Says J. R. Day", *The New York Times*, (1 December 1915), p. 3. "Ridiculed by A. B. Parker", *The New York Times*, (2 December 1915), p. 2. "Amen Corner Pokes Fun at Public Men", *The New York Times*, (4 December 1915), p. 8. "Roosevelt Urges Unity in Defense", *The New York Times*, (6 December 1915), p. 3. "Roosevelt Bitter in Assailing Wilson", *The New York Times*, (20 December 1915), p. 4.
- 848.** "Ford Finds Peace Elusive", *The New York Times*, (21 December 1915), p. 1.
- 849.** "Henry Ford Is out in Praise of Wilson", *The New York Times*, (15 September 1916), p. 3. "Henry Ford Urges Election of Wilson", *The New York Times*, (28 September 1916), p. 4. "No Ford Cash for Wilson Campaign" and "Mr. Ford Sees Victory", *The New York Times*, (3 October 1916), p. 1. "Henry Ford Gratified", *The New York Times*, (12 November 1916) p. 4.
- 850.** "The German Favorite Son", *The New York Times*, (23 May 1916), p. 10. "The Hyphen Vote, the Silent Vote, and the American Vote", *The New York Times*, (2 October 1916), p. 10.
- 851.** H. Ford quoted in: "Ford Says Press and the Bankers Got Us into War", *The New York Times*, (18 July 1919), p. 1.
- 852.** "\$200,000 Libel Suit Filed Against Ford", *The New York Times*, (19 August 1923), p. 2.
- 853.** "\$200,000 Libel Suit Filed Against Ford", *The New York Times*, (19 August 1923), p. 2. **See also:** *Jewish World*, (5 January 1922). This interview apparently appeared in a Detroit area newspaper on or about 5 January 1922.

- 854.** “Ford Ill in Norway, Delays Peace Work”, *The New York Times*, (21 December 1915), p. 1. “Demand Ford Expel Mme. Schwimmer”, *The New York Times*, (22 December 1915), p. 3. “Ford’s Peace plan Vetoed by Norway”, *The New York Times*, (23 December 1915), p. 1.
- 855.** “Denies Peace Ship Led to Ford Attack”, *The New York Times*, (5 September 1927), p. 17. “Mme. Schwimmer on Stand in Suit”, *The New York Times*, (27 June 1928), p. 16.
- 856.** “Ford Peace Mission Died Belligerently”, *The New York Times*, (1 February 1916), p. 4.
- 857.** “Ford Exonerated Mme. Schwimmer”, *The New York Times*, (29 June 1928), p. 12. “Peace SHip Leader Wins Suit for Libel”, *The New York Times*, (30 June 1928), p. 12.
- 858.** “Pacifists Can’t Find \$200,000 Ford Gift”, *The New York Times*, (20 January 1916), p. 20. “Warned the Dutch Against Ford Party”, *The New York Times*, (21 January 1916), p. 3.
- 859.** “Mme. Schwimmer at Home”, *The New York Times*, (18 May 1917), p. 13. “Woman Asks Ford to Vindicate Her”, *The New York Times*, (4 September 1927), p. E1.
- 860.** “Lays Ford’s Attacks to Peace Ship Fiasco”, *The New York Times*, (13 July 1927), p. 9.
- 861.** “Einstein Advocates Resistance to War”, *The New York Times*, (15 December 1930), pp. 1, 12 at 12. **See also:** “Pacifists Demand Citizenship rights”, *The New York Times*, (18 January 1931), p. 34. **See also:** “Sees Lasting Peace after Another War”, *The New York Times*, (4 November 1931), p. 23. **See also:** “Mme Schwimmer Calls on Holmes”, *The New York Times*, (22 January 1933), p. 23. **See also:** “Dr. Einstein Urges Hitler Protests”, *The New York Times*, (17 March 1933), p. 15.
- 862.** “Mme. Schwimmer Gets Ford’s Reply”, *The New York Times*, (18 September 1927), p. 9.
- 863.** “Woman Asks Ford to Vindicate Her”, *The New York Times*, (4 September 1927), p. E1. “Denies Peace Ship Led to Ford Attack”, *The New York Times*, (5 September 1927), p. 17. “Mme. Schwimmer Gets Ford’s Reply”, *The New York Times*, (18 September 1927), p. 9. “Pacifist Disavows Influencing Ford”, *The New York Times*, (28 June 1928), p. 18. “Ford Exonerated Mme. Schwimmer”, *The New York Times*, (29 June 1928), p. 12.
- 864.** *The New York Times*, (9 July 1927), pp. 9, 12; *The New York Times*, (10 July 1927), p. 12. **See also:** H. Ford and L. Marshall, *Statement by Henry Ford Regarding Charges Against Jews, Made in His Publications: The Dearborn independent, and a Series of Pamphlets Entitled “The International Jew,” Together with an Explanatory Statement by Louis Marshall, President of the American Jewish Committee, and His Reply to Mr. Ford*, American Jewish Committee, New York, (1927). **See also:** *Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty; Selected Papers and Addresses*, Volume 1, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1957), pp. 321-389. **See also:** M. Rosenstock, *Louis Marshall, Defender of Jewish Rights*, Chapters 5-7, Wayne State University Press, Detroit, (1965). **See also:** H. Bennett and P. Marcus, *We Never Called Him Henry*, Chapter 7, Gold Medal Books, Fawcett Publications, (1951), pp. 46-56. **See also:** H. Bennett, *True* (“Man’s Magazine”), (October, 1951), p. 125.
- 865.** “Editor to Sue Ford; Hires Untermeyer”, *The New York Times*, (9 July 1923), p. 17. “Bernstein-Ford Suit Ends”, *The New York Times*, (28 July 1927), p. 21.
- 866.** “Mrs. Boissevain Accepts”, *The New York Times*, (30 November 1915), p. 6.
- 867.** “Ford’s Pilgrims, Ready to Sail, in Passport Tangle”, *The New York Times*, (3 December 1915), p. 1.
- 868.** Letter from L. Marshall to R. Gottheil of 8 January 1913, *Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty; Selected Papers and Addresses*, Volume 1, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1957), pp. 322-323. Letter from L. Marshall to J. Spargo of 31

December 1920, *Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty; Selected Papers and Addresses*, Volume 1, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1957), pp. 353-355.

869. “H. A. Wise Wood Out for Col. Roosevelt”, *The New York Times*, (18 may 1916), p. 5.

870. “Odd Definitions Given by Ford in Libel Suit”, *The New York Times*, (17 July 1919), p. 2.

871. “Jewish Financiers”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (29 September 1922), p. 10.

872. “‘Jewish World Plot.’”, *The London Times*, (16 August 1921), pp. 9-10. “‘Jewish Peril’ Exposed””, *The London Times*, (17 August 1921), pp. 9-10. “The Protocol Forgery”, *The London Times*, (18 August 1921), pp. 9-10. “The End of the ‘Protocols.’””, *The London Times*, (18 August 1921), p. 9. “The ‘Protocols.’””, *The London Times*, (20 August 1921), p. 9. “Forged Protocols ”, *The London Times*, (20 August 1921), p. 7. “The Protocols ”, *The London Times*, (22 September 1921), p. 6.

873. H. A. Jones, “Gentle Advice to ‘My Dear Wells’”, *The New York Times*, (5 December 1920), p. 103. J. Spargo, “H. G. Wells Lost in the Russian Shadow; First Article”, *The New York Times*, (5 December 1920), p. 102. “Spargo Denounces Anti-Semitic Move”, *The New York Times*, (6 December 1920), p. 10. J. Spargo, “When H. G. Wells Smokes the Opium of Utopia”, *The New York Times*, (12 December 1920) p. XX3. “Spargo Says Wells Blames Bolshevism for Ills of Muscovites and Much of Europe’s Misery”, *The New York Times*, (15 December 1920), p. 2. H. A. Jones, “Yet Once More, My Dear Wells”, *The New York Times*, (2 January 1921), p. X2. H. G. Wells, “Mr. Wells on His Critics”, *The New York Times*, (6 January 1921), p. 10. J. Spargo, “Spargo Answers Wells”, *The New York Times*, (10 January 1921), p. 9. “Issue a Protest on Anti-Semitism”, *The New York Times*, (17 January 1921), p. 10. “Spargo Condemns Racial Antagonism”, *The New York Times*, (22 February 1921), p. 10. H. Bernstein, “The New Anti-Semitic Workings”, *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), p. 43. “Spargo Would Let Ford Go on Talking”, *The New York Times*, (26 November 1921), p. 9. Spargo was also seen in *The New York Times* in many articles not here referenced, discussing Bolshevism, Russia and Poland.

874. H. Ford, *My Life and Work*, Doubleday, Page & Company, New York, (1923), pp. 250-252.

875. J. Spargo, “H. G. Wells Lost in the Russian Shadow; First Article”, *The New York Times*, (5 December 1920), p. 102.

876. J. Spargo, “Why I Am No Longer a Socialist”, *Nation’s Business*, Volume 17, (February, 1929), pp. 15-17, 96, 98, 100; (March, 1929), pp. 29-31, 168, 170. Reprinted: *Why I Am No Longer a Socialist*, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C., (1929).

877. J. Spargo, “Why I Am No Longer a Socialist”, *Nation’s Business*, Volume 17, (February, 1929), pp. 15-17, 96, 98, 100; (March, 1929), pp. 29-31, 168, 170; at page 98 of the February issue. Reprinted: *Why I Am No Longer a Socialist*, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C., (1929).

878. See: “Frank, Jacob, and the Frankists”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 7 Fr-Ha, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 55-71. See also: G. Scholem, “The Holiness of Sin”, *Commentary* (American Jewish Committee), Volume 51, Number 1, (January, 1971), pp. 41-70; reprinted: G. Scholem, “Redemption Through Sin”, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*, Schocken Books, New York, (1971), pp. 78-141. See also: G. G. Scholem, *Sabbatai Sevi: The Mystical Messiah, 1626-1676*, Princeton University Press, (1973). See also: Rabbi M. S. Antelman, *To Eliminate the Opiate*, Volume 1, Chapter 10, Zahavia, New York, (1974). See also: H. Graetz, *Popular History of the Jews*, Volume 5, Fifth Edition,

- Hebrew publishing Company, New York, (1937), pp. 245-259.
- 879.** E. Goldman, *My Disillusionment in Russia*, Doubleday, Page & Co., Garden City, New York, (1923); **and** *My Further Disillusionment in Russia*, Doubleday, Page & Co., Garden City, New York, (1924).
- 880.** B. J. Hendrick, "Radicalism among the Polish Jews", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 6, (April, 1923), pp. 591-601, at 597.
- 881.** W. J. Bryan, "Cross of Gold" quoted in: R. F. Reid, *Three Centuries of American Rhetorical Discourse*, Waveland Press, Prospect Heights, Illinois, (1988), pp. 601-606. A. C. Baird, *American Public Address*, McGraw Hill, New York, (1956), pp. 194-200.
- 882.** S. D. Butler, *War Is a Racket*, Round Table Press, New York, (1935).
- 883.** J. Daniels, *The Life of Woodrow Wilson, 1856-1924*, The John C. Winston Company, Philadelphia, (1924).
- 884.** D. Lawrence, *The True Story of Woodrow Wilson*, George H. Doran Company, New York, (1924).
- 885.** W. Wilson, *The New Freedom: A Call for the Emancipation of the Generous Energies of a People*, Doubleday, Page & Company, Garden City, New York, (1913), pp. 13-14.
- 886.** T. Fritsch, in P. Lehmann, Editor, *Neue Wege aus Theodor Fritsch's Lebensarbeit: eine Sammlung von Hammer-Aufsätzen zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstage*, Hammer-Verlag, Leipzig, (1922); English translation in: R. S. Levy *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D.C. Heath, Toronto, (1991), pp. 192- 199, at 197-198.
- 887.** J. Spargo, "Why I Am No Longer a Socialist", *Nation's Business*, Volume 17, (February, 1929), pp. 15-17, 96, 98, 100; (March, 1929), pp. 29-31, 168, 170; at pages 15-16 of the February issue. Reprinted: *Why I Am No Longer a Socialist*, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C., (1929).
- 888.** J. Spargo, "Why I Am No Longer a Socialist", *Nation's Business*, Volume 17, (February, 1929), pp. 15-17, 96, 98, 100; (March, 1929), pp. 29-31, 168, 170; at page 96 of the February issue. Reprinted: *Why I Am No Longer a Socialist*, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C., (1929).
- 889.** B. J. Hendrick, "The Jews in America: I How They Came to This Country", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 2, (December, 1922), pp. 144-161; **and** "The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286; **and** "The Jews in America: III The Menace of the Polish Jew", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 4, (February, 1923), pp. 366-377.
- 890.** B. J. Hendrick, "Radicalism among the Polish Jews", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 6, (April, 1923), pp. 591-601.
- 891.** J. Spargo, "Why I Am No Longer a Socialist", *Nation's Business*, Volume 17, (February, 1929), pp. 15-17, 96, 98, 100; (March, 1929), pp. 29-31, 168, 170; at pages 96 and 98 of the February issue. Reprinted: *Why I Am No Longer a Socialist*, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C., (1929).
- 892.** A. Ponsonby, *Falsehood in War-Time, Containing an Assortment of Lies Circulated Throughout the Nations During the Great War*, G. Allen & Unwin, ltd. London, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1928).
- 893.** **French** *Rapport de la Commission d'Enquête sur les Atrocités Allemandes*, Darling & Son, London, (1915); **Italian** *Relazione della Commissione d'Inchiesta sulle Atrocità Tedesche*, Vincenzo Bartelli, Perugia, (1915), **Portuguese** *Relatorio da Comissão sobre as Barbaridades Atribuidas aos Alemães, nomeada pelo Governo de Sua Magestade Britannica presidida pelo Visconde Bryce*, Thomas Nelson & Sons, Paris, Edimburgo, (1915); **Spanish** *Informe Acerca de los Atentados Atribuidos á los Alemanes, Emitido por la Comisión Nombrada por el Gobierno de su Majestad Británica y Presidida por el muy*

Honorable Vizconde Bryce, Thomas Nelson & Sons, Paris, Edimburgo, (1915).

894. J. R. Marcus, *The Rise and Destiny of the German Jew*, The Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Cincinnati, (1934), p. 93.

895. I. Zangwill, “Zionism and the Future of the Jews”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 6, Number 5, (September, 1903), pp. 3895-3898.

896. V. I. Lenin, “Anti-Jewish Pogroms”, *Collected Works*, Volume 29, English translation of the Fourth Russian Edition, Progress Publishers, Moscow, (1972), pp. 252-253. **See also:** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), p. 251. **See also:** G. B. Shaw, *The Jewish Guardian*, (1931). **See also:** *Congress Bulletin*, American Jewish Congress, New York, (5 January 1940). **See also:** *The Jewish Voice*, (January, 1942). **See also:** G. Aronson, *Soviet Russia and the Jews*, American Jewish League against Communism, New York, (1949). **See also:** J. Stalin, “Anti-Semitism: Reply to an Inquiry of the Jewish News Agency in the United States” (12 January 1931), *Works*, Volume 13, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, (1955), p. 30. **See also:** S. S. Montefiore, *Stalin: The Court of the Red Star*, Vintage, New York, (2003), pp. 305-306. **See also:** “Anti-Semitism”, *Great Soviet Encyclopedia: A Translation of the Third Edition*, Volume 2, (1973), pp. 175-177, at 176. **See also:** “Jews”, *Great Soviet Encyclopedia: A Translation of the Third Edition*, Volume 9, Macmillan, New York, (1975), pp. 292-293, at 293.

897. D. Ben-Gurion, *Ba-Maarachah*, Volume 3, Tel-Aviv, (1948), pp. 200-211, English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 606-619, at 616.

898. C. Weizmann, *Chaim Weizmann*, V. Gollanez, London, (1945); quoted in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 583-588, at 588.

899. I. Zangwill, “Zionism and the Future of the Jews”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 6, Number 5, (September, 1903), pp. 3895-3898, at 3897-3898.

900. I. Zollschan, “The Significance of Mixed Marriage”, *Jewish Questions: Three Lectures*, New York, Bloch Pub. Co., (1914), pp. 20-42, at 31-33.

901. V. Jabotinsky, “A Letter on Autonomy”, T. Zohar, Editor, *Israel among the Nations: Selection of Zionist Texts*, World Zionist Organization Dept., Research Section, Jerusalem, (1966); reprinted in L. Brenner, *51 Documents: Zionist Collaboration with the Nazis*, pp. 7-20, at 10-14.

902. S. Schwarzfuchs, *Napoleon, the Jews, and the Sanhedrin*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, Boston, (1979), pp. 99-100.

903. N. Syrkin, under the nom de plume “Ben Elieser”, *Die Judenfrage und der sozialistische Judenstaat*, Steiger, Bern, (1898); English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 333-350, at 344.

904. N. Syrkin, under the nom de plume “Ben Elieser”, *Die Judenfrage und der sozialistische Judenstaat*, Steiger, Bern, (1898); English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 333-350, at 341.

905. M. L. Lilienblum, “The Future of Our People”, in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 173-177, at 177.

906. L. Brenner, *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, Chapter 3, Croom Helm, London, L. Hill, Westport, Connecticut, (1983), p. 32; Brenner refers to: D. Niewyk, *The Jews in Weimar Germany*, Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, (1980), p. 30.

907. M. Grunwald, “Rasse, Volk, Nation”, *Die Wahrheit* (Wien), Volume 38, Number 10, (12 May 1922), pp. 8-9; Number 11, (30 May 1922), pp. 9-10; Number 12, (9 June 1922), p. 6; Number 13, (23 June 1922), pp. 6-7; Number 14, (7 July 1922), p. 8; Number 15, (20 July 1922), pp. 7-8; Number 16, (11 August 1922), pp. 5-7; Number 17, (25 August 1922),

pp. 5-7; Number 18/19, (21 September 1922), pp. 10-11; Number 20, (12 October 1922), p. 7; Number 22, (10 November 1922), p. 6.

908. T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 172.

909. H. Class under the *nom de plume* D. Frymann, *Wenn ich der Kaiser wär': politische Wahrheiten und Notwendigkeiten*, Dieterich, Leipzig, (1912); English translation, R. S. Levy, "Daniel Freymann If I were the Kaiser (1912)", *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D.C. Heath, Toronto, (1991), pp. 130-133, at 133.

910. L. Brenner, *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, Chapter 2, Croom Helm, London, L. Hill, Westport, Connecticut, (1983), p. 21; *citing*: I. Zollschan, *Jewish Questions: Three Lectures*, New York, Bloch Pub. Co., (1914), pp. 17-18

911. B. J. Hendrick, "The Jews in America: I How They Came to This Country", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 2, (December, 1922), pp. 144-161; **and** "The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286; **and** "The Jews in America: III The Menace of the Polish Jew", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 4, (February, 1923), pp. 366-377; **and** "Radicalism among the Polish Jews", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 6, (April, 1923), pp. 591-601.

912. S. Dubnow, *Die Grundlagen des Nationaljudentums*, Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, (1905). English translation from K. A. Strom, Editor, *The Best of Attack! and National Vanguard Tabloid*, National Alliance, Arlington, Virginia, (1984), p. 60.

913. S. Dubnow, M. Selzer, Editor, "The Doctrine of Jewish Nationalism (1897)", *Zionism Reconsidered: The Rejection of Jewish Normalcy*, Macmillan, New York, (1970), pp. 131-156, at 146-147.

914. F. M. Arouet de Voltaire, *Histoire de Charles XII, Roi de Suède*, (1731); **and** *Dictionnaire Philosophique*, Multiple Editions; multiple English translations, including: W. F. Flemming, *A Philosophical Dictionary*, Volume 6, Dingwall-Rock, New York, (1901), pp. 266-313; **and** *Essai sur les Moeurs et l'Esprit des Nations, et sur les Principaux faits de l'Histoire Depuis Charlemagne Jusqu'à Louis XIII*, Chapter 104, (1769); **and** *Philosophie Générale: Métaphysique, Morale et Théologie*, Chez Sanson et Compagnie, Aux Deux-Ponts, (1792).

915. J. Wellhausen, *Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah*, Third Edition, Adam and Charles Black, London, (1891), pp. 201-203.

916. N. Syrkin, under the *nom de plume* "Ben Elieser", *Die Judenfrage und der sozialistische Judenstaat*, Steiger, Bern, (1898); English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 333-350, at 343.

917. M. J. Berdichevski, "Wrecking and Building", in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 293-295, at 293.

918. A. Ha-Am, "The Negation of the Diaspora", in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 270-277, at 270-271.

919. J. H. Brenner, "Self-Criticism", in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 307-312, at 307-308.

920. M. Higger, *The Jewish Utopia*, Lord Baltimore Press, Baltimore, (1932).

921. E. M. Friedman, "Zionism and the American Spirit", *Forum*, Volume 58, (July, 1917), pp. 67-80; *reprinted as: Zionism and the American Spirit: A New Perspective*, University Zionist Society, New York, (1917).

922. J. Klatzkin, *Tehumim: Ma'amarim*, Devir, Berlin, (1925); English translation by A. Hertzberg in his, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 316-327, at 320-321.

923. “Mr. Zangwill on Zionism”, *The London Times*, (16 October 1923), p. 11. I. Zangwill, “Is Political Zionism Dead? Yes”, *The Nation*, Volume 118, Number 3062, (12 March 1924), pp. 276-278.

924. “Mr. Zangwill on Zionism”, *The London Times*, (16 October 1923), p. 11. I. Zangwill, “Is Political Zionism Dead? Yes”, *The Nation*, Volume 118, Number 3062, (12 March 1924), pp. 276-278.

925. “Peace, War—and Bolshevism”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (4 April 1919), p. 7. “1918 Peace Views of Lloyd George”, *The New York Times*, (26 March 1922), Editorial Section, p. 33.

926. B. Katzenelson, *Ba-Mivhan*, Tel-Aviv, (1935), pp. 67-70; translated to English in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 390-395, at 391.

927. B. M. Baruch, *Baruch: My Own Story*, Henry Holt and Company, New York, (1957), p. 92. *See also page 191.*

928. “Jacob H. Schiff and a Past American Era: A Joint Work of the Yankee and the Jew”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 41, Number 1, (November, 1920), pp. 19-20. B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?”, *The World’s War*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286, at 279.

929. J. Buchanan, “Bush-Nazi Link Confirmed”, *The New Hampshire Gazette*, Volume 248, Number 1, (10 October 2003); URL:

<http://www.nhgazette.com/articles/NN_Bush_Nazi_Link.html>

J. Buchanan and S. Michael, “‘Bush-Nazi Dealings Continued Until 1951’—Federal Documents”, *The New Hampshire Gazette*, Volume 248, Number 3, (7 November 2003); URL:

<http://www.nhgazette.com/articles/NN_Bush_Nazi_2.html>

J. Buchanan, *Fixing America: Breaking the Stranglehold of Corporate Rule, Big Media & the Religious Right*, Far West Publishing Company, Santa Fe, New Mexico, (2004). **See also:** E. Schweitzer, *Amerika und der Holocaust: Die verschwiegene Geschichte*, Knauer Taschenbuch Verlag, München, (2004).

930. B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?”, *The World’s War*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286, at 278-280.

931. B. M. Baruch, *Baruch: My Own Story*, Henry Holt and Company, New York, (1957), pp. 107-108. **See also:** A. Muhlstein, *Baron James: The Rise of the French Rothschilds*, Vendome Press, New York, (1982).

932. B. M. Baruch, *Baruch: My Own Story*, Henry Holt and Company, New York, (1957), pp. 87-88.

933. B. M. Baruch, *Baruch: My Own Story*, Henry Holt and Company, New York, (1957), pp. 114-116, 133-134.

934. S. D. Butler, *War Is a Racket*, Round Table Press, New York, (1935).

935. C. B. Dall, FDR, *My Exploited Father-in-Law*, Christian Crusade Publications, Tulsa, Oklahoma, (1967); **and** *A Tribute to Lincoln, Our Money-Martyred President: An Address in Springfield, Illinois*, Omni Publications, Hawthorne, California, (1970); **and** *Amerikas Kriegspolitik: Roosevelt und seine Hintermänner*, Grabert-Verlag, Tübingen, (1972); **and** A. J. Hilder and C. B. Dall, *The War Lords of Washington (Secrets of Pearl Harbor); an Interview with Col. Curtis Dall*, Educator Publications, Fullerton, California, (1972); **and** C. B. Dall, *Who Controls Our Nation’s Federal Policies — and Why?*, Noontide Press, Los

Angeles, (1973); **and** C. B. Dall and B. Freedman, *Israel's Five Trillion Dollar Secret*, Liberty Bell Publications, Reedy, West Virginia, (1977); **and** C. B. Dall, *Col. Dall Reports to the Board*, Liberty Lobby, Washington, D.C., Serial Publication, (1900's); **and** C. B. Dall and R. M. Bartell, *Liberty Lobby Progress Report*, Serial Publication, Liberty Lobby, Washington, D.C., (1970's) ; **and** C. B. Dall, *Colonel Dall Reports*, Serial Publication Liberty Lobby Washington, D.C., (1900's); **and** C. B. Dall and C. M. Dunn, *Ephemeral Materials*, 1957-, Liberty Lobby, Washington, D.C.

936. R. Grossman, "The Colonel's World", *Chicago Tribune Magazine*, (27 March 2005), pp. 12-16, 20, 25-26, 28-29, at 14.

937. D. A. Hyde, *Dedication and Leadership: Learning from the Communists*, University of Notre Dame Press, (1966).

938. W. Chambers, *Witness*, Random House, New York, (1952), pp. 192-193.

939. H. P. Long, *Every Man a King: The Autobiography of Huey P. Long*, National Book Co., New Orleans, (1933); **and** *My First Days in the White House*, Telegraph Press, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, (1935). **See also:** T. H. Williams, *Huey Long*, New York, Knopf, (1969). **See also:** H. M. Christman, *Kingfish to America, Share Our Wealth: Selected Senatorial Papers of Huey P. Long*, Schocken Books, New York, (1985). **See also:** W. I. Hair, *The Kingfish and His Realm: The Life and Times of Huey P. Long*, Louisiana State University Press, (1991).

940. R. P. Warren, "The Briar Patch" in: *Twelve Southerners, I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition*, New York, London, Harper, (1930).

941. R. P. Warren, *All the King's Men*, Harcourt, Brace, New York, (1946).

942. A. Radosh and R. Radosh, *Red Star over Hollywood: The Film Colony's Long Romance with the Left*, Encounter Books, San Francisco, (2005).

943. H. B. Deutsch, *The Huey Long Murder Case*, Doubleday, Garden City, New York, (1963). D. Zinman, *The Day Huey Long was Shot, September 8, 1935*, I. Obolensky, New York, (1963). E. Reed, *Requiem for a Kingfish*, Award Publications/E. Reed Organization Baton Rouge, Louisiana, (1986). D. H. Ubelaker, "The Remains of Dr. Carl Austin Weiss: Anthropological Analysis", *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Volume 41, Number 1, (1996), pp. 60-79.

944. H. B. Deutsch, *The Huey Long Murder Case*, Doubleday, Garden City, New York, (1963).

945. D. Zinman, *The Day Huey Long was Shot, September 8, 1935*, I. Obolensky, New York, (1963).

946. D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), p. 85.

947. A. Weishaupt, *Ueber Materialismus und Idealismus*, E.C. Grattenauer, Nürnberg, (1786); **and** *Apologie der Illuminaten*, Grattenauer, Frankfurth, (1786); **and** *Einleitung zu meiner Apologie*, Grattenauer, Frankfurt, (1787); **and** *Nachtrag zur Rechtfertigung meiner Absichten*, Frankfurt, Leipzig, (1787); **and** *Apologie des Misvergnügens und Ubels*, Frankfurt, Leipzig, (1787); **and** *Das verbesserte System der Illuminaten mit allen seinen Einrichtungen und Graden*, Grattenauer, Frankfort, Leipzig, (1787); **and** *Kurze Rechtfertigung meiner Absichten: zur Beleuchtung der neuesten Originalschriften*, Frankfurt, Leipzig, (1787); **and** *Nachtrag von weitem Originalschriften, welche die Illuminaten-sette überhaupt, sonderbar aber den stifter verselben Adam Weishaupt, gewesenenen professor zu Ingolstadt betreffen, und den der aus dem Baron Bassusischen schloss zu Sandersdorf, einem bekannten Illuminaten-Neste, vorgenommen visitation entdeckt, sofort aus churfürstlich höchsten befehl gedruckt, und zum geheimen archiv genommen worden sind, um solche jedermann auf Verlagen zur einsicht vorlegen zu lassen. Zwo abt., J. Lentner, München,*

(1787); **and** with A. Court de Gébelin, Philo, Sanchuniathon, *et al.*, *Saturn, Mercur, und Hercules: drey morgenländische Allegorien*, In der Montagischen Buchhandlung, Regensburg, (1789); **and** *Ueber Wahrheit und sittliche Vollkommenheit*, Montag und Weiss, Regensburg, (1793); **and** with A. Knigge, L. A. C. Grolmann, *Die neuesten Arbeiten*, München, (1794); **and** *Die neuesten Arbeiten des Spartacus und Philo in dem Illuminaten-Orden*, Illuminatenorden, München, (1794); **and** *Ueber die Selbstkenntniss, ihre Hindernisse und Vortheile*, Montag und Weiss, Regensburg, (1794); **and** *Ueber die geheime Welt- und Regierungskunst . . .*, F. Esslinger, Frankfurt, (1795); **and** *Ueber Wahrheit und sittliche Vollkommenheit, : Montag- und Weissische Buchhandlung*, Regensburg, (1793-1797); **and** *Ueber die Staats-Ausgaben und Auflagen: Ein philosophisch-statistischer Versuch*, (1817). **For historic criticism of Weishaupt, see:** A. A. Barruel, *Mémoires pour Servir a l'Histoire du Jacobinisme*, De l'Imprimerie Française, Chez P. Le Boussonier, Londres, (1797-1798); English translation by R. Clifford: *Memoirs Illustrating the History of Jacobism*, Printed for the translator by T. Burton and co., London, (1798). **See also:** J. Robison, *Proofs of a Conspiracy Against All the Religions and Governments of Europe: Carried on in the Secret Meetings of Free Masons, Illuminati, and Reading Societies*, Printed for William Creech, and T. Cadell, Junior, and W. Davies, Edinburgh, London, (1797). H. Gruber, "Illuminati," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume 7, Robert Appleton Company, New York, (1910). **The Other Authors and Personalities:** "Metternich, Klemens Lothar Wenzel, Prince von", *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume 10, Robert Appleton Company, New York, (1911), pp. 245-247. **See also:** K. Marx, *Manifest der kommunistischen Partei (The Communist Manifesto)*, (1848), numerous editions and translations; **and** *Das Kapital*, numerous editions and translations. **See also:** R. Gougenot Des Mousseaux, *Le juif: le judaïsme et la judaïsation des peuples chrétiens*, H. Plon, Paris, (1869); German translation: *Der Jude, das Judentum und die Verjudung der christlichen Völker*, Hoheneichen-Verlag, München, (1921). **See also:** H. Goedsche under the *nom de plume* Sir John Retcliffe, *Biarritz. Auf dem Judenfriedhof von Prag*, C.S. Liebrecht, Berlin, (1868); **and** *Um die Weltherrschaft: historisch-politischer Roman aus der Gegenwart*, C. Sigism, Berlin, (1876); **and** *Um die Weltherrschaft! Historischpolitischen Roman*, Carl Sigism, Liebrecht, Berlin, (1876); **and** *Das Geheimnis der jüdischen Weltherrschaft. Aus einem Werke des vorigen Jahrhunderts, das von den Juden aufgekauft wurde und aus dem Buchhandel verschwand*, Deutsches Wochenblatt, Berlin, (1919); **and** *Garibaldi*, Retcliffe-Verlag G.m.b.h., Berlin, (1926); **and** *Sir John Retcliffe's historisch-politischen Romane*, Rich. Eckstein Nachf., I.M. Bernhardt, Berlin, (1881-1891); **and** *Die Weltherrschaft der Juden "der neue Kabbalistische Sanhedrin"*, Nationaler Wirtschaftsdienst, Mannheim, (1932). **See also:** E. A. Chabauty, *Les Juifs, nos maîtres!: documents et développements nouveaux sur la question juive*, Société générale de librairie catholique, Paris, (1882); **and** under the *nom de plume* C. C. de Saint-André, *Francs-maçons et juifs: sixième age de l'église d'après l'Apocalypse*, Société General de Librairie Catholique, Paris, Bruxelles, (1880). **See also:** E. K. Dühring, *Die Judenfrage als Racen-, Sitten- und Culturfrage: mit einer weltgeschichtlichen Antwort*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, (1881); English translation by A. Jacob, *Eugen Dühring on the Jews*, Nineteen Eighty Four Press, Brighton, England, (1997); **and** *Der Werth des Lebens: Eine philosophische Betrachtung*, Eduard Trewendt, Breslau, (1865); **and** *Kritische Geschichte der Philosophie von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, Heimann, Berlin, (1869); **and** *Kritische Geschichte der Nationalökonomie und des Socialismus*, T. Grieben, Berlin, (1871); **and** *Die Ueberschätzung Lessing's und Dessen Anwaltschaft für die Juden*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, (1881); **and** *Sache, Leben und Feinde: Als Hauptwerk und Schlüssel zu seinen sämtlichen Schriften*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, Leipzig, (1882); **and** *Der Ersatz der Religion durch Vollkommeneres und die Ausscheidung alles Judenthums durch den modernen*

- Völkergeist*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, (1883); **and** *Die Parteien in der Judenfrage*, München, (1907).
- 948.** A. Maude, Letter to the Editor on “The Jewish Peril”, *The London Times*, (12 May 1920), p. 12.
- 949.** A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 498.
- 950.** P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), pp. 278-287.
- 951.** T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and Wang, New York, (1993), p. 129.
- 952.** D. Ben-Gurion, as quoted in D. Duke, *Jewish Supremacism: My Awakening on the Jewish Question*, Free Speech Press, Covington, Louisiana, (2002), p. 345; Duke cites: A. Hertzberg and A. Hirt-Manheimer, “Relax. It’s Okay to be the Chosen People”, *Reform Judaism*, (May,1998).
- 953.** *Time Magazine*, Volume 52, Number 7, (16 August 1948), p. 25.
- 954.** “Messianic Movements”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 1417-1427, at 1426-1427.
- 955.** *Look Magazine*, (16 January 1962), p. 20.
- 956.** M. Hess, English translation by M. Waxman, *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918/1943), p. 17.
- 957.** *From*: A. Nadler, “Last Exit to Brooklyn: The Lubavitcher’s Powerful and Preposterous Messianism”, *The New Republic*, (4 May 1992), pp. 27-35, at 34. Nadler appears to quote from: N. Loewenthal, *Communicating the Infinite: The Emergence of the Habad School*, University of Chicago Press, (1990).
- 958.** C. Bray and M. Hennell, *The Philosophy of Necessity, Or, the Law of Consequences as Applicable to Mental, Moral, and Social Science*, Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longmans, London, (1841); **and** *An Outline of the Various Social Systems and Communities Which Have Been Founded on the Principle of Cooperation: With an Introductory Essay by the Author of “The Philosophy of Necessity”*, Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, London, (1844); **and** *An Essay upon the Union of Agriculture and Manufactures, and upon the Organization of Industry*, Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, London, (1844).
- 959.** C. C. Hennell, *An Inquiry Concerning the Origin of Christianity*, Smallfield, London, (1838); German translation: *Untersuchung über den Ursprung des Christenthums*, Hallberger, Stuttgart, (1840).
- 960.** G. Eliot, *Daniel Deronda*, William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh, London, (1876).
- 961.** “Judaism”, *Great Soviet Encyclopedia: A Translation of the Third Edition*, Volume 2, (1973), pp. 311-312, at 312.
- 962.** M. Nordau, *Zionism and Anti-Semitism*, Fox, Duffield & Company, (1905), pp. 12-16.
- 963.** I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914).
- 964.** P. L. Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner*, Princeton University Press, (1990). R. W. Stock, *Die Judenfrage durch fünf Jahrhunderte*, Verlag Der Stürmer, Nürnberg, (1939).
- 965.** B. Disraeli, *Coningsby; or, The New Generation*, H. Colburn, London, (1844), pp. 249-254. B. Disraeli, *Lord George Bentinck: A Political Biography*, Chapter 24, Third Revised Edition, Colburn, (1852), pp. 482-507.
- 966.** M. Hess, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English: *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918).

967. A. comte de Gobineau, *Essai sur l'Inégalité des Races Humaines*, Paris, Librairie de Firmin Didot, (1853-1855), Didot Frères, Rumpler, Hanovre, (1853-1855); English translation by A. Collins, *The Inequality of Human Races*,: William Heinemann, London, (1915); German translation by L. Schemann and P. Kleinecke, *Versuch über die Ungleichheit der Menschenrassen*, F. Frommann, Stuttgart, (1902); An abridged translation to Czech by F. X. Lánský, *O Nerovnosti Lidských Plemen*, Orbis, Praha.

968. C. Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, H. B. Koenig, Bonn, Volume 1, (1847-1862), p. 414.

969. E. Renan, *Études d'Histoire Religieuse*, Fifth Revised Edition, M. Lévy frères, Paris, (1862), pp. 85-88, 130; **and** *Vie de Jésus*, Michel Lévy frères, Paris, (1863); English translation by C. E. Wilbour, *The Life of Jesus*, Carleton, New York, Michel Lévy frères, Paris, (1864); **and** *Histoire Générale et Système Comparé des Langues Sémitiques*, Fifth Revised and Enlarged Edition, Michel Lévy Frères, Paris, (1878), pp. 3-4.

970. F. v. Hellwald, *Culturgeschichte in ihrer natürlichen Entwicklung bis zur Gegenwart*, Lampart & Comp., Augsburg, (1875); **and** "Der Kampf ums Dasein im Menschen- und Völkerleben", *Das Ausland*, Volume 45, (1872), pp. 105ff., *see also: Das Ausland*, (1872), 901ff., 957ff.

971. H. S. Chamberlain, *Die Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, F. A. Bruckmann, München, (1899); English translation by J. Lees, *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, John Lane, New York, (1910).

972. G. v. List, *Das Geheimnis der Runen, mit einer Runentafel*, P. Zillmann Gross-Lichterfelde, (1907); English translation by S. E. Flowers, *The Secret of the Runes*, Destiny Books, Rochester, Vermont, (1988); Spanish, *El Secreto de las Runas*, Eds. Armanen, Santiago, Chile, (2000); Polish translation by E. Kulejewska, *Runy i ty: rozklady interpretacja zycie*, Studio Astropsychologii, (2002). G. v. List, *Die Armanenschaft der Ario-Germanen*, Verlag der Guido-von-List-Gesellschaft; In Kommission bei E.F. Steinacker, Wien, Leipzig, (1908); **and** *Die Ursprache der Ario-Germanen und ihre Mysteriensprache*, Guido-von-List-Gesellschaft, Wien, (1914); **and** *Der Ubergang vom Wuotanismus zum Christentum*, G. von List, Berlin-Lichterfelde, (1926). **See also:** H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974); English translation *Adolf Hitler: Founder of Israel*, Modjeskis' Society Dedicated to Preservation of Cultures, San Diego, (1997).

973. J. Lanz-Liebenfels, *Katholizismus wider Jesuitismus*, Frankfurt, (1903); "Zur Theologie der gotischen Bibel", *Vierteljahrsschrift für Bibelkunde* (Lumen, Leipzig), Volume 1, (1903); **and** *Anthropozoon Biblicum*, Berlin, (1904); **and** *Theozoologie, oder Die Kunde von den Sodomsäfflingen und dem Götter-Elektron eine Einführung in die älteste und neueste Weltanschauung und eine Rechtfertigung des Fürstentums und des Adels. . .*, Moderner Verlag, Wien, (1905); **and** *Das Breve, Dominus ac redemptor noster: Aufhebung des Jesuitenordens durch Clemens XIV mit einer Einleitung und einem dogmatischkanonistischen Nachweis der Verwerklichkeit des S.J. versehen*, Neuer Frankfurter Verlag, Frankfurt a.M., (1906); **and** *Der Taxil-Schwidel: ein welthistorischer Ulk*, Neuer Frankfurter Verlag, Frankfurt a.M., (1906); **and** *Revolution oder Evolution? Eine freikonservative Osterpredigt für das Herrentum europäischer Rasse*, Ostara, Wien, (1906); **and** *Die Theosophie und die assyrischen "Menschentiere" in ihren Verhältnis zu den neuesten Resultaten der anthropologischen Forschung*, P. Zillmann, Berlin, (1907); **and** *Die Archäologie und Anthropologie und die assyrischen Menschentiere: mit einer Tafel*, P. Zillmann, Berlin, (1907); **and** *Der Affenmensch der Bibel: mit vier Tafeln und zehn illustrationen im Text*, P. Zillmann, Berlin, (1907); **and** *Die griechischen Bibel-Versionen. (Septuaginta und Hexapla.) Herausgegeben, mit Ammerkungen und deutscher Uebersetzung versehen*, Lumen, Leipzig, (1908); **and** *Die Lateinischen Bibel-Versionen (Itala und*

Vulgata) Volume 1, Genesis, Lumen, Wien, (1909); **and** *Moses als Darwinist: eine Einführung in die anthropologische Religion*, F. Schalk, Wien, (1911); **and** “Kraus und das Rassenproblem”, *Der Brenner*, Volume 4, (1913-1914); **and** *Rasse und dichtung . . .*, Ostara, Mödling-Wien, (1916); **and** *Weltende und Weltwende*, Lorch, (1923); **and** *Grundriss der ariosophischen Geheimlehre*, Oestrich, (1925); **and** J. Lanz-Liebenfels, H. Reichstein **and** A. Hitler, *Das Buch der Psalmen deutsch: das Gebetbuch der Ariosophen, Rassenmystiker und Antisimiten. I. Band*, Herbert Reichstein, Düsseldorf-Unterrath, (1926); **and** J. Lanz-Liebenfels, *Der Weltkrieg als Rassenkampf der Dunklen gegen die Blondnen*, Vienna, (1927); **and** *Theozoologie, oder Naturgeschichte der Götter*, J. Lanz v. Liebenfels, Wien, (1928); **and** *Theozoologie, oder Naturgeschichte der Götter*, J. Lanz v. Liebenfels, Wien, (1928); **and** *Bibliomystikon, oder: Die Geheimbibel der Eingeweihten; ariosophische Bibeldokumente und Bibelkommentare zu allen Büchern der heiligen Schrift, auf Grund der anthropologischen und archäologischen Forschungen und der arischen, klassischen und orientalischen Bibelversionen zusammengestellt*, In 10 Volumes, Pforzheim i. Baden, (1929-1934); **and** *Ostara österreichisches Flugschriften-Magazin freikonservativer Richtung*; (1905-1917 / 1926-1931); **and** *Praktisch-empirisches Handbuch der ariosophischen Astrologie*, Düsseldorf, (1926-1934). **See also:** H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974); English translation *Adolf Hitler: Founder of Israel*, Modjeskis’ Society Dedicated to Preservation of Cultures, San Diego, (1997). **See also:** E. Hieronimus, *Lanz von Liebenfels: eine Bibliographie*, U. Berg, Toppenstedt, (1991). **See also:** W. Daim, *Der Mann, der Hitler die Ideen gab*, Ueberreuter, Wien, (1994).

974. I. Zollschan, *Das Rassenproblem unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der theoretischen Grundlagen der jüdischen Rassenfrage*, W. Braumüller, Wien, (1910); **and** *Jewish Questions: Three Lectures*, New York, Bloch Pub. Co., (1914).

975. W. Hartenau (W. Rathenau), “Höre, Israel!”, *Die Zukunft*, Volume 18, (6 March 1897), pp. 454-462. W. Rathenau, *Reflexionen*, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1908).

976. “Starts Open Fight Against Preparedness”, *The New York Times*, (22 December 1915), p. 12.

977. *The Jewish Communal Register of New York City, 1917-1918*, Second Edition, Kehillah, New York, (1919), pp. 1009-1010 (In the First Edition at 1018-1019).

978. E. Slater and R. Slater, “Jacob Schiff”, *Great Jewish Men*, Jonathan David Publishers, New York, (2003), pp. 274-276, at 275-276.

979. I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judean Publishing Company, New York, (1914), p. 14.

980. I. Zangwill, “Zangwill Urges Jews to Support Allies”, *The London Times*, (10 September 1914), frontpage; **and** “Mr. Schiff on Peace”, *The London Times*, (25 November 1914), p. 9; **and** “The Voice of Jerusalem”, *The London Times*, (2 December 1914), p. 9.

981. *See also:* “Consequences of the War”, *The New York Times*, (22 November 1914), Section 3, p. 2; **and** “See Peace Campaign in Mr. Schiff’s Talk”, *The New York Times*, (23 November 1914), p. 3.

982. C. Knickerbocker, *New York Journal-American*, (3 February 1949). A. de Goulévitch, *Czarism and Revolution*, Omni Publications, Hawthorne, California, (1962), pp. 223-232. J. Perloff, *The Shadows of Power: The Council on Foreign Relations and the American Decline*, Western Islands, Boston, (1988), p. 39. G. E. Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, American Opinion, Appleton, Wisconsin, (1995). p. 265.

983. “Zionism in Palestine”, *The London Times*, (19 July 1910), p. 7.

984. Cf. L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), pp. 52-56.

985. Letter from A. Einstein to H. Zangger of 28 February 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 7, Princeton University Press, (2004). On the role of bankers in the Nazi regime, see: H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974); English translation *Adolf Hitler: Founder of Israel*, Modjeskis' Society Dedicated to Preservation of Cultures, San Diego, (1997), especially pp. 50-52.

986. "Text of Untermeyer's Address", *The New York Times*, (7 August 1933), p. 4. **See also:** "Untermeyer Back, Greeted in Harbor", *The New York Times*, (7 August 1933), p. 4.

987. F. Thyssen, *I Paid Hitler*, Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., New York, Toronto, (1941).

988. J. Buchanan, "Bush-Nazi Link Confirmed", *The New Hampshire Gazette*, Volume 248, Number 1, (10 October 2003); URL:

<http://www.nhgazette.com/articles/NN_Bush_Nazi_Link.html>

J. Buchanan and S. Michael, "'Bush-Nazi Dealings Continued Until 1951'—Federal Documents", *The New Hampshire Gazette*, Volume 248, Number 3, (7 November 2003); URL:

<http://www.nhgazette.com/articles/NN_Bush_Nazi_2.html>

J. Buchanan, *Fixing America: Breaking the Stranglehold of Corporate Rule, Big Media & the Religious Right*, Far West Publishing Company, Santa Fe, New Mexico, (2004). **See also:** E. Schweitzer, *Amerika und der Holocaust: Die verschwiegene Geschichte*, Knauer Taschenbuch Verlag, München, (2004).

989. Letter from O. S. Strauss to D. Philipson of 2 September 1918, quoted in: L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), p. 54.

990. L. Marshall to J.M. Senior, *Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty; Selected Papers and Addresses*, Volume 2, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1957), pp. 721-723.

991. Letter from J. H. Schiff to D. Philipson of 5 September 1918, quoted in: L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), pp.53-54.

992. E. C. Mullins, *Secrets of the Federal Reserve: The London Connection*, Bankers Research Institute, Staunton, Virginia, (1983); **and** *The Federal Reserve Conspiracy*, Common Sense, Union, New Jersey, (1954); **and** *A Study of the Federal Reserve*, Kasper and Horton, New York, (1952).

993. B. J. Hendrick, "The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286, at 281.

994. E. M. House, *Philip Dru: Administrator*, B. W. Huebsch, New York, (1912).

995. E. C. Mullins, *Secrets of the Federal Reserve: The London Connection*, Bankers Research Institute, Staunton, Virginia, (1983); **and** *The Federal Reserve Conspiracy*, Common Sense, Union, New Jersey, (1954); **and** *A Study of the Federal Reserve*, Kasper and Horton, New York, (1952).

996. B. J. Hendrick, "The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286, at 281.

997. A. Muhlstein, *Baron James: The Rise of the French Rothschilds*, Vendome Press, New York, (1982).

998. P. B. Boucher, *Histoire de l'usure: chez les Egyptiens, les Juifs, les Grecs, les Romains, nos ancêtres et les Chinois, et considération sur les ravages qu'elle exerce actuellement en*

France ; dans laquelle l'auteur présente les moyens propres à la réprimer, prouve que l'édit de 1770, qui fixe l'intérêt de l'argent à 5 pour 100, est encore pleine vigueur, et donne une explications des articles 1153 et 1907 due Code Napoléon, relatifs au prêt à intérêt, Chaigneau Jeune, Paris (1807).

999. A. C. Sutton, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, Buccaneer Books, Cutchogue, New York, (1974).

1000. A. C. Sutton, *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*, GSG & Associates, San Pedro, California, (2002).

1001. I. T. T. Lincoln, *The Autobiography of an Adventurer*, H. Holt and Co., New York, (1932). H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974); English translation *Adolf Hitler: Founder of Israel*, Modjeskis' Society Dedicated to Preservation of Cultures, San Diego, (1997), picture page between pages 35 and 36 and pp. 50-52, 62-63. B. Wasserstein, *The Secret Lives of Trebitsch Lincoln*, Yale University Press, (1988).

1002. H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974); English translation *Adolf Hitler: Founder of Israel*, Modjeskis' Society Dedicated to Preservation of Cultures, San Diego, (1997), picture page between pages 35 and 36 and pp. 50-52, 62-63. See also: D. Irving, *Hitler's War and The War Path*, "Last updated Friday, April 13, 2001" <<http://www.fpp.co.uk/books/Hitler/>>, pp. xxiv-xxv.

1003. Refer to the love letters between Lewisohn and Viereck in the "Ludwig Lewisohn papers, 1903-1980's" at the College of Charleston libraries, Special Collections, Third Floor, Mss 28, Box 1, Folders 1, 3 and 5.

1004. Daryl Bradford Smith interview of Eustace Mullins of 25 January 2006, "The French Connection", *GCN LIVE*, <http://www.iamthewitness.com>.

1005. N. M. Johnson, "George Sylvester Viereck: Poet and Propagandist", *Books at Iowa*, Number 9, (November, 1968), URL:

<http://www.lib.uiowa.edu/spec-coll/Bai/johnson2.htm>

and *George Sylvester Viereck: Pro-German Publicist in America, 1910-1945*, Dissertation Thesis (Ph. D.), University of Iowa University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, (1971); **and** *George Sylvester Viereck, German-American Propagandist*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Illinois, (1972).

1006. "Hears Baruch Sold on Peace Note Tip", *The New York Times*, (4 January 1917), p.1. "American Board to Buy for Allies", *The New York Times*, (25 August 1917), p. 1. **See also:** "May Sieze Oil Rich Lands", *The New York Times*, (28 April 1918), p. 11.

1007. N. Syrkin, under the nom de plume "Ben Elieser", *Die Judenfrage und der sozialistische Judenstaat*, Steiger, Bern, (1898); English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 333-350, at 346.

1008. S. Kahan, "Preface", *The Wolf of the Kremlin*, William Morrow and Company, Inc., New York, (1987).

1009. J. Prinz, *The Secret Jews*, Random House, New York, (1973), pp. 13-14.

1010. J. Prinz, *The Secret Jews*, Random House, New York, (1973), p. 195.

1011. "Jews", *Great Soviet Encyclopedia: A Translation of the Third Edition*, Volume 2, Macmillan, New York, (1973), pp. 292-293, at 293.

1012. I. Zangwill, "Is Political Zionism Dead? Yes", *The Nation*, Volume 118, Number 3062, (12 March 1924), pp. 276-278, at 276.

1013. I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914).

1014. J. H. Brenner, "Self-Criticism", in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 307-312, at 310-311.

1015. D. S. Jordan, *Unseen Empire; a Study of the Plight of Nations that Do Not Pay Their Debts*, American Unitarian Association, Boston, (1912).

1016. *Congressional Record: Containing the Proceedings and Debates of the Second Session of the Sixty-Fourth Congress of the United States*, Volume 54, Part 3, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., (27 January 1917-12 February 1917), pp. 2946-2948.

1017. E. C. Mullins, *Secrets of the Federal Reserve: The London Connection*, Bankers Research Institute, Staunton, Virginia, (1983); **and** *The Federal Reserve Conspiracy*, Common Sense, Union, New Jersey, (1954); **and** *A Study of the Federal Reserve*, Kasper and Horton, New York, (1952).

1018. On Untermeyer, see: Corp Author: United States., Congress., House., Committee on rules., *Investigation of the Money Trust. No. 1-[2] Hearings Before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives, on House Resolutions 314 and 356. Friday, January 26, 1912.*, Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Print. Off., (1912). **See also:** Corp Author: United States., Congress., House., Committee on Banking and Currency., *Money Trust Investigation. . . Statistical and Other Information Compiled under Direction of the Committee.*, Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Print. Off., (1912). **See also:** A. P. Pujo and Arsène Paulin and E. A. Hayes. Corp Author: United States., Congress., House., Committee on Banking and Currency, *Money Trust Investigation. Investigation of Financial and Monetary Conditions in the United States under House Resolutions Nos. 429 and 504, Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.*, Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Print. Off., (1913). **See also:** J. G. Milburn, W. F. Taylor, *Money Trust Investigation: Brief on Behalf of the New York Stock Exchange*, New York, C.G. Burgoyne, (1913). **See also:** J. P. Morgan, *Testimony of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan and Mr. Henry P. Davison Before the Money Trust Investigation*, J.P. Morgan & Co., New York, (1913). **On Brandeis, see:** L. D. Brandeis, *Other People's Money and How the Bankers Use It*, F.A. Stokes, New York, (1914). **See also:** L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis*, In Five Volumes, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975). This set has numerous letters as well as editorial comment related to Brandeis and Untermeyer's campaigns against some bankers.

1019. N. W. Aldrich, *The Independent*, (July, 1914).

1020. C. A. Lindbergh, *Banking and Currency and The Money Trust*, National Capital Press, Washington, D.C., (1913), pp. 92-98.

1021. "Hylan Heads West to Push Cities Bloc", *The New York Times*, (9 December 1922), pp. 1-2.

1022. L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), p. 108.

1023. J. Daniels, *The Life of Woodrow Wilson, 1856-1924*, The John C. Winston Company, Philadelphia, (1924).

1024. D. Lawrence, *The True Story of Woodrow Wilson*, George H. Doran Company, New York, (1924).

1025. W. Wilson, *The New Freedom: A Call for the Emancipation of the Generous Energies of a People*, Doubleday, Page & Company, Garden City, New York, (1913), pp. 13-14.

1026. R. I. Friedman, *The False Prophet: Rabbi Meir Kahane: from FBI Informant to Knesset Member*, Lawrence Hill Books, Brooklyn, New York, (1990), pp. 105-108.

1027. M. R. Johnson, "The Judeo-Russian Mafia: From the Gulag to Brooklyn to World Dominion", *The Barnes Review*, Volume 12, Number 3, (May/June 2006), pp. 43-47. **See also:** D. Satter, *Darkness at Dawn: The Rise of the Russian Criminal State*, Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut, (2003). **See also:** R. I. Friedman, *Red Mafiya: How the*

Russian Mob Has Invaded America, Little, Brown, Boston, (2000). **See also:** P. Klebnikov, *Godfather of the Kremlin: The Decline of Russia in the Age of Gangster Capitalism*, Harcourt, New York, (2000). **See also:** J. O. Finckenauer, *Russian Mafia in America: Immigration, Culture, and Crime*, Northeastern University Press, Boston, (1998). **See also:** S. Handelman, *Comrade Criminal: Russia's New Mafiya*, Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut, (1995).

1028. *Congressional Record: Proceedings and Debates of the First Session of the Seventy-Second Congress of the United States of America*, Volume 75, Part 11, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., (1 June 1932-11 June 1932), pp. 12595-12603.

1029. T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), pp. 5-6, 25, 68, 93.

1030. J. Klatzkin, *Tehumim: Ma'amarim*, Devir, Berlin, (1925). English translation in J. B. Agus, *The Meaning of Jewish History*, Volume 2, Abelard-Schuman, New York, (1963), p. 426.

1031. A. Hitler, translated by S. Attanasio, *Hitler's Secret Book*, Bramhall House, New York, (1962).

1032. H. Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*, Viking, New York, (1963), pp. 55-56; in the revised 1964 edition at pp. 60-61.

1033. A. Eichmann, "Eichmann Tells His Own Damning Story", *Life Magazine*, Volume 49, Number 22, (28 November 1960), pp. 19-25, 101-112; at 22.

1034. A. Eichmann, "Eichmann Tells His Own Damning Story", *Life Magazine*, Volume 49, Number 22, (28 November 1960), pp. 19-25, 101-112; at 23, 24, 102, 104, 106, 110; and "Eichmann's Own Story: Part II", *Life Magazine*, (5 December 1960), pp. 146-161; at 150, 158, 161.

1035. "Who Were Hitler's Jewish Soldiers", *The Jewish Chronicle*, (6 December 1996), p. 1. **See also:** W. Hoge, "Rare Look Uncovers Wartime Anguish of Many Part-Jewish Germans", *The New York Times*, (6 April 1997), p. 16. **See also:** B. M. Rigg, *Hitler's Jewish Soldiers: The Untold Story of Nazi Racial Laws and Men of Jewish Descent in the German Military*, University Press of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, (2002); **and** *Rescued from the Reich: How One of Hitler's Soldiers Saved the Lubavitcher Rebbe*, Yale University Press, New Haven, (2004).

1036. A. Eichmann, Israel: Bet ha-mishpat ha-mehozi (Jerusalem), Israel: Misrad ha-mishpatim, Yisra'el: Misrad ham-Mispatîm, *The Trial of Adolf Eichmann: Record of Proceedings in the District Court of Jerusalem*, Volume 4, Israel State Archives, Trust for the Publication of the Proceedings of the Eichmann Trial, in co-operation with the Israel State Archives and Yad Vashem, the Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Authority, Jerusalem, (1993).

1037. E. Heimer, *Der Giftpilz: Ein Stürmerbuch für Jung u. Alt*, Der Stürmer, Nürnberg, (1938), pp. 62, 63.

1038. Chaim Weizmann's letter of 29 August 1939 to Prime Minister Chamberlain, that the Jews had declared war on Germany, "Jews Fight for Democracies" *The London Times*, (6 September 1939), p. 8. **See also:** *The Jewish Chronicle*, (8 September 1939).

1039. D. J. Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*, Knopf, New York, (1996).

1040. H. Morgenthau, "Zionism a Surrender, Not a Solution", *The World's Work*, Volume 42, Number 3, (July, 1921), pp. i-viii, at i.

1041. H. Morgenthau, "Zionism a Surrender, Not a Solution", *The World's Work*, Volume 42, Number 3, (July, 1921), pp. i-viii, at viii.

1042. J. Brand, *Desperate Mission: Joel Brand's Story*, Criterion Books, New York, (1958); **and** *Advocate for the Dead: The Story of Joel Brand*, A. Deutsch, London, (1958, ©1956); **and** *ha-Satan veba-nefesh*, Ladori, Tel Aviv, (1960); **and** *Adolf Eichmann: Fakten gegen Fabeln*, Ner-Tamid-Verlag, München, (1961).

1043. A. Weissberg-Cybulski, *Bi-shelihut nidonim la-mavet*, Tel-Aviv, `Ayanot, (1956); **German** *Die Geschichte von Joel Brand*, Kiepenheuer & Witsch, Köln, (1956); **English** *Advocate for the Dead: The Story of Joel Brand*, A. Deutsch, London, (1958); **Danish** *Joel Brands Historie*, Gyldendal, København, (1957); **Italian** *La Storia di Joel Brand*, Feltrinelli, Milano, (1958).

1044. A. Eichmann, "Eichmann Tells His Own Damning Story", *Life Magazine*, Volume 49, Number 22, (28 November 1960), pp. 19-25, 101-112; and "Eichmann's Own Story: Part II", *Life Magazine*, (5 December 1960), pp. 146-161; at 146.

1045. <<http://www.theage.com.au/news/national/war-crime-suspect-admits-to-fascist-role/2006/02/15/1139890808344.html>>

1046. R. H. Williams, *The Ultimate World Order—As Pictured in "The Jewish Utopia"*, CPA Book Publisher, Boring, Oregon, (1957?), pp. 58-60.

1047. A. T. Clay, "Political Zionism", *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 127, Number 2, (February, 1921), pp. 268-279, at 269. H. Morgenthau, "Zionism a Surrender, Not a Solution", *The World's Work*, Volume 42, Number 3, (July, 1921), pp. i-viii, at iv.

1048. B. Disraeli, *Coningsby; or, The New Generation*, The Century Co., New York, (1904), pp. 230-235.

1049. Lord George Sydenham Clarke Sydenham of Combe, *The Jewish World Problem*, reprinted from *The Nineteenth Century and After*, (November, 1921), pp. 888-901.

1050. K. G. W. Ludecke, *I Knew Hitler: The Story of a Nazi AWho Escaped the Blood Purge*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, (1937), p. 213.

1051. H. Morgenthau, "Zionism a Surrender, Not a Solution", *The World's Work*, Volume 42, Number 3, (July, 1921), pp. i-viii, at iii-iv.

1052. T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 172.

1053. V. Ostrovsky and C. Hoy, *By Way of Deception*, St. Martin's Paperbacks, New York, (1990), pp. 87-88.

1054. A. Einstein, "Jewish Nationalism and Anti-Semitism", *The Jewish Chronicle*, (17 June 1921), p. 16.

1055. A. Einstein, A. Engel translator, "How I became a Zionist", *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 57, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 234-235, at 235.

1056. J. Stachel, *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 79, note 41.

1057. A. Einstein, "Jewish Nationalism and Anti-Semitism", *The Jewish Chronicle*, (17 June 1921), p. 16.

1058. A. Einstein quoted in: J. Stachel, "Einstein's Jewish Identity", *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 65. Stachel cites, *About Zionism: Speeches and Letters*, Macmillan, New York, (1931), pp. 48-49. For Zionist Ha-Am's use of the image of atomisation and dispersion, see: A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 276.

1059. At the time Einstein made his statement, Jews and Gentiles often referred to Jews as "Orientals".

1060. Einstein repeatedly spoke of the Germans as "greedy" to acquire territory and of the "loss of energy" when different "races" attempted to live together. He have been speaking literally. Georg Friedrich Nicolai wrote of the struggle of life to acquire the energy of the sun

and he applied this struggle to humanity. G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), pp. 36-39, 44-53.

1061. A. Einstein quoted in: R. W. Clarck, *Einstein, the Life and Times*, World Publishing Company, USA, (1971), p. 292. Clarck refers to: *Neue Rundschau*, Volume 33, Part 2, pp. 815-816.

1062. W. E. Mosse, “Die Niedergang der deutschen Republik und die Juden”, *The Crucial Year 1932*, p. 38; English translation in: K. Polkehn, “The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941”, *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 56-57.

1063. English translation by John Stachel in J. Stachel, “Einstein’s Jewish Identity”, *Einstein from ‘B’ to ‘Z’*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 67. Stachel cites, “Botschaft”, *Jüdische Rundschau*, Volume 30, (1925), p. 129; French translation, *La Revue Juive*, Volume 1, (1925), pp. 14-16.

1064. J. Stachel, “Einstein’s Jewish Identity”, *Einstein from ‘B’ to ‘Z’*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 65. Stachel cites, *About Zionism: Speeches and Letters*, Macmillan, New York, (1931), pp. 78-79.

1065. A. Einstein quoted in “Einstein on Arrival Braves Limelight for Only 15 Minutes”, *The New York Times*, (12 December 1930), pp. 1, 16, at 16.

1066. E. A. Ross, *The Old World in the New: The Significance of past and Present Immigration to the American People*, Century Company, New York, (1914), p. 144.

1067. Reprinted in the relevant part in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 505.

1068. A. Einstein, “Why do They Hate the Jews?”, *Collier’s*, Volume 102, (26 November 1938); reprinted in *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), pp. 191-198, at 194, 196. Einstein expressed himself in a similar way to Peter A. Bucky, P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 87.

1069. T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), pp. 5-6, 25, 68, 93.

1070. J. Klatzkin, *Tehumim: Ma’amarim*, Devir, Berlin, (1925). English translation in J. B. Agus, *The Meaning of Jewish History*, Volume 2, Abelard-Schuman, New York, (1963), pp. 425-426.

1071. S. Dubnow, *Die Grundlagen des Nationaljudentums*, Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, (1905). English translation from K. A. Strom, Editor, *The Best of Attack! and National Vanguard Tabloid*, National Alliance, Arlington, Virginia, (1984), p. 60.

1072. F. M. Arouet de Voltaire, *Histoire de Charles XII, Roi de Suède*, (1731); **and** *Dictionnaire Philosophique*, Multiple Editions; multiple English translations, including: W. F. Flemming, *A Philosophical Dictionary*, Volume 6, Dingwall-Rock, New York, (1901), pp. 266-313; **and** *Essai sur les Moeurs et l’Esprit des Nations, et sur les Principaux faits de l’Histoire Depuis Charlemagne Jusqu’à Louis XIII*, Chapter 104, (1769); **and** *Philosophie Générale: Métaphysique, Morale et Théologie*, Chez Sanson et Compagnie, Aux Deux-Ponts, (1792).

1073. J. Wellhausen, *Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah*, Third Edition, Adam and Charles Black, London, (1891), pp. 201-203.

1074. See: John Gill’s (1697-1771) *Exposition* works on: *Exodus* 3:2. *Psalms* 80:8; 129:2. II *Corinthians* 4:16. **See also:** “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 330.

1075. A. Ha-Am, “The Jewish State and the Jewish Problem”, in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 262-269, at 266. *Contrast Ha-Am’s comment with: Dr. Birnbaum, “Dr BIRNBAUM mentioned that it had often been contended that Zionism was but a reaction against anti-Semitism. . . .”*, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (3 September 1897), p. 12.

1076. Letter from C. Weizmann to A. Ha-Am of December 14 and 15, 1914, in: C. Weizmann, Edited by L. Stein, *et al.*, *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*, Volume 7, Israel Universities Press, Jerusalem, (1975), pp. 81-83, at 81-82. Reprinted in: L. Brenner, Editor, *51 Documents: Zionist Collaboration with the Nazis*, Barricade Books Inc., Fort Lee, New Jersey, (2002), pp. 21-22, at 22.

1077. I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), pp. 4-5, 10-11, 17-20.

1078. I. Zangwill, “Zionism and the Future of the Jews”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 6, Number 5, (September, 1903), pp. 3895-3898, at 3897-3898.

1079. J. H. Brenner, “Self-Criticism”, in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 307-312, at 308, 310.

1080. An interesting dialog on this issue takes place in the 1991 film *The Quarrel* directed by Eli Cohen.

1081. J. B. Agus, *The Meaning of Jewish History*, Volume 2, Abelard-Schuman, New York, (1963), pp. 446-447.

1082. M. Selzer, Editor, “Statement by the Holy Gerer Rebbe, the Sfas Emes, on Zionism (1901)”, *Zionism Reconsidered: The Rejection of Jewish Normalcy*, Macmillan, New York, (1970), pp. 19-22, at 19-20.

1083. T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), pp. 68, 93.

1084. W. E. Blackstone, *Jesus Is Coming*, Third Revision, The Bible house, Los Angeles, (1908), pp. 211, 238-241.

1085. *The New York Times*, Magazine Section, (12 February 1995), pp. 38, 65.

1086. B. H. Freedman, “Palestine”, *Economic Council Letter*, (15 October 1947); **and** *Destiny Magazine*, (29 January 1948); “A Jewish Defector Warns America”, Address at the Willard Hotel in Washington, D. C. in 1961, a transcription of which is widely available on the internet; **and** *The Hidden Tyranny Revealed*, New Christian Crusade Church, Metairie, Louisiana, (1970); **and** *Why Congress is Crooked or Crazy or Both*, New York, (1975). **See also:** C. B. Dall and B. Freedman, *Israel’s Five Trillion Dollar Secret*, Liberty Bell Publications, Reedy, West Virginia, (1977). **See also:** D. Reed, *Somewhere South of Suez*, Devin-Adair, New York, (1951), pp. 330-332. **See also:** J. Rorty, “Storm Over the Investigating Committees”, *Commentary*, Volume 19, Number 2, (February, 1955), pp. 128-136, at 131. **See Also:** A. Forster, *Square One*, D. I. Fine, New York, (1988), p. 121. **See also:** “Ready to Meet Suit, Jewish Group Says”, *The New York Times*, (8 July 1946), p. 3. **See also:** “Mufti Mentioned at Libel Hearing” *The New York Times*, (4 May 1948), p. 20. **See also:** “Anti-Zionist Lists Policy ‘Dictators’”, *The New York Times*, (5 May 1948), p. 35. **See also:** “Witness Admits Aiding Arab Cause”, *The New York Times*, (7 May 1948), p. 7. **See also:** “Anti-Zionist Tells of Dinner in Capital”, *The New York Times*, (8 May 1948), p. 4. **See also:** “Anti-Zionist Tells of Threats on Life”, *The New York Times*, (14 May 1948), p. 6. **See also:** “Denies Link to Smith”, *The New York Times*, (18 May 1948), p. 48. **See also:** “Richardson Admits Link to M’Williams”, *The New York Times*, (19 May 1948), p. 22. **See also:** “Anti-Nazi Leader Cleared of Libel”, *The New York Times*, (27 May 1948), p. 23. **See also:** “Accuser Disputed by Mrs. Rosenberg”, *The New York Times*, (9 December 1950), p. 18. **See also:** “Night Session Held on Rosenberg Case”, *The New York Times*, (12

December 1950), p. 41. **See also:** “Two Deny Charges in Rosenberg Case”, *The New York Times*, (13 December 1950), p. 25. **See also:** “Rankin Role Told in Rosenberg Case”, *The New York Times*, (14 December 1950), p. 41. **See also:** “Committee Clears Anna M. Rosenberg”, *The New York Times*, (15 December 1950), p. 24. **See also:** “Rosenberg Accusers Face Perjury Inquiry”, *The New York Times*, (16 January 1951), p. 26. **See also:** “Sues for \$12,000,000”, *The New York Times*, (22 March 1952), p. 30. **See also:** “Goldberg Urged to Reverse Pro-Israeli Policies of U. S.”, *The New York Times*, (20 August 1965), p. 8.

1087. “Jack Stachel, U. S. Communist And Party Official, Dies at 65”, *The New York Times*, (2 January 1966), p. 73.

1088. J. Prinz, *Wir Juden*, Erich Reiss, Berlin, (1934), p. 44.

1089. N. Weyl, *The Jew in American Politics*, Arlington House, New Rochelle, New York, (1968), pp. 118-120. Weyl cites: M. Epstein, *The Jew and Communism*, Trade Union Sponsoring Committee, New York, (1959); and N. Glazer, *The Social Basis of American Communism*, Harcourt, Brace, New York, (1961), pp. 151-152.

1090. W. Trohan, “3 Men Called a Government in Themselves”, *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, (29 May 1950, Final Edition), pp. 1-2.

1091. F. S. Litten, “Note: Einstein and the Noulens Affair”, *British Journal for the History of Science*, Volume 24, (1991), pp. 465-467.

1092. M. Born, *My Life: Recollections of a Nobel Laureate*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1975), p. 185.

1093. Letter from A. Einstein to H. Zangger of 15 or 22 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of ALbert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 217, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 185-186, at 185.

1094. Letter from A. Einstein to H. and M. Born of 27 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 284, Princeton University Press, (2004).

1095. L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), pp. 98-105.

1096. L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 4, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), pp. 365, 452-453, 507-508.

1097. I. Zangwill, Letter to the Editor, *The London Times*, (20 August 1921), p. 7.

1098. *Confer:* H. de Vreis de Heekelingen, *Les Protocols des Sages de Sion Constituent-ils un Faux*, Lausanne, (1938); *partial English translation in:* L. Fry, “The Berne Trials”, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, Appendix 2, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), pp. 263-267; *see also* pp. 106-111. **See also:** W. Creutz, *Les Protocoles des Sages de Sion: Leur Authenticité*, Les Nouvelles Éditions Nationales, Brunoy, (1934); English translation, *New Light on the Protocols: Latest Evidence on the Veracity of this Remarkable Document*, The Right Cause, Chicago, (1935). **See also:** *The Jewish Victory at Berne: Side Lights on the Verdict*, Christian Aryan Protection League, London, (1935). **See also:** U. Fleischhauer, *Die echten Protokolle der Weisen von Zion; Sachverständigengutachten, erstattet im Auftrage des Richteramtes V in Bern*, U. Bodung, Erfurt, (1935). **See also:** *The Berne Trail—Concerning the “Protocols of the Elders of Zion.” Fourteenth Session; Tuesday, May 14, 1935—P.M.*, (1935). **See also:** H. Jonak von Freyenwald, *Der Berner Prozess um die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion. Akten und Gutachten*, U. Bodung, Bund Nationalsozialistischer Eidgenossen, Erfurt, (1939). **See also:** G. Schwartz-Bostunitsch, *Jüdischer Imperialismus*, O. Ebersberger, Landsberg am Lech., (1935). **See also:** R. E. Edmondson, *The Damning Parallels of the Protocol “Forgeries” as Adopted and Fulfilled in the United States by Jewish-Radical Leadership: A Diabolical*

Capitalist-Communist Alliance Unmasked, New York, (1935). **See also:** S. Vász, *Das Berner Fehlurteil über die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion: eine kritische Betrachtung über das Prozessverfahren*, U. Bodung, Erfurt, (1935). **See also:** *Berner Bilderbuch vom Zionisten-Prozess um die "Protokolle der Weisen von Zion."*, U. Bodung-Verlag, Erfurt, (1936). **See also:** G. Barroso, *Os Protocolos dos Sábios de Sião; o Imperialismo de Israel, o Plano dos Judeus para a Conquista do Mundo, o Código do Anti-Cristo, Provas de Autenticidade, Documentos*, Agencia Minerva, São Paulo, (1936). **See also:** K. Bergmeister, *Der jüdische Weltverschwörungsplan; die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion vor dem Strafgerichte in Bern*, U. Bodung, Erfurt, (1937); English translation, *The Jewish World Conspiracy; The Protocols of the Elders of Zion before the Court in Berne*, Sons of Liberty, Liberty Bell Publications, Hollywood, California, (1938).

1099. H. Bernstein, *The Truth about 'The Protocols of Zion'*, Exhibit G, Ktav Publishing House, New York, (1971), pp. 36-369.

1100. L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), pp. 92-97.

1101. L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), pp. 79-90.

1102. *The "Protocols," Bolshevism and the Jews: An Address to Their Fellow-Citizens*, American Jewish Committee, New York, (1921).

1103. L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 4, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), p. 507.

1104. L. Marshall to J. Henkin, J. Spargo and M. Senior (and the Editors' notes to same), *Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty; Selected Papers and Addresses*, Volume 1, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1957), pp. 350-355; Volume 2, pp. 721-723.

1105. L. Marshall to J. Henkin, J. Spargo and M. Senior (and the Editors' notes to same), *Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty; Selected Papers and Addresses*, Volume 1, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1957), pp. 350-355; Volume 2, pp. 721-723.

1106. *The New York Times*, (9 July 1927), pp. 9, 12; *The New York Times*, (10 July 1927), p. 12. **See also:** H. Ford and L. Marshall, *Statement by Henry Ford Regarding Charges Against Jews, Made in His Publications: The Dearborn independent, and a Series of Pamphlets Entitled "The International Jew," Together with an Explanatory Statement by Louis Marshall, President of the American Jewish Committee, and His Reply to Mr. Ford*, American Jewish Committee, New York, (1927). **See also:** *Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty; Selected Papers and Addresses*, Volume 1, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1957), pp. 321-389. **See also:** M. Rosenstock, *Louis Marshall, Defender of Jewish Rights*, Chapters 5-7, Wayne State University Press, Detroit, (1965). **See also:** H. Bennett and P. Marcus, *We Never Called Him Henry*, Chapter 7, Gold Medal Books, Fawcett Publications, (1951), pp. 46-56. **See also:** H. Bennett, *True* ("Man's Magazine"), (October, 1951), p. 125.

1107. Marshall to Ford, 5 July 1927, *Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty; Selected Papers and Addresses*, Volume 1, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1957), pp. 379-380 at 380.

1108. *The New York Times*, (9 July 1927), pp. 1, 9; *The New York Times*, (10 July 1927), p. 1.

1109. "Ford Stops Book on Jews in Europe", *The New York Times*, (14 November 1927), p.23. "Asks Ford to Press Ban on Sale of Book", *The New York Times*, (26 November 1927), p. 17. "Gets Ford's Ban on Book", *The New York Times*, (10 December 1927), p. 35.

- 1110.** Marshall to Ford, 21 December 1927, *Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty; Selected Papers and Addresses*, Volume 1, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1957), pp. 386-387 at 387.
- 1111.** B. Brasol, *The Protocols and World Revolution, Including a Translation and Analysis of the "Protocols of the Meetings of the Zionist Men of Wisdom"*, Small, Maynard & Company, Boston, (1920); **and** *Socialism Vs. Civilization*, C. Scribner's Sons, New York, (1920); **and** *The World at the Cross Roads*, Small, Mayhard & Co., Boston, (1921); **and** *The Balance Sheet of Sovietism*, Duffield, New York, (1922).
- 1112.** L. Fry, "About the Author", *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), front matter.
- 1113.** M. Barkun, *Religion and the Racist Right: The Origin of the Christian Identity Movement*, Revised Edition, University of North Carolina Press, (1997).
- 1114.** H. Bennett and P. Marcus, *We Never Called Him Henry*, Chapter 7, Gold Medal Books, Fawcett Publications, New York (1951), p. 42.
- 1115.** H. Bennett and P. Marcus, *We Never Called Him Henry*, Chapter 7, Gold Medal Books, Fawcett Publications, New York (1951), pp. 46-56 at 56.
- 1116.** H. Bennett and P. Marcus, *We Never Called Him Henry*, Chapter 7, Gold Medal Books, Fawcett Publications, (1951), p. 56.
- 1117.** D. Reed, *Somewhere South of Suez*, Devin-Adair Company, U. S. A., (1951), pp. 324-327.
- 1118.** L. Marshall to R. Marshall, 11 January 1928, *Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty; Selected Papers and Addresses*, Volume 1, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1957), pp. 387-389 at 388.
- 1119.** L. Marshall to H. Bernstein, 11 January 1928, *Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty; Selected Papers and Addresses*, Volume 1, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1957), p. 388.
- 1120.** "Zionists in a Row at Big Convention", *The New York Times*, (29 June 1915), p. 8. "\$100,000 Raised by the Zionists", *The New York Times*, (30 June 1915), p. 8.
- 1121. On Untermeyer, see:** Corp Author: United States., Congress., House., Committee on rules., *Investigation of the Money Trust. No. 1-[2] Hearings Before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives, on House Resolutions 314 and 356. Friday, January 26, 1912.*, Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Print. Off., (1912). **See also:** Corp Author: United States., Congress., House., Committee on Banking and Currency., *Money Trust Investigation. . . Statistical and Other Information Compiled under Direction of the Committee.*, Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Print. Off., (1912). **See also:** A. P. Pujo and Arsène Paulin and E. A. Hayes. Corp Author: United States., Congress., House., Committee on Banking and Currency, *Money Trust Investigation. Investigation of Financial and Monetary Conditions in the United States under House Resolutions Nos.429 and 504, Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.*, Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Print. Off., (1913). **See also:** J. G. Milburn, W. F. Taylor, *Money Trust Investigation: Brief on Behalf of the New York Stock Exchange*, New York, C.G. Burgoyne, (1913). **See also:** J. P. Morgan, *Testimony of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan and Mr. Henry P. Davison Before the Money Trust Investigation*, J.P. Morgan & Co., New York, (1913). **On Brandeis, see:** L. D. Brandeis, *Other People's Money and How the Bankers Use It*, F.A. Stokes, New York, (1914). **See also:** L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis*, In Five Volumes, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975). This set has numerous letters as well as editorial comment related to Brandeis and Untermeyer's campaigns against some bankers.

1122. “Text of Untermeyer’s Address”, *The New York Times*, (7 August 1933), p. 4. **See also:** “Untermeyer Back, Greeted in Harbor”, *The New York Times*, (7 August 1933), p. 4.

1123. L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 4, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), pp. 264-265. **See also:** H. R. Miller, *Scandals in the Highest Office; Facts and Fictions in the Private Lives of our Presidents*, Random House, New York, (1973), pp. 172-199, especially 182-183, 196. Mrs. Peck published a book: M. A. Hulbert, *The Story of Mrs. Peck, an Autobiography*, Minton, Balch & Company, New York, (1933).

1124. “Hears Baruch Sold on Peace Note Tip”, *The New York Times*, (4 January 1917), p.1. “American Board to Buy for Allies”, *The New York Times*, (25 August 1917), p. 1. “May Sieze Oil Rich Lands”, *The New York Times*, (28 April 1918), p. 11. J. A. Schwarz, *The Speculator: Bernard Baruch in Washington, 1917-1965*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, (1981).

1125. M. I. Urofsky, “Attorney for the People—The ‘Outrageous’ Brandeis Nomination”, *Supreme Court Historical Society 1979 Yearbook*, Volume 4, Supreme Court Historical Society, Washington, D. C., (1979).

1126. “Hylan in Attack upon Untermeyer”, *The New York Times*, (2 November 1921), p. 3.

1127. N. C. Butler, “Across the Busy Years: Part VI. Things Seen and Heard in Politics”, *Scribner’s Magazine*, Volume 100, Number 3, (September, 1936), p. 161.

1128. L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 2, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), p. 659. A. Bein, *Theodore Herzl: A Biography of the Founder of Modern Zionism*, Meridian Books, New York, (1962).

1129. “The Turkish Situation by One Born in Turkey”, *The American Monthly Review of Reviews*, Volume 25, Number 2, (February, 1902), pp. 182-191, at 186-188. “Zionism”, *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Eleventh Edition, (1911).

1130. I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), pp. 9, 11. J. Prinz, *The Secret Jews*, Random House, New York, (1973), pp. 111-112.

1131. C. Weizmann to S. Levin, *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*, Volume 7, Series A, Israeli University Press, Jerusalem, (1975), pp. 10-13, at 11.

1132. “Weizmann, Chaim”, *Encyclopedia International*, Volume 19, Grolier, New York, (1966), pp. 288-289, at 288. Weizmann’s autobiography and his letters and papers provide a wealth of information about his involvement in Zionism during World War I, **see:** C. Weizmann, *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*, Volumes 7 and 8, Series A, Israeli University Press, Jerusalem, (1975); **and** *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1949).

1133. D. L. George, *War Memoirs of David Lloyd George*, Volume 2, I. Nicholson & Watson, London, (1933-1936), pp. 586-587.

1134. H. E. Barnes, *The Genesis of the World War: An Introduction to the Problem of War Guilt*, A.A. Knopf, New York, London, (1927); **and** *In Quest of Truth and Justice: De-bunking the War Guilt Myth*, National Historical Society, Chicago, (1928); **and** *War in the Twentieth Century*, Dryden Press, New York, 1940.

1135. H. E. Barnes, “When Last We Were Neutral”, *The American Mercury*, (November, 1939), pp. 276-284, at 279. Entered in the Congressional Record of the United States of America, *Congressional Record: Proceedings and Debates of the 76th Congress: Second Session*, Volume 85, Part 2, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., (1939), pp. 578-580, at 579.

1136. H. E. Barnes, *War in the Twentieth Century*, Random House, Dryden Press, New York, (1940), pp. 75-76.

- 1137.** L. Marshall to J. Spargo, *Louis Marshall: Champion of Liberty; Selected Papers and Addresses*, Volume 1, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1957), pp. 351-353, at 351.
- 1138.** L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), p. 68.
- 1139.** F. Owen, *Tempestuous Journey: Lloyd George: His Life and Times*, McGraw-Hill Company, Inc. New York, (1955), p. 426.
- 1140.** H. Morgenthau, "Zionism a Surrender, Not a Solution", *The World's Work*, Volume 42, Number 3, (July, 1921), pp. i-viii, at v-vi.
- 1141.** B. L. Brasol, *The World at the Cross Roads*, Small, Mayhard & Co., Boston, (1921), pp. 371-379.
- 1142.** D. Reed, "The End of Lord Northcliffe", *The Controversy of Zion*, Chapter 34, Bloomfield, Sudbury, (1978).
- 1143.** D. Reed, *The Controversy of Zion*, Veritas Publishing Company, Bullsbrook, Western Australia, (1985), p. 299.
- 1144.** E. Bulwer-Lytton, *Rienzi: The Pilgrims of the Rhine; The Coming Race*, Brainard, New York, Continental Press, New York, (1848); and *Rienzi, Two Volumes in One; The Pilgrims of the Rhine; the Coming Race*, Boston, Dana Estes & Co., 1848; and *The Pilgrims of the Rhine. The Coming Race*, Dana Estes & Co., Boston, (1849); and *The Coming Race: Or the New Utopia*, Francis B. Felt & Co., New York, (1871).
- 1145.** N. Syrkin, under the nom de plume "Ben Elieser", *Die Judenfrage und der sozialistische Judenstaat*, Steiger, Bern, (1898); English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 333-350.
- 1146.** Cf. E. T. S. Dugdale, "The 25 Points", *The Programme of the N.S.D.A.P. and its General Conceptions*, Franz Eher Nachf., Munich (1932), pp. 18-20; reprinted as an Appendix "The Program of the National Socialist German Workers Party" in K. G. W. Ludecke, *I Knew Hitler: The Story of a Nazi AWho Escaped the Blood Purge*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, (1937), pp. 793-796; reprinted as "Appendix A" in A. C. Sutton, *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*, GSG & Associates, San Pedro, California, (2002), pp. 179-181.
- 1147.** B. Lazare, *Job's Dungheap*, Schocken Books, New York, (1948); quoted in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 476.
- 1148.** See, for example: Einstein's postscript in his letter to P. Epstein of 5 October 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 122, Princeton University Press, (2004).
- 1149.** Letter from A. Einstein to A. D. Fokker of 30 July 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 78, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 117-119, at 117.
- 1150.** See, for example: R. Tagore, *Nationalism*, Macmillan, New York, (1917); German translation: *Nationalismus*, Kurt Wolff, München, (1918).
- 1151.** Letter from A. Einstein to H. Born of 31 August 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 97, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 79-80, at 80.
- 1152.** "Personal-Glimpses: Einstein Finds the World Narrow", *The Literary Digest*, (16 April 1921), pp. 33-34.
- 1153.** **On Untermyer, see:** Corp Author: United States., Congress., House., Committee on rules., *Investigation of the Money Trust. No. 1-[2] Hearings Before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives, on House Resolutions 314 and 356. Friday, January 26, 1912.*, Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Print. Off., (1912). **See also:** Corp Author: United

States., Congress., House., Committee on Banking and Currency., *Money Trust Investigation. . . Statistical and Other Information Compiled under Direction of the Committee.*, Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Print. Off., (1912). **See also:** A. P. Pujo and Arsène Paulin and E. A. Hayes. Corp Author: United States., Congress., House., Committee on Banking and Currency, *Money Trust Investigation. Investigation of Financial and Monetary Conditions in the United States under House Resolutions Nos.429 and 504, Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.*, Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Print. Off., (1913). **See also:** J. G. Milburn, W. F. Taylor, *Money Trust Investigation: Brief on Behalf of the New York Stock Exchange*, New York, C.G. Burgoyne, (1913). **See also:** J. P. Morgan, *Testimony of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan and Mr. Henry P. Davison Before the Money Trust Investigation*, J.P. Morgan & Co., New York, (1913). **On Brandeis, see:** L. D. Brandeis, *Other People's Money and How the Bankers Use It*, F.A. Stokes, New York, (1914). **See also:** L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis*, In Five Volumes, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975). This set has numerous letters as well as editorial comment related to Brandeis and Untermyer's campaigns against some bankers.

1154. Corp Author: United States., Congress., House., Committee on rules., *Investigation of the Money Trust. No. 1-[2] Hearings Before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives, on House Resolutions 314 and 356. Friday, January 26, 1912.*, Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Print. Off., (1912). **See also:** Corp Author: United States., Congress., House., Committee on Banking and Currency., *Money Trust Investigation. . . Statistical and Other Information Compiled under Direction of the Committee.*, Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Print. Off., (1912). **See also:** A. P. Pujo and Arsène Paulin and E. A. Hayes. Corp Author: United States., Congress., House., Committee on Banking and Currency, *Money Trust Investigation. Investigation of Financial and Monetary Conditions in the United States under House Resolutions Nos.429 and 504, Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.*, Washington, D. C., U. S. Govt. Print. Off., (1913). **See also:** J. G. Milburn, W. F. Taylor, *Money Trust Investigation: Brief on Behalf of the New York Stock Exchange*, New York, C.G. Burgoyne, (1913). **See also:** J. P. Morgan, *Testimony of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan and Mr. Henry P. Davison Before the Money Trust Investigation*, J.P. Morgan & Co., New York, (1913).

1155. E. C. Mullins, *Secrets of the Federal Reserve: The London Connection*, Bankers Research Institute, Staunton, Virginia, (1983); **and** *The Federal Reserve Conspiracy*, Common Sense, Union, New Jersey, (1954); **and** *A Study of the Federal Reserve*, Kasper and Horton, New York, (1952).

1156. "The Crash of 1929", *The American Experience*, PBS Video Documentary, (1990).

1157. W. W. Reade, *The Martyrdom of Man*, Trübner & Co., London, (1872).

1158. B. D. Wolfe, *Marxism: One Hundred Years in the Life of a Doctrine*, Dial Press, New York, (1965), p. 67. Wolfe cites: "From Engels's introduction to the reissue of a pamphlet by Sigismund Borkheim. Borkheim's pamphlet, *Zur Erinnerung fuer die deutschen Mordspatrioten 1806-07* [***] The introduction is reproduced in *Werke*, Vol. XXI, pp. 350-351."

1159. R. Radosh and A. Radosh, *Red Star over Hollywood: The Film Colony's Long Romance with the Left*, Encounter Books, San Francisco, (2005).

1160. G. E. Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), pp. 222-224. R. McNair Wilson, *Monarchy or Money Power*, Eyre and Spottiswoode Ltd., London, (1933), pp. 81-83.

- 1161.** G. E. Griffin, "The Rothschild Formula", *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Chapter 11, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), pp. 217-234.
- 1162.** G. E. Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), p. 374. Griffin cites C. Siem, *La Vieille France*, Number 216, (17-24 March 1921), pp. 13-16.
- 1163.** B. M. Baruch, *Baruch: My Own Story*, Henry Holt and Company, New York, (1957), pp. 213-217.
- 1164.** G. Orwell, *Animal Farm: A Fairy Story*, Secker & Warburg, London, (1945).
- 1165.** M. Nordau, *The Interpretation of History*, Willey Book Company, New York, (1910), pp. 311-313; which is an English translation by M. A. Hamilton of *Der Sinn der Geschichte*, C. Duncker, Berlin, (1909).
- 1166.** E. M. House, *Philip Dru: Administrator*, B. W. Huebsch, New York, (1912). **See also:** A. D. H. Smith, *The Real Colonel House*, George H. Doran Company, New York, (1918); **and** *Mr. House of Texas*, Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York, London, (1940). **See also:** E. J. Dillon, *The Inside Story of the Peace Conference*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1920). **See also:** E. H. House and C. Seymour, *What Really Happened at Paris; the Story of the Peace Conference, 1918-1919*, C. Scribner's Sons, New York, (1921). **See also:** B. J. Hendrick, *The Life and Letters of Walter H. Page*, Volume 1, Doubleday, Page & Co., Garden City, New York, (1922), p. 270ff. **See also:** E. M. House and S. Charles, *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, Boston, New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, (1926-1928). **See also:** A. Macphail, *Three Persons*, L. Carrier & Co., J. Murray, New York, Montreal, London, (1929). **See also:** G. S. Viereck, *The Strangest Friendship in History: Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House*, Liveright, Inc., New York, (1932). **See also:** W. C. Caton, *Die Rolle des obersten House im Rahmen der friedensaktion Wilsons im Jahre 1916/17 ...*, Buchdr. B. Müller, Heidelberg, (1937). **See also:** A. H. Kober, *Wilson und der Weltkrieg: Rätsel einer Freundschaft*, Societäts-Verlag, Frankfurt a.M., (1938). **See also:** A. L. George and J. L. George, *Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House: A Personality Study*, The John Day Company, New York, (1956). **See also:** R. N. Richardson, *Colonel Edward M. House: The Texas years, 1858-1912*, Volume 1, Publications in History, Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Texas, (1964). **See also:** S. Freud and W. Bullitt, *Thomas Woodrow Wilson, Twenty-Eighth President of the United States: A Psychological Study*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, (1966/1967). **See also:** J. Reinertson, *Colonel House, Woodrow Wilson and European Socialism, 1917-1919*, Madison, Wisconsin, (1971). **See also:** R. W. Wall, *Edward M. House's influence on United States foreign policy 1913-1917*, Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene, Texas, (1972).
- 1167.** M. Nordau, *The Interpretation of History*, Willey Book Company, New York, (1910), pp. 290-297; which is an English translation by M. A. Hamilton of *Der Sinn der Geschichte*, C. Duncker, Berlin, (1909).
- 1168.** Letter from Count von Bernstorff to Count von Montgelas of 5 May 1914, English translation by E. T. S. Dugdale, *German Diplomatic Documents 1871-1914*, Volume 4, Harper & Brothers, New York, London, (1931), p. 348.
- 1169.** Letter from Count von Bernstorff to Count von Montgelas of 5 May 1914, *Die Grosse Politik der Europäischen Kabinette 1871-1914: Sammlung der diplomatischen Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes. Im Auftrage des Auswärtigen Amtes herausgegeben von Johannes Lepsius, Albrecht Mendelssohn Bartholdy, Friedrich Thimme.*, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, Berlin, (1926), pp. 110-111.
- 1170.** Letter from Count von Bernstorff to German Foreign Office of 6 May 1914, English translation by E. T. S. Dugdale, *German Diplomatic Documents 1871-1914*, Volume 4,

Harper & Brothers, New York, London, (1931), pp. 347-348.

1171. Letter from Count von Bernstorff to German Foreign Office of 6 May 1914, *Die Grosse Politik der Europäischen Kabinette 1871-1914: Sammlung der diplomatischen Akten des Auswärtigen Amtes. Im Auftrage des Auswärtigen Amtes herausgegeben von Johannes Lepsius, Albrecht Mendelssohn Bartholdy, Friedrich Thimme.*, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, Berlin, (1926), p. 110.

1172. B. L. Brasol, *The World at the Cross Roads*, Small, Mayhard & Co., Boston, (1921), pp. 196-210.

1173. B. L. Brasol, *The World at the Cross Roads*, Small, Mayhard & Co., Boston, (1921), pp. 371-379.

1174. E. C. Mullins, *Secrets of the Federal Reserve: The London Connection*, Bankers Research Institute, Staunton, Virginia, (1983); **and** *The Federal Reserve Conspiracy*, Common Sense, Union, New Jersey, (1954); **and** *A Study of the Federal Reserve*, Kasper and Horton, New York, (1952).

1175. C. K. Streit, "Where Iron Is, There Is the Fatherland!" *A Note on the Relation of Privilege and Monopoly to War*, B. W. Huebsch, Inc., New York, (1920); **and** *Union Now: A Proposal for a Federal Union of the Democracies of the North Atlantic*, Harper, New York, (1938); **and** *World Government or Anarchy? Our Urgent Need for World Order*, World Citizens Association, Chicago, (1939); **and** *A Constructive Proposal: a Federal Union Now of Democracies. . .*, New York, (1939); **and** *Union Now with Britain*, Harper & Bros., New York, London, (1941); **and** *Union Now: a Proposal for Atlantic Federal Union of the Free*, Harper & Bros., New York, London, (1949); **and** *Freedom's Frontier: Atlantic Union Now, the Vast Opportunity the Two American Revolutions Offer Sovereign Citizens Today*, Freedom & Union Press, Washington, (1961).

1176. "Doubt Col. House Wrote Letter Ascribed to Him", *The New York Times*, (13 October 1939), p. 10. "A Historical Report", *The New York Times*, (14 October 1939), p. 18. "Defends Colonel House", *The New York Times*, (18 October 1939), p. 22. "Asks Thorkelson Reprimand", *The New York Times*, (21 October 1939), p. 6.

1177. G. W. Armstrong, *The Crime of '20: the Unpardonable Sin of "Frenzied Finance"*, Press of the Venney Co., E.G. Senter, Dallas, Texas, (1922); **and** *Truth: The Story of the Dynasty of the Money Trust in America, Part 1*, Fort Worth, Texas, Stafford-Lowdon Co., (1923); **and** *The Calamity of '30, Its Cause and the Remedy*, Fort Worth, Texas, (1931); **and** *A State Currency System: To Hell with Wall Street*, Stafford-Lowdon Co., Fort Worth, Texas, (1932); **and** *The Rothschild Money Trust*, Sons of Liberty, Metairie, Louisiana, (1940); **and** *The March of Bolshevism*, Babcock Co., Fort Worth, Texas, (1945); **and** *World Empire*, Judge Armstrong Foundation, Babcock, Fort Worth, Texas, (1945/1947); **and** *Traitors*, Judge Armstrong Foundation, Fort Worth, Texas, (1948); **and** *Zionist Wall Street*, Judge Armstrong Foundation, Fort Worth, Texas, (1949); **and** *Money and the Tariff*, Judge Armstrong Foundation, Fort Worth, Texas, (1949); **and** *The Zionists*, Judge Armstrong Foundation, Fort Worth, Texas, (1950); **and** *The Truth about My Alleged \$50,000,000.00 Donation*, Judge Armstrong Foundation, Fort Worth, Texas, (1950); **and** *Our Constitution*, Judge Armstrong Foundation, Fort Worth, Texas, (1950); **and** *Third Zionist War*, Judge Armstrong Foundation, Fort Worth, Texas, (1951); **and** *Memoirs of George W. Armstrong*, Steck, Austin, Texas, (1958).

1178. G. W. Armstrong, *The Zionists*, Judge Armstrong Foundation, Fort Worth, Texas, (1950). *Third Zionist War*, Judge Armstrong Foundation, Fort Worth, Texas, (1951).

1179. "Mr. Rhodes's Ideal of Anglo-Saxon Greatness", *The New York Times*, (9 April 1902), p. 1. **See also:** W. T. Stead, "Cecil John Rhodes", *The American Monthly Review of Reviews*, Volume 25, Number 5, (May, 1902), pp. 548-560, at 556-557. **See also:** "The Progress of

the World”, *The American Monthly Review of Reviews*, Volume 25, Number 5, (May, 1902), pp. 515-598. **See also:** S. G. L. Millin, *Cecil Rhodes*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1933); **and** Rhodes, Chatto & Windus, London, (1952). **See also:** C. Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time*, Macmillan, New York, (1966), pp.130-133, 144-153, 950-956, 1247-1278; **and** *The Anglo-American Establishment: From Rhodes to Cliveden*, Books in Focus, New York, (1981), p. ix; **and** “The Round Table Groups in Canada, 1908-38”, *Canadian Historical Review*, Volume 43, Number 3, (September, 1962), pp. 204-224. **See also:** J. E. Flint, *Cecil Rhodes*, Little, Brown, Boston, (1974). **See also:** R. I. Rotberg and M. F. Shore, *The Founder: Cecil Rhodes and the Pursuit of Power*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1988). **See also:** A. Thomas, *Rhodes*, St. Martin’s Press, New York, (1997).

1180. G. E. Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), p. 208.

1181. S. Landman, *Great Britain, the Jews and Palestine*, New Zionist Press (New Zionist Publication Number 1), London, (1936), pp. 7, 10.

1182. A. Einstein, “Why do They Hate the Jews?”, *Collier’s*, Volume 102, (26 November 1938); reprinted in *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), p. 192.

1183. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 87.

1184. A. Hitler, translated by S. Attanasio, *Hitler’s Secret Book*, Bramhall House, New York, (1962), p. 211.

1185. D. K. Buchwald, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 37, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 60, note 4.

1186. K. Kautsky, *Are the Jews a Race?*, International Publishers, New York, (1926), pp. 193-194.

1187. “The German Favorite Son”, *The New York Times*, (23 May 1916), p. 10. “The Hyphen Vote, the Silent Vote, and the American Vote”, *The New York Times*, (2 October 1916), p. 10.

1188. S. Joseph, “In Dispute at America’s Door”, *The New York Times*, (10 June 1916), p. 10.

1189. L. Endlich, *Goldman Sachs: The Culture of Success*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1999), pp. 41-43.

1190. V. Jabotinsky, “Evidence Submitted to the Palestine Royal Commission (11 February 1937)”, in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 559-570, at 562-563.

1191. As but one example of many articles in *The New York Times*, see: “Russian Jews Hope for Allied Victory: See Their Chances of Future Reform in Triumph of Democracy: Germany Their Worst Foe: Most Reactionary Elements in Muscovite Officialdom Said to be of Teutonic Origin.”, *The New York Times*, (16 October 1916), p. 8.

1192. B. Freedman, *The Hidden Tyranny*, New Christian Crusade Church, Metairie, Louisiana, (1970).

1193. See Einstein’s articles and the editorial comment in: *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Documents 34, 35, 37, Princeton University Press, (2002).

1194. B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286, at 286. The next article in the series is: “The Jews in America: III The Menace of the Polish Jew”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 4, (February, 1923), pp. 366-377.

1195. B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: I How They Came to This Country”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 2, (December, 1922), pp. 144-161; **and** “The Jews in

America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286; **and** “The Jews in America: III The Menace of the Polish Jew”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 4, (February, 1923), pp. 366-377.

1196. B. J. Hendrick, “Radicalism among the Polish Jews”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 6, (April, 1923), pp. 591-601, at 601.

1197. B. Borochoy, *Nationalism and Class Struggle*, New York, (1935), pp. 135-136, 183-205; quoted in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 360-366, at 361.

1198. Video documentary, “Jewish Chicago 1833-1948”, *Chicago Stories*, Network Chicago WTTW 11, Chicago, (2003).

1199. H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974); English translation *Adolf Hitler: Founder of Israel*, Modjeskis’ Society Dedicated to Preservation of Cultures, San Diego, (1997).

1200. Some of Smolenskin’s writings are found in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 142-157.

1201. D. Eckart and A. Hitler, *Der Bolschewismus von Moses bis Lenin: Zwiegespräch zwischen Adolf Hitler und mir*, Hoheneichen-Verlag, München, (1924); English translation by W. L. Pierce, “Bolshevism from Moses to Lenin”, *National Socialist World*, (1966). URL: <<http://www.jrbooksonline.com/DOCs/Eckart.doc>> p. 9. Sombart’s book was translated into English by M. Epstein, *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, (1951).

1202. B. Shaw, *What I Really Wrote about the War*, Constable, London, (1930), p. 118; reprinted: Brentano’s, New York, (1931), p. 99.

1203. S. Landman, *Great Britain, the Jews and Palestine*, New Zionist Press (New Zionist Publication Number 1), London, (1936), pp. 4-6. **See also:** B. Freedman, *The Hidden Tyranny*, New Christian Crusade Church, Metairie, Louisiana, (1970).

1204. J. A. Malcolm, *Origins of the Balfour Declaration: Dr. Weizmann’s Contribution*, British Museum, London, (1944).

1205. R. John, *Behind the Balfour Declaration: The Hidden Origins of Today’s Mideast Crisis*, Institute for Historical Review, Costa Mesa, California, (1988); **and** “Behind the Balfour Declaration: Britain’s Great War Pledge To Lord Rothschild”, *The Journal for Historical Review*, Volume 6, Number 4, (Winter, 1985-1986), pp. 389ff.:

<http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v06/v06p389_John.html>

1206. C. Weizmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann*, H. Hamilton, London, (1949).

1207. A. Böhm, *Die Zionistische Bewegung*, Volume 1, Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, Hozaah Ivrit Co., Ltd., Tel Aviv, (1935), p. 656.

1208. Response from V. I. Gaster was published “The Balfour Declaration”, *The London Times*, (10 November 1949), p. 5.

1209. F. Owen, *Tempestuous Journey: Lloyd George: His Life and Times*, McGraw-Hill Company, Inc. New York, (1955), pp. 426-428, 492.

1210. W. D. Rubinstein, “The Secret of Leopold Amery”, *History Today*, Volume 49, Number 2, (February, 1999), pp. 17-23. D. Davis, “Balfour Declaration’s Author was a Secret Jew”, *The Jerusalem Post*, (12 January 1999), p. 1.

1211. Y. Küçük, *Şebeke = Network*, YGS Yayinlari, Kadiköy, Istanbul, (2002).

1212. I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), pp. 9, 11. J. Prinz, *The Secret Jews*, Random House, New York, (1973), pp. 111-112.

1213. B. H. Freedman, *Why Congress is Crooked or Crazy or Both*, New York, (1975).

<<http://www.natvan.com/pdf/12-04-04.pdf>>

- 1214.** As quoted in: B. Freedman, *The Hidden Tyranny*, New Christian Crusade Church, Metairie, Louisiana, (1970). I have not verified that the primary source quotation is accurate.
- 1215.** As quoted in: B. Freedman, *The Hidden Tyranny*, New Christian Crusade Church, Metairie, Louisiana, (1970); who cites “Scribner’s Commentator in 1936”, which perhaps refers to *Scribner’s Magazine*, which later merged with *Commentator*. I have not verified that the primary source quotation is accurate.
- 1216.** “Eine große Rede Weizmanns in Jerusalem Vor der Abreise aus Palästina”, *Jüdische Rundschau*, Volume 25, Number 4, (16 January 1920), p. 4. R. Sharif, “Christians for Zion, 1600-1919”, *Journal for Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 123-141, at 136-139. A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 528, 594.
- 1217.** D. L. George, *Memoirs of the Peace Conference*, Volume 2, Howard Fertig, New York, (1939/1972), pp. 725-726. *See also*: Volume 2, pp. 586-587; and Volume 4, pp. 1836-1843.
- 1218.** S. Freud and W. C. Bullitt, *Thomas Woodrow Wilson, A Psychological Study*, Discus Books, New York, (1968), pp. 232-233.
- 1219.** P. Birdsall, “Neutrality and Economic Pressures, 1914-1917”, *Science and Society*, (Spring, 1939).
- 1220.** H. Morgenthau, “Zionism a Surrender, Not a Solution”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 42, Number 3, (July, 1921), pp. i-viii, at iii-iv.
- 1221.** *See*: Letter from A. D. Fokker to A. Einstein of 18 November 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 168, Princeton University Press, (2004).
- 1222.** “Zionists Plan Campaign”, *The New York Times*, (1 July 1914), p. 11.
- 1223.** M. Paléologue, *An Ambassador’s Memoirs*, Volume 1, Chapter 4, George H. Doran, New York, (1923), p. 173.
- 1224.** “America and the War”, *The London Times*, (15 August 1914), p. 5. However, *See also*: “Jew and German”, *The London Times*, (15 August 1914), p. 3. “American Sympathy Increasing”, *The London Times*, (17 August 1914), p. 7. “Through German Eyes”, *The London Times*, (18 August 1914), p. 5. “Kaiser’s Protest to America”, *The London Times*, (19 August 1914), p. 5.
- 1225.** M. T. Cicero, *Pro Flaccus*, Chapter 28; translated by C. D. Yonge, *The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero*, Volume 2, George Bell & Sons, London, (1880), pp. 454-455.
- 1226.** M. Higger, *The Jewish Utopia*, Lord Baltimore Press, Baltimore, (1932), pp. 12-13, 57.
- 1227.** P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), pp. 278-279, 296, 304, 314-315.
- 1228.** “Vienna’s ‘Black Friday’”, *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, (2 June 1873), front page.
- 1229.** H. Bielohlawek, “Yes, We Want to Annihilate the Jews!” in R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 115-120.
- 1230.** H. Münsterberg, *The War and America*, D. Appleton, New York, London, (1914).
- 1231.** “Zionists Answer Nathan”, *The New York Times*, (20 January 1914), p. 3. “Nathan Answers Haifa Criticism”, *The New York Times*, (1 February 1914), Section 3, p. 3.
- 1232.** I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), p. 19.
- 1233.** A. Hitler, “The International Jew and the International Stock Exchange: Guilty of World War [1923]”, in R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath, Lexington, Massachusetts, Toronto, (1991).

- 1234.** K. Kautsky, *Are the Jews a Race?*, International Publishers, New York, (1926), pp. 213-215, 240-241, 243.
- 1235.** I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), pp. 9, 11. J. Prinz, *The Secret Jews*, Random House, New York, (1973), pp. 111-112.
- 1236.** “Messianic Movements”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 1417-1427, at 1421.
- 1237.** B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: I How They Came to This Country”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 2, (December, 1922), pp. 144-161, at 149.
- 1238.** “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 333-334, 355.
- 1239.** A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *Israel chez les nations: Les Juifs et l’antisémitisme*, C. Lévy, Paris, (1893); English translation by F. Hellman, *Israel among the Nations: A Study of the Jews and Antisemitism*, G. P. Putnam’s Sons, New York, W. Heinemann, London, (1895), p. 356. H. N. Casson, “The Jew in America”, *Munsey’s Magazine*, Volume 34, Number 4, (January, 1906), pp. 381-395. B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: I How They Came to This Country”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 2, (December, 1922), pp. 144-161.
- 1240.** “Messianic Movements”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 1417-1427, at 1418.
- 1241.** “Messianic Movements”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 1417-1427, at 1425.
- 1242.** “Jewish Socialists Acclaim Zionism”, *The New York Times*, (30 November 1917), p. 6.
- 1243.** “Russian Battle is Still Raging”, *The New York Times*, (14 December 1917), pp. 1-2, at 2.
- 1244.** P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), p. 325.
- 1245.** R. Earley, *War, Money and American Memory: Myths of Virtue, Valor and Patriotism*, Diane Publications, Collingdale, Pennsylvania, (2000).
- 1246.** L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), p. 43.
- 1247.** T. Fritsch, “The Desperate Act of a Desperate People”, (1922), in R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 192-199.
- 1248.** G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), p. 493.
- 1249.** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 16 and 217, Princeton University Press, (2004).
- 1250.** W. Buch, *50 Jahre antisemitische Bewegung. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte*, Deutscher Volksverlag G.m.b.H., H. Bachmann, München, (1937); English translation in: P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), p. 310.
- 1251.** H. Münsterberg, *The War and America*, D. Appleton, New York, London, (1914). **See also:** *Truth about Germany: Facts about the War*, Trow Press, New York, (1914). **See also:** E. v. Mach, *What Germany Wants*, Little, Brown and Company, Boston, (1914). **See also:** R. G. Usher, *Pan-Germanism*, Second Revised and Enlarged Edition, Grosset & Dunlap,

New York, (1914). **See also:** *Deutschland und der Weltkrieg*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1915); English translation by W. W. Whitelock, *Modern Germany in Relation to the Great War*, Mitchell Kennerley, New York, (1916). **See also:** C. A. Lindbergh, *Why Is Your Country at War and What Happens to You after the War, and Related Subjects*, National Capital Press, Inc., Washington, D.C., (1917); reprinted as: *Your Country at War and What Happens to You after a War*, Dorrance & Co., Philadelphia, (1934).

1252. É. Durkheim, “Germany above All” *The German Mental Attitude and the War*, Librairie Armand Colin, Paris, (1915). **See also:** “By a German”, *I Accuse! (J’Accuse!)*, Grosset & Dunlap, New York, (1915). **See also:** W. F. Barry, *The World’s Debate: An Historical Defence of the Allies*, George H. Doran, New York, (1917). **See also:** W. T. Hornaday, *A Searchlight on Germany: Germany’s Blunders, Crimes and Punishment*, American Defense Society, New York, (1917). **See also:** D. W. Johnson, *Plain Words from America: A Letter to a German Professor*, London, New York, Toronto, Hodder & Stoughton, (1917). **More recently:** D. J. Goldhagen, *Hitler’s Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*, Knopf, New York, (1996). **See Hartmut Stern’s response to Goldhagen:** *KZ-Lügen: Antwort auf Goldhagen*, FZ-Verlag, München, Second Edition, (1998), ISBN: 3924309361; and *Jüdische Kriegserklärungen an Deutschland: Wortlaut, Vorgeschichte, Folgen*, FZ-Verlag, München, Second Edition, (2000), ISBN: 3924309507.

1253. “This is War!”, *The American Mercury*, Volume 42, Number 188, (August, 1939), pp. 437-443, at 443; which cites: “Suppressed Speech by Company Sergeant-Major (Published in *No More War*, London).”

1254. M. Hess, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English: “Fourth Letter”, “Note III” and “Note IV”, *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918), pp. 56-57, 240-244.

1255. T. N. Kaufman, *Germany Must Perish!*, Argyle Press, Newark, New Jersey, (1941).

1256. F. Neilson, *The Makers of War*, C. C. Nelson, Appleton, Wisconsin, (1950), pp. 149-150.

1257. R. E. Martin, *Stehen wir vor einem Weltkrieg?*, F. Engelmann, Leipzig, (30 June 1908); and *Der Weltkrieg und sein Ende*, Rudolf Martin, Berlin, (1915). **See also:** E. v. Mach, *What Germany Wants*, Little, Brown and Company, Boston, (1914). **See also:** *Truth about Germany: Facts about the War*, Trow Press, New York, (1914). **See also:** *Deutschland und der Weltkrieg*, Berlin, Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, (1915); English translation by W. W. Whitelock, *Modern Germany in Relation to the Great War*, Mitchell Kennerley, New York, (1916). **See also:** C. A. Lindbergh, *Why Is Your Country at War and What Happens to You after the War, and Related Subjects*, National Capital Press, Inc., Washington, D.C., (1917); reprinted as: *Your Country at War and What Happens to You after a War*, Dorrance & Co., Philadelphia, (1934). **See also:** G. v. Jagow, *Ursachen und Ausbruch des Weltkrieges*, Reimar Hobbing, Berlin, (1919). **See also:** L. Brentano, *Der Weltkrieg und E. D. Morel: Ein Beitrag sur englischen Vorgeschichte des Krieges*, Drei Masken Verlag, München, (1921). **See also:** C. E. Playne, *The Neuroses of the Nations*, G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd., London, (1925). **See also:** I. C. Willis, *England’s Holy War; a Study of English Liberal Idealism During the Great War*, Knopf, New York, (1928). **See also:** *Deshalb haben wir den Krieg nicht verloren!*, Norddeutsches Druck- und Verlagshaus, Hannover, (1926). **See also:** H. Bauer, *Sarajewo: Die Frage der Verantwortlichkeit der serbischen Regierung an dem Attentat von 1914*, W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, (1930). **See also:** M. H. Cochran, *Germany not Guilty in 1914 (Examining a Much Prized Book)*, Stratford, Boston, (1931). **See also:** H. C. Peterson, *Propaganda for War; the Campaign Against American Neutrality, 1914-1917*, University of Oklahoma Press, (1939); **See also:** J. R. Mock and C. Larson, *Words that Won the War; the Story of the Committee on Public*

Information, 1917-1919, Princeton University Press, (1939). **See also:** F. Neilson, *The Makers of War*, C. C. Nelson, Appleton, Wisconsin, (1950). B. Freedman, *The Hidden Tyranny*, New Christian Crusade Church, Metairie, Louisiana, (1970).

1258. E. v. Mach, "Appendix A", *What Germany Wants*, Little, Brown and Company, Boston, (1914), pp. 146-153.

1259. C. F. Horne, Editor, "Speech of the Chancellor Before the Reichstag", *Source Records of the Great War*, Volume 1, The American Legion, Indianapolis, (1931), pp. 409-415, at 409-410.

1260. P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), p. 325.

1261. B. D. Wolfe, *Marxism: One Hundred Years in the Life of a Doctrine*, Dial Press, New York, (1965), p. 67. Wolfe cites: "From Engels's introduction to the reissue of a pamphlet by Sigismund Borkheim. Borkheim's pamphlet, *Zur Erinnerung fuer die deutschen Mordspatrioten 1806-07* [***] The introduction is reproduced in *Werke*, Vol. XXI, pp. 350-351."

1262. W. Wilson, "War Message", Sixty-Fifth Congress, First Session, Senate Document Number 5, Serial Number 7264, Washington, D.C., (1917) pp. 3-8.

1263. "3379 (XXX). Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination", General Assembly—Thirtieth Session, Resolutions adopted on the reports of the Third Committee, 2400th Plenary Meeting, (10 November 1975), pp. 83-84. URL:

<http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/30/ares30.htm>

Confer: Zionism & Racism: Proceedings of an International Symposium, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Tripoli, (1977), pp. 249-250. Cf. F. A. Sayegh, *Zionism: A Form of Racism And Racial Discrimination* "Four Statements Made at the U.N. General Assembly, Office of the Permanent Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations, (1976), pp. 40-41. URL:

http://www.ameu.org/uploads/sayegh_march1_03.pdf

After the fall of the Soviet Union, which had long sponsored racial integration (*see*: "Circus" a motion picture released in 1936 directed by Grigori Alexandrov starring Lyubov Orlova), the U. N. withdrew this resolution under great pressure from Zionists.

1264. "3379 (XXX). Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination", General Assembly—Thirtieth Session, Resolutions adopted on the reports of the Third Committee, 2400th Plenary Meeting, (10 November 1975), pp. 83-84. URL:

<http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/30/ares30.htm>

Confer: Zionism & Racism: Proceedings of an International Symposium, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Tripoli, (1977), pp. 249-250. Cf. F. A. Sayegh, *Zionism: A Form of Racism And Racial Discrimination* "Four Statements Made at the U.N. General Assembly, Office of the Permanent Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations, (1976), pp. 40-41. URL:

http://www.ameu.org/uploads/sayegh_march1_03.pdf

After the fall of the Soviet Union, which had long sponsored racial integration (*see*: "Circus"

a motion picture released in 1936 directed by Grigori Alexandrov starring Lyubov Orlova), the U. N. withdrew this resolution under great pressure from Zionists.

1265. F. A. Sayegh, *Zionism: A Form of Racism And Racial Discrimination* " Four Statements Made at the U.N. General Assembly, Office of the Permanent Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations, (1976), pp. 51-52.

<http://www.ameu.org/uploads/sayegh_march1_03.pdf>

1266. Preface, *Zionism & Racism: Proceedings of an International Symposium*, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Tripoli, (1977), p. vii.

1267. A. Hitler, English translation by Ralph Manheim, *Mein Kampf*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, New York, (1971), pp. 56-57.

1268. M. Hess, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English: *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918).

1269. Y. M. Pines, quoted and translated in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 412.

1270. See, for example: A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 120-121, 187, 188, 271, 356, 422, 481, 498-499, 560-561.

1271. G. Holdheim, "Der Zionismus in Deutschland", *Süddeutsche Monatshefte*, Volume 12, (1930), p. 855; English translation in: K. Polkehn, "The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 57.

1272. *Central-Verein Zeitung*, Volume, 9, Number 28, (11 July 1930); and Volume 9, Number 37, (12 September 1930); and Volume 9, Number 38, (19 September 1930). K. Polkehn, "The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82.

1273. *Central-Verein Zeitung*, Volume, 9, Number 28, (11 July 1930), p. 2.

1274. English translation in: K. Polkehn, "The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 59.

1275. C. Brunner, *Der Judenhass und die Juden*, Third Enlarged Edition, Oesterheld & Co., Berlin, (1919), pp. 192-197.

1276. M. M. Kaplan, *The Future of the American Jew*, Macmillan, New York, (1948); quoted in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 536-544, at 537, 544.

1277. A. M. Lilienthal, *What Price Israel*, Henry Regnery Company, Chicago, (1953), pp. vi-viii, 239. See also: "Israel's Flag Is Not Mine", *Reader's Digest*, (September, 1949), pp. 49-53. "The State of Israel and the State of the Jew", *Vital Speeches of the Day*, Volume 16, Number 13, (15 April 1950).

<<http://www.alfredlilienthal.com>>

1278. M. Menuhin, "Preface", *The Decadence of Judaism in Our Time*, Exposition Press, New York, (1965).

1279. M. Menuhin, *The Decadence of Judaism in Our Time*, Exposition Press, New York, (1965), pp. 488-489.

1280. Cf. F. A. Sayegh, *Zionism: A Form of Racism And Racial Discrimination* "Four Statements Made at the U.N. General Assembly, Office of the Permanent Observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the United Nations, (1976).

<http://www.ameu.org/uploads/sayegh_march1_03.pdf>

Sayegh cites: T. Herzl, *Zionist Writings: Essays and Addresses*, Volume 1 Covering 1896-1898, Herzl Press, New York, (1973), pp. 62-70, 89-97, 119-124, 148, 232-239.

1281. J. B. Agus, *The Meaning of Jewish History*, Volume 2, Abelard-Schuman, New York, (1963), pp. 412-413. **See also:** A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 509, 577, 581-582.

1282. I. Shahak and N. Mezvinsky, *Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel*, Pluto Press, London, (1999), p. 18.

1283. T. A. Kolsky, *Jews Against Zionism: The American Council for Judaism, 1942-1948*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, (1990), p. 17.

1284. A. Ha-Am, "The Jewish State and the Jewish Problem", in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 262-269, at 264.

1285. A. Ha-Am, "The Jewish State and the Jewish Problem", in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 262-269, at 266.

1286. "B'nai B'rith Leader Discusses the Jews", *The Dearborn Independent*, (14 May 1920); reprinted in "Jewish Influences in American Life", *The International Jew: The World's Foremost Problem*, Volume 3, (1921), pp. 167-178.

1287. H. Morgenthau, "Zionism a Surrender, Not a Solution", *The World's Work*, Volume 42, Number 3, (July, 1921), pp. i-viii, at vii.

1288. H. Morgenthau, "Zionism a Surrender, Not a Solution", *The World's Work*, Volume 42, Number 3, (July, 1921), pp. i-viii, at vii.

1289. L. D. Brandeis, *The Jewish Problem; How to Solve It*, Zionist Essays Pub. Committee, New York, (1915).

1290. M. C. Piper, *Final Judgment: The Missing Link in the JFK Assassination Conspiracy*, Wolfe Press, Washington, D.C., (1993).

1291. A. Golan, *Operation Susannah*, Harper & Row, New York, (1978). **See also:** D. Raviv, *Every Spy a Prince: The Complete History of Israel's Intelligence Community*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, (1990). **See also:** V. Ostrovsky and C. Hoy, *By Way of Deception: A Devastating Insider's Portrait of the Mossad*, Stoddart, Toronto, (1990). V. Ostrovsky, *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad's Secret Agenda*, Harper Paperbacks, New York, (1994). **See also:** I. Black and B. Morris, *Israel's Secret Wars: A History of Israel's Intelligence Services*, Grove Weidenfeld, New York, (1991). **See also:** S. Teveth, *Ben-Gurion's Spy: The Story of the Political Scandal That Shaped Modern Israel*, Columbia University Press, New York, (1996). **See also:** J. Beinlin, *The Dispersion of Egyptian Jewry: Culture, Politics, and the Formation of a Modern Diaspora*, University of California Press, Berkeley, (1998).

1292. W. Beecher, "Israel, in Error, Attacks U. S. Ship; 10 Navy Men Die, 100 Hurt in Raids North of Sinai Israelis, in Error, Attack U.S. Navy Ship 10 Navy Men Die and 100 Are Hurt Communications Vessel Is Raided From Air and Sea North of Sinai Peninsula", *The New York Times*, (9 June 1967), p. 1. N. Sheehan, "Sailors Describe Attack on Vessel; Israelis Struck So Suddenly U. S. Guns Were Unloaded", *The New York Times*, (11 June 1967), p. 27. "Israel Offers Compensation", *The New York Times*, (11 June 1967), p. 27. McClure M. Howland, "Families of Sailors" Letter to the Editor, *The New York Times*, (15 June 1967), p. 46. "Israel Accused at Hearing on U. S. Ship", *The New York Times*, (18 June 1967), p.

20. "U. S. Again Accused", *The New York Times*, (20 June 1967), p. 13. N. Sheehan, "Order Didn't Get to U. S. S. Liberty; Pentagon Reports Message Directing Ship Off Sinai to Move Arrived Late Ship 15.5 Miles Offshore", *The New York Times*, (29 June 1967), p. 1. **See also:** J. M. Ennes, *Assault on the Liberty: The True Story of the Israeli Attack on an American Intelligence Ship*, Random House, New York, (1979). **See also:** BBC Documentary, *Dead in the Water*, (21 August 2004, 7:00-8:10pm; rpt 1:50-3:00am) <http://www.bbc.co.uk/bbcfour/documentaries/features/dead_in_the_water.shtml>

1293. V. Ostrovsky, *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad's Secret Agenda*, Harper Collins, New York, (1994), p. 32.

1294. J. J. Mearsheimer and S. M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U. S. Foreign Policy*, Faculty Research Working Papers Series, Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, (March, 2006), p. 1.

1295. S. Steinlight, "The Jewish Stake in America's Changing Demography: Reconsidering a Misguided Immigration Policy", *Backgrounder*, (October, 2001), p. 10.

1296. T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 172.

1297. A. D. Gordon, *Kitve A. D. Gordon*, In Five Volumes, Tel-Aviv, ha-Va'ad ha-merkazi shel mifleget ha-Po'el ha-tsa'ir, (1927-1930), parts translated to English in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 371-386, at 384-385.

1298. I. Zangwill, "Is Political Zionism Dead? Yes", *The Nation*, Volume 118, Number 3062, (12 March 1924), pp. 276-278.

1299. J. Chrysostom, translated by P. W. Harkins, "Discourses Against Judaizing Christians", *The Fathers of the Church*, Volume 68, Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D. C., (1979).

1300. R. Martin, *Pugio fidei adversus Mauros et Judaeos*, Gregg Press, Farnborough, Hants, England, (1687/1967).

1301. Porchetus de Salvaticis, *Victoria Porcheti aduersus impios Hebreos, in qua tum ex sacris literis, tum ex dictis Talmud, ac Caballistaru, et alioru omniu authoru, quos, HebrQei recipiut, monstratur veritas catholice fidei*, Impressit Guillerm[us] Desplains impensis Egidij Gourmötij & Francisci Regnault, Parrhisijs, (1520).

1302. A. Margaritha, *Der gantz Jüdisch Glaub mit sampt ainer gründtlichen vnd warhafften anzaygung: aller Satzungen, Ceremonien, Gebetten, Haymliche vnd offentliche Gebreüch, deren sich dye Juden halten, durcdas ganzt Jar. Mit schönen und gegründten Argumenten wyder jren Glauben*, H. Steyner, Augspurg, (1530).

1303. M. Bucer, *Von den Jude ob, vn[d] wie die vnder den Christe zu halten sind, ein Rathschlag, durch die Gelerte am Ende dis Büchtlins verzeichnet, zugericht. Item Ein weitere Erklerung vnd Beschirmung des selbigen Rahtschlags*, Wolfgang Köpfel, Strassburg, (1539); **and** M. Bucer and J. Kymeus, *Ratschlag jetz von den Corfürsten vnnd Fürsten, zü Franckfort gehalten, Ob Christlicher Obrigkeit gebüren müge, das sie die Jüden, vnter denn Christen zü wonen gedulden, vn[d] wo sie zü gedulden, welcher gestalt vnd mass. Durch die gelerten am ende dis Büchtlins verzeichnet zü gericht*, Laurens vann der Müllen, Cöllen, (1539).

1304. J. Eck, *Ains Juden büechlins verlegung: darin ain Christ, gantzer Christenhait zu schmach, will es geschehe den Juden vnrecht in bezichtigung der Christen Kinder Mordt*, Alexander Weissenhorn, Ingoldstat, (1541).

1305. M. Luther, *Von den Juden und ihren Lügen*, Hans Lufft, Wittenberg, (1543); Reprinted, Ludendorffs, München, (1932); English translation by Martin H. Bertram, "On the Jews and Their Lies", *Luther's Works*, Volume 47, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, (1971), pp. 123-306.

1306. D. Diderot, “Juif”, *Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire Raisonné des Sciences, des Arts et des Métiers*, Volume 9, A. Neufchastel, (1765).

1307. F. M. Arouet de Voltaire, *Histoire de Charles XII, Roi de Suède*, (1731); **and** *Dictionnaire Philosophique*, Multiple Editions; multiple English translations, including: W. F. Flemming, *A Philosophical Dictionary*, Volume 6, Dingwall-Rock, New York, (1901), pp. 266-313; **and** *Essai sur les Moeurs et l’Esprit des Nations, et sur les Principaux faits de l’Histoire Depuis Charlemagne Jusqu’à Louis XIII*, Chapter 104, (1769); **and** *Philosophie Générale: Métaphysique, Morale et Théologie*, Chez Sanson et Compagnie, Aux Deux-Ponts, (1792).

1308. L. Holst, *Das Judentum in allen dessen Teilen. Aus einem staatswissenschaftlichen Standpunkt betrachtet*, Mainz, (1821).

1309. R. Wagner under the *nom de plume* K. Freigedank, “Das Judentum in der Musik”, *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, (3 and 6 September 1850); Reprinted with revisions and an appendix, R. Wagner, *Das Judentum in der Musik*, J. J. Weber, Leipzig, (1869); the original unrevised 1850 article was reprinted in *Gesammelte Schriften und Dichtungen*, Volume 5; English translation of the 1869 version by E. Evans, *Judaism in Music (Das Judentum in der Musik) Being the Original Essay Together with the Later Supplement*, W. Reeves, London, (1910); Also, “Judaism in Music”, *Richard Wagner’s Prose Works*, Volume 3, Broude Brothers, New York, (1966), pp. 75-122.; which is a reprint of the original “Judaism in Music”, *Richard Wagner’s Prose Works*, Volume 3, Kegan Paul, Trench, and Trübner, London, (1894).

1310. W. Marr, *Der Judenspiegel*, Im Selbstverlage des Verfassers, (1862); **and** *Der Sieg des Judenthums über das Germanenthum*, Rudolph Costenoble, Bern, (1879); **and** *Vom jüdischen Kriegsschauplatz: eine Streitschrift*, R. Costenoble, Bern, (1879); **and** *Wählet keinen Juden: Der Weg zum Siege des Germanenthums über das Judentum*, O. Hentze, Berlin, (1879); **and** *Vom jüdischen Kriegsschauplatz eine Streitschrift*, R. Costenoble, Bern, (1879); **and** *Jeiteles teutonicus. Harfenklänge aus dem vermauschelten Deutschland*, Leipzig, (1879); **and** *Der Judenkrieg, seine Fehler und wie er Zu organisiren ist*, Richard Oschatz, Chemnitz, (1880); **and** *Goldene Ratten und rothe Mäuse*, E. Schmeitzner, Chemnitz, (1880); **and** *Wo steckt der Mauschel? oder, Jüdischer Liberalismus und wissenschaftlicher Pessimismus*, W. Raich, New York, (1880); **and** *Der Weg zum Siege des Germanenthums über das Judentum*, O. Hentze, Berlin, (1880); **and** *Wählet keinen Juden: ein Mahnwort an die deutschen Wähler*, O. Hentze, Berlin, (1881).

1311. E. K. Dühring, *Die Judenfrage als Racen-, Sitten- und Culturfrage: mit einer weltgeschichtlichen Antwort*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, (1881); English translation by A. Jacob, *Eugen Dühring on the Jews*, Nineteen Eighty Four Press, Brighton, England, (1997); **and** *Der Werth des Lebens: Eine philosophische Betrachtung*, Eduard Trewendt, Breslau, (1865); **and** *Kritische Geschichte der Philosophie von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, Heimann, Berlin, (1869); **and** *Kritische Geschichte der Nationalökonomie und des Socialismus*, T. Grieben, Berlin, (1871); **and** *Die Ueberschätzung Lessing’s und Dessen Anwaltschaft für die Juden*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, (1881); **and** *Sache, Leben und Feinde: Als Hauptwerk und Schlüssel zu seinen sämmtlichen Schriften*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, Leipzig, (1882); **and** *Der Ersatz der Religion durch Vollkommeneres und die Ausscheidung alles Judenthums durch den modernen Völkergeist*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, (1883); **and** *Die Parteien in der Judenfrage*, München, (1907).

1312. E. A. Drumont, *Richard Wagner, l’Homme et le musicien, à propos de Rienzi*, E. Dentu, Paris, (1869); **and** *Le dernier des Trémolin, : Société générale de librairie catholique*, Paris, (1879); **and** *La France juive; essai d’histoire contemporaine*, C. Marpon & E. Flammarion, Paris, (1886); German translation: *Das verjudete Frankreich: Versuch*

einer Tagesgeschichte, A. Deubner, Berlin, (1889); **and** *La France juive devant l'opinion: La "France juive" et la critique, la conquête juive, le système juif et la question sociale, l'escrime sémitique, ce qu'on voit dans un tribunal*, Marpon & Flammarion, Paris, (1886); **and** *La fin d'un monde: étude psychologique et sociale*, A. Savine, Paris, (1889); **and** *La dernière bataille nouvelle étude psychologique et sociale*, E. Dentu, Paris, (1890); **and** *La daeniére batailla*, E. Dentu, Paris, (1890); **and** *Le testament d'un antisémite*, E. Dentu, Paris, (1891); **and** *Le testament d'un antisémite*, E. Dentu, Paris, (1891); **and** *Le secret de Fourmies: avec un plan de la place de l'église*, A. Savine, Paris, (1892); **and** *Les juifs contre la France une nouvelle Pologne*, Librairie Antisémite, Paris, (1899); **and** *Nos maîtres la tyrannie maçonnique*, Paris : Librairie antisémite, (1899); **and** *Pour la République! revue politique mensuelle*, Paris, (1899-1900); **and** *Socialismo Cattolico, con prefazione di Arturo Labriola, Societa editrice partenopea*, Napoli, (1911). **See also**: L. B. and E. A. Drumont, *Juif! quelques vers en réponse à La France juive*, A. Lanier, Paris, (1886). **See also**: H. Desportes and E. A. Drumont, *Le mystère du sang chez les juifs de tous les temps*, Albert Savine, Éditeur, Paris, (1889). **See also**: A. Rohling and E. A. Drumont, *Le juif selon le Talmud*, Albert Savine, Paris, (1889); German translation: *Prof. Dr. Aug. Rohling's Talmud-Jude*, T. Fritsch, Leipzig, (1891). **See also**: E. A. Drumont, A. de Rothschild and A. L. Burdeau, *Burdeau-Rothschild contre Drumont; Le proces de la libre parole, debats complets*, Paris, (1892). **See also**: J. Aron and E. A. Drumont, *Lettre ouverte à monsieur Édouard Drumont*, Paris, (1896). **See also**: A. Blanchard and E. A. Drumont, *Lettre de Benjamin Israël à Edouard Drumont la vérité sur la question juive en France*, C. Poinson, Neuilly-Plaisance, (1899). **See also**: M. L'Hermite and E. A. Drumont, *Drumont-démon, l'anti-pape: l'insurrection des Congrégations, le Belluaire; Moines et soldats, Alger-Milan*, L. Sery, Issoudun, (1899). **See also**: A. B. Monniot, *Les gouvernants contre la nation la trahison du ministère Waldeck*, Librairie antisémite, Paris, (1900). **See also**: P. Vergnet and E. A. Drumont, *Edouard Drumont, intime*, Libre parole, Paris, (1912). **See also**: The journals: *La libre parole illustrée / Libre parole / Almanach de la libre parole*. **1313**. T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 172. **1314**. L. Pinsker, translated by D. S. Blondheim, *Auto-Emancipation: An Admonition to His Brethren by a Russian Jew*, Federation of American Zionists, New York, (1916). **1315**. An English translation of the minutes appears in: "Wannsee Conference on the Final Solution of the Jewish Question", R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D.C. Heath, Toronto, (1991), pp. 252-258; *see also*: pp. 250-252. **1316**. N. Syrkin, under the nom de plume "Ben Elieser", *Die Judenfrage und der sozialistische Judenstaat*, Steiger, Bern, (1898); English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 333-350, at 339. **1317**. T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), pp. xviii-xix, 5, 18, 21-25, 27, 29, 31-34, 37, 41-42, 50, 55-59, 67-73, 93-94, 98-100. **1318**. T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), p. 29. **1319**. *See*: "Letters to the Editor" with respect to the Memorandum to the Protestant monarchs regarding the "Restoration of the Jews", *The London Times*, (26 August 1840), p. 6. **1320**. "The Zionist Congress: Full Report of the Proceedings", *The Jewish Chronicle*, (3 September 1897), pp. 10-15, at 11. **1321**. "The Turkish Situation by One Born in Turkey", *The American Monthly Review of Reviews*, Volume 25, Number 2, (February, 1902), pp. 182-191, at 186-188.

- 1322.** M. Hess, "Eleventh Letter", *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English: *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918/1943), pp. 141-159, at 150-152.
- 1323.** M. Hess, "Eleventh Letter", *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English: *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918/1943), pp. 160-162.
- 1324.** Cyprian, Twelfth Treatise, "Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews", First Book, Testimony 24, *The Anti-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*, Volume 5, Christian Literature Publishing Company, New York, (1886), p. 514-515.
- 1325.** T. Herzl, *The Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, Zionist Organization of America, New York, (1943), p. 43.
- 1326.** M. A. Hoffman II, *Judaism's Strange Gods*, Independent History and Research, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, (2000), pp. 108-109.
- 1327.** Cf. S. Snobelen, "'The Mystery of the Restitution of All Things': Isaac Newton on the Return of the Jews", in J. E. Force and R. H. Popkin, Editors, *The Millenarian Turn: Millenarian Contexts of Science, Politics, and Everyday Anglo-American Life in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, Chapter 7, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, (2001), pp. 95-118, at 112, note 11.
- 1328.** I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), pp. 9, 11. J. Prinz, *The Secret Jews*, Random House, New York, (1973), pp. 111-112.
- 1329.** D. Ben-Gurion, *Memoirs*, The World Publishing Company, New York, Cleveland, (1970), not paginated.
- 1330.** T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 317.
- 1331.** T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 56.
- 1332.** T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 84.
- 1333.** T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), pp. 143, 171, 182, 231.
- 1334.** "The Zionist Congress: Full Report of the Proceedings", *The Jewish Chronicle*, (3 September 1897), pp. 10-15, at 11.
- 1335.** M. Nordau and G. Gottheil, *Zionism and Anti-Semitism*, Fox, Duffield & Company, (1905), p. 19.
- 1336.** B. Disraeli, *Coningsby; or, The New Generation*, The Century Co., New York, (1904), pp. 231.
- 1337.** G. Thomas and M. Dillon, *Robert Maxwell, Israel's Superspy*, Carroll and Graf, New York, (2002).
- 1338.** B. Freedman as quoted in D. Reed, *Somewhere South of Suez*, Devin-Adair Company, U. S. A., (1951), pp. 331-332.
- 1339.** J. Rorty, "Storm Over the Investigating Committees", *Commentary*, Volume 19, Number 2, (February, 1955), pp. 128-136, at 131.
- 1340.** A. Forster, *Square One*, D. I. Fine, New York, (1988), p. 121.
- 1341.** P. Findley, *They Dare to Speak Out: People and Institutions Confront Israel's Lobby*, Lawrence Hill, Westport, Connecticut, (1985); **and** *Deliberate Deceptions: Facing the Facts about the U.S.-Israeli Relationship*, Lawrence Hill Books, Chicago, (1993); **and** *Silent No More: Confronting America's False Images of Islam*, D : Amana Publications, Beltsville, Maryland, (2001).

- 1342.** D. Reed, *Somewhere South of Suez*, Devin-Adair Company, U. S. A., (1951); **and** *The Controversy of Zion*, Bloomfield, Sudbury, (1978).
- 1343.** T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volumes 1 and 2, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), pp. 37, 97, 170, 455, 457, 480.
- 1344.** S. Landman, *Great Britain, the Jews and Palestine*, New Zionist Press, London, (1936), p. 3
- 1345.** A. T. Clay, "Political Zionism", *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 127, Number 2, (February, 1921), pp. 268-279, at 277-279. B. L. Brasol, *The World at the Cross Roads*, Small, Mayhard & Co., Boston, (1921), pp. 371-379.
- 1346.** M. Samuel, "Diaries of Theodor Herzl", in: M. W. Weisgal, *Theodor Herzl: A Memorial*, The New Palestine, New York, (1929), pp. 125-180, at 129. T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), pp. 4, 111.
- 1347.** T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 307.
- 1348.** T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 172.
- 1349.** T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), p. 99.
- 1350.** L. Pinsker, translated by D. S. Blondheim, *Auto-Emancipation: An Admonition to His Brethren by a Russian Jew*, Federation of American Zionists, New York, (1916).
- 1351.** A. Einstein, *The World As I See It*, Citadel, New York, (1993), pp. 92-97, 103, 106, 108.
- 1352.** P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), pp. 303-305.
- 1353.** B. Borochoy, *Nationalism and Class Struggle*, New York, (1935), pp. 135-136, 183-205; quoted in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 355-360, at 356.
- 1354.** T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 183.
- 1355.** T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), pp. 23, 99.
- 1356.** "Prof. Einstein Here, Explains Relativity", *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), pp. 1, 13, at 1.
- 1357.** *See, for example*, J. Goebbels, "Der Führer", *Aufsätze auf der Kampfzeit*, Zentralverlag der NSDAP, Munich, (1935), pp. 214-216; **and** "Goldene Worte für einen Diktator und für solche, die es werden wollen", *Der Angriff*, (1 September 1932); reprinted in: *Wetterleuchten: Aufsätze aus der Kampfzeit*, Zentralverlag der NSDAP., Franz Eher Nachf., München, (1939), pp. 325-327. On the Zionists' quest to find a "great man" to be their "dictator", *see*: N. Goldman, "Zionismus und nationale Bewegung", *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 4, (1920-1921), pp. 237-242, at 240-242; which was part of a series including: "Zionismus und nationale Bewegung", *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 1, (1920-1921), pp. 45-47; and "Zionismus und nationale Bewegung", *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 7, (1920-1921), pp. 423-425.
- 1358.** *Cf.* Schlomo Ginossar, a. k. a. Simon Ginsburg, a. k. a. Salomon Ginzberg, "Early Days", *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1925-1950*, Universitah ha-'uvrit bi-Yerushalayim, Jerusalem, (1950), pp. 71-74, at 73. **See also**: J. Stachel, *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 79, note 41.

1359. See, for example: A. Lynch, *The Case Against Einstein*, P. Allan, London, (1932). H. Dingler, *Die Grundlagen der Physik; synthetische Prinzipien der mathematischen Naturphilosophie*, Second Edition, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, (1923); **and** *Physik und Hypothese Versuch einer induktiven Wissenschaftslehre nebst einer kritischen Analyse der Fundamente der Relativitätstheorie*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1921); **and** “Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Grundlagen der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 21, (1920), pp. 668-669. H. Nordenson, *Relativity, Time and Reality: A Critical Investigation of the Einstein Theory of Relativity from a Logical Point of View*, Allen and Unwin, London, (1969).

1360. L. Essen, “Relativity — Joke or Swindle?”, *Electronics and Wireless World*, (February, 1988), pp. 126-127. URL: <<http://www.cfpf.org.uk/articles/scientists/essen.html>>

1361. J. T. Blankart, “Relativity or Interdependence”, *Catholic World*, Volume 112, (February, 1921), pp. 588- 610, at 606.

1362. K. Sugimoto, translated by B. Harshav, *Albert Einstein, A Photographic Biography*, Schocken Books, New York, (1989), p. 74.

1363. P. Weyland, “Einsteins Relativitätstheorie—eine wissenschaftliche Massensuggestion”, *Tägliche Rundschau*, (August 6, 1920).

1364. E. Gehrcke, “Die gegen die Relativitätstheorie erhobenen Einwände”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 1, Number 3, (1 January 1913), pp. 62-66; republished *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 20-28, “Massensuggestion” appears at page 28; Gehrcke also delivered a lecture, which Einstein attended, on 24 August 1920 in the Berlin Philharmonic, *Die Relativitätstheorie eine wissenschaftliche Massensuggestion*, Arbeitsgemeinschaft Deutscher Naturforscher zur Erhaltung reiner Wissenschaft, Berlin, (1920); republished in *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, pp. 54-68. See also: *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924). The editors of *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 102; cite the earliest appearance by Gehrcke of this charge as: E. Gehrcke, Ed., P. Drude, *Lehrbuch der Optik*, Third Edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1912), p. 470. Reference is also had to this fact in H. Goenner, “The Reaction to Relativity Theory. I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920”, *Science in Context*, Volume 6, Number 1, (1993), pp. 107-133.

1365. B. Thüring, “Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen”, *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, Volume 4, (1940), pp. 134-162. Republished as: *Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen*, Dr. Georg Lüttke Verlag, Berlin, (1941).

1366. Č. Dvořák quoted in J. T. Blackmore, *Ernst Mach: His Work, Life, and Influence*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, (1972), p. 279.

1367. H. Goenner, “The Reaction to Relativity Theory in Germany, III: ‘A Hundred Authors against Einstein’”, J. Earman, M. Janssen, J. D. Norton, Editors, *The Attraction of Gravitation: New Studies in the History of General Relativity*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (1993), p. 249.

1368. J. Stark, *Die gegenwärtige Krisis in der Deutschen Physik*, Johann Ambrosius Barth, Leipzig, (1922), Forward and pp. 6-16.

1369. “Einstein’s Triumph”, *The New York Times*, (13 April 1923), p. 16.

1370. See: C. Schönbeck, “Albert Einstein und Philipp Lenard”, *Schriften der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Volume 8, (2000), pp. 1-42, at 37.

1371. C. Brown, *The New York Times*, (8 July 1921), p. 9.

- 1372.** “Prof. Einstein Here, Explains Relativity”, *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), pp. 1, 13, at 1.
- 1373.** A. Einstein to H. Zangger of 24 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 233, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 197-198, at 197.
- 1374.** A. Einstein, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 188.
- 1375.** J. Klatzkin, *Krisis und Entscheidung im Judentum; der Probleme des modernen Judentums*, Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, (1921). Heinrich Class under the pseudonym Daniel Frymann, *Wenn ich der Kaiser wär’: politische Wahrheiten und Notwendigkeiten*, Dieterich, Leipzig, (1912); English translation, R. S. Levy, “If I were the Kaiser / Daniel Freymann”, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, Chapter 14, D.C. Heath, Toronto, (1991).
- 1376.** T. Lessing, *Der jüdische Selbsthaß*, Zionistischer Bücherbund, Berlin, (1930).
- 1377.** P. Lenard, *Deutsche Physik in vier Bänden*, J. F. Lehmann, München, (1936-1937); **and** *Philipp Lenard, der deutsche Naturforscher: sein Kampf um nordische Forschung: Reichssiegerarbeit*, J. F. Lehmanns Verlag, München, (1937). J. Stark and W. Müller, *Jüdische und deutsche Physik, Vorträge zur Eröffnung des Kolloquiums für theoretische Physik an der Universität München*, Helingsche Verlagsanstalt, (1941). **See also:** P. Lenard and J. Stark, “Hitlergeist und Wissenschaft”, *Großdeutsche Zeitung. Tageszeitung für nationale und soziale Politik und Wirtschaft*, Volume 1, Number 81, (8 May 1924), pp. 1-2; reprinted *Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte*, Volume 7, Number 71, (February, 1936), pp. 110-111; annotated English translation, K. Hentschel, “Philipp Lenard & Johannes Stark: The Hitler Spirit and Science [May 8, 1924]” *Physics and National Socialism: An Anthology of Primary Sources*, Basel, Boston, Birkhäuser, (1996), pp. 7-10; which book also contains numerous other Nazi-era texts in English translation.
- 1378.** Cf. C. Weizmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1949), p. 35.
- 1379.** J. B. Agus, *The Meaning of Jewish History*, Volume 2, Abelard-Schuman, New York, (1963), pp. 407-408. Agus cites: A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *Israel among the Nations: A Study of the Jews and Antisemitism*, G.P. Putnam’s sons, New York, W. Heinemann, London, (1895), pp. 45, 131, 134; and T. Mommsen, *Auch ein Wort über unser Judentum*, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, Berlin, (1880), pp. 5, 7, 15-16.
- 1380.** M. Hess, English translation by M. Waxman, *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918/1943), pp. 17-18, 24.
- 1381.** A. Einstein, *The World As I See It*, Citadel, New York, (1993), p. 98.
- 1382.** Letter from A. Einstein to H. Bergman of 5 November 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 155, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 132-133, at 132. **See also:** H. N. Bialik, “Bialik on the Hebrew University”, in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 281-288, at 284-285.
- 1383.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 88.
- 1384.** Letter from A. Einstein to H. Bergman of 5 November 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 155, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 132-133, at 132.
- 1385.** M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 16.
- 1386.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 35, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 156-157.

1387. M. Winteler-Einstein, English translation by A. Beck, “Albert Einstein—A Biographical Sketch”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987), pp. xv-xxii, at xx.

1388. Letter from A. Einstein to P. Ehrenfest of 8 November 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 160, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 135-136, at 136.

1389. “Salluste”, “Henri Heine et Karl Marx. Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme”, *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 11, (1 June 1928), pp. 567-589; **and** “Henri Heine et Karl Marx II. Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme”, *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 12, (15 June 1928), pp. 900-923; **and** “Henri Heine et Karl Marx III. Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme”, *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 13, (1 July 1928), pp. 153-175; **and** “Henri Heine et Karl Marx IV. Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme”, *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 14, (15 July 1928), pp. 426-445. **See also, Rabbi Liber’s Response:** “Judaïsm et Socialisme”, *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 15, (1 August 1928), pp. 607-628; **To which “Salluste” Replied:** “Autour d’une Polémique: Marxism et Judaïsm”, *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 16, (15 August 1928), pp. 795-834.

1390. Cf. Mentor, “Peace, War—and Bolshevism”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (4 April 1919), p. 7; **and** “From My Note Book”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (11 April 1919), p. 9.

1391. “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 361-365.

1392. “Salluste”, “Henri Heine et Karl Marx. Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme”, *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 11, (1 June 1928), pp. 567-589, at 574. An alternative English translation appears in D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), p. 83.

1393. Rabbi Liber, “Judaïsm et Socialisme”, *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 15, (1 August 1928), pp. 607-628, at 623-624.

1394. “Salluste”, “Autour d’une Polémique: Marxism et Judaïsm”, *La Revue de Paris*, Volume 35, Number 16, (15 August 1928), pp. 795-834. “Salluste”, *Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme: Henri Heine et Karl Marx*, Jules Tallandier, Paris, (1930), at pp. 33-34.

1395. M. Kominsky, *The Hoaxers: Plain Liars, Fancy Liars, and Damned Liars*, Branden Press, Boston, (1970), pp. 189-191.

1396. M. Kominsky, *The Hoaxers: Plain Liars, Fancy Liars, and Damned Liars*, Branden Press, Boston, (1970), pp. 190-191.

1397. M. Higger, *The Jewish Utopia*, Lord Baltimore Press, Baltimore, (1932).

1398. “Salluste”, *Les Origines Secrètes du Bolchevisme: Henri Heine et Karl Marx*, Jules Tallandier, Paris, (1930), pp. 34-35.

1399. J. Klausner, *The Messianic Idea in Israel, from its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah*, Translated from the third Hebrew edition by W. F. Stinespring, Macmillan, New York, (1955), pp. 160-164.

1400. B. Haase, “Die Ostjudenfrage”, *Central-Verein Zeitung*, Volume 1, Number 1, (4 May 1922), p. 6. “Ostjudenfrage”, *Central-Verein Zeitung*, Volume 1, Number 1, (4 May 1922), p. 5.

1401. *Time Magazine*, Volume 52, Number 7, (16 August 1948), p. 27.

1402. J. Jiladi, *Discord in Zion: Conflict Between Ashkenazi & Sephardi Jews in Israel*, Scorpion Pub., London, (1990).

1403. B. Thüring, “Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren Möglichkeiten und Ursachen”, *Forschungen zur Judenfrage*, Volume 4, (1940), p. 154. Republished as: *Albert Einsteins Umsturzversuch der Physik und seine inneren*

Möglichkeiten und Ursachen, Dr. Georg Lüttke Verlag, Berlin, (1941).

1404. T. Lessing, *Der jüdische Selbsthass*, Matthes & Seitz, München, (1984), pp. 84-84.

1405. R. Wagner under the *nom de plume* K. Freigedank, “Das Judenthum in der Musik”, *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, (3 and 6 September 1850); Reprinted with revisions and an appendix, R. Wagner, *Das Judenthum in der Musik*, J. J. Weber, Leipzig, (1869); the original unrevised 1850 article was reprinted in *Gesammelte Schriften und Dichtungen*, Volume 5; English translation of the 1869 version by E. Evans, *Judaism in Music (Das Judenthum in der Musik) Being the Original Essay Together with the Later Supplement*, W. Reeves, London, (1910); Also, “Judaism in Music”, *Richard Wagner’s Prose Works*, Volume 3, Broude Brothers, New York, (1966), pp. 75-122.; which is a reprint of the original “Judaism in Music”, *Richard Wagner’s Prose Works*, Volume 3, Kegan Paul, Trench, and Trübner, London, (1894).

1406. L. Pinsker, “Auto-Emancipation”, quoted in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 181-198, at 190. Hertzberg cites: English translation by D. Blondheim in B. Netanyahu, *Road to Freedom*, New York, (1944), pp. 74-95, 105-106.

1407. B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286, at 269-271.

1408. Josephus, “Flavius Josephus Against Apion”, *The Works of Flavius Josephus: Comprising the Antiquities of the Jews; a History of the Jewish Wars; and Life of Flavius Josephus, Written by Himself*, Book 2, S. S. Scranton Co., Hartford, Connecticut, (1916), pp. 917-918.

1409. A. Hitler, *The Speeches of Adolf Hitler April 1922-August 1939*, Volume 1, Howard Fertig, New York, (1969), pp. 30-31.

1410. A. Hitler, *The Speeches of Adolf Hitler April 1922-August 1939*, Volume 1, Howard Fertig, New York, (1969), p. 699.

1411. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), pp. 32, 110, 116-117.

1412. It should be noted that Arnold Sommerfeld stated at the end of 1915, that Einstein was the greatest spirit since Gauss and Newton. *See:* Letter from A. Sommerfeld to K. Schwarzschild of 28 December 1915, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, Cod. Ms. K. Schwarzschild 743. Sommerfeld was one of the first to profit by promoting Einstein while demeaning the deceased Poincaré in Sommerfeld’s annotations for *Das Relativitätsprinzip*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1913)—a book published shortly after Poincaré died, which failed to include any of Poincaré’s works, but obviously helped to promote Sommerfeld.

1413. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 31.

1414. E. K. Dühring, *Die Judenfrage als Racen-, Sitten- und Culturfrage: mit einer weltgeschichtlichen Antwort*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, (1881); English translation by A. Jacob, *Eugen Dühring on the Jews*, Nineteen Eighty Four Press, Brighton, England, (1997), pp. 96-97.

1415. Letter from P. Ehrenfest to A. Einstein of 9 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 203, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 173-175, at 174.

1416. N. Syrkin, under the *nom de plume* “Ben Elieser”, *Die Judenfrage und der sozialistische Judenstaat*, Steiger, Bern, (1898); English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 333-350, at 344.

1417. A. A. Roback, *Jewish Influence in Modern Thought*, Sci-Art Publishers, Harvard Square, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (1929), pp. 237-238, 245-246, 250-251.

- 1418.** D. Bronder, *Bevor Hitler kam: Eine historische Studie*, Hans Pfeiffer Verlag, Hannover, (1964), p. 204 (p. 211 in the 1974 edition). H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974); English translation *Adolf Hitler: Founder of Israel*, Modjeskis' Society Dedicated to Preservation of Cultures, San Diego, (1997), pp. 4, 73.
- 1419.** L. Roth, "Jewish Thought in the Modern World", *The Legacy of Israel*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, (1927), pp. 433-463 at 463.
- 1420.** L. Pinsker, "Auto-Emancipation", in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 181-198, at 193. H. N. Bialik, "Bialik on the Hebrew University", in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 281-288, at 284. A. D. Gordon, *Kitve A. D. Gordon*, In Five Volumes, Tel-Aviv, ha-Va'ad ha-merkazi shel mifleget ha-Po'el ha-tsa'ir, (1927-1930), parts translated to English in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 371-386, at 376. S. H. Landau, *Kithe*, Warsaw, (1935), pp. 36-43; translated to English in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 434-439, at 437-438.
- 1421.** I. Zollschan, "The Cultural Value of the Jewish Race", *Jewish Questions: Three Lectures*, New York, Bloch Pub. Co., (1914), pp. 3-19.
- 1422.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 35, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 156-157.
- 1423.** Letter from V. G. Ehrenberg to A. Einstein of 23 November 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 173, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 145.
- 1424.** L. D. Brandeis, M. I. Urofsky and D. W. Levy, Editors, *Letters of Louis D. Brandeis* Volume 4, State University of New York Press, Albany, New York, (1975), pp. 536-537.
- 1425.** A. Sterling, *The Jew and Civilization*, Aetco, New York, (1924), pp. 202-203.
- 1426.** A. Sterling, *The Jew and Civilization*, Aetco, New York, (1924), pp. 221-222.
- 1427.** A. Einstein, A. Engel translator, "How I became a Zionist", *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 57, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 234-235, at 235.
- 1428.** M. Steinglass, "Emil Ludwig before the Judge", *American Jewish Times*, (April, 1936), p. 35; as quoted in: L. Brenner, *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, Chapter 6, Croom Helm, London, L. Hill, Westport, Connecticut, (1983), p. 59.
- 1429.** A. Eichmann, "Eichmann Tells His Own Damning Story", *Life Magazine*, Volume 49, Number 22, (28 November 1960), pp. 19-25, 101-112; at 22.
- 1430.** J. L. Magnes, *Like All Nations?*, Jerusalem, (1930), quoted in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 443-449, at 447.
- 1431.** M. Buber, *Israel and the World*, Schocken Books, New York, (1948), quoted in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 457-463, at 460-461.
- 1432.** Friedrich Wilhelm Ghillany, under the pseudonym Richard von der Alm, *Die Urtheile heidnischer und jüdischer Schriftsteller der vier ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte über Jesus und die ersten Christen: eine Zuschrift an die gebildeten Deutschen zur weiteren Orientirung in der Frage über die Gottheit Jesu*, Otto Wigand, Leipzig, (1864); and *Theologische briefe an die gebildeten der deutschen Nation*, In Three Volumes, Otto Wigand, Leipzig, (1862-1863).
- 1433.** *Acts*, Chapter 4, Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book 20, Chapter 5.
- 1434.** S. Schwarzfuchs, *Napoleon, the Jews, and the Sanhedrin*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, Boston, (1979), p. 49.
- 1435.** D. J. Boorstein, *The Americans: The Colonial Experience*, Vintage Books, New York, (1958), pp. 64-65.

- 1436.** P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), pp. 285-285.
- 1437.** R. Gottheil, "The Jews as a Race and as a Nation", *The World's Best Orations*, Volume 6, F. P. Kaiser, St. Louis, (1899), pp. 2294-2298, at 2296, at 2297.
- 1438.** R. Gottheil, *The Aims of Zionism*, Publication No. 1 of the American Federation of Zionists, New York, (1899); quoted in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 496-500, at 498-500.
- 1439.** M. Nordau and G. Gottheil, *Zionism and Anti-Semitism*, Fox, Duffield & Company, New York, (1905), p. 27.
- 1440.** A. I. Kook, *Orat*, Second Edition, Jerusalem, (1950); English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 419-431, at 422, 425, 427.
- 1441.** English translation from K. A. Strom, Editor, *The Best of Attack! and National Vanguard Tabloid*, National Alliance, Arlington, Virginia, (1984), p. 60.
- 1442.** N. Goldman, quoted by C. Bloch, *Mi Natan Li-meshisah Ya'akov ve-Yisrael Le-vozezim? Meharsim ve-maharivim mi-Herts! ve-Nordoy derekh Goldman ve-Klatskin el ha-shehitah ve-hurban ha-Yahadut, mishak dam 'im goral Yisra'el*, Bronx, (1957). English translation from J. B. Agus, *The Meaning of Jewish History*, Volume 2, Abelard-Schuman, New York, (1963), p. 427-428.
- 1443.** E. Flegg, "Why I am a Jew", English translation by V. Gollancz in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 480-485, at 481.
- 1444.** K. J. Herrmann, "Historical Perspectives on Political Zionism and Antisemitism", *Zionism & Racism: Proceedings of an International Symposium*, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Tripoli, (1977), pp. 197-210, at 204-205. A lengthy quotation from Klatzkin, in English translation, appears in: M. Menuhin, *The Decadence of Judaism in Our Time*, Exposition Press, New York, (1965), pp. 482-483.
- 1445.** F. W. Ghillany, *Die Menschenopfer der alten Hebräer. Eine geschichtliche Untersuchung. . .*, Nürnberg, (1842); **and** *Die Judenfrage: Eine Beigabe zu Bruno Bauers Abhandlung über dieser Gegenstand*, Nürnberg, (1843); **and** *Das Judentum und die Kritik; odor, Es bleibt dei den Menschenopfern der Hebräer und bei der Nothwendigkeit einer zeitgemaessen Reform des Judenthums*, J.A. Stein, Nurnberg, (1844). Friedrich Wilhelm Ghillany, under the pseudonym Richard von der Alm, *Die Urtheile heidnischer und jüdischer Schriftsteller der vier ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte über Jesus und die ersten Christen: eine Zuschrift an die gebildeten Deutschen zur weiteren Orientirung in der Frage über die Gottheit Jesu*, Otto Wigand, Leipzig, (1864); **and** *Theologische briefe an die gebildeten der deutschen Nation*, In Three Volumes, Otto Wigand, Leipzig, (1862-1863).
- 1446.** P. L. Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner*, Princeton University Press, (1990), p. 260. Rose cites: F. W. Ghillany, "Dedication", *Die Judenfrage: Eine Beigabe zu Bruno Bauers Abhandlung über dieser Gegenstand*, Nürnberg, (1843); **and** R. W. Stock, *Die Judenfrage durch fünf Jahrhunderte*, Verlag Der Stürmer, Nürnberg, (1939), pp. 406ff.
- 1447.** J. Klatzkin, *Tehumim: Ma'amarim*, Devir, Berlin, (1925). English translation in J. B. Agus, *The Meaning of Jewish History*, Volume 2, Abelard-Schuman, New York, (1963), pp. 425-426.
- 1448.** B. Lazare, *Antisemitism: Its History and Causes*, (1894), pp. 20-23. *L'Antisémitisme, son Histoire et ses Causes*, L. Chailley, Paris, (1894).
- 1449.** B. J. Hendrick, "The Jews in America: I How They Came to This Country", *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 2, (December, 1922), pp. 144-161; **and** "The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?", *The World's Work*, Volume 44,

Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286; **and** “The Jews in America: III The Menace of the Polish Jew”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 4, (February, 1923), pp. 366-377; **and** “Radicalism among the Polish Jews”, *The World’s Work*, Volume 44, Number 6, (April, 1923), pp. 591-601. **See also:** D. M. Dunlop, *The History of the Jewish Khazars*, Princeton University Press, (1954). **See also:** A. Koestler, *The Thirteenth Tribe: The Khazar Empire and Its Heritage*, Random House, New York, (1976). P. B. Golden, *Khazar Studies: An Historico-Philological Inquiry into the Origins of the Khazars*, In Two Volumes, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, (1980). **See also:** N. Golb and O. Pritsak, *Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, (1982). **See also:** ha-Levi Judah (12th Century) and M. Lazar, *Book of the Kuzari: A Book of Proof and Argument in Defense of a Despised Faith: a 15th Century Ladino Translation (Ms. 17812, B.N. Madrid)*, Labyrinthos, Culver City, California, (1990). ha-Levi Judah (12th Century) and N. D. Korobkin, *The Kuzari: In Defense of the Despised Faith*, J. Aronson, Northvale, New Jersey, (1998). **See also:** P. Wexler, *The Ashkenazi Jews: A Slavo-Turkic People in Search of a Jewish Identity*, Slavica Publishers, Columbus, Ohio, (1993). **See also:** K. A. Brook, *The Jews of Khazaria*, Jason Aronson, Northvale, New Jersey, (1999). **See also:** M. F. Hammer, *et al.*, “Jewish and Middle Eastern Non-Jewish Populations Share a Common Pool of Y-Chromosome Biallelic Haplotypes”, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Volume 97, (2000), pp. 6769-6774. **See also:** M. P. Stumpf and D. B. Goldstein, “Genealogical and Evolutionary Inference with the Human Y Chromosome”, *Science*, Volume 291, (2001), pp. 1738-1742. **See also:** M. F. Hammer, *et al.*, “Hierarchical Patterns of Global Human Y-Chromosome Diversity”, *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, Volume 18, (2001), pp. 1189-1203. **See also:** D. M. Behar, *et al.*, “Multiple Origins of Ashkenazi Levites: Y Chromosome Evidence for Both Near Eastern and European Ancestries”, *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, Volume 73, Number 4, (October, 2003), pp. 768-779. **See also:** D. M. Behar, *et al.*, “The Matrilineal Ancestry of Ashkenazi Jewry: Portrait of a Recent Founder Event”, *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, Volume 78, Number 3, (March, 2006), pp. 487-497.

1450. H. P. Blavatsky, “Who the Jews Really Are”, *The Secret Doctrine: The Synthesis of Science, Religion, and Philosophy*, Volume 2, Part 2, Section 3, The Theosophical Publishing Society, (1893), pp. 493-494.

1451. Josephus, “Flavius Josephus Against Apion”, *The Works of Flavius Josephus: Comprising the Antiquities of the Jews; a History of the Jewish Wars; and Life of Flavius Josephus, Written by Himself*, Book 2, S. S. Scranton Co., Hartford, Connecticut, (1916), pp. 905-906, 911.

1452. Strabo, translated by H. L. Jones, *Geography*, Volume 7, Book 16, Chapter 2, Sections 34-36, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (2000), pp. 281, 283.

1453. <http://www.observer.co.uk/international/story/0%2C6903%2C605798%2C00.html>

1454. G. H. Borrow, *The Zincoli, or, An Account of the Gypsies of Spain*, Volume 1, John Murray, London, (1841), pp. 157-158.

1455. S. Freud, *Der Mann Moses und die monotheistische Religion*, (1938); English translation, *Moses and Monotheism*, Knopf, New York, (1939).

1456. Tacitus, translated by A. J. Church and W. J. Brodribb, *The Complete Works of Tacitus*, The Modern Library, New York, (1942), p. 658. An alternative, and far more accessible translation appears in: Tacitus, *History of the Jews*, Book V, Chapters 2-8 in: “Dissertation III”, *The Works of Flavius Josephus: Comprising the Antiquities of the Jews; a History of the Jewish Wars; and Life of Flavius Josephus, Written by Himself*, S. S. Scranton Co., Hartford, Connecticut, (1916), pp. 951-956.

1457. Tacitus, translated by A. J. Church and W. J. Brodribb, *The Complete Works of Tacitus*, The Modern Library, New York, (1942), pp. 659-660. An alternative, and far more accessible translation appears in: Tacitus, *History of the Jews*, Book V, Chapters 2-8 in: “Dissertation III”, *The Works of Flavius Josephus: Comprising the Antiquities of the Jews; a History of the Jewish Wars; and Life of Flavius Josephus, Written by Himself*, S. S. Scranton Co., Hartford, Connecticut, (1916), pp. 951-956.

1458. F. Delitzsch, *Die grosse Täuschung: kritische Betrachtungen zu den alttestamentlichen Berichten über Israels Eindringen in Kanaan, die Gottesoffenbarung vom Sinai und die Wirksamkeit der Propheten*, In Two Volumes, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, Berlin, Stuttgart, (1921).

1459. *Genesis* 3:13-16; 9:25-27; 19:24-29; 22:1-18. *Exodus* 8:26; 12:12-13, 29-30; 13:2; 15:3. *Leviticus* 25:44-46; 26:29; 27:28-29. *Numbers* 11:33-34; 15:35-36; 25:1-9; 31:1-54. *Deuteronomy* 7:1-26; 28:1-68; 29:20-24; 32:19-43. *Joshua* 6:17-21; 13:14, 21-22. *Judges* 6:1-40; 8:18; 11:29-40. *I Samuel* 6:19. *I Kings* 13:1-2. *II Kings* 2:24; 6:26-30; 16:3-4; 17:17; 21:6; 23:20-25. *I Chronicles* 13:10; 21:14-15. *II Chronicles* 28:1-4. *Psalms* 2:8-9; 78:31-51; 83:9-10; 137:8-9. *Isaiah* 10:6; 13:1-22; 19:2-4; 34:1-17; 61:5-9. *Hosea* 13:16. *Joel* 3:8. *Zechariah* 14:2-3. *Malachi* 2:2-3. *Jeremiah* 7:3; 19:5; 32:35. *Ezekiel* 16:20-21; 20:26, 31; 23:37.

1460. I. Epstein, Editor, Kethuboth 11b, *The Babylonian Talmud*, Volume 17 (Kethuboth I), The Soncino Press, London, (1936), pp. 57-58.

1461. I. Epstein, Editor, *The Babylonian Talmud*, Sanhedrin II, Volume 28, The Soncino Press, London, (1935), pp. 469-470.

1462. J. Siegel-Itzkovich, “Ritual Circumcisers Can Pass Infection to Babies”, *The Jerusalem Post*, (29 August 2004), p. 7. **See also:** M. Haberman, “Fear Rabbi Gave Tots Herpes Probe Death of Baby after Circumcision”, *Daily News* (New York), (2 February 2005), p. 7. **See also:** “Rabbi’s Circumcision Rites Linked to Herpes Death”, *The Houston Chronicle*, (3 February 2005), p. A9. **See also:** “Baby ‘Herpes Death’ Inquiry”, *The Daily Telegraph* (Sydney, Australia), 3 February 2005), p. 26. **See also:** “Circumcision Rite Poses ‘Inherent Risks,’ City Sez”, *Daily News* (New York), (3 February 2005), p. 42. **See also:** J. Siegel-Itzkovich, “The Kindest Cut of All”, *The Jerusalem Post*, (18 September 2005), p. 7. **See also:** (Rev) Michael Plaskow Mbe, Richard Rinberg, Glenn Woiceshyn, Colin L. Leci, Henry Kaye, Joe Frankl, Yoel Tamari, Shifra Tarem, Raymond Cannon, Shakil Khan, Ellie Morris, Leon Harris, Naomi Cohen, “Letters”, *The Jerusalem Post*, (19 September 2005), p. 14. **See also:** J. Rutenberg, “Metro Briefing New York: Manhattan: Infection Connected To Religious Rite”, *The New York Times*, (14 December 2005), p. B9. **See also:** D. Saltonstall, “2 More Tots Infected with Herpes”, *Daily News* (New York), (14 December 2005), p. 20. **See also:** D. Saltonstall, “New Cases of Tot Herpes Infections”, *Daily News* (New York), (14 December 2005), p. 20. **See also:** J. Rutenberg and A. Newman, “City Officials and Rabbis Clash Over Rite”, *The New York Times*, (5 January 2006), p. B5; **and** “Mayor Balances Hasidic Ritual Against Fears for Babies’ Health”, *The New York Times*, (6 January 2006), pp. A1, B4. **See also:** J. Purnick, “Taking a Stand On a Rite With Hazards”, *The New York Times*, (9 January 2006), p. B1.

1463. I. Epstein, Editor, “Shabbath”, *The Babylonian Talmud*, Volume 8, Part 2, The Soncino Press, (1938), pp. 666-669, at 668-669.

1464. I. Epstein, Editor, “Shabbath”, *The Babylonian Talmud*, Volume 8, Part 2, The Soncino Press, (1938), pp. 666-669, at 668-669.

1465. “Circumcision”, *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Volume 4 CHAZARS-DREYFUS CASE, Funk and Wagnells Company, New York, London, (1903), pp. 92-102, at 99.

1466. J. Buxtorf, “Touching the Jews Messiah who is yet for to come”, Chapter 36, *Synagoga Judaica: Das ist Jüden Schul ; Darinnen der gantz Jüdische Glaub und Glaubensubung. . . grundlich erkläret*, Basel, (1603); as translated in the 1657 English edition, *The Jewish Synagogue: Or An Historical Narration of the State of the Jewes, At this Day Dispersed over the Face of the Whole Earth*, Printed by T. Roycroft for H. R. and Thomas Young at the Three Pidgeons in Pauls Church-Yard, London, (1657).

1467. Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, (1972); English translation: *The Five Books of Quintus Sept. Flor. Tertullianus Against Marcion*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, (1868). “Marcionites”, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume 9, Robert Appleton Company, New York, (1910), pp. 645-649.

1468. F. Delitzsch, *Die grosse Täuschung: kritische Betrachtungen zu den alttestamentlichen Berichten über Israels Eindringen in Kanaan, die Gottesoffenbarung vom Sinai und die Wirksamkeit der Propheten*, In Two Volumes, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, Berlin, Stuttgart, (1921).

1469. J. Chrysostom, translated by P. W. Harkins, “Discourses Against Judaizing Christians”, *The Fathers of the Church*, Volume 68, Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D. C., (1979), p. 18.

1470. T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 172.

1471. Aristotle, *Nichomachean Ethics* V, 5, 1133ab; **and** *Politics*, I, 10, 1258ab.

1472. B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: II Do the Jews Dominate American Finance?”, *The World’s War*, Volume 44, Number 3, (January, 1923), pp. 266-286, at 275.

1473. D. S. Jordan, *Unseen Empire; a Study of the Plight of Nations that Do Not Pay Their Debts*, American Unitarian Association, Boston, (1912).

1474. Josephus, “Flavius Josephus Against Apion”, *The Works of Flavius Josephus: Comprising the Antiquities of the Jews; a History of the Jewish Wars; and Life of Flavius Josephus, Written by Himself*, Book 1, S. S. Scranton Co., Hartford, Connecticut, (1916), p. 886.

1475. W. Marr, *Der Judenspiegel*, Im Selbstverlage des Verfassers, (1862); **and** *Der Sieg des Judenthums über das Germanenthum*, Rudolph Costenoble, Bern, (1879); **and** *Vom jüdischen Kriegsschauplatz: eine Streitschrift*, R. Costenoble, Bern, (1879); **and** *Wählet keinen Juden: Der Weg zum Siege des Germanenthums über das Judenthum*, O. Hentze, Berlin, (1879); **and** *Vom jüdischen Kriegsschauplatz eine Streitschrift*, R. Costenoble, Bern, (1879); **and** *Jeiteles teutonicus. Harfenklänge aus dem vermauschelten Deutschland*, Leipzig, (1879); **and** *Der Judenkrieg, seine Fehler und wie er Zu organisiren ist*, Richard Oschatz, Chemnitz, (1880); **and** *Goldene Ratten und rothe Mäuse*, E. Schmeitzner, Chemnitz, (1880); **and** *Wo steckt der Mauschel? oder, Jüdischer Liberalismus und wissenschaftlicher Pessimismus*, W. Raich, New York, (1880); **and** *Der Weg zum Siege des Germanenthums über das Judenthum*, O. Hentze, Berlin, (1880); **and** *Wählet keinen Juden: ein Mahnwort an die deutschen Wähler*, O. Hentze, Berlin, (1881). **See also:** O. Glagau [Glogau???], *Die Bösen und Grundergeschwindel in Berlin*, Leipzig, (1876); *Les besoins de l’Empire et le nouveau Kulturkampf*, Osnabruck, (1879).

1476. Refer to the Eleventh Edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1910) in its article “Anti-Semitism”. H. Blum, *Das deutsche Reich zur Zeit Bismarcks. Politische geschichte von 1871 bis 1890*, Bibliographisches Institut, Leipzig, Wien, (1893), pp. 153-181.

1477. P. L. Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner*, Princeton University Press, (1990), p. 260. Rose cites: F. W. Ghillany, *Die Judenfrage: Eine Beigabe zu Bruno Bauers Abhandlung über dieser Gegenstand*, Nürnberg, (1843), p. xxi; **and** R. W. Stock, *Die Judenfrage durch fünf Jahrhunderte*, Verlag Der Stürmer, Nürnberg, (1939), pp.

412ff.

1478. P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), pp. 278-287.

1479. H. v. Treitschke, *Preussische Jahrbücher*, Volume 44, (1879), pp. 572-574; English translation in R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 69-73, at 72.

1480. S. Nilus, *The Protocols and World Revolution Including a Translation and Analysis of the "Protocols of the Meetings of the Zionist Men of Wisdom"*, Small, Maynard & Co., Boston, (1920), pp. 120-122; **and** the V. E. Mardsen translation as republished as: *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, The Thunderbolt, Savannah, Georgia, p.73.

1481. E. K. Dühring, *Die Judenfrage als Racen-, Sitten- und Culturfrage: mit einer weltgeschichtlichen Antwort*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, (1881); English translation by A. Jacob, *Eugen Dühring on the Jews*, Nineteen Eighty Four Press, Brighton, England, (1997), pp. 101, 104, 110-111, 113-114, 115, 120, 121, 124, 127. **See also:** E. K. Dühring, *Die Ueberschätzung Lessing's und Dessen Anwaltschaft für die Juden*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, (1881).

1482. English translation from: P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967). p. 315.

1483. M. Samuel, "Diaries of Theodor Herzl", in: M. W. Weisgal, *Theodor Herzl: A Memorial*, The New Palestine, New York, (1929), pp. 125-180, at 129. T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), pp. 4, 111.

1484. Talmud, *Abodah Zarah* 26a.

1485. G. Dalman, *Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar, and the Liturgy of the Synagogue*, Deighton Bell, Cambridge, (1893).

1486. M. Luther, *Von den Juden und ihren Lügen*, Hans Lufft, Wittenberg, (1543); Reprinted, Ludendorffs, München, (1932); English translation by Martin H. Bertram, "On the Jews and Their Lies", *Luther's Works*, Volume 47, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, (1971), pp. 123-306, at 264.

1487. G. H. Borrow, *The Zincoli, or, An Account of the Gypsies of Spain*, Volume 1, John Murray, London, (1841), pp. 159-160.

1488. N. Syrkin, under the nom de plume "Ben Elieser", *Die Judenfrage und der sozialistische Judenstaat*, Steiger, Bern, (1898); English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 333-350, at 334-335.

1489. J. Stachel, *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 79, note 41.

1490. A. Einstein, "Jewish Nationalism and Anti-Semitism", *The Jewish Chronicle*, (17 June 1921), p. 16.

1491. A. Hitler, English translation by Ralph Manheim, *Mein Kampf*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, New York, (1971), pp. 11, 13, 63.

1492. **See also:** J. Badi, *Fundamental Laws of the State of Israel*, Twayne Publishers, New York, (1961), p. 156.

1493. Video Documentary, S. Jacobovici, *Falasha: Exile of the Black Jews*, New Yorker Video, Matara Film Productions, New York, (1983).

1494. *Exodus* 20:5, 34:14, *Deuteronomy* 4:24, 5:9, 6:15.

1495. *Exodus* 15:3.

1496. N. Bentwich, *Philo-Judæus of Alexandria*, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, (1910).

1497. B. Lazare, *Antisemitism: Its History and Causes*, (1894); *L'Antisémitisme, son Histoire et ses Causes*, L. Chailley, Paris, (1894).

1498. Philo the Jew, “On the Embassy to Gaius”, *The Works of Philo*, Hendrick Publishing, U. S. A., (2000), pp. 757-790, at 772.

1499. *Ezekiel 23:20. Berakoth 25b, 58a. Shabbath 150a. Yebamoth 98a. Niddah 45a. Arakin 19b.*

1500. M. Kahane, *On Jews and Judaism: Selected Articles 1961-1990*, Volume 1, Institute for the Publication of the Writings of Rabbi Meir Kahane, Jerusalem, (1993), p. 130. An English translation of the entire text of *Midrash Tehillim 22:1* appears in: W. G. Braude, *The Midrash on Psalms*, Volume 1, Yale University Press, New Haven, (1959), p. 297.

1501. Philo the Jew, “Flaccus”, *The Works of Philo*, Hendrick Publishing, U. S. A., (2000), pp. 725-741, at 741.

1502. Philo the Jew, “Flaccus”, *The Works of Philo*, Hendrick Publishing, U. S. A., (2000), pp. 725-741, at 737.

1503. Tacitus, translated by A. J. Church and W. J. Brodribb, *The Complete Works of Tacitus*, The Modern Library, New York, (1942), pp. 659-660. An alternative, and far more accessible translation appears in: Tacitus, *History of the Jews*, Book V, Chapters 2-8 in: “Dissertation III”, *The Works of Flavius Josephus: Comprising the Antiquities of the Jews; a History of the Jewish Wars; and Life of Flavius Josephus, Written by Himself*, S. S. Scranton Co., Hartford, Connecticut, (1916), pp. 951-956.

1504. Philo the Jew, “On the Embassy to Gaius”, *The Works of Philo*, Hendrick Publishing, U. S. A., (2000), pp. 757-790, at 775-776.

1505. Y. Harkabi, *Israel’s Fateful Hour*, Harper & Row, New York, (1988), pp. 147-149, 156-158.

1506. English translation in: Y. Harkabi, *Israel’s Fateful Hour*, Harper & Row, New York, (1988), p. 148. Harkabi cites: M. Kahane, *Thorns in Your Eyes*, New York, Jerusalem, (1980?), pp. 244-245.

1507. Y. Harkabi, *Israel’s Fateful Hour*, Harper & Row, New York, (1988), p. 156.

1508. Y. Harkabi, *Israel’s Fateful Hour*, Harper & Row, New York, (1988), p. 157.

1509. Philo the Jew, “On the Embassy to Gaius”, *The Works of Philo*, Hendrick Publishing, U. S. A., (2000), pp. 757-790, at 787.

1510. Josephus, “Embassy of the Jews to Caius”, *The Works of Flavius Josephus: Comprising the Antiquities of the Jews; a History of the Jewish Wars; and Life of Flavius Josephus, Written by Himself*, “Antiquities of the Jews”, Book 18, Chapter 8, S. S. Scranton Co., Hartford, Connecticut, (1916), pp. 563-567. Also: *Contra Apionem*, Book 2, Chapter 8, Section 95.

1511. Philo the Jew, “On the Embassy to Gaius”, *The Works of Philo*, Hendrick Publishing, U. S. A., (2000), pp. 757-790, at 773-774.

1512. Josephus, “Embassy of the Jews to Caius”, *The Works of Flavius Josephus: Comprising the Antiquities of the Jews; a History of the Jewish Wars; and Life of Flavius Josephus, Written by Himself*, “Antiquities of the Jews”, Book 18, Chapter 8, S. S. Scranton Co., Hartford, Connecticut, (1916), pp. 563-567.

1513. Philo the Jew, “On the Embassy to Gaius”, *The Works of Philo*, Hendrick Publishing, U. S. A., (2000), pp. 757-790, at 774.

1514. “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 353.

1515. E. L. Martin, *The Temples that Jerusalem Forgot*, ASK Publications, Portland, Oregon, (2000).

1516. Philo the Jew, “On the Embassy to Gaius”, *The Works of Philo*, Hendrick Publishing, U. S. A., (2000), pp. 757-790, at 786.

- 1517.** Philo the Jew, “On the Embassy to Gaius”, *The Works of Philo*, Hendrick Publishing, U. S. A., (2000), pp. 757-790, at 780.
- 1518.** Philo the Jew, “On the Embassy to Gaius”, *The Works of Philo*, Hendrick Publishing, U. S. A., (2000), pp. 757-790, at 787.
- 1519.** Philo the Jew, “On the Embassy to Gaius”, *The Works of Philo*, Hendrick Publishing, U. S. A., (2000), pp. 757-790, at 788.
- 1520.** Josephus, “Antiquities of the Jews”, Book XX, Chapter 8, *The Works of Flavius Josephus: Comprising the Antiquities of the Jews; a History of the Jewish Wars; and Life of Flavius Josephus, Written by Himself*, S. S. Scranton Co., Hartford, Connecticut, (1916), pp. 609-613, at 612-613. **See also:** Tacitus, *Annal*, Book XV, in: “Dissertation III”, *The Works of Flavius Josephus: Comprising the Antiquities of the Jews; a History of the Jewish Wars; and Life of Flavius Josephus, Written by Himself*, S. S. Scranton Co., Hartford, Connecticut, (1916), p. 960.
- 1521.** H. Graetz, *Popular History of the Jews*, Volume 5, Fifth Edition, Hebrew publishing Company, New York, (1937), p. 247.
- 1522.** Philo the Jew, “On the Embassy to Gaius”, *The Works of Philo*, Hendrick Publishing, U. S. A., (2000), pp. 757-790, at 787, 788, 790.
- 1523.** Philo the Jew, “On the Embassy to Gaius”, *The Works of Philo*, Hendrick Publishing, U. S. A., (2000), pp. 757-790, at 766-767.
- 1524.** Josephus, “Claudius restores to Agrippa his grandfather’s kingdoms—augments his dominions; and publishes an edict in behalf of the Jews”, *The Works of Flavius Josephus: Comprising the Antiquities of the Jews; a History of the Jewish Wars; and Life of Flavius Josephus, Written by Himself*, “Antiquities of the Jews”, Book 19, Chapter 5, S. S. Scranton Co., Hartford, Connecticut, (1916), pp. 593-594.
- 1525.** J. Wellhausen, “Israel”, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Ninth Edition, (1881); **and** *Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah*, Third Edition, Adam and Charles Black, London, (1891); **and** *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel: With a Reprint of the Article Israel from the Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Meridian Books, New York, (1957); **and** *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, Fourth Unaltered Edition, W. de Gruyter, Berlin, (1963).
- 1526.** A. Einstein, translated by A. Harris, “The Disarmament Conference of 1932. I.” *The World As I See It*, Citadel, New York, (1993), pp. 59-60.
- 1527.** Letter from A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz of 12 January 1920, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 256, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 214-215, at 214.
- 1528.** A. Einstein, *The World As I See It*, Citadel, New York, (1993), p. 109.
- 1529.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), pp. 88-89.
- 1530.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), pp. 107-108.
- 1531.** Cf. K. J. Herrmann, “Historical Perspectives on Political Zionism and Antisemitism”, *Zionism & Racism: Proceedings of an International Symposium*, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Tripoli, (1977), pp. 197-208.
- 1532.** J. Wellhausen, *Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah*, Third Edition, Adam and Charles Black, London, (1891), pp. 201-203.
- 1533.** J. Klatzkin, *Tehumim: Ma’amarim*, Devir, Berlin, (1925). English translation in J. B. Agus, *The Meaning of Jewish History*, Volume 2, Abelard-Schuman, New York, (1963), pp. 425-426.

- 1534.** K. J. Herrmann, “Historical Perspectives on Political Zionism and Antisemitism”, *Zionism & Racism: Proceedings of an International Symposium*, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Tripoli, (1977), pp. 197-210, at 204-205. A lengthy quotation from Klatzkin, in English translation, appears in: M. Menuhin, *The Decadence of Judaism in Our Time*, Exposition Press, New York, (1965), pp. 482-483.
- 1535.** M. Bar-Ilan, *Kitve Rabi Me’ir Bar-Ilan*, Volume 1, Mosad ha-Rav Kuk, Jerusalem, (1950), pp. 5-16; English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 548-555, at 548.
- 1536.** *Moed Katan 17a*, Rabbi Y. S. Schorr, et al., Editors, “Tractate Moed Katan”, *Talmud Bavli: the Schottenstein edition: the Gemara: the classic Vilna edition, with an annotated, interpretive elucidation, as an aid to Talmud study / elucidated by a team of Torah scholars under the general editorship of Hersh Goldwurm and Nosson Scherman.*, Volume 21, Mesorah Publications, Ltd., Brooklyn, New York, (1999), p. 17a².
- 1537.** Mo’ed Katan, Rabbi I. Epstein, Editor, “Seder Mo’ed”, *The Babylonian Talmud*, Volume 14, The Soncino Press, (1938), p. 107.
- 1538.** A. Einstein, translated by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 29, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 110-111.
- 1539.** J. Stachel, “Einstein’s Jewish Identity”, *Einstein from ‘B’ to ‘Z’*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (2002), pp. 57-83, at 68.
- 1540.** A. Einstein to J. Winteler, English translation by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Document 115, Princeton University Press, (1987), pp. 176-177, at 177.
- 1541.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 5, Document 499, Princeton University Press, (1995), pp. 373-374, at 374.
- 1542.** R. Romain, *La Conscience de l’Europe*, Volume 1, pp. 696ff. English translation from A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein: A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), pp. 365-367. **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to R. Romain of 15 September 1915, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 118, Princeton University Press, (1998); **and** Letter from A. Einstein to R. Romain of 22 August 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 374, Princeton University Press, (1998).
- 1543.** J. Bacque, *Other Losses: An Investigation into the Mass Deaths of German Prisoners at the Hands of the French and Americans after World War II*, Stoddart, Toronto, (1989).
- 1544.** Letter from A. Einstein to Paul Ehrenfest of 22 March 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 10, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 9-10, at 10.
- 1545.** T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), pp. 5-6, 25, 68, 93.
- 1546.** M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 16.
- 1547.** English translation in: K. Polkehn, “The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941”, *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 59.
- 1548.** L. S. Dawidowicz, “The Zionist Federation of Germany Addresses the New German State”, *A Holocaust Reader*, Behrman House, Inc., West Orange, New Jersey, (1976), pp. 150-155. **See also:** H. Tramer, Editor, S. Moses, *In zwei Welten: Siegfried Moses zum fünfundsiebzigsten Geburtstag*, Verlag Bitan, Tel-Aviv, (1962), pp. 118. ff; cited in K. Polkehn, “The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941”, *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 59.
- 1549.** English translation quoted from J. Stachel, “Einstein’s Jewish Identity”, *Einstein from ‘B’ to ‘Z’*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (2002), pp. 57-83, at 78. Stachel cites M.

- Besso, A. Einstein, *Correspondance, 1903-1955*, Hermann, Paris, (1972), p. 238.
- 1550.** Letter from A. Einstein to M. Besso of 12 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 207, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 178-179, at 179.
- 1551.** D. Brian, *The Unexpected Einstein: The Real Man Behind the Icon*, Wiley, Hoboken, New Jersey, (2005), p. 42.
- 1552.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 34, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 153-155, at 153.
- 1553.** A. Einstein quoted in: H. Gutfreund, "Albert Einstein and the Hebrew University", J. Renn, Editor, *Albert Einstein Chief Engineer of the Universe: One Hundred Authors for Einstein*, Wiley-VCH, Berlin, (2005), pp. 314-318, at 316.
- 1554.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 34, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 153-155, at 153.
- 1555.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 34, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 153-155, at 153-154.
- 1556.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 35, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 156-157.
- 1557.** Letter from A. Einstein to P. Nathan of 3 April 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 366, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 492. Also: *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987), p. lx, note 44.
- 1558.** P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), pp. 278-294.
- 1559.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 88.
- 1560.** A. Einstein, *The World As I See It*, Citadel, New York, (1993), pp. 107-108.
- 1561.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 37, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 159.
- 1562.** A. Einstein quoted in A. Fölsing, English translation by E. Osers, *Albert Einstein, a Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), p. 494; which cites speech to the *Central-Verein Deutscher Staatsbürger Jüdischen Glaubens*, in Berlin on 5 April 1920, in D. Reichenstein, *Albert Einstein. Sein Lebensbild und seine Weltanschauung*, Berlin, (1932). This letter from Einstein to the Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith of 5 April 1920 is reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 368, Princeton University Press, (2004).
- 1563.** "Zeitschau", *Im deutschen Reich*, Volume 27, Number 3, (March, 1921), pp. 90-97, at 92.
- 1564.** D. K. Buchwald, et al., Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 37, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 304, note 8.
- 1565.** "Professor Einstein erklärt das „Sunday Expresß“-Interview für gefälscht", *Central-Verein Zeitung*, Volume 10, Number 37, (11 September 1931), p. 443.
- 1566.** A. Einstein, translated by A. Harris, "The Disarmament Conference of 1932. I." *The World As I See It*, Citadel, New York, (1993), pp. 59-60.
- 1567.** J. Stachel, *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 79, note 41.
- 1568.** A. Einstein, "Jewish Nationalism and Anti-Semitism", *The Jewish Chronicle*, (17 June 1921), p. 16.
- 1569.** J. Stachel, "Einstein's Jewish Identity", *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 65. Stachel cites, *About Zionism: Speeches and Letters*, Macmillan, New York, (1931), pp. 48-49. For Zionist Ha-Am's use of the image of atomisation and dispersion, see:

A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 276.

1570. A. Einstein, "Jewish Nationalism and Anti-Semitism", *The Jewish Chronicle*, (17 June 1921), p. 16.

1571. A. Einstein, A. Engel translator, "How I became a Zionist", *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 57, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 234-235, at 235.

1572. At the time Einstein made his statement, Jews and Gentiles often referred to Jews as "Orientals".

1573. Einstein repeatedly spoke of the Germans as "greedy" to acquire territory and of the "loss of energy" when different "races" attempted to live together. He have been speaking literally. Georg Friedrich Nicolai wrote of the struggle of life to acquire the energy of the sun and he applied this struggle to humanity. G. Nicolai, *Die Biologie des Krieges, Betrachtungen eines deutschen Naturforschers*, O. Füssli, Zürich, (1917); English translation: *The Biology of War*, Century Co., New York, (1918), pp. 36-39, 44-53.

1574. R. W. Clarck, *Einstein, the Life and Times*, World Publishing Company, USA, (1971), p. 292. Clarck refers to: *Neue Rundschau*, Volume 33, Part 2, pp. 815-816.

1575. W. E. Mosse, "Die Niedergang der deutschen Republik und die Juden", *The Crucial Year 1932*, p. 38; English translation in: K. Polkehn, "The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 56-57.

1576. English translation by John Stachel in J. Stachel, "Einstein's Jewish Identity", *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 67. Stachel cites, "Botschaft", *Jüdische Rundschau*, Volume 30, (1925), p. 129; French translation, *La Revue Juive*, Volume 1, (1925), pp. 14-16.

1577. J. Stachel, "Einstein's Jewish Identity", *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 65. Stachel cites, *About Zionism: Speeches and Letters*, Macmillan, New York, (1931), pp. 78-79.

1578. A. Einstein quoted in "Einstein on Arrival Braves Limelight for Only 15 Minutes", *The New York Times*, (12 December 1930), pp. 1, 16, at 16.

1579. E. A. Ross, *The Old World in the New: The Significance of past and Present Immigration to the American People*, Century Company, New York, (1914), p. 144.

1580. A. Einstein, "Why do They Hate the Jews?", *Collier's*, Volume 102, (26 November 1938); reprinted in *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), pp. 191-198, at 194, 196. Einstein expressed himself in a similar way to Peter A. Bucky, P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 87.

1581. T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), pp. 5-6, 25, 68, 93.

1582. L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), p. 137.

1583. J. Prinz, *Wir Juden*, Erich Reiss, Berlin, (1934), pp. 154-155.

1584. J. Prinz, *Wir Juden*, Erich Reiss, Berlin, (1934), p. 44.

1585. E. Bernstein, "Jews and German Social Democracy", *Die Zukunft* (New York), Volume 26, (March, 1921), pp. 145ff.; English translation in: P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), pp. 322-330. On Marx's alleged "self-hatred", *see*: H. Hirsch, "The Ugly Marx: Analysis of an 'Outspoken Anti-Semite'", *Philosophical Forum*, Volume 8, (1978), pp.150-162. *See also*: P. L. Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner*, Princeton University Press, (1990), pp. 296-305. *See also*: R. Grooms, "The

Racism of Marx and Engels”, *The Barnes Review*, Volume 2, Number 10, (October, 1996), pp. 3-8. Communists have always been opportunistic Jew baiters.

1586. *See especially* Chapter 5: L. Brenner, *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, Croom Helm, London, L. Hill, Westport, Connecticut, (1983).

<<http://www.aaargh-international.org/engl/zad/zad.html>>

1587. D. Bronder, *Bevor Hitler kam: Eine historische Studie*, Hans Pfeiffer Verlag, Hannover, (1964), p. 204 (p. 211 in the 1974 edition). H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974); English translation *Adolf Hitler: Founder of Israel*, Modjeskis’ Society Dedicated to Preservation of Cultures, San Diego, (1997).

1588. H. Koehler, *Inside the Gestapo: Hitler’s Shadow Over the World*, Pallas Pub. Co. Ltd., London, (1940). **See also:** H. Frank, *Im Angesicht des Galgens; Deutung Hitlers und seiner Zeit auf Grund eigener Erlebnisse und Erkenntnisse. Geschrieben im Nürnberger Justizgefängnis*, F. A. Beck, München-Gräfelfing, (1953), pp. 330-331. **See also:** D. Bronder, *Bevor Hitler kam: Eine historische Studie*, Hans Pfeiffer Verlag, Hannover, (1964), p. 204 (p. 211 in the 1974 edition). **See also:** H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974); English translation *Adolf Hitler: Founder of Israel*, Modjeskis’ Society Dedicated to Preservation of Cultures, San Diego, (1997).

1589. D. Bronder, *Bevor Hitler kam: Eine historische Studie*, Hans Pfeiffer Verlag, Hannover, (1964), pp. 203-204 (pp. 210-211 in the 1974 edition).

1590. “Who Were Hitler’s Jewish Soldiers”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (6 December 1996), p. 1. **See also:** W. Hoge, “Rare Look Uncovers Wartime Anguish of Many Part-Jewish Germans”, *The New York Times*, (6 April 1997), p. 16. **See also:** B. M. Rigg, *Hitler’s Jewish Soldiers: The Untold Story of Nazi Racial Laws and Men of Jewish Descent in the German Military*, University Press of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, (2002); **and** *Rescued from the Reich: How One of Hitler’s Soldiers Saved the Lubavitcher Rebbe*, Yale University Press, New Haven, (2004).

1591. E. Kaye, *The Hole in the Sheet: A Modern Woman Looks at Orthodox and Hasidic Judaism*, L. Stuart Inc., Secaucus, New Jersey, (1987).

1592. “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 353-354, 357-361.

1593. J. H. Brenner, “Self-Criticism”, in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 307-312. Brenner cites Mendele Moher Sefarim’s works (Mendele’s real name was Shalom Jacob Abramowitz).

1594. A. D. Gordon, *Kitve A. D. Gordon*, In Five Volumes, Tel-Aviv, ha-Va’ad ha-merkazi shel mifleget ha-Po’el ha-tsa’ir, (1927-1930), parts translated to English in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 371-386, *see especially* pp. 372, 376, 377, 379.

1595. B. Katzenelson, *Ba-Mivhan*, Tel-Aviv, (1935); parts translated to English in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 390-395, *see especially* pp. 390-391.

1596. V. Jabotinsky, *Evidence Submitted to the Palestine Royal Commission*, London, (1937), pp. 10-29; in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 559-570, 1t 560-561.

1597. M. Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: A Biography*, Delacorte Press, New York, (1978), p. 67.

1598. L. Brenner, *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, Chapter 2, Croom Helm, London, L. Hill, Westport, Connecticut, (1983), p. 24. *Brenner cites:* C. Greenberg, “The Myth of Jewish Parasitism”, *Jewish Frontiers*, (March, 1942), p. 20. Brenner also refers to Yehezkel

Kaufman, "Hurban Hanefesh: A Discussion of Zionism and Anti-Semitism", *Issues*, (Winter, 1967), p.106.

1599. See: *The Holocaust Chronicle*, Publications International, Ltd., Lincolnwood, Illinois, (2003), p. 177.

1600. M. Samuel, "Diaries of Theodor Herzl", in: M. W. Weisgal, *Theodor Herzl: A Memorial*, The New Palestine, New York, (1929), pp. 125-180, at 129. T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), pp. 4, 111.

1601. M. Nordau, *Der Sinn der Geschichte*, C. Duncker, Berlin, (1909); English translation: *The Interpretation of History*, Willey Book Co., New York, (1910), pp. 309-315.

1602. I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), p. 13.

1603. J. B. Agus, *The Meaning of Jewish History*, Volume 2, Abelard-Schuman, New York, (1963), pp. 410-411, 420.

1604. C. Lombroso, Italian: *L'Uomo di Genio*, Bocca, Torino, (1888); English: *The Man of Genius*, C. Scribner's Sons, New York, (1891); French: *L'Homme de Génie*, Alcan, Paris, (1889); **and** *Le Crime, Causes et Remèdes*, F. Alcan, Paris, (1907); English: *Crime: Its Causes and Remedies*, W. Heinemann, London, (1911); **and** *L'Uomo di Genio in Rapporto alla Psichiatria, alla Storia ed all'Estetica*, Fratelli Bocca, Torino, (1888); **and** *Applications de l'Anthropologie Criminelle*, Félix Alcan, Paris, (1892); **and** *Les Anarchistes*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1896); **and** *Le Più Recenti Scoperte ed Applicazioni della Psichiatria ed Antropologia Criminale*, Bocca, Torino, (1893); **and** *Palimpsesti del Carcere; Raccolta Unicamente Destinata Agli Uomini di Scienza*, Bocca, Torino, (1888); **and** *L'Anthropologie Criminelle et ses Récents Progrès*, F. Alcan, Paris, (1890); **and** French: *L'Antisemitismo e le Scienze Moderne*, L. Roux e C., Torino, (1894); German: *Der antisemitismus und die Juden im lichte der modernen Wissenschaft*, G.H. Wigand, Leipzig, (1894); **and** French: *L'Antisémitisme*, V. Giard & E. Brière, Paris, (1899); Spanish: *El Antisemitismo*, Viuda de Rodríguez Serra, Madrid, (1900's); **and** *L'Uomo Delinquente, in Rapporto all'Antropologia, alla Giurisprudenza ed alle Discipline Carcerarie: Delinquente-Nato e Pazzo Morale*, Fratelli Bocca, Torino, (1884); **and** *Kerker-Palimpseste; Wandinschriften und Selbstbekenntnisse gefangener Verbrecher*, Verlagsanstalt und Druckerei a.g., Hamburg, (1899); **and** *Criminal Man According to the Classification of Cesare Lombroso*, Patterson Smith, Montclair, New Jersey, (1911); **and** *L'Homme Criminel; Criminel-né, Fou Moral, Épileptique; Étude Anthropologique et Médico-Légale*, Alcan, Paris, (1887); **and** *Nuovi Studii sul Genio*, R. Sandrom, Milano, (1902); **and** *Les Applications de l'Anthropologie Criminelle*, Alcan, Paris, (1892); **and** *Crime: Its Causes and Remedies*, Little, Brown, Boston, (1911); **and** *L'Homme Criminel; Criminel né, fou Moral, Épileptique, Criminel fou, Criminel d'Occasion*, F. Alcan, Paris, (1895); **and** *Palimpsestes des Prisons Recueillis*, A. Storck, Lyon, (1894); **and** *Der Verbrecher, in anthropologischer, ärztlicher und juristischer Beziehung*, Richter, Hamburg, (1887-1890); **and** Italian: *Genio e Degenerazione. Nuovi Studi e Nuove Battaglie*, Sandron, Palermo, (1897); German: *Entartung und Genie*, G.H. Wigand, Leipzig, (1894); **and** *Genie und Irrsinn in ihren Beziehungen zum Gesetz, zur Kritik und zur Geschichte*, P. Reclam, Leipzig, (1887); **and** *Neue Fortschritte in den Verbrecherstudien*, Leipzig, (1894); **and** *Neue Verbrecherstudien. . .*, a.S., Carl Marhold, Halle, (1907); **and** *Die Anarchisten; eine kriminalpsychologische und socialogische Studie*, J.F. Richter, Hamburg, (1895); **and** **and** *Die Ursachen und Bekämpfung des Verbrechens*, H. Bermühler, Berlin, (1902); **and** *Genio e Follia; in Rapporto alla Medicina Legale, alla Critica ed alla Storia*, Bocca, Roma, (1882); **and** *Aplicaciones Judiciales y Médicas de la Antropología Criminal*, La España Moderna, Madrid, (1892); **and** *Les Palimpsestes des*

Prisons, A. Storck, Lyon, G. Masson, Paris, (1894); **and** *Der Selbstmord der Verbrecher insbesondere im Zellengefängnis*, Berlin, (1901); **and** *L'Homme Criminel: Etude Anthropologique et Psychiatrique*, Félix Alcan Ed., Paris, (1895); **and** *Criminal Man According to the Classification of Cesare Lombroso*, G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York, (1911); **and** *Genie und Entartung: Autorisierte Übersetzung aus dem Stalienischen*, P. Reclam, Leipzig, (1910); **and** *The Heredity of Acquired Characteristics*; **and** *L'Uomo Bianco e l'Uomo di Colore Letture su l'Origine e la Varietà delle Razze Umane*, Fratelli Bocca, Torino, Firenze, (1892); **and** *Studien über Genie und Entartung*, P. Reclam, Leipzig, (1910); **and** *Problemes du Jour*, Libr. Universelle, Paris, (1906); **and** *Lombroso und die Criminal-Anthropologie von heute*, Hubertusburg, (1897); **and** *L'Amore nel Suicidio e nel Delitto*, Ermanno Loescher, Torino, (1881); **and** *Criminal Anthropology: Its Origin and Application*, Forum Pub. Co., New York, (1895); **and** *The Physiognomy of the Anarchists*, Philadelphia, (1891/1993); **and** *Virchow und die Kriminalanthropologie*, (1896); **and** *The Physiology & Psychology of Crime*, American Institute for Psychological Research, Albuquerque, (1895/1980); **and** *Pazzi ed Anomali; Sággi*, Lapi, Città di Castello, (1886); **and** *Studj Clinici ed Esperimentali sulla Natura, Causa e Terapia della Pellaagra*, G. Bernardoni, Milano, (1870); **and** *Études de sociologie: Les Anarchistes*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1897). **See also:** C. Lombroso, E. Ferri, R. Garofalo, *Et al., Polemica in Difesa della Scuola Criminale Positiva*, N. Zanichelli, Bologna, (1886). **See also:** C. Lombroso, G. Regnier, and A. Bournet, *L'Homme Criminel; Étude Anthropologique et Médico-Légale*, F. Alcan, Paris, (1887). **See also:** C. Lombroso, R. Laschi, *Il Delitto Politico e le Rivoluzioni in Rapporto al Diritto, all'Antropologia Criminale ed alla Scienza di Governo. Con 10 Tavole e 21 Figure nel Testo*, Fratelli Bocca, Torino, (1890). **See also:** C. Lombroso, R. Laschi, Rodolfo, and A. Bouchard, *Le Crime Politique et les Révolutions par Rapport au Droit, à l'Anthropologie Criminelle et à la Science du Gouvernement*, F. Alcan, Paris, (1892). **See also:** C. Lombroso, R. Laschi, Rudolfo, H. Kurella, *Der politische Verbrecher und die Revolutionen in anthropologischer, juristischer und staatswissenschaftlicher Beziehung*, Verlagsanstalt und Druckerei, Hamburg, (1891-1892). **See also:** C. Lombroso, G. Ferrero, Italian: *La Donna Delinquente: La Prostituta e la Donna Normale*, L. Roux, Torino, (1893); German: *Das Weib als Verbrecherin und Prostituirte: Anthropologische Studien, gegründet auf eine Darstellung der Biologie und Psychologie des normalen Weibes*, Verlagsanstalt und Druckerei, Hamburg, (1894); French: *La Femme Criminelle et la Prostituée*, F. Alcan, Paris, (1896); English: *The Female Offender*, T.F. Unwin, London, (1895). **See also:** P. Näcke, C. Lombroso, *Ein Willkommengruss von Herrn Lombroso*, Leipzig, (1894). **See also:** L. Fratiny, C. Lombroso, *Une Interview. Criminalité Génialité: C. Lombroso Jugé par Mignozzi-Bianchi*, Firenze, (1909).

1605. I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), p. 13.

1606. *Abodah Zarah* 26b.

1607. J. Stern, *Terror in the Name of God: Why Religious Militants Kill*, Ecco, New York, (2003), p. 91.

1608. M. Hess, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English translation, *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918/1943), pp. 62-63.

1609. G. E. Griffin, "The Rothschild Formula", *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Chapter 11, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), pp. 217-234.

1610. English translation from: P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967). p. 304.

1611. B. Lazare, *Antisemitism: Its History and Causes*, (1894), pp. 182-183. *L'Antisémitisme, son Histoire et ses Causes*, L. Chailley, Paris, (1894).

1612. A. Hitler and D. Eckart, *Der Bolschewismus von Moses bis Lenin*, Hoheneichen-Verlag, München, (1924); English translation by W. L. Pierce, *Bolshevism from Moses to Lenin: A Dialogue between Adolf Hitler and Me*, World Union of National Socialists, Arlington, Virginia, (1966).

1613. D. Eckart, quoted in A. Hitler, translated by R. Manheim with an introduction by A. Foxman, *Mein Kampf*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, New York, (1999), p. 687.

1614. J. R. Marcus, *The Rise and Destiny of the German Jew*, The Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Cincinnati, (1934), p. 62.

1615. M. Kahane, *On Jews and Judaism: Selected Articles 1961-1990*, Volume 1, Institute for the Publication of the Writings of Rabbi Meir Kahane, Jerusalem, (1993), p. 104.

1616. J. Stern, *Terror in the Name of God: Why Religious Militants Kill*, Ecco, New York, (2003), p. 105. Stern cites E. Sprinzak, "From Messianic Pioneering to Vigilante Terrorism", in D. C. Rapoport, Editor, *Inside Terrorist Organizations*, Frank Cass, London, (1988), pp. 194-216.

1617. B. Kimmerling, "Israel's Culture of Martyrdom", *The Nation*, (10-17 January 2005), pp. 29-30, 33-34, 36, 38, 40, at 29; which is a review of I. Zertal, *Israel's Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood*, Cambridge University Press, (2005); and Y. Grodzinsky, *In the Shadow of the Holocaust: The Struggle Between Jews and Zionists in the Aftermath of World War II*, Common Courage Press, Monroe, Maine, (2004).

1618. Philo the Jew, "Flaccus" and "On the Embassy to Gaius", *The Works of Philo*, Hendrick Publishing, U. S. A., (2000), pp. 725-741 and 757-790. Josephus, "Against Apion", *The Works of Josephus*.

1619. R. Garaudy, *Les Mythes Fondateurs de la Politique Israélienne*, Samisdat, Paris, (1996); English translations: *The Founding Myths of Israeli Politics*, and *The Mythical Foundations of Israeli Policy*, Studies Forum International, London, (1997) and *The Founding Myths of Modern Israel*, Institute for Historical Review, Newport Beach, California, (2000). **See also:** N. Finkelstein, , *The Holocaust Industry: Reflection on the Exploitation of Jewish Suffering*, Verso, London, New York, (2000); and *Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-semitism and the Abuse of History*, University of California Press, Berkeley, (2005). **See also:** B. Kimmerling, "Israel's Culture of Martyrdom", *The Nation*, (10-17 January 2005), pp. 29-30, 33-34, 36, 38, 40; which is a review of I. Zertal, *Israel's Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood*, Cambridge University Press, (2005); and Y. Grodzinsky, *In the Shadow of the Holocaust: The Struggle Between Jews and Zionists in the Aftermath of World War II*, Common Courage Press, Monroe, Maine, (2004).

1620. Rudolf Glandeck Freiherr von Sebottendorf (b. Adam Alfred Rudolf Glauer), *Bevor Hitler kam: Urkundliches aus der Frühzeit der nationalsozialistischen Bewegung*, Grassinger, München, (1933).

1621. E. T. S. Dugdale, "The 25 Points", *The Programme of the N.S.D.A.P. and its General Conceptions*, Franz Eher Nachf., Munich (1932), pp. 18-20, at 19; reprinted as an Appendix "The Program of the National Socialist German Workers Party" in K. G. W. Ludecke, *I Knew Hitler: The Story of a Nazi AWho Escaped the Blood Purge*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, (1937), pp. 793-796, at 795, note 1.

1622. G. Knopp, M. P. Remy, "Hitler: The Private Man", *The Rise and Fall of Adolf Hitler*, Volume 1, Video Documentary, The History Channel, (1995).

1623. H. Rauschnig, *Germany's Revolution of Destruction*, W. Heinemann, London, Toronto, (1939); **and** *The Revolution of Nihilism: Warning to the West*, Alliance Book Corp., New York, Longmans, Green & Co.; **and** (1939); **and** *The Voice of Destruction*, Putnam,

New York, (1939); **and** *Germany's Revolution of Destruction*, W. Heinemann, London, (1939); **and** *Hitler Speaks: A Series of Political Conversations with Adolf Hitler on His Real Aims*, T. Butterworth Ltd., London, (1939); **and** *Hitler's Aims in War and Peace*, W. Heinemann London, Toronto,(1939); **and** *Hitler Could Not Stop*, New York, Council on Foreign Relations, Inc., (1939); **and** *The Revolution of Nihilism: Warning to the West*, New York, Alliance Book Corp., Longmans, Green & Co., (1940); **and** *Hitler and the War*, American Council on Public Affairs, Washington, D.C., (1940); **and** *Verboten! The book that Hitler Fears*, Kelly and Walsh, Shanghai, (1940); **and** *Make and Break with the Nazis: Letters on a Conservative Revolution*, Secker and Warburg, London, (1941); **and** *The Beast from the Abyss*, W. Heinemann, London, (1941); **and** *Hitler Wants the World*, Argus Press, London, (1941); **and** *The Redemption of Democracy: The Coming Atlantic Empire*, Alliance Corp., New York, (1941); **and** *The Conservative Revolution*, G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York, (1941); **and** *Makers of Destruction*, Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, (1942); **and** *Men of Chaos*, G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York, (1942); **and** *Time of Delirium*, D. Appleton-Century company, Inc. New York, London, (1946).

1624. H. Rauschnig, "Hitler Told Me This", *The American Mercury*, Volume 48, Number 192, (December, 1939), pp. 385-393, at 389.

1625. H.W. Koch, "1933: The Legality of Hitler's Rise to Power", *Aspects of the Third Reich*, St. Martin's Press, New York, (1985), p. 39. C. Zentner and F. Bedürftig, *The Encyclopedia of the Third Reich*, Volume 2, Macmillan, New York, Toronto, (1991), p. 757. S. W. Mitscham, *Why Hitler?: The Genesis of the Nazi Reich*, Praeger, Westport, Connecticut, (1996), p. 137.

1626. B. Katzenelson, *Ba-Mivhan*, Tel-Aviv, (1935), pp. 67-70; translated to English in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 390-395, at 395.

1627. T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), pp. 23, 99.

1628. T. Herzl, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, In Five Volumes, Herzl Press, New York, (1960).

1629. C. Weizmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1949), p. 201.

1630. A. H. Silver, *Vision and Victory*, Zionist Organization of America, New York, (1949); as quoted in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 592-600, at 593-594.

1631. "Rule till 1937 Sought", *The New York Times*, (21 March 1933), pp. 1, 11.

1632. "Two Dictatorships", *The London Times*, (7 August 1935), p. 11.

1633. J. Goebbels, *Communism with the Mask Off. Speech Delivered in Nürnberg on September 13th, 1935 at the Seventh National Socialist Party Congress.*, M. Müller, Berlin, (1935).

1634. "Man of the Year", *Time*, Volume 33, Number 1, (2 January 1939), pp. 11-14.

1635. A. C. Sutton, *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*, GSG & Associates, San Pedro, California, (2002).

1636. J. Goebbels and Mjöltnir—pseudonym of the caricature artist Hans Schweitzer, *Die verfluchten Hakenkreuzler: Etwas zum Nachdenken*, Verl. F. Eher, München, (1929). **See also:** J. Goebbels, *Die zweite Revolution: Briefe an Zeitgenossen*, Streiter-Verlag Zwickau (Sa.), (1926); **and** "Goldene Worte für einen Diktator und für solche, die es werden wollen", *Der Angriff*, (1 September 1932); reprinted in: *Wetterleuchten: Aufsätze aus der Kampfzeit*, Zentralverlag der NSDAP., Franz Eher Nachf., München, (1939), pp. 325-327.

1637. M. Burleigh, *The Third Reich: A New History*, Hill and Wang, New York, (2000), p. 789. Burleigh cites: H. R. Trevor-Roper, *The Last Days of Hitler*, Fourth Edition, Macmillan,

London, (1971), p. 51.

1638. M. Burleigh, *The Third Reich: A New History*, Hill and Wang, New York, (2000), pp. 790-791. Burleigh cites: “. . . warum dann überhaupt noch leben!’ Hitlers Legebepreungen am 23, 25 und 27 April 1945”, *Der Spiegel*, Volume 3, Number 20, (10 January 1966), pp. 32-46; **and** S. Behrenbeck, *Der Kult um die toten Helden: Nationalsozialistische Mythen, Riten und Symbole 1923 bis 1945*, SH-Verlag, Vierow, (1996), p. 584.

1639. M. Burleigh, *The Third Reich: A New History*, Hill and Wang, New York, (2000), p. 791. Burleigh cites: J. Noakes and G. Pridham, Editors, *Nazism, 1919-1945: A Documentary Reader*, Volume 4, Document 1397, University of Exeter Press, Exeter, United Kingdom, (1998), p. 667.

1640. M. Burleigh, *The Third Reich: A New History*, Hill and Wang, New York, (2000), p. 789.

1641. R. Payne, *The Life and Death of Adolf Hitler*, Praeger Publishers, New York, (1973), p. 541. Payne cites: H. Guderian, *Panzer Leader*, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1952), p. 423.

1642. M. Burleigh, *The Third Reich: A New History*, Hill and Wang, New York, (2000), p. 791. Burleigh cites: “. . . warum dann überhaupt noch leben!’ Hitlers Legebepreungen am 23, 25 und 27 April 1945”, *Der Spiegel*, Volume 3, Number 20, (10 January 1966), pp. 32-46; **and** S. Behrenbeck, *Der Kult um die toten Helden: Nationalsozialistische Mythen, Riten und Symbole 1923 bis 1945*, SH-Verlag, Vierow, (1996), p. 584.

1643. A. O’Hare McCormick, “Hitler Seeks Jobs for All Germans”, *The new York Times*, (10 July 1933), pp. 1, 6, at 6.

1644. R. Payne, *The Life and Death of Adolf Hitler*, Praeger Publishers, New York, (1973), p. 542. Payne cites: M. Bormann, H. R. Trevor-Roper, Editor, *The Bormann Letters*, Nicolson and Weidenfeld, London, (1954), pp. 103-104.

1645. M. Hess, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English translation by M. Waxman: *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918/1943), pp. 177-178.

1646. English translation in: R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 222-223, at 223. An alternative translation appears in: “Holocaust”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 8, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), col. 852.

1647. A. Hitler in M. Domarus, Editor, *Hitler: Reden und Proklamationen, 1932-1945: Kommentiert von einem deutschen Zeitgenossen*, Süddeutscher Verlag, München, (1965), pp. 1057-1058.

1648. H. Frank, (16 December 1941), quoted in: *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*, Volume 2, United States, Office of Chief of Counsel for the Prosecution of Axis Criminality, Washington, D. C., United States Government Printing Office, (1946), p. 634. **See also:** Y. Arad, Yitzhak, I. Gutman, A. Margalio, Abraham, Editors, *Documents on the Holocaust: Selected Sources on the Destruction of the Jews of Germany and Austria, Poland, and the Soviet Union*, Yad Vashem in cooperation with the Anti-Defamation League and Ktav Pub. House, Jerusalem, (1981).

1649. H. Frank quoted in H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974).

1650. A. Hitler, “My Political Testament”, English translation in: R. Payne, *The Life and Death of Adolf Hitler*, Praeger Publishers, New York, (1973), pp. 589-591, at 589.

1651. A. Hitler, “Staatsmänner oder Nationalverbrecher”, *Völkischer Beobachter* (formerly Thule’s *Münchner Beobachter*), (15 March 1921), p. 2.

1652. A. Hitler, *Hitler’s Secret Book*, Grove Press, New York, (1928/1962).

- 1653.** K. J. Herrmann, “Historical Perspectives on Political Zionism and Antisemitism”, *Zionism & Racism: Proceedings of an International Symposium*, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Tripoli, (1977), pp. 197-210, at 204-205. A lengthy quotation from Klatzkin, in English translation, appears in: M. Menuhin, *The Decadence of Judaism in Our Time*, Exposition Press, New York, (1965), pp. 482-483.
- 1654.** N. Syrkin, under the nom de plume “Ben Elieser”, *Die Judenfrage und der sozialistische Judenstaat*, Steiger, Bern, (1898); English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 333-350, at 343.
- 1655.** B. D. Wolfe, *Marxism: One Hundred Years in the Life of a Doctrine*, Dial Press, New York, (1965), p. 67. Wolfe cites: “From Engels’s introduction to the reissue of a pamphlet by Sigismund Borkheim. Borkheim’s pamphlet, *Zur Erinnerung fuer die deutschen Mordspatrioten 1806-07* [***] The introduction is reproduced in *Werke*, Vol. XXI, pp. 350-351.”
- 1656.** A. Einstein, “Unpublished Preface to a Blackbook”, *Out of My Later Years*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1950), pp. 258-259, at 259.
- 1657.** B. Lazare, “Jewish Nationalism and Emancipation (1897-1899)”, in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea: A Historical Analysis and Reader*, Garden City, N.Y. Doubleday, (1959), pp. 471-476, at 471.
- 1658.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 84.
- 1659.** A. H. Silver, *Vision and Victory*, Zionist Organization of America, New York, (1949); in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 592-600, at 597.
- 1660.** A. M. Lilienthal, *What Price Israel*, Henry Regnery Company, Chicago, (1953), pp. vi-viii, 239. *See also*: “Israel’s Flag Is Not Mine”, *Reader’s Digest*, (September, 1949), pp. 49-53. “The State of Israel and the State of the Jew”, *Vital Speeches of the Day*, Volume 16, Number 13, (15 April 1950). *See also*: R. Garaudy, *Les Mythes Fondateurs de la Politique Israélienne*, Samisdat, Paris, (1996); English translations: *The Founding Myths of Israeli Politics*, and *The Mythical Foundations of Israeli Policy*, Studies Forum International, London, (1997) and *The Founding Myths of Modern Israel*, Institute for Historical Review, Newport Beach, California, (2000). *See also*: B. Kimmerling, “Israel’s Culture of Martyrdom”, *The Nation*, (10-17 January 2005), pp. 29-30, 33-34, 36, 38, 40; which is a review of I. Zertal, *Israel’s Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood*, Cambridge University Press, (2005); and Y. Grodzinsky, *In the Shadow of the Holocaust: The Struggle Between Jews and Zionists in the Aftermath of World War II*, Common Courage Press, Monroe, Maine, (2004).
- 1661.** Letter from P. Ehrenfest to A. Einstein of 8 February 1920, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 303, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 251-254, at 254.
- 1662.** Letter from P. Ehrenfest to A. Einstein of 9 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 203, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 173-175, at 174.
- 1663.** Letter from P. Ehrenfest to A. Einstein of 9 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 203, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 173-175, at 175.
- 1664.** R. P. Boas, “The Problem of American Judaism”, *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 119, Number 2, (February, 1917), pp. 145-152.
- 1665.** K. G. W. Ludecke, *I Knew Hitler: The Story of a Nazi AWho Escaped the Blood Purge*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1937), pp. 191-218.

- 1666.** D. Reed, *Disgrace Abounding*, Jonathan Cape, London, (1939), pp. 249, 251.
- 1667.** J. Klatzkin, *Tehumim: Ma'amarim*, Devir, Berlin, (1925). English translation in J. B. Agus, *The Meaning of Jewish History*, Volume 2, Abelard-Schuman, New York, (1963), p. 425-426.
- 1668.** L. Simon, Introduction to A. Einstein, Edited by L. Simon, *About Zionism: Speeches and Letters by Professor Albert Einstein*, Macmillan, New York, (1931), pp. 9-12.
- 1669.** "Text of Untermeyer's Address", *The New York Times*, (7 August 1933), p. 4. **See also:** "Untermeyer Back, Greeted in Harbor", *The New York Times*, (7 August 1933), p. 4.
- 1670.** N. Syrkin, under the nom de plume "Ben Elieser", *Die Judenfrage und der sozialistische Judenstaat*, Steiger, Bern, (1898); English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 333-350, at 338-340.
- 1671.** *Central-Verein Zeitung*, Volume, 9, Number 28, (11 July 1930); and Volume 9, Number 37, (12 September 1930); and Volume 9, Number 38, (19 September 1930). K. Polkehn, "The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82.
- 1672.** K. Polkehn, "The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 56-57.
- 1673.** P. W. Fabry, *Mutmassungen über Hitler: Urteile von Zeitgenossen*, Droste, Düsseldorf, (1969), p. 130. Fabry cites: *Israelischen Familienblatt*.
- 1674.** L. Lewisohn, "A Year of Crisis", in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 488-492, at 489. Hertzberg cites: L. Lewisohn, *Rebirth* (editor), New York, (1935), pp. 290-296.
- 1675.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 61.
- 1676.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 62.
- 1677.** Letter from A. Einstein to the Prussian Academy of Sciences of 5 April 1933, *The World As I See It*, Citadel, New York, (1993), pp. 82-84, at 83.
- 1678.** *Reproduced in:* F. Jerome, *The Einstein File*, St. Martin's Press, New York, (2002), second plate following page 170.
- 1679.** A. Einstein, "Time, Space and Gravitation", *The Times* (London), (28 November 1919), pp. 13-14; reprinted in *Science* and in E. E. Slossen, *Easy Lessons in Einstein*, Harcourt Brace and Howe, New York, (1920), pp. 109-114. Einstein was perhaps inspired to make this remark by a letter from A. F. Lindemann of 23 November 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 174, Princeton University Press, (2004). Einstein told Ehrenfest of his joke in a letter of 4 December 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 189, Princeton University Press, (2004).
- 1680.** D. Fahey, *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, Browne and Nolan Limited, London, (1935), p. 77.
- 1681.** *The Jewish Chronicle*, (17 June 1921), p. 26.
- 1682.** M. Nordau, "Max Nordau on the General Situation of the Jews", *The Jewish Chronicle*, (3 September 1897), pp. 7-9, at 8.
- 1683.** *Daily Graphic* as quoted in *The Jewish Chronicle*, (17 June 1921), p. 26.
- 1684.** *See:* "Challenges Prof. Einstein: St. Paul Professor Asserts Relativity Theory Was Advanced in 1866", *The New York Times*, (10 April 1921), p. 21.
- 1685.** "Einstein Refuses to Debate Theory: Dean Reuter Dahl's Challenge to Discuss Relativity Declined as Detraction from Mission", *New York American*, (12 April 1921).
- 1686.** A. Einstein, "Een interview met Prof. Einstein", *Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant*, (4 July 1921). English translation found in, M. Janssen, *et al* Editors, *The Collected Papers of*

- Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Appendix D, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 623.
- 1687.** R. S. Shankland, "Conversations with Albert Einstein", *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 56.
- 1688.** H. Dukas and B. Hoffmann, *Albert Einstein: The Human Side*, Princeton University Press, (1979), p. 55.
- 1689.** C. Weizmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1949), p. 201.
- 1690.** J. Prinz, *Wir Juden*, Erich Reiss, Berlin, (1934), pp. 50-55. Letter from A. Einstein to M. Born of 22 March 1934, in M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), pp. 121-122.
- 1691.** C. Weizmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1949), p. 201. We must be careful not to confuse Kerensky and his "liberalism" with Lenin, Chernyshevsky and "Bolshevism".
- 1692.** C. Weizmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1949), pp. 31-35, 42, 47, 50-53, 65, 82, 156-163, 200-207, 288-289.
- 1693.** C. Weizmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann*, Harper, New York, (1949), p. 289.
- 1694.** M. Nordau, *Der Zionismus*, Jüdischen Volksstimme, Brünn, (ca. 1898), pp. 8, 14. **See also:** M. Nordau, *Die Tragödie der Assimilation*, Berlin, Wien, R. Löwit, (1920).
- 1695.** C. Weizmann, *Trial and Error: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1949), p. 289.
- 1696.** Letter from A. Einstein to M. Born of 22 March 1934, in M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), pp. 121-122.
- 1697.** A. Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), p. 213. **See also:** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 63.
- 1698.** D. Eckart and A. Hitler, *Der Bolschewismus von Moses bis Lenin: Zwiegespräch zwischen Adolf Hitler und mir*, Hoheneichen-Verlag, München, (1924); English translation by W. L. Pierce, "Bolshevism from Moses to Lenin", *National Socialist World*, (1966). URL: <<http://www.jrbooksonline.com/DOCs/Eckart.doc>> p. 7.
- 1699.** K. J. Herrmann, "Historical Perspectives on Political Zionism and Antisemitism", *Zionism & Racism: Proceedings of an International Symposium*, International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Tripoli, (1977), pp. 197-210, at page 208.
- 1700.** Letter from P. Ehrenfest to A. Einstein of 9 December 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 203, Princeton University Press, (2004).
- 1701.** M. Shonfeld, *The Holocaust Victims Accuse: Documents and Testimony on Jewish War Criminals*, Neturei Karta of U.S.A., Brooklyn, (1977).
- 1702.** Rabbi M. D. Weissmandel, *Min ha-metsar: zikhronot mi-shenot 702-705*, Hotsa'at Emunah, New York, (1960); **and** *Ten Questions to the Zionists*, (1974). **See also:** L. Brenner, *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, Croom Helm, London, L. Hill, Westport, Connecticut, (1983); **and** *51 Documents: Zionist Collaboration with the Nazis*, Barricade Books Inc., Fort Lee, New Jersey, (2002). **See also:** M. J. Nurenberger, *The Scared and the Doomed: The Jewish Establishment Vs. The Six Million*, Mosaic Press, Oakville, New York, (1985). **See also:** W. R. Perl, *The Holocaust Conspiracy: An International Policy of Genocide*, Shapolsky Publishers, New York, (1989). **See also:** T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and Wang, New York, (1993).
- 1703.** Rabbi E. Schwartz, "WHY DO YOU VIOLATE G'D'S ORDER? IT WILL NOT SUCCEED", *The New York Times*, (18 May 1993), p. A16.

- 1704.** A. Einstein, A. Engel translator, “How I became a Zionist”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 57, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 234-235, at 235.
- 1705.** E. Wiesel, *Legends of Our Time*, Schocken Books, New York, (1982), p. 142.
- 1706.** D. K. Shipler, “Most West Bank Arabs Blaming U. S. for Impasse”, *The New York Times*, (14 April 1983), p. A3; **and** “Israel’s Military Chief Retires and Is Replaced by His Deputy”, *The New York Times*, (20 April 1983), p. A8; **and** “The Israeli Army Signs a Political Truce”, *The New York Times*, Section 4, (15 May 1983), p. 3. **See also:** A. Lewis, “Hope Against Hope”, *The New York Times*, Section 4, (17 April 1983), p. 19; **and** “The New Israel; Away from the Early Zionist Dream”, *The New York Times*, (30 July 1984), p. A21. **See also:** J. Kuttab, “West Bank Arabs Foresee Expulsion”, *The New York Times*, (1 August 1983), p. A15. **See also:** A. Cowell, “Israel Frees More Prisoners, But Arabs Are Not Mollified”, *The New York Times*, (4 March 1994), p. A10. **See also:** Y. M. Ibrahim, “Palestinians See a People’s Hatred in a Killer’s Deed”, *The New York Times*, (6 March 1994), p. E16.
- 1707.** “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 330.
- 1708.** R. Romain, *La Conscience de l’Europe*, Volume 1, pp. 696ff. English translation from A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein: A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), pp. 365-367. **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to R. Romain of 15 September 1915, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 118, Princeton University Press, (1998); **and** Letter from A. Einstein to R. Romain of 22 August 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 374, Princeton University Press, (1998).
- 1709.** J. Bacque, *Other Losses: An Investigation into the Mass Deaths of German Prisoners at the Hands of the French and Americans after World War II*, Stoddart, Toronto, (1989).
- 1710.** Letter from A. Einstein to Paul Ehrenfest of 22 March 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 10, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 9-10, at 10.
- 1711.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 35, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 156-157.
- 1712.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 111.
- 1713.** A. Unsöld, “Albert Einstein — Ein Jahr danach”, *Physikalische Blätter*, Volume 36, (1980), pp.337-339; **and** Volume 37, Number 7, (1981), p. 229.
- 1714.** A. Einstein, “Atomic War or Peace”, *Atlantic Monthly*, (November, 1945, and November 1947); *as reprinted in:* A. Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), p. 125.
- 1715.** A. Einstein, “To the Heroes of the Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto”, *Bulletin of the Society of Polish Jews*, New York, (1944), reprinted in *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), pp. 212-213.
- 1716.** A. Einstein, quoted in O. Nathan and H. Norton, *Einstein on Peace*, Avenel Books, New York, (1981), p. 331.
- 1717.** A. Einstein quoted in A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein: A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), pp. 727-728.
- 1718.** M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 189.
- 1719.** M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 199.
- 1720.** “A Modest Proposal”, *Time Magazine*, Volume 37, Number 12, (24 March 1941), pp. 95-96.

1721. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 56.

1722. W. Diewerge, *Das Kriegsziel der Weltplutokratie: dokumentarische Veröffentlichung zu dem Buch des Präsidenten der amerikanischen Friedensgesellschaft Theodore Nathan Kaufman "Deutschland muss sterben" ("Germany must perish")*, Zentral Verlag der NSDAP, F. Eher Nachf., Berlin, (1941). *See also:* *Wenn Du dieses Zeichen siehst. . .*, NSDAP Propaganda Brochure, (November, 1941). *See also:* H. Goitsch, *Niemals!*, Zentral Verlag der NSDAP, F. Eher Nachf., Berlin, (1944). *See also:* *Der Angriff*, (23 July 1941). *See also:* *Das Reich*, (3 August 1941). *See also:* "Nazis Attack Roosevelt", *The New York Times*, (24 July 1941), p. 8. *See also:* "Jews of Hanover Forced from Homes", *The New York Times*, (9 September 1941), p. 4; and Kaufman's response, p. 4.

1723. É. Durkheim, *"Germany above All" The German Mental Attitude and the War*, Librairie Armand Colin, Paris, (1915). *See also:* "By a German", *I Accuse! (J'Accuse!)*, Grosset & Dunlap, New York, (1915). *See also:* W. F. Barry, *The World's Debate: An Historical Defence of the Allies*, George H. Doran, New York, (1917). *See also:* W. T. Hornaday, *A Searchlight on Germany: Germany's Blunders, Crimes and Punishment*, American Defense Society, New York, (1917). *See also:* D. W. Johnson, *Plain Words from America: A Letter to a German Professor*, London, New York, Toronto, Hodder & Stoughton, (1917).

1724. M. Hess, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English: *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918).

1725. T. N. Kaufman, *Germany Must Perish!*, Argyle Press, Newark, New Jersey, (1941), pp. 88-89, 93, 94, 96.

1726. T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and Wang, New York, (1993), p. 142.

1727. An English translation of the minutes appears in: R. S. Levy, "Wannsee Conference on the Final Solution of the Jewish Question", *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D.C. Heath, Toronto, (1991), pp. 252-258; *see also:* pp. 250-252.

1728. *Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal, Nuremberg, 14 November 1945 — 1 October 1946*, Volume 12, Secretariat of the Tribunal, Nuremberg, Germany, p. 315.

1729. *Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal, Nuremberg, 14 November 1945 — 1 October 1946*, Volume 12, Secretariat of the Tribunal, Nuremberg, Germany, p. 316.

1730. *Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal, Nuremberg, 14 November 1945 — 1 October 1946*, Volume 12, Secretariat of the Tribunal, Nuremberg, Germany, p. 316.

1731. M. Roseman, *The Wannsee Conference and the Final Solution: A Reconsideration*, Henry Holt, New York, (2002), p. 105. Roseman cites: R. M. W. Kempner, *Eichmann und Komplizen*, Europa Verlag, Zürich, (1961), pp. 152-153.

1732. Refer to Eichmann's testimony at trial, and: A. Eichmann, "Eichmann Tells His Own Damning Story", *Life Magazine*, Volume 49, Number 22, (28 November 1960), pp. 19-25, 101-112; and "Eichmann's Own Story: Part II", *Life Magazine*, (5 December 1960), pp. 146-161.

1733. K. G. W. Ludecke, *I Knew Hitler: The Story of a Nazi AWho Escaped the Blood Purge*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, (1937), pp. 191-218.

1734. English translation in: R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 127-128, at 128.

1735. English translation in: R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 222-223, at 223. An alternative translation appears in: "Holocaust", *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 8, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), col. 852.

1736. A. Hitler in M. Domarus, Editor, *Hitler: Reden und Proklamationen, 1932-1945: Kommentiert von einem deutschen Zeitgenossen*, Süddeutscher Verlag, München, (1965), pp. 1057-1058.

1737. H. Frank, (16 December 1941), quoted in: *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*, Volume 2, United States, Office of Chief of Counsel for the Prosecution of Axis Criminality, Washington, D. C., United States Government Printing Office, (1946), p. 634. **See also:** Y. Arad, Yitzhak, I. Gutman, A. Margalioth, Abraham, Editors, *Documents on the Holocaust: Selected Sources on the Destruction of the Jews of Germany and Austria, Poland, and the Soviet Union*, Yad Vashem in cooperation with the Anti-Defamation League and Ktav Pub. House, Jerusalem, (1981).

1738. H. Frank quoted in H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974).

1739. The exact phrasing depends upon translation, but one finds such phrases in: A. Ha-Am, "The Negation of the Diaspora", in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 270-277, at 272-273, 277.

1740. N. Sokolow, *History of Zionism 1600-1918*, Volume 1, Longmans, Green and Co., New York, (1919), p. xvii.

1741. P. S. Mowrer, "The Assimilation of Israel", *The Atlantic Monthly*, Volume 128, Number 1, (July, 1921), pp. 101-110.

1742. B. L. Brasol, *The World at the Cross Roads*, Small, Mayhard & Co., Boston, (1921), pp. 371-379.

1743. English translation in: K. Polkehn, "The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 59.

1744. J. Prinz, "Zionism under the Nazi Government", *Young Zionist* (London), (November, 1937), p. 18; *as quoted in:* L. Brenner, *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, Chapter 5, Croom Helm, London, L. Hill, Westport, Connecticut, (1983), p. 47.

1745. E. M. Friedman, "Zionism and the American Spirit", *Forum*, Volume 58, (July, 1917), pp. 67-80; *reprinted as: Zionism and the American Spirit: A New Perspective*, University Zionist Society, New York, (1917).

1746. I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), p. 18.

1747. T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), p. 29.

1748. L. Kellner, "Eröffnungsrede zum ersten Kongress", *Theodor Herzls Zionistische Schriften*, Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, (1920), p. 139-144, at 140.

1749. E. K. Dühring, *Die Judenfrage als Racen-, Sitten- und Culturfrage: mit einer weltgeschichtlichen Antwort*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, (1881); English translation by A. Jacob, *Eugen Dühring on the Jews*, Nineteen Eighty Four Press, Brighton, England, (1997), pp. 211-212. **See also:** E. K. Dühring, *Der Werth des Lebens: Eine Denkerbetrachtung im Sinne heroischer Lebensauffassung*, Fifth Edition, Reisland, Leipzig, (1894), p. 9.

1750. Confer: W. Daim, *Der Mann, der Hitler die Ideen gab: Jörg Lanz von Liebenfels*, Third Improved Edition, Ueberreuter, Wien, (1994).

1751. M. Buber, "Das Judentum und die Juden", *Drei Reden über das Judentum*, Rütten & Loening, Frankfurt a. M., (1911); English translation: "Judaism and the Jews", *On Judaism*,

Schocken Books, New York, (1967), pp. 11-21, at 15, 19.

1752. J. R. Marcus, *The Rise and Destiny of the German Jew*, The Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Cincinnati, (1934), pp. 61-62.

1753. F. v. Hellwald, *Culturgeschichte in ihrer natürlichen Entwicklung bis zur Gegenwart*, Lampart & Comp., Augsburg, (1875); and “Der Kampf ums Dasein im Menschen- und Völkerleben”, *Das Ausland*, Volume 45, (1872), pp. 105ff., *see also: Das Ausland*, (1872), 901ff., 957ff. **See also:** R. Weikart, *The Human Life Review*, Volume 30, Number 2, (Spring 2004), pp. 29-37; and *From Darwin to Hitler: Evolutionary Ethics, Eugenics, and Racism in Germany*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, (2004).

1754. F. Galton, *Hereditary Genius: An Inquiry into its Laws and Consequences*, Macmillan, London, (1869); and *Inquiries into Human Faculty and its Development*, Macmillan and Co., London, (1883); and *The Possible Improvement of the Human Breed under the Existing Conditions of Law and Sentiment*, Washington, D. C., (1902). **See also:** The journal *Biometrika*.

1755. W. D. Gould, “The Religious Opinions of Thomas Jefferson”, *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Volume 20, Number 2, (September, 1933), pp. 191-208, at 202.

1756. Letter from T. Jefferson to B. Rush of 21 April 1803, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Volume 10, Issued Under the Auspices of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association of the United States, Washington, D.C., (1905), pp. 379-385, at 381-382.

1757. R. H. Williams, *The Ultimate World Order—As Pictured in “The Jewish Utopia”*, CPA Book Publisher, Boring, Oregon, (1957?), pp. 43-47.

1758. *The Cause of World Unrest*, G. Richards, Ltd., London, G.P. Putnam, New York, (1920); which reproduces articles which first appeared in *The Morning Post* of London.

1759. “The Jewish Peril, a Disturbing Pamphlet: Call for Inquiry”, *The London Times*, (8 May 1920).

1760. English: *The International Jew: The World’s Foremost Problem*, In Four Volumes, (1920-1922); which reproduces articles which first appeared in *THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT*. **German:** *Der internationale Jude*, Hammer-Verlag, (1922). **Russian:** *Mezhdunarodnoe evreistvo: perevod s angliiskago*, (1925). **Italian:** *L’Internazionale Ebraica. Protocolli dei “Savi Anziani” di Sion*, La Vita Italiana, Rassegna Mensile di Politica, Roma, (1921). **Spanish:** B. Wenzel, *El Judío Internacional: Un Problema del Mundo*, Hammer-Verlag, Leipzig, (1930). **Portuguese:** S. E. Castan and H. Ford, *O Judeu Internacional*, Revisão, Porto Alegre, RS, Brasil, (1989).

1761. See: “The Government and Palestine. Mr. Churchill’s Statement”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (17 June 1921), pp. 17-19. **See also:** “Mr. Churchill’s Vision”, *The London Times*, (15 June 1921), p. 10.

1762. W. Churchill quoted in B. Avishai, *The Tragedy of Zionism: Revolution and Democracy in the Land of Israel*, Farrar Straus Giroux, New York, (1985), p. 349. **See also:** J. B. Agus, *The Meaning of Jewish History*, Volume 2, Abelard-Schuman, New York, (1963), p.431. **See also:** A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 594.

1763. C. Sykes, *Crossroads to Israel*, Indiana University Press, (1973), p. 207.

1764. N. Goldman, “Zionismus und nationale Bewegung”, *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 1, (1920-1921), pp. 45-47, at 46. Goldman’s articles continued with: “Zionismus und nationale Bewegung”, *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 4, (1920-1921), pp. 237-242; and “Zionismus und nationale Bewegung”, *Der Jude*, Volume 5, Number 7, (1920-1921), pp. 423-425.

1765. T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), p. 183.

1766. T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), pp. 23, 99.

1767. B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and Sword: England and Palestine from the Bronze Age to Balfour*, New York University Press, New York, (1956). **See also:** C. Duvernoy, *Le prince et le prophète*, Le département des publications de l'Agence juive, Jérusalem, (1966); English translation: *The Prince and the Prophet*, Land of Promise Productions, Paradise, California, (1973); Christian Action for Israel, (1979). **See also:** "Hechler, William Henry", *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 8 He-Ir, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, (1971), cols. 237-239. **See also:** E. Newman, "Non-Jewish Pioneers of Zionism", in A. W. Kac, Editor, *The Messiahship of Jesus: What Jews and Jewish Christians Say*, Moody Press, Chicago, (1980), pp. 291-297. **See also:** M. Ould-Mey, "The Non-Jewish Origin of Zionism", *The Arab World Geographer / Le Géographe du monde arabe*, Volume 5, Number 1, (2002), pp. 34-52:

<<http://mama.indstate.edu/users/mouldmey/The%20Non-Jewish%20Origin%20of%20Zionism.PDF>>

1768. "Hechler, William Henry", *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 8 He-Ir, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, (1971), cols. 237-239, at 237.

1769. I Friedman, "The Political Activity of Theodor Herzl", in G. Shimoni and R. S. Wistrich, Editors, *Theodor Herzl: Visionary of the Jewish State*, Herzl Press, New York, (1999). Friedman cites: H. Ellern and B. Ellern, *Herzl, Hechler, the Grand Duke of Baden and the German Emperor, 1896-1904. Documents Found by Hermann and Bessi Ellern Reproduced in Facsimile*, Tel Aviv, (1961), pp. 1-8.

1770. E. Newman, "Non-Jewish Pioneers of Zionism", in A. W. Kac, Editor, *The Messiahship of Jesus: What Jews and Jewish Christians Say*, Moody Press, Chicago, (1980), pp. 291-297, at 297.

1771. C. Duvernoy, *Le prince et le prophète*, Le département des publications de l'Agence juive, Jérusalem, (1966); English translation: *The Prince and the Prophet*, Land of Promise Productions, Paradise, California, (1973); Christian Action for Israel, (1979). Here quoted from the English translation by Jack Joffe as found at:

<http://www.israelinprophecy.org/live_site/english/pdf_documents/CLAUDE%20DUVERNOY_P&P_090903_w-gen-index_reduced.pdf>, (1979/2003), pp. 119-120.

1772. M. Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: The Armed Prophet*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, (1967), p. 69.

1773. B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and Sword: England and Palestine from the Bronze Age to Balfour*, New York University Press, New York, (1956), pp. 122, 126, 165-166, 169.

1774. B. Disraeli, *Lord George Bentinck: A Political Biography*, Chapter 24, Third Revised Edition, Colburn, (1852), pp. 494-499.

1775. A. Hitler, "My Political Testament", English translation in: R. Payne, *The Life and Death of Adolf Hitler*, Praeger Publishers, New York, (1973), pp. 589-591.

1776. G. Meir, *My Life*, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, (1975), p. 162.

1777. B. L. Brasol, *The World at the Cross Roads*, Small, Mayhard & Co., Boston, (1921), pp. 371-379.

1778. F. Nicosia, *The Third Reich and the Palestine Question*, University of Texas Press, Austin, (1985), pp. 52-60.

1779. M. Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: The Armed Prophet*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, (1967), p. 68.

1780. D. Ben-Gurion, quoted in: Y. Gelber, "Zionist Policy and the Fate of European Jewry (1939-1942)", *Yad Vashem Studies*, Volume 13, Martyrs' and Heroes Remembrance Authority, Jerusalem, (1979), pp. 169-210, at 199.

- 1781.** T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and Wang, New York, (1993), pp. 99-101.
- 1782.** J. Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica: Das ist Jüden Schul ; Darinnen der gantz Jüdische Glaub und Glaubensübung. . . grundlich erkläret*, Basel, (1603); as translated in the 1657 English edition, *The Jewish Synagogue: Or An Historical Narration of the State of the Jewes, At this Day Dispersed over the Face of the Whole Earth*, Printed by T. Roycroft for H. R. and Thomas Young at the Three Pidgeons in Pauls Church-Yard, London, (1657), pp. 319-320.
- 1783.** K. Polkehn, "The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 58; citing C. Sykes, *Crossroads to Israel*, London, (1965); *Kreuzwege nach Israel; die Vorgeschichte des jüdischen Staates*, C. H. Beck, München, (1967), p. 151.
- 1784.** M. Buber, "Old Zionism and Modern Israel", *Jewish Newsletter*, Volume 14, Number 11, (2 June 1958), front page.
- 1785.** H. Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*, Viking, New York, (1963), pp. 55-56; in the revised 1964 edition at pp. 60-61.
- 1786.** B. Kimmerling, "Israel's Culture of Martyrdom", *The Nation*, (10 January 2005).
- 1787.** See, for example: B. Hecht, *Perfidy*, Messner, New York, (1961).
- 1788.** L. Dickstein, "Hell's Own Cookbook", *The New York Times*, Book Review Section, (17 November 1996), p. 7.
- 1789.** M. Shonfeld, *The Holocaust Victims Accuse: Documents and Testimony on Jewish War Criminals*, Neturei Karta of U.S.A., Brooklyn, (1977).
- 1790.** S. Landman, *Great Britain, the Jews and Palestine*, New Zionist Press (New Zionist Publication Number 1), London, (1936), pp. 12-13, 15.
- 1791.** R. Gottheil, "The Jews as a Race and as a Nation", *The World's Best Orations*, Volume 6, F. P. Kaiser, St. Louis, (1899), pp. 2294-2298, at 2296.
- 1792.** Letter from A. Einstein to M. Born of 22 March 1934, in M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), pp. 121-122.
- 1793.** T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and Wang, New York, (1993), pp. 99-101.
- 1794.** A. Hitler, *The Speeches of Adolf Hitler April 1922-August 1939*, Volume 1, Howard Fertig, New York, (1969), pp. 727-728. "Cited from Fritz Seidler, *The Bloodless Pogrom*. London, 1934."
- 1795.** A. Hitler, *The Speeches of Adolf Hitler April 1922-August 1939*, Volume 1, Howard Fertig, New York, (1969), pp. 729-730.
- 1796.** S. Kahan, "Preface", *The Wolf of the Kremlin*, William Morrow and Company, Inc., New York, (1987).
- 1797.** "Jews", *Great Soviet Encyclopedia: A Translation of the Third Edition*, Volume 2, Macmillan, New York, (1973), pp. 292-293, at 293.
- 1798.** I. Zangwill, "Is Political Zionism Dead? Yes", *The Nation*, Volume 118, Number 3062, (12 March 1924), pp. 276-278, at 276.
- 1799.** J. Klatzkin, *Tehumim: Ma'amarim*, Devir, Berlin, (1925); English translation by A. Hertzberg in his, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 316-327, at 317, 322, 325.
- 1800.** L. Lewisohn, "A Year of Crisis", in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 488-492. Hertzberg cites: L. Lewisohn, *Rebirth* (editor), New York, (1935), pp. 290-296.
- 1801.** Refer to the love letters between Lewisohn and Viereck in the "Ludwig Lewisohn papers, 1903-1980's" at the College of Charleston libraries, Special Collections, Third Floor,

Mss 28, Box 1, Folders 1, 3 and 5.

1802. “Question Dickinson, Agent of Viereck”, *The New York Times*, (18 January 1919), p. 4.

1803. N. M. Johnson, “George Sylvester Viereck: Poet and Propagandist”, *Books at Iowa*, Number 9, (November, 1968), URL:

<http://www.lib.uiowa.edu/spec-coll/Bai/johnson2.htm>

and *George Sylvester Viereck: Pro-German Publicist in America, 1910-1945*, Dissertation Thesis (Ph. D.), University of Iowa University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, (1971); **and** *George Sylvester Viereck, German-American Propagandist*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Illinois, (1972).

1804. Daryl Bradford Smith interview of Eustace Mullins of 25 January 2006, “The French Connection”, *GCN LIVE*, <http://www.iamthewitness.com>.

1805. M. R. Cohen, “Parkes’ *The Jew and His Neighbour* and Lewisohn’s *The Answer*”, *Reflections of a Wondering Jew*, The Beacon Press, Boston, (1950), pp. 116-123, at 119-123.

1806. English translation in: R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 127-128, at 128.

1807. English translation in: R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 222-223, at 223. An alternative translation appears in: “Holocaust”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 8, Macmillan, Jerusalem, (1971), col. 852.

1808. A. Hitler in M. Domarus, Editor, *Hitler: Reden und Proklamationen, 1932-1945: Kommentiert von einem deutschen Zeitgenossen*, Süddeutscher Verlag, München, (1965), pp. 1057-1058.

1809. H. Frank, (16 December 1941), quoted in: *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*, Volume 2, United States, Office of Chief of Counsel for the Prosecution of Axis Criminality, Washington, D. C., United States Government Printing Office, (1946), p. 634. **See also:** Y. Arad, Yitzhak, I. Gutman, A. Margalioth, Abraham, Editors, *Documents on the Holocaust: Selected Sources on the Destruction of the Jews of Germany and Austria, Poland, and the Soviet Union*, Yad Vashem in cooperation with the Anti-Defamation League and Ktav Pub. House, Jerusalem, (1981).

1810. H. Frank quoted in H. Kardel, *Adolf Hitler, Begründer Israels*, Verlag Marva, Genf, (1974).

1811. T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and Wang, New York, (1993), pp. 99-101.

1812. I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), p. 18.

1813. Confer: J. Stolzing, “Houston Stewart Chamberlain. Zu seinem 70. Geburtstage”, *Völkischer Beobachter*, Volume 38, Number 137, (9 September 1925), p. 1. **See also:** J. Goebbels, diary entry of 8 May 1926, *Die Tagebücher von Joseph Goebbels, sämtliche Fragmente, Teil I, Aufzeichnungen 1924-1941, Interimsregister*, München, New York, K.G. Saur, (1987), p. 178. **See also:** G. Schott, *Chamberlain, der Seher des Dritten Reiches; das Vermächtnis Houston Stewart Chamberlains an das deutsche Volk, in einer Auslese aus seinen Werken*, F. Bruckmann München, (1934), p.17. **See also:** H.S. Chamberlains letter to Dr. Boepple of 1 January 1924, L. Schmidt, *Houston Stewart Chamberlain. Auswahl aus seinen Werken*, F. Hirt, Breslau, (1934), p.66. **See also:** J. Köhler, *Wagners Hitler: Der Prophet und sein Vollstrecker*, Blessing, München, (1997), p. 385.

1814. H. P. Blavatsky, “The Svastika”, *The Secret Doctrine: The Synthesis of Science, Religion, and Philosophy*, Volume 2, Part 1, Stanza 4, The Theosophical Publishing Society, (1893), pp. 103-106.

1815. M. Nordau, *Entartung*, C. Duncker, Berlin, (1892-1893); English translation: *Degeneration*, D. Appleton, New York, (1895); **and** *Der Sinn der Geschichte*, C. Duncker, Berlin, (1909); English translation: *The Interpretation of History*, Willey Book Co., New York, (1910); **and** *The Drones Must Die*, G.W. Dillingham Co., New York, (1897); **and** with M. A. Lewenz, *Morals and the Evolution of Man*, Lewenz, Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York, (1922).

1816. B. Lazare, *Job's Dungheap*, Schocken Books, New York, (1948); quoted in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 472.

1817. J. Stern, "Theodor Herzl, *Der Judenstaat. Versuch einer modernen Lösung der Judenfrage*", *Neue Zeit*, Volume 15, Number 1, (1896-1897), p. 186; English translation in: P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), p. 321.

1818. Letter from P. Ehrenfest to A. Einstein of 9 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 203, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 173-175, at 174.

1819. A. Einstein, *The World As I See It*, Citadel, New York, (1993), pp. 105-106.

1820. G. Istóczy, "Speech to the Hungarian Parliament of 25 June 1878", published in: W. Marr, *Vom jüdischen Kriegsschauplatz eine Streitschrift*, Second Edition, R. Costenoble, Bern, (1879), pp. 41-43; English translation in: R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 100-103, at 102-103.

1821. R. Dmowski, "The Jews and the War"; English translation by J. Kulczycki in R. S. Levy, Editor, J. Kulczycki, translator, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Lexington, Massachusetts, Toronto, (1991), pp. 182-189, at 184.

1822. A. Rosenberg, *Die Spur des Juden im Wandel der Zeiten*, Fourth Edition, Zentral Verlag der NSDAP Franz Eher Nachfolger, (1939), pp. 152-153; English translation by A. Jacob in: *Eugen Dühring on the Jews*, Nineteen Eighty Four Press, Brighton, England, (1997). pp. 44-45.

1823. A. Rosenberg, *Die Spur des Juden im Wandel der Zeiten*, Deutscher Volks-Verlag, München, (1920); as quoted in: *Alfred Rosenberg Schriften aus den Jahren 1917-1921 mit einer Einleitung von Alfred Baeumler*, Hoheneichen-Verlag, München, (1944), pp. 320-321.

1824. H. Grimm, *Warum, woher, aber wohin?*, Klosterhaus-Verlag, Lippoldsberg, (1954).

1825. J. Boas, "A Nazi Travels to Palestine", *History Today*, Volume 30, Number 1, (January, 1980), pp. 33-38.

1826. "The Zionist Programme", *The Jewish Chronicle*, (3 September 1897), p. 13.

1827. H. F. K. Günther, *Rassenkunde des deutschen Volkes*, J. F. Lehmann, München, (1923), p. 430.

1828. I. Zollschan, "The Significance of the Mixed Marriage", *Jewish Questions: Three Lectures*, New York, Bloch Pub. Co., (1914), pp. 20-42.

1829. *Genesis* 28:1, 6. *Leviticus* 20:26. *Deuteronomy* 7:1-4. *Ezra* 9. *Nehemiah* 9:2; 13:3, 23-30.

1830. *Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal, Nuremberg, 14 November 1945 — 1 October 1946*, Volume 12, Secretariat of the Tribunal, Nuremberg, Germany, p. 315.

1831. "Georg Kareski Approves of Ghetto Laws. Interview in Dr. Goebbels' 'Angriff'", *The Jewish Chronicle*, (3 January 1936), p. 16.

1832. *Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal, Nuremberg, 14 November 1945 — 1 October 1946*, Volume 12, Secretariat of the Tribunal,

Nuremberg, Germany, p. 316.

1833. *Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal, Nuremberg, 14 November 1945 — 1 October 1946*, Volume 12, Secretariat of the Tribunal, Nuremberg, Germany, p. 316.

1834. F. Nicosia, *The Third Reich and the Palestine Question*, University of Texas Press, Austin, (1985), p. 53.

1835. I. Zollschan, *Das Rassenproblem unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der theoretischen Grundlagen der jüdischen Rassenfrage*, W. Braumüller, Wien, (1910); **and** *Jewish Questions: Three Lectures*, New York, Bloch Pub. Co., (1914).

1836. A. I. Berndt, “Comment in the German News Agency on the Nuremberg Laws”, *Jüdische Rundschau*, Number 75, (17 September 1935); English translation from Y. Arad, I. Gutman and A. Margalio, Editors, *Documents on the Holocaust*, Eighth Edition, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, Nebraska, London, (1999), pp. 82-83.

1837. “Georg Kareski Approves of Ghetto Laws. Interview in Dr Goebbels’ ‘Angriff’”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (3 January 1936), p. 16.

1838. L. Brenner, *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, Chapter 12, Croom Helm, London, L. Hill, Westport, Connecticut, (1983), pp. 135-141.

1839. Reprinted in: L. Brenner, Editor, *51 Documents: Zionist Collaboration with the Nazis*, Barricade Books Inc., Fort Lee, New Jersey, (2002), pp. 155-156. An alternative English translation appears in: F. Nicosia, *The Third Reich and the Palestine Question*, University of Texas Press, Austin, (1985), p. 56.

1840. *See also:* J. Badi, *Fundamental Laws of the State of Israel*, Twayne Publishers, New York, (1961), p. 156.

1841. Y. Kotler, *Heil Kahane*, Adama Books, New York, (1986), pp. 153, 195, 198-212. L. Brenner, *Jews in America Today*, L. Stuart, Secaucus, New Jersey, (1986), pp. 298, 301. G. Cromer, “Negotiating the Meaning of the Holocaust: An Observation on the Debate About Kahanism in Israeli Society”, *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, Volume 2, Number 2, (1987), pp. 289-297, at 292-294.

1842. M. Kahane, *On Jews and Judaism: Selected Articles 1961-1990*, Volume 1, Institute for the Publication of the Writings of Rabbi Meir Kahane, Jerusalem, (1993), p. 81.

1843. “JUDEA DECLARES WAR ON GERMANY”, *Daily Express*, (24 March 1933), front page, banner headline. **See also:** Chaim Weizmann’s letter of 29 August 1939 to Prime Minister Chamberlain, that the Jews had declared war on Germany, “Jews Fight for Democracies” *The London Times*, (6 September 1939), p. 8. **See also:** *The Jewish Chronicle*, (8 September 1939). **For an extensive analysis of Jewish declarations of war against Germany, see:** H. Stern, *Jüdische Kriegserklärungen an Deutschland: Wortlaut, Vorgeschichte, Folgen*, FZ-Verlag, München, Second Edition, (2000), ISBN: 3924309507; **and** *KZ-Lügen: Antwort auf Goldhagen*, FZ-Verlag, München, Second Edition, (1998), ISBN: 3924309361.

1844. R. Weltsch, English translation by L. S. Dawidowicz, “Wear the Yellow Badge with Pride!”, *A Holocaust Reader*, Behrman House, Inc., West Orange, New Jersey, (1976), pp. 147-150, at 147-148.

1845. E. Black, *The Transfer Agreement: The Dramatic Story of the Pact Between the Third Reich and Jewish Palestine*, Brookline Books, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (1984/1999). T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and Wang, New York, (1993), pp. 19-22, 24-29, 33-34.

1846. K. Polkahn, “The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941”, *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82.

- 1847.** K. Polkehn, "The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82.
- 1848.** English translation by L. S. Dawidowicz, "The Zionist Federation of Germany Addresses the New German State", *A Holocaust Reader*, Behrman House, Inc., West Orange, New Jersey, (1976), pp. 150-155.
- 1849.** J. Prinz, "Zionism under the Nazi Government", *Young Zionist* (London), (November, 1937), p. 18; as quoted in: L. Brenner, *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, Chapter 5, Croom Helm, London, L. Hill, Westport, Connecticut, (1983), p. 47.
- 1850.** "Rasse als Kulturfaktor", *Jüdische Rundschau*, Volume 38, Number 62, (4 August 1933), pp. 391 (front page) -392, at 392; as quoted and translated in: L. Brenner, *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, Chapter 5, Croom Helm, London, L. Hill, Westport, Connecticut, (1983), p. 51.
- 1851.** H. Höhne, *The Order of the Death's Head: The Story of Hitler's S. S.*, English translation by R. Barry, Coward-McCann, Inc., New York, (1970), pp. 331-333. Höhne cites: [38] *Jüdische Rundschau*, (28 April 1933). [39] H. Lamm, *Über die innere und äussere Entwicklung des deutschen Judentums im Dritten Reich*, p. 94. [40] H. Lamm, *Über die innere und äussere Entwicklung des deutschen Judentums im Dritten Reich*, p. 156. [41] H. Lamm, *Über die innere und äussere Entwicklung des deutschen Judentums im Dritten Reich*, p. 149. A. Eichmann, *Record of Interrogation*, Volume 1, Column 67. [42] *Das Schwarze Korps*, (15 May 1935).
- 1852.** J. Boas, "A Nazi Travels to Palestine", *History Today*, Volume 30, Number 1, (January, 1980), pp. 33-38, at 38.
- 1853.** K. A. Schleunes, *The Twisted Road to Auschwitz: Nazi Policy Toward German Jews 1933-1939*, University of Illinois Press, (1970), pp. 178-182.
- 1854.** F. Nicosia, *The Third Reich and the Palestine Question*, University of Texas Press, Austin, (1985), p. 57.
- 1855.** M. Hess, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English translation, *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918/1943), pp. 62-63.
- 1856.** M. Hess, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English translation, *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918/1943), p. 80.
- 1857.** M. Hess, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English translation, *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918/1943), pp. 121-126.
- 1858.** F. Nicosia, *The Third Reich and the Palestine Question*, University of Texas Press, Austin, (1985), p. 57.
- 1859.** M. Steinglass, "Emil Ludwig before the Judge", *American Jewish Times*, (April, 1936), p. 35; as quoted in: L. Brenner, *Zionism in the Age of the Dictators*, Chapter 6, Croom Helm, London, L. Hill, Westport, Connecticut, (1983), p. 59.
- 1860.** T. Herzl, *A Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, The Maccabæan Publishing Co., New York, (1904), pp. 25, 68, 93.
- 1861.** K. Polkehn, "The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 74; citing "RFSS film roll 411".
- 1862.** A. Einstein, "Our Debt to Zionism", *Out of My Later Years*, Carol Publishing Group, New York, (1995), pp. 262-264, at 262.
- 1863.** K. Polkehn, "The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 79.

- 1864.** J. G. Lockhart, *Cecil Rhodes: The Colossus of Southern Africa*, Macmillan, New York, (1963), pp. 103-104.
- 1865.** J. H. Park, Editor, *British Prime Ministers of the Nineteenth Century: Policies and Speeches*, New York University Press, New York, (1950), pp. 237-244, at 237-240.
- 1866.** R. Sharif, "Christians for Zion, 1600-1919", *Journal for Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 123-141.
- 1867.** M. Hess, "Eleventh Letter", *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English: *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918/1943), pp. 145-159, 167-169.
- 1868.** M. M. Noah, *Call to America to Build Zion*, Arno Press, New York, (1814/1977); **and** *Discourse Delivered at the Consecration of the Synagogue of [K. K. She`erit Yisra`el] in the City of New-York on Friday, the 10th of Nisan, 5578, Corresponding with the 17th of April, 1818*, Printed by C.S. Van Winkle, New-York, (1818); **and** *Discourse on the Evidences of the American Indians Being the Descendants of the Lost Tribes of Israel: Delivered Before the Mercantile Library Association, Clinton Hall, J. Van Norden, New York, (1837); and Discourse on the Restoration of the Jews: Delivered at the Tabernacle, Oct. 28 and Dec. 2., 1844*, Harper, New York, (1845); **and** *The Jews, Judea, and Christianity: A Discourse on the Restoration of the Jews*, Hugh Hughes, London, (1849).
- 1869.** "Pan-Judaism", *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, (14 July 1878), p. 9. "General Notes", *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, (8 September 1878), p. 9.
- 1870.** M. Shapiro, *The Jewish 100: A Ranking of the Most Influential Jews of All Time*, Citadel Press, Secaucus, New Jersey, (1996), p. 113.
- 1871.** M. Shapiro, *The Jewish 100: A Ranking of the Most Influential Jews of All Time*, Citadel Press, Secaucus, New Jersey, (1996), p. 87. It perhaps should be noted here that David Alroy was a real person and a false Messiah of the Twelfth Century.
- 1872.** J. H. Park, Editor, *British Prime Ministers of the Nineteenth Century: Policies and Speeches*, New York University Press, New York, (1950), pp. 237-244, at 243-244.
- 1873.** P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Destruction: A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany*, Howard Fertig, New York, (1967), p. 325.
- 1874.** "Ex-Kaiser Denies, Baron Reaffirms", *The New York Times*, (7 July 1922), frontpage. "Text of Ex-Kaiser's Denial", *The New York Times*, (8 July 1922), p. 4.
- 1875.** T. Ravenscroft, *The Spear of Destiny: The Occult Power Behind the Spear Which Pierced the Side of Christ*, Spearman, London, (1972). T. Ravenscroft and T. Wallace-Murphy, *The Mark of the Beast: The Continuing Story of the Spear of Destiny*, Sphere, London, (1990). H. A. Buechner and W. Bernhart, *Adolf Hitler and the Secrets of the Holy Lance*, Thunderbird Press, Metairie, Louisiana, (1988). J. E. Smith and G. Piccard, *Secrets of the Holy Lance: The Spear of Destiny in History & Legend*, Adventures Unlimited Press, Kempton, Illinois, (2005).
- 1876.** J. B. Agus, *The Meaning of Jewish History*, Volume 2, Abelard-Schuman, New York, (1963), pp. 410-411.
- 1877.** F. A. Hayek, edited by S. Kresge and L. Wenar, *Hayek on Hayek: An Autobiographical Dialogue*, University of Chicago Press, (1994), p. 48.
- 1878.** J. B. Agus, *The Meaning of Jewish History*, Volume 2, Abelard-Schuman, New York, (1963), p. 411.
- 1879.** H. M. Kallen quoted in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 529.
- 1880.** G. E. Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), p. 208.

1881. G. E. Griffin, *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, Fourth Edition, American Media, Westlake Village, California, (2002), p. 208.

1882. “Mr. Rhodes’s Ideal of Anglo-Saxon Greatness”, *The New York Times*, (9 April 1902), p. 1. **See also:** W. T. Stead, “Cecil John Rhodes”, *The American Monthly Review of Reviews*, Volume 25, Number 5, (May, 1902), pp. 548-560, at 556-557. **See also:** “The Progress of the World”, *The American Monthly Review of Reviews*, Volume 25, Number 5, (May, 1902), pp. 515-598. **See also:** S. G. L. Millin, *Cecil Rhodes*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1933); **and** *Rhodes*, Chatto & Windus, London, (1952). **See also:** C. Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time*, Macmillan, New York, (1966), pp.130-133, 144-153, 950-956, 1247-1278; **and** *The Anglo-American Establishment: From Rhodes to Cliveden*, Books in Focus, New York, (1981), p. ix; **and** “The Round Table Groups in Canada, 1908-38”, *Canadian Historical Review*, Volume 43, Number 3, (September, 1962), pp. 204-224. **See also:** J. E. Flint, *Cecil Rhodes*, Little, Brown, Boston, (1974). **See also:** R. I. Rotberg and M. F. Shore, *The Founder: Cecil Rhodes and the Pursuit of Power*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1988). **See also:** A. Thomas, *Rhodes*, St. Martin’s Press, New York, (1997).

1883. “The Pan-Germanic Movement”, *The American Monthly Review of Reviews*, Volume 26, Number 1, (July, 1902), p. 93; which cites: Sir Rowland Blennerhassett, “The Pan-Germanic”, *National Review* (W. H. Allen, London), (1902?).

1884. A. H. M. Ramsay, *The Nameless War*, Chapter 1, Britons Publishing Company, London, (1952).

1885. J. Robison, *Proofs of a Conspiracy Against All the Religions and Governments of Europe: Carried on in the Secret Meetings of Free Masons, Illuminati, and Reading Societies*, Printed for William Creech, and T. Cadell, Junior, and W. Davies, Edinburgh, London, (1797); see especially the fourth edition of 1798, to which Robison added a postscript.

1886. Abbé Barruel, *Mémoires pour Servir a l’Histoire du Jacobinisme*, De l’Imprimerie Françoise, Chez P. Le Boussonier, Londres, (1797-1798); English translation by R. Clifford: *Memoirs Illustrating the History of Jacobism*, Printed for the translator by T. Burton and Co., London, (1798).

1887. M. A. Hoffman II, *Judaism’s Strange Gods*, Independent History and Research, Coeur d’Alene, Idaho, (2000), pp. 108-109.

1888. “Messianic Movements”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 1417-1427, at 1426.

1889. “LURIA, ISAAC BEN SOLOMON”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 572-578, at 574.

1890. “Throng Storms Depot to Greet Jewish Leader”, *The New York Times*, (10 February 1930), p. 7.

1891. A. Nadler, “Last Exit to Brooklyn: The Lubavitcher’s Powerful and Preposterous Messianism”, *The New Republic*, (4 May 1992), pp. 27-35. M. A. Hoffman II, *Judaism’s Strange Gods*, Independent History and Research, Coeur d’Alene, Idaho, (2000), p. 58.

1892. *Exodus* 34:11-17. *Psalm* 72. *Isaiah* 1:9; 2:1-4; 6:9-13; 9:6-7; 10:20-22; 11:4, 9-12; 17:6; 37:31-33; 41:9; 42; 43; 44; 61:6. *Jeremiah* 3:17; 33:15-16. *Ezekiel* 20:38; 25:14. *Daniel* 12:1, 10. *Amos* 9:8-10. *Obadiah* 1:18. *Micah* 4:2-3; 5:8. *Zechariah* 8:20-23; 14:9. *Romans* 9:27-28; 11:1-5.

1893. E. Bulwer-Lytton, *Rienzi: The Pilgrims of the Rhine; The Coming Race*, Brainard, New York, Continental Press, New York, (1848); **and** *Rienzi, Two Volumes in One; The*

Pilgrims of the Rhine; the Coming Race, Boston, Dana Estes & Co., 1848; **and** *The Pilgrims of the Rhine. The Coming Race*, Dana Estes & Co., Boston, (1849); **and** *The Coming Race: Or the New Utopia*, Francis B. Felt & Co., New York, (1871).

1894. *Genesis* 6:1-5. *Numbers* 13:25-33. I *Enoch*.

1895. Zohar, I, 25a-25b, 28b-29a; III, 208a. T. R. Weiland, *Eve, Did She or Didn't She: The Seedline Hypothesis under Scrutiny*, Mission to Israel Ministries, Scottsbluff, Nebraska, (2000). M. Barkun, *Religion and the Racist Right: The Origin of the Christian Identity Movement*, Revised Edition, University of North Carolina Press, (1997).

1896. *Genesis* 6:1-5; “The Book of the Watchers”, I *Enoch*, Chapters 1-36.

1897. A. Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*, University of Chicago Press, (1949).

1898. A. Mayor, *The First Fossil Hunters: Paleontology in Greek and Roman Times*, Princeton University Press, (2000).

1899. I *Enoch* 22:7.

1900. E. Bulwer-Lytton, *Rienzi: The Pilgrims of the Rhine; The Coming Race*, Brainard, New York, Continental Press, New York, (1848); and *Rienzi, Two Volumes in One; The Pilgrims of the Rhine; the Coming Race*, Boston, Dana Estes & Co., 1848; here quoted from: *The Pilgrims of the Rhine to which is Prefixed The Ideal World. The Coming Race*, Chapter 9, Estes and Lauriat, (1892), p. 277; which appears to be a reprint of: *The Pilgrims of the Rhine. The Coming Race*, Dana Estes & Co., Boston, (1849).

1901. M. M. Dondo, *The French Faust: Henri de Saint-Simon*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1955).

1902. H. G. Wells, *Imperialism and the Open Conspiracy*, Faber & Faber, London, (1929); **and** *The Way to World Peace*, E. Benn Ltd., London, (1930); **and** *What Are We to Do with Our Lives?*, Doubleday, Doran, Garden City, New York, (1931); **and** *The Work, Wealth and Happiness of Mankind*, Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, (1931); **and** *After Democracy: Addresses and Papers on the Present World Situation*, Watts & Co., London, (1932); **and** *What Should Be Done—Now: A Memorandum on the World Situation*, The John Day Company, New York, (1932); **and** *The Shape of Things to Come*, The Macmillan Co., New York, (1933); **and** *The New America, the New World*, Macmillan Co., New York, (1935); **and** *Things to Come: A Film Story Based on the Material Contained in His History of the Future “The Shape of Things to Come”*, Cresset Press, London, (1935); **and** *World Brain*, Methuen & Co., London, (1938); **and** *The Holy Terror*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (1939); **and** *The Fate of Homo Sapiens: An Unemotional Statement of the Things That Are Happening to Him Now, and of the Immediate Possibilities Confronting Him*, Secker and Warburg, London, (1939); **and** *The Fate of Man: An Unemotional Statement of the Things That Are Happening to Him Now, and of the Immediate Possibilities Confronting Him*, Longmans, New York, (1939); **and** *The New World Order: Whether it Is Attainable, How it Can Be Attained, and What Sort of World a World at Peace Will Have to Be*, Secker and Warburg, London, (1940); **and** *The Rights of Man; Or, What Are We Fighting For?*, Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, (1940); **and** *The Common Sense of War and Peace: World Revolution or War Unending*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, New York, (1940); **and** *Babes in the Darkling Wood, a Novel*, Alliance book Corp., New York, (1940); **and** *All Aboard for Ararat*, Secker & Warburg, London, (1940); **and** *You Can't be too Careful: A Sample of Life 1901-1951*, Secker & Warburg, London, (1941); **and** *The Outlook for Homo Sapiens: An Unemotional Statement of the Things That Are Happening to Him Now, and of the Immediate Possibilities Confronting Him*, Secker and Warburg, London, (1942); **and** *Science and the World Mind*, New Europe Pub. Co., London, (1942); **and** *Phoenix: How to Rebuild the World: A*

Summary of the Inescapable Conditions of World Reorganization, Haldeman-Julius, Girard, Kansas, (1942); **and** *A Thesis on the Quality of Illusion in the Continuity of the Individual Life in the Higher Metazoa: With Particular Reference to the Species Homo Sapiens*, London, (1942). **See also:** L. V. Uspenskii, H. G. Wells, *The New Rights of Man: Text of Letter to Wells from Soviet Writer, Who Pictures the Ordeal and Rescue of Humanistic Civilization*, H. G. Wells' Reply and Program for Liberated Humanity, Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas (1942).

1903. See the forward of the first German edition of K. Kautsky, "Rasse und Judentum", *Ergänzungshefte zur Neuen Zeit*, Number 20, (1914/1915 Ausgabe am 30. Oktober 1914), pp. 1-5.

1904. "Late Items of Foreign News", *The Chicago Tribune*, (8 November 1861), p. 3.

1905. Consult Herzl's Diaries and see: H. Ellern and B. Ellern, *Herzl, Hechler, the Grand Duke of Baden and the German Emperor, 1896-1904. Documents Found by Hermann and Bessi Ellern Reproduced in Facsimile*, Tel Aviv, (1961).

1906. A. Golan, *Operation Susannah*, Harper & Row, New York, (1978). **See also:** D. Raviv, *Every Spy a Prince: The Complete History of Israel's Intelligence Community*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, (1990). **See also:** V. Ostrovsky and C. Hoy, *By Way of Deception: A Devastating Insider's Portrait of the Mossad*, Stoddart, Toronto, (1990). V. Ostrovsky, *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad's Secret Agenda*, Harper Paperbacks, New York, (1994). **See also:** I. Black and B. Morris, *Israel's Secret Wars: A History of Israel's Intelligence Services*, Grove Weidenfeld, New York, (1991). **See also:** S. Teveth, *Ben-Gurion's Spy: The Story of the Political Scandal That Shaped Modern Israel*, Columbia University Press, New York, (1996). **See also:** J. Beinlin, *The Dispersion of Egyptian Jewry: Culture, Politics, and the Formation of a Modern Diaspora*, University of California Press, Berkeley, (1998).

1907. L. Fry, *Waters Flowing Eastward: The War Against the Kingship of Christ*, TBR Books, Washington, D. C., (2000), pp. 101-102. For a nearly contemporary portrayal of events, see: "The Modern Jews", *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 340-342.

1908. "Restoration of the Jews: Memorandum", *The London Times*, (26 August 1840), pp. 5-6. News of this "Memorandum" first appeared in *The London Times* on 9 March 1840, on page 3, under the title, "Restoration of the Jews".

1909. I. Shahak and N. Mezvinsky, *Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel*, Pluto Press, London, (1999), p. 18.

1910. J. Stern, *Terror in the Name of God: Why Religious Militants Kill*, Ecco, New York, (2003), p. 95.

1911. D. Hartley, *Observations on Man, His Frame, His Duty, and His Expectations in Two Parts*. Printed by S. Richardson for James Leake and Wm. Frederick, booksellers in Bath and sold by Charles Hitch and Stephen Austen, booksellers in London, London, (1749).

1912. "Messianic Movements", *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 1417-1427, at 1418.

1913. G. Halsell, *Prophecy and Politics: Militant Evangelists on the Road to Nuclear War*, Lawrence Hill & Co., Westport, Connecticut, (1986); **and** *Prophecy and Politics: The Secret Alliance Between Israel and the U. S. Christian Right*, Lawrence Hill & Co., Westport, Connecticut, (1986); **and** *Forcing God's Hand: Why Millions Pray for a Quick Rapture—and Destruction of Planet Earth*, Crossroads International Pub., Washington, D.C., (1999), Amana Publications, Beltsville, Maryland, (2003); **Turkish:** M. Acar, H. Özmen, *et al.* translators, *Tanri'yi kiyamete zorlamak: Armagedon, Hristiyan kiyametçiligi ve Israil*

= *Forcing God's Hand: Why Millions Pray for a Quick Rapture: And Destruction of Planet Earth*, Kim, Ankara, (2002).

1914. S. Clarke, "The Conversion and Restoration of the Jews", *A Collection of the Promises of Scripture: or, The Christian's Inheritance*, Part 3, Section 10, American Tract Society, New York, and J. Buckland, London, (1750). **See also:** *A Discourse Concerning the Connexion of the Prophecies in the Old Testament, and the Application of Them to Christ. Being an Extract from the Sixth Edition of a Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God, &c. . . .*, J. Knapton, London, (1725).

1915. S. Clarke, *A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God And Other Writings*, Edited by E. Vialati, Cambridge University Press, (1998), pp. 19-20. Cf. Thomas Reid, *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man*, Essay III, Of Memory, CHAPTER III, OF DURATION, (1785); in *The Works of Thomas Reid, D.D. F.R.S. Edinburgh. Late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow. With an Account of His Life and Writings*, Edited by D. Stewart, Volume 2, E. Duyckinck, Collins and Hannay, and R. and W. A. Bartow, New York, (1822), pp. 132-134.

1916. G. Bruno, *De la causa, principio, et vno*, John Charleswood, London, (1584); English translation, *Cause, Principle, and Unity*, Multiple Editions; German translation, *Von der Ursache, dem Princip und dem Einen*, Multiple Editions; **and** *De l'Infinito Universo e Mondi*, John Charleswood, London, (1584); English translation, *Giordano Bruno, His Life and Thought. With Annotated Translation of his Work, On the Infinite Universe and Worlds*, Schuman, New York, (1950); German translation, *Zwiegespräche vom Unendlichen: All und den Welten*, E. Diedrich, Jena, (1892). Collected Works in German, *Gesammelte Werke*, E. Diedrich, Leipzig, (1904-1909).

1917. H. More, *A COLLECTION Of Several Philosophical Writings OF Dr. HENRY MORE, Fellow of Christ's-College in Cambridge*, Joseph Downing, London, (1712); which contains: *AN ANTIDOTE AGAINST ATHEISM: OR, An Appeal to the Natural Faculties of the Mind of Man, Whether there be not a GOD*, The Fourth Edition corrected and enlarged: WITH AN APPENDIX Thereunto annexed, "An Appendix to the foregoing Antidote," Chapter 7, pp. 199-201.

1918. J. Locke, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Chapter 15, Section 12.

1919. I. Newton, *Principia*, Book I, Definition VIII, Scholium; **and** Book III, General Scholium.

1920. J. E. Force and R. H. Popkin, Editors, *The Millenarian Turn: Millenarian Contexts of Science, Politics, and Everyday Anglo-American Life in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, (2001). H. More, J. Fleisher, *et al.*, *Conjectura Cabbalistica., Or, a Conjectural Essay of Interpreting the Minde of Moses, According to a Threefold Cabbala: viz., Literal, Philosophical, Mystical, Or, Divinely Moral*, Printed by James Fleisher, and are to be sold by William Morden bookseller in Cambridge, London, (1653). F. M. v. Helmont, H. More, J. Gironnet, *et al.*, *Opuscula Philosophica: Quibus Continentur Principia Philosophiæ Antiquissimæ & Recentissimæ. Ac Philosophia Vulgaris Refutata. Quibus Subjuncta Sunt Cc. Problemata De Revolutione Animarum Humanarum*, Prostant Amstelodami, (1690). I. Newton, *Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel, and the Apocalypse of St. John*, Printed by J. Darby and T. Browne and sold by J. Roberts etc., London, (1733).

1921. S. Snobelen, "'The Mystery of the Restitution of All Things': Isaac Newton on the Return of the Jews", in J. E. Force and R. H. Popkin, Editors, *The Millenarian Turn: Millenarian Contexts of Science, Politics, and Everyday Anglo-American Life in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, Chapter 7, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, (2001), pp. 95-118, at 95. Snobelen cites: Jewish National and University Library

(Jerusalem) Yahuda MS 6, f. 12r.

1922. S. Snobelen, “‘The Mystery of the Restitution of All Things’: Isaac Newton on the Return of the Jews”, in J. E. Force and R. H. Popkin, Editors, *The Millenarian Turn: Millenarian Contexts of Science, Politics, and Everyday Anglo-American Life in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, Chapter 7, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, (2001), pp. 95-118, at 101. Snobelen cites: Jewish National and University Library (Jerusalem) Yahuda MS 9.2, f. 143r.

1923. S. Snobelen, “‘The Mystery of the Restitution of All Things’: Isaac Newton on the Return of the Jews”, in J. E. Force and R. H. Popkin, Editors, *The Millenarian Turn: Millenarian Contexts of Science, Politics, and Everyday Anglo-American Life in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, Chapter 7, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, (2001), pp. 95-118, at 97.

1924. Refer to the “Third Letter” in: M. Hess, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English: *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918).

1925. H. N. Bialik, “Bialik on the Hebrew University”, in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 281-288, at 287.

1926. *Deuteronomy* 18:15-19. *Psalms* 2:1-12, 69:22. *Isaiah* 8:14-15. *Luke* 2:34-35. *Romans* 9:33. *I Corinthians* 1:18, 23. *2 Corinthians* 2:15-16. *I Peter* 2:8.

1927. B. Disraeli, *Lord George Bentinck: A Political Biography*, Chapter 24, Third Revised Edition, Colburn, (1852), pp. 485, 497-498, 505-507.

1928. “Messianic Movements”, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 11 LEK-MIL, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 1417-1427, at 1421.

1929. “Jacob and Esau”, *The Jewish Chronicle*, (24 November 1911), p. 22.

1930. M. Hess, “Eleventh Letter”, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English: *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918/1943), pp. 141-159, at 150-152.

1931. Cyprian, Twelfth Treatise, “Three Books of Testimonies Against the Jews”, First Book, Testimony 24, *The Anti-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*, Volume 5, Christian Literature Publishing Company, New York, (1886), p. 514-515.

1932. T. Vaughan, T. W. and H. Blunden, *Magia Adamica, Or, the Antiquitie of Magic, and the Descent Therof from Adam Downwards, Proved: Whereunto Is Added, a Perfect, and Full Discoverie of the True Coelum Terrae, or the Magician's Heavenly Chaos, and First Matter of All Things*, Printed by T.W. for H. Blunden, London, (1650). **See also:** T. Vaughan, H. Blunden, R. Vaughan, et al., *Lumen De Lumine: Or, a New Magicall Light*, Printed for H. Blunden at the Castle in Corne-Hil, London, (1651). **See also:** H. C. Agrippa von Nettesheim, *Three Books of Occult Philosophy*, Printed by R.W. for Gregory Moule, London, (1651). **See also:** R. Fludd, *Mosaicall Philosophy: Grounded upon the Essential Truth or Eternal Sapience Written First in Latin, and Afterwards Thus Rendered into English*, Printed for Humphrey Moseley, at the Prince's Armes in St. Paul's Church-Yard, London, (1659). **See also:** J. Brinsley, *The Christians Cabala, Or, Sure Tradition Necessary to Be Known and Believed by All That Will Be Saved: A Doctrine Holding Forth Good Tidings of Great Joy, to the Greatest of Penitent Sinners : with a Character of One That Is Truly Such: As it Was Lately Held Forth to the Church of God at Great Yarmouth*, Printed for George Sawbridge, London, (1662).

1933. F. M. v. Helmont, H. More, J. Gironnet, et al., *Opuscula philosophica: quibus continentur principia philosophiæ antiquissimæ & recentissimæ. Ac philosophia vulgaris*

refutata. Quibus subjuncta sunt cc. Problemata de revolutione animarum humanarum, Prostant Amstelodami, (1690). **See also:** P. Buchius, F. M. v. Helmont, and Philanglus, *The Divine Being and its Attributes Philosophically Demonstrated from the Holy Scriptures, and Original Nature of Things According to the Principles of F.M.B. of Helmont*, Printed and are to be sold by Randal Taylor, London, (1693). **See also:** J. B. v. Helmont and F. M. v. Helmont, *Joannis Baptistæ van Helmont. . . Opuscula Medica Inaudita. I. De Lithiasi. II. De Febribus. III. De Humoribus Galeni. IV. De Peste*, Apud Ludovicum Elsevirium, Amsterodami, (1648). **See also:** Y-Worth, F. M. v. Helmont, Paracelsus, *et al.*, *Trifertes Sagani, or Immortal Dissolvent: Being a. . . Discourse of the Matter and Manner of Preparing the Liquor Alkahest of Helmont, the Great Hilech of Paracelsus, the Sal Circulatum minus of Ludovicus De Comit: or Our Fiery Spirit of the Four Elements. Together with its Use in Preparing Magisteries, Arcanas, Quintessences and Other Secret Medicines of the Adepts*, W. Pearson for T. Ballard, London, (1705). **See also:** J. B. v. Helmont and F. M. v. Helmont, *Ortus medicinæ: Id est, initia physiciæ inaudita : progressus medicinae novus, in morborum ultionem, ad vitam longam*, Apud Ludovicum Elsevirium, Amsterodami, (1648). **See also:** J. B. v. Helmont, W. Charleton and F. M. v. Helmont, *A Ternary of Paradoxes: The Magnetick Cure of Wounds, Nativity of Tartar in Wine, Image of God in Man*, Printed by James Flesher for William Lee, London, (1650). **See also:** G. Starkey and J. B. v. Helmont, *Natures Explication and Helmont's Vindication, Or, a Short and Sure Way to a Long and Sound Life Being a Necessary and Full Apology for Chymical Medicaments, and a Vindication of Their Excellency Against Those Unworthy Reproaches Cast on the Art and its Professors. . . by Galenists, Usually Called Methodists*, Printed by E. Cotes for Thomas Alsop, London, (1657). **See also:** J. B. v. Helmont and F. M. v. Helmont, *Oriatrike, Or, Physick Refined: the Common Errors Therein Refuted, and the Whole Art Reformed & Rectified : Being a New Rise and Progress of Philosophy and Medicine for the Destruction of Diseases and Prolongation of Life*, Printed for L. Loyd, London, (1662). **See also:** J. B. v. Helmont, J. C., and F. M. v. Helmont, *Van Helmont's Works Containing His Most Excellent Philosophy, Physick, Chirurgery, Anatomy : Wherein the Philosophy of the Schools Is Examined, Their Errors Refuted, and the Whole Body of Physick Reformed and Rectified : Being a New Rise and Progresse of Philosophy and Medicine, for the Cure of Diseases, and Lengthening of Life*, Printed for Lodowick Lloyd, London, (1664). **See also:** J. B. v. Helmont and F. M. v. Helmont, *Opera Omnia*, Sumptibus Johannis Justi Erythropili, Typis Johannis Philippi Andreae, Francofurti, (1682). **See also:** J. B. v. Helmont, C. Knorr von Rosenroth and F. M. v. Helmont, *Aufgang der Artzney-Kunst: Das ist, noch nie erhörte Brund-Lehren von der Natur, zu einer neuen Beförderung der Artzney-Sachen, sowol die Kranckheiten zu vertreiben als ein langes Leben zu erlangen*, In Verlegung Johann Andreæ Endters Sel. Söhne: Gedruckt bey Johann Holst, Sultzbach, (1683). **See also:** F. M. v. Helmont and J. B. v. Helmont, *A. T. Limojon de St. Didier, et al.*, *One Hundred Fifty Three Chymical Aphorisms. . . : Done by the Labour. . . of Eremita Suburbanus*, Printed for the Author: And Are to Be Sold by W. Cooper at the Pelican in Little Britain: And D. Newman at the Kings-Arms in the Poultry, London, (1688). **See also:** F. M. v. Helmont, G. Janssonius Van Waesberghe, and J. Janssonius Van Waesberge, *Clii aphorismi chemici: Ad quos quicquid est scientiæ chemicæ commodè referri potest*, Apud Janssonio-Waesbergios, Amstelaedami, (1688). **See also:** F. M. v. Helmont, P. Buchius, J. C. Amman, *Francisci Mercuri ab Helmont Observationes circa Hominem Ejusque Morbos: Certissimis Sanae Rationis & Experientiae Superstructae*, Apud Joannem Wolters, Amstelaedami, (1692). **See also:** P. B. Buchius, Philanglus, and F. M. v. Helmont, *The Divine Being and its Attributes Philosophically Demonstrated from the Holy Scriptures, and Original Nature of Things According to the Principles of F.m.b. of Helmont*, : Printed and

Are to Be Sold by Randal Taylor, London,(1693). **See also:** F. M. v. Helmont and D. Kellner, *Kurtze Vorstellung der zur edlen chymie gehörigen Wissenschaft bestehend in CLIII. Aphorismis oder kurtzen Sätzen, dahin alles, was zur Alchymie gehöret, gar füglich gezogen werden kan*, A.m. Hynitzsch, Nordhausen, (1699). **See also:** F. M. v. Helmont and J. Clark, *Seder Olam, Or, the Order, Series or Succession of All the Ages, Periods, and Times of the Whole World Is Theologically, Philosophically and Chronologically Explicated and Stated Also the Hypothesis of the Pre-existency and Revolution of Humane Souls Together with the Thousand Years Reign of Christ on Earth. . . : to Which Is Also Annexed Some Explanatory Questions of the Book of the Revelations. . . : and an Appendix Containing Some Emendations and Explanations of Divers Passages in the Two Foregoing Treatises, out of the Author's Original Manuscripts and Papers*, Printed for Sarah Howkins, London, (1694). **See also:** F. M. v. Helmont, *A Cabbalistical Dialogue in Answer to the Opinion of a Learned Doctor in Philosophy and Theology, That the World Was Made of Nothing As it Is Contained in the Second Part of the Cabbala Denudata & Apparatus in Lib. Sohar, P. 308 &C., To Which Is Subjoyned a Rabbinical and Paraphractical Exposition of Genesis I. Written in High-dutch by the Author of the Foregoing Dialogue, First Done in Latin, by Now Made English*, Printed for Benjamin Clark, London, (1682); **and** *The Spirit of Diseases, Or, Diseases from the Spirit Laid Open in Some Observations Concerning Man and His Diseases : Wherein Is Shewed How Much the Mind Influenceth the Body in Causing and Curing of Diseases : the Whole Deduced from Certain and Infallible Principles of Natural Reason and Experience*, Printed for Sarah Howkins, London, (1694); **and** *The Paradoxal Discourses of F.m. Van Helmont Concerning the Macrocosm and Microcosm, Or, the Greater and Lesser World and Their Union*, Printed by J.C. and Freeman Collins for Robert Kettlewel, London, (1685); **and** *Two Hundred Queries Moderately Propounded Concerning the Doctrine of the Revolution of Humane Souls and its Conformity to the Truths of Christianity*, Printed for Rob. Kettlemell, London, (1684); **and** *An Hundred and Fifty-three Chymical Aphorisms To Which, What-Ever Relates to the Science of Chymistry May Fitly Be Referred*, Printed for Awnsam Churchill, London, (1690); **and** *Franciscii Mercurii Freyherrn von Helmont Paradoxal Discourse: oder, ungemeyne Meynungen von dem Macrocosmo und Microcosmo, das ist: von der grossen und kleinern Welt und verselben Vereinigung mit Einander. . . auf der Englischen in die hochteutsche Sprache übersetset*, Gottfried Liebernickel, Hamburg, (1691); **and** *Alphabeti verè naturalis hebraici brevissima delineatio: quae simul methodum suppeditat, juxta quam qui surdi nati sunt sic informari possunt, ut non alios saltem loquentes intelligant, sed & ipsi ad sermonis usum perveniant*, Typis Abrahami Lichtenthaleri, Sulzbaci, (1657); **and** *Seder olam, sive ordo seculorum: historica enarratio doctrinae*, Leyden, (1693); **and** *Seder Olam, Or, the Order, Series, or Succession of All the Ages, Periods, and Times of the Whole World Is Theologically, Philosophically, and Chronologically Explicated and Stated ; Also the Hypothesis of the Pre-Existency and Revolution of Humane Souls ; Together with the Thousand Years Reign of Christ on the Earth*, Printed for Sarah Hopkins, in George-Yard, Lumbard-Street, London, (1694); **and** *Kurtzer Entwurff des eigentlichen Natur-Alphabets der heiligen Sprache: Nach dessen Anleitung man auch taubgeborne verstehend und redend machen kan*, Abraham Lichtenthaler, Sultzbach, (1667); **and** *Een Zeer Korte Afbeelding Van Het Ware Natuurlyke Hebreuwse A.B.C. Welke Te Gelyk De Wyse Vertoont, Volgens Welke Die Doof Geboren Syn, Sodanig Konnen Onderwesen Werden, Dat Sy Niet Alleenig Andere Die Spreken Konnen, Verstaan, Maar Selfs Tot Het Gebruik Van Spreken Komen*, Pieter Rotterdam, Amsterdam, (1697); **and** *Eenige Voor-Bedagte En Over-Wogene Bedenkingen: Over De Vier Eerste Kapittelen Des Eersten Boeks Moysis, Genesis Genaamt*, Pieter Rotterdam, T'Amsterdam, (1698); **and** *Some Premeditate and Considerate Thoughts upon the First*

Four Chapters of the First Book of Moses Called Genesis, London, (1701); and *Einige Gedancken über die vier ersten Capitel des ersten Buchs Mosis, Genesis genannt*, (1698); and *Quædam Præmeditatae & consideratae cogitationes super quatuor priora capita libri primi Moysis, Genesis nominati*, Prostant Apud Henr. Wetstenium, Amstelodami, (1697); **and** *C.LIII Aphorismes Chymiques: Ausquels on Peut Facilement Rapporter Tout Ce Qui Regarde La Chymie : Mis En Ordre Par Les Soins & Le Travail De L'hermite du Fauxbourg*, Laurent D'houry, Paris, (1692); **and** *Admonitio de rationis humanae deceptione in spiritualibus fugiendâ*, Regio-Monti, (1646); **and** *Brevissima Descrizione Dell'alfabeto Veramente Naturale Ebraico. Essa Può Fornire Insieme Il Metodo Col Quale Coloro Che Sono Nati Sordi Possono Essere Istruiti Così Da Comprendere non Solo Gli Altri Parlanti, Ma Essi Stessi Giungere All'uso Del Linguaggio*, Scuola Tipografica Sordomuti, Siena, (1667/1960); **and** *Autobiographical Memoirs of F. M. van Helmont: Or, Extraordinary Passages from His Life*, (1600); **and** *Eenige Gedakten*, Hendrik Jansse, T'Amsterdam, (1690); and *Taina tvoreniia, po vidimym I nevidimym chudesam ego, iz bozhestvennago magicheskago tsentral'nago svieta: pokazannaia chadam premudrosti ot niekiikh prosvieshchennykh magov: nynie dlia razmnozheniia poznaniia v pervyi raz izdannaiia na svieta iz drevnikhrukopisei*, V Tipografii i. Lopukhina, Moskva, (1785); **and** *Aanmerkingen*, Pieter Rotterdam, T'Amsterdam, (1692); **and** *Thesaurus Novus Experientiae Medicæ Aureus: Oder, Guldener Artzney-Schatz neuer niemels entdeckter Medicamenten wider allerhand Leibs-Kranckheiten auss den fûrtrefflichen Schriften*, Bey Eman. Und Joh. Rud. Thurneysen, Basel, (1723); **and** *Ortvs medicinae. Id est, initia physicae inavdita. Progreffus medicinae novus, in morborvm vltionem ad vitam longam*, Apud Ludovicum Elzevirium, Amsterodami, (1652).

1934. A. Conway, *The Principles of the Most Ancient and Modern Philosophy Concerning God, Christ and the Creatures. . . Being a Little Treatise Published since the Author's Death, Translated out of the English into Latin, with Annotations Taken from the Ancient Philosophy of the Hebrews, and Now Again Made English*, Printed in Latin at Amsterdam by M. Brown, and reprinted at London, (1692). A. Conway, et al., *Conway letters: The Correspondence of Anne, viscountess Conway, Henry More, and Their Friends, 1642-1684*, Oxford University Press, (1930).

1935. M. Hess, *Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitätsfrage*, Eduard Wengler, Leipzig, (1862); English translation by M. Waxman: *Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*, Bloch, New York, (1918/1943), pp. 114-117. Hess refers to: J. Salvador, *Histoire des institutions de Moïse, et du peuple hébreu*, Ponthieu et Cie., Paris, Ponthieu, Michelsen et Cie., Leipzig, (1828); German: *Geschichte der mosaischen Institutionen und des jüdischen Volks*, Hoffmann und Campe, Hamburg, (1836); **and** *Paris, Rome, Jérusalem; ou, La question religieuse au XIXe siècle*, M. Lévy, Paris, (1860).

1936. The literature of the "Anglo-Israel" or "British-Israel" movement is extensive. To name but a few of the hundreds of titles published from the early 1800's to the present: R. Weaver, *Monumenta antiqua: Or, The Stone Monuments of Antiquity Yet Remaining in the British Isles, Particularly as Illustrated by Scripture. Also a Dissertation on Stonehenge: Together with a Compendious Account of the Druids. To Which Are Added Conjectures on the Origin and Design of the Pyramids of Egypt, and of the Round Towers of Ireland*, J.B. Nichols & Son, London, (1840). **See also:** E. Hine, *The English Nation Identified with the Lost House of Israel by Twenty-Seven Identifications*, J. Heywood, Birmingham, R. Davies, Manchester, (1871). **See also:** W. Carpenter, *The Israelites Found in the Anglo-Saxons: The Ten Tribes Supposed to Have Been Lost, Traced from the Land of Their Captivity to Their Occupation of the Isles of the Sea: With an Exhibition of Those Traits of Character and National Characteristics Assigned to Israel in the Books of the Hebrew Prophets*, G.

Kenning, London, (1874). **See also:** W. H. Poole, *Anglo-Israel, or, The British Nation the Lost Tribes of Israel*, Toronto, (1879); **and** *Anglo-Israel: Or, The Saxon Race, Proved to Be the Lost Tribes of Israel. In nine Lectures*, W. Briggs, Toronto, (1889). **See also:** F. R. A. Glover, *England the Remnant of Judah and the Israel of Ephraim*, London, (1881). **See also:** T. R. Howlett, *Anglo-Israel and the Jewish problem. The Ten Lost Tribes of Israel Found and Identified in the Anglo-saxon Race. The Jewish Problem Solved in the Reunion of Israel and Judah, and Restoration of the Israelitish Nation*, Spangler & Davis, Philadelphia, (1892). **See also:** P. S. McKillop, *Britain and America, the Lost Israelites: Or, the Ten Tribes Identified in the Anglo-Celtic Race*, St. Albans, Vermont, (1902). **See also:** R. Harris, *The Lost Tribes of Israel*, S. W. Partridge, London, (1907). **See also:** J. L. Thomas, *The Restoration of Israel*, Marshall, London, New York, (1922). **See also:** S. A. Brown, *The House of Israel: Or, The Anglo-Saxon*, Pub. for S.A. Brown by Boyer Print. & advertising Co., Portland, Oregon, (1925). **See also:** M. Barkun, *Religion and the Racist Right: The Origin of the Christian Identity Movement*, Revised Edition, University of North Carolina Press, (1997).

1937. “The Modern Jews”, *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 333-334, 355.

1938. A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *Israel chez les nations: Les Juifs et l'antisémitisme*, C. Lévy, Paris, (1893); English translation by F. Hellman, *Israel among the Nations: A Study of the Jews and Antisemitism*, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, W. Heinemann, London, (1895), p. 356. H. N. Casson, “The Jew in America”, *Munsey's Magazine*, Volume 34, Number 4, (January, 1906), pp. 381-395. B. J. Hendrick, “The Jews in America: I How They Came to This Country”, *The World's Work*, Volume 44, Number 2, (December, 1922), pp. 144-161.

1939. B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and Sword: England and Palestine from the Bronze Age to Balfour*, New York University Press, New York, (1956). **See also:** C. Duvernoy, *Le prince et le prophète*, Le département des publications de l'Agence juive, Jérusalem, (1966); English translation: *The Prince and the Prophet*, Land of Promise Productions, Paradise, California, (1973); Christian Action for Israel, (1979). **See also:** E. Newman, “Non-Jewish Pioneers of Zionism”, in A. W. Kac, Editor, *The Messiahship of Jesus: What Jews and Jewish Christians Say*, Moody Press, Chicago, (1980), pp. 291-297. **See also:** M. Ould-Mey, “The Non-Jewish Origin of Zionism”, *The Arab World Geographer / Le Géographe du monde arabe*, Volume 5, Number 1, (2002), pp. 34-52:

<<http://mama.indstate.edu/users/mouldmey/The%20Non-Jewish%20Origin%20of%20Zionism.PDF>>

1940. W. Camden, *Britannia sive Florentissimorum regnorum, Angliæ, Scotiæ, Hiberniæ, et invlarum adiacentium ex intima antiquitate chorographica descriptio*, Per Radulphum Newbery. Cum gratia & priuilegio Regiæ Maiestatis, Londini, (1586).

1941. T. Evans, G. H. Hughes, *Drych y prif oesoedd: yn ôl yr argraffiad cyntaf, 1716*, Gwasg Prifysgol Cymru, Caerdydd [Wales], (1961).

1942. English translation from the Latin by Dr. Marcel van den Broecke, *Cartographica Neerlandica Background for Ortelius Map No. 16 ANGLIÆ, SCOTIÆ ET HIBERNIÆ, SIVE/BRITANNICAR: INSVLARVM DESCRIPTIO*, English Edition of 1606:

<http://www.orteliusmaps.com/book/ort16.html>

http://www.orteliusmaps.com/book/ort_text16.html

1943. B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and Sword: England and Palestine from the Bronze Age to Balfour*, New York University Press, New York, (1956), p. 3.

1944. A. Sammes, *Britannia Antiqua Illustrata: Or, the Antiquities of Ancient Britain, Derived from the Phoenicians: Wherein the Original Trade of this Island Is Discovered, the Names of Places, Offices Dignities, as Likewise the Idolatry, Language, and Customs of the*

Primitive Inhabitants Are Clearly Demonstrated from That Nation. . . Together with a Chronoloical History of this Kingdom, from the First Traditional Beginning, until the Year of Our Lord 800. . . Faithfully Collected out of the Best Authors ... with the Antiquities of the Saxons, as Well as Phoenicians, Greeks, and Romans. The First Volume, Printed by T. Roycroft, for the Author, London, 1676

1945. H. Rowlands, *Mona Antiqua Restaurata. An Archæological Discourse on the Antiquities, Natural and Historical, of the Isle of Anglesey, the Antient Seat of the British Druids. In Two Essays. With an Appendix, Containing a Comparative Table of Primitive Words, and the Derivatives of Them in Several of the Tongues of Europe; with Remarks upon Them. Together with Some Letters, and Three Catalogues, Added Thereunto. I. of the Members of Parliament from the County of Anglesey, Ii. Of the High-sheriffs; and Iii. Of the Beneficed Clergy Thereof, Printed by A. Rhames, Dublin, (1723).*

1946. W. Stukeley, *Stonehenge: A Temple Restor'd to the British Druids, : Printed for W. Innys and R. Manby, London, (1740); and Abury, a Temple of the British Druids with Some Others, Described, Wherein Is a More Particular Account of the First and Patriarchal Religion, and of the Peopling the British Islands, Printed for the Author, London, (1743).*

1947. L. A. Waddell, *The Phoenician Origin of Britons, Scots & Anglo-Saxons Dicovered by Phoenician & Sumerian Inscription in Britain, by Pre-roman Briton Coins & a Mass of New History, Williams and Norgate, London, (1924).*

1948. B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and Sword: England and Palestine from the Bronze Age to Balfour, New York University Press, New York, (1956).*

1949. T. Brightman, *Brightmans predictions and prophecies vvritten 46 yeares since: concerning the three churches of Germanie, England, and Scotland : fore-telling the miserie of Germanie, the fall of the pride of bishops in England by the assistance of the Scottish Kirk: all which should happen, as he foretold, between the yeares of 36 and 41, &c., (1641); and A reuelation of the Reuelation: that is, the Reuelation of St. John opened clearely with a logicall resolution and exposition : wherein the sense is cleared, out of the Scripture, the euent also of thinges foretold is discussed out of the church-historyes, Amsterdam, (1615); and The revelation of S. Iohn illustrated with an analysis & scholions Where in the sence is opened by the scripture, & the euent of things fore-told, shewed by histories, Class [on van Dorpe], Leyden, (1616); and A revelation of the Apocalyps, that is, the Apocalyps of S. Iohn illustrated vvith an analysis & scolions where the sense is opened by the scripture, & the events of things foretold, shewed by histories. Hereunto is prefixed a generall view: and at the end of the 17. chapter, is inserted a refutation of R. Bellarmine touching Antichrist, in his 3. book of the B. of Rome, Iudocus Hondius & Hendrick Laurens, Amsterdam, (1611); and Apocalypsis apocalypseos: id est Apocalypsis D. Joannis analysi et scholiis illustrata; ubi ex scriptura sensus rerumque praedictarum ex historiis eventus discutiuntur. Huic Synopsis praefigitur universalis, et refutatio Rob. Bellarmini de antichristo libro tertio de Romano Pontifice ad finem capituli decimi septimi inseritur, Heidelberg, (1612); and Een Grondighe ontdeckinghe ofte duydelijcke uytlegginghe, met een logicele ontknoopinghe, over de gantsche openbaringe Iohannis des Apostels: waer in de sin uyt de Schriftuere verklaert, ende insghelijchs de uytkomsten der dinghen die voorseyt waren, met de kerchelijcke historien aenghewesen worden, Jan Evertsz Cloppenburch, boeckvercooper, 'tAmstelredam, (1621).*

1950. F. Kett, *An Epistle [S]ent to Divers [Pa]pistes in England Prouing [Th]e Pope to Be the Beast in the [1]3 of the Reuelations, and to Be the Man Exalted in the Temple of God, as God, Thess. 2.2, Henry Marsh, London, (1585).*

1951. F. Kett, *The Glorious and Beautifull Garland of Mans Glorification. Containing the Godlye Misterie of Heauenly Ierusalem, the Helmet of Our Saluation. The Comming of*

Christ in the Fleshe for Our Glorie, and His Glorious Com[m]ing in the End of the World to Crowne Men with Crownes of Eternall Glorie. Beeing an Heauenly Adamant to Drawe Thee to Christ and a Spirituall Rod to Mortifie Thy Life. Made and Set Foorth by Frauncis Kett, Doctor of Phisick, Roger Ward, London, (1585).

1952. R. Sharif, "Christians for Zion, 1600-1919", *Journal for Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 123-141.

1953. R. Sharif, "Christians for Zion, 1600-1919", *Journal for Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 123-141.

1954. "The State and Prospect of the Jews", *The London Times*, (24 January 1839), p. 3. B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and Sword: England and Palestine from the Bronze Age to Balfour*, New York University Press, New York, (1956), p. 89.

1955. R. Sharif, "Christians for Zion, 1600-1919", *Journal for Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 123-141, at 123-124. Sharif cites: (1) F. Kobler, *The Vision was There: Of the British Movement for the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine*, Published for the World Jewish Congress, British Section, by Lincolns-Prager, London, (1956), p. 7. (2) N. Sokolow, "Introduction", *History of Zionism, 1600-1918*, Volume 1, Longmans, Green and Co., London, (1919), p. xxvi. (3) N. Sokolow, "Introduction", *History of Zionism, 1600-1918*, Volume 1, Longmans, Green and Co., London, (1919), p. xxvii.

1956. H. Finch, *The Worlds Great Restauration. Or the Calling of the Ievves and (With Them) of All the Nations and Kingdomes of the Earth, to the Faith of Christ*, William Gouge, London, (1621).

1957. J. Milton, *Paradise Regained*, Printed by J.M. for John Starkey, London, (1671).

1958. J. Collet, *A Treatise of the Future Restoration of the Jews and Israelites to Their Land: with Some Account of the Goodness of the Country, and Their Happy Condition There, till They Shall Be Invaded by the Turks : with Their Deliverance from All Their Enemies, When the Messiah Will Establish His Kingdom at Jerusalem, and Bring in the Last Glorious Ages*, Printed for J. Highmore, M. Cooper and G. Freer, London, (1747).

1959. J. Eyre, *Observations upon the Prophecies Relating to the Restoration of the Jews: with an Appendix in Answer to the Objections of Some Late Writers*, Printed for T. Cadell, London, (1771).

1960. C. Jerram, *An Essay Tending to Shew the Grounds Contained in Scripture for Expecting a Future Restoration of the Jews*, Printed by J. Burges and sold by W.H. Lunn, J. Deighton, and J. Nicholson, Cambridge, (1796). **See also:** C. Jerram, *A Sermon Preached at the Parish Church of St. Paul, Covent Garden, on Thursday Evening, May 7, 1829, Before the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews*, (1829).

1961. "Mother Shipton", *The Prophetie of Mother Shipton in the Raigne of King Henry the Eighth Foretelling the Death of Cardinall Wolsey, the Lord Percy and Others, as Also What Should Happen in Insuing Times*, Printed for Richard Lounds, London, (1641).

1962. U. Shipton, *The Second Part of Mother Shiptons Prophecies: With Sixteen Others. . . Not Onely Concerning the Kingdome of England, but Also of the Turks Invading Germany, the Downfall of the Pope, and the Calling of the Jews*, Printed for Joshua Coniers in the Long-Walke near Christ-church hospital, London, (1651). **See also:** R. Head, *The Life and Death of the Famous Mother Shipton; Containing, an Account of Her Strange Birth, and the Most Important Passages of Her Life; Also Her Prophecies Now Newly Collected and Explained, and Illustrative of Some of the Most Wonderful Events That Have Happened, or Are to Come to Pass. Taken from a Very Scarce Copy*, Published Upwards of Two Hundred Years Since, Dean and Munday, London. **See also:** R. Head, *The Life and Death of Mother Shipton. Being not only a true Account of her Strange BIRTH, and most Important Passages of her LIFE, but also of her Prophecies: Now newly Collected. and Historically Experienced,*

from the time of her Birth, in the Reign of KING HENRY the VII, until this present year 1684, Containing the most Important Passages of State during the reign of these Kings and Queens of England following, viz. Henry the VIII. King James. Edward the VI. King Charles the I. Queen Mary. King Charles the II. Queen Elizabeth. Whom God Preserve. Strangly Preserved amongst other writings belonging to an Old Monastery in York-shire, and now published for the Information of Posterity. To which are added some other Prophecies yet unfulfil'd. As also Mr. Folwells's Predictions concerning the Turk, Pope, and French King, With Reflections thereupon, Printed for Benj. Harris, at the Stationers-Armes and Anchor under the Piazza of the Royal Exchange, London, (1684).

1963. C. Hindley, *The Life, Prophecies, and Death of the Famous Mother Shipton : Being Not Only a True Account of Her Strange Birth and Most Important Passages of Her Life, but Also All Her Prophecies*, J. Buck, Brighton, (1862).

1964. W. H. Harrison, "Spiritualist", *Mother Shipton Investigated: the Result of Critical Examination in the British Museum of the Literature Relating to the Yorkshire Sibyl*, Norwood Editions, Norwood, Pennsylvania, (1881/1976).

1965. J. M. Snoek, *The Grey Book*, Humanities Press, New York, (1970), pp. I-XXVI.

1966. M. Luther, *Das Jhesus Christus ain geborner Jude sey*, Melchior Ramminger, Wittenberg, (1523); **also:** *Das Jhesus Christus eyn geborner Jude sey*, Cranach u. Döring, 1523; English translation in: "That Jesus Christ was Born a Jew", *Luther's Works*, Volume 45, Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, (1962), pp. 199-229.

1967. M. Luther, *Von den Juden und ihren Lügen*, Hans Lufft, Wittenberg, (1543); Reprinted, Ludendorffs, München, (1932); English translation by Martin H. Bertram, "On the Jews and Their Lies", *Luther's Works*, Volume 47, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, (1971), pp. 123-306.

1968. M. Ould-Mey, "The Non-Jewish Origin of Zionism", *The Arab World Geographer / Le Géographe du monde arabe*, Volume 5, Number 1, (2002), pp. 34-52:

<<http://mama.indstate.edu/users/mouldmey/The%20Non-Jewish%20Origin%20of%20Zionism.PDF>>

1969. A. J. B. Simonini to A. Barruel Simonini of 1 August 1806, *Le Contemporain* (Paris), (July, 1878), pp. 58-61; **also:** N. Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société, ou, Philosophie de l'histoire contemporaine*, Volume 3, Seguin Frère, Avignon (1881), pp. 658-661; **also** A. Nechvolodov, *L'empereur Nicolas II et les Juifs: Essais sur la révolution russe dans ses rapports avec l'activité universelle du judaïsme contemporain*, Étienne Chiron, Paris, (1924), pp. 231-234.

1970. G. S. Faber, *Thoughts on the Calvinistic and Arminian Controversy*, Printed for F.C. and J. Rivington, London, (1803); **and** *A Dissertation on the Prophecies That Have Been Fulfilled, Are Now Fulfilling, or Will Hereafter Be Fulfilled Relative to the Great Period of 1260 Years, the Papal and Mohammedan Apostacies, the Tyrannical Reign of Antichrist, or the Infidel Power, and the Restoration of the Jews: to Which Is Added, an Appendix*, Andrews and Cummings, Boston, (1808); **and** *A General and Connected View of the Prophecies, Relative to the Conversion, Restoration, Union, and Future Glory of the Houses of Judah and Israel; the Progress, and Final Overthrow, of the Antichristian Confederacy in the Land of Palestine; and the Ultimate General Diffusion of Christianity*, Published by William Andrews. T.B. Wait & Co. Printers, Boston, (1809); **and** *A Dissertation on the Prophecy Contained in Daniel IX 24-27: Generally Denominated the Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks*, F.C. and J. Rivington, London, (1811); **and** *The conversion of the Jews to the Faith of Christ*, A. Macintosh, London, (1822); **and** *The Fourteenth Report of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews: with an Appendix Containing Extracts of Correspondence, and a List of Subscribers and Benefactors to March 31, 1822;*

to Which Is Prefixed a Sermon Preached Before the Society on April 18, 1822 at the Parish Church of St. Paul, Covent Garden, by the Rev. George Stanley Faber, London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, London, (1822); **and** *The Conversion of the Jews to the Faith of Christ the True Medium of the Conversion of the Gentile World: a Sermon Preached Before the London Society for Promoting Christianity Amongst the Jews, on Thursday, April 18, 1822, at the Parish Church of St. Paul, Covent Garden*, Published for the Baltimore Auxiliary Society for Meliorating the Condition of the Jews, Baltimore, (1823); **and** *Protestantism & Catholicism: the Catholic Question: to the editor of the St. James's Chronicle*, St. James Chronicle, Edinburgh, (1829); **and** *The Difficulties of Romanism*, Towar & Hogan, Philadelphia, (1829); **and** *Recapitulated Apostasy, the True Rationalè of the Concealed Apocalyptic Name of the Roman Empire*, Printed for J.G. & F. Rivington, London, (1833); **and** *Difficulties of Infidelity*, Rivington, London, (1833); **and** *The Primitive Doctrine of Justification Investigated: Relatively to the Several Definitions of the Church of Rome and the Church of England; and with a Special Reference to the Opinions of the Late Mr. Knox, as Published in His Remains*, R.B. Seeley and W. Burnside, London, (1839); **and** *Views of Daniel VIII; Extracted from His Dissertations on the Prophecies*, Sold by I. Wilcox, Providence, (1844); **and** *Rome and the Bible*, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London, (1845); **and** *A Sermon Preached Before the London Society for the Promotion of Christianity Amongst the Jews*, Justus Cobb, Printer, Middlebury, (1847); **and** *Facts and Assertions, Or, a Brief and Plain Exhibition of the Incongruity of the Peculiar Doctrines of the Church of Rome: With Those Both of the Sacred Scriptures and of the Early Writers of the Christian Church Catholic*, Printed for the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London, (1851); **and** *The Revival of the French Emperorship Anticipated from the Necessity of Prophecy*, T. Bosworth, London, (1853); **and** *The Predicted Downfall of the Turkish Power: The Preparation for the Return of the Ten Tribes*, T. Bosworth, London, (1853).

1971. Sanhedrin 97a, 97b, 98a, 98b, 99a, 99b. Compare to *Job* 12.

1972. "Napoleon I (Bonaparte)", *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume 10, Robert Appleton Company, (1911).

1973. A. Lemoine, *Napoléon Ier [i.e. Premier] et les Juifs*, : F. Frères, Paris, (1900). **See also:** E. Kahn, *Napoleon and the Jews*, Rabbinical Dissertation, Hebrew Union College, Ohio, (1902). **See also:** R. Anchel, . . . *Napoléon et les Juifs*, Les Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, (1928). **See also:** K. E. Zeis, *Napoleon and the Jews*, Masters Thesis, Univ of Wisconsin, Madison, (1939). **See also:** B. Weider, *Napoleon et les Juifs*, Souvenir Napoléonien du Canada Montreal, (1971). **See also:** F. Kobler, *Napoleon and the Jews*, Schoken Books, New York, (1975). S. Schwarzfuchs, *Napoleon, the Jews, and the Sanhedrin*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, Boston, (1979). **See also:** J. Lémann, *Napoléon et les juifs*, Avalon, Paris, (1989).

1974. "The Modern Jews", *The North American Review*, Volume 60, Number 127, (April, 1845), pp. 329-368, at 344.

1975. F. Kobler, *Napoleon and the Jews*, Schoken Books, New York, (1975), p. 166. **See also:** A. C. L. Crawford, a. k. a. Lord Lindsay, "Letters on Egypt, Edom, and the Holy Land", *The Quarterly Review*, Volume 125, (December, 1838), pp. 166-192. **See also:** J. D. Klier, *Russia Gathers Her Jews: The Origins of the "Jewish Question" in Russia, 1772-1825*, Northern Illinois University Press, Dekalb, Illinois, (1986).

1976. L. Mayer, *Restoration of the Jews: Being an Extract from an Entire New Work, Intended to Be Published by Subscription Entitled "Truth Dispelling the Clouds of Error, by the Fulfilment of the Prophecies": Addressed to the Jews*, London, (1803); **and** *Bonaparte the Emperor of the Gauls, Considered as the Lucifer and Gog of Isaiah and*

Ezekiel: And the Issue of the Present Contest Between Great Britain and France Represented According to Divine Revelation, with an Appeal to Reason on the Errors of Commentators, C. Stower, London, (1804); **and** *Restoration of the Jews: Containing an Explanation of the Prophecies in the Books of Daniel and the Revelations, That Relate to the Period When Their Restoration Will Be Accomplished. With an Illustration, Applicable to the Jews, of the Two Olive Trees, and the Two Candlesticks, That Are Said to Stand Before the God of the Earth, and the Two Witnesses, Who Were to Prophecy, Clothed in Sackcloth, 1260 Days. Addressed to the Jews*, London, (1806); **and** *Peace with France, and Catholic Emancipation: Repugnant to the Command of God*, London, (1806); **and** *The Important Period, and Long Wished for Revolution, Shewn to Be at Hand, When God Will Cleanse the Earth by His Judgments*, Williams & Smith, London, (1806); **and** *The Prophetic Mirror; Or, a Hint to England: Containing an Explanation of Prophecy That Relates to the French Nation, and the Threatened Invasion; Proving Bonaparte to Be the Beast That Arose out of the Earth, with Two Horns like a Lamb, and Spake as a Dragon, Whose Number is 666. Rev. XIII*, London, (1806); **and** *Bonaparte the Emporor of the French, Considered as the Lucifer and Gog of Isaiah and Ezekiel: And the Issues of the Present Contest Between Great Britain and France, Represented According to Divine Revelation with an Appeal to Reason, on Prophecy, and the Errors of Commentators. . . Also an Hieroglyphic Published in 1804, of the Destiny of Europe, the Fate of the German Empire, and the Fall of Russia. And a New Explanation of Daniel's Seventy Weeks*, London, (1806); **and** *Truth Dispelling the Clouds of Error: Containing a New Explanation of Nebuchadnezzar's Great Image and the Prophecies of Balaam, Which Relate to the Total Destruction of the Antichristian Powers, and the Annihilation of the Turkish and Persian Empires. Part I*, W. Nicholson for Williams & Smith, London, (1807); **and** *Death of Bonaparte, and Universal Peace: A New Explanation of Nebuchadnezzar's Great Image, and Daniel's Four Beasts*, W. Nicholson, London, (1809).

1977. From: A. Nadler, "Last Exit to Brooklyn: The Lubavitcher's Powerful and Preposterous Messianism", *The New Republic*, (4 May 1992), pp. 27-35, at 34. Nadler appears to quote from: N. Loewenthal, *Communicating the Infinite: The Emergence of the Habad School*, University of Chicago Press, (1990).

1978. M. P. Baxter, "The Coming Battle and the Appalling National Convulsions Foreshown in Prophecy Immediately to Occur During the Period 1861-67 / by an Episcopal Minister", *Second Advent Library* (Jenks), Volume 105, Number 2, W. Harbert, Philadelphia, (1860); **and** "End of the World about 1864-69 : as Held and Clearly Demonstrated by More than Fifty Expositors ... Whose Predictions of Coming Calamities Are Verified by the Present American Commotion Which Is Only a Prelude to the Dreadful Wars, Famines, Pestilences, and Earthquakes, That Will Prevail until the End in 1869 ... : and Then the Subjugation of England about 1864-5 by Napoleon the Antichrist ... / by the Rev. M. Baxter ...", *Second Advent Library* (Jenks), Volume 105, Number 1, E. Dutton, Boston, (1861); **and** *Louis Napoleon, the Destined Monarch of the World, and Personal Antichrist, Foreshown in Prophecy to Confirm a Seven Years' Covenant with the Jews About, or Soon after 1863, and Then, (After the Resurrection and the Translation of the Wise Virgins Has Taken Place Two Years and from Four to Six Weeks after the Covenant,) Subsequently to Become Completely Supreme over England and Most of America, and All Christendom, and Fiercely to Persecute Christians During the Latter Half of the Seven Years, until He Finally Perishes at the Descent of Christ at the Battle of Armageddon, about or Soon after 1870: Including an Examination of the Views of the Revs. G. S. Faber, Edward Irving, E. Bickersteth, T. Birks, C. Maitland, Sir E. Denny, Lord Congleton, Major Phillips, Judge Strange, Dr. Tregelles, Etc.: with Seven Diagrams and Two Maps... / by the Rev. M. Baxter, of the*

Episcopal Church..., Third Enlarged Edition, Wm. S. & A. Martien, Philadelphia; ; D. Appleton & Co., New York; Sheldon & Co. ; J. E. Tilton & Co., Boston; S. C. Griggs & Co., Chicago; W. C. Chewett & Co., Toronto, (1863); **and** *Forty Future Wonders Predicted in Daniel and Revelation: Between 1906 and the End of this Age in Passover Week, 1929 or 1931, as Foreshown in the Prophecies of Daniel and Revelation... ; with Quotations from the Expositions of Archbishop Cyprian, the Late Duke of Manchester, Lord Cavan... ; with Five Appendices and 50 Illustrations (Some Being from Ancient Bibles in the British Museum / by Rev. M. Baxter (Founder of the "Christian Herald" and "Prophetic News")*, Eleventh Edition, M. Baxter, London, (1903).

1979. A. Muhlstein, *Baron James: The Rise of the French Rothschilds*, Vendome Press, New York, (1982), p. 41.

1980. S. Schwarzfuchs, *Napoleon, the Jews, and the Sanhedrin*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, Boston, (1979), p. 1.

1981. F. Kobler, *Napoleon and the Jews*, Schocken Books, New York, (1975), pp. 174-175.

1982. S. Schwarzfuchs, *Napoleon, the Jews, and the Sanhedrin*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, Boston, (1979), p. 165.

1983. S. Schwarzfuchs, *Napoleon, the Jews, and the Sanhedrin*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, Boston, (1979), p. 166.

1984. F. Kobler, *Napoleon and the Jews*, Schocken Books, New York, (1975), p. 162. Kobler cites: J. A. C. Chaptal, *Mes Souvenirs sur Napoléon*, E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie, Paris, (1893), pp. 242ff. Kobler believes the quotation is apocryphal.

1985. J. Somers, D. Defoe, J. Dunton, G. Burnet, T. Harrison, *Vox populi, vox Dei: being true maxims of government : proving I. That all kings, governours, and forms of government proceed from the people, II. The nature of our constitution is fairly stated, with the original contract between king & people, and a journal of the late revolution, III. That resisting of tyrannical power is allow'd by scripture and reason, IV. That the children of Israel did often resist and turn out their evil princes, and that God Almighty did approve of resistance, V. That the primitive Christians did often resist their tyrannical emperors, and that Bishop Athanasius, St. Chrysostom, Luther, and Melancthon, &c. did approve of resistance, VI. That the Protestants in all ages did resist their evil and destructive princes, VII. Together with a historical account of the depriving of kings for their evil government in Israel, France, Spain, Scotland, &c. and in England before and since the Conquest, VIII. That absolute passive-obedience is a damnable and treasonable doctrine. By contradicting the glorious attributes of God, and encouraging of rebellion, usurpation and tyranny : To which no answer will be made, or dare be made, or can be made, without treason, not to be behind Mr. Lesley, or any Jacobite assurance*, Printed for the Author, and are to be sold by T. Harrison ..., London, (1709). T. Paine, *Common sense: addressed to the inhabitants of America, on the following interesting subjects : I. Of the origin and design of government in general, with concise remarks on the English Constitution. II. Of monarchy and hereditary succession. III. Thoughts on the present state of American affairs. IV. Of the present ability of America, with some miscellaneous reflections*, W. and T. Bradford, Philadelphia, (1776).

1986. See: "Frank, Jacob, and the Frankists", *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 7 Fr-Ha, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 55-71. **See also:** G. Scholem, "The Holiness of Sin", *Commentary* (American Jewish Committee), Volume 51, Number 1, (January, 1971), pp. 41-70; reprinted: G. Scholem, "Redemption Through Sin", *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*, Schocken Books, New York, (1971), pp. 78-141. **See also:** G. G. Scholem, *Sabbatai Sevi: The Mystical Messiah, 1626-1676*, Princeton University Press, (1973). **See also:** Rabbi M. S. Antelman, *To Eliminate the Opiate*, Volume 1, Chapter 10, Zahavia, New

York, (1974). **See also:** H. Graetz, *Popular History of the Jews*, Volume 5, Fifth Edition, Hebrew publishing Company, New York, (1937), p. 245-259.

1987. A. Hitler, English translation by Ralph Manheim, *Mein Kampf*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, New York, (1971), pp. 64-65.

1988. G. Dalman, *Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar, and the Liturgy of the Synagogue*, Deighton Bell, Cambridge, (1893), p. 22.

1989. I *Enoch* 22:7.

1990. Quoted in: *Revelation: It's Climax at Hand!*, Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc., International Bible Students Association, Brooklyn, New York, (1988), p. 105.

1991. G. Dalman, *Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar, and the Liturgy of the Synagogue*, Deighton Bell, Cambridge, (1893), pp. 99-100.

1992. E. A. Drumont, *Les juifs contre la France une nouvelle Pologne*, Librairie Antisémite, Paris, (1899), pp. 36-48; English translation in: R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 107-112, at 107, 111. **See also:** E. A. Drumont, A. de Rothschild and A. L. Burdeau, *Burdeau-Rothschild contre Drumont; Le proces de la libre parole, debats complets*, Paris, (1892).

1993. G. Hosking, *Russia and the Russians: A History*, Harvard University Press, (2001), p. 258.

1994. Historical Research Department of the Nation of Islam (Chicago), *The Secret Relationship between Blacks and Jews*, Chicago, Latimer Associates, (1991). **For counter-argument, see:** H. D. Brackman, *Ministry of Lies: The Truth behind the Nation of Islam's The Secret Relationship between Blacks and Jews*, Four Walls Eight Windows, New York, (1994); **and** "Jews Had Negligible Role in Slave Trade", *The New York Times*, (14 February 1994), p. A16. **Contrast these with Brackman's own statements in his PhD dissertation:** H. D. Brackman, PhD Dissertation, University of Californian, Los Angeles, *The Ebb and Flow of Conflict—History of Black-Jewish Relations Through 1900*, University Microfilms International (Dissertation Services), Ann Arbor, Michigan, (1977); **and see:** T. Martin, *The Jewish Onslaught: Despatches from the Wellesley Battlefield*, Majority Press, Dover, Massachusetts, (1993). **See also:** L. Brenner, Letter to the Editor, *The New York Times*, (28 February 1994), p. A16; **and** "Harold Brackman Believes in Recycling Garbage", *New York Amsterdam News*, (11 March 1995). **See also:** M. A. Hoffman II, *Judaism's Strange Gods*, Independent History and Research, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, (2000), pp. 66-67.

1995. B. M. Baruch, *Baruch: My Own Story*, Henry Holt and Company, New York, (1957), pp. 107-108. A. Muhlstein, *Baron James: The Rise of the French Rothschilds*, Vendome Press, New York, (1982).

1996. S. D. Butler, *War Is a Racket*, Round Table Press, New York, (1935).

1997. P. L. Rose, *Revolutionary Antisemitism in Germany from Kant to Wagner*, Princeton University Press, (1990), pp. 104-105. Rose cites: J. H. Herder, "Bekehrung der Juden", *Adrastea* (Leipzig), Volume 4, (1802); Reprinted: J. H. Herder, *Sämtliche Werke*, Collected Works in 33 Volumes Edited by Bernhard Ludwig Suphan, Volume 24, Georg Olms, Hildesheim, (1877 Reprinted 1967), p. 67.

1998. G. Higgins, *Anacalypsis: An Attempt to Draw Aside the Veil of the Saitic Isis : Or, an Inquiry into the Origin of Languages, Nations, and Religions*, Volume 2, Book 5, Chapter 2, Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longman, London, (1836), p. 358.

1999. D. Hartley, *Observations on Man, His Frame, His Duty, and His Expectations in Two Parts*, Volume 2, Printed by S. Richardson for James Leake and Wm. Frederick, booksellers in Bath and sold by Charles Hitch and Stephen Austen, booksellers in London, London, (1749), pp. 184, 366-381.

- 2000.** See, for example: H. Biellohlawek, "Yes, We Want to Annihilate the Jews!" in R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 115-120.
- 2001.** A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *Israel chez les nations: Les Juifs et l'antisémitisme*, C. Lévy, Paris, (1893); English translation by F. Hellman, "The Jew is the product of His Tradition and His Law", *Israel among the Nations: A Study of the Jews and Antisemitism*, Chapter 6, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, W. Heinemann, London, (1895), pp. 123-147.
- 2002.** I. Zangwill, *The Problem of the Jewish Race*, Judaen Publishing Company, New York, (1914), pp. 9, 11. J. Prinz, *The Secret Jews*, Random House, New York, (1973), pp. 111-112.
- 2003.** Y. Küçük, *Şebeke = Network*, YGS Yayinlari, Kadiköy, Istanbul, (2002).
- 2004.** *Sanhedrin* 97a-99b.
- 2005.** Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, (1972); English translation: *The Five Books of Quintus Sept. Flor. Tertullianus Against Marcion*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, (1868). "Marcionites", *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume 9, Robert Appleton Company, New York, (1910), pp. 645-649.
- 2006.** "Marcionites", *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume 9, Robert Appleton Company, New York, (1910), pp. 645-649, at 646-647.
- 2007.** G. Scholem, "The Holiness of Sin", *Commentary* (American Jewish Committee), Volume 51, Number 1, (January, 1971), pp. 41-70, at 63.
- 2008.** G. Scholem, "The Holiness of Sin", *Commentary* (American Jewish Committee), Volume 51, Number 1, (January, 1971), pp. 41-70, at 64.
- 2009.** G. Scholem, "The Holiness of Sin", *Commentary* (American Jewish Committee), Volume 51, Number 1, (January, 1971), pp. 41-70, at 65.
- 2010.** "Frank, Jacob, and the Frankists", *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 7 Fr-Ha, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, The Macmillan Company, New York, (1971), cols. 55-71, at 60, 68.
- 2011.** E. A. Drumont, *Les juifs contre la France une nouvelle Pologne*, Librairie Antisémité, Paris, (1899), pp. 36-48; English translation in: R. S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Toronto, (1991), pp. 107-112, at 111.
- 2012.** R. Dmowski, "The Jews and the War", in R. S. Levy, Editor, J. Kulczycki, translator, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, D. C. Heath and Company, Lexington, Massachusetts, Toronto, (1991), pp. 182-189.
- 2013.** T. Brightman, *Brightmans predictions and prophecies vwritten 46 yeares since: concerning the three churches of Germanie, England, and Scotland: fore-telling the miserie of Germanie, the fall of the pride of bishops in England by the assistance of the Scottish Kirk: all which should happen, as he foretold, between the yeares of 36 and 41, &c.*, (1641); **and** *A reuelation of the Reuelation: that is, the Reuelation of St. John opened clearly with a logical resolution and exposition: wherein the sense is cleared, out of the Scripture, the euent also of thinges foretold is discussed out of the church-historyes*, Amsterdam, (1615); **and** *The revelation of S. Iohn illustrated with an analysis & scholions Where in the sence is opened by the scripture, & the euent of things fore-told, shewed by histories*, Class [on van Dorpe], Leyden, (1616); **and** *A revelation of the Apocalyps, that is, the Apocalyps of S. Iohn illustrated vwith an analysis & scolions where the sense is opened by the scripture, & the events of things foretold, shewed by histories. Hereunto is prefixed a generall view: and at the end of the 17. chapter, is inserted a refutation of R. Bellarmine touching Antichrist, in his 3. book of the B. of Rome*, Iudocus Hondius & Hendrick Laurens, Amsterdam, (1611); **and** *Apocalypsis apocalypseos: id est Apocalypsis D. Joannis analysi et scholiis illustrata: ubi ex scriptura sensus rerumque praedictarum ex historiis eventus discutiuntur. Huic*

Synopsis praefigitur universalis, et refutatio Rob. Bellarmini de antichristo libro tertio de Romano Pontifice ad finem capituli decimi septimi inseritur, Heidelberg, (1612); and *Een Grondighe ontdeckinghe ofte duydelijcke uytlegginghe, met een logicale ontknoopinghe, over de gantsche openbaringhe Iohannis des Apostels: waer in de sin uyt de Schriftuere verklaert, ende insghelijchs de uytkomsten der dinghen die voorseyt waren, met de kerchelijcke historien aenghewesen worden*, Jan Evertsz Cloppenburch, boeckvercooper. . . , 'tAmstelredam, (1621).

2014. H. Finch, *The Worlds Great Restauration. Or the Calling of the Ievves and (With Them) of All the Nations and Kingdomes of the Earth, to the Faith of Christ*, William Gouge, B. of D. and Preacher of Gods word in Black-Fryers, London, Printed by Edvvard Griffin for William Bladen, and are to be sold at his shop neare the great north dore of Pauls, at the signe of the Bible, (1621).

2015. H. M. Kallen quoted in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), p. 532.

2016. *Peace and War: United States Foreign Policy, 1931-1941*, United States Department of State, Publication 1983, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., (1943), pp. 178-185.

2017. A. H. P. Kent, *Petition to Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States for the Redress of Grievances Suffered by My Son, Tyler Kent, a Loyal Citizen of the United States*, Washington, D. C., (1944). **See also:** J. S. Snow, *The case of Tyler Kent*, Published jointly by Domestic and Foreign Affairs and Citizens Press, Chicago, New York, (1946). **See also:** R. Whalen, "The Strange Case of Tyler Kent", *Diplomat*, (November, 1965), pp. 16-19, 62-64. **See also:** W. F. Kimball, "Churchill and Roosevelt: The Personal Equation", *Prologue*, Volume 6, (Fall, 1974), pp. 169-82. **See also:** F. L. Loewenheim, H. D. Langley, and M. Jonas, *Roosevelt and Churchill: Their Secret Wartime Correspondence*, Saturday Review Press, New York, (1975). **See also:** J. Leutze, "The Secret of the Churchill-Roosevelt Correspondence: September 1939-May 1940", *Journal of Contemporary History*, Volume 10, (1975), pp. 465-91. **See also:** J. P. Lash, *Roosevelt and Churchill 1939-1941: The Partnership that Saved the West*, Norton, New York, (1976). **See also:** D. Irving, "Tyler Gatewood Kent: The Many Motives of a Misguided Cypher Clerk", *Focal Point*, (23 November 1981), pp. 3-10. **See also:** Kimball, Warren F., and Bartlett, Bruce. "Roosevelt and Prewar Commitments to Churchill: The Tyler Kent Affair", *Diplomatic History*, Volume 5, Number 4, (Fall, 1981), pp. 291-312. **See also:** R. Harris, "The American Tearoom Spy", *The London Times*, (4 December 1982), p. 6. **See also:** R. Bearnse and A. Read, *Conspirator: the Untold Story of Churchill, Roosevelt and Tyler Kent, Spy*, Macmillan, London, (1991).

2018. A. H. Silver, *Vision and Victory*, Zionist Organization of America, New York, (1949); in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 592-600, at 599.

2019. D. Ben-Gurion, *Ba-Maarachah*, Volume 3, Tel-Aviv, (1948), pp. 200-211, English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 606-619, at 616.

2020. D. Ben-Gurion, *Ba-Maarachah*, Volume 3, Tel-Aviv, (1948), pp. 200-211, English translation in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 606-619, at 607-608.

2021. K. Polkahn, "The Secret Contacts: Zionism and Nazi Germany, 1933-1941", *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3/4, (Spring-Summer, 1976), pp. 54-82, at 58; citing C. Sykes, *Crossroads to Israel*, London, (1965); *Kreuzwege nach Israel; die Vorgeschichte des jüdischen Staates*, C. H. Beck, München, (1967), p. 151.

2022. C. Weizmann, “The Key to Immigration”, *Rebirth and Destiny of Israel*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), p. 41.

2023. T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and Wang, New York, (1993), p. 98.

2024. M. Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: The Armed Prophet*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, (1967), p. 69.

2025. T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, Hill and Wang, New York, (1993), p. 129.

2026. C. Weizmann, *Chaim Weizmann*, V. Gollanez, London, (1945); quoted in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 575-578, at 576.

2027. C. Weizmann, *Chaim Weizmann*, V. Gollanez, London, (1945); quoted in A. Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, (1959), pp. 578-583, at 581.

2028. M. Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: The Armed Prophet*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, (1967), p. 69.

2029. “Letters on Egypt, Edom, and the Holy Land” by A. C. L. Crawford, a. k. a. Lord Lindsay, *The Quarterly Review*, Volume 63, Number 125, (January, 1839), pp. 166-192.

2030. “Letters on Egypt, Edom, and the Holy Land” by A. C. L. Crawford, a. k. a. Lord Lindsay, *The Quarterly Review*, Volume 63, Number 125, (January, 1839), pp. 166-192, at 190.

2031. See: P. Langevin, “Le Physicien”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 20, Number 5, (September, 1913), pp. 675-718. **See also:** H. A. Lorentz, “Deux mémoires de Henri Poincaré sur la physique mathématique”, *Acta Mathematica*, Volume 38, (1921), pp. 293-308; reprinted in *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 683-695; **and** Volume 11, (1956), pp. 247-261. **See also:** W. Pauli, “Relativitätstheorie”, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, Volume 5, Part 2, Chapter 19, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1921), pp. 539-775; English translation by G. Field, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, London, Edinburgh, New York, Toronto, Sydney, Paris, Braunschweig, (1958). **See also:** H. Thirring, “Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper und spezielle Relativitätstheorie”, *Handbuch der Physik*, Volume 12 (“Theorien der Elektrizität Elektrostatik”), Springer, Berlin, (1927), pp. 245-348, especially 264, 270, 275, 283. **See also:** S. Guggenheimer, *The Einstein Theory Explained and Analyzed*, Macmillan, New York, (1929). **See also:** J. Mackaye, *The Dynamic Universe*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1931). **See also:** J. Le Roux, “Le Problème de la Relativité d’Après les Idées de Poincaré”, *Bulletin de la Société Scientifique de Bretagne*, Volume 14, (1937), pp. 3-10. **See also:** Sir Edmund Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume II, Philosophical Library Inc., New York, (1954), especially pp. 27-77; **and** “Albert Einstein”, *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the Royal Society*, Volume 1, (1955), pp. 37-67. **See also:** G. H. Keswani, “Origin and Concept of Relativity, Parts I, II & III”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 15, Number 60, (February, 1965), pp. 286-306; Volume 16, Number 61, (May, 1965), pp. 19-32; Volume 16, Number 64, (February, 1966), pp. 273-294; **and** Volume 17, Number 2, (August, 1966), pp. 149- 152; Volume 17, Number 3, (November, 1966), pp. 234-236. **See also:** G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, “Intimations of Relativity before Einstein”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (December, 1983), pp. 343-354. **See also:** G. B. Brown, “What is Wrong with Relativity?”, *Bulletin of the Institute of Physics and the Physical Society*, Volume 18, Number 3, (March, 1967), pp. 71-77. **See also:** C. Cuvaj, “Henri Poincaré’s Mathematical Contributions to Relativity and the Poincaré Stresses”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 36, (1968), pp. 1109-1111. **See also:** C. Giannoni, “Einstein and the Lorentz-Poincaré Theory of Relativity”, *PSA: Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of*

the Philosophy of Science Association, Volume 1970, (1970), pp. 575-589. JSTOR link:

<<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0270-8647%281970%291970%3C575%3AEATLTO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Z>>

See also: J. Mehra, *Einstein, Hilbert, and the Theory of Gravitation*, Reidel, Dordrecht, Netherlands, (1974). **See also:** W. Kantor, *Relativistic Propagation of Light*, Coronado Press, Lawrence, Kansas, (1976). **See also:** R. McCormach, “Editor’s Forward”, *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences*, Volume 7, (1976), pp. xi-xxxv. **See also:** H. Ives, D. Turner, J. J. Callahan, R. Hazelett, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers*, Devin-Adair Co., Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979). **See also:** J. Leveugle, “Henri Poincaré et la Relativité”, *La Jaune et la Rouge*, Volume 494, (April, 1994), pp. 29-51; **and** *La Relativité, Poincaré et Einstein, Planck, Hilbert: Histoire véridique de la Théorie de la Relativité*, L’Harmattan, Paris, (2004). **See also:** A. A. Logunov, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995); **and** *The Theory of Gravity*, Nauka, Moscow, (2001); **and** Анри Пуанкаре и ТЕОРИЯ ОТНОСИТЕЛЬНОСТИ, Наука, Москва, (2004). An English translation of this book will soon appear as: *Henri Poincaré and the Theory of Relativity*. **See also:** E. Gianetto, “The Rise of Special Relativity: Henri Poincaré’s Works before Einstein”, *ATTI DEL XVIII CONGRESSO DI STORIA DELLA FISICA E DELL’ASTRONOMICA*, pp. 172-207; URL:

<<http://www.brera.unimi.it/Atti-Como-98/Giannetto.pdf>>

See also: S. G. Bernatosian, *Vorovstvo i obman v nauke*, Erudit, St. Petersburg, (1998), ISBN: 5749800059 . **See also:** U. Bartocci, *Albert Einstein e Olinto De Pretto: La vera storia della formula piu famosa del mondo*, Societa Editrice Andromeda, Bologna, (1999). **See also:** Jean-Paul Auffray, *Einstein et Poincaré: sur les Traces de la Relativité*, Le Pommier, Paris, (1999). **See also:** Y. Brovko, “Einshteinianstvo—agenturnaya set mirovovo kapitala”, *Molodaia Gvardiia*, Number 8, (1995), pp. 66-74, at 70. Юрий Бровко, “Эйнштейнианство — агентурная сеть Мирового капитала”, *Молодая гвардия*, № 8, (1995), сс. 66-74; **and** Y. Brovko, “Razgrom einshteinianstvo”, *Priroda i Chelovek. Svet*, Number 7, (2002), pp. 8-10. Юрий Бровко, “Разгром эйнштейнианства”, *Природа и Человек. Свет*, № 7, (2002), сс. 8-10. URL:

<<http://medograd.narod.ru/einstein.html>>

For counter-argument, see: R. Dugas, *A History of Mechanics*, Dover, New York, (1988), pp. 463-501. **See also:** T. Hirose, “Electrodynamics before the Theory of Relativity, 1890-1905”, *Japanese Studies in the History of Science*, Volume 5, (1966), pp. 1-49; **and** “Theory of Relativity and the Ether”, *Japanese Studies in the History of Science*, Volume 7, (1967), pp. 37-53; **and** “Origins of Lorentz’ Theory of Electrons and the Concept of the Electromagnetic Field”, *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences*, Volume 1, (1969), pp. 151-209; **and** “The Ether Problem, the Mechanistic Worldview, and the Origins of the Theory of Relativity”, *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences*, Volume 7, (1976), pp. 3-82. **See also:** S. Goldberg, “Henri Poincare and Einstein’s Theory of Relativity”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 35, (1967), pp. 934-944; **and** “The Lorentz Theory of Electrons and Einstein’s Theory of Relativity”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 35, (1969), pp. 982-994; **and** “Poincare’s Silence and Einstein’s Relativity: The Role of Theory and

Experiment in Poincaré's Physics", *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Volume 5, Number 17, (1970), pp. 73-84; **and** *Understanding Relativity*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Stuttgart, (1984). **See also:** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, Toronto, Melbourne, (1982). **See also:** A. I. Miller, "A Study of Poincaré's 'Sur la Dynamique de l'Électron'", *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 10, (1972), pp. 207-328; *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 45, Number 11, (November, 1977), pp. 1040-1048; **and** *Albert Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity, Emergence (1905) and Early Interpretation (1905-1911)*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., (1981). **See also:** W. Rindler, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 38, (1970), pp. 1111-1115. **See also:** G. Holton, "On the Origins of the Special Theory of Relativity", *Thematic Origins of Scientific Thought*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, (1973 revised 1988), pp. 191-236; **and** "On the Origins of the Special Theory of Relativity", *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 28, Number 7, (October, 1960), pp. 627-636, especially 633-636; Volume 30, Number 6, (June, 1962), 462-469; **and** *Special Relativity Theory: Selected Papers*, American Institute of Physics, New York, (1963), pp. 1-8.

2032. Lange introduced the term "Inertialsystem" and defined the concept: L. Lange, "Über die wissenschaftliche Fassung der Galilei'schen Beharrungsgesetzes", *Philosophische Studien*, Volume 2, (1885), pp. 266-297, 539-545; L. Lange, "Ueber das Beharrungsgesetz", *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, mathematisch-physische Classe*, Volume 37, (1885), pp. 333-351; **and** *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Bewegungsbegriffes und ihr voraussichtliches Endergebniss. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Kritik der mechanischen Principien von Ludwig Lange*, Wilhelm Engelmann, Leipzig, (1886); **and** "Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Bewegungsbegriffes und ihr voraussichtliches Endergebniss", *Philosophische Studien*, Volume 3, (1886), pp. 337-419, 643-691; **and** "Das Inertialsystem vor dem Forum der Naturforschung: Kritisches und Antikritisches", *Philosophische Studien*, Volume 20, (1902), pp. 1-71; **and** *Das Inertialsystem vor dem Forum der Naturforschung*, Wilhelm Engelmann, Leipzig, (1902); **and** "Mein Verhältnis zu Einstein's Weltbild" ("My Relationship to Einstein's Conception of the World"), *Psychiatrisch-neurologische Wochenschrift*, Volume 24, (1922), pp. 116, 154-156, 168-172, 179-182, 188-190, 201-207.

For references to Lange, and analysis of his work, **see:** B. Thüring, "Fundamental-System und Inertial-System", *Methodos; rivista trimestrale di metodologia e di logica simbolica*, Volume 2, (1950), pp. 263-283; **and** *Die Gravitation und die philosophischen Grundlagen der Physik*, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin, (1967), pp. 75-77, 234-240; **See also:** M. v. Laue, "Dr. Ludwig Lange", *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 35, Number 7, (1948), pp. 193-196; **See also:** E. Mach, *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, (1960), pp. 291-297; **See also:** E. Gehrcke, *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 17, 30-34; **and** "Über den Sinn der Absoluten Bewegung von Körpern", *Sitzungsberichten der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Volume 12, (1912), pp. 209-222; **and** "Über die Koordinatensystem der Mechanik", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 15, (1913), pp. 260-266; **and** A. Müller, "Das Problem des absoluten Raumes und seine Beziehung zum allgemeinen Raumproblem", *Die Wissenschaft*, Volume 39, Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, (1911); **See also:** H. Seeliger, "Kritisches Referat über Lange's Arbeiten", *Vierteljahrsschrift der Astronomischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 22, (1886), pp. 252-259; **and** "Über die sogenannte absolute Bewegung", *Sitzungsberichte der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, (1906), Volume 36, pp. 85-137.

For Lange's immediate predecessors, **see:** C. Neumann, *Ueber die Principien der Galilei-Newton'schen Theorie*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1870); "The Principles of the

Galilean-Newtonian Theory”, *Science in Context*, Volume 6, (1993), pp. 355-368; **See also:** William Thomson and P. G. Tait, *Treatise on Natural Philosophy*, Volume 1, Part 1, §§§ 245, 249, 267, Cambridge University Press, (1879); **See also:** H. Streintz, *Die physikalischen Grundlagen der Mechanik*, B.G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1883); **See also:** James Thomson, “On the Law of Inertia; the Principle of Chronometry; and the Principle of Absolute Clinural Rest, and of Absolute Rotation”, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, Volume 12, (November 1883-July 1884), pp. 568-578; **and** “A Problem on Point-motions for Which a Reference-frame Can So Exist as to Have the Motions of the Points, Relative to It, Rectilinear and Mutually Proportional”, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, Volume 12, (November 1883-July 1884), pp. 730-742; **See also:** P. G. Tait, “Note on Reference Frames”, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, Volume 12, (November 1883-July 1884), pp. 743-745.

2033. W. Voigt, “Ueber das Doppler’sche Princip”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1887), pp. 41-51; reprinted *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 16, Number 20, (15 October 1915), pp. 381-386; English translation, as well as very useful commentary, are found in A. Ernst and Jong-Ping Hsu (W. Kern is credited with assisting in the translation), “First Proposal of the Universal Speed of Light by Voigt in 1887”, *Chinese Journal of Physics* (The Physical Society of the Republic of China), Volume 39, Number 3, (June, 2001), pp. 211-230; URL’s:

<<http://psroc.phys.ntu.edu.tw/cjp/v39/211/211.htm>>

<<http://psroc.phys.ntu.edu.tw/cjp/v39/211.pdf>>

See also: W. Voigt, “Theorie des Lichtes für bewegte Medien”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1887), pp. 177-238.

Lorentz acknowledged Voigt’s priority, and suggested that the “Lorentz Transformation” be called the “Transformations of Relativity”: H. A. Lorentz, *Theory of Electrons*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1909), p. 198 footnote; **and** “Deux mémoires de Henri Poincaré sur la physique mathématique”, *Acta Mathematica*, Volume 38, (1921), p. 295; reprinted in *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 683-695; **and** Volume 11, (1956), pp. 247-261.

Minkowski also acknowledged Voigt’s priority: *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 81; **and** *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 9, Number 22, (November 1, 1908), p. 762. J. Le Roux proposed the nomenclature “Voigt-Lorentzian Transformation” and “Voigt-Lorentzian Group” in “Der Bankrott der Relativitätstheorie”, H. Israel, *et al*, Eds., *Hundert Autoren Gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, (1931), pp. 20-27, at 22.

For further discussion of Voigt’s relativistic transformation, see: F. Hund, “Wer hat die Relativitätstheorie geschaffen?”, *Physikalische Blätter*, Volume 36, Number 8, (1980), pp. 237-240. **See also:** W. Schröder, “Hendrik Antoon Lorentz und Emil Wiechert (Briefwechsel und Verhältnis der beiden Physiker)”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 30, Number 2, (1984), pp. 167-187. **See also:** R. Dugas, *A History of Mechanics*, Dover, New York, (1988), pp. 468, 484, 494. **See also:** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, Toronto, Melbourne, (1982), pp. 121-122.

2034. O. Heaviside, “The Electromagnetic Effects of a Moving Charge”, *The Electrician*, Volume 22, (1888), pp. 147-148; **and** “On the Electromagnetic Effects due to the Motion of Electricity Through a Dielectric”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 27, (1889), pp. 324-339; **and** “On the Forces, Stresses and Fluxes of Energy in the Electromagnetic Field”,

Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, Volume 183A, (1892), p. 423; **and** “A Gravitational and Electromagnetic Analogy”, *The Electrician*, Volume 31, (1893), pp. 281-282, 359; **and** *The Electrician*, Volume 45, (1900), pp. 636, 881.

2035. H. R. Hertz, “Über sehr schnelle elektrische Schwingungen”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 31, (1887), pp. 421-449; English translation in: *Electric Waves, Being Researches on the Propagation of Electric Action with Finite Velocity Through Space*, London, New York, Macmillan, (1893), p. 29ff.; **and** “Über einen Einfluß des ultravioletten Lichtes auf die elektrische Entladung”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 31, (1887), pp. 983-1000; English translation in: *Electric Waves, Being Researches on the Propagation of Electric Action with Finite Velocity Through Space*, London, New York, Macmillan, (1893), p. 63ff.; **and** *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1887), pp. 487ff.; **and** “Über die Einwirkung einer geradlinigen elektrischen Schwingung auf eine benachbarte Strombahn”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 34, (1888), pp. 155-171; **and** “Über die Ausbreitungsgeschwindigkeit der elektrodynamischen Wirkungen”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 34, (1888), pp. 551-569; **and** “Über elektrodynamische Wellen im Luftraume und deren Reflexion”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 34, (1888), pp. 609-623; **and** “Ueber die Grundgleichungen der Elektrodynamik für ruhende Körper”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1890), pp. 106-149; reprinted *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 40, (1890), pp. 577-624; reprinted *Untersuchung über die Ausbreitung der Elektrischen Kraft*, Johann Ambrosius Barth, Leipzig, (1892), pp. 208-255; translated into English by D. E. Jones, as: “On the Fundamental Equations of Electromagnetics for Bodies at Rest”, *Electric Waves, Being Researches on the Propagation of Electric Action with Finite Velocity Through Space*, London, New York, Macmillan, (1893), pp. 195-239; **and** “Ueber die Grundgleichungen der Elektrodynamik für bewegte Körper”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 41, (1890), pp. 369-399; reprinted *Untersuchung über die Ausbreitung der Elektrischen Kraft*, Johann Ambrosius Barth, Leipzig, (1892), pp. 256-285; translated into English by D. E. Jones, as: “On the Fundamental Equations of Electromagnetics for Bodies in Motion”, *Electric Waves, Being Researches on the Propagation of Electric Action with Finite Velocity Through Space*, London, New York, Macmillan, (1893), pp. 241-268.; **and** “Über den Durchgang der Kathodenstrahlen durch dünne Metallschichten”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 45, (1892), pp. 28-32.

2036. G. F. FitzGerald, “On the Electromagnetic Theory of the Reflection and Refraction of Light”, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, Volume 171, (1880), pp. 691-711; **and** “On Electromagnetic Effects Due to the Motion of the Earth”, *The Scientific Transactions of the Royal Dublin Society*, Series 2, Volume 1, (Read May 5th, 1882, published 1883), pp. 319-324; **and** “The Ether and Earth’s Atmosphere (Letter to the Editor)”, *Science*, Volume 13, Number 328, (1889), p. 390; **and** “Boltzmann on Maxwell”, *Nature*, Volume 49, (1894), pp. 381-382. **See also:** O. Lodge, “Aberration Problems”, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A*, Volume 184, (1893), p. 184.

2037. J. Larmor, “A Dynamical Theory of the Electric and Luminiferous Medium”, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A*, Volume 185, (1894), pp. 719-822; Volume 186, (1895), pp. 695-743; Volume 188, (1897), pp. 205-300; **and** “Dynamical Theory of the Ether I & II”, *Nature*, Volume 49, (11 January 1894), pp. 260-262; **and** (18 January 1894), pp. 280-283; **and** *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 44, (1897), p. 503; **and** *Aether and Matter*, Cambridge University Press, (1900); **and** “Can Convection Through the Æther be Detected Electrically?”, *The Scientific Writings of the Late George Francis FitzGerald*, Longmans, Green & Co., London, (1902), pp. 566-569; **and** “On the

Influence of Convection on Optical Rotary Polarization”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 4, (September, 1902), pp. 367-370; **and** “On the Intensity of the Natural Radiation from Moving Bodies and its Mechanical Reaction”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 7, (May, 1904), pp. 578-586; **and** “On the Ascertained Absence of Effects of Motion through the Æther, in Relation to the Constitution of Matter, and the FitzGerald-Lorentz Hypothesis”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 7, (June, 1904), pp. 621-625; **and** “Æther and Absolute Motion”, *Nature*, Volume 76, (18 July 1907), pp. 269-270.

2038. H. A. Lorentz, “Over den Invloed, Dien de Beweging der Aarde op de Lichtverschijnselen Uitoefent”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Natuurkunde, Verslagen en Mededeelingen* (Amsterdam), Volume 2, (1886), pp. 297-372; French translation, “De l’Influence du Mouvement de la Terre sur les Phénomènes Lumineux”, *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, First Series, Volume 21, (1887), pp. 103-176; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 4, M. Nijhoff, The Hague, (1935-1939), pp. 153-214; **and** “Over de terugkaatsing van licht door lichamen die zich bewegen”, *Verslagen der Zittingen de Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Amsterdam), Volume 1, (1892), pp. 28-31; reprinted in English “On the Reflection of Light by Moving Bodies”, *Collected Papers*, Volume 4, pp. 215-218; **and** “De Relatieve Beweging van de Aarde en den Aether”, *Verslagen der Zittingen de Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Amsterdam), Volume 1, (1892/1893), pp. 74-79; translated in English, “The Relative Motion of the Earth and the Ether”, *Collected Papers*, Volume 4, pp. 219-223; **and** “La Théorie Électromagnétique de Maxwell et son Application aux Corps Mouvants”, *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, First Series, Volume 25, (1892), pp. 363-552; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 2, pp. 164-343; **and** *Versuch einer Theorie der electrischen und optischen Erscheinungen in bewegten Körpern*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, (1895); unaltered reprint by B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1906); reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 5, pp. 1-137; **and** “Concerning the Problem of the Dragging Along of the Ether by the Earth”, *Verslagen der Zittingen de Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Amsterdam), Volume 6, (1897), p. 266; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 4, pp. 237-244; **and** “Optical Phenomena Connected with the Charge and Mass of the Ions”, *Verslagen der Zittingen de Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Amsterdam), Volume 6, (1898), p. 506, 555; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 3, pp. 17-39; **and** “Vereenvoudigde Theorie der Electriche en Optische Verschijnselen in Lichamen die Zich Bewegen”, *Verslagen van de gewone vergaderingen der wis- en natuurkundige afdeeling, Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam*, Volume 7, (1899), pp. 507-522; English translation, “Simplified Theory of Electrical and Optical Phenomena in Moving Bodies”, *Proceedings of the Section of Sciences, Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam*, Volume 1, (1899), pp. 427-442; reprinted in K. F. Schaffner, *Nineteenth Century Aether Theories*, Pergamon Press, New York, Oxford, (1972), pp. 255-273; French translation, “Théorie Simplifiée des Phénomènes Électriques et Optiques dans des Corps en Mouvement”, *Verslagen der Zittingen de Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Amsterdam), Volume 7, (1899), p. 507; **and** *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Volume 7, (1902), pp. 64-80; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 5, pp. 139-155; **and** “La Théorie de l’Aberration de Stokes dans l’Hypothèse d’un Éther n’Ayant pas Partout la Même Densité”, *Verslagen der Zittingen de Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Amsterdam), Volume 7, (1899), p. 523; *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam (Noninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam)*, Volume 1, (1899),

p. 425 *et seq.*; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 4, pp. 245-251; **and** “Considérations sur la Pesantuer”, *Verslagen der Zittingen de Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Amsterdam), Volume 8, (1900), p. 603; *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Series 2, Volume 7, (1902), pp. 325-342; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 5, pp. 198-215; **and** “Über die scheinbare Masse der Ionen”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 2, Number 5, (November, 1900), pp. 78-80; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 3, pp. 113-116; **and** “Théorie des Phénomènes Magnéto-Optiques Récemment Découverts”, *Rapports présentés au Congrès international de physique réuni à Paris en 1900 sous les auspices de la Société française de physique, rassemblés et publiés par Ch.-Éd. Guillaume et L. Poincaré*, Volume 3, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1900-1901), pp. 1-33; **and** “De Electronen-Theorie”, *Nederlandsch Natuur en Geneeskundig Congres, Verhandelingen*, Volume 8, (April 12, 1901), p. 35; reprinted in *Collected Papers*, Volume 9, pp. 102-111; **and** “Sur la Méthode du Mirior Tourant pour la Détermination de la Vitesse de la Lumière”, *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Series 2, Volume 6, (1901), pp. 303-318; reprinted in *Collected Papers*, Volume 4, 104-118; **and** *Sichtbare und unsichtbare Bewegungen*, F. Vieweg, Braunschweig, (1902); **and** *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, Volume 5, Part 2, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1904), “Maxwells elektromagnetische Theorie” (submitted June, 1903), Chapter 13, pp. 63-144, and “Weiterbildung der Maxwellschen Theorie, Elektronentheorie” (submitted December, 1903), Chapter 14, pp. 145-280; **and** “Electromagnetische Verschijnselen in een Stelsel dat Zich met Willekeurige Snelheid, Kleiner dan die van Het Licht, Beweegt”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 12, (23 April 1904), pp. 986-1009; translated into English, “Electromagnetic Phenomena in a System Moving with any Velocity Smaller than that of Light”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam (Noninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam)*, 6, (May 27, 1904), pp. 809-831; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 5, pp. 172-197; a redacted and shortened version appears in *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), pp. 11-34; a German translation from the English, “Elektromagnetische Erscheinung in einem System, das sich mit beliebiger, die des Lichtes nicht erreichender Geschwindigkeit bewegt,” appears in *Das Relativitätsprinzip: eine Sammlung von Abhandlungen*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1913), pp. 6-26; **and** *Ergebnisse und Probleme der Elektronentheorie*, Julius Springer, Berlin, (published 1905, received on 20 December 1904; second revised edition published 1906); reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 8, pp. 79-124; **and** *Abhandlungen über theoretische Physik*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1907); **and** *The Theory of Electrons and Its Applications to the Phenomena of Light and Radiant Heat*, B.G. Teubner; Leipzig, G.E. Stechert & Co., New York, (1909); Second Edition, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1916); reprinted Dover, New York, (1952); **and** “Alte und neue Fragen der Physik”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 1234-1257; **and** *Het Relativiteitsbeginsel voor eenparige translaties (1910–1912)*, Brill, Leiden; **and** *Het Relativiteitsbeginsel; drie Voordrachten Gehouden in Teyler’s Stifting*, Erven Loosjes, Haarlem, (1913); German translation, *Das Relativitätsprinzip; drei Vorlesungen gehalten in Teylers Stifting zu Haarlem*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig-Berlin, (1914/1920); **and** “Considérations Élémentaires sur le Principe de Relativité”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 25, (1914), pp. 179-201; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 7, pp. 147-165; **and** “Die Maxwellsche Theorie und die Elektronentheorie”, *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, E. G. Warburg, Ed., *Physik*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1915), p. 311; **and** “The Michelson-Morley-Experiment and the Dimensions of Moving Bodies”, *Nature*, Volume 106, (1921), pp. 793-795; **and** *Lessen Over Theoretische Natuurkunde aan de*

Rijks-Universiteit te Leiden Gegeven, (1922); German translation, *Vorlesungen über theoretische physik an der Universität Leiden*, Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft M. B. H., Leipzig, (1927-1931); English translation, *Lectures on Theoretical Physics*, Macmillan, London, (1931); **and** *Problems of Modern Physics. A Course of Lectures Delivered in the California Institute of Technology*, Ginn and Company, Boston, (1927).

2039. J. H. Poincaré, URL:

<http://gallica.bnf.fr/metacata.idq?Bgc=&Mod=&CiRestriction=%28@_Auteur%20henri%26poincare%29&RPT=>

“Sur les Hypothèses Fondamentales de la Géométrie”, *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France*, Volume 15, (1887), pp. 203-216; **and** *Théorie Mathématique de la Lumière*, Naud, Paris, (1889); **and** “Les Géométries Non-Euclidiennes”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 2, (1891), pp. 769-774; **and** “A Propos de la Théorie de M. Larmor”, *L’Éclairage électrique*, Volume 3, (April 6, May 18, 1895), pp. 5-13, 289-295; Volume 5, (October 5, November 8, 1895) pp. 5-14, 385-392; reprinted *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 369-426; **and** “La Mesure du Temps”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 6, (January, 1898) pp. 1-13; English translation by G. B. Halsted, *The Value of Science*, The Science Press, New York, (1907), pp. 26-36; **and** “La Théorie de Lorentz at le Principe de Réaction”, *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Series 2, Volume 5, (1900), pp. 252-278; reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume IX, pp. 464-488; **and** “RELATIONS ENTRE LA PHYSIQUE EXPÉRIMENTALE ET LA PHYSIQUE MATHÉMATIQUE”, *RAPPORTS PRÉSENTÉS AU CONGRÈS INTERNATIONAL DE PHYSIQUE DE 1900*, Volume I, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1900), pp. 1-29; translated into German “Über die Beziehungen zwischen der experimentellen und mathematischen Physik”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 2, (1900-1901), pp. 166-171, 182-186, 196-201; English translation in *Science and Hypothesis*, Chapters 9 and 10; **and** *Électricité et Optique*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1901), especially Chapter 6, pp. 516-536; **and** *La Science et l’Hypothèse*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1902); translated into English *Science and Hypothesis*, Dover, New York, (1952), which appears in *The Foundations of Science*; translated into German with substantial notations by Ferdinand and Lisbeth Lindemann *Wissenschaft und Hypothese*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1904); **and** Poincaré’s St. Louis lecture from September of 1904, *La Revue des Idées*, 80, (November 15, 1905); “L’État Actuel et l’Avenir de la Physique Mathématique”, *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématique*, Series 2, Volume 28, (1904), p. 302-324; English translation, “The Principles of Mathematical Physics”, *The Monist*, Volume 15, Number 1, (January, 1905), pp. 1-24; **and** *La Valeur de la Science*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1905); English translation by G. B. Halsted, *The Value of Science*, The Science Press, New York, (1907), pp. 26-36; the *The Value of Science*, itself, appears in *The Foundations of Science*; *Science and Hypothesis*, *The Value of Science*, *Science and Method*, The Science Press, Garrison, New York, (1913/1946), University Press of America, Washington D. C., (ca. 1982); **and** “Sur la Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 140, (1905), pp. 1504-1508; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 77-81 URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

reprinted *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 489-493;

English translations appear in: G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, “Intimations of Relativity before Einstein”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (December, 1983), pp. 343-354, at pp. 350-353; **and**, translated by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 7-14; **and** “Sur la Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Rendiconti del Circolo matimatico di Palermo*, Volume 21, (1906, submitted July 23rd, 1905), pp. 129-176; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 18-76 URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume IX, pp. 494-550; redacted English translation by H. M. Schwartz with modern notation, “Poincaré’s Rendiconti Paper on Relativity”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 39, (November, 1971), pp. 1287-1294; Volume 40, (June, 1972), pp. 862-872; Volume 40, (September, 1972), pp. 1282-1287; English translation by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov with modern notation, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 15-78; **and** “La Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 19, (1908), pp. 386-402; reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume IX, pp. 551-586; English translation: “The New Mechanics”, *Science and Method*, Book III, which is reprinted in *Foundations of Science*; **and** *Science et Méthode*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1908); translated in English as *Science and Method*, numerous editions; *Science and Method* is also reprinted in *Foundations of Science*; **and** “La Mécanique Nouvelle”, *Comptes Rendus des Sessions de l’Association Française pour l’Avancement des Sciences*, Conférence de Lille, Paris, (1909), pp. 38-48 ; *La Revue Scientifique*, Volume 47, (1909), pp. 170-177; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 18-76 URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

and 28 April 1909 Lecture in Göttingen: “La Mécanique Nouvelle”, *Sechs Vorträge über der reinen Mathematik und mathematischen Physik auf Einladung der Wolfskehl-Kommission der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften gehalten zu Göttingen vom 22.-28. April 1909*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1910), pp. 51-58; “The New Mechanics”, *The Monist*, Volume 23, (1913), pp. 385-395; **13 October 1910 Lecture in Berlin:** “Die neue Mechanik”, *Himmel und Erde*, Volume 23, (1911), pp. 97-116; *Die neue Mechanik*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1911); **and** *Dernières Pensées*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1913); translated in English as *Mathematics and Science: Last Essays*, Dover, New York, (1963); **and** *The Foundations of Science: Science and Hypothesis, The Value of Science, Science and Method*, The Science Press, Garrison, New York, (1913/1946), University Press of America, Washington D. C., (ca. 1982).

2040. P. Drude, “Ueber Fernwirkungen”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 62, (1897), pp. 693, I-XLIX; **and** *Lehrbuch der Optik*, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1900); translated into English *The Theory of Optics*, Longmans, Green and Co., London, New York, Toronto, (1902), see especially pp. 457-482; **and** “Zur Elektronentheorie der Metalle. I & II”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 1, (1900), pp. 566-613; Volume 3, (1900), pp. 369-402; **and**

“Optische Eigenschaften und Elektronentheorie, I & II”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 14, (1904), pp. 677-725, 936-961; **and** “Die Natur des Lichtes” in A. Winkelmann, *Handbuch der Optik*, Volume 6, Second Edition, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1906), pp. 1120-1387; **and** *Physik des Aethers auf elektromagnetischer Grundlage*, F. Enke, Stuttgart, (1894), Posthumous Second Revised Edition, W. König, (1912).

2041. P. Langevin, *Comptes Rendus Hebdomadaires des Séances de l'Académie des Sciences*, Volume 139, (1904), p. 1204; **and** “La Physique des Électrons”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 16, (1905), pp. 257-276; **and** *Bulletin des Séances de la Société Française de Physique: Résumé des Communications*, (1905), p. 13; **and** “Sur une Formule Fondamentale de la Théorie Cinétique”, *Comptes Rendus Hebdomadaires des Séances de l'Académie des Sciences*, Volume 140, (1905), pp. 35-38; **and** “Sur l'Impossibilité Physique de Mettre en Évidence le Mouvement de Translation de la Terre”, *Comptes Rendus Hebdomadaires des Séances de l'Académie des Sciences*, Volume 140, (1905), pp. 1171-1173; **and** “Magnétisme et Théorie des Électrons”, *Annales de Chimie et de Physique*, Volume 5, (1905), pp. 70-127; **and** “Une Formule Fondamentale de la Théorie Cinétique”, *Annales de Chimie et de Physique*, Volume 5, (1905), pp. 245-288; **and** “La Physique des Électrons”, *Revue Générale des Sciences et Appliquées*, Volume 16, (1905), pp. 257-276; **and** “Sur la Théorie du Mouvement Brownien”, *Comptes Rendus Hebdomadaires des Séances de l'Académie des Sciences*, Volume 146, (1908) pp. 530-533; **and** “L'Évolution de l'Espace et du Temps”, *Scientia*, Volume 10, (1911), pp. 31-54; **and** *La Théorie Rayonnement et les Quanta. Rapports et Discussions de la Réunion Tenue à Bruxelles, du 30 Octobre au 3 Novembre 1911, sous les Auspices de M. E. Solvay. Publiés par MM. P. Langevin et M. de Broglie*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1912), 393-406; **and** “L'Inertie de l'Énergie et ses Conséquences”, *Journal de Physique*, Volume 3, (1913), pp. 553-591; **and** “Le Physicien”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 20, Number 5, (September, 1913), pp. 675-718; **and** *Die Theorie der Strahlung und der Quanten : Verhandlungen auf einer von E. Solvay einberufenen Zusammenkunft, 30. Oktober bis 3. November 1911 : mit einem Anhang über die Entwicklung der Quantentheorie vom Herbst 1911 bis zum Sommer 1913 / in deutscher Sprache herausgegeben von A. Eucken*, Verlag Chemie, Berlin, (1914), pp. 318-329; **and** *Oeuvres Scientifiques de Paul Langevin*, Paris, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, (1950).

2042. Aberration: J. Bradley, “An Account of a New Discovered Motion of the Fixed Stars”, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, Volume 35, Number 406, (1729), p. 637; F. Fresnel, *Annales de Chimie et de Physique*, Series 2, Volume 9, (1818), pp. 57-66. *See also:* W. Velmann, “Fresnel's Hypothese zur Erklärung der Aberrationserscheinungen”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 75, (1870), pp. 145-160; **and** “Ueber die Fortpflanzung des Lichtes in bewegten Medien”, Volume 76, (1870), pp. 129-144; **and** “Ueber die Fortpflanzung des Lichtes in bewegten Medien”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 150, (1873), pp. 497-534.

Doppler-Fizeau Effect: C. Doppler, “Über das farbige Licht der Doppelsterne u. einiger anderer Gestirne des Mimmels. Versuch einer das Bradleysche Aberrationstheorem als integrierenden Teil in sich schliessenden allgemeinen Theorie”, *Neuere Abhandlungen der Königlichen Böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Series 2, Volume 5, (1842, Jahrgang 1841-42), pp. 462-482, (1845), p. 419ff.; H. Fizeau, *Annales de Chimie et de Physique*, Volume 19, (1870), p. 211. M. Einstein-Marity and A. Einstein, “Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 17, (1905), pp. 910-912.

2043. *See:* M. Planck, “Das Prinzip der Relativität und die Grundgleichungen der Mechanik”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 8, (1906), pp. 136-141. **See also:** W. Kaufmann, “Über die Konstitution des Elektrons”, *Annalen der*

Physik, Volume 19, (1906), pp. 530-531. **See also:** E. G. Cullwick, "Einstein and Special Relativity: Some Inconsistencies in his Electrodynamics", *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 32, Number 2, (June, 1981), pp. 167-176.

2044. M. Einstein-Marity and A. Einstein, "Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 17, (1905), pp. 891-921.

2045. D. Trbuhović-Gjurić, *Im Schatten Albert Einsteins, Das tragische Leben der Mileva Einstein-Marić*, Paul Haupt, Bern, (1983). **See also:** D. Krstic, Matica Srpska (Novi Sad), Collected Papers. *Natural Sciences*, Volume 40, (1971), p. 190, note 2; **and** "The Wishes of Dr. Einstein", *Dnevnik* (Novi Sad), Volume 28, Number 9963, (1974), p. 9; **and** "The Education of Mileva Marić-Einstein, the First Woman Theoretical Physicist, at the Royal Classical High School in Zagreb at the End of the 19th Century", *Collected Papers on History of Education* (Zagreb), Volume 9, (1975), p. 111; **and** "The First Woman Theoretical Physicist", *Dnevnik* (Novi Sad), Volume 30, VIII/21, (1976); **and** *Mileva and Albert Einstein: Love and Joint Scientific Work*, Diodakta, (1976); **and** D. Krstic, "Mileva Einstein-Marić", in E. R. Einstein, *Hans Albert Einstein: Reminiscences of His Life and Our Life Together*, Appendix A, Iowa Institute of Hydraulic Research, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, (1991), pp. 85-99, 111-112. **See also:** T. Pappas, *Mathematical Scandals*, Wide World Publishing/Tetra, San Carlos, California, (1997), pp. 121-129. **See also:** M. Maurer, "Weil nicht sein kann, was nicht sein darf. . . 'DIE ELTERN' ODER 'DER VATER' DER RELATIVITÄTSTHEORIE? Zum Streit über den Anteil von Mileva Marić an der Entstehung der Relativitätstheorie", *PCnews*, Number 48 (Nummer 48), Volume 11 (Jahrgang 11), Part 3 (Heft 3), Vienna, (June, 1996), pp. 20-27; reprinted from *Dokumentation des 18. Bundesweiten Kongresses von Frauen in Naturwissenschaft und Technik vom 28.-31*, Birgit Kanngießer, Bremen, (May, 1992), not dated, pp. 276-295; an earlier version appeared, co-authored by P. Seibert, *Wechselwirkung*, Volume 14, Number 54, Aachen, (April, 1992), pp. 50-52 (Part 1); Volume 14, Number 55, (June, 1992), pp. 51-53 (Part 2). URL:

<http://rli.at/Seiten/kooperat/maric1.htm>

See also: E. H. Walker, "Did Einstein Espouse his Spouses Ideas?", *Physics Today*, Volume 42, Number 2, (February, 1989), pp. 9, 11; **and** "Mileva Marić's Relativistic Role", *Physics Today*, Volume 44, Number 2, (February, 1991), pp. 122-124; **and** "Ms. Einstein", *AAAS* [American Association for the Advancement of Science] *Annual Meeting Abstracts for 1990*, (February 15-20, 1990), p. 141; **and** "Ms. Einstein", *The Baltimore Sun*, (30 March 1990), p. 11A. **See also:** S. Troemel-Ploetz, "Mileva Einstein-Marić: The Woman Who did Einstein's Mathematics", *Women's Studies International Forum*, Volume 13, Number 5, (1990), pp. 415-432; *Index on Censorship*, Volume 19, Number 9, (October, 1990), pp. 33-36. **See also:** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1982), p. 47. **See also:** W. Sullivan, "Einstein Letters Tell of Anguished Love Affair", *The New York Times*, (3 May 1987), pp. 1, 38. **See also:** "Did Einstein's Wife Contribute to His Theories?", *The New York Times*, (27 March 1990), Section C, p. 5. **See also:** S. L. Garfinkel, "First Wife's Role in Einstein's Work Debated", *The Christian Science Monitor*, (27 February 1990), p. 13. **See also:** D. Overbye, "Einstein in Love", *Time*, Volume 135, Number 18, (30 April 1990), p. 108; **and** *Einstein in Love: A Scientific Romance*, Viking, New York, (2000). **See also:** "Was the First Mrs Einstein a Genius, too?", *New Scientist*, Number 1706, (3 March 1990), p. 25. **See also:** A. Gabor, *Einstein's Wife: Work and Marriage in the Lives of Five Great Twentieth-Century Women*, Viking, New York, (1995). **See also:** J. Haag, "Einstein-Marić, Mileva", *Women in World History: A Biographical Encyclopedia*, Volume

5, Yorkin Publications, (2000), pp. 77-81. **See also:** M. Zackheim, *Einstein's Daughter: The Search for Lieserl*, Riverhead Books, Penguin Putnam, New York, (1999). **See also:** Television Documentary, *Einstein's Wife: The Life of Mileva Maric-Einstein*, URL:

<http://www.pbs.org/opb/einsteinswife/>

For counter-argument, see: J. Stachel, "Albert Einstein and Mileva Marić: A Collaboration that Failed to Develop", found in *Creative Couples in the Sciences*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, New Jersey, (1996), pp. 207-219; **and** Stachel's reply to Walker, *Physics Today*, Volume 42, Number 2, (February, 1989), pp. 11, 13. **See also:** A. Fölsing, "Keine 'Mutter der Relativitätstheorie'", *Die Zeit*, Number 47, (16 November 1990), p. 94. **See also:** A. Pais, *Einstein Lived Here*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1994), pp. 14-16.

For the Einstein's correspondence, see: J. Stachel, Editor, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987); English translations by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987). **See also:** J. Renn and R. Schulmann, Editors, *Albert Einstein/Mileva Maric: The Love Letters*, Princeton University Press, (1992). **See also:** M. Popović, *In Albert's Shadow: The Life and Letters of Mileva Maric, Einstein's First Wife*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, (2003).

2046. M. Planck, "Das Prinzip der Relativität und die Grundgleichungen der Mechanik", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 8, (1906), pp. 136-141; "Die Kaufmannschen Messungen der Ablenkbarkeit der β -Strahlen in ihrer Bedeutung für die Dynamik der Elektronen", *Physikalische Zeitschrift* Volume 7, (1906), pp. 753-759, with a discussion on pp. 759-761.

2047. W. Kaufmann, "Über die Konstitution des Elektrons", *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1905), pp. 949-956, especially p. 954; **and** "Über die Konstitution des Elektrons", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 19, (1906), pp. 487-553; "Nachtrag zu der Abhandlung: 'Über die Konstitution des Elektrons'", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 20, (1906), pp. 639-640.

2048. P. Ehrenfest, "Die Translation deformierbarer Elektronen und der Flächensatz", *Annalen der Physik*, 23, (1907), pp. 204-205.

2049. J. Laub, "Zur Optik der bewegten Körper", *Annalen der Physik*, 23, (1907), pp. 738-744.

2050. M. v. Laue, "Die Mitführung des Lichtes durch bewegte Körper nach dem Relativitätsprinzip", *Annalen der Physik*, 23, (1907), pp. 989-990.

2051. A. Einstein, "Über das Relativitätsprinzip und die aus demselben gezogenen Folgerung", *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 4, (1907), pp. 411-462.

2052. Cf. S. Mohorovičić, *Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie und ihr mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Charakter*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1923), pp. 29-30; **and** "Über die räumliche und zeitliche Translation", "»Bulletin« d. süslaw. Akad. D. Wiss." (*Jugoslovenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*), Volume 6/7, Zagreb, (1916-1917), p. 48; **and** "Die Folgerung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie und die Newtonsche Physik", *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, New Series, Volume 20, Jena, (1921), pp. 737-739; **and**, as cited by Mohorovičić: E. Guillaume and C. Willigens, "Über die Grundlagen der Relativitätstheorie", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 109-114; **and** E. Guillaume, "Graphische Darstellung der Optik bewegter Körper", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 386-388.

2053. W. Kaufmann, “Über die Konstitution des Elektrons”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1905), pp. 949-956, at 954 and 956.

2054. W. Kaufmann, “Über die Konstitution des Elektrons”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 19, (1906), pp. 487-553, at 530.

2055. M. Planck, “Das Prinzip der Relativität und die Grundgleichungen der Mechanik”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 8, (1906), pp. 136-141, at 136. Planck repeated himself in a very similar statement in 1907, “Zur Dynamik bewegter Systeme”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, Volume 13, (13 June 1907), pp. 541-570, at 546.

2056. M. Planck, “Die Kaufmannschen Messungen der Ablenkbarkeit der β -Strahlen in ihrer Bedeutung für die Dynamik der Elektronen”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift* Volume 7, Number 21, (1906), pp. 753-759, with a discussion on pp. 759-761, at 756 and 761.

2057. S. Oppenheim and F. Kottler, *Kritik des Newton'schen Gravitationsgesetzes; mit einem Beitrag: Gravitation und Relativitätstheorie von F. Kottler*, Deutsche Staatsrealschule in Karolinenthal, Prag, (1903).

2058. A. Einstein, “Über die vom Relativitätsprinzip geforderte Trägheit der Energie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 23, (1907), pp. 371-384, at 373.

2059. A. Einstein to J. Stark, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 5, Document 58, Princeton University Press, (1995), p. 42.

2060. A. Einstein to M. Marić, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Document 131, (1987), p. 189.

2061. R. S. Shankland, “The Michelson-Morley Experiment”, *Scientific American*, Volume 211, Number 5, (1964), pp. 107-114, at 114. *See also:* R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein. II”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 41, Number 7, (July, 1973), pp. 895-901. R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57. R. S. Shankland, “Michelson-Morley Experiment”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 32, Number 1, (January, 1964), pp. 16-35.

2062. R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein. II”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 41, Number 7, (July, 1973), pp. 895-901, at 896. *See also:* R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 48; **and** R. S. Shankland, “Michelson-Morley Experiment”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 32, Number 1, (January, 1964), pp. 16-35, at 35.

2063. A. Einstein, translated by Y. A. Ono, “How I Created the Theory of Relativity”, *Physics Today*, Volume 35, Number 8, (August, 1982), pp. 45-47, at 46.

2064. A. Einstein, translated by A. Beck, “On the Development of our Views Concerning the Nature and Constitution of Radiation”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Document 60, Princeton University Press, (1989), pp. 379-394, at 383.

2065. R. S. Shankland, “The Michelson-Morley Experiment”, *Scientific American*, Volume 211, Number 5, (1964), pp. 107-114, at 114.

2066. *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 60.

2067. G. H. Keswani, “Origin and Concept of Relativity, Part I”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 15, Number 60, (February, 1965), pp. 286-306, at 299-300.

2068. M. Born, *Einstein's Theory of Relativity*, Methuen & Co. Ltd., London, (1924), pp. 188.

2069. M. Born, *Physics in my Generation*, second revised edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, (1969), p. 104.

2070. A. Sommerfeld as annotator, *Das Relativitätsprinzip*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1913), p. 27.

2071. A. Einstein, *Physics Today*, Volume 35, Number 8, (August, 1982), p. 46.

2072. See, H. A. Lorentz, “Deux Mémoires de Henri Poincaré sur la Physique Mathématique”, *Acta Mathematica*, Volume 38, (1921), pp. 293-308; **and** compare it to Lorentz’ commentary from 1906, and notes from 1909, H. A. Lorentz, *Theory of Electrons*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1909), pp. 223-230, 328-329; in which he calls Albert Einstein’s proxy theory of Poincaré’s corrections of Lorentz’ theory “artificial”, a fallacy of *Petitio Principii*. Lorentz, who attributed to Einstein, what he knew to belong to Poincaré, may have done so out of resentment for Poincaré, as some have suggested—after all, Poincaré completed gracefully that which Lorentz had long struggled after—and/or Lorentz may have given Einstein credit for Poincaré’s work so that he, Lorentz, could attack its fallacious nature without offending Poincaré.

2073. A. H. Bucherer, “Messungen an Becquerelstrahlen. Die experimentelle Bestätigung der Lorentz-Einsteinschen Theorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 9, Number 22, (November 1, 1908), pp. 755-762.

2074. P. Frank, “Die Stellung des Relativitätsprinzips im System der Mechanik und der Elektrodynamik”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, Volume 118, (1909), pp. 373-446; at 373, 376, 420, and 442. Frank introduced the term “Group of the Galilean Transformations” in this paper, at page 382.

2075. W. Ritz and A. Einstein, “Zum gegenwärtigen Stand des Strahlungsproblems”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 10, Number 9, (1909), pp. 323-324; reprinted in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Document 57; republished in W. Ritz, *Gesammelte Werke: Œuvres Publiées par la Société Suisse de Physique*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1911), pp. 507-508.

2076. W. Ritz, “Das Prinzip der Relativität in der Optik. (Antrittsrede zur Habilitation.)”, *Gesammelte Werke: Œuvres Publiées par la Société Suisse de Physique*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1911), pp. 509-518, at 516.

2077. Cf. A. I. Miller, *Albert Einstein’s Special Theory of Relativity, Emergence (1905) and Early Interpretation (1905-1911)*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., (1981), pp. 376-377.

2078. Cf. A. I. Miller, *Albert Einstein’s Special Theory of Relativity, Emergence (1905) and Early Interpretation (1905-1911)*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., (1981), p. 270. See, for example: M. Born, “Zur Kinematik des starren Körpers im System des Relativitätsprinzips”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1910), pp. 161-179, at 161.

2079. R. Hiecke, “Über das Relativitätsprinzip”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 16, Number 13, (1914), p. 569.

2080. Cf. A. I. Miller, *Albert Einstein’s Special Theory of Relativity, Emergence (1905) and Early Interpretation (1905-1911)*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., (1981), p. 295.

2081. See: E. Cohn, “Physikalisches über Raum und Zeit”, *Himmel und Erde*, Volume 23, (1911), pp. 117ff.; *Physikalisches über Raum und Zeit*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, Berlin, (1911). E. Freundlich, *The Foundations of Einstein’s Theory of Gravitation*, Second Edition, Methuen & Co., London, (1924). A. Reuterdahl, *Scientific Theism Versus Materialism*, The Devin-Adair Company, New York, (1920), pp. 174, 267, and 268. F. A. Lindemann, “Introduction” dated “March, 1920” in M. Schlick, *Space and Time in Contemporary Physics*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1920), p. iv. H. Reichenbach, *The Philosophy*

of *Space & Time*, Dover, New York, (1958), p. 161.

2082. H. Weyl, *Space-Time-Matter*, Dover, New York, (1952), pp. 165, 169, 172, 327.

2083. *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 9, Number 22, (November 1, 1908), p. 762.

2084. S. Walter, “Minkowski, Mathematicians, and the Mathematical Theory of Relativity”, in H. Goenner, et al., Editors, *The Expanding Worlds of General Relativity*, Birkhauser, Boston, (1999), pp. 45-86.

2085. *The Principle of Relativity: Original Papers by A. Einstein and H. Minkowski Translated into English by M. N. Saha and S. N. Bose*, University of Calcutta, (1920), H. Minkowski, “Principle of Relativity”, translated by Dr. Meghnad N. Saha, p. 2.

2086. H. Minkowski, *Annalen der Physik*, 47, (1915), p. 928.

2087. M. Planck, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 8, (1906), p. 136; “Die Kaufmannschen Messungen der Ablenkbarkeit der β -Strahlen in ihrer Bedeutung für die Dynamik der Elektronen”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift* Volume 7, (1906), pp. 753-759, with a discussion on pp. 759-761.

2088. H. Poincaré, *Dernières Pensées*, Flammarion, Paris, (1913); English translation *Mathematics and Science: Last Essays*, Dover, New York, (1963), pp. 15, 23, 75, 99.

Poincaré makes clear his attribution of the formulation, which he completed and corrected, stems from Lorentz in “Sur la Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 140, (1905), pp. 1504-1508; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 77-81 URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

reprinted *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 489-493; English translations appear in: G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, “Intimations of Relativity before Einstein”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (December, 1983), pp. 343-354, at pp. 350-353; **and**, translated by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 7-14; **and** “Sur la Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Rendiconti del Circolo matimatico di Palermo*, Volume 21, (1906, submitted July 23rd, 1905), pp. 129-176; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 18-76 URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume IX, pp. 494-550; redacted English translation by H. M. Schwartz with modern notation, “Poincaré’s Rendiconti Paper on Relativity”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 39, (November, 1971), pp. 1287-1294; Volume 40, (June, 1972), pp. 862-872; Volume 40, (September, 1972), pp. 1282-1287; English translation by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov with modern notation, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 15-78; **and** “La Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 19, (1908), pp. 386-402; reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume IX, pp. 551-586; English translation: “The New Mechanics”, *Science and Method*, Book III, which is reprinted in *Foundations of Science*.

Note that in the latter papers, Poincaré address relativistic gravitation, the propagation of gravitation at *celeritas*, and the perihelion of Mercury, long before Einstein published his version of the general theory of relativity in 1915/16. In this context *see also*: H. A. Lorentz, “Alte und neue Fragen der Physik”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, Number 26, (December 15, 1910), pp. 1234-1257; reprinted in part in H. A. Lorentz, A. Einstein, and H. Minkowski, *Das Relativitätsprinzip: eine Sammlung von Abhandlungen*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig & Berlin, (1913), pp. 74-89, though not in later editions; *see also*: *Das Relativitätsprinzip, Drei Vorlesungen gehalten in Teylers Stiftung zu Haarlem*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, Berlin, (1914/1920), pp. 19-20.

2089. M. v. Laue, *Die Relativitätsprinzip der Lorentztransformation*, Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, (1921), pp. 12, 48.

2090. H. A. Lorentz, “Deux mémoires de Henri Poincaré sur la physique mathématique”, *Acta Mathematica*, Volume 38, (1921), pp. 293-308; reprinted in *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 683-695; **and** Volume 11, (1956), pp. 247-261; taken from H. E. Ives’ translation, “Revisions of the Lorentz Transformation”, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Volume 95, Number 2, (April, 1951), p. 125; reprinted R. Hazelett and D. Turner Editors, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers, a Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair Company, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979), p. 125.

Contrast Lorentz’ statement of Poincaré’s priority, with the fact that Lorentz participated in the production of: H. A. Lorentz, A. Einstein, and H. Minkowski, *Das Relativitätsprinzip: eine Sammlung von Abhandlungen*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig & Berlin, (1913), which did not include any work by Poincaré, and Lorentz’ statement published in 1913, “The principle of relativity, for which we have Einstein to thank, . . .” “Das Relativitätsprinzip, welches wir Einstein verdanken, . . .”—H. A. Lorentz, *Das Relativitätsprinzip; drei Vorlesungen gehalten in Teylers Stiftung zu Haarlem*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig-Berlin, (1920). p. 1; “Het relativiteitsbeginsel, dat wij aan EINSTEIN te danken hebben, . . .”—H. A. Lorentz, *Het Relativiteitsbeginsel; drie Voordrachten Gehouden in Teyler’s Stiftung*, Erven Loosjes, Haarlem, (1913), p. 1; and it appears that Lorentz succumbed to some pressure, real or perceived, to award Einstein undeserved credit, while on other occasions, he told the truth.

2091. H. A. Lorentz, *The Einstein Theory of Relativity*, Brentano’s, New York, (1920), pp. 11-12.

2092. A. Einstein, quoted in *The Expanded Quotable Einstein*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, Oxford, (2000), p. 91.

2093. A. Einstein, quoted in *The Expanded Quotable Einstein*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, Oxford, (2000), p. 91.

2094. A. Einstein, “H. A. Lorentz, His Creative Genius and His Personality”, in G. L. De Haas-Lorentz, Ed., *H. A. Lorentz: Impressions of His Life and Work*, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, (1957), p. 5.

2095. R. S. Shankland, *Einstein, a Centenary Volume*, Harvard University Press, (1979), p. 39. *See also*: R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 57.

2096. A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, (1982), p. 13.

2097. A. D. Fokker, “The Scientific Work”, in G. L. De Haas-Lorentz, Ed., *H. A. Lorentz: Impressions of His Life and Work*, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, (1957), p. 78-79.

2098. A. Einstein, translated by A. Beck, “Relativity and Gravitation: Reply to a Comment by M. Abraham”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 4, Document 8, (1996),

p. 131.

2099. A. Einstein, “Elementary Derivation of the Equivalence of Mass and Energy”, *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 41, (1935), pp. 223-230, at 230.

2100. A. Einstein, *Relativity, The Special and the General Theory*, Crown Publishers, Inc., New York, (1961), pp. 150-151.

2101. A. Einstein, *Sidelights on Relativity*, translated by: G. B. Jeffery and W. Perret, Methuen & Co., London, (1922); *republished, unabridged and unaltered*: Dover, New York, (1983), p. 20.

2102. A. Einstein quoted in “Einstein, too, is puzzled; It’s at Public Interest”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (4 April 1921), p. 6.

2103. G. L. De Haas-Lorentz, “Reminiscences”, *H. A. Lorentz: Impressions of His Life and Work*, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, (1957), pp. 113-115.

2104. M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 44.

2105. “Conference on the Michelson-Morley Experiment”, *The Astrophysical Journal*, Volume 68, Number 5, (December, 1928), pp. 341-402, at 350.

2106. Letter from A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz of 19 January 1920, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 265, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 220.

2107. Letter from P. Ehrenfest to A. Einstein of 2 September 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 98, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 81-82, at 82.

2108. Letter from P. Ehrenfest to A. Einstein of 9 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 203, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 173-175, at 174.

2109. A. Einstein, “Über das Relativitätsprinzip und die aus demselben gezogenen Folgerung”, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, 4, (1907), p. 416.

2110. A. Einstein, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 38, (1912), p. 888; English translation by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 4, Document 6, Princeton University Press, (1996), p. 125.

2111. See, for example, H. Weyl, *Space-Time-Matter*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 324, note 35.

2112. A. Einstein to J. Stark, translated by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 4, Document 85, Princeton University Press, (1995), p. 58.

2113. V. Volterra, “Henri Poincaré”, a lecture delivered at the inauguration of The Rice Institute, *The Book of the Opening of the Rice Institute*, Volume 3, Houston, Texas, (1912), pp. 919-920; reprinted in: *The Rice Institute Pamphlets* Volume 1, Number 2, (May, 1915), pp. 153-154; reprinted in: *Saggi scientifici*, N. Zanichelli, Bologna, (1920), pp. 119-157.

2114. A. G. Webster, “Henri Poincaré as a Mathematical Physicist”, *Science*, Volume 38, Issue 991, (December 26, 1913), p. 907.

2115. E. Gehrcke, “Die gegen die Relativitätstheorie erhobenen Einwände”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 1, Number 3, (January 17, 1913), pp. 62-66; reprinted in *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), p. 20.

2116. A. A. Robb, *A Theory of Time and Space*, Cambridge University Press, (1914), p. 1.

2117. A. Einstein, translated by Anna Beck, “Die Relativitäts-Theorie”, *Vierteljahrsschrift der Naturforschenden Gesellschaft in Zürich*, Volume 56, (1911), pp. 1-14; in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 3, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, (1993), p. 355.

2118. L. Silberstein, “General Relativity without the Equivalence Hypothesis”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 36, (July, 1918), pp. 94-128.

2119. F. Kottler, “Über die Raumzeitlinien der Minkowski’schen Welt”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 121, (1912), pp. 1659-1759; **and** “Relativitätsprinzip und beschleunigte Bewegung”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 44, (1914), pp. 701-748; **and** “Fallende Bezugssysteme vom Standpunkt des Relativitätsprinzip”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 45, (1914), pp. 481-516; **and** “Beschleunigungsrelative Bewegungen und die konforme Gruppe der Minkowski’schen Welt”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 125, (1916), pp. 899-919; **and** “Über Einsteins Äquivalenzhypothese und die Gravitation”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 50, (1916), pp. 955-972; **and** “Über die physikalischen Grundlagen der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 56, (1918), pp. 401-462; **and** F. Kottler, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, 6, 2, 22a, pp. 159-237; **and** “Newton’sches Gesetz und Metrik”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 131, (1922), p. 1-14; **and** “Maxwell’schen Gleichungen und Metrik”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 131, (1922), pp. 119-146.

2120. H. Bateman, “On General Relativity”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 37, (1919), pp. 219-223, at 219. **See also:** H. Bateman, “The Conformal Transformations of a Space of Four Dimensions and their Applications to Geometrical Optics”, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 7, (1909), pp. 70-89; **and** *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 18, (1909), p. 890; **and** “The Transformation of the Electrodynamical Equations”, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 8, (1910), pp. 223-264, 375, 469; **and** “The Physical Aspects of Time”, *Memoirs and Proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society*, Volume 54, (1910), pp. 1-13; **and** *American Journal of Mathematics*, Volume 34, (1912), p. 325; **and** *The Mathematical Analysis of Electrical and Optical Wave-Motion on the Basis of Maxwell’s Equations*, Cambridge University Press, (1915); **and** “The Electromagnetic Vectors”, *The Physical Review*, Volume 12, Number 6, (December, 1918), pp. 459-481; **and** *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 21, (1920), p. 256. **Confer:** E. Whittaker, *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the Royal Society*, Volume 1, (1955), pp. 44-45; **and** *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), pp. 8, 64, 76, 94, 154-156, 195. **See also:** W. Pauli, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, New York, (1958), pp. 81, 96, 199. **See also:** E. Bessel-Hagen, “Über der Erhaltungssätze der Elektrodynamik”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 84, (1921), pp. 258-276. **See also:** F. D. Murnaghan, “The Absolute Significance of Maxwell’s Equations”, *The Physical Review*, Volume 17, Number 2, (February, 1921), pp. 73-88. **See also:** G. Kowalewski, “Über die Batemansche Transformationsgruppe”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, Volume 157, Number 3, (1927), pp. 193-197.

2121. J. Riem, “Das Relativitätsgesetz”, *Deutsche Zeitung* (Berlin), Number 286, (26 June 1920). **See also:** “Gegen den Einstein Rummel!”, *Umschau*, Volume 24, (1920), pp. 583-584; “Amerika über Einstein”, *Deutsche Zeitung*, (1 July 1921 evening edition); **and** “Zu Einsteins Amerikafahrt. Stimmen amerikanischer Blätter und die Antwort Reuterdahls.” *Deutsche Zeitung*, (13 September 1921); **and** “Ein amerikanisches Weltanschauungsbuch”, *Der Reichsbote* (Berlin), Number 463, (4 October 1921); **and** “Um Einsteins Relativitätstheorie”, *Deutsche Zeitung*, (18 November 1921); **and** “Die astronomischen Beweismittel der Relativitätstheorie”, *Hellweg Westdeutsche Wochenschrift für Deutsche*

Kunst, Volume 1, (1921), pp. 314-316; **and** “Keine Bestätigung der Relativitätstheorie”, *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, Volume 36, (1921), p. 420; **and** “Lenards gewichtige Stimme gegen die Relativitätstheorie”, *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, Volume 36, (1921), p. 551; “Neues zur Relativitätstheorie”, *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, Volume 37, (1922), pp. 13-14; **and** “Rotverschiebung und Michelsonscher Versuch”, *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, Volume 37, (1922), p. 717; **and** “Beobachtungstatsachen zur Relativitätstheorie”, *Umschau*, Volume 27, (1923), pp. 328-329; **and** “Relativitätstheorie und Konstitution der Materie”, *Umschau*, Volume 29, (1925), pp. 908-910.

2122. C. Nordmann, *Einstein et l'universe*, (1921), translated by Joseph McCabe as *Einstein and the Universe*, Henry Holt & Co., New York, (1922), pp. 10-11, 16.

2123. E. Noble, “The Relational Element in Monism”, *The Monist*, Volume 15, Number 3, (1905), pp. 321-337.

2124. D. Hilbert, “On the Foundations of Logic and Arithmetic”, *The Monist*, Volume 15, Number 3, (1905), pp. 338-352.

2125. H. Poincaré, “The Principles of Mathematical Physics”, *The Monist*, Volume 15, Number 1, (January, 1905), pp. 1-24.

2126. An interesting clip appeared in *The New York Times* on 27 January 1932, page 20, quoting Henry White Callahan’s letter to the editor in the context of the theory of relativity on the monist view that “the whole thing is one!” See also: D. M. Y. Sommerville, *The Elements of Non-Euclidean Geometry*, G. Bell, London, (1914), p. 201.

2127. A. Bolliger, *Anti-Kant oder Elemente der Logik, der Physik und der Ethik*, Felix Schneider, Basel, (1882), esp. pp. 336-354.

2128. *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), pp. 1, 13, at 13.

2129. L. Infeld, *Quest—An Autobiography*, Chelsea, New York, (1980), p. 258.

2130. “Aladdin Einstein”, *The Freeman* (New York), Volume 3, Number 59, (27 April 1921), pp. 153-154.

2131. W. Pauli, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, Volume 5, Part 2, Section 19, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1921), pp. 539-775, at 543-545.

2132. W. Pauli, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, London, Edinburgh, New York, Toronto, Sydney, Paris, Braunschweig, (1958), p. 3.

2133. W. Pauli, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, London, Edinburgh, New York, Toronto, Sydney, Paris, Braunschweig, (1958), p. 3.

2134. See for example: A. Lynch, *The Case Against Einstein*, P. Allan, London, (1932). H. Dingler, *Die Grundlagen der Physik; synthetische Prinzipien der mathematischen Naturphilosophie*, Second Edition, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, (1923); **and** *Physik und Hypothese Versuch einer induktiven Wissenschaftslehre nebst einer kritischen Analyse der Fundamente der Relativitätstheorie*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1921); **and** “Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Grundlagen der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 21, (1920), pp. 668-669. H. Nordenson, *Relativity, Time and Reality: A Critical Investigation of the Einstein Theory of Relativity from a Logical Point of View*, Allen and Unwin, London, (1969).

2135. L. Essen, “Relativity — Joke or Swindle?”, *Electronics and Wireless World*, (February, 1988), pp. 126-127. URL:

<<http://www.cfpf.org.uk/articles/scientists/essen.html>>

2136. J. T. Blankart, “Relativity or Interdependence”, *Catholic World*, Volume 112, (February, 1921), pp. 588- 610, at 606.

2137. S. T. Skidmore, “The Mistakes of Dr. Einstein”, *The Forum*, Volume 66, (August, 1921), pp. 119-131.

2138. F. Adler, *Ortzeit, Systemzeit, Zonenzeit und das ausgezeichnete Bezugssystem der Elektrodynamik. Eine Untersuchung über die Lorentzsche und Einsteinsche Kinematik*, Wiener Volksbuchhandlung, (1920).

2139. R. Weinmann, *Gegen Einsteins Relativierung von Zeit und Raum (gemeinverständlich)*, München, Berlin, Oldenbourg, (1922); “Kommt der Relativitätstheorie philosophische Bedeutung zu?”, *Philosophie und Leben*, Volume 2, (1923), pp. 154-159; *Anti-Einstein*, Hillmann, Leipzig, (1923); “Anti-Einstein Quintessenz”, *Archiv für Systematische Philosophie und Soziologie*, Volume 30, (1927), pp. 263-270; *Widersprüche und Selbstwidersprüche der Relativitätstheorie*, Hillmann, Leipzig, (1925); *Versuch einer endgültigen Widerlegung der speziellen Relativitätstheorie*, Hillmann, Leipzig, (1926); “Der Widersinn und die Überflüssigkeit der speziellen Relativitätstheorie”, *Annalen der Philosophie und philosophischen Kritik*, Volume 8, (1929), pp. 46-57; “Die Unhaltbarkeit der speziellen Relativitätstheorie”, *Natur und Kultur*, Volume 27, (1930), pp. 121-125.

2140. S. Mohorovičić, *Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie und ihr mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Charakter*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1923); “Raum, Zeit und Welt”, in K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, (1958/1962), Part 1 in Volume 1, (1958), pp. 168-281; Part 2 in Volume 2, (1962), pp. 219-352.

2141. H. Bergson, *Durée et Simultanéité, à Propos de la Théorie d’Einstein*, English translation by L. Jacobson, *Duration and simultaneity, with Reference to Einstein’s Theory*, The Library of Liberal Arts, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, (1965); which contains a bibliography at pages xliii-xlv.

2142. E. Guillaume’s letter, translated by A. Reuter Dahl, “Guillaume, Barred in Move To Debate Einstein, Calls Meeting Political Reunion”, *Minneapolis Journal*, (14 May 1922), p. 14; reprinted with slight modifications, “The Origin of Einsteinism”, *The New York Times*, (12 August 1923), Section 7, p. 8. **See also:** “Einstein Faces in Paris Grave Blow at Theory”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (31 March 1922). **See also:** “Dr. Guillaume’s Proofs of Einstein Theory’s Fallacy Revealed to the Journal”, *Minneapolis Journal*, (9 April 1922). **See also:** E. Guillaume, “Un Résultat des Discussions de la Théorie d’Einstein au Collège de France”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, Number 11, (15 June 1922), pp. 322-324. **See also:** “Les Bases de la Physique moderne”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 43, (1917), pp. 5-21, 89-112, 185-198; **and** “Sur le Possibilité d’Exprimer la Théorie de la Relativité en Fonction du Temps Universel”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 44, (1917), pp. 48-52; **and** “La Théorie de la Relativité en Fonction du Temps Universel”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 46, (1918), pp. 281-325; **and** “Sur la Théorie de la Relativité”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 1, (1919), pp. 246-251; **and** “Représentation et Mesure du Temps”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 2, (1920), pp. 125-146; **and** “La Théorie de la Relativité et sa Signification”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 27, (1920), pp. 423-469; **and** “Relativité et Gravitation”, *Bulletin de la Société Vaudoise des Sciences Naturelles*, Volume 53, (1920), pp. 311-340; **and** “Les Bases de la Théorie de la Relativité”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, (15 April 1920) pp. 200-210; **and** C. Willigens, “Représentation Géométrique du Temps Universel dans la Théorie de la Relativité Restreinte”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 2, (1920), p. 289; **and** E. Guillaume, *La Théorie de la Relativité. Résumé des Conférences Faites à l’Université de Lausanne au Semestre d’été 1920*, Rouge & Co., Lausanne, (1921); **and** E.

Guillaume and C. Willigens, “Über die Grundlagen der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 109-114; **and** E. Guillaume, “Graphische Darstellung der Optik bewegter Körper”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 386-388; **and** Guillaume’s Appendix II, “Temps Relatif et Temps Universel”, in L. Fabre, *Une Nouvelle Figure du Monde: les Théories d’Einstein*, Second Edition, Payot, Paris, (1922); **and** E. Guillaume, “Y a-t-il une Erreur dans le Premier Mémoire d’Einstein?”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, (1922), pp. 5-10; **and** “La Question du Temps d’après M. Bergson, à Propos de la Théorie d’Einstein”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, (1922), pp. 573-582; **and** Guillaume’s introduction in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. V-XVI; **and** H. Bergson, *Durée et Simultanéité, à Propos de la Théorie d’Einstein*, English translation by L. Jacobson, *Duration and simultaneity, with Reference to Einstein’s Theory*, The Library of Liberal Arts, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, (1965); which contains a bibliography at pages xliii-xlv. **See also:** P. Painlevé, “La Mécanique Classique et la Théorie de la Relativité”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 173, (1921), pp. 677-680. **See also:** S. Mohorovičić, “Raum, Zeit und Welt. II Teil”, in K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, Volume 2, (1962), pp. 219-352, at 273-275. **See also:** K. Hentschel, *Interpretationen und Fehlinterpretationen der speziellen und der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie durch Zeitgenossen Albert Einsteins*, Birkhäuser, Basel, Boston, Berlin, (1990). **See also:** A. Genovesi, *Il Carteggio tra Albert Einstein ed Edouard Guillaume. “Tempo Universale” e Teoria della Relatività Ristretta nella Filosofia Francese Contemporanea*, Franco Angeli, Milano, (2000). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 24 September 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 383, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 3 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 385, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 9 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 387, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 17 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 392, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 24 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 394, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 25 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 280, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from M. Grossmann to A. Einstein of 5 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 300, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 9 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 305, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 15 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 316, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to M. Grossmann of 27 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 330, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to P. Oppenheim of 29 April 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 399, Princeton University Press, (2004).

2143. A. Patschke, *Umsturz der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie. 4 mathematische Geburtsfehler. Einführung in die einheitliche Erklärung und Mechanik der Naturkräfte. Kreuzigung und Auferstehung des Lichtäthers*, Berlin-Wilersdorf, (1922).

- 2144.** H. Dingle, *Science at the Crossroads*, Martin Brian & O’Keeffe, London, (1972).
- 2145.** H. Dingler, *Die Grundlagen der Physik; synthetische Prinzipien der mathematischen Naturphilosophie*, Second Edition, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, (1923); **and** *Physik und Hypothese Versuch einer induktiven Wissenschaftslehre nebst einer kritischen Analyse der Fundamente der Relativitätstheorie*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1921); **and** “Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Grundlagen der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 21, (1920), pp. 668-669.
- 2146.** H. Strasser, *Die Transformationsformeln von Lorentz und die „Transformationsformeln“ der Einsteinschen speziellen Relativitätstheorie*, Ernst Bircher, Bern, Leipzig, (1924).
- 2147.** S. Guggenheimer, *The Einstein Theory Explained and Analyzed*, Macmillan, New York, (1929).
- 2148.** A. Lynch, *The Case Against Einstein*, P. Allan, London, (1932).
- 2149.** J. Mackaye, *The Dynamic Universe*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1931).
- 2150.** H. Nordenson, *Relativity, Time and Reality: A Critical Investigation of the Einstein Theory of Relativity from a Logical Point of View*, Allen and Unwin, London, (1969).
- 2151.** L. Essen, *The Special Theory of Relativity: A Critical Analysis*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, (1971); “Relativity — Joke or Swindle?”, *Electronics and Wireless World*, (February, 1988), pp. 126-127. <<http://www.cfpf.org.uk/articles/scientists/essen.html>>
- 2152.** W. Theimer, *Die Relativitätstheorie, Lehre-Kritik-Wirkung*, Francke, Munich, (1977).
- 2153.** B. J. Gut, *Immanent-logische Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Kugler, Oberwil, Switzerland, (1981).
- 2154.** S. Mohorovičić, *Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie und ihr mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Charakter*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1923), pp. 23-24, 30.
- 2155.** M. Abraham, *Theorie der Elektrizität*, Fourth Edition, Volume 2 (“Elektromagnetische Theorie der Strahlung”), Leipzig, Berlin, B. G. Teubner, (1920), pp. 350-390, at 359. The Third Edition of 1914 credits Poincaré at pp. 365-368.
- 2156.** H. Poincaré, “La Mécanique Nouvelle”, *Comptes Rendus des Sessions de l’Association Française pour l’Avancement des Sciences*, Conférence de Lille, Paris, (1909), pp. 38-48; *La Revue Scientifique*, Volume 47, (1909), pp. 170-177; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 18-76 URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

and **28 April 1909 Lecture in Göttingen**: “La Mécanique Nouvelle”, *Sechs Vorträge über der reinen Mathematik und mathematischen Physik auf Einladung der Wolfskehl-Kommission der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften gehalten zu Göttingen vom 22.-28. April 1909*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1910), pp. 51-58; “The New Mechanics”, *The Monist*, Volume 23, (1913), pp. 385-395; **13 October 1910 Lecture in Berlin**: “Die neue Mechanik”, *Himmel und Erde*, Volume 23, (1911), pp. 97-116; *Die neue Mechanik*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1911);

2157. S. Mohorovičić, “Über die räumliche und zeitliche Translation”, “»Bulletin« d. süslaw. Akad. D. Wiss.” (*Jugoslovenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*), Volume 6/7, Zagreb, (1916-1917), p. 48; **and** “Die Folgerung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie und die Newtonsche Physik”, *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, New Series, Volume 20, Jena, (1921), pp. 737-739. *See also*: as cited by Mohorovičić: E. Guillaume and C. Willigens, “Über die Grundlagen der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921),

pp. 109-114; **and** E. Guillaume, “Graphische Darstellung der Optik bewegter Körper”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 386-388.

2158. F. Klein to W. Pauli, *Wissenschaftlicher Briefwechsel mit Bohr, Einstein, Heisenberg, u.a. = Scientific correspondence with Bohr, Einstein, Heisenberg, a.o.*, Document 10, Springer, New York, (1979), p. 27.

2159. M. Born, *Physics in my Generation*, second revised edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, (1969), pp. 102-103.

2160. A. Reuterdahl, *Einstein And The New Science*, Reprint from *The Bi-Monthly Journal of the College of St. Thomas*, Volume 9, Number 3, (July, 1921), p. 8.

2161. J. Riem, “Zu Einsteins Amerikafahrt”, *Deutsche Zeitung*, (13 September 1921).

2162. This letter is reproduced in French in C. Seelig, *Albert Einstein: Eine dokumentarische Biographie*, Europa Verlag, Zürich, Stuttgart, Wien, (1954), p. 163; English translation by M. Savill, *Albert Einstein: A Documentary Biography*, Staples Press, London, (1956), pp. 134-135. R. S. Shankland stated that the letter was in the Einstein Archives in Princeton in 1973, cf. “Conversations with Albert Einstein. II”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 41, Number 7, (July, 1973), pp. 895-901, at 895. A partial English translation is found in A. Moszkowski, *Einstein: The Searcher*, Chapter 6, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1921), p. 231.

2163. A. Moszkowski, *Einstein: The Searcher*, Chapter 6, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1921), pp. 1, 3.

2164. H. Poincaré’s St. Louis lecture from September of 1904, *La Revue des Idées*, 80, (November 15, 1905); “L’État Actuel et l’Avenir de la Physique Mathématique”, *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématique*, Series 2, Volume 28, (1904), p. 302-324; English translation, “The Principles of Mathematical Physics”, *The Monist*, Volume 15, Number 1, (January, 1905), pp. 1-24, at 16.

2165. A. Moszkowski to A. Einstein, translated by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 292, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 281.

2166. A. Fürst and A. Moszkowski, “Der Herr Lumen”, *Das Buch der 1000 Wunder*, Section 187, Albert Langen, München, (1916), pp. 254-257. A. Moszkowski, *Der Sprung über den Schatten*, Albert Langen, München, (1917), pp. 213-219.

2167. A. Moszkowski, “Das Relativitätsproblem”, *Archiv für systematische Philosophie*, New Series, Volume 17, Number 3, (1911), pp. 255-281, at 258-259.

2168. S. Walter, “Minkowski, Mathematicians, and the Mathematical Theory of Relativity”, in H. Goenner, et al., Editors, *The Expanding Worlds of General Relativity*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (1999), pp. 45-86.

2169. O. Darrigol, “The Electrodynamical Origins of Relativity Theory”, *Historical Studies in the Physical and Biological Sciences: HSPS*, Volume 26, Number 2, (1996), pp. 241-312; which is reprinted as Chapter 9 of Darrigol’s *Electrodynamics from Ampère to Einstein*, Oxford University Press, (2000); as quoted in S. Abiko, “On Einstein’s Distrust of the Electromagnetic Theory: the Origin of the Light Velocity Postulate”, *Historical Studies in the Physical and Biological Sciences: HSPS*, Volume 33, Number 2, (2003), pp. 193-215, at 200.

2170. L. Lange, “Mein Verhältnis zu Einstein’s Weltbild”, *Psychiatrisch-neurologische Wochenschrift*, Volume 24, Number 29/30, (1922), pp. 188-189.

2171. S. Oppenheim and F. Kottler, *Kritik des Newton’schen Gravitationsgesetzes; mit einem Beitrag: Gravitation und Relativitätstheorie von F. Kottler*, Deutsche Staatsrealschule in Karolinenthal, Prag, (1903).

2172. *Encyclopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, 6, 2, 22a, p. 171, note (13).

2173. T. J. J. See, quoted in, “Prof. See Attacks German Scientist, Asserting That His Doctrine Is 122 Years Old”, *The New York Times*, 13 April 1923, Section 1, p. 5.

2174. T. J. J. See, "Einstein's Theory of Gravitation", *The Observatory*, Volume 39, (1916), pp. 511-512; **See also:** J. Riem, "Das Relativitätsgesetz", *Deutsche Zeitung*, Number 286, (26 June 1920). **See also:** "Prof. See Attacks German Scientist, Asserting That His Doctrine Is 122 Years Old", *The New York Times*, (13 April 1923), p. 5; **and** T. J. J. See, "Einstein a Second Dr. Cook?", *The San Francisco Journal*, (13 May 1923), pp. 1, 6; **and** (20 May 1923), p. 1; "Einstein a Trickster?", *The San Francisco Journal*, (27 May 1923); response by R. Trumpler, "Historical Note on the Problem of Light Deflection in the Sun's Gravitational Field", *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 1496, (1923), pp. 161-163; reply by See, "Soldner, Foucault and Einstein", *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, (1923), p. 372; rejoinder by L. P. Eisenhart, "Soldner and Einstein", *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 1512, (1923), pp. 516-517; rebuttal by A. Reuterdaahl, "The Einstein Film and the Debacle of Einsteinism", *The Dearborn Independent*, (22 March 1924), p. 15; **and** T. J. J. See, "New Theory of the Ether", *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 217, (1923), pp. 193-283. **See also:** "Is the Einstein Theory a Crazy Vagary?", *The Literary Digest*, (2 June 1923), pp. 29-30. **See also:** R. Morgan, "Einstein Theory Declared Colossal Humbug by U.S. Naval Astronomer", *The Dearborn Independent*, (21 July 1923), p. 14. **See also:** "Prof. See Attacks German Scientist Asserting that his Doctrine is 122 Years Old", *The New York Times*, Section 1, (13 April 1923), p. 5. **See also:** "Einstein Geometry Called Careless", *The San Francisco Journal*, (14 October 1924). **See also:** T. J. J. See, "Is Einstein's Arithmetic Off?", *The Literary Digest*, Volume 83, Number 6, (8 November 1924), pp. 20-21. **See also:** "Navy Scientist Claims Einstein Theory Error", *The Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, (13 October 1924). Ironically, Reuterdaahl accused See of Plagiarizing his exposure of Einstein's plagiarism in America, first recognized by Gehrcke and Lenard in Germany! "Reuterdaahl Says See Takes Credit for Work of Others", *The Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, (14 October 1924); **and** "A Scientist Yields to Temptation", *The Minneapolis Journal*, (2 February 1925). **See also:** "Prof. See declares Einstein in Error. Naval Astronomer Says Eclipse Observations Fully Confirm Newton's Gravitation Theory. Says German began Wrong. A Mistake in Mathematics is Charged, with 'Curved Space' Idea to Hide it." *The New York Times*, (14 October 1924), p. 14; responses by Eisenhart, Eddington and Dyson, *The New York Times*, (16 October 1924), p. 12. **See also:** "Captain See vs. Doctor Einstein", *Scientific American*, Volume 138, (February 1925), p. 128; **and** T. J. J. See, *Researches in Non-Euclidian Geometry and the Theory of Relativity: A Systematic Study of Twenty Fallacies in the Geometry of Riemann, Including the So-Called Curvature of Space and Radius of World Curvature, and of Eighty Errors in the Physical Theories of Einstein and Eddington, Showing the Complete Collapse of the Theory of Relativity*, United States Naval Observatory Publication: Mare Island, Calif. : Naval Observatory, (1925). **See also:** "See Says Einstein has Changed Front. Navy Mathematician Quotes German Opposing Field Theory in 1911. Holds it is not New. Declares he himself Anticipated by Seven Years Relation of Electrodynamics to Gravitation", *The New York Times*, Section 2, (24 February 1929), p. 4. See refers to his works: *Electrodynamic Wave-Theory of Physical Forces*, Thos. P. Nichols, Boston, London, Paris, (1917); **and** *New Theory of the Aether*, Inhaber Georg Oheim, Kiel, (1922); **and** "New Theory of the Ether", *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 217, (1923), pp. 193-283.

2175. A. Reuterdaahl, "The Origin of Einsteinism", *The New York Times*, Section 7, (12 August 1923), p. 8. Reply to F. D. Bond's response, "Reuterdaahl and the Einstein Theory", *The New York Times*, Section 7, (15 July 1923), p. 8. Response to A. Reuterdaahl, "Einstein's Predecessors", *The New York Times*, Section 8, (3 June 1923), p. 8. Which was a reply to F. D. Bond, "Relating to Relativity", *The New York Times*, Section 9, (13 May 1923), p. 8. Which was a response to H. A. Houghton, "A Newtonian Duplication?", *The New York*

Times, Section 1, Part 1, (21 April 1923), p. 10. *See also*: A. Reuterdahl, “Einstein and the New Science”, *Bi-Monthly Journal of the College of St. Thomas*, Volume 11, Number 3, (July, 1921).

2176. A. Reuterdahl, “The Origin of Einsteinism”, *The New York Times*, Section 7, (12 August 1923), p. 8. Reply to F. D. Bond’s response, “Reuterdahl and the Einstein Theory”, *The New York Times*, Section 7, (15 July 1923), p. 8. Response to A. Reuterdahl, “Einstein’s Predecessors”, *The New York Times*, Section 8, (3 June 1923), p. 8. Which was a reply to F. D. Bond, “Relating to Relativity”, *The New York Times*, Section 9, (13 May 1923), p. 8. Which was a response to H. A. Houghton, “A Newtonian Duplication?”, *The New York Times*, Section 1, Part 1, (21 April 1923), p. 10. *See also*: A. Reuterdahl, “Einstein and the New Science”, *Bi-Monthly Journal of the College of St. Thomas*, Volume 11, Number 3, (July, 1921). *See also*: J. T. Blankart, “Relativity of Interdependence; Reuterdahl’s Theory Contrasted with Einstein’s”, *Catholic World*, Volume 112, (February, 1921), pp. 588-610.

2177. “Challenges Prof. Einstein: St. Paul Professor Asserts Relativity Theory Was Advanced in 1866”, *The New York Times*, (10 April 1921), p. 21.

2178. “Challenges Prof. Einstein: St. Paul Professor Asserts Relativity Theory Was Advanced in 1866”, *The New York Times*, (10 April 1921), p. 21. *See also*: “Einstein Charged with Plagiarism”, *New York American*, (11 April 1921). *See also*: “Einstein Refuses to Debate Theory”, *New York American*, (12 April 1921).

2179. J. H. Ziegler, „Das Ding an sich“ und das Ende der sog. Relativitätstheorie, Weltformel-Verlag, Zürich, (1923), pp. 31-32.

2180. H. Poincaré, “La Théorie de Lorentz at le Principe de Réaction”, *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Series 2, Volume 5, *Recueil de travaux offerts par les auteurs à H. A. Lorentz, professeur de physique à l’université de Leiden, à l’occasion du 25^{me} anniversaire de son doctorate le 11 décembre 1900*, Nijhoff, The Hague, (1900), p. 272:

“In order for the compensation to occur, the phenomena must correspond, not to the true time t , but to some determined *local time* t' defined in the following way.

I suppose that observers located at different points synchronize their watches with the aid of light signals; which they attempt to adjust to the time of the transmission of these signals, but these observers are unaware of their movement of translation and they consequently believe that the signals travel at the same speed in both directions, they restrict themselves to crossing the observations, sending a signal from A to B , then another from B to A . The local time t' is the time determined by watches synchronized in this manner.

If in such a case

$$1 / K_0^{1/2}$$

is the speed of light, and v the translation of the Earth, that I imagine to be parallel to the positive x axis, one will have:

$$t' = t - vx / V^2$$

“Pour que la compensation se fasse, il faut rapporter les phénomènes, non pas au temps vrai t , mais à un certain *temps local* t' défini de la façon suivante.

Je suppose que des observateurs placés en différents points, règlent leurs montres à l’aide de signaux lumineux; qu’ils cherchent à corriger ces signaux du temps de la

transmission, mais qu'ignorant le mouvement de translation dont ils sont animés et croyant par conséquent que les signaux se transmettent également vite dans les deux sens, ils se bornent à croiser les observations, en envoyant un signal de A en B , puis un autre de B en A . Le temps local t' est le temps marqué par les montres ainsi réglées.

Si alors

$$1 / K_0^{1/2}$$

est la vitesse de la lumière, et v la translation de la Terre que je suppose parallèle à l'axe des x positifs, on aura:

$$t' = t - vx / V^{29}$$

and *Electricité et Optique*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1901), p. 530: "Allow me a couple of remarks regarding the new variable t' : it is what Lorentz calls *the local time*. At a given point t and t' will not defer but by a constant, t' will, therefore, always represent the time, but the origin of the times being different for the different points serves as justification for his designation." "Disons deux mots sur la nouvelle variable t' : c'est ce que Lorentz appelle *le temps locale*. En un point donné t et t' ne différeront que par une constante, t' représentera donc toujours le temps mais l'origine des temps étant différente aux différents points: cela justifie sa dénomination." and from 1902, *Science and Hypothesis*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 90: "There is no absolute time. When we say that two periods are equal, the statement has no meaning, and can only acquire a meaning by convention. Not only have we no direct intuition of the equality of two periods, but we have not even direct intuition of the simultaneity of two events occurring in two different places. I have explained this in an article entitled "Mesure du Temps."

2181. H. Thirring, "Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper und spezielle Relativitätstheorie", *Handbuch der Physik*, Volume 12, "Theorien der Elektrizität Elektrostatik", Springer, Berlin, (1927), p. 270, footnote.

2182. R. P. Richardson, "Relativity and its Precursors", *The Monist*, Volume 39, (1929), pp. 126-152, at 136, 138.

2183. F. Haiser, "Das Relativitätsprinzip", *Politisch-anthropologische Revue*, Volume 19, (1920/1921), pp. 495-502. O. Zettl, "Die Idee der Relativität", *Der Weg*, Volume 1, (1924/1925), pp. 220-224, 249-254.

2184. *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, Volume 8, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, (1981), p. 498.

2185. E. V. Huntington, "A New Approach to the Theory of Relativity", *Festschrift Heinrich Weber zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstag am 5. März 1912 / gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1912), pp. 147-169; reprinted "A New Approach to the Theory of Relativity", *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 23, Number 136, (April, 1912), pp. 494-513. **See also:** S. Mohorovičić, "Äther, Materie, Gravitation und Relativitätstheorie", *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Volume 18, Number 1, (1923), pp. 34-63, at 34. **See also:** H. Ives in, D. Turner and R. Hazelett, *The EINSTEIN Myth and the Ives Papers: A Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979). **See also:** L. Jánossy, "Über die physikalische Interpretation der Lorentz-Transformation", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 6, Volume 11, (1953), pp. 293-322; **and** *Theory of Relativity Based on Physical Reality*, Akademiai Kiadó, Budapest, (1971). **See also:** G. Builder, "Ether and Relativity", *Australian Journal of Physics*, Volume 11, (1958), pp. 279-; **and** "The

- Constancy of the Velocity of Light,” *Australian Journal of Physics*, Volume 11, (1958), pp. 457-480; abridged form reprinted with bibliography in: *Speculations in Science and Technology*, Volume 2, (1971), p. 422. **See also:** S. J. Prokhovnic, *The Logic of Special Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, (1967); **and** *Light in Einstein’s Universe: The Role of Energy in Cosmology and Relativity*, Dordrecht, Boston, D. Reidel Pub. Co., (1985). **See also:** K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, In Two Volumes, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, Austria, (1958/1962). **See also:** J. A. Winnie, “The Twin-Rod Thought Experiment,” *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 40, (1972), pp. 1091-1094. M.F. Podlaha, “Length Contraction and Time Dilation in the Special Theory of Relativity—Real or Apparent Phenomena?”, *Indian Journal of Theoretical Physics*, Volume 25, (1975), pp. 74-75. **See also:** M. Ruderfer, “Introduction to Ives’ ‘Derivation of the Lorentz Transformations’”, *Speculations in Science and Technology*, Volume 2, (1979), p. 243. **See also:** D. Lorenz, “Über die Realität der FitzGerald-Lorentz Kontraktion”, *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Wissenschaftstheorie*, Volume 13/2, (1982), pp. 308-312. **See also:** D. Dieks, “The ‘Reality’ of the Lorentz Contraction,” *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Wissenschaftstheorie*, Volume 115/2, (1984), p. 341. **See also:** F. Winterberg, *The Planck Aether Hypothesis*, Gauss Press, Reno, Nevada, (2002), pp. 141-148.
- 2186.** A. Einstein quoted in “Einstein on Arrival Braves Limelight for Only 15 Minutes”, *The New York Times*, (12 December 1930), pp. 1, 16, at 16
- 2187.** H. B. G. Casimir, “The Influence of Lorentz’ Ideas on Modern Physics”, in G. L. De Haas-Lorentz, Ed., *H. A. Lorentz: Impressions of His Life and Work*, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, (1957), p. 168.
- 2188.** R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 56.
- 2189.** A. Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), p. 4.
- 2190.** H. Goenner, “The Reaction to Relativity Theory. I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920”, *Science in Context*, Volume 6, Number 1, (1993), pp. 107-133, at 111.
- 2191.** “Einstein Ignores Capt. See”, *The New York Times*, (18 October 1924), p. 17.
- 2192.** “Challenges Prof. Einstein: St. Paul Professor Asserts Relativity Theory Was Advanced in 1866”, *The New York Times*, (10 April 1921), p. 21. **See also:** “Einstein Charged with Plagiarism”, *New York American*, (11 April 1921). **See also:** “Einstein Refuses to Debate Theory”, *New York American*, (12 April 1921).
- 2193.** R. Drill, “Die Kultur der Haeckel-Zeit”, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, (18 August 1919); **and** “Nachwort”, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, (2 September 1919); **and** “Ordnung und Chaos. Ein Beitrag zum Gesetz von der Erhaltung der Kraft. I-II”, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, (30 November 1919 / 2 December 1919).
- 2194.** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Documents 198, 199 and 222, Princeton University Press, (2004).
- 2195.** *The New York Times*, (4 April 1922), p. 21.
- 2196.** “Cardinal Doubts Einstein”, *The New York Times*, (8 April 1929), p. 4. **See also:** “Einstein Ignores Cardinal”, *The New York Times*, (9 April 1929), p. 10. **See also:** “Cardinal Opposes Einstein”, *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, (8 April 1929), p. 33. **See also:** “Cardinal Hits at Einstein Theory”, *The Minneapolis Journal*, (8 April 1929). **See also:** “Cardinal Gives Further Views on Einstein”, *Boston Evening American*, (12 April 1929). **See also:** “Cardinal Warns Against Destructive Theories”, *The Pilot* [Roman Catholic Newspaper, Boston], (13 April 1929), pp. 1-2. **See also:** “Vatican Paper Praises Critic of Dr. Einstein”, *The Minneapolis Morning Journal*, (24 May 1929).
- 2197.** M. Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge*, University of Chicago Press, (1958), p. 13. **See also:** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, (1982), pp. 113-114. **See also:** W.

Broad and N. Wade, *Betrayers of the Truth: Fraud and Deceit in the Halls of Science*, Simon & Schuster, New York, (1982), p. 139.

2198. *The New York Times*, (24 February 1936), p. 7. **See also:** “Calls Ether Reality; Differs with Einstein; Proof is Submitted”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (23 February 1936).

2199. **See also:** “Einstein Theory will be Refuted by an American”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (24 October 1929), p. 18. **See also:** “Calls Ether Reality; Differs with Einstein; Proof is Submitted”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (23 February 1936).

2200. R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57; **and** “Conversations with Albert Einstein. II”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 41, Number 7, (July, 1973), pp. 895-901.

2201. R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 54.

2202. A. Einstein quoted in R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, The World Publishing Company, (1971), p. 261; referencing A. Einstein to A. Sommerfeld, in A. Hermann. *Briefwechsel. 60 Briefe aus dem goldenen Zeitalter der modernen Physik*, Schwabe & Co., Basel, Stuttgart, (1968), p. 69.

2203. A. Einstein, *Neues Wiener Journal*, (29 September 1920). C. Kirsten and H. J. Treder, *Albert Einstein in Berlin 1913-1933*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, Volume 2, (1979), pp. 139, 205.

2204. “Cardinal Warns Against Destructive Theories”, *The Pilot* [Roman Catholic Newspaper, Boston], (13 April 1929), pp. 1-2

2205. “Vatican Paper Praises Critic of Dr. Einstein”, *The Minneapolis Morning Journal*, (24 May 1929).

2206. A. v. Brunn, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 19, Number 11, (13 March 1931), pp. 254-256; English translation by A. M. Hentschel appears in K. Hentschel, *Physics and National Socialism*, Birkhäuser, Basel, Boston, Berlin, (1996), p. 14.

2207. I. K. Geissler, “Ringgenberg Schluss mit der Einstein-Irrung!”, H. Israel, *et al*, Eds., *Hundert Autoren Gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, (1931), pp. 10-12, at 10. Geissler refers to his book, *Eine mögliche Wesenserklärung für Raum, Zeit, das Unendliche und die Kausalität, nebst einem Grundwort zur Metaphysik der Möglichkeiten*, Gutenberg, Berlin, (1900).

2208. Found in the Arvid Reuter Dahl files in the Department of Special Collections, O’Shaughnessy-Frey Library, University of St. Thomas, Minnesota.

2209. Edited by, and with commentary from, D. Turner and R. Hazelett, *The EINSTEIN Myth and the Ives Papers: A Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979).

2210. Sir Edmund Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume II, Philosophical Library Inc., New York, (1954), p. 40.

2211. *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the Royal Society*, Volume 1, The Royal Society, Headley Brothers LTD., (1955), pp. 37-67, at 42.

2212. W. Voigt, “Ueber das Doppler’sche Princip”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1887), pp. 41-51; reprinted *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 16, Number 20, (15 October 1915), pp. 381-386; English translation, as well as very useful commentary, are found in A. Ernst and Jong-Ping Hsu (W. Kern is credited with assisting in the translation), “First Proposal of the Universal Speed of Light by Voigt in 1887”, *Chinese Journal of Physics* (The Physical Society of the Republic of China), Volume 39, Number 3, (June, 2001), pp. 211-230; URL’s:

<<http://psroc.phys.ntu.edu.tw/cjp/v39/211.pdf>>

See also: W. Voigt, “Theorie des Lichtes für bewegte Medien”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1887), pp. 177-238.

2213. M. Born, *Einstein’s Theory of Relativity*, Methuen & Co. Ltd., London, (1924), p. 188.

2214. M. Born, *Einstein’s Theory of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1962), p. 224.

2215. M. Born, “Physics and Relativity”, *Physics in my Generation*, 2nd rev. ed., Springer, New York, (1969), pp. 101-103.

2216. P. G. Bergmann, *The Riddle of Gravitation*, Scribner, New York, (1968), p. 29.

2217. G. H. Keswani, “Origin and Concept of Relativity, Part I”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 15, Number 60, (February, 1965), pp.286-306, at 293-295.

2218. This quote, which is widely attributed to Einstein, was brought to my attention in an anonymous e-mail—thank you, whoever you are!

2219. A. Eddington, *The Philosophy of Physical Science*, Ann Arbor Paperbacks, The University of Michigan Press, Second Printing, (1967), p. 16.

2220. Cf. H. More, *A COLLECTION Of Several Philosophical Writings OF Dr. HENRY MORE, Fellow of Christ’s-College in Cambridge*, Joseph Downing, London, (1712); which contains: *AN ANTIDOTE AGAINST ATHEISM: OR, An Appeal to the Natural Faculties of the Mind of Man, Whether there be not a GOD*, The Fourth Edition corrected and enlarged: WITH AN APPENDIX Thereunto annexed, “An Appendix to the foregoing Antidote,” Chapter 7, pp. 199-201. F. H. Bradley, “In What Sense are Psychical States Extended?”, *Mind*, New Series, Volume 4, Number 14, (April, 1895), pp. 225-235.

2221. A. Schuster, *The Progress of Physics during 33 years (1875-1908) Four Lectures delivered to the University of Calcutta during March 1908*, Cambridge University Press, (1911), pp. 109-111.

2222. Among many others, Eduard Study also objected to the solipsism of positivism in a letter to Einstein of 24 May 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 45, Princeton University Press, (2004).

2223. E. Mach, *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwicklung*, 3rd Ed., F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig, (1897), pp. 236-237.

2224. A. Schuster, *The Progress of Physics during 33 years (1875-1908) Four Lectures delivered to the University of Calcutta during March 1908*, Cambridge University Press, (1911), pp. 114-117. See: H. Hertz, “Author’s Preface”, *The Principles of Mechanics Presented in a New Form*, Macmillan, London, New York, (1899); reprinted, Dover, New York, (1956). See also: *Vorlesungen über mathematische Physik*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1876 and multiple later editions); *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1882); *Vorlesungen über die Theorie der Wärme*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1894).

2225. J. Mackaye, *The Dynamic Universe*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1931), pp. 42-43, 100-101.

2226. H. A. Lorentz, *Das Relativitätsprinzip; drei Vorlesungen gehalten in Teylers Stiftung zu Haarlem*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig-Berlin, (1920). p. 23.

2227. F. Hund, “Wer hat die Relativitätstheorie geschaffen?”, *Physikalische Blätter*, Volume 36, Number 8, (1980), pp. 237-240, at 240.

2228. A. Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown Publishers, Inc., (1954), p. 281.

2229. A. Einstein, “H. A. Lorentz, His Creative Genius and His Personality”, in G. L. de Haas-Lorentz, *H. A. Lorentz: Impressions of His Life and Work*, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, (1957), pp. 5-9, at 6-7.

2230. Mie quotes Abraham, “Allgemeine Diskussion über Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 21, (1920), pp. 666-668, at 667; the editors of: *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 46, Note 26, p. 359; attribute this reference to: M. Abraham, “Electromagnetische Theorie der Strahlung”, *Theorie der Elektrizität*, Volume 2, Second Edition, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1908).

2231. H. Seal, “Space and Time”, *The Westminster Review*, Volume 152, Number 6, (1899), pp. 675-679, at 676-678.

2232. E. K. Dühning, *Neue Grundgesetze zur rationellen Physik und Chemie*, Volume 1, Chapter 1, Fues’s Verlag (R. Reisland), Leipzig, (1878/1886), pp. 1-34

2233. A. Bolliger, *Anti-Kant oder Elemente der Logik, der Physik und der Ethik*, Felix Schneider, Basel, (1882), esp. pp. 336-354.

2234. H. A. Lorentz, *Theory of Electrons*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1909), p. 11; reprinted Dover, New York, (1952). See also: pp. 30-31.

2235. H. Dingle, *Science at the Crossroads*, Martin Brian & O’Keeffe, London, (1972), pp. 165-166.

2236. H. Vaihinger, *Philosophy of the ‘As if’*, Barnes & Noble, Inc., New York, (1966), p. 232. Vaihinger also pointed out that many scientists considered the hypothesis of the æther nothing more than a useful fiction, at page 40; **and**, at page 41, “In all modern science there is a tendency to depose hypotheses hitherto regarded as firmly established and to degrade them to the position of useful fictions.”

2237. A. Einstein, *Sidelights on Relativity*, translated by: G. B. Jeffery and W. Perret, Methuen & Co., London, (1922); *republished, unabridged and unaltered*: Dover, New York, (1983), pp. 16, 23.

2238. Taken from a letter from Oliver Heaviside to Vilhelm Friman Køren Bjerknes dated “8/3/20”. C. J. Bjerknes, *Albert Einstein: The Incurable Plagiarist*, XTX Inc., Downers Grove, Illinois, (2002), pp. 25-26.

2239. A. Einstein and I. Infeld, *The Evolution of Physics*, Simon & Schuster, New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore, (1966), p. 153.

2240. E. Haeckel, *Die Welträthsel: Gemeinverständliche Studien über Monistische Philosophie*, Emil Strauß, Bonn, (1899), pp. 243-316, and especially pp. 261-267, and 282-284; English translation by Joseph McCabe, *The Riddle of the Universe: At the Close of the Nineteenth Century*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1900), p. 227. G. W. De Tunzelmann ridiculed Haeckel in *A Treatise on Electrical Theory and the Problem of the Universe. Considered from the Physical Point of View, with Mathematical Appendices*, Appendix Q, Charles Griffin, London, (1910), pp. 617-625. Haeckel’s name often appears in the literature.

2241. H. Spencer, *First Principles of a New System of Philosophy*, Second American Edition, D. Appelton and Company, New York, (1874), pp. 96-97.

2242. A. Einstein quoted in R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, World Publishing, New York, (1971), p. 264.

2243. C. Giannoni, “Einstein and the Lorentz-Poincaré Theory of Relativity”, *PSA: Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*, Volume 1970, (1970), pp. 575-589. JSTOR link:

<<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0270-8647%281970%291970%3C575%3AEATLTO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Z>>

Note that Giannoni undervalues the contributions of Poincaré.

2244. M. v. Laue, *Das Relativitätsprinzip der Lorentztransformation*, Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, (1921), p. 48. A. Einstein, *Relativity, The Special and the General*

Theory, Crown Publishers, Inc., New York, (1961), p. 33.

2245. E. Cohn, “Über die Gleichungen der Electrodynamik für bewegte Körper”, *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Series 2, Volume 5, (1900), p. 519.

2246. J. H. Poincaré, “Sur la Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 140, (1905), pp. 1504-1508; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 77-81
URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

reprinted *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 489-493; English translations appear in: G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, “Intimations of Relativity before Einstein”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (December, 1983), pp. 343-354, at pp. 350-353; **and**, translated by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 7-14.

2247. W. Voigt, “Ueber das Doppler’sche Princip”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1887), pp. 41-51; reprinted *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 16, Number 20, (15 October 1915), pp. 381-386; English translation, as well as very useful commentary, are found in A. Ernst and Jong-Ping Hsu (W. Kern is credited with assisting in the translation), “First Proposal of the Universal Speed of Light by Voigt in 1887”, *Chinese Journal of Physics* (The Physical Society of the Republic of China), Volume 39, Number 3, (June, 2001), pp. 211-230; URL’s:

<<http://psroc.phys.ntu.edu.tw/cjp/v39/211/211.htm>>

<<http://psroc.phys.ntu.edu.tw/cjp/v39/211.pdf>>

See also: W. Voigt, “Theorie des Lichtes für bewegte Medien”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1887), pp. 177-238.

2248. A. Henderson, A. W. Hobbs, J. W. Lasley, Jr., *The Theory of Relativity*, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, Oxford University Press, (1924), p. 16, footnote.

2249. *Brockhaus Enzyklopädie*, F. A. Brockhaus, Wiesbaden, Volume 19, (1974), p 697. For Voigt’s use of the term ‘tensor’ see: W. Voigt, *Die fundamentalen physikalischen Eigenschaften der Krystalle in elementarer Darstellung*, Veit, Leipzig, (1898), pp. 20 ff.; **and** S. Bochner, “The Significance for Some Basic Mathematical Conceptions for Physics”, *Isis*, Volume 54, (1963), pp. 179-205, at 193; **and** W. Voigt, *Elementare Mechanik als Einleitung in das Studium der theoretischen Physik*, second revised edition, Veit, Leipzig, (1901), pp. 10-26.

2250. *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 9, Number 22, (November 1, 1908), p. 762. While some believe that Voigt was expressing his modesty, it might also be that he was pointedly asserting the primacy of the *elastic* theory of light.

2251. *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, (1952), p. 48.

2252. H. Poincaré’s St. Louis lecture from September of 1904, *La Revue des Idées*, 80, (November 15, 1905); “L’État Actuel et l’Avenir de la Physique Mathématique”, *Bulletin*

des Sciences Mathématique, Series 2, Volume 28, (1904), p. 302-324; English translation, “The Principles of Mathematical Physics”, *The Monist*, Volume 15, Number 1, (January, 1905), pp. 1-24.

2253. R. J. Boscovich, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, (1966), pp. 204-205.

2254. G. F. FitzGerald, “The Ether and Earth’s Atmosphere (Letter to the Editor)”, *Science*, Volume 13, Number 328, (1889), p. 390.

2255. H. A. Lorentz, “Over de terugkaatsing van licht door lichamen die zich bewegen”, *Verslagen der Zittingen de Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Amsterdam), Volume 1, (1892), pp. 28-31; reprinted in English “On the Reflection of Light by Moving Bodies”, *Collected Papers*, Volume 4, pp. 215-218; **and** “De Relatieve Beweging van de Aarde en den Aether”, *Verslagen der Zittingen de Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Amsterdam), Volume 1, (1892/1893), pp. 74-79; translated in English, “The Relative Motion of the Earth and the Ether”, *Collected Papers*, Volume 4, pp. 219-223; **and** “La Théorie Électromagnétique de Maxwell et son Application aux Corps Mouvants”, *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, First Series, Volume 25, (1892), pp. 363-552; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 2, pp. 164-343.

2256. *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, (1952), p. 7.

2257. O. Heaviside, “The Electromagnetic Effects of a Moving Charge”, *The Electrician*, Volume 22, (1888), pp. 147-148; **and** “On the Electromagnetic Effects due to the Motion of Electricity Through a Dielectric”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 27, (1889), pp. 324-339; **and** “On the Forces, Stresses and Fluxes of Energy in the Electromagnetic Field”, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, Volume 183A, (1892), p. 423; **and** “A Gravitational and Electromagnetic Analogy”, *The Electrician*, Volume 31, (1893), pp. 281-282, 359; **and** *The Electrician*, Volume 45, (1900), pp. 636, 881.

2258. R. J. Boscovich, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, (1966), pp. 204-205.

2259. P. Frank, “Die Stellung des Relativitätsprinzips im System der Mechanik und der Elektrodynamik”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, Volume 118, (1909), pp. 373-446; at 373, 376, 420, and 442. Frank introduced the term “Group of the Galilean Transformations” in this paper, at page 382. Peter Guthrie Tait wrote about inertial “Galilei-wise” motion in 1884, “Note on Reference Frames”, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, Volume 12, (November 1883-July 1884), pp. 743-745. I do not think that Galileo was first to this concept. See: A. G. Molland, “An Examination of Bradwardine’s Geometry”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 19, Number 2, (1978), pp. 113-175; See also: J. A. Weisheipl, *The Development of Physical Theory in the Middle Ages*, Ann Arbor Paperbacks, University of Michigan Press, (1971).

2260. Lorentz’ letter as quoted and translated by A. Ernst and Jong-Ping Hsu (W. Kern is credited with assisting in the translation), “First Proposal of the Universal Speed of Light by Voigt in 1887”, *Chinese Journal of Physics* (The Physical Society of the Republic of China), Volume 39, Number 3, (June, 2001), pp. 211-230, at 214. The authors note that the concept of general and local time was Lorentz’ idea, not Voigt’s. In other words, Voigt’s concept was kinematic, and Einstein held no priority over Voigt for the idea of relativistic “time”. The Lorentz to Voigt letter is cited as “Deutsches Museum München, Archives, HS 5549”.

2261. H. A. Lorentz, *Theory of Electrons*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1909), p. 198 footnote; reprinted Dover, New York, (1952).

2262. H. A. Lorentz, “Deux mémoires de Henri Poincaré sur la physique mathématique”, *Acta Mathematica*, Volume 38, (1921), pp. 293-308; reprinted in *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 683-695; **and** Volume 11, (1956), pp. 247-261; “for certain of the physical magnitudes which enter in the formulas I have not indicated the transformation which suits best. This has been done by Poincaré, and later by Einstein and Minkowski,” taken from H. E. Ives’ translation, “Revisions of the Lorentz Transformation”, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Volume 95, Number 2, (April, 1951), p. 125; reprinted R. Hazelett and D. Turner Editors, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers, a Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair Company, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979), p. 125.

2263. W. Voigt, “Ueber das Doppler’sche Princip”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1887), pp. 41-51; reprinted *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 16, Number 20, (15 October 1915), pp. 381-386; English translation, as well as very useful commentary, are found in A. Ernst and Jong-Ping Hsu (W. Kern is credited with assisting in the translation), “First Proposal of the Universal Speed of Light by Voigt in 1887”, *Chinese Journal of Physics* (The Physical Society of the Republic of China), Volume 39, Number 3, (June, 2001), pp. 211-230; URL’s:

<<http://psroc.phys.ntu.edu.tw/cjp/v39/211/211.htm>>

<<http://psroc.phys.ntu.edu.tw/cjp/v39/211.pdf>>

See also: W. Voigt, “Theorie des Lichtes für bewegte Medien”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1887), pp. 177-238.

2264. J. Larmor, *Aether and Matter*, Cambridge University Press, (1900), pp. ix, xiv, 161-179; **and** “A Dynamical Theory of the Electric and Luminiferous Medium”, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A*, Volume 185, (1894), pp. 719-822; Volume 186, (1895), pp. 695-743; Volume 188, (1897), pp. 205-300; **and** “Dynamical Theory of the Ether I & II”, *Nature*, Volume 49, (11 January 1894), pp. 260-262; and (18 January 1894), pp. 280-283; **and** *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 44, (1897), p. 503. **Confer:** M. N. Macrossan, “A Note on Relativity before Einstein”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 37, Number 2, (June, 1986), pp. 232-234.

2265. H. A. Lorentz, “Simplified Theory of Electrical and Optical Phenomena in Moving System”, *Proceedings of the Section of Sciences, Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam*, Volume 1, (1899), pp. 427-442; reprinted in K. F. Schaffner, *Nineteenth Century Aether Theories*, Pergamon Press, New York, Oxford, (1972), pp. 255-273; French translation, “Théorie Simplifiée des Phénomènes Électriques et Optiques dans des Corps en Mouvement”, *Verslagen der Zittingen de Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Amsterdam), Volume 7, (1899), p. 507; **and** *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Volume 7, (1902), pp. 64-80; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 5, pp. 139-155

2266. H. Poincaré, “Sur la Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 140, (1905), pp. 1504-1508; reprinted *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 489-493; English translation by G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, “Intimations of Relativity before Einstein”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (December, 1983), pp. 343-354, at 351.

2267. A. A. Logunov, translated by G. Pontecorvo, *On the articles by Henri Poincare ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Second Edition, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 9, 10, 14.

2268. *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), pp. 47-48.

2269. Cf. J. Stachel, et al., Editors, "Einstein's Reviews for the *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik*", *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Princeton University Press, (1989), pp. 109-111.

2270. H. A. Rowland, *The Physical Papers of Henry August Rowland*, The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland, (1902), pp. 673-674.

2271. E. V. Huntington, "A New Approach to the Theory of Relativity", *Festschrift Heinrich Weber zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 5. März 1912 / gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1912), pp. 147-169; reprinted "A New Approach to the Theory of Relativity", *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 23, Number 136, (April, 1912), pp. 494-513. **See also:** S. Mohorovičić, "Äther, Materie, Gravitation und Relativitätstheorie", *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Volume 18, Number 1, (1923), pp. 34-63, at 34. **See also:** H. Ives in, D. Turner and R. Hazelett, *The EINSTEIN Myth and the Ives Papers: A Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979). **See also:** L. Jánossy, "Über die physikalische Interpretation der Lorentz-Transformation", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 6, Volume 11, (1953), pp. 293-322; **and** *Theory of Relativity Based on Physical Reality*, Akademiai Kiadó, Budapest, (1971). **See also:** G. Builder, "Ether and Relativity", *Australian Journal of Physics*, Volume 11, (1958), pp. 279-; **and** "The Constancy of the Velocity of Light," *Australian Journal of Physics*, Volume 11, (1958), pp. 457-480; abridged form reprinted with bibliography in: *Speculations in Science and Technology*, Volume 2, (1971), p. 422. **See also:** S. J. Prokhovnic, *The Logic of Special Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, (1967); **and** *Light in Einstein's Universe: The Role of Energy in Cosmology and Relativity*, Dordrecht, Boston, D. Reidel Pub. Co., (1985). **See also:** K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, In Two Volumes, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, Austria, (1958/1962). **See also:** J. A. Winnie, "The Twin-Rod Thought Experiment," *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 40, (1972), pp. 1091-1094. M.F. Podlaha, "Length Contraction and Time Dilation in the Special Theory of Relativity—Real or Apparent Phenomena?", *Indian Journal of Theoretical Physics*, Volume 25, (1975), pp. 74-75. **See also:** M. Ruderfer, "Introduction to Ives' 'Derivation of the Lorentz Transformations'", *Speculations in Science and Technology*, Volume 2, (1979), p. 243. **See also:** D. Lorenz, "Über die Realität der FitzGerald-Lorentz Kontraktion", *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Wissenschaftstheorie*, Volume 13/2, (1982), pp. 308-312. **See also:** D. Dieks, "The 'Reality' of the Lorentz Contraction," *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Wissenschaftstheorie*, Volume 115/2, (1984), p. 341. **See also:** F. Winterberg, *The Planck Aether Hypothesis*, Gauss Press, Reno, Nevada, (2002), pp. 141-148.

2272. F. Winterberg, *The Planck Aether Hypothesis: An Attempt for a Finitistic Non-Archimedean Theory of Elementary Particles*, Carl Friedrich Gauss Academy of Science Press, Reno, Nevada, (2002), pp. 144-145.

2273. L. Jánossy, "Über die physikalische Interpretation der Lorentz-Transformation", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 6, Volume 11, (1953), pp. 293-322, at 306-307. **See also:** L. Jánossy, *Theory of Relativity Based on Physical Reality*, Akademiai Kiadó, Budapest, (1971).

2274. J. C. Maxwell, *A Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism*, Volume I, Third Edition, Clarendon, Oxford, (1892), pp. 5-6. W. S. Jevons, *The Principles of Science*, Second Revised Edition, Macmillan, London, New York, (1877), p. 321. E. Mach, *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, La Salle, Illinois, (1960), p. 367.

- 2275.** A. A. Logunov, *Henri Poincare i TEORIA OTNOSITELNOSTI*, Nauka, Moscow, (2004), pp. 45-49.
- 2276.** A. Einstein, “Über das Relativitätsprinzip und die aus demselben gezogenen Folgerung”, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 4, (1907), pp. 411-462, at 416.
- 2277.** See: A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, (1982), p. 142; where Pais refers to Einstein’s so-called “Morgan manuscript” of 1921, which is reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 50, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 372-378. **Einstein plagiarized this from:** N. R. Campbell, “The Common Sense of Relativity”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 21, Number 124, (April, 1911), pp. 502-517, at 505. **See also:** R. D. Carmichael, “On the Theory of Relativity: Analysis of the Postulates”, *The Physical Review*, First Series, Volume 35, (September, 1912), pp. 153-176; and “On the Theory of Relativity: Mass, Force and Energy”, *The Physical Review*, Series 2, Volume 1, (February, 1913), pp. 161-197.
- 2278.** A. Einstein, “Über das Relativitätsprinzip und die aus demselben gezogenen Folgerung”, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 4, (1907), pp. 411-462, at 416.
- 2279.** R. D. Carmichael, *The Theory of Relativity*, Mathematical Monographs No. 12, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, Chapman & Hall, Limited, London, (1920), pp. 13-14.
- 2280.** H. A. Lorentz, *The Theory of Electrons*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 230.
- 2281.** A. Einstein, *The Theory of Relativity and other Essays*, Carol Publishing Group, (1996), pp. 6-8.
- 2282.** W. de Sitter, “On the Bearing of the Principle of Relativity on Gravitational Astronomy”, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 71, (March, 1911), pp. 388-415, at 388-389.
- 2283.** A. Einstein, *Relativity, the Special and the General Theory*, Crown Publishing, Inc., New York, (1961), p. 148.
- 2284.** A. Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown Publishers, Inc., New York, (1954), p. 307.
- 2285.** A. Einstein, “On the Method of Theoretical Physics”, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), p. 271.
- 2286.** A. Einstein, quoted in A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, Toronto, Melbourne, (1982), p. 131.
- 2287.** A. Einstein and I. Infeld, *The Evolution of Physics*, Simon & Schuster, New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore, (1966), p. 31. Compare to the more lucid, prior statements of: W. K. Clifford, *The Common Sense of the Exact Sciences*, Dover, New York, (1955), pp. 193-194. E. Mach, “The Economy of Science”, *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, LaSalle, Illinois, (1960), pp. 577-595. K. Pearson, *The Grammar of Science*, Second Revised and Enlarged Edition, Adam and Charles Black, London, (1900), pp. 30-37. H. Poincaré, *Dernières Pensées*, Flammarion, Paris, (1913); English translation, *Mathematics and Science: Last Essays*, Dover, New York, (1963), pp. 22-23. Einstein often plagiarized these works.
- 2288.** P. Frank, “Einstein’s Philosophy of Science”, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, Volume 21, Number 3, (July, 1949), 349-355.
- 2289.** A. Einstein, “Elementary Derivation of the Equivalence of Mass and Energy”, *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 41, (1935), pp. 223-230, at 223.
- 2290.** H. A. Rowland, *The Physical Papers of Henry August Rowland*, The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland, (1902), pp. 673-674.
- 2291.** R. J. Boscovich, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, (1966), pp. 197-205. **Confer:** H. V. Gill, *Roger Boscovich, S. J.*

(1711-1787) *Forerunner of Modern Physical Theories*, M. H. Gill and Son, LTD., Dublin, (1941).

2292. L. Lange, “Das Inertialsystem vor dem Forum der Naturforschung: Kritisches und Antikritisches”, *Philosophische Studien*, Volume 20, (1902), p. 18.

2293. J. B. Stallo, *Die Begriffe und Theorieen der modernen Physik*, Johann Ambrosius Barth, Leipzig, (1901), pp. 205, 331.

2294. J. Violle, *Lehrbuch der Physik*, Julius Springer, Berlin, (1892), p. 90; cited in J. Stachel, Ed., *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Princeton University Press, (1989), p. 255, Note 13.

2295. H. Poincaré, *Wissenschaft und Hypothese*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1904), pp. 113-114, 119, especially 243, 340.

2296. F. Hausdorff, translator, annotator, *Über die Bewegung der Körper durch den Stoss / Über die Centrifugalkraft*, Ostwald’s Klassiker der exakten Wissenschaften, Nr. 138, Wilhelm Engelmann, Leipzig, (1903), pp. 64, 73.

2297. Galileo Galilei, translated by S. Drake, *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems—Ptolemaic & Copernican*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, (1967), p. 187.

2298. R. J. Boscovich, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, (1966), p. 203.

2299. I. Newton, *The Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*, Volume 1, Benjamin Motte, London, (1729), p. 30.

2300. J. D. Everett, *Elementary Treatise on Natural Philosophy by A. Privat Deschanel*, 6th Ed., D. Appelton and Company, New York, (1883), p. 43. **See also:** H. Streintz, *Die physikalischen Grundlagen der Mechanik*, B.G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1883).

2301. J. D. Everett, “On Absolute and Relative Motion”, *Report of the Sixty-Fifth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, Volume 65, (1895), p. 620.

2302. J. Larmor, *Aether and Matter*, Cambridge University Press, (1900), p. 18. G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, “Intimations of Relativity: Relativity before Einstein”, *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (1983), pp. 343-354.

2303. H. Poincaré, *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), p. 412; reprinted from: “A Propos de la Théorie de M. Larmor”, *L’Éclairage électrique*, Volume 5, (October 5th, 1895) pp. 5-14.

2304. H. Poincaré, *Electricité et Optique*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1901), p. 536.

2305. H. Poincaré, “RELATIONS ENTRE LA PHYSIQUE EXPÉRIMENTALE ET LA PHYSIQUE MATHÉMATIQUE”, *RAPPORTS PRÉSENTÉS AU CONGRÈS INTERNATIONAL DE PHYSIQUE DE 1900*, Volume I, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1900), pp. 1-29; translated into German “Über die Beziehungen zwischen der experimentellen und mathematischen Physik”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 2, (1900-1901), pp. 166-171, 182-186, 196-201; English translation in *Science and Hypothesis*, Chapters 9 and 10, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 172.

2306. J. Stachel, Editor, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Princeton University Press, (1989), pp. xxiv-xxv.

2307. H. Poincaré, *La Science et l’Hypothèse*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1902); translated into English *Science and Hypothesis*, Dover, New York, (1952), at p. 111, which work also appears in *The Foundations of Science*.

2308. J. Stachel, Editor, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Princeton University Press, (1989), pp. xxiv-xxv.

2309. H. Poincaré’s St. Louis lecture from September of 1904, *La Revue des Idées*, Volume 80, (15 November 1905); “L’État Actuel et l’Avenir de la Physique Mathématique”, *Bulletin*

des Sciences Mathématique, Series 2, Volume 28, (1904), pp. 302-324; **reprinted**: *La Valeur de la Science*, Chapters 7 and 8, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1904). **English translation**: “The Principles of Mathematical Physics”, *The Monist*, Volume 15, Number 1, (January, 1905), pp. 1-24; **alternative English translation**: *The Value of Science*, Chapters 7 and 8, The Science Press, New York, (1907), pp. 91-105, at 94.

2310. H. Poincaré, “Sur la Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 140, (1905), pp. 1504-1508; reprinted *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 489-493; English translation by G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, “Intimations of Relativity before Einstein”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (December, 1983), pp. 343-354, at 350.

2311. H. Poincaré, *Science and Method*, reprinted in *The Foundations of Science*, The Science Press, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, (1946), pp. 498-499, 505.

2312. A. Einstein, translated by A. Beck, “Relativity and Gravitation: Reply to a Comment by M. Abraham”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 4, Document 8, (1996), p. 131.

2313. A. Einstein, *Physics Today*, **35**, 8, (August, 1982), p. 46. Note the reference is to the frame of the moving body, not the frame of a moving medium, and to electrons, not light. As usual, Einstein is nonspecific in his reference. Fizeau performed numerous experiments, some to measure light’s speed on Earth: H. Fizeau, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, 29, (1849), p. 90; which could be compared to Bradley’s interpolation of light speed in the reference frame of the vacuum, as Einstein did in 1952, “But the result of Fizeau’s experiment and the phenomenon of aberration also guided me.”—J. Stachel, Ed., *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume II, Princeton University Press, (1989), p. 262; to infer a Michelson-like test, as a positive or a negative result, depending, *inter alia*, on the accuracy attributed to the results; and Fizeau conducted some experiments to test Fresnel’s coefficient of drag in moving media: H. Fizeau, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, 33, (1851), pp. 349-355; **and** *Annales de Chimie et de Physique*, Series 2, Volume 9, p. 57-66; and Einstein would have interpreted these as taking place with reference to the resting æther, “In Aarau ist mir eine gute Idee gekommen zur Untersuchung, welchen Einfluß die Relativbewegung der Körper gegen den Lichtäther auf die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit des Lichtes in durchsichtigen Körpern hat.”—J. Stachel, Ed., *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume I, Princeton University Press, (1987), p. 230; had he ever considered them.

Though Lorentz averred that the Fizeau result compelled a resting æther, in 1895, it was Jakob Laub, in 1907, who first sought to arrive at the Lorentz Transformation by means of the Fizeau experiment of moving medium with respect to Fresnel’s coefficient of drag, and it was Max von Laue who corrected Laub’s formulation: J. Laub, *Annalen der Physik*, 23, (1907), pp. 738-744; **and**, 25, (1908), pp. 175-184. M. v. Laue, *Annalen der Physik*, 23, (1907), pp.989-990.

For an older interpretation, see also: P. Drude, *The Theory of Optics*, Longmans, Green and Co., London, New York, Toronto, (1902), pp. 457-482. **See also**: J. Larmor, *Aether and Matter*, Cambridge University Press, (1900), p. 177-179. **See also**: H. Poincaré, “La Théorie de Lorentz at le Principe de Réaction”, *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Series 2, Volume 5, *Recueil de travaux offerts par les auteurs à H. A. Lorentz, professeur de physique à l’université de Leiden, à l’occasion du 25^{me} anniversaire de son doctorate le 11 décembre 1900*, Nijhoff, The Hague, (1900), pp. 252-278; reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume IX, p. 488. **See also**: H. A. Lorentz, *Versuch einer Theorie der electrischen und optischen Erscheinungen in bewegten Körpern*, §68, E. J. Brill, Leiden, (1895), p. 101.

Einstein made no mention of Fresnel's drag coefficient until after Laub published on the subject, and then he criticized Laub in Einstein's *Jahrbuch* review of 1907: A. Einstein, "Über das Relativitätsprinzip und die aus demselben gezogenen Folgerung", *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, 4, (1907), p. 414. Einstein later failed to cite Laub or Laue, when he parroted their work in 1916: A. Einstein, *Relativity, the Special and the General Theory*, Crown, New York, (1961), pp. 38-41.

2314. H. A. Lorentz, *Das Relativitätsprinzip; drei Vorlesungen gehalten in Teylers Stiftung zu Haarlem*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig-Berlin, (1920). p. 23.

2315. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 93.

2316. W. Pauli, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, London, Edinburgh, New York, Toronto, Sydney, Paris, Braunschweig, (1958), p. 5.

2317. A. Sommerfeld, *Electrodynamics*, Academic Press, New York, (1952), p. 235.

2318. A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein, A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), pp. 184-185.

2319. P. Frank, *Einstein, His Life and Times*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1967), pp. 32, 54-55. Note that Frank uses Budde's terminology of the 'Fundamental System' 'F'. Compare to Streintz' use of the term: H. Streintz, *Physikalische Grundlagen der Mechanik*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1883).

2320. T. Young, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, Volume 94, (1804), p. 1; *Works*, Volume I, p. 188.

2321. F. Fresnel, *Annales de Chimie et de Physique*, Series 2, Volume 9, pp. 57-66.

2322. J. C. Maxwell, *Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism*, Multiple Editions, §§ 600, 601. H. R. Hertz, "Ueber die Grundgleichungen der Elektrodynamik für ruhende Körper", *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1890), pp. 106-149; reprinted *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 40, (1890), pp. 577-624; reprinted *Untersuchung über die Ausbreitung der Elektrischen Kraft*, Johann Ambrosius Barth, Leipzig, (1892), pp. 208-255; translated into English by D. E. Jones, as: "On the Fundamental Equations of Electromagnetics for Bodies at Rest", *Electric Waves*, Macmillan, London, (1894, 1900), pp. 195-239; and "Ueber die Grundgleichungen der Elektrodynamik für bewegte Körper", *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 41, (1890), pp. 369-399; reprinted *Untersuchung über die Ausbreitung der Elektrischen Kraft*, Johann Ambrosius Barth, Leipzig, (1892), pp. 256-285; translated into English by D. E. Jones, as: "On the Fundamental Equations of Electromagnetics for Bodies in Motion", *Electric Waves*, Macmillan, London, (1894, 1900), pp. 241-268. P. Volkmann, *Einführung in das Studium der theoretischen Physik*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1900), pp. 53-54. J. Larmor, *Aether and Matter*, Cambridge University Press, (1900). p. 273. V. Volterra, "Sulle Funzioni Coniugate", *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Rendiconti. Classe di scienze fisiche, matematiche e naturali*, Volume 5, (1889), pp. 599-611. P. Drude, *The Theory of Optics*, Longmans, Green and Co., London, New York, Toronto, (1902), p. 457. C. Neumann, *Ueber die Principien der Galilei-Newton'schen Theorie*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1870); English translation, "The Principles of the Galilean-Newtonian Theory", *Science in Context*, Volume 6, (1993), pp. 355-368.

2323. A. Einstein to E. Mach, translated by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 5, Document 448, Princeton University Press, (1995), p. 340.

2324. A. Einstein, "Relativitäts-Theorie", *Vierteljahrsschrift der Naturforschenden Gesellschaft in Zürich*, Volume 56, (1911), pp. 1-14; quoted from the English translation by Anna Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 3, Princeton University Press, (1993), pp. 343-345.

- 2325.** M. Abraham, “Zur Theorie der Strahlung und des Strahlungsdruckes”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 14, (1904), p. 238.
- 2326.** W. S. Jevons, *The Principles of Science*, 2nd Ed., Macmillan, London, (1877), p. 331.
- 2327.** W. de Sitter, “On the Bearing of the Principle of Relativity on Gravitational Astronomy”, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 71, (March, 1911), pp. 388-415, at 388-389.
- 2328.** A. Einstein, *Relativity, the Special and the General Theory*, Crown Publishing, Inc., New York, (1961), p. 148.
- 2329.** J. H. Ziegler, *Die universelle Weltformel und ihre Bedeutung für die wahre Erkenntnis aller Dinge*, 1 Vortrag, Kommissionsverlag Art. Institut Orell Füßli, Zürich, (1902), p. 9.
- 2330.** H. A. Lorentz, *Collected Papers*, Volume 5, Martinus Nijhoff, (1937), pp. 3-4; reprint of *Versuch einer Theorie der Electricischen und optischen Erscheinungen in bewegten Körpern*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, (1895); unaltered reprint by B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1906).
- 2331.** J. Larmor, *Aether and Matter*, Cambridge University Press, (1900), p. 78.
- 2332.** P. Drude, *The Theory of Optics*, Longmans, Green and Co., London, New York, Toronto, (1902), pp. 261, 457.
- 2333.** H. Poincaré, *Science and Hypothesis*, Dover, New York, (1952). p. 169; quoting, “RELATIONS ENTRE LA PHYSIQUE EXPÉRIMENTALE ET LA PHYSIQUE MATHÉMATIQUE”, *RAPPORTS PRÉSENTÉS AU CONGRÈS INTERNATIONAL DE PHYSIQUE DE 1900*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1900), Volume I, p. 21.
- 2334.** J. C. Maxwell, “Ether”, *Scientific Papers*, Dover, (1952), p. ???
- 2335.** H. Poincaré, *Science and Hypothesis*, Dover, New York, (1952). pp. 211-212.
- 2336.** H. Poincaré, *Savants et Écrivains*, Flammarion, Paris, (1910), p. 235.
- 2337.** H. Poincaré, “The Value of Science”, *Popular Science Monthly*, Volume 70, Number 4, (1907), p. 348; as quoted in J. E. Boodin, “Energy and Reality II. The Definition of Energy”, *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, Volume 5, Number 15, (16 July 1908), pp. 393-406, at 404-405.
- 2338.** Emil Cohn, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1901), p. 74; *Annalen der Physik*, 7, (1902), p. 30.
- 2339.** M. Faraday, “Thoughts on Ray-vibrations”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 3, Volume 28, Number 188, (May, 1846), pp. 345-350; reprinted in *Experimental Researches in Electricity*, Three Volumes Bound as Two, Volume 3, Dover, New York, (1965), pp. 447-452.
- 2340.** W. K. Clifford, *Lectures and Essays*, Volume I, Macmillan, London, (1879), p. 85; *See also: The Common Sense of the Exact Sciences*, Edited by K. Pearson, D. Appleton, New York, Macmillan, London, (1885), especially Chapter 4, “Position”, Section 1, “All Position is Relative”, pp. 134-135; **and** Section 19, “On the Bending of Space”, p. 201, Note 1.
- 2341.** K. Pearson in W. K. Clifford, *Common Sense of the Exact Sciences*, Dover, New York, (1955), p. 203.
- 2342.** A. Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown Publishers, Inc., (1954), p. 281.
- 2343.** R. J. Boscovich, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, Supplement, Sec. I, Article 16 & Sec. II, Article 21.
- 2344.** D. Brian, *Einstein, A Life*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, (1996), p. 59.
- 2345.** D. Brian, *Einstein, A Life*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, (1996), pp. 60-61.
- 2346.** E. H. Rhodes, “The Scientific Conception of the Measurement of Time”, *Mind*, Volume 10, Number 39, (July, 1885), pp. 347-362.
- 2347.** G. E. Lessing, *Laocoön*, (1766):
<<http://www.gutenberg2000.de/lessing/laokoon/laokoon.htm>>

Numerous English editions are in print.

2348. R. S. Shankland, "Michelson-Morley Experiment", *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 32, Number 1, (January, 1964), pp. 16-35.

2349. J. C. Maxwell, "Ether", *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Ninth Edition, Volume 8, Charles Scribner's Sons, (1878), pp. 568-572, at 569.

2350. A. Einstein, *Autobiographical Notes*, Open Court, La Salle and Chicago, (1979), pp. 48-51. B. Hoffman and H. Dukas, *Albert Einstein: Creator & Rebel*, Plume, New York, (1972). A. I. Miller, *Albert Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity, Emergence (1905) and Early Interpretation (1905-1911)*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., (1981), pp. 168-172, 189-191, 212. A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, (1982), p. 131. S. Goldberg, *Understanding Relativity*, (1984) pp. 107-108. G. Holton, *Thematic Origins of Scientific Thought*, Revised Edition, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (1988), pp. 390, 392.

2351. R. S. Shankland, "Michelson-Morley Experiment", *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 32, (1964), p. 23.

2352. A. Einstein, "Autobiographical Notes", *Albert Einstein, Philosopher-Scientist*, Edited by P. A. Schilpp, The Library of Living Philosophers, Volume VII, The Library of Living Philosophers, Inc., Evanston, Illinois, (1949), p. 53. **See also:** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 26.

2353. *See, for example:* R. A. Wetzel, "The New Relativity in Physics", *Science*, New Series, Volume 38, Number 979, (3 October 1913), pp. 466-474, at 473-474. E. E. Slosson, *Easy Lessons in Einstein*, Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, (1921), pp. 41-44, 115.

2354. "Personal-Glimpses: Einstein Finds the World Narrow", *The Literary Digest*, (16 April 1921), pp. 33-34. **See also:** C. Seelig, *Albert Einstein: Eine dokumentarische Biographie*, Europa Verlag, Zürich, Stuttgart, Wien, (1954), pp. 134-135.

2355. A. Moszkowski, *Einstein: The Searcher*, Chapter 6, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1921), pp. 115-119.

2356. A. Moszkowski, "Das Relativitätsproblem", *Archiv für systematische Philosophie*, New Series, Volume 17, Number 3, (1911), pp. 255-281, at 258-259.

2357. A. Einstein quoted in "Einstein, Too, Is Puzzled; It's at Public Interest", *The Chicago Tribune*, (4 April 1921), p. 6.

2358. A. Fürst and A. Moszkowski, "Der Herr Lumen", *Das Buch der 1000 Wunder*, Section 187, Albert Langen, München, (1916), pp. 254-257. A. Moszkowski, *Der Sprung über den Schatten*, Albert Langen, München, (1917), pp. 213-219.

2359. H. Poincaré, *Science and Method*, Dover, U. S. A., (n. d.), pp. 71-72, 81-84.

2360. C. Flammarion, *Lumen*, Dodd, Mead, and Company, New York, (1897); William Heinemann, London, (1897), pp. 218-220.

2361. A. Moszkowski, *Einstein: The Searcher*, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1921), p. 231. R. W. Clark references this letter as being undated in the collection of the ETH, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, World Publishing, New York, (1971), p. 660 (notes for page 149).

2362. S. Mohorovičić, *Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie und ihr mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Charakter*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1923), pp. 23-24, 30.

2363. M. Abraham, *Theorie der Elektrizität*, Fourth Edition, Volume 2 ("Elektromagnetische Theorie der Strahlung"), Leipzig, Berlin, B. G. Teubner, (1920), pp. 350-390, at 359. The Third Edition of 1914 credits Poincaré at pp. 365-368.

2364. H. Poincaré, "La Mécanique Nouvelle", *Comptes Rendus des Sessions de l'Association Française pour l'Avancement des Sciences*, Conférence de Lille, Paris, (1909),

pp. 38-48; *La Revue Scientifique*, Volume 47, (1909), pp. 170-177; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 18-76 URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

and **28 April 1909 Lecture in Göttingen**: “La Mécanique Nouvelle”, *Sechs Vorträge über der reinen Mathematik und mathematischen Physik auf Einladung der Wolfskehl-Kommission der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften gehalten zu Göttingen vom 22.-28. April 1909*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1910), pp. 51-58; “The New Mechanics”, *The Monist*, Volume 23, (1913), pp. 385-395; **13 October 1910 Lecture in Berlin**: “Die neue Mechanik”, *Himmel und Erde*, Volume 23, (1911), pp. 97-116; *Die neue Mechanik*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1911).

2365. S. Mohorovičić, “Über die räumliche und zeitliche Translation”, “»Bulletin« d. süslaw. Akad. D. Wiss.” (*Jugoslovenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*), Volume 6/7, Zagreb, (1916-1917), p. 48; and “Die Folgerung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie und die Newtonsche Physik”, *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, New Series, Volume 20, Jena, (1921), pp. 737-739. See also: as cited by Mohorovičić: E. Guillaume and C. Willigens, “Über die Grundlagen der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 109-114; and E. Guillaume, “Graphische Darstellung der Optik bewegter Körper”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 386-388.

2366. F. Klein to W. Pauli, *Wissenschaftlicher Briefwechsel mit Bohr, Einstein, Heisenberg, u.a. = Scientific correspondence with Bohr, Einstein, Heisenberg, a.o.*, Document 10, Springer, New York, (1979), p. 27.

2367. M. Born, *Physics in my Generation*, second revised edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, (1969), pp. 102-103.

2368. A. Reuter Dahl, *Einstein And The New Science*, Reprint from *The Bi-Monthly Journal of the College of St. Thomas*, Volume 9, Number 3, (July, 1921), p. 8.

2369. J. Riem, “Zu Einsteins Amerikafahrt”, *Deutsche Zeitung*, (13 September 1921).

2370. C. Nordmann, *Einstein et l’universe*, (1921), translated by Joseph McCabe as *Einstein and the Universe*, Henry Holt & Co., New York, (1922), pp. 10-11, 16.

2371. W. Pauli, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, London, Edinburgh, New York, Toronto, Sydney, Paris, Braunschweig, (1958), p. 3.

2372. H. Thirring, “Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper und spezielle Relativitätstheorie”, *Handbuch der Physik*, Volume 12, “Theorien der Elektrizität Elektrostatik”, Springer, Berlin, (1927), p. 270, footnote.

2373. H. Spencer, *Principles of Psychology*, Volume 1, Section 93, Third Edition, (1895), pp. 222-224. See also: *First Principles of Philosophy*, Volume 1, Part 2, Section 47, second edition, D. Appleton, New York, (1874), pp. 162-167; and “The Relations of Coexistence and Non-Coexistence”, *Principles of Psychology*, Volume 2, Chapter 22, Sections 365-368, third edition, (1895), pp. 271-278.

2374. W. Bölsche, “Hausschatz des Wissens”, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Natur*, Part I, Volume I, J. Neumann, Neudamm, (1896), pp. 19-23.

2375. R. A. Proctor, *The Expanse of Heaven: A Series of Essays on the Wonders of the Firmament*, Longmans, Green & Co., London, New York, (1897), p. 207. Compare to H. Poincaré, *Mathematics and Science: Last Essays (Dernières Pensées)*, Chapter 2, Dover, New York, (1963), p. 18; which is an English translation of: “L’Espace et le Temps”, *Scientia*, Volume 12, (1912), pp. 159-171.

2376. A. Einstein, “Zum gegenwärtigen Stande des Gravitationsproblems”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 14, (1913), pp. 1249-1262.

2377. A. Einstein, English translation by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 3, Document 18, Princeton University Press, (1993), p. 357. “Diskussion”, *Naturforschende Gesellschaft in Zürich. Vierteljahrschrift, Sitzungsberichte*, Volume 56, Part 2, (1911), pp. II-IX.

2378. H. Poincaré, “Space and Time”, *Mathematics and Science: Last Essays*, Dover, New York, (1963), pp. 17, 18, 24.

2379. J. Thomson, “On the Law of Inertia; the Principle of Chronometry; and the Principle of Absolute Clinural Rest, and of Absolute Rotation”, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, Volume 12, (November 1883-July 1884), pp. 568-578, at 568-569.

2380. E. Montgomery, “Space and Touch, I, II & III”, *Mind*, Volume 10, (1885), pp. 227-244, 377-398, and 512-531, at 389, 393.

2381. S. H. Hodgson, *Time and Space: A Metaphysical Essay*, Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, London, (1865), pp. 135ff.

2382. W. Voigt, “Ueber das Doppler’sche Princip”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1887), pp. 41-51; republished *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 16, Number 20, (October 15, 1915), pp. 381-386; English translation, as well as very useful commentary, are found in A. Ernst and Jong-Ping Hsu (W. Kern is credited with assisting in the translation), “First Proposal of the Universal Speed of Light by Voigt in 1887”, *Chinese Journal of Physics* (The Physical Society of the Republic of China), Volume 39, Number 3, (June, 2001), pp. 211-230; URL:

<<http://psroc.phys.ntu.edu.tw/cjp/v39/211.pdf>>

See also: W. Voigt, “Theorie des Lichtes für bewegte Medien”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1887), pp. 177-238.

Lorentz acknowledged Voigt’s priority, and suggested that the “Lorentz Transformation” be called the “Transformations of Relativity”: H. A. Lorentz, *Theory of Electrons*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1909), p. 198 footnote; **and** “Deux mémoires de Henri Poincaré sur la physique mathématique”, *Acta Mathematica*, Volume 38, (1921), p. 295; reprinted in *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 683-695; **and** Volume 11, (1956), pp. 247-261. Minkowski also acknowledged Voigt’s priority: *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 81; **and** *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 9, Number 22, (November 1, 1908), p. 762. J. Le Roux proposed the nomenclature “Voigt-Lorentzian Transformation” and “Voigt-Lorentzian Group” in “Der Bankrott der Relativitätstheorie”, H. Israel, *et al*, Editors, *Hundert Autoren Gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, (1931), pp. 20-27, at 22. For further discussion of Voigt’s relativistic transformation, *see*: F. Hund, “Wer hat die Relativitätstheorie geschaffen?”, *Physikalische Blätter*, Volume 36, Number 8, (1980), pp. 237-240. W. Schröder, “Hendrik Antoon Lorentz und Emil Wiechert (Briefwechsel und Verhältnis der beiden Physiker)”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 30, Number 2, (1984), pp. 167-187. R. Dugas, *A History of Mechanics*, Dover, New York, (1988), pp. 468, 484, 494. A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, Toronto, Melbourne, (1982), pp. 121-122.

2383. J. Stachel, Editor, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Princeton University Press, (1989), pp. xxiv-xxv.

2384. H. Poincaré, “La Mesure du Temps”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 6, (January, 1898) pp. 1-13; **reprinted:** *La Valeur de la Science*, Chapter 2, E. Flammarion,

Paris, (1904). **English translation:** *The Value of Science*, The Science Press, New York, (1907), pp. 26-36.

2385. H. Poincaré, *Electricité et Optique*, second revised edition, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1901), p. 530.

2386. J. C. Maxwell, “Ether”, *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Ninth Edition, Volume 8, Charles Scribner’s Sons, (1878), pp. 568-572, at 569.

2387. H. Poincaré, “La Théorie de Lorentz et le Principe de la Réaction”, *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Series 2, Volume 5, (1900), pp. 252-278, at 272-273.

2388. A. Einstein, “Das Prinzip von der Erhaltung der Schwerpunktsbewegung und die Trägheit der Energie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 20, (1906), pp. 627-633, at 627.

2389. J. Stachel, Editor, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Princeton University Press, (1989), pp. xxiv-xxv.

2390. H. Poincaré, *Science and Hypothesis*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 90; see also pp. 84-88 for a recapitulation of the “Measurement of Time” dissertation.

2391. P. Frank, “Einstein’s Philosophy of Science”, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, Volume 21, Number 3, (July, 1949), 349-355.

2392. A. Einstein, quoted in A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, (1982), p. 133.

2393. J. Stachel, Editor, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Princeton University Press, (1989), pp. xxiv-xxv.

2394. H. Poincaré’s St. Louis lecture from September of 1904, *La Revue des Idées*, Volume 80, (15 November 1905); “L’État Actuel et l’Avenir de la Physique Mathématique”, *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématique*, Series 2, Volume 28, (1904), pp. 302-324; **reprinted:** *La Valeur de la Science*, Chapters 7 and 8, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1904). **English translation:** “The Principles of Mathematical Physics”, *The Monist*, Volume 15, Number 1, (January, 1905), pp. 1-24; **alternative English translation:** *The Value of Science*, Chapters 7 and 8, The Science Press, New York, (1907), pp. 91-105, at 99-100.

2395. *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), pp. 38-40. In order to maintain conformity with the original German text, necessary corrections have been made. In addition to other necessary changes, “resting” has been substituted for “stationary”, in conformity with the original German text.

2396. A. Einstein, “Über die vom Relativitätsprinzip geforderte Trägheit der Energie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 23, (1907), pp. 371-384, at 373.

2397. P. Carus, “The Principle of Relativity”, *The Monist*, Volume 22, (1912), pp. 188-229, at 199-202.

2398. D. F. Comstock, “The Principle of Relativity”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 31, Number 803, (20 May 1910), pp. 767-772, at 768-770.

2399. R. D. Carmichael, “On the Theory of Relativity”, *The Physical Review*, Volume 35, Number 3, (September 1912), pp. 153-176, at 170-171; republished in “The Theory of Relativity”, *Mathematical Monographs* No. 12, John Wiley & Sons, New York, (1914/1920), pp. 40-41.

2400. A. Einstein, “The Relativity of Simultaneity”, *Relativity: The Special and the General Theory*, Chapter 9, Methuen, New York, (1920), pp. 30-33.

2401. E. Guillaume’s letter, translated by A. Reuterdahl, “Guillaume, Barred in Move To Debate Einstein, Calls Meeting Political Reunion”, *Minneapolis Journal*, (14 May 1922), p. 14; reprinted with slight modifications, “The Origin of Einsteinism”, *The New York Times*, (12 August 1923), Section 7, p. 8. **See also:** “Einstein Faces in Paris Grave Blow at Theory”, *The Chicago Tribune*, (31 March 1922). **See also:** “Dr. Guillaume’s Proofs of Einstein

Theory's Fallacy Revealed to the Journal", *Minneapolis Journal*, (9 April 1922). **See also:** E. Guillaume, "Un Résultat des Discussions de la Théorie d'Einstein au Collège de France", *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, Number 11, (15 June 1922), pp. 322-324. **See also:** "Les Bases de la Physique moderne", *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 43, (1917), pp. 5-21, 89-112, 185-198; **and** "Sur le Possibilité d'Exprimer la Théorie de la Relativité en Fonction du Temps Universel", *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 44, (1917), pp. 48-52; **and** "La Théorie de la Relativité en Fonction du Temps Universel", *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 46, (1918), pp. 281-325; **and** "Sur la Théorie de la Relativité", *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 1, (1919), pp. 246-251; **and** "Représentation et Mesure du Temps", *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 2, (1920), pp. 125-146; **and** "La Théorie de la Relativité et sa Signification", *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 27, (1920), pp. 423-469; **and** "Relativité et Gravitation", *Bulletin de la Société Vaudoise des Sciences Naturelles*, Volume 53, (1920), pp. 311-340; **and** "Les Bases de la Théorie de la Relativité", *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, (15 April 1920) pp. 200-210; **and** C. Willigens, "Représentation Géométrique du Temps Universel dans la Théorie de la Relativité Restreinte", *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 5, Volume 2, (1920), p. 289; **and** E. Guillaume, *La Théorie de la Relativité. Résumé des Conférences Faites à l'Université de Lausanne au Semestre d'été 1920*, Rouge & Co., Lausanne, (1921); **and** E. Guillaume and C. Willigens, "Über die Grundlagen der Relativitätstheorie", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 109-114; **and** E. Guillaume, "Graphische Darstellung der Optik bewegter Körper", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), pp. 386-388; **and** Guillaume's Appendix II, "Temps Relatif et Temps Universel", in L. Fabre, *Une Nouvelle Figure du Monde: les Théories d'Einstein*, Second Edition, Payot, Paris, (1922); **and** E. Guillaume, "Y a-t-il une Erreur dans le Premier Mémoire d'Einstein?", *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, (1922), pp. 5-10; **and** "La Question du Temps d'après M. Bergson, à Propos de la Théorie d'Einstein", *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 33, (1922), pp. 573-582; **and** Guillaume's introduction in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. V-XVI; **and** H. Bergson, *Durée et Simultanéité, à Propos de la Théorie d'Einstein*, English translation by L. Jacobson, *Duration and simultaneity, with Reference to Einstein's Theory*, The Library of Liberal Arts, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, (1965); which contains a bibliography at pages xliii-xlv. **See also:** P. Painlevé, "La Mécanique Classique et la Théorie de la Relativité", *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L'Académie des sciences*, Volume 173, (1921), pp. 677-680. **See also:** S. Mohorovičić, "Raum, Zeit und Welt. II Teil", in K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, Volume 2, (1962), pp. 219-352, at 273-275. **See also:** K. Hentschel, *Interpretationen und Fehlinterpretationen der speziellen und der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie durch Zeitgenossen Albert Einsteins*, Birkhäuser, Basel, Boston, Berlin, (1990). **See also:** A. Genovesi, *Il Carteggio tra Albert Einstein ed Edouard Guillaume. "Tempo Universale" e Teoria della Relatività Ristretta nella Filosofia Francese Contemporanea*, Franco Angeli, Milano, (2000). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 24 September 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 383, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 3 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 385, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 9 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part

A, Document 387, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 17 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 392, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 24 October 1917, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 394, Princeton University Press, (1998). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 25 January 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 280, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from M. Grossmann to A. Einstein of 5 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 300, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to E. Guillaume of 9 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 305, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from E. Guillaume to A. Einstein of 15 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 316, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to M. Grossmann of 27 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 330, Princeton University Press, (2004). **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to P. Oppenheim of 29 April 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 399, Princeton University Press, (2004).

2402. A. Einstein, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 2, (1914), p. 1018; reprinted *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 11.

2403. See: J. Laub, “Zur Optik der bewegten Körper I & II”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 23, (1907), pp. 738-744; **and** Volume 25, (1908), pp. 175-184. See also: M. v. Laue, “Die Mitführung des Lichtes durch bewegte Körper nach dem Relativitätsprinzip”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 23, (1907), pp. 989-990. Einstein made no mention of Fresnel’s drag coefficient until after Laub published on the subject, and then he criticized Laub in Einstein’s *Jahrbuch* review of 1907 depending on Laue’s criticism of it as if original: A. Einstein, “Über das Relativitätsprinzip und die aus demselben gezogenen Folgerung”, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 4, (1908), pp. 411-462, at 414. Laue informed Einstein of Laub’s work and of his critique in private correspondence, before Einstein wrote his article. See: Letter from M. v. Laue to A. Einstein of 4 September 1907, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 5, Document 57, Princeton University Press, (1993). Einstein again took credit for this work in an interview by R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 48. See also: “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 41, Number 1, (1973), pp. 895-901. For an earlier predecessor, see: W. Veltmann, “Fresnel’s Hypothese zur Erklärung der Aberrationserscheinungen”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 75, (1870), pp. 145-160; **and** “Ueber die Fortpflanzung des Lichtes in bewegten Medien”, Volume 76, (1870), pp. 129-144; **and** “Ueber die Fortpflanzung des Lichtes in bewegten Medien”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 150, (1873), pp. 497-534.

2404. Letter from A. Einstein to P. Zeeman of 13 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 209, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 179-180.

2405. “Kinertia” aka Robert Stevenson, “Do Bodies Fall?”, *Harper’s Weekly*, Volume 59, (August 29-November 7, 1914), pp. 210, 234, 254, 285-286, 309-310, 332-334, 357-359, 382-383, 405-407, 429-430, 453-454. On 27 June 1903, “Kinertia” filed an article with the Royal Prussian Academy in Berlin in 1903. See also: A. Reuterdahl, “‘Kinertia’ Versus Einstein”, *The Dearborn Independent*, (30 April 1921); **and** “Einstein and the New Science”, *Bi-Monthly Journal of the College of St. Thomas*, Volume 11, Number 3, (July, 1921). For an interesting contrast, see: E. Cohn, “Physikalisches über Raum und Zeit”, *Himmel und*

Erde, Volume 23, (1911), pp. 117ff.; *Physikalisches über Raum und Zeit*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, Berlin, (1911).

2406. C. Neumann, *Ueber die Principien der Galilei-Newton'schen Theorie*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1870); English translation, "The Principles of the Galilean-Newtonian Theory", *Science in Context*, Volume 6, (1993), pp. 355-368.

2407. W. Voigt, "Ueber das Doppler'sche Princip", *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1887), pp. 41-51, at 45; reprinted *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 16, Number 20, (October 15, 1915), pp. 381-386; English translation, as well as very useful commentary, are found in A. Ernst and Jong-Ping Hsu (W. Kern is credited with assisting in the translation), "First Proposal of the Universal Speed of Light by Voigt in 1887", *Chinese Journal of Physics* (The Physical Society of the Republic of China), Volume 39, Number 3, (June, 2001), pp. 211-230; URL's:

<http://psroc.phys.ntu.edu.tw/cjp/v39/211/211.htm>

<http://psroc.phys.ntu.edu.tw/cjp/v39/211.pdf>

See also: W. Voigt, "Theorie des Lichtes für bewegte Medien", *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1887), pp. 177-238.

Lorentz acknowledged Voigt's priority, and suggested that the "Lorentz Transformation" be called the "Transformations of Relativity": H. A. Lorentz, *Theory of Electrons*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1909), p. 198 footnote; **and** H. A. Lorentz, "Deux mémoires de Henri Poincaré sur la physique mathématique", *Acta Mathematica*, Volume 38, (1921), p. 295; reprinted in *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 683-695; **and** Volume 11, (1956), pp. 247-261. Minkowski also acknowledged Voigt's priority: *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 81; **and** *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 9, Number 22, (November 1, 1908), p. 762. J. Le Roux proposed the nomenclature "Voigt-Lorentzian Transformation" and "Voigt-Lorentzian Group" in "Der Bankrott der Relativitätstheorie", H. Israel, *et al*, Eds., *Hundert Autoren Gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, (1931), pp. 20-27, at 22.

For further discussion of Voigt's relativistic transformation, see: F. Hund, "Wer hat die Relativitätstheorie geschaffen?", *Physikalische Blätter*, Volume 36, Number 8, (1980), pp. 237-240. **See also:** W. Schröder, "Hendrik Antoon Lorentz und Emil Wiechert (Briefwechsel und Verhältnis der beiden Physiker)", *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 30, Number 2, (1984), pp. 167-187. **See also:** R. Dugas, *A History of Mechanics*, Dover, New York, (1988), pp. 468, 484, 494. **See also:** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, Toronto, Melbourne, (1982), pp. 121-122.

2408. Letter from A. Einstein to M. Marić of 28 December 1901, English translation by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Document 131, Princeton University Press, (1987), pp. 189-190.

2409. H. A. Lorentz, "Théorie Simplifiée des Phénomènes Électriques et Optiques dans des Corps en Mouvement", *Verslagen der Zittingen de Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Amsterdam), Volume 7, (1899), p. 507; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 5, pp. 139-155; "Vereenvoudigde theorie der electriche en optische verschijnselen in lichamen die zich bewegen", *Verslagen van de gewone vergaderingen der wis- en natuurkundige afdeeling, Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam*, Volume 7, (1899), pp. 507-522; English translation,

“Simplified Theory of Electrical and Optical Phenomena in Moving Bodies”, *Proceedings of the Section of Sciences, Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam*, Volume 1, (1899), pp. 427–442; reprinted in K. F. Schaffner, *Nineteenth Century Aether Theories*, Pergamon Press, New York, Oxford, (1972), pp. 255-273.

2410. P. Drude, *Lehrbuch der Optik*, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1900); translated into English *The Theory of Optics*, Longmans, Green and Co., London, New York, Toronto, (1902), see especially pp. 457-482. On Einstein’s ownership of this work, see: *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Princeton University Press, (1989), pp. 135-136, footnote 13.

2411. E. Cohn, “Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Systeme”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (November, 1904), pp. 1294-1303, at 1295. Einstein cited Cohn’s paper in his *Jahrbuch* review article of 1907, and a copy of Cohn’s 1904 paper is in his preserved collection. See: *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Note 128, Hardcover, p. 272. Cohn cites the Dutch version of Lorentz’ work, “Electromagnetische Verschijnselen in een Stelsel dat zich met Willekeurige Snelheid, Kleiner dan die van het Licht, Beweegt.” *Verlagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen der Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam*, Volume 12, (23 April 1904), pp. 986-1009. Einstein cites Cohn in the direct context of Lorentz’ 1904 paper in: “Über das Relativitätsprinzip und die aus demselben gezogenen Folgerung”, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 4, (1907), pp. 411-462, at 413.

2412. *Das Relativitätsprinzip*, Note 2, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, Berlin, (1913), p. 27.

2413. A. Einstein, “Das Prinzip von der Erhaltung der Schwerpunktsbewegung und die Trägheit der Energie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 20, (1906), pp. 627-633, at 627. Einstein cites Poincaré’s “La Théorie de Lorentz et le Principe de la Réaction”, *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Series 2, Volume 5, (1900), pp. 252-278, which gives the clock synchronization method at pp. 272-273.

2414. A. Einstein, *Relativity, The Special and the General Theory*, Crown Publishers, Inc., New York, (1961), pp. 150-151.

2415. A. Einstein and J. Laub, “Über die elektromagnetischen Grundgleichungen für bewegte Körper”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 26, (1908), pp. 532-540.

2416. The Eleatic Philosophers. **See also:** Ocellus Lucanus, Taurus, Julius Firmicus Maternus, Proclus, in: T. Taylor, *Ocellus Lucanus. On the Nature of the Universe. Taurus, the Platonic Philosopher, on the Eternity of the World. Julius Firmicus Maternus of the Thema Mundi; in Which the Positions of the Stars at the Commencement of the Several Mundane Periods Is Given. Select Theorems on the Perpetuity of Time, by Proclus*, T. Taylor, London, (1831). Numerous Reprints. **See also:** Philo Judæus, “On the Eternity of the World”, *The Works of Philo*, Hendrickson Publishers, U.S.A., (1993), pp. 707-724. **See also:** Moses Maimonides, *The Guide for the Perplexed*, Part 2, Chapters 13 and 14, Dover, New York, (1956), pp. 171-176. **See also:** Spinoza, “Concerning God”, *Ethics*, Part 1, (1677), Multiple Editions. **See also:** I. Newton, *Principia*, Book I, Definition VIII, Scholium; **and** Book III, General Scholium. *Opticks*, Query 31. **See also:** S. Clarke, *A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God : More Particularly in Answer to Mr. Hobbs, Spinoza and Their Followers*, W. Botham, for J. Knapton, London, (1705); **and** G. W. Leibnitz, S. Clarke, *Collection of PAPERS, Which passed between the late Learned Mr. LEIBNITZ, and Dr. CLARKE, In the Years 1715 and 1716. Relating to the PRINCIPLES OF Natural Philosophy and Religion*, James Knapton, London, (1717). **Confer:** Thomas Reid, *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man*, Essay III, Of Memory, CHAPTER III, OF DURATION, (1785); in *The Works of Thomas Reid, D.D. F.R.S. Edinburgh. Late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow. With an Account of His Life and Writings*, Edited by D.

Stewart, Volume 2, E. Duyckinck, Collins and Hannay, and R. and W. A. Bartow, New York, (1822), pp. 132-134. **See also:** D. Hartley, "Of the Being and Attributes of God, and of Natural Religion", *Observations on Man, His Frame, His Duty, and His Expectations in Two Parts*, Volume 2, Chapter 1, Printed by S. Richardson for James Leake and Wm. Frederick, booksellers in Bath and sold by Charles Hitch and Stephen Austen, booksellers in London, London, (1749), pp. 5-70. **See also:** P. G. Tait and B. Stewart, *The Unseen Universe; or Physical Speculations on a Future State*, Macmillan, London, (1875). **See also:** T. L. Nichols, *The Spiritualist Newspaper: A Record of the Progress of the Science and Ethics of Spiritualism*, London, (12 April 1878), p. 175; **and** (19 April 1878), p. 189. **See also:** M. Wirth, *Herrn Professor Zöllner's Hypothese intelligenter vierdimensionaler Wesen und seine Experimente mit dem amerikanischen Medium Herrn Slade. Ein Vortrag, gehalten am 25. Oct. und 1. Nov., 1878, im Akademisch-Philosophischen Verein zu Leipzig und als Aufruf zur Parteiergreifung an die deutschen Studenten*, O. Mutze, Leipzig, (1878). **See also:** F. Michelis, *Ist die Annahme eines Raumes mit mehr als drei Dimensionen wissenschaftlich berechtigt? Eine an die Adresse des Herrn Professor Dr. Zöllner zu Leipzig gerichtete Frage*, Fr. Wagner'schen Buchh., Freiburg in Baden, (1879). **See also:** O. Simony, *Über spiritistische Manifestationen vom naturwissenschaftlichen Standpunkte*, Hartleben, Wien, (1884). **See also:** Charles Garner, under the pseudonym Stuart C. Cumberland, *Besucher aus dem Jenseits*, Breslau, (1885). **See also:** C. Cranz, "Gemeinverständliches über die sogenannte vierte Dimension", *Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge*, New Series, Volume 5, Number 112/113, (1890), pp. 567-636; **and** "Die vierte Dimension in der Astronomie", *Himmel und Erde*, Volume 4, (1891), pp. 55-73. **See also:** E. Carpenter, *From Adam's Peak to Elephanta: Sketches in Ceylon and India*, MacMillan and S. Sonnenschein, New York, (1892). **See also:** A. Willink, *The World of the Unseen; An Essay on the Relation of Higher Space to Things Eternal*, Macmillan, New York, (1893). **See also:** F. Podmore, *Studies in Psychical Research*, Putnam, New York, (1897); reproduced by Arno Press, New York, (1975); **and** *Modern Spiritualism: A History and a Criticism*, Methuen, London, (1902). **See also:** Schrey von Kalgen, *Dimensionen. Eine neue Weltanschauung. Die Beweis der Zöllnerschen Theorie*, O. Mutze, Leipzig, (1901). **See also:** R. J. Campbell, *The New Theology*, Macmillan, New York, (1907). This work drew sharp criticism, and several books were published in an effort to refute it. **See also:** W. W. Smith, *A Theory of the Mechanism of Survival: The Fourth Dimension and its Applications*, Kegan Paul, London, (1920).

2417. Louis-Sébastien Mercier, *L'an deux mille quatre cent quarante: rêve s'il en fût jamais*, Londres, (1771). English translation: *Memoirs of the Year Two Thousand Five Hundred*, Multiple Editions. **See also:** W. Irving, *Rip Van Winkle*, ca. 1820 in *The Sketch Book*, Multiple Editions. **See also:** A. E. Abbott, *Flatland: A Romance of Many Dimensions*, Seeley, London, (1884). **See also:** A. T. Schofield, *Another World; or the Fourth Dimension*, Swan Sonnenschein, New York, (1888). *See: Nature*, Volume 38, p. 363. **See also:** E. Bellamy, *Looking Backward*, Houghton, Mifflin, (1888). **See also:** M. Twain, *A Connecticut Yankee in King Author's Court*, (1889), Multiple Editions. **See also:** D. McMartin, *A Leap into the Future, or, How Things will be a Romance of the Year 2000*, Albany, NY : Weed, Parsons & Company, 1890 **See also:** G. Macdonald, *Lilith: A Romance*, Dodd, Mead and Company, New York, (1895). **See also:** H. G. Wells, *The Time Machine*, Heinemann, London, (1895) *see:* Bernard Bergonzi, "The Publication of The Time Machine 1894-5", *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Volume 11, Number 41, (February, 1960), pp. 42-51; stable JSTOR URL:

<<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0034-6551%28196002%292%3A11%3A41%3C42%3AT>

POTTM%3E2.0.CO%3B2-0>.

H. G. Wells, "The Remarkable Case of Davidson's Eyes", *The Stolen Bacillus and other Incidents*, Methuen, London, (1895); **and** *The Wonderful Visit*, Chapter 7, J. M. Dent, London, (1895), pp. 26ff.; **and** "The Plattner Story", *The Plattner Story and Others*, Methuen, London, (1897); **and** *The Invisible Man: A Grotesque Romance*, C. A. Pearson, London, (1897); **and** "The Stolen Body", *Twelve Stories and Dream*, Macmillan, London, (1903). **See also:** J. Conrad and F. M. Hueffer, *The Inheritors*, Doubleday, Page & Company, New York, (1901). **See also:** A. Robida, *L'Horloge des Siècles*, F. Juven, Paris, (1902). **See also:** D. M. Y. Sommerville, "A Visit from the Fourth Dimension", *College Echoes, St. Andrews University Magazine*, Cupar, Fife, Volume 12, (1901), pp. 166-168; **and** "A Loophole in Space", *College Echoes, St. Andrews University Magazine*, Cupar, Fife, Volume 15, (1904), pp. 106-109. **See also:** W. Busch, *Eduards Traum*, Fourth Edition, Bassermann, München, (1904), pp. 18, 85. *Cf.* P. Carus, *Open Court*, Volume 8, Number 4266, (1908), p. 115. **See also:** G. Griffith, *The Mummy and Miss Nitocris: A Phantasy of the Fourth Dimension*, T. Werner Laurie, London, (1906). **See also:** C. H. Hinton, *An Episode of Flatland, or How a Plane Folk Discovered the Third Dimension, to which is Added an Outline of the History of Unæa*, Sonnenschein, London, (1907); reviewed *Nature*, Volume 76, p. 246. D. Burger published a third book on Abbott's "Flatland" theme, *Sphereland*, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York, (1965). **See also:** G. Apollinaire, *Le Roi-Lune*.

2418. With respect to psychologists and their equating of time with space, W. Smith stated in 1902, "Kant speaks of time as a line; **and** psychologists are learning to regard time as a projection at right angles to the plane of the present. But that this spatiality is essential to the time-concept has not been, in general, recognized." in "The Metaphysics of Time", *The Philosophical Review*, Volume 11, Number 4, (July, 1902), pp. 372-391. G. F. Stout stated, in 1902, "Psychologists generally hold the same type of theory for the two cases of space and time cognition, and the indications of individual views given under Extension (q. v.) hold largely also for time." *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, Volume 2, Macmillan, New York, London, (1902), p. 705.

2419. W. Smith, "The Metaphysics of Time", *The Philosophical Review*, Volume 11, Number 4, (July, 1902), pp. 372-391. Smith references F. A. Lange, *Logische Studien, ein Beitrag zur Neubegründung der formalen Logik und der Erkenntnistheorie*, J. Baedeker, Iserlohn, (1877), p. 139.

2420. F. Ueberweg, English translation by G. S. Morris, "with additions" by N. Porter, *History of Philosophy from Thales to the Present Time*, Scribner, Armstrong & Co, New York, (1876), pp. 51-60.

2421. Ocellus Lucanus, Translated by T. Taylor, *Ocellus Lucanus. On the nature of the universe. Taurus, the Platonic philosopher, On the eternity of the world. Julius Firmicus Maternus Of the thema mundi; in which the positions of the stars at the commencement of the several mundane periods is given. Select theorems on the perpetuity of time, by Proelus*, Thomas Taylor, London, (1831); Republished by the Philosophical Research Society, (1976/1999).

2422. Plato, English translation by B. Jowett, *Timæus and Parmenides*, both found in *The Dialogues of Plato*, Multiple Editions.

2423. Aristotle, *Physics, Metaphysics, On the Heavens (De cælo), On Generation and Corruption*, each in multiple editions, all reprinted in *Great Books of the Western World*.

2424. *Cf.* *The Gospel According to Mary Magdalene*, Chapter 4, Verses 22, 23, 30; Chapter 8, Verse 17.

2425. Philo Judæus, “On the Eternity of the World (*De Æternitate Mundi*)”, *The Works of Philo*, Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., USA, (1993), pp. 707-724.

2426. Ocellus Lucanus, Translated by T. Taylor, *Ocellus Lucanus. On the nature of the universe. Taurus, the Platonic philosopher, On the eternity of the world. Julius Firmicus Maternus Of the thema mundi; in which the positions of the stars at the commencement of the several mundane periods is given. Select theorems on the perpetuity of time, by Proelus*, Thomas Taylor, London, (1831); Republished by the Philosophical Research Society, (1976/1999).

2427. Augustine, *Confessions*, Book 11, Multiple Editions.

2428. Ocellus Lucanus, Translated by T. Taylor, *Ocellus Lucanus. On the nature of the universe. Taurus, the Platonic philosopher, On the eternity of the world. Julius Firmicus Maternus Of the thema mundi; in which the positions of the stars at the commencement of the several mundane periods is given. Select theorems on the perpetuity of time, by Proelus*, Thomas Taylor, London, (1831); Republished by the Philosophical Research Society, (1976/1999).

2429. Ocellus Lucanus, Translated by T. Taylor, *Ocellus Lucanus. On the nature of the universe. Taurus, the Platonic philosopher, On the eternity of the world. Julius Firmicus Maternus Of the thema mundi; in which the positions of the stars at the commencement of the several mundane periods is given. Select theorems on the perpetuity of time, by Proelus*, Thomas Taylor, London, (1831); Republished by the Philosophical Research Society, (1976/1999).

2430. Zohar, I, 47a, “The answer is that God being omniscient knows all things and to him the past and the future are as the present; the past with its countless generations of men and the future enfolding everything that shall be in the course of ages to come, and this is the meaning involved in the above words, for everything created and made by God cannot but be good.”—N. De Manhar, *Zohar: Bereshith—Genesis: An Expository Translation from Hebrew*, Third Revised Edition, Wizards Bookshelf, San Diego, (1995), p. 204.

2431. G. Bruno, *De la causa, principio, et vno*, John Charleswood, London, (1584); English translation, *Cause, Principle, and Unity*, Multiple Editions; German translation, *Von der Ursache, dem Princip und dem Einen*, Multiple Editions; **and** *De l’Infinito Universo e Mondi*, John Charleswood, London, (1584); English translation, *Giordano Bruno, His Life and Thought. With Annotated Translation of his Work, On the Infinite Universe and Worlds*, Schuman, New York, (1950); German translation, *Zwiesgespräche vom Unendlichen: All und den Welten*, E. Diedrich, Jena, (1892). Collected Works in German, *Gesammelte Werke*, E. Diedrich, Leipzig, (1904-1909).

2432. H. More, *A COLLECTION Of Several Philosophical Writings OF Dr. HENRY MORE, Fellow of Christ’s-College in Cambridge*, Joseph Downing, London, (1712); which contains: *AN ANTIDOTE AGAINST ATHEISM: OR, An Appeal to the Natural Faculties of the Mind of Man, Whether there be not a GOD*, The Fourth Edition corrected and enlarged: WITH AN APPENDIX Thereunto annexed, “An Appendix to the foregoing Antidote,” Chapter 7, pp. 199-201.

2433. J. Locke, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Chapter 15, Section 12.

2434. I. Newton, *Principia*, Book I, Definition VIII, Scholium; **and** Book III, General Scholium.

2435. S. Clarke, *A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God And Other Writings*, Edited by E. Vialati, Cambridge University Press, (1998), pp. 19-20. Cf. Thomas Reid, *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man*, Essay III, Of Memory, CHAPTER III, OF DURATION, (1785); in *The Works of Thomas Reid, D.D. F.R.S. Edinburgh. Late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow. With an Account of His Life and Writings*,

Edited by D. Stewart, Volume 2, E. Duyckinck, Collins and Hannay, and R. and W. A. Bartow, New York, (1822), pp. 132-134.

2436. G. W. Leibnitz, S. Clarke, *Collection of PAPERS, Which passed between the late Learned Mr. LEIBNITZ, and Dr. CLARKE, In the Years 1715 and 1716. Relating to the PRINCIPLES OF Natural Philosophy and Religion*, James Knapton, London, (1717). Multiple Reprints.

2437. G. Berkeley, *Principles of Human Knowledge, De Motu, Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous, An Essay Towards a New Theory of Vision*; each in multiple editions, all reprinted in: D. M. Armstrong, Editor, *Berkeley's Philosophical Writings*, Collier Books, New York, (1965).

2438. D. Hartley, "Of the Being and Attributes of God, and of Natural Religion", *Observations on Man, His Frame, His Duty, and His Expectations in Two Parts*, Volume 2, Chapter 1, Printed by S. Richardson for James Leake and Wm. Frederick, booksellers in Bath and sold by Charles Hitch and Stephen Austen, booksellers in London, London, (1749), pp. 5-70.

2439. R. J. Boscovich, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, (1966).

2440. J. L. Lagrange (ca. 1797), "Application de Théorie des Fonctions a la Mécanique", *Œuvres de Lagrange*, Volume 9, Part 3, Chapter 1, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1881), pp. 337-344, at 337. *See also*: J. L. Lagrange, *Mecanique Analytic*, Chez la Veuve Desaint, Paris, (1788); **and** *Théorie des Fonctions Analytiques*, Volume 4, Third Part, Chapter 1, Section 1, Nouvelle édition, Courcier, Paris, (1813); fourth edition, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1881). *See also*: G. S. Klügel, "Abmessung", *Mathematisches Wörterbuch*, Volume 1, E. B. Schwickert, Leipzig, (1803), pp. 3-7, at 7.

2441. I. Kant, *Kant's Inaugural Dissertation of 1770: Translated into English, with an Introduction and Discussion*, Columbia University Contributions to Philosophy, Psychology and Education, Volume 1, Number 2, Columbia College, New York, (1894), Section 3, Paragraph 14, p. 62, note 1.

2442. A. Schopenhauer, *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*. English translation by R. B. Haldane and J. Kemp, *The World as Will and Idea*.

2443. J. F. Herbart, *Joh. Fr. Herbart's sämtliche Werke in chronologischer Reihenfolge / hrsg. von Karl Kehrbach und Otto Flugel*, In 19 Volumes, H. Beyer, Langensalza (1887-1912).

2444. G. T. Fechner, (under the pseudonym "Dr. Mises"), "Der Raum hat vier Dimensionen", *Vier Paradoxa*, Chapter 2, L. Voss, Leipzig, (1846), pp. 17-40; reprinted with changes and an addendum, *Kleine Schriften*, Chapter 5, Breitkopf and Härtel, Leipzig, (1875), pp. 254-276. *See also*: G. T. Fechner, *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, mathematisch-physische Classe*, Volume 2, 1850; **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 64, (185), p. 337; **and** *Elemente der Psychophysik*, Breitkopf und Hartel, Leipzig, (1860); **and** *Ueber die physikalische und philosophische Atomenlehre*, second enlarged edition, H. Mendelssohn, Leipzig, (1864); **and** *Revision der Hauptpunkte der Psychophysik*, Breitkopf und Hartel, Leipzig, (1882); **and** "In Sachen des Zeitsinnes und der Methode der richtigen und falschen Fälle, gegen Estel und Lorenz", *Philosophische Studien*, Volume 3, (1884), pp. 1-37; **and** *Abhandlungen der mathematisch-physische Classe der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Volume 22, (1884), p. 3.

2445. E. A. Poe, *Eureka*, (1848).

2446. J. B. Stallo, *General Principles of the Philosophy of Nature*, W. M. Crosby and H. P. Nichols, Boston, (1848); "The Concepts and Theories of Modern Physics", Volume 38,

International Scientific Series, D. A. Appleton and Company, New York, (1881); reprinted Volume 42, *The International Scientific Series*, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., London, (1882); Edited by P. W. Bridgman, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (1960); *Reden, Abhandlungen und Briefe*, E. Steiger & Co., New York, (1893).

2447. Cf. E. H. Synge, "The Space-Time Hypothesis before Minkowski", *Nature*, Volume 106, Number 2647, (27 January 1921), p. 693. **See also:** G. Windred, "The History of Mathematical Time: II", *Isis*, Volume 20, Number 1, (November, 1933), pp. 192-219, at 197.

2448. H. Spencer, *Principles of Psychology*, Volume 1, Section 93, third edition, (1895), pp. 222-224. **See also:** *First Principles of Philosophy*, Volume 1, Part 2, Section 47, second edition, D. Appleton, New York, (1874), pp. 162-167; **and** "The Relations of Coexistence and Non-Coexistence", *Principles of Psychology*, Volume 2, Chapter 22, Sections 365-368, third edition, (1895), pp. 271-278.

2449. E. Mach, "Ueber die Entwicklung der Raumvorstellungen", *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, (1866), translated by P. E. B. Jourdain in Mach's *History and Root of the Principle of the Conservation of Energy*, Open Court, Chicago, (1911), pp. 88-90.

2450. J. J. Baumann, *Die Lehren von Raum, Zeit und Mathematik in der neueren Philosophie*, Volume 2, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1868), pp. 658 ff.

2451. E. K. Dühring, *Kritische Geschichte der allgemeinen Principien der Mechanik*, Chapter 4, Theobald Grieben, Berlin, (1873); **and** *Neue Grundgesetze zur rationellen Physik und Chemie*, Volume 1, Chapter 1, Fues's Verlag (R. Reisland), Leipzig, (1878/1886), pp. 1-34; **and** *Robert Mayer, der Galilei des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, E. Schmeitzner, Chemnitz, (1880-1895).

2452. F. A. Lange, *Logische Studien: Ein Beitrag zur Neubegründung der formalen Logik und der Erkenntnistheorie*, J. Baedeker, Iserlohn, (1877).

2453. T. H. Green, "Can there be a Natural Science of Man? [In Three Parts]", *Mind*, Volume 7, Number 25, (January, 1882), pp. 1-29; Volume 7, Number 26, (April, 1882), pp. 161-185; **and** T. H. Green and A. C. Bradley, "Can there be a Natural Science of Man?", *Mind*, Volume 7, Number 27, (July, 1882), pp. 321-348. T. H. Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, (1883). *Criticisms are found in:* S. Pringle-Pattison, *Hegelianism and Personality*, W. Blackwood, Edinburgh, London, (1887); **and** E. B. McGilvary, "The Eternal Consciousness", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 10, Number 40, (October, 1901), pp. 479-497.

2454. C. H. Hinton, "What is the Fourth Dimension?", *Dublin University Magazine*, Volume 96, Number 571, (1880), pp. 15-34, at 27-34; reprinted in *Cheltenham Ladies' College Magazine*; reprinted as "What is the Fourth Dimension? Ghosts Explained", Swann Sonnenschein, London, (1884); reprinted in *Scientific Romances: First Series*, Swann Sonnenschein, London, (1886), pp. 1-32, which was itself reprinted by Arno Press, New York, (1976); reprinted in *Speculations on the Fourth Dimension: Selected Writings of Charles H. Hinton*, edited by Rudolf v. B. Rucker, Dover, New York, (1980), pp. 1-22; **See also** by Hinton: *A New Era of Thought*, Swann Sonnenschein, London, (1888); **and** "The Recognition of the Fourth Dimension" (read before the Philosophical Society of Washington, 9 November 1901), *Bulletin of the Philosophical Society of Washington*, Volume 14, (1902), pp. 179-203; reprinted in *The Fourth Dimension*, Swann Sonnenschein, London, J. Lane, New York, (1904); **and** "The Fourth Dimension", *Harper's Magazine*, Volume 109, Number 601, (July, 1904), pp. 229-233.

2455. J. Venn, "Our Control of Space and Time", *Mind*, Volume 6, Number 21, (January, 1881), pp. 18-31. For similar arguments, some of which antedate Venn's work, *see:* C.

Flammarion, *Lumen*, Dodd, Mead, and Company, New York, (1897); also William Heinemann, London, (1897). Somewhat similar stories to the story of Lumen are told by Comte Didier de Chousy, *Ignis*; Aaron Bernstein, *Naturwissenschaftliche Volksbücher*, (confer: F. Gregory, “The Mysteries and Wonders of Natural Science: Bernstein’s *Naturwissenschaftliche Volksbücher* and the Adolescent Einstein”, in J. Stachel and D. Howard, Editors, *Einstein: The Formative Years 1879-1909*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2000), pp. 23-41); and Hudson Maxim, see: “Hudson Maxim’s Anticipations of Einstein”, *Current Opinion*, Volume 71, (November, 1921), pp. 636-638.

2456. G. Teichmüller, *Die wirkliche und die scheinbare Welt: neue Grundlegung der Metaphysik*, W. Koebner, Breslau, (1882).

2457. S., “Four-Dimensional Space”, *Nature*, (March 26, 1885), p. 481.

2458. R. Mewes, “Das Wesen der Materie und des Naturerkennens”, *Zeitschrift für Luftschiffahrt*, Volume 8, Number 7, (1889), pp. 158-162. See also: “Über die Ableitung des Weberschen Grundgesetzes aus dem Dopplerschen Prinzip”, *Physik des Äthers*, Part 1, (1892), pp. 1-3, Part 2, (1894), pp. 13-16, 18-19, 33. These are reprinted in part in “Wissenschaftliche Begründung der Raumzeitlehre oder Relativitätstheorie (1884-1894) mit einem geschichtlichen Anhang”, *Gesammelte Arbeiten von Rudolf Mewes*, Volume 1, Rudolf Mewes, Berlin, (1920), pp. 25-33, 36-47.

2459. W. Voigt, “Ueber das Doppler’sche Princip”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1887), pp. 41-51; reprinted *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 16, Number 20, (October 15, 1915), pp. 381-386; English translation, as well as very useful commentary, are found in A. Ernst and Jong-Ping Hsu (W. Kern is credited with assisting in the translation), “First Proposal of the Universal Speed of Light by Voigt in 1887”, *Chinese Journal of Physics* (The Physical Society of the Republic of China), Volume 39, Number 3, (June, 2001), pp. 211-230; URL’s:

<<http://psroc.phys.ntu.edu.tw/cjp/v39/211/211.htm>>

<<http://psroc.phys.ntu.edu.tw/cjp/v39/211.pdf>>

See also: W. Voigt, “Theorie des Lichtes für bewegte Medien”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1887), pp. 177-238; and *Die fundamentalen physikalischen Eigenschaften der Krystalle in elementarer Darstellung*, Veit, Leipzig, (1898), pp. 20 ff.; and S. Bochner, “The Significance for Some Basic Mathematical Conceptions for Physics”, *Isis*, Volume 54, (1963), pp. 179-205, at 193; **See also:** W. Voigt, *Elementare Mechanik als Einleitung in das Studium der theoretischen Physik*, second revised edition, Veit, Leipzig, (1901), especially pp. 10-26.

2460. A. F. Shand, “The Unity of Consciousness”, *Mind*, Volume 13, Number 50, (1888), pp. 231-243; and “Space and Time”, Volume 13, Number 51, (1888), pp. 339-355.

2461. H. Bergson, *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*, G. Allen, New York, Macmillan, (1921).

2462. F. H. Bradley, “Can a Man Sin against Knowledge?”, *Mind*, Volume 9, Number 34, (April, 1884), pp. 286-290; and “On the Analysis of Comparison”, *Mind*, Volume 11, Number 41, (January, 1886), pp. 83-85; and “Is there any Special Activity of Attention?”, *Mind*, Volume 11, Number 43, (July, 1886), pp. 305-323; and “Association and Thought”, *Mind*, Volume 12, Number 47, (July, 1887), pp. 354-381; and “Why do We Remember Forwards and not Backwards?”, *Mind*, Volume 12, Number 48, (October, 1887), pp. 579-582; and “On Pleasure, Pain, Desire and Volition”, *Mind*, Volume 13, Number 49,

(January, 1888), pp. 1-36; **and** "Reality and Thought", *Mind*, Volume 13, Number 51, (July, 1888), pp. 370-382; **and** "Consciousness and Experience", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 2, Number 6, (April, 1893), pp. 211-216; **and** "A Reply to Criticism", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 3, Number 10, (April 1894), pp. 232-239; **and** "Some Remarks on Punishment", *International Journal of Ethics*, Volume 4, Number 3, (April, 1894), pp. 269-284; **and** "The Limits of Individual and National Self-Sacrifice", *International Journal of Ethics*, Volume 5, Number 1, (October, 1894), pp. 17-28; **and** "What Do We Mean by the Intensity of Psychological States", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 4, Number 13, (January, 1895), pp. 1-27; **and** "On the Supposed Uselessness of the Soul", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 4, Number 14, (April, 1895), pp. 176-179; **and** "In What Sense are Psychological States Extended?", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 4, Number 14, (April, 1895), pp. 225-235; **and** "The Contrary and the Disparate", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 5, Number 20, (October, 1896), pp. 464-482; **and** "Some Remarks on Memory and Inference", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 8, Number 30, (April, 1899), pp. 145-166; **and** "A Defence of Phenomenalism in Psychology", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 9, Number 33, (January, 1900), pp. 26-45; **and** "Some Remarks on Conation", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 10, Number 40, (October, 1901), pp. 437-454; **and** "On Active Attention", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 11, Number 41, (January, 1902), pp. 1-30; **and** "On Mental Conflict and Imputation", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 11, Number 43, (July, 1902), pp. 289-315; **and** "The Definition of Will", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 11, Number 44, (October, 1902), pp. 437-469; **and** "The Definition of Will", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 12, Number 46, (April, 1903), pp. 145-176; **and** "The Definition of Will", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 13, Number 49, (January, 1904), pp. 1-37; **and** "On Truth and Practice", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 13, Number 51, (July, 1904), pp. 309-335; **and** "On Floating Ideas and the Imaginary", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 15, Number 60, (October, 1906), pp. 445-472; **and** "On Truth and Copying", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 16, Number 62, (April, 1907), pp. 165-180; **and** "On Memory and Judgment", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 17, Number 66, (April, 1908), pp. 153-174; **and** "On the Ambiguity of Pragmatism", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 17, Number 66, (April, 1908), pp. 226-237; **and** "On Our Knowledge of Immediate Experience", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 18, Number 69, (January, 1909), pp. 40-64; **and** "On Truth and Coherence", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 18, Number 71, (July, 1909), pp. 329-342; **and** "Coherence and Contradiction", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 18, Number 72, (October, 1909), pp. 489-508; **and** "On Appearance, Error and Contradiction", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 19, Number 74, (April, 1910), pp. 153-185; **and** "Reply to Mr. Russell's Explanations", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 20, Number 77, (January, 1911), pp. 74-76; **and** "On Some Aspects of Truth", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 20, Number 79, (July, 1911), pp. 305-341; **and** "A Reply to a Criticism", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 21, Number 81, (January, 1912), pp. 148-150.

2463. Jean-Marie Guyau, with an introduction by A. Fouillée, *La Genèse de l'Idée de Temps*, Alcan, Paris, (1890).

2464. H. G. Wells, *The Time Machine*, Heinemann, London, (1895) *see*: Bernard Bergonzi, "The Publication of The Time Machine 1894-5", *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Volume 11, Number 41, (February, 1960), pp. 42-51; stable JSTOR URL:

<<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0034-6551%28196002%292%3A11%3A41%3C42%3ATPOTTM%3E2.0.CO%3B2-0>>.

H. G. Wells, "The Remarkable Case of Davidson's Eyes", *The Stolen Bacillus and other Incidents*, Methuen, London, (1895); **and** *The Wonderful Visit*, Chapter 7, J. M. Dent, London, (1895), pp. 26ff.; **and** "The Plattner Story", *The Plattner Story and Others*,

Methuen, London, (1897); **and** *The Invisible Man: A Grotesque Romance*, C. A. Pearson, London, (1897); **and** “The Stolen Body”, *Twelve Stories and Dream*, Macmillan, London, (1903).

2465. Menyhért (Melchior) Palágyi, *Neue Theorie des Raumes und der Zeit*, Engelmanns, Leipzig, (1901); reprinted in *Zur Weltmechanik, Beiträge zur Metaphysik der Physik von Melchior Palágyi, mit einem Geleitwort von Ernst Gehrcke*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1925).

2466. G. S. Fullerton, “The Doctrine of Space and Time [In Five Parts]”, *The Philosophical Review*, Volume 10, Number 2, (March, 1901), pp. 113-123; Volume 10, Number 3, (May, 1901), pp. 229-240; Volume 10, Number 4, (July, 1901), pp. 375-385; Volume 10, Number 5, (September, 1901), pp. 488-504; Volume 10, Number 6, (November, 1901), pp. 583-600.

2467. J. H. Ziegler, *Die universelle Weltformel und ihre Bedeutung für die wahre Erkenntnis aller Dinge*, 1 Vortrag, Kommissionsverlag Art. Institut Orell Füssli, Zürich, (1902); **and** *Die universelle Weltformel und ihre Bedeutung für die wahre Erkenntnis aller Dinge*, 2 Vortrag, Kommissionsverlag Art. Institut Orell Füssli, Zürich, (1903); **and** *Die wahre Einheit von Religion und Wissenschaft. Vier Abhandlungen von J. H. Ziegler*, 1. Ueber die wahre Bedeutung des Begriffs Natur. 2. Ueber das wahre Wesen der sogenannten Schwerkraft. 3. Ueber der wahre System der chemischen Elemente. 4. Ueber der Sonnengott von Sippar, Kommissionsverlag Art. Institut Orell Füssli, Zürich, (1904); **and** *Die wahre Ursache der hellen Lichtstrahlung des Radiums*, Kommissionsverlag Art. Institut Orell Füssli, Zürich, (1904); second improved edition (1905).

2468. W. Smith, “The Metaphysics of Time”, *The Philosophical Review*, Volume 11, Number 4, (July, 1902), pp. 372-391. Smith references F. A. Lange, *Logische Studien, ein Beitrag zur Neubegründung der formalen Logik und der Erkenntnistheorie*, J. Baedeker, Iserlohn, (1877), p. 139. With respect to psychologists and their equating of time with space, G. F. Stout stated, in 1902, “Psychologists generally hold the same type of theory for the two cases of space and time cognition, and the indications of individual views given under Extension (q. v.) hold largely also for time.” *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, Volume 2, Macmillan, New York, London, (1902), p. 705.

2469. J. H. Poincaré, “Sur les Hypothèses Fondamentales de la Géométrie”, *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France*, Volume 15, (1887), pp. 203-216; **and** *Théorie Mathématique de la Lumière*, Naud, Paris, (1889); **and** “Les Géométries Non-Euclidiennes”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 2, (1891), pp. 769-774; **and** “A Propos de la Théorie de M. Larmor”, *L'Éclairage électrique*, Volume 3, (April 6, May 18, 1895), pp. 5-13, 289-295; Volume 5, (October 5, November 8, 1895), pp. 5-14, 385-392; reprinted *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 369-426; **and** “La Mesure du Temps”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 6, (January, 1898), pp. 1-13; English translation by G. B. Halsted, *The Value of Science*, The Science Press, New York, (1907), pp. 26-36; **and** “La Théorie de Lorentz at le Principe de Réaction”, *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Series 2, Volume 5, (1900), pp. 252-278; reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume 9, pp. 464-488; **and** “RELATIONS ENTRE LA PHYSIQUE EXPÉRIMENTALE ET LA PHYSIQUE MATHÉMATIQUE”, *RAPPORTS PRÉSENTÉS AU CONGRÈS INTERNATIONAL DE PHYSIQUE DE 1900*, Volume I, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1900), pp. 1-29; translated into German “Über die Beziehungen zwischen der experimentellen und mathematischen Physik”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 2, (1900-1901), pp. 166-171, 182-186, 196-201; English translation in *Science and Hypothesis*, Chapters 9 and 10; **and** *Electricité et Optique*, second revised edition, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1901), especially Chapter 6, pp. 516-536; **and** *La Science et l'Hypothèse*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1902); translated into English *Science and Hypothesis*, Dover, New York, (1952), which appears in *The Foundations of Science*; translated into German with

substantial notations by Ferdinand and Lisbeth Lindemann *Wissenschaft und Hypothese*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1904); **and** Poincaré's St. Louis lecture from September of 1904, *La Revue des Idées*, 80, (November 15, 1905); "L'État Actuel et l'Avenir de la Physique Mathématique", *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématique*, Series 2, Volume 28, (1904), p. 302-324; English translation, "The Principles of Mathematical Physics", *The Monist*, Volume 15, Number 1, (January, 1905), pp. 1-24; **and** *La Valeur de la Science*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1905); English translation by G. B. Halsted, *The Value of Science*, The Science Press, New York, (1907), pp. 26-36; *The Value of Science*, itself, appears in *The Foundations of Science; Science and Hypothesis, The Value of Science, Science and Method*, The Science Press, Garrison, New York, (1913/1946), University Press of America, Washington D. C., (ca. 1982); **and** "Sur la Dynamique de l'Électron", *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L'Académie des sciences*, Volume 140, (1905), pp. 1504-1508; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 77-81 URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

reprinted *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 489-493; English translations appear in: G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, "Intimations of Relativity before Einstein", *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (December, 1983), pp. 343-354, at pp. 350-353; **and**, translated by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 7-14; **and** "Sur la Dynamique de l'Électron", *Rendiconti del Circolo matimatico di Palermo*, Volume 21, (1906, submitted 23 July 1905), pp. 129-176; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 18-76 URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume 9, pp. 494-550; redacted English translation by H. M. Schwartz with modern notation, "Poincaré's Rendiconti Paper on Relativity", *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 39, (November, 1971), pp. 1287-1294; Volume 40, (June, 1972), pp. 862-872; Volume 40, (September, 1972), pp. 1282-1287; English translation by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov with modern notation, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 15-78; **and** "La Dynamique de l'Électron", *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 19, (1908), pp. 386-402; reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume 9, pp. 551-586; English translation: "The New Mechanics", *Science and Method*, Book III, which is reprinted in *Foundations of Science*; **and** *Science et Méthode*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1908); translated into English as *Science and Method*, numerous editions; *Science and Method* is also reprinted in *Foundations of Science*; **and** "La Mécanique Nouvelle", *Comptes Rendus des Sessions de l'Association Française pour l'Avancement des Sciences*, Conférence de Lille, Paris, (1909), pp. 38-48; *La Revue Scientifique*, Volume 47, (1909), pp. 170-177; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 18-76 URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

and **28 April 1909 Lecture in Göttingen**: “La Mécanique Nouvelle”, *Sechs Vorträge über der reinen Mathematik und mathematischen Physik auf Einladung der Wolfskehl-Kommission der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften gehalten zu Göttingen vom 22.-28. April 1909*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1910), pp. 51-58; “The New Mechanics”, *The Monist*, Volume 23, (1913), pp. 385-395; **13 October 1910 Lecture in Berlin**: “Die neue Mechanik”, *Himmel und Erde*, Volume 23, (1911), pp. 97-116; *Die neue Mechanik*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1911); and *Dernières Pensées*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1913); translated into English as *Mathematics and Science: Last Essays*, Dover, New York, (1963); and *The Foundations of Science: Science and Hypothesis, The Value of Science, Science and Method*, The Science Press, Garrison, New York, (1913/1946), University Press of America, Washington D. C., (ca. 1982).

2470. R. Mehmke, “Ueber die darstellende Geometrie der Räume von vier und mehr Dimensionen, mit Anwendungen auf die graphische Mechanik, die graphische Lösung von Systemen numerischer Gleichungen und auf Chemie”, *Mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Mitteilungen* (Stuttgart, Württemberg), Series 2, Volume 6, (1904), pp. 44-54.

2471. R. Marcolongo, “Sugli integrali delle equazione dell’eletto dinamica”, *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Rendiconti. Classe di scienze fisiche, matematiche e naturali*, Series 5, Volume 15, (1 Semestre, April, 1906), pp. 344-349.

2472. R. Hargreaves, “Integral Forms and Their Connexion with Physical Equations”, *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Volume 21, (1908), pp. 107-122.

2473. V. Welby, “Time as Derivative”, *Mind*, New Series, Volume 16, Number 63, (July, 1907), pp. 383-400, at 400. See also: V. Welby, “Mr. McTaggart on the ‘Unreality of Time’”, *Mind*, New Series, Volume 18, Number 70, (April, 1909), pp. 326-328; and J. E. McTaggart, “The Unreality of Time”, *Mind*, New Series, Volume 17, Number 68, (October, 1908), pp. 457-474.

2474. J. E. McTaggart, “The Unreality of Time”, *Mind*, New Series, Volume 17, Number 68, (October, 1908), pp. 457-474.

2475. H. Minkowski, “Das Relativitätsprinzip”, Lecture of 5 November 1907, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 47, (1915), pp. 927-938; and “Relativitätsprinzip”, *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 24, (1915), pp. 1241-1244; and “Die Grundgleichungen für die elektromagnetischen Vorgänge in bewegten Körpern”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1908), pp. 53-111; reprinted *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 68, (1910), pp. 472-525; reprinted *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, Volume 2, D. Hilbert, Editor, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1911), pp. 352-404; and “Raum und Zeit”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 10, (1909), pp. 104-111; reprinted *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, Volume 2, D. Hilbert, Editor, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1911), pp. 431-444; and “Raum und Zeit”, With notes by A. Sommerfeld, *Das Relativitätsprinzip: eine Sammlung von Abhandlungen*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1913), pp. 56-73; and “Eine Ableitung der Grundgleichungen für die elektromagnetischen Vorgänge in bewegten Körpern vom Standpunkte der Elektronentheorie”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 68, (1910), pp. 526-551; reprinted *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, Volume 2, D. Hilbert, Editor, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1911), pp. 405-430; and *Zwei Abhandlungen über die Grundgleichungen der Elektrodynamik*, Berlin, Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, (1910). English translations of some of Minkowski’s works are found in: *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952); and *The Principle of Relativity; Original Papers by A. Einstein and H. Minkowski, Tr. into English by M. N. Saha and S. N. Bose. . . with a Historical Introduction*

by P. C. Mahalanobis, University of Calcutta, Calcutta, (1920).

2476. D'Alembert, "DIMENSION", *ENCYCLOPÉDIE, OU DICTIONNAIRE RAISONNÉ DES SCIENCES, DES ARTS ET DES MÉTIERS, PAR UNE SOCIÉTÉ DE GENS DE LETTRES*, Volume 4, p. 1010. See: R. C. Archibald, "Time as a Fourth Dimension", *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, Volume 20, Number 8, (May, 1914), pp. 409-412.

2477. G. S. Klügel, "Abmessung", *Mathematisches Wörterbuch*, Volume 1, E. B. Schwickert, Leipzig, (1803), pp. 3-7, at 7.

2478. C. Cranz, "Gemeinverständliches über die sogenannte vierte Dimension", *Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge*, New Series, Volume 5, Number 112/113, (1890), pp. 567-636, at 621.

2479. E. Wölffing, "Die vierte Dimension", *Die Umschau*, Volume 1, Number 18, (1897), pp. 309-314, at 312.

2480. *Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume 5*, U.S.A., (1886), Hippolytus, "The Refutation of All Heresies", Book I, Chapter V, pp. 13-14.

2481. J. E. Boodin, "A Revolution in Metaphysics and in Science", *Philosophy of Science*, Volume 5, Number 3, (July, 1938), pp. 267-275.

2482. D. Turner, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers: A Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979), pp. 8-17.

2483. Aristotle, translated by W. D. Ross, *Metaphysics*, Book 3, Chapter 4, 1001 a 32, from *Great Books of the Western World*, Volume 8 (Aristotle I), Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., Chicago, London, Toronto, Geneva, (1952), p. 520.

2484. P. Carus, "The Principle of Relativity", *The Monist*, Volume 22, (1912), pp. 188-229, at 188.

2485. K. Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations*, Routledge and Keagan Paul, London, (1963), pp. 33-39.

2486. *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 75.

2487. A. Reiser (Rudolf Kayser), *Albert Einstein, a Biographical Portrait*, Albert & Charles Boni, New York, (1930), pp. 105-106.

2488. H. Weyl, *Space Time Matter*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 217.

2489. H. Weyl, *Philosophy of Mathematics and Natural Science*, Princeton University Press, (1949), p. 264.

2490. E. Cunningham, *The Principle of Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, (1914), p. 191.

2491. E. Cunningham, *The Principle of Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, (1914), p. 213-214.

2492. M. Čapek, *Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 2, (1965), pp. 441-461; *Philosophical Impact of Contemporary Physics*, Chapters 3 and 12, Van Nordstrand, Princeton, New Jersey, (1961).

2493. H. N. Gardiner, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, Volume 2, Macmillan, New York, London, (1902), pp. 703-704. G. Teichmüller, *Die wirkliche und die scheinbare Welt: neue Grundlegung der Metaphysik*, W. Koebner, Breslau, (1882).

2494. Menyhért (Melchior) Palágyi, *Neue Theorie des Raumes und der Zeit*, Engelmanns, Leipzig, (1901); reprinted in *Zur Weltmechanik, Beiträge zur Metaphysik der Physik von Melchior Palágyi, mit einem Geleitwort von Ernst Gehrcke*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1925), p. 29.

2495. F. Ueberweg, English translation by G. S. Morris, "with additions" by N. Porter, *History of Philosophy from Thales to the Present Time*, Scribner, Armstrong & Co, New York, (1876), pp. 51-60.

2496. Ocellus Lucanus, Translated and Annotated by T. Taylor, *Ocellus Lucanus. On the nature of the universe. Taurus, the Platonic philosopher, On the eternity of the world. Julius Firmicus Maternus Of the thema mundi; in which the positions of the stars at the commencement of the several mundane periods is given. Select theorems on the perpetuity of time*, by Proelus, Thomas Taylor, London, (1831); Republished by the Philosophical Research Society, (1976/1999), pp. 1-29.

2497. A. Einstein, *Relativity, The Special and the General Theory*, Crown Publishers, Inc., New York, (1961), pp. 150-151.

2498. A. Einstein, *Sidelights on Relativity*, translated by: G. B. Jeffery and W. Perret, Methuen & Co., London, (1922); *republished, unabridged and unaltered*: Dover, New York, (1983), p. 20.

2499. J. H. Poincaré, “Sur la Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 140, (1905), pp. 1504-1508; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 77-81
URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

reprinted *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 489-493; English translations appear in: G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, “Intimations of Relativity before Einstein”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (December, 1983), pp. 343-354, at pp. 350-353; **and**, translated by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 7-14; **and** “Sur la Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Rendiconti del Circolo matimatico di Palermo*, Volume 21, (1906, submitted July 23rd, 1905), pp. 129-176; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 18-76
URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume IX, pp. 494-550; redacted English translation by H. M. Schwartz with modern notation, “Poincaré’s Rendiconti Paper on Relativity”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 39, (November, 1971), pp. 1287-1294; Volume 40, (June, 1972), pp. 862-872; Volume 40, (September, 1972), pp. 1282-1287; English translation by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov with modern notation, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 15-78. **See also:** E. Cunningham, *The Principle of Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, (1914), p. 173.

2500. A. Einstein, “Relativitäts-Theorie”, *Vierteljahrsschrift der Naturforschenden Gesellschaft in Zürich*, Volume 56, (1911), pp. 1-14; quoted from the English translation by Anna Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 3, Princeton University Press, (1993), p. 350.

2501. *See:* H. Minkowski, “Die Grundgleichungen für die elektromagnetischen Vorgänge in bewegten Körpern”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1908), pp. 53-111, at 54; reprinted *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, Volume 2, D. Hilbert, Editor, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1911),

pp. 352-404, at 352. *See also*: “Das Relativitätsprinzip”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 47, (1915), pp. 927-938, at 938.

2502. M. Born, “Physics and Relativity”, *Physics in my Generation*, second revised edition, Springer, New York, (1969), p. 101.

2503. M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 1

2504. M. Born, *My Life: Recollections of a Nobel Laureate*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1975), pp. 98, 130.

2505. J. Leveugle, “Hilbert et Poincaré”, *Poincaré et la Relativité : Question sur la Science*, Cahpter 10, (2002), ISBN: 2-9518876-1-2, pp.147-230; **and** *La Relativité, Poincaré et Einstein, Planck, Hilbert: Histoire véridique de la Théorie de la Relativité*, L’Harmattan, Paris, (2004). *See also*: L. Pyenson, *The Young Einstein and the Advent of Relativity*, Bristol, Adam Hilger, (1985), pp. 103-104. *See also*: C. Reid, *Hilbert*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, (1970), pp. 100, 105.

2506. R. Marcolongo, “Sugli integrali delle equazione dell’elettro dinamica”, *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Rendiconti. Classe di scienze fisiche, matematiche e naturali*, Series 5, Volume 15, (1 Semestre, April, 1906), pp. 344-349.

2507. R. Mehmke, “Ueber die darstellende Geometrie der Räume von vier und mehr Dimensionen, mit Anwendungen auf die graphische Mechanik, die graphische Lösung von Systemen numerischer Gleichungen und auf Chemie”, *Mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Mitteilungen* (Stuttgart, Württemberg), Series 2, Volume 6, (1904), pp. 44-54.

2508. R. Hargreaves, “Integral Forms and Their Connexion with Physical Equations”, *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Volume 21, (1908), pp. 107-122.

2509. H. Bateman, “The Conformal Transformations of a Space of Four Dimensions and their Applications to Geometrical Optics”, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 7, (1909), pp. 70-89; **and** *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 18, (1909), p. 890; **and** “The Transformation of the Electrodynamical Equations”, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 8, (1910), pp. 223-264, 375, 469; **and** “The Physical Aspects of Time”, *Memoirs and Proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society*, Volume 54, (1910), pp. 1-13; **and** *American Journal of Mathematics*, Volume 34, (1912), p. 325; **and** *The Mathematical Analysis of Electrical and Optical Wave-Motion on the Basis of Maxwell’s Equations*, Cambridge University Press, (1915); **and** “The Electromagnetic Vectors”, *The Physical Review*, Volume 12, Number 6, (December, 1918), pp. 459-481; **and** “On General Relativity”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 37, (1919), pp. 219-223; **and** *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 21, (1920), p. 256. **Confer**: E. Whittaker, *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the Royal Society*, Volume 1, (1955), pp. 44-45; **and** *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), pp. 8, 64, 76, 94, 154-156, 195. *See also*: W. Pauli, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, New York, (1958), pp. 81, 96, 199. *See also*: E. Bessel-Hagen, “Über der Erhaltungssätze der Elektrodynamik”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 84, (1921), pp. 258-276. *See also*: F. D. Murnaghan, “The Absolute Significance of Maxwell’s Equations”, *The Physical Review*, Volume 17, Number 2, (February, 1921), pp. 73-88. *See also*: G. Kowalewski, “Über die Batemansche Transformationsgruppe”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, Volume 157, Number 3, (1927), pp. 193-197.

2510. A. Einstein, “Relativitäts-Theorie”, *Vierteljahrsschrift der Naturforschenden Gesellschaft in Zürich*, Volume 56, (1911), pp. 1-14; “Diskussion”, *Sitzungsberichte*, II-IX, (1911); English translation by Anna Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 3, Princeton University Press, (1993), pp. 340-358.

2511. H. Poincare, “La Mesure du Temps”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 6, (January, 1898) pp. 1-13; English translation by G. B. Halsted, *The Value of Science*, The Science Press, New York, (1907), pp. 26-36; **and** *Electricité et Optique*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1901), p. 530; **and** “La Théorie de Lorentz et le Principe de la Réaction”, *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Series 2, Volume 5, (1900), pp. 252-278, at 272-273; **and** *Science and Hypothesis*, Dover, New York, (1952). pp. 84-88; **and** *La Revue des Idées*, 80, (November 15, 1905); “L’État Actuel et l’Avenir de la Physique Mathématique”, *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématique*, Series 2, Volume 28, (1904), p. 302-324; English translation, “The Principles of Mathematical Physics”, *The Monist*, Volume 15, Number 1, (January, 1905), pp. 1-24; **and** “La Mécanique Nouvelle”, *Sechs Vorträge über ausgewählte Gegenstände aus der reinen Mathematik und mathematischen Physik*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, Berlin, (1910), pp. 49- 58.

2512. H. Bateman, “The Electromagnetic Vectors”, *The Physical Review*, Volume 12, Number 6, (December, 1918), pp. 459-481, at 463. *Bateman’s footnotes*: [1] H. Minkowski, *Gött. Nachr.*, 1908. [2] R. Hargreaves, *Cambr. Phil. Trans.*, Vol. 21, 1908, p. 107. Some interesting developments and applications of Hargreaves’ theorem have been made in an enthusiastic way by M. de Donder in Belgium, *Bull. De l’Acad. roy. de Belgique (Classe des Sciences)*, 1909, p. 66; 1911, p. 3; 1912, p. 3. [3] H. Bateman, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, Vol. 8, 1910, p. 223.

2513. G. Y. Rainich, *Mathematics of Relativity*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, Chapman & Hall, Limited, London, (1950), pp. v, 80.

2514. O. Darrigol, “The Electrodynamical Origins of Relativity Theory”, *Historical Studies in the Physical and Biological Sciences: HSPS*, Volume 26, Number 2, (1996), pp. 241-312; which is reprinted as Chapter 9 of Darrigol’s *Electrodynamics from Ampère to Einstein*, Oxford University Press, (2000); as quoted in S. Abiko, “On Einstein’s Distrust of the Electromagnetic Theory: the Origin of the Light Velocity Postulate”, *Historical Studies in the Physical and Biological Sciences: HSPS*, Volume 33, Number 2, (2003), pp. 193-215, at 200.

2515. V. Welby, “Time as Derivative”, *Mind*, New Series, Volume 16, Number 63, (July, 1907), pp. 383-400, at 400. *See also*: V. Welby “Mr. McTaggart on the ‘Unreality of Time’”, *Mind*, New Series, Volume 18, Number 70, (April, 1909), pp. 326-328; **and** J. E. McTaggart, “The Unreality of Time”, *Mind*, New Series, Volume 17, Number 68, (October, 1908), pp. 457-474.

2516. C. J. Keyser, “Mathematical Emancipations: The Passing of the Point and the Number Three: Dimensionality and Hyperspace”, *The Monist*, Volume 16, (1906), pp. 65-83, at 68-69.

2517. W. Smith, “The Metaphysics of Time”, *The Physical Review*, Volume 11, Number 4, (July, 1902), pp. 372-391. Smith references F. A. Lange, *Logische Studien, ein Beitrag zur Neubegründung der formalen Logik und der Erkenntnistheorie*, J. Baedeker, Iserlohn, (1877), p. 139.

2518. *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, Volume 2, Macmillan, New York, London, (1902), p. 705.

2519. H. L. Mansel, *Metaphysics or the Philosophy of Consciousness Phenomenal and Real*, Second Edition, Adam and Charles Black, Edinburgh, (1866), p. 64.

2520. Arvid Reuterdaahl claimed to have coined the phrase “Space-Time” in 1913, and to have copyrighted it in 1915. (*See*: H. Israel, *et al*, Eds., *Hundert Autoren Gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, (1931), p. 45.) Reuterdaahl’s claim to priority for the phrase is untenable. E. B. Wilson and G. N. Lewis published a paper the preceding year: “The Space-Time Manifold of Relativity: The Non-Euclidean Geometry of Mechanics and

Electrodynamics”, *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Volume 48, Number 11, (November, 1912), pp. 389-507.

2521. R. Mewes, “Das Wesen der Materie und des Naturerkennens”, *Zeitschrift für Luftschiffahrt*, Volume 8, Number 7, (1889), pp. 158-162; **and** “Über die Ableitung des Weberschen Grundgesetzes aus dem Dopplerschen Prinzip”, *Physik des Äthers*, Part 1, (1892), pp. 1-3, Part 2, (1894), pp. 13-16, 18-19, 33. These are reprinted in part in “Wissenschaftliche Begründung der Raumzeitlehre oder Relativitätstheorie (1884-1894) mit einem geschichtlichen Anhang”, *Gesammelte Arbeiten von Rudolf Mewes*, Volume 1, Rudolf Mewes, Berlin, (1920), pp. 25-33, 36-47.

2522. Menyhért (Melchior) Palágyi, *Neue Theorie des Raumes und der Zeit*, Engelmanns, Leipzig, (1901); reprinted in *Zur Weltmechanik, Beiträge zur Metaphysik der Physik von Melchior Palágyi, mit einem Geleitwort von Ernst Gehrcke*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1925).

2523. S., “Four-Dimensional Space”, *Nature*, (March 26, 1885), p. 481.

2524. A. E. Abbott, *Flatland: A Romance of Many Dimensions*, Seeley, London, (1884).

2525. S. Newcomb, “Elementary Theorems Relating to the Geometry of a Space of Three Dimensions and of Uniform Positive Curvature in the Fourth Dimension”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelle’s Journal)*, Volume 83, (1877), pp. 293-299; **and** “Note on a Class of Transformations Which Surfaces May Undergo in Space of More than Three Dimensions”, *American Journal of Mathematics*, Volume 1, (1878), pp. 1-4; **and** “On the Fundamental Concepts of Physics”, *Bulletin of the Washington Philosophical Society*, Volume 11, (1888/1891), pp. 514-515; **and** “Modern Mathematical Thought”, *Bulletin of the New York Mathematical Society*, Volume 3, Number 4, (January, 1894), pp. 95-107; **and** “The Philosophy of Hyperspace”, *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 4, Number 5, (February, 1898), pp. 187-195; **and** “Is the Airship Coming?”, *McClure’s Magazine*, Volume 17, (September, 1901), pp. 432-435; **and** “The Fairyland of Geometry”, *Harper’s Magazine*, Volume 104, Number 620, (January, 1902), pp. 249-252.

2526. J. E. Beichler, “The *Psi*-ence Fiction of H.G.Wells”, *YGGDRASIL: The Journal of Paraphysics*, (1997).

<<http://members.aol.com/Mysphyt1/yggdrasil-2/Psifi.htm>>

2527. J. Venn, “Our Control of Space and Time”, *Mind*, Volume 6, Number 21, (January, 1881), pp. 18-31. For similar arguments, some of which antedate Venn’s work, *see*: C. Flammarion, *Lumen*, Dodd, Mead, and Company, New York, (1897); *also* William Heinemann, London, (1897). Somewhat similar stories to the story of Lumen are told by Comte Didier de Chousy, *Ignis*; Aaron Bernstein, *Naturwissenschaftliche Volksbücher*, (*confer*: F. Gregory, “The Mysteries and Wonders of Natural Science: Bernstein’s *Naturwissenschaftliche Volksbücher* and the Adolescent Einstein”, in J. Stachel and D. Howard, Editors, *Einstein: The Formative Years 1879-1909*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2000), pp. 23-41); **and** Hudson Maxim, *see*: “Hudson Maxim’s Anticipations of Einstein”, *Current Opinion*, Volume 71, (November, 1921), pp. 636-638.

2528. C. H. Hinton, “What is the Fourth Dimension?”, *Dublin University Magazine*, Volume 96, Number 571, (1880), pp. 15-34, at 27-34; reprinted in *Cheltenham Ladies’ College Magazine*; reprinted as “What is the Fourth Dimension? Ghosts Explained”, Swann Sonnenschein, London, (1884); reprinted in *Scientific Romances: First Series*, Swann Sonnenschein, London, (1886), pp. 1-32, which was itself reprinted by Arno Press, New York, (1976); reprinted in *Speculations on the Fourth Dimension: Selected Writings of Charles H. Hinton*, Edited by Rudolf v. B. Rucker, Dover, New York, (1980), pp. 1-22; **and** *A New Era of Thought*, Swann Sonnenschein, London, (1888); **and** “The Recognition of the

Fourth Dimension” (read before the Philosophical Society of Washington, November 9th, 1901), *Bulletin of the Philosophical Society of Washington*, Volume 14, (1902), pp. 179-203; reprinted in *The Fourth Dimension*, Swann Sonnenschein, London, J. Lane, New York, (1904); **and** “The Fourth Dimension”, *Harper’s Magazine*, Volume 109, Number 601, (July, 1904), pp. 229-233.

2529. B. Riemann, translated by W. K. Clifford, “On the Hypotheses which Lie at the Bases of Geometry”, *Nature*, Volume 8, Number 183, (May 1, 1873), pp. 14-17; Volume 8, Number 184, (May 8, 1873), pp. 36-37.

2530. J. B. Stallo, *General Principles of the Philosophy of Nature*, WM. Crosby and H. P. Nichols, Boston, (1848), pp 52-55.

2531. G. T. Fechner, (under the pseudonym “Dr. Mises”), “Der Raum hat vier Dimensionen”, *Vier Paradoxa*, Chapter 2, L. Voss, Leipzig, (1846), pp. 17-40; reprinted with changes and an addendum, *Kleine Schriften*, Chapter 5, Breitkopf and Härtel, Leipzig, (1875), pp. 254-276. *See also:* G. T. Fechner, *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, mathematisch-physische Classe*, Volume 2, 1850; **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 64, (185), p. 337; **and** *Elemente der Psychophysik*, Breitkopf und Hartel, Leipzig, (1860); **and** *Ueber die physikalische und philosophische Atomenlehre*, Second, Enlarged, Edition, H. Mendelssohn, Leipzig, (1864); **and** *Revision der Hauptpunkte der Psychophysik*, Breitkopf und Hartel, Leipzig, (1882); **and** *Philosophische Studien*, Volume 3, (1884), p. 1; **and** *Abhandlungen der mathematisch-physische Classe der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Volume 22, (1884), p. 3.

2532. G. T. Fechner, (under the pseudonym “Dr. Mises”), “Der Raum hat vier Dimensionen”, *Vier Paradoxa*, L. Voss, Leipzig, (1846).

2533. R. J. Boscovich, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, (1966), p. 200.

2534. J. Larmor, *Aether and Matter*, Cambridge University Press, (1900), p. 78.

2535. E. K. Dühring, *Kritische Geschichte der allgemeinen Principien der Mechanik*, Chapter 4, Theobald Grieben, Berlin, (1873)—the later editions of this book delve more deeply into the subject; **and** *Neue Grundgesetze zur rationellen Physik und Chemie*, Volume 1, Chapter 1, Fues’s Verlag (R. Reisland), Leipzig, (1878/1886), pp. 1-34; **and** *Robert Mayer, der Galilei des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, E. Schmeitzner, Chemnitz, (1880-1895).

2536. R. Mewes, “Das Wesen der Materie und des Naturerkennens”, *Zeitschrift für Luftschiffahrt*, Volume 8, Number 7, (1889), pp. 158-162; **and** “Über die Ableitung des Weberschen Grundgesetzes aus dem Dopplerschen Prinzip”, *Physik des Äthers*, Part 1, (1892), pp. 1-3, Part 2, (1894), pp. 13-16, 18-19, 33. These are reprinted in part in “Wissenschaftliche Begründung der Raumzeitlehre oder Relativitätstheorie (1884-1894) mit einem geschichtlichen Anhang”, *Gesammelte Arbeiten von Rudolf Mewes*, Volume 1, Rudolf Mewes, Berlin, (1920), pp. 25-33, 36-47.

2537. J. J. Baumann, *Die Lehren von Raum, Zeit und Mathematik in der neueren Philosophie*, Volume 2, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1868), pp. 658 ff.

2538. F. A. Lange, *Logische Studien: Ein Beitrag zur Neubegründung der formalen Logik und der Erkenntnistheorie*, J. Baedeker, Iserlohn, (1877).

2539. G. Teichmüller, *Die wirkliche und die scheinbare Welt: neue Grundlegung der Metaphysik*, W. Koebner, Breslau, (1882).

2540. E. H. Synge, “The Space-Time Hypothesis before Minkowski”, *Nature*, Volume 106, Number 2647, (27 January 1921), p. 693. *See also:* G. Windred, “The History of Mathematical Time: II”, *Isis*, Volume 20, Number 1, (November, 1933), pp. 192-219, at 197.

2541. Menyhért (Melchior) Palágyi, *Neue Theorie des Raumes und der Zeit*, Engelmanns, Leipzig, (1901); reprinted in *Zur Weltmechanik, Beiträge zur Metaphysik der Physik von Melchior Palágyi, mit einem Geleitwort von Ernst Gehrcke*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1925).

2542. R. Mewes, “Das Wesen der Materie und des Naturerkennens”, *Zeitschrift für Luftschiffahrt*, Volume 8, Number 7, (1889), pp. 158-162, at 160. *See also*: “Über die Ableitung des Weberschen Grundgesetzes aus dem Dopplerschen Prinzip”, *Physik des Äthers*, Part 1, (1892), pp. 1-3, Part 2, (1894), pp. 13-16, 18-19, 33. These are reprinted in part in “Wissenschaftliche Begründung der Raumzeitlehre oder Relativitätstheorie (1884-1894) mit einem geschichtlichen Anhang”, *Gesammelte Arbeiten von Rudolf Mewes*, Volume 1, Rudolf Mewes, Berlin, (1920), pp. 25-33, 36-47.

2543. J. H. Ziegler, *Die universelle Weltformel und ihre Bedeutung für die wahre Erkenntnis aller Dinge*, 1 Vortrag, Kommissionsverlag Art. Institut Orell Füssli, Zürich, (1902); **and** *Die universelle Weltformel und ihre Bedeutung für die wahre Erkenntnis aller Dinge*, 2 Vortrag, Kommissionsverlag Art. Institut Orell Füssli, Zürich, (1903); **and** *Die wahre Einheit von Religion und Wissenschaft. Vier Abhandlungen von J.H. Ziegler*, 1. Ueber die wahre Bedeutung des Begriffs Natur. 2. Ueber das wahre Wesen der sogenannten Schwerkraft. 3. Ueber der wahre System der chemischen Elemente. 4. Ueber der Sonnengott von Sippar, Kommissionsverlag Art. Institut Orell Füssli, Zürich, (1904); **and** *Die wahre Ursache der hellen Lichtstrahlung des Radiums*, Kommissionsverlag Art. Institut Orell Füssli, Zürich, (1904); Second Improved Edition (1905).

2544. R. Marcolongo, “Sugli integrali delle equazione dell’elettro dinamica”, *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Rendiconti. Classe di scienze fisiche, matematiche e naturali*, Series 5, Volume 15, (1 Semestre, April, 1906), pp. 344-349.

2545. H. Bergson, *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*, G. Allen, New York, Macmillan, (1921).

2546. “Ueber die Entwicklung der Raumvorstellungen”, *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, (1866), translated by Phillip E. B. Jourdain in Mach’s *History and Root of the Principle of the Conservation of Energy*, Open Court, Chicago, (1911), pp. 88-90.

2547. B. Stewart and P. G. Tait, *The Unseen Universe*, Macmillan and Company, London and New York, (1886, 5th Ed. 1876), p. 221.

2548. E. A. Poe, *Eureka*, (1848).

2549. I. Kant, *Kant’s Inaugural Dissertation of 1770: Translated into English, with an Introduction and Discussion*, Columbia University Contributions to Philosophy, Psychology and Education, Volume 1, Number 2, Columbia College, New York, (1894), Section 3, Paragraph 14, p. 62, note 1. *See also*: G. Windred, “The History of Mathematical Time: II”, *Isis*, Volume 20, Number 1, (November, 1933), pp. 192-219, at 203.

2550. D’Alembert, “DIMENSION”, *ENCYCLOPÉDIE, OU DICTIONNAIRE RAISONNÉ DES SCIENCES, DES ARTS ET DES MÉTIERS, PAR UNE SOCIÉTÉ DE GENS DE LETTRES* Volume 4, p. 1010. *See*: R. C. Archibald, “Time as a Fourth Dimension”, *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, Volume 20, Number 8, (May, 1914), pp. 409-412.

2551. J. L. Lagrange (ca. 1797), “Application de Théorie des Fonctions a la Méchanique”, *Œuvres de Lagrange*, Volume 9, Part 3, Chapter 1, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1881), pp. 337-344, at 337. *See also*: J. L. Lagrange, *Mecanique Analytic*, Chez la Veuve Desaint, Paris, (1788); **and** *Théorie des Fonctions Analytiques*, Volume 4, Third Part, Chapter 1, Section 1, Nouvelle édition, Courcier, Paris, (1813); Fourth Edition, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1881). *See also*: G. S. Klügel, “Abmessung”, *Mathematisches Wörterbuch*, Volume 1, E. B. Schwickert, Leipzig, (1803), pp. 3-7, at 7.

2552. J. Locke, *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Chapter 15, Section 12.

2553. H. More, *Enchiridion Metaphysicum: sive de rebus incorporeis succincta et luculenta Dissertatio. Opera Omnia, tum quae Latinè, tum quae Anglicè scripta sunt; nunc vero Latinitate donata*, Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 28, Section 7, E. Fleisher, London, (1671), p. 384 reproduced by Thommes Press, Bristol, England, Dulles, Virginia, (1997). Cf. R. Zimmermann, *Henry More und die vierte Dimension des Raumes*, C. Gerold's Sohn, Wien, (1881).

2554. P. G. Tait and B. Stewart, *The Unseen Universe; or Physical Speculations on a Future State*, Macmillan, London, (1875). **See also:** T. L. Nichols, *The Spiritualist Newspaper: A Record of the Progress of the Science and Ethics of Spiritualism*, London, (12 April 1878), p. 175; **and** (19 April 1878), p. 189. **See also:** M. Wirth, *Herrn Professor Zöllner's Hypothese intelligenter vierdimensionaler Wesen und seine Experimente mit dem amerikanischen Medium Herrn Slade. Ein Vortrag, gehalten am 25. Oct. und 1. Nov., 1878, im Akademisch-Philosophischen Verein zu Leipzig und als Aufruf zur Parteiergreifung an die deutschen Studenten*, O. Mutze, Leipzig, (1878). **See also:** F. Michelis, *Ist die Annahme eines Raumes mit mehr als drei Dimensionen wissenschaftlich berechtigt? eine an die Adresse des Herrn Professor Dr. Zöllner zu Leipzig gerichtete Frage*, Fr. Wagner'schen Buchh., Freiburg in Baden, (1879). **See also:** O. Simony, *Über spiritistische Manifestationen vom naturwissenschaftlichen Standpunkte*, Hartleben, Wien, (1884). **See also:** Charles Garner, under the pseudonym Stuart C. Cumberland, *Besucher aus dem Jenseits*, Breslau, (1885). **See also:** C. Cranz, "Gemeinverständliches über die sogenannte vierte Dimension", *Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge*, New Series, Volume 5, Number 112/113, (1890), pp. 567-636; **and** "Die vierte Dimension in der Astronomie", *Himmel und Erde*, Volume 4, (1891), pp. 55-73. **See also:** E. Carpenter, *From Adam's peak to Elephanta: sketches in Ceylon and India*, MacMillan and S. Sonnenschein, New York, (1892). **See also:** A. Willink, *The World of the Unseen; An Essay on the Relation of Higher Space to Things Eternal*, Macmillan, New York, (1893). **See also:** F. Podmore, *Studies in Psychical Research*, Putnam, New York, (1897); reproduced by Arno Press, New York, (1975); **and** *Modern Spiritualism: A History and a Criticism*, Methuen, London, (1902). **See also:** Schrey von Kalgen, *Dimensionen. Eine neue Weltanschauung. Die Beweis der Zöllnerschen Theorie*, O. Mutze, Leipzig, (1901). **See also:** R. J. Campbell, *The New Theology*, Macmillan, New York, (1907). This work drew sharp criticism, and several books were published in an effort to refute it. **See also:** W. W. Smith, *A Theory of the Mechanism of Survival: The Fourth Dimension and its Applications*, Kegan Paul, London, (1920).

2555. Louis-Sébastien Mercier, *L'an deux mille quatre cent quarante: rêve s'il en fût jamais*, Londres, (1771). English translation: *Memoirs of the Year Two Thousand Five Hundred*, Multiple Editions. **See also:** W. Irving, *Rip Van Winkle*, ca. 1820 in *The Sketch Book*, Multiple Editions. **See also:** A. E. Abbott, *Flatland: A Romance of Many Dimensions*, Seeley, London, (1884). **See also:** A. T. Schofield, *Another World; or the Fourth Dimension*, Swan Sonnenschein, New York, (1888). *See: Nature*, Volume 38, p. 363. **See also:** E. Bellamy, *Looking Backward*, Houghton, Mifflin, (1888). **See also:** M. Twain, *A Connecticut Yankee in King Author's Court*, (1889), Multiple Editions. **See also:** G. Macdonald, *Lilith: A Romance*, Dodd, Mead and Company, New York, (1895). **See also:** H. G. Wells, *The Time Machine*, Heinemann, London, (1895) *see:* Bernard Bergonzi, "The Publication of The Time Machine 1894-5", *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, Volume 11, Number 41, (February, 1960), pp. 42-51; stable JSTOR URL:

<<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0034-6551%28196002%292%3A11%3A41%3C42%3ATPOTTM%3E2.0.CO%3B2-0>>.

H. G. Wells, "The Remarkable Case of Davidson's Eyes", *The Stolen Bacillus and other Incidents*, Methuen, London, (1895); **and** *The Wonderful Visit*, Chapter 7, J. M. Dent, London, (1895), pp. 26ff.; **and** "The Plattner Story", *The Plattner Story and Others*, Methuen, London, (1897); **and** *The Invisible Man: A Grotesque Romance*, C. A. Pearson, London, (1897); **and** "The Stolen Body", *Twelve Stories and Dream*, Macmillan, London, (1903). **See also:** J. Conrad and F. M. Hueffer, *The Inheritors*, Doubleday, Page & Company, New York, (1901). **See also:** A. Robida, *L'Horloge des Siècles*, F. Juven, Paris, (1902). **See also:** D. M. Y. Sommerville, "A Visit from the Fourth Dimension", *College Echoes, St. Andrews University Magazine*, Cupar, Fife, Volume 12, (1901), pp. 166-168; **and** "A Loophole in Space", *College Echoes, St. Andrews University Magazine*, Cupar, Fife, Volume 15, (1904), pp. 106-109. **See also:** W. Busch, *Eduards Traum*, Fourth Edition, Bassermann, München, (1904), p. 18,85. Cf. P. Carus, *Open Court*, Volume 8, Number 4266, (1908), p. 115. **See also:** G. Griffith, *The Mummy and Miss Nitocris: A Phantasy of the Fourth Dimension*, T. Werner Laurie, London, (1906). **See also:** C. H. Hinton, *An Episode of Flatland, or How a Plane Folk Discovered the Third Dimension, to which is Added an Outline of the History of Unæa*, Sonnenschein, London, (1907); reviewed *Nature*, Volume 76, p. 246. D. Burger published a third book on Abbott's "Flatland" theme, *Sphereland*, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York, (1965). **See also:** G. Apollinaire, *Le Roi-Lune*.

2556. J. K. F. Zöllner, *Über die Natur der Cometen. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theorie der Erkenntnis*, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1872); **and** "On Space of Four Dimensions", *Quarterly Journal of Science*, New Series, Volume 8, (1878), pp. 227-237; **and** *Die transcendente Physik und die sogenannte Philosophie; eine deutsche Antwort auf eine "sogenannte wissenschaftliche Frage"*, L. Staackmann, Leipzig, (1879); **and** *Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen*, In Four Volumes, Staackmann, Leipzig, (1878-1881); especially, as noted by Sommerville: "Ueber Wirkungen in die Ferne", Volume 1, Chapter 1, pp. 220 ff. and 272 ff.; "Analogien zwischen den Gesetzen der Elektrodynamik und den Gesetzen der Raumanschauung", Volume 1, Chapter 6, pp. 499 ff.; **and** "Thomson's Dämonen und die Schatten Plato's", Volume 1, Chapter 13, pp. 724ff.; **and** "Zur Metaphysik des Raumes", Volume 2, Chapter 25, pp. 892-941 and 1173-1182; "Die Transcendentale Physik und die sogenannte Philosophie", Volume 3, Vorrede, pp. lxxxvii ff.; Partial English translation by C. C. Massey, *Transcendental Physics: An Account of Experimental Investigations from the Scientific Treatises of Johann Carl Friedrich Zollner*, W. H. Harrison, London, (1880), and Colby & Rich, Boston, (1881); **and** Arno Press, New York, (1976); **and** *Das Skalen-Photometer: ein neues Instrument zur mechanischen Messung des Lichtes; nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte und Theorie der mechansichen Photometrie ; mit . . . einem Nachtrag zum dritten Bande der "Wissenschaftlichen Abhandlungen" über die "Geschichte der vierten Dimension" und die "hypnotischen Versuche des Hrn. Professor Weinhold etc."*, Staackmann, Leipzig, (1879); **and** *Zur Aufklärung des Deutschen Volkes über Inhalt und Aufgabe der Wissenschaftlichen Abhandlungen von F. Zöllner*, Staackmann, Leipzig, (1880).

For the history of this movement, see: C. Cranz, "Gemeinverständliches über die sogenannte vierte Dimension", *Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge*, New Series, Volume 5, Number 112/113, (1890), pp. 567-636; **and** "Die vierte Dimension in der Astronomie", *Himmel und Erde*, Volume 4, (1891), pp. 55-73.

2557. B. Riemann, "Neue mathematische Principien der Naturphilosophie", *Bernhard Riemann's Gesammelte mathematische Werke und wissenschaftlicher Nachlass*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1892), pp. 528-532; reprinted by Dover, New York, (1953). For an analysis of this paper and additional relevant references, see: D. Laugwitz, *Bernhard*

Riemann 1826-1866 Turning Points in the Conception of Mathematics, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (1999), pp. 281-287.

2558. E. Mach, *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, La Salle, Illinois, (1960), footnote pp. 589-591. *See also:* W. M. Wundt, *Der Spiritismus: eine sogenannte wissenschaftliche Frage*, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1879). C. Cranz, “Gemeinverständliches über die sogenannte vierte Dimension”, *Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge*, New Series, Volume 5, Number 112/113, (1890), pp. 567-636; **and** “Die vierte Dimension in der Astronomie”, *Himmel und Erde*, Volume 4, (1891), pp. 55-73.

2559. A. E. Dolbear, *Matter, Ether and Motion*, Lee and Shepard Publishers, Boston, (1894).

2560. T. P. Hall, “The Possibility of a Realization of Four-Fold Space”, *Science*, Volume 19, Number 484, (May 13, 1892), pp. 272-274.

2561. E. C. Sanford, “The Possibility of a Realization of Four-Fold Space”, *Science*, Volume 19, Number 488, (June 10, 1892), p. 332.

2562. H. Schubert, “The Fourth Dimension. Mathematical and Spiritual”, *The Monist*, Volume 3, Number 3, (April, 1893), pp. 402-449, at 449; reprinted in *Mathematic Essays and Recreations*, Open Court, Chicago, (1898), pp. 64-111, at 111; English translation by T. J. McCormack of *Mathematische Mussestunden: Eine Sammlung von Geduldspielen, Kunststücken und Unterhaltungsaufgaben mathematischer Natur*, various editions/publishers.

2563. G. S. Fullerton, “On Space of Four Dimensions”, *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, Volume 18, Number 2, (April, 1884), pp. 113-121.

2564. F. Bacon, *Novum Organum*, URL:

<http://www.constitution.org/bacon/nov_org.htm>

2565. P. G. Tait, “Zöllner’s Scientific Papers”, *Nature*, (28 March 1878), pp. 420-422.

2566. *See:* “Has Einstein Turned Physics into Metaphysics?”, *Current Opinion*, Volume 70, (June, 1921), pp. 803-805.

2567. *See:* C.M. Ingleby, “Transcendent Space”, *Nature*, Volume 1, (January 13, 1870), p. 289; (February 17, 1870), p. 407; **and** “Prof. Clifford on Curved Space”, *Nature*, Volume 7, (February 13, 1873), pp. 282-283; C.M. Ingleby, “The Antinomies of Kant”, *Nature*, Volume 7, (February 6, 1873), p. 262; **and** W. K. Clifford, “The Unreasonable”, *Nature*, Volume 7, (February 13, 1873), p. 282; **and** C.M. Ingleby, “The Unreasonable”, *Nature*, Volume 7, (February 20, 1873), pp. 302-303. *See also:* S. Roberts, “Remarks on Mathematical Terminology, and the Philosophic Bearing of Recent Mathematical Speculations concerning the Realities of Space”, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Volume 14, (November 9, 1882), pp. 5-15, at p. 9. *See also:* A. Cayley, *Presidential Address Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, Southport Meeting, London, (1883), pp. 3-37; **and** *The Collected Mathematical Papers of Arthur Cayley*, Volume 11, Cambridge University Press, (1889-1897), pp. 429-459, at p. 436. *See also:* E. C. Sanford, in response to T. P. Hall’s “The Possibility of a Realization of Four-Fold Space”, *Science*, Volume 19, Number 488, (June 10, 1892), p. 332.; Hall’s paper: *Science*, Volume 19, Number 484, (May 13, 1892), pp. 272-274. *See also:* J. H. Hyslop, “The Fourth Dimension of Space”, *The Philosophical Review*, Volume 5, Number 4, (July, 1896), pp. 352-370. *See also:* L. J. Lafleur, “Time as a Fourth Dimension”, *The Journal of Philosophy*, Volume 37, Number 7, (28 March 1940), pp. 169-178. *See also:* C. T. K. Chari, “On Representations of Time as ‘The Fourth Dimension’ and their Metaphysical Inadequacy (in Discussions)”, *Mind*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 230, (April, 1949), pp. 218-221.

2568. F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring: Herrn Eugen Dührings Umwälzung der Wissenschaft*, Numerous Editions—Numerous Translations (Chinese, Korean, Czech, Hungarian, Spanish, French, Greek, English: *Anti-Dühring: Herr Eugen Dühring’s Revolution in Science*, etc.).

2569. R. Mewes, Dürhing appears in numerous places in Mewes' writings in the *Zeitschrift für Sauerstoff- und Stickstoff-Industrie* (numerous titles through time) which he edited, and in his collected works. E. Mach, *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, La Salle, Illinois, (1960), pp. xxiv, 442, 603. A. Moszkowski, *Einstein: The Searcher*, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1921), pp. 54-56.

2570. J. B. Stallo, "The Concepts and Theories of Modern Physics", *The International Scientific Series*, Volume XLII, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., (1882), p. 269.

2571. J. H. Hyslop, "The Fourth Dimension of Space", *The Physical Review*, Volume 5, Number 4, (July, 1896), pp. 352-370.

2572. E. H. Cutler, "Fourth Dimension Absurdities", with editorial notes by H. P. Manning, *The Fourth Dimension Simply Explained*, Dover, New York, (1960), pp. 60-69, at 60-61.

2573. See: H. P. Manning, *Geometry of Four Dimensions*, Macmillan, New York, (1914); reprinted Dover, U.S.A., (1956), pp. 2-3; G. J. Whitrow, "Why Physical Space has Three Dimensions", *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 6, Number 21, (May, 1955), pp. 13-31, at 18-19; J. Wallis, *A Treatise of Algebra, Both Historical and Practical*, Printed by John Playford for Richard Davis, London, (1685), p. 126; with regards to Michael Stifel, reference is made to his revision of Christoff Rudolff's *Die Coss*, Königsberg, (1553), reprinted *Die Coss Christoffe Rudolffs mit schönen Exempeln der Coss durch Michael Stifel gebessert und sehr gemehrt*, W. Janson, Amsterdam, (1615)—as described by David Eugene Smith, *Rara Arithmetica*, Ginn and Company, Boston, London, New York, (1908), p. 258.

2574. H. P. Manning, *Geometry of Four Dimensions*, Macmillan, New York, (1914); reprinted Dover, U.S.A., (1956), p. 1.

2575. H. P. Manning, *Geometry of Four Dimensions*, Macmillan, New York, (1914); reprinted Dover, U.S.A., (1956), p. 1.

2576. A. Einstein and J. Laub, "Über die elektromagnetischen Grundgleichungen für bewegte Körper", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 26, (1908), p. 532.

2577. A. Einstein, "Erklärung der Perihelbewegung des Merkur aus der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie", *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (1915), pp. 831-839; reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 24; English translation by B. Doyle, *A Source Book in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 1900-1975*, Harvard University Press, (1979), which is reproduced in *The Collected Papers*.

2578. A. Einstein, "Space, Ether and Field in Physics", *Forum Philosophicum*, Volume 1, Number 2, (December, 1930), p. 182.

2579. H. Minkowski, "Space and Time", *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 83.

2580. A. Einstein, *Sidelights on Relativity*, translated by: G. B. Jeffery and W. Perret, Methuen & Co., London, (1922); *republished, unabridged and unaltered*: Dover, New York, (1983), p. 23.

2581. See: W. Pauli, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, 5, 2, 19, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1921), pp. 539-775, at 548; L. Graetz, *Der Äther und die Relativitätstheorie*, J. Engelhorn[']s [successor], Stuttgart, (1923), p. 79; H. Thirring, "Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper und spezielle Relativitätstheorie", *Handbuch der Physik*, Volume 12 ("Theorien der Elektrizität Elektrostatik"), Springer, Berlin, (1927), p. 264, footnote 2.

- 2582.** P. Spiller, *Die Urkraft des Weltalls nach ihrem Wesen und Wirken auf allen Naturgebieten*, Stuhr'schen Buchhandlung, Berlin, (1876), p. 132.
- 2583.** H. A. Lorentz, *Collected Papers*, Volume 5, Martinus Nijhoff, (1937), pp. 3-4; reprint of *Versuch einer Theorie der Electricischen und optischen Erscheinungen in bewegten Körpern*, E. J. Brill, Leiden, (1895); unaltered reprint by B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1906).
- 2584.** H. Schubert, "The Fourth Dimension. Mathematical and Spiritual", *The Monist*, Volume 3, Number 3, (April, 1893), pp. 402-449, at 413-414; reprinted in *Mathematic Essays and Recreations*, Open Court, Chicago, (1898), pp. 64-111, at 75-76; English translation by T. J. McCormack of *Mathematische Mussestunden: Eine Sammlung von Geduldspielen, Kunststücken und Unterhaltungsaufgaben mathematischer Natur*, various editions/publishers.
- 2585.** H. Schubert, "The Fourth Dimension. Mathematical and Spiritual", *The Monist*, Volume 3, Number 3, (April, 1893), pp. 402-449, at 449; reprinted in *Mathematic Essays and Recreations*, Open Court, Chicago, (1898), pp. 64-111, at 111; English translation by T. J. McCormack of *Mathematische Mussestunden: Eine Sammlung von Geduldspielen, Kunststücken und Unterhaltungsaufgaben mathematischer Natur*, various editions/publishers.
- 2586.** E. Wölffing, "Die vierte Dimension", *Die Umschau*, Volume 1, Number 18, (1897), pp. 309-314, at 312.
- 2587.** Archbishop Tillotson, *Sermons*, Fourth Edition, Volume 6, Sermon 6, Chiswell, London, (1704), pp. 156-157.
- 2588.** Quoted in C. L. Poor, "What Einstein Really Did", *Scribner's Magazine*, Volume 88, (July-December 1930), pp. 527-538, at 527. Poor was very much aware of the fact that Einstein would plagiarize known formulas by irrationally asserting known empirical facts as if *a priori* first principles and then pretend to "deduce"—through induction—the hypotheses and equations of his predecessors, to then deduce the same known empirical facts as conclusions from the hypotheses and equations he had taken from others without acknowledgment, in a fallacy of *Petitio Principii*. Charles Lane Poor quoted Anthony Berkeley (a. k. a. A. B. Cox, a. k. a. Francis Iles) in the context of Einstein's fabricated and vague inductions by fallacy of *Petitio Principii*, artfully posing as deductions. Poor also accused Einstein and his coterie of making too hasty of universal generalizations of specific terrestrial phenomena.
- 2589.** Hilbert's proofs are contained in the file: Cod. Ms. D. Hilbert 634, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen. The complete proofs are transcribed in: C. J. Bjerknes, *Anticipations of Einstein in the General Theory of Relativity*, XTX Inc., Downers Grove, Illinois, (2003), pp. 224-248. Facsimiles of the mutilated pages 7 and 8, and page 11 of the proofs are published in: F. Winterberg, "On 'Belated Decision in the Hilbert-Einstein Priority Dispute', published by L. Corry, J. Renn, and J. Stachel", *Zeitschrift für Naturforschung A*, Volume 59a, Number 10, (October, 2004), pp. 715-719, at 716-718.
- 2590.** L. Corry, J. Renn, and J. Stachel, "Belated Decision in the Hilbert-Einstein Priority Dispute", *Science*, Volume 278, (14 November 1997), pp. 1270-1273.
- 2591.** *See:* V. P. Vizgin, "On the Discovery of the Gravitational Field Equations by Einstein and Hilbert: New Materials", *Uspekhi Fizicheskikh Nauk*, Volume 44, Number 12, (2001), pp. 1283-1298. *See also:* D. E. Rowe, "Einstein Meets Hilbert: At the Crossroads of Physics and Mathematics", *Physics in Perspective*, Volume 3, Number 4, (November, 2001), pp. 379-424. *See also:* D. Overbye, *Einstein in Love: A Scientific Romance*, Viking, New York, (2000), pp. 294-295. *See also:* R. Schulmann, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. *liv*, note 20; p. 196, note 3; pp. 222-223, note 2. **and** M. Janssen, *et al.*, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert*

Einstein, Volume 7, Princeton University Press, (2002), p. 139, note 4.

2592. The *Associated Press* covered the story: “Study Confirms Einstein Originated Theory of Relativity”, (18 November 1997); **and** “Study Settles Einstein Theories”, (18 November 1997). **See also:** C. Suplee, “Researchers Definitively Rule Einstein Did Not Plagiarize Relativity Theory”, *The Washington Post*, (14 November 1997), p. A24. **See also:** *Daily Mail*, London, (14 November 1997), p. 37. **See also:** “Einstein Cleared of Stealing His Greatest Discovery”, *The Record*, Kitchner-Waterloo, Ontario, (14 November 1997), p. A11. **See also:** “Research Shows Einstein didn’t Steal Ideas for Theory”, *Calgary Herald*, (14 November 1997), p. A7. **See also:** “Einstein’s Rival was Relatively Late with Solution: Investigation Removes Stigma of Plagiarism from Scientist’s Milestone Theory”, *The Ottawa Citizen*, (14 November 1997), p. A13; Byline Roger Highfield, *The Daily Telegraph*. **See also:** “Albert Einstein”, *Chicago Sun-Times*, (16 November 1997), p. 44. **See also:** “Asides”, *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, (16 November 1997), Editorial Section, p. C-2. **See also:** W. J. Broad, “Findings Back Einstein In a Plagiarism Dispute”, *The New York Times*, (18 November 1997), p. F2. **See also:** “Einstein”, Television Broadcast WFSB-TV Eyewitness News, (18 November 1997, 5:00-5:30 PM Eastern Time). **See also:** “Albert Einstein”, Radio Broadcast WMAQ-AM All News, (18 November 1997, 3:00-4:00 PM). **See also:** “After All This Space-Time, Einstein is Cleared of Plagiarism”, *Canadian Business and Current Affairs: Globe & Mail Metro Edition*, (22 November 1997). **See also:** “Somewhere, Einstein must be Smiling”, *St. Petersburg Times*, (23 November 1997), Perspective, Editorials Section, p. 2D. **See also:** “Einstein Weathers the Gale”, *Rocky Mountain News*, (22 November 1997), Editorial Section F, p. 69A. **See also:** “Einsteins Ehrenrettung: Physiker ist alleiniger Vater der allgemeinen Relativitaetstheorie”, *Sueddeutsche Zeitung*, (27 November 1997). **See also:** “After Decades of Doubt, Experts Give Einstein His Due, Relatively Speaking: His Theory Came First, Journal Says”, *Star Tribune*, Minneapolis, (28 November 1997), p. 29.A. **See also:** “Einstein Cleared”, *The Jerusalem Post*, (30 November 1997), p. 10. **See also:** “Einstein did not Plagiarize Hilbert’s Relativity Theory, Study Concludes”, *St. Louis Dispatch*, (7 December 1997), p. A.11. **See also:** “Searching for Math’s Holy Grail: The Misadventures of Those Who Tackled—and Finally Solved—”, *The San Francisco Chronicle*, (7 December 1997), Sunday Review Section, p. 5. **See also:** “Einstein und Hilbert”, *Neue Zuercher Zeitung*, (12 December 1997), Briefe and die NZZ Section, p. 71. **See also:** R. Scharf, “Allgemeine Relativitaetstheorie nicht von Hilbert beendet Historische Klarstellung”, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, (14 January 1998).

2593. C. J. Bjerknes, *Albert Einstein : The Incurable Plagiarist*, XTX Inc., Downers Grove, Illinois, (2002).

2594. F. Winterberg, “On ‘Belated Decision in the Hilbert-Einstein Priority Dispute’, published by L. Corry, J. Renn, and J. Stachel”, *Zeitschrift für Naturforschung A*, Volume 59a, Number 10, (October, 2004), pp. 715-719.

2595. C. J. Bjerknes, “A Theory of Einstein the Irrational Plagiarist”, *The Canberra Times*, (19 September 2002).

2596. *Infinite Energy Magazine*, Volume 8, Number 49, (May/June, 2003), pp. 65-68.

2597. T. Sauer, “The Relativity of Discovery: Hilbert’s First Note on the Foundations of Physics”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 53, Number 6, (1999), pp. 529-575.

2598. *English:* A. A. Logunov, M. A. Mestvirishvili and V. A. Petrov, “How Were the Hilbert-Einstein Equations Discovered?” *Physics-USpekhi*, Volume 47, Number 6, (June, 2004), pp. 607-621. *Russian:* A. A. Logunov, M. A. Mestvirishvili and V. A. Petrov, “How were the Hilbert-Einstein equations discovered?” *Uspekhi Fizicheskikh Nauk*, Volume 174, Number 6, (2004), pp. 663-678.

- 2599.** V. P. Vizgin, “On the discovery of the gravitational field equations by Einstein and Hilbert: new materials”, *Uspekhi Fizicheskikh Nauk*, Volume 44, Number 12, (2001), pp. 1283-1298.
- 2600.** *English:* A. A. Logunov, M. A. Mestvirishvili and V. A. Petrov, “How Were the Hilbert-Einstein Equations Discovered?” *Physics-Uspekhi*, Volume 47, Number 6, (June, 2004), pp. 607-621. *Russian:* A. A. Logunov, M. A. Mestvirishvili and V. A. Petrov, “How were the Hilbert-Einstein equations discovered?” *Uspekhi Fizicheskikh Nauk*, Volume 174, Number 6, (2004), pp. 663-678.
- 2601.** C. Suplee, “Researchers Definitively Rule Einstein Did Not Plagiarize Relativity Theory”, *The Washington Post*, (14 November 1997), p. A24.
- 2602.** L. Corry, J. Renn and J. Stachel, “Belated Decision in the Hilbert-Einstein Priority Dispute”, *Science*, Volume 278, (14 November 1997), pp. 1270-1273, at 1271.
- 2603.** A redacted quote from: J. Renn and J. Stachel’s quotation of Thorne’s words, “Hilbert’s Foundation of Physics: From a Theory of Everything to a Constituent of General Relativity”, Preprint 118, Max-Planck-Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte, (1999), p. 1. The authors cite: K. S. Thorne, *Black Holes and Time Warps: Einstein's Outrageous Legacy*, W. W. Norton, New York, London, (1994), p. 117.
- 2604.** M. Planck, “Zur Dynamik bewegter Systeme”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, Volume 13, (13 June 1907), pp. 541-570. A. Einstein, “Über das Relativitätsprinzip und die aus demselben gezogenen Folgerung”, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 4, (1908), pp. 411-462, at 414.
- 2605.** D. Hilbert, “Mathematische Probleme”, *Nachrichten von der Königlich Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1900), pp. 253-297. English translation by M. W. Newson, “Mathematical Problems”, *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, Volume 8, (1902), pp. 437-479.
- 2606.** T. Sauer, “The Relativity of Discovery: Hilbert’s First Note on the Foundations of Physics”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 53, Number 6, (1999), pp. 529-575, at 540-541 and 555.
- 2607.** A. Einstein, “Zur allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie (Nachtrag)”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (1915), pp. 799-801; which was submitted on 11 November 1915 and was published on 18 November 1915. This article is reprinted in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 22. A. Einstein, “Erklärung der Perihelbewegung des Merkur aus der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (1915), pp. 803, 831-839; pp. 831-839 are reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 24; English translation by B. Doyle, “Explanation of the Perihelion Motion of Mercury from the General Theory of Relativity”, *A Source Book in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 1900-1975*, Harvard University Press, (1979), which is reproduced in *The Collected Papers*.
- 2608.** Hilbert to Einstein, A. M. Hentschel translator, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 140, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 144. In conformity with the original German text, I have replaced “handsome” with “beautiful”.
- 2609.** Einstein to Hilbert, A. M. Hentschel translator, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 144, Princeton University Press, (1998), pp. 146-147.
- 2610.** Einstein to Hilbert, A. M. Hentschel translator, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 148, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 148.
- 2611.** H. Weyl, *Space-Time-Matter*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 239.

2612. Letter from G. Herglotz to D. Hilbert, date not known, SUB Cod. Ms. Hilbert 147. Citation from: T. Sauer, “The Relativity of Discovery: Hilbert’s First Note on the Foundations of Physics”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 53, Number 6, (1999), pp. 529-575, at 568, note 156.

2613. T. Sauer, “The Relativity of Discovery: Hilbert’s First Note on the Foundations of Physics”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 53, Number 6, (1999), pp. 529-575, at 568, note 156.

2614. T. Sauer, “The Relativity of Discovery: Hilbert’s First Note on the Foundations of Physics”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 53, Number 6, (1999), pp. 529-575, at 545.

2615. See: W. Kaufmann, “Über die Konstitution des Elektrons”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1905), pp. 949-956; **and** “Über die Konstitution des Elektrons”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 19, (1906), pp. 487-553. M. Planck, “Das Prinzip der Relativität und die Grundgleichungen der Mechanik”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 8, (1906), pp. 136-141; **and** “Die Kaufmannschen Messungen der Ablenkbarkeit der β -Strahlen in ihrer Bedeutung für die Dynamik der Elektronen”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift* Volume 7, Number 21, (1906), pp. 753-759, with a discussion on pp. 759-761. A. H. Bucherer, “Messungen an Becquerelstrahlen. Die experimentelle Bestätigung der Lorentz-Einsteinschen Theorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 9, Number 22, (November 1, 1908), pp. 755-762. P. Frank, “Die Stellung des Relativitätsprinzips im System der Mechanik und der Elektrodynamik”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, Volume 118, (1909), pp. 373-446, at 376. M. Born, “Zur Kinematik des starren Körpers im System des Relativitätsprinzips”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1910), pp. 161-179, at 161. W. Ritz, “Das Prinzip der Relativität in der Optik. (Antrittsrede zur Habilitation.)”, *Gesammelte Werke: Œuvres Publiées par la Société Suisse de Physique*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1911), pp. 509-518, at 516. E. Cohn, “Physikalisches über Raum und Zeit”, *Himmel und Erde*, Volume 23, (1911), pp. 117ff.; *Physikalisches über Raum und Zeit*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, Berlin, (1911). H. Weyl, *Space-Time-Matter*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 165, 172, 327. E. Freundlich, *The Foundations of Einstein’s Theory of Gravitation*, Second Edition, Methuen & Co., London, (1924). A. Reuterdahl, *Scientific Theism Versus Materialism*, The Devin-Adair Company, New York, (1920), pp. 174, 267, and 268. F. A. Lindemann, “Introduction” dated “March, 1920” in M. Schlick, *Space and Time in Contemporary Physics*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1920), p. iv. H. Reichenbach, *The Philosophy of Space & Time*, Dover, New York, (1958), p. 161.

2616. D. Hilbert, “Die Grundlagen der Physik, (Erste Mitteilung.) Vorgelegt in der Sitzung vom 20. November 1915.”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1915), pp. 395-407. Hilbert followed this article with: “Die Grundlagen der Physik, (Zweite Mitteilung.)”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1917), pp. 53-76; **and** “Die Grundlagen der Physik”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 92, (1924), pp. 1-32.

2617. A. Einstein, “Die Feldgleichungen der Gravitation”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (1915), pp. 844-847; reprinted in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 25. This was submitted 25 November 1915 and was published 2 December 1915.

2618. In the republication of Felix Klein's "Zu Hilberts erster Note über die Grundlagen der Physik", *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1917), pp. 469-482; in F. Klein, *Gesammelte mathematische Abhandlungen*, Volume 1, Chapter 31, Springer, Berlin, (1921), pp. 553-567, at 566; a notation points out that it was Hilbert who *deduced* the field equations in a *scientific synthesis*, before Einstein, while Einstein simply asserted them (in a fallacy of *Petitio Principii* posing as an *inductive analysis*). Einstein, himself, acknowledged that Hilbert provided the *deductive synthesis*, which produced the equations, in Einstein's 1916 paper on Hamilton's principle.

2619. Letter from M. Born to D. Hilbert of 23 November 1915, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, Cod. Ms. D. Hilbert 40 A: Nr. 11; the relevant part of which is reproduced in D. Wuensch, „zwei wirkliche Kerle“: *Neues zur Entdeckung der Gravitationsgleichungen der Allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie durch Albert Einstein und David Hilbert*, Termessos, Göttingen, (2005), pp. 73-74.

2620. See: Letter from A. Einstein to A. Sommerfeld of 2 February 1916, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 186, Princeton University Press, (1998).

2621. J. Mehra, *Einstein, Hilbert, and the Theory of Gravitation*, D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, Holland, Boston, (1974), p. 44. H. A. Lorentz, "Over Einstein's Theorie der Zwaartekracht. I, II, & III", *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 24, (1916), pp. 1389-1402, 1759-1774; Volume 25, (1916), pp. 468-486; English translation, "On Einstein's Theory of Gravitation. I, II & III", *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 19, (1917), pp. 1341-1354, 1354-1369; Volume 20, (1917), pp. 2-19, 20; reprinted in *Collected Papers*, Volume 5, M. Nijhoff, The Hague, (1934-39), pp. 246-313.

2622. H. Reichenbach, *The Philosophy of Space & Time*, Dover, New York, (1958), pp. 254-255.

2623. Einstein to Zangger, A. M. Hentschel translator, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 152, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 151. Hilbert described his theory as being of ideal beauty both in his letter to Einstein and in his lecture of 20 November 1915, as is stated in the second paragraph of both the proofs and the published paper.

2624. A. Einstein, "Zur Theorie der Gravitation", *Sitzungsberichte der Naturforschende Gesellschaft in Zürich. Vierteljahrsschrift* 59., Part 2, (1914), pp. iv-vi. A. Einstein and A. Fokker, "Nordströmsche Gravitationstheorie vom Standpunkt des absoluten Differentialkalküls", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 44, (1914), pp. 321-328.

2625. A. Einstein, "Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 49, Number 7, (1916), pp. 769-822, at 810. Reprinted *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 30.

2626. A. Einstein to A. Sommerfeld, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 96. It is not within the scope of this paper to thoroughly investigate the role of Grossmann and the tragedy of Einstein's betrayal of his trust. There is already extensive literature on this subject.

2627. A. Einstein, "Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 49, Number 7, (1916), pp. 769-822, at 769, 810. *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), pp. 109-164.

2628. A. Einstein, English translation by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 167, (1998), p. 163.

2629. J. Mehra, *Einstein, Hilbert, and the Theory of Gravitation*, D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, Holland, Boston, (1974), p. 84.

2630. D. Hilbert, “Die Grundlagen der Physik, (Erste Mitteilung.) Vorgelegt in der Sitzung vom 20. November 1915.”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1915), pp. 395-407, at 405.

2631. D. Hilbert, “Die Grundlagen der Physik”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 92, (1924), pp. 1-32, at 2. J. Mehra, *Einstein, Hilbert, and the Theory of Gravitation*, D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, Holland, Boston, (1974), p. 84.

2632. In addition to the quotations presented here, see: A. J. Kox, *et al.* Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 31, Notes 3 and 4, Princeton University Press, (1996), p. 346. See also: A. J. Kox, *et al.* Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part A, Document 278, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 366.

2633. A. Einstein, “Hamilton’s Principle and the General Theory of Relativity”, *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 167. This is an English translation of “Hamiltonsches Prinzip und allgemeine Relativitätstheorie”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (1916), pp. 1111-1116, at 1111. Reprinted in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 41.

2634. A. Einstein, *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), pp. 191-193. “T” has been substituted for “ \mathfrak{Z} ”.

2635. E. Wiechert, “Perihelbewegung des Merkur und die allgemeine Mechanik”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (26 February 1916), pp. 124-141, at 124-125, 137; republished, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 17, (1916), pp. 442-448. Wiechert notes that the inertial-gravitational mass equivalence is an *a posteriori* problem, not an *a priori* principle, at page 126.

2636. Letter from G. Mie to D. Hilbert of 13 February 1916, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, Cod. Ms. David Hilbert 254; cited in D. Wuensch, „zwei wirkliche Kerle“ *Neues zur Entdeckung der Gravitationsgleichungen der Allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie durch Albert Einstein und David Hilbert*, Termessos, Göttingen, (2005), p. 91.

2637. F. Klein, “Zu Hilberts erster Note über die Grundlagen der Physik”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1917), pp. 469-482; republished with notations in F. Klein, *Gesammelte mathematische Abhandlungen*, Volume 1, Chapter 31, Springer, Berlin, (1921), pp. 553-567. **See also:** Letter from Klein to W. Pauli, *Wissenschaftlicher Briefwechsel mit Bohr, Einstein, Heisenberg, u. a. = Scientific correspondence with Bohr, Einstein, Heisenberg, a. o.*, Springer, New York, (1979), pp. 27-28. **See also:** F. Klein, “Fragen zu Einstein”, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, Cod. Ms. Felix Klein 22B, pp. 89-93, at 92-93; cited in D. Wuensch, „zwei wirkliche Kerle“ *Neues zur Entdeckung der Gravitationsgleichungen der Allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie durch Albert Einstein und David Hilbert*, Termessos, Göttingen, (2005), pp. 88-90.

2638. H. Weyl, “Gravitation and Electricity”, *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 212; **and** *Space-Time-Matter*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 239.

2639. W. Pauli, “Relativitätstheorie” *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen*, Volume 5, Part 2, Chapter 19, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1921), pp. 539-775; English translation by G. Field, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press,

New York, (1958).

2640. F. Kottler, “Gravitation und Relativitätstheorie”, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen*, Volume 6, Part 2, Chapter 22a, pp. 159-237, at 199. *See also:* Kottler’s letter to Einstein of 30 March 1918, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Part B, Document 495, Princeton University Press, (1998), pp. 702-708.

2641. J. Larmor, “On the Nature and Amount of the Gravitational Deflexion of Light”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 45, Number 265, (January, 1923), pp. 243-256, at 250.

2642. W. C. Dampier, *A History of Science and its Relations with Philosophy and Religion*, Cambridge University Press, (1932), p. 427.

2643. E. Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), pp. 76, 159, 170-175.

2644. J. Mehra, *Einstein, Hilbert, and the Theory of Gravitation*, D. Reidel, Dordrecht, Holland, Boston, (1974).

2645. J. Earman and C. Glymour, “Einstein and Hilbert: Two Months in the History of General Relativity”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 19, Number 3, (1978), pp. 291-308, at 300-302.

2646. T. Sauer, “The Relativity of Discovery: Hilbert’s First Note on the Foundations of Physics”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 53, Number 6, (1999), pp. 529-575, at 545.

2647. T. Sauer, “The Relativity of Discovery: Hilbert’s First Note on the Foundations of Physics”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 53, Number 6, (1999), pp. 529-575, at 546.

2648. *Private Communication*

2649. A. Einstein, quoted in *The Expanded Quotable Einstein*, collected and edited by A. Calaprice, Princeton University Press, (2000), pp. 306-307.

2650. A. Einstein quoted in M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 153.

2651. A. Einstein quoted in M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 39.

2652. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 102.

2653. R. Highfield and P. Carter, *The Private Lives of Albert Einstein*, St. Martin’s Press, New York, (1993), pp. 153-154. The authors propose the possibility of “an innocent explanation” for Mileva’s condition, but their suggestion is unpersuasive.

2654. G. J. Whitrow, Editor, *Einstein: The Man and his Achievement*, Dover, New York, (1967), p. 21.

2655. M. Zackheim, *Einstein’s Daughter, the Search for Lieserl*, Riverhead Books, Penguin Putnam, New York, (1999).

2656. M. Winteler-Einstein, English translation by A. Beck, “Albert Einstein—A Biographical Sketch”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987), pp. xv-xxii, at xviii.

2657. P. Micheltore, *Einstein, Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, New York, (1962), p. 43. M. Marić to H. Savić, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Document 125, Princeton University Press, (1987).

2658. Michele Zackheim, *Einstein’s Daughter, the Search for Lieserl*, Riverhead Books, Penguin Putnam, New York, (1999), p. 244.

- 2659.** “Deposition in Divorce Proceedings” English translation by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 676, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 713. *See also:* M. Zackheim, *Einstein’s Daughter, the Search for Lieserl*, Riverhead Books, Penguin Putnam, New York, (1999), pp. 78-79.
- 2660.** M. White and J. Gribbin, *Einstein, A Life in Science*, Plume, New York, (1995), p. 123.
- 2661.** *See:* A. Einstein to Ilse Einstein, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 536, Princeton University Press, (1998); **and** Ilse Einstein to Georg Nikolai, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 545, Princeton University Press, (1998).
- 2662.** Ilse Einstein to Georg Nikolai, English translation by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 545, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 565. *See also:* D. Overbye, *Einstein in Love: A Scientific Romance*, Viking, New York, (2000), pp. 343, 404, note 22. *See also:* A. Einstein to Ilse Einstein, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 536, Princeton University Press, (1998).
- 2663.** Letter from A. Einstein to “Berlin-Schöneberg Office of Taxation” of 10 February 1920, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 306, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 256-257, at 257.
- 2664.** D. Overbye, *Einstein in Love: A Scientific Romance*, Viking, New York, (2000), pp. 343, 404, note 22. *See:* A. Einstein to Ilse Einstein, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 536, Princeton University Press, (1998); **and** Ilse Einstein to Georg Nikolai, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 545, Princeton University Press, (1998).
- 2665.** A. Einstein quoted in M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 8.
- 2666.** P. Frank, *Einstein: His Life and Times*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1947), p. 293.
- 2667.** R. Highfield and P. Carter, *The Private Lives of Albert Einstein*, St. Martin’s Press, New York, (1993), p. 148.
- 2668.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, “Einstein’s Roving Eye”, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), pp. 127-135.
- 2669.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 25.
- 2670.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 86, *see also:* p. 117.
- 2671.** C. J. Bjerknes, *Albert Einstein: The Incurable Plagiarist*, XTX Inc., Downer Grove, Illinois, (2002). *See also:* P. Langevin, “Le Physicien”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 20, Number 5, (September, 1913), pp. 675-718. *See also:* H. A. Lorentz, “Deux mémoires de Henri Poincaré sur la physique mathématique”, *Acta Mathematica*, Volume 38, (1921), pp. 293-308; reprinted in *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 683-695; **and** Volume 11, (1956), pp. 247-261. *See also:* W. Pauli, “Relativitätstheorie”, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen*, Volume 5, Part 2, Chapter 19, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1921), pp. 539-775; English translation by G. Field, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, London, Edinburgh, New York, Toronto, Sydney, Paris, Braunschweig, (1958). *See also:* H. Thirring, “Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper und spezielle Relativitätstheorie”, *Handbuch der Physik*, Volume 12 (“Theorien der Elektrizität Elektrostatik”), Springer, Berlin, (1927), pp. 245-348, *especially* 264, 270, 275, 283. *See also:* S. Guggenheimer, *The Einstein Theory Explained and Analyzed*, Macmillan, New York, (1929). *See also:* J. Mackaye, *The Dynamic Universe*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1931). *See also:* J. Le Roux, “Le Problème

de la Relativité d'Après les Idées de Poincaré”, *Bulletin de la Société Scientifique de Bretagne*, Volume 14, (1937), pp. 3-10. **See also:** Sir Edmund Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume II, Philosophical Library Inc., New York, (1954), especially pp. 27-77; **and** “Albert Einstein”, *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the Royal Society*, Volume 1, (1955), pp. 37-67. **See also:** G. H. Keswani, “Origin and Concept of Relativity, Parts I, II & III”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 15, Number 60, (February, 1965), pp. 286-306; Volume 16, Number 61, (May, 1965), pp.19-32; Volume 16, Number 64, (February, 1966), pp. 273-294; **and** Volume 17, Number 2, (August, 1966), pp. 149- 152; Volume 17, Number 3, (November, 1966), pp. 234-236. **See also:** G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, “Intimations of Relativity before Einstein”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (December, 1983), pp. 343-354. **See also:** G. B. Brown, “What is Wrong with Relativity?”, *Bulletin of the Institute of Physics and the Physical Society*, Volume 18, Number 3, (March, 1967), pp. 71-77. **See also:** C. Cuvaj, “Henri Poincaré’s Mathematical Contributions to Relativity and the Poincaré Stresses”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 36, (1968), pp. 1109-1111. **See also:** C. Giannoni, “Einstein and the Lorentz-Poincaré Theory of Relativity”, *PSA: Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*, Volume 1970, (1970), pp. 575-589. JSTOR link:

<<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0270-8647%281970%291970%3C575%3AEATLTO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Z>>

See also: J. Mehra, *Einstein, Hilbert, and the Theory of Gravitation*, Reidel, Dordrecht, Netherlands, (1974). **See also:** W. Kantor, *Relativistic Propagation of Light*, Coronado Press, Lawrence, Kansas, (1976). **See also:** R. McCormach, “Editor’s Forward”, *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences*, Volume 7, (1976), pp. xi-xxxv. **See also:** H. Ives, D. Turner, J. J. Callahan, R. Hazelett, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers*, Devin-Adair Co., Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979). **See also:** J. Leveugle, “Henri Poincaré et la Relativité”, *La Jaune et la Rouge*, Volume 494, (April, 1994), pp. 29-51; **and** *La Relativité, Poincaré et Einstein, Planck, Hilbert: Histoire véridique de la Théorie de la Relativité*, L’Harmattan, Paris, (2004). **See also:** A. A. Logunov, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995); **and** *The Theory of Gravity*, Nauka, Moscow, (2001). **See also:** E. Gianetto, “The Rise of Special Relativity: Henri Poincaré’s Works before Einstein”, *ATTI DEL XVIII CONGRESSO DI STORIA DELLA FISICA E DELL’ASTRONOMICA*, pp. 172-207; URL:

<<http://www.brera.unimi.it/Atti-Como-98/Gianetto.pdf>>

See also: S. G. Bernatosian, *Vorovstvo i obman v nauke*, Erudit, St. Petersburg, (1998), ISBN: 5749800059. **See also:** U. Bartocci, *Albert Einstein e Olinto De Pretto: La vera storia della formula piu famosa del mondo*, Societa Editrice Andromeda, Bologna, (1999). **See also:** Jean-Paul Auffray, *Einstein et Poincaré: sur les Traces de la Relativité*, Le Pommier, Paris, (1999).

2672. E. Gehrcke, “Zur Kritik und Geschichte der neueren Gravitationstheorien”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 51, (1916), pp. 119-124; reprinted *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp.40-44.

2673. Letter from A. Einstein to W. Wien of 17 October 1916, translated by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 267, Princeton

University Press, (1998), p. 255.

2674. W. H. McCrea, “The Evolution of Theories of Space-Time and Mechanics”, *Philosophy of Science*, Volume 6, Number 2, (April, 1939), pp. 137-162, at 147-148.

2675. A. Pais, *Einstein Lived Here*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1994), p. 15. **See also:** A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein, A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), pp. 315, 375.

2676. R. W. Clarck, *Einstein, the Life and Times*, World Publishing Company, USA, (1971), p. 122.

2677. A. Reiser (Rudolf Kayser), *Albert Einstein, a Biographical Portrait*, Albert & Charles Boni, New York, (1930), p. 51.

2678. D. Brian, *Einstein, A Life*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, (1996), pp. 1, 3.

2679. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), pp. 1, 2, 18. F. Klein to W. Pauli, *Wissenschaftlicher Briefwechsel mit Bohr, Einstein, Heisenberg, u.a. = Scientific correspondence with Bohr, Einstein, Heisenberg, a.o.*, Document 10, Springer, New York, (1979), p. 27.

2680. C. Nordmann, *L'illustration*, (15 April 1922).

2681. *Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger*, (23 March 1921). E. Gehrcke, *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie*, and *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), p. 74.

2682. Quoted in R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, World Publishing, New York, (1971), pp. 286-287. Clark cites: C. Nordmann, *L'illustration*, (15 April 1922).

2683. P. Michelmore, *Einstein: Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, New York, (1962), p. 35.

2684. A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein: A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), p. 333.

2685. P. Halsman, *Einstein: A Centenary Volume*, Harvard University Press, (1980), p. 27.

2686. P. Michelmore, *Einstein: Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, New York, (1962), p. 75.

2687. F. Klein, “Über die Integralform der Erhaltungssätze und die Theorie der räumlich geschlossenen Welt”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1918), pp. 394-423.

2688. Letter from F. Klein to W. Pauli of 8 March 1921, in: *Wissenschaftlicher Briefwechsel mit Bohr, Einstein, Heisenberg, u.a. = Scientific correspondence with Bohr, Einstein, Heisenberg, a.o.*, Document 10, Springer, New York, (1979), pp. 27-28, at 27. **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to F. Klein of 14 April 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 22, Princeton University Press, (2004).

2689. J. Plesch quoted in R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, The World Publishing Company, (1971), p. 348.

2690. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), pp. 8-9.

2691. “Expert on Writing Amazes Einstein”, *The New York Times*, (23 February 1930), p. 53.

2692. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 114. A. E. Dolbear, *Matter, Ether, and Motion*, Second Revised and Enlarged Edition, Lee and Shepard, Boston, (1894), pp. 354-395.

2693. D. Brian, *Einstein: A Life*, J. Wiley, New York, (1996), pp. 215-216.

2694. U. Sinclair, *Mental Radio*, Thomas, Springfield, Illinois, (1930).

2695. D. Brian, *Einstein: A Life*, J. Wiley, New York, (1996), p. 216.

2696. D. Brian, *Einstein: A Life*, J. Wiley, New York, (1996), p. 216. Brian cites: M. C. Sinclair, *Southern Belle*, Crown, New York, (1957), p. 340.

2697. D. Brian, *Einstein: A Life*, J. Wiley, New York, (1996), p. 216. Brian cites: “”Millionaires Offered \$ to sit Next and Violin Offered”, *Outlook and Independent*, (24 December 1930).

- 2698.** P. Micheltore, *Einstein: Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, New York, (1962), p. 52.
- 2699.** R. S. Shankland, "Conversations with Albert Einstein", *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 52.
- 2700.** P. Micheltore, *Einstein: Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, New York, (1962), p. 48. G. J. Whitrow, Editor, *Einstein: The Man and his Achievement*, Dover, New York, (1967), p. 19.
- 2701.** M. Zackheim, *Einstein's Daughter, The Search for Lieserl*, Riverhead Books, (1999), p. 100.
- 2702.** Carl Seelig, *Albert Einstein*, Europa Verlag, Zürich, (1960), p. 130.
- 2703.** A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein, A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), p. 243.
- 2704.** S. Walter, "Minkowski, Mathematicians, and the Mathematical Theory of Relativity", in H. Goenner, et al., Editors, *The Expanding Worlds of General Relativity*, Birkhauser, Boston, (1999), pp. 45-86.
- 2705.** M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 1; and "Physics and Relativity", *Physics in my Generation*, 2nd rev. ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, (1969), p. 101. A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein: A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), p. 243.
- 2706.** M. Born, *My Life: Recollections of a Nobel Laureate*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, (1975), p. 131.
- 2707.** Letter from A. Einstein to P. Ehrenfest of 2 February 1920, A. Hentschel, translator, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 294, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 246-247, at 246.
- 2708.** Letter from P. Ehrenfest to A. Einstein of 8 February 1920, A. Hentschel, translator, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 303, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 251-254, at 252.
- 2709.** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, (1982), pp. 67-68.
- 2710.** A. Einstein, translated by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987), p. 16.
- 2711.** A. M. Hentschel, Translator, A. Einstein to P. Hertz, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 111, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 122.
- 2712.** A. Einstein's letter to F. Klein of 26 March 1917 translated by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 319, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 311.
- 2713.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992).
- 2714.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), pp. 24, 95. "Einstein Sees Boston; Fails on Edison Test", *The New York Times*, (18 May 1921), p. 15.
- 2715.** T. Sauer, "The Relativity of Discovery: Hilbert's First Note on the Foundations of Physics", *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 53, Number 6, (1999), pp. 529-575, at 539.
- 2716.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), pp. 24-25.
- 2717.** *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), pp. 1, 13, at 13.
- 2718.** L. Infeld, *Quest—An Autobiography*, Chelsea, New York, (1980), p. 258.
- 2719.** See: H. Goenner, "The Reaction to Relativity Theory. I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920", *Science in Context*, Volume 6, Number 1, (1993), pp. 107-133, at 111.
- 2720.** See: "Einstein Ignores Capt. See", *The New York Times*, (18 October 1924), p. 17.

2721. “Challenges Prof. Einstein: St. Paul Professor Asserts Relativity Theory Was Advanced in 1866”, *The New York Times*, (10 April 1921), p. 21. **See also:** “Einstein Charged with Plagiarism”, *New York American*, (11 April 1921). **See also:** “Einstein Refuses to Debate Theory”, *New York American*, (12 April 1921).

2722. *See:* *The New York Times*, (4 April 1922), p. 21.

2723. “Cardinal Doubts Einstein”, *The New York Times*, (8 April 1929), p. 4. **See also:** “Einstein Ignores Cardinal”, *The New York Times*, (9 April 1929), p. 10. **See also:** “Cardinal Opposes Einstein”, *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, (8 April 1929), p. 33. **See also:** “Cardinal Hits at Einstein Theory”, *The Minneapolis Journal*, (8 April 1929). **See also:** “Cardinal Gives Further Views on Einstein”, *Boston Evening American*, (12 April 1929). **See also:** “Cardinal Warns Against Destructive Theories”, *The Pilot* [Roman Catholic Newspaper, Boston], (13 April 1929), pp. 1-2. **See also:** “Vatican Paper Praises Critic of Dr. Einstein”, *The Minneapolis Morning Journal*, (24 May 1929).

2724. *See:* M. Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge*, University of Chicago Press, (1958), p. 13; **and** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, (1982), pp. 113-114; **and** W. Broad and N. Wade, *Betrayers of the Truth: Fraud and Deceit in the Halls of Science*, Simon & Schuster, New York, (1982), p. 139.

2725. *See:* *The New York Times*, (24 February 1936), p. 7.

2726. R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57; **and** “Conversations with Albert Einstein. II”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 41, Number 7, (July, 1973), pp. 895-901.

2727. R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 54.

2728. A. Einstein quoted in R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, The World Publishing Company, (1971), p. 261; referencing A. Einstein to A. Sommerfeld, in A. Hermann. *Briefwechsel. 60 Briefe aus dem goldenen Zeitalter der modernen Physik*, Schwabe & Co., Basel, Stuttgart, (1968), p. 69.

2729. J. Renn quoted by C. Suplee, “Researchers Definitively Rule Einstein Did Not Plagiarize Relativity Theory”, *The Washington Post*, (14 November 1997), p. A24.

2730. A. Einstein, “Erklärung der Perihelbewegung des Merkur aus der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (1915), pp. 831-839; reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 24; English translation by B. Doyle, “Explanation of the Perihelion Motion of Mercury from the General Theory of Relativity”, *A Source Book in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 1900-1975*, Harvard University Press, (1979), which is reproduced in *The Collected Papers*.

2731. *See:* J. Starck, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 38, (1912), p. 467. A. Einstein, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 38, (1912), p. 888.

2732. J. G. v. Soldner, “Ueber die Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahls von seiner geradlinigen Bewegung, durch die Attraktion eines Weltkörpers, an welchem er nahe vorbei geht”, [*Berliner*] *Astronomisches Jahrbuch für das Jahr 1804*, pp. 161-172; reprinted in the relevant part with P. Lenard’s analysis in, “Über die Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahls von seiner geradlinigen Bewegung durch die Attraktion eines Weltkörpers, an welchem er nahe vorbeigeht; von J. Soldner, 1801”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 65, (1921), pp. 593-604; English translation in S. L. Jaki, “Johann Georg von Soldner and the Gravitational Bending of Light, with an English Translation of His Essay on It Published in 1801”, *Foundations of Physics*, Volume 8, (1978), pp. 927-950; critical response by M. v. Laue, “Erwiderung auf Hrn. Lenards Vorbemerkungen zur Soldnerschen Arbeit von 1801”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 66, (1921), pp. 283-284. Soldner followed up Newton’s query in the *Opticks*,

“QUERY 1. Do not bodies act upon light at a distance, and by their action bend its rays; and is not this action (*cæteris paribus*) strongest at the least distance?” **See also:** P. Lenard, *Über Äther und Uräther*, Second Edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1922). **See also:** E. Gehrcke, “Zur Frage der Relativitätstheorie”, *Kosmos*, Special Edition on the Theory of Relativity, (1921), pp. 296-298; **and** “Die Gegensätze zwischen der Aethertheorie und Relativitätstheorie und ihre experimentelle Prüfung”, *Zeitschrift für technische Physik*, Volume 4, (1923), pp. 292-299; abstracts: *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 219, Number 5248, (1923), pp. 266-267; **and** *Univerzum*, Volume 1, (1923), pp. 261-263; **and** E. Gehrcke, *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Berlin, Hermann Meusser, (1924), pp. 82, 92-94. **See also:** *Frankfurter Zeitung*, Morning Edition, (6 November 1921), p. 1 and (18 November 1921), as cited by the editors of *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, (2002), p. 112. **See also:** T. J. J. See, “Einstein a Second Dr. Cook?”, “Einstein a Trickster?”, *The San Francisco Journal*, (13 May 1923), pp. 1, 6; (20 May 1923), p. 1; (27 May 1923); response by R. Trumpler, “Historical Note on the Problem of Light Deflection in the Sun’s Gravitational Field”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 1496, (1923), pp. 161-163; reply by See, “Soldner, Foucault and Einstein”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, (1923), p. 372; response by L. P. Eisenhart, “Soldner and Einstein”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 1512, (1923), pp. 516-517; rebuttal by A. Reuterdaahl, “The Einstein Film and the Debacle of Einsteinism”, *The Dearborn Independent*, (22 March 1924), p. 15. **See also:** J. Eisenstaedt, “De l’Influence de la Gravitation sur la Propagation de la Lumière en Théorie Newtonienne. L’Archéologie des Trous Noirs”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 42, (1991), pp. 315-386. **See also:** A. F. Zakharov, *Astronomical and Astrophysical Transactions*, Volume 5, (1994), p. 85.

2733. E. Mach, “Zur Theorie der Pulswellenzeichner”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 47, (1863), pp. 43-48; **and** “Zur Theorie des Gehörorgans”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 48; unaltered reprint, *Zur Theorie des Gehörorgans*, J. G. Calve, Prag, (1872); **and** “Untersuchungen über den Zeitsinn des Ohres”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 51, (1865), pp. 133-150; *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik vormals Fichte-Ulricische Zeitschrift*, (1866); **and** *Zwei populäre Vorträge über Optik*, Leuschner & Lubensky, Graz, (1867); **and** “Mach’s Vorlesungs-Apparate”, *Repertorium für Experimental-Physik, für physikalische Technik, mathematische & astronomische Instrumentenkunde*, Volume 4, (1868), pp. 8-9; **and** *Die Geschichte und die Wurzel des Satzes von der Erhaltung der Arbeit*, J. G. Calve, Prag, (1872); English translation by Philip E. B. Jourdain, *History and Root of the Principle of the Conservation of Energy*, Open Court, Chicago, 1911; **and** “Resultate einer Untersuchung zur Geschichte der Physik”, *Lotos. Zeitschrift für Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 23, (1873), pp. 189-191; **and** *Grundlinien der Lehre von den Bewegungsempfindungen*, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1875); **and** “Neue Versuche zur Prüfung der Doppler’schen Theorie der Ton- und Farbenänderung durch Bewegung”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 77, (1878), pp. 299-310; **and** *Die ökonomische Natur der physikalischen Forschung*, Wien, (1882); **and** *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwicklung historisch-kritisch dargestellt*, F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig, (1883 and multiple revised editions, thereafter); Translated into English as *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, La Salle, (numerous editions); **and** *Über Umbildung und Anpassung im naturwissenschaftlichen*

Denken, Wien, (1884); **and** *Beiträge zur Analyse der Empfindungen*, G. Fischer, Jena, (1886); English translation by C. M. Williams, *Contributions to the Analysis of the Sensations*, Open Court, Chicago, (1897); **and** *Der relative Bildungswert der philologischen und der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Unterrichtsfächer*, Prag, (1886); **and** “Über den Unterricht in der Wärmelehre”, *Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 1, (1887), pp. 3-7; **and** “Über das psychologische und logische Moment im naturwissenschaftlichen Unterricht”, *Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 4, (1890), pp. 1-5; **and** “Some Questions of Psycho-Physics”, *The Monist*, Volume 1, (1891), pp. 394-400; **and** *Populär-wissenschaftliche Vorlesungen*, fourth expanded edition, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1896/1910); English translation of initial lectures by Thomas McCormack, *Popular Scientific Lectures*, Open Court, Chicago, (1895); **and** *Die Principien der Wärmelehre: Historisch-kritisch entwickelt*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1896); *Principles of the Theory of Heat: Historically and Critically Elucidated*, Dordrecht, Boston, (1986); **and** “Über Gedankenexperimente.” *Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 10, (1896), pp. 1-5; **and** “On the Stereoscopic Application of Roentgen’s Rays”, *The Monist*, Volume 6, (1896), pp. 321-323; **and** “Durchsicht-Stereoskopbilder mit Röntgenstrahlen”, *Zeitschrift für Elektrotechnik*, Volume 14, (1896), pp. 359-361; **and** “The Notion of a Continuum”, *The Open Court*, Volume 14, (1900), pp. 409-414; **and** *Erkenntnis und Irrtum: Skizzen zur Psychologie der Forschung*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1905); **and** *Space and Geometry in the Light of Physiological, Psychological and Physical Inquiry*, English translation by T. J. McCormack, Open Court, Chicago, (1906); **and** “Die Leitgedanken meiner naturwissenschaftlichen Erkenntnislehre und ihre Aufnahme durch die Zeitgenossen”, *Scientia: Revista di Scienza*, Volume 7, Number 14, (1910), p. 2; *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 599-606; **and** *Die Analyse der Empfindungen und das Verhältnis des Physischen zum Psychischen*, sixth expanded edition, G. Fischer, Jena, (1911); English translation by C. M. Williams, *The Analysis of Sensations, and the Relation of the Physical to the Psychical*, Open Court, Chicago, (1914); **and** *Kultur und Mechanik*, Stuttgart, (1915); **and** *Die Leitgedanken meiner naturwissenschaftlichen Erkenntnislehre und ihre Aufnahme durch die Zeitgenossen. Sinnliche Elemente und naturwissenschaftliche Begriffe*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1919); **and** *Die Prinzipien der physikalischen Optik: Historisch und erkenntnispsychologisch entwickelt*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1921); *The Principles of Physical Optics: An Historical and Philosophical Treatment*, English translated by J. S. Anderson, Methuen & Co., London, (1926).

2734. F. Tisserand, “Sur le Mouvement des Planètes Autour du Soleil d’après la Loi Électrodynamique de Weber”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 75, (1872), pp. 760-763; **and** “Notice sur les Planètes intra-Mercurielles”, *Annuaire pour l’an / présente au Roi par le Bureau des Longitudes*, (1882), pp. 729-772; **and** “Résumé des Tentatives Faites Jusqu’ici pour Déterminer la Parallaxe du Soleil”, *Annales de l’Observatoire Nationale de Paris. Mémoires*, Volume 16, (1882); **and** “Sur le Mouvement des Planètes, en Supposant l’Attraction Représentée par l’une des Lois Électrodynamiques de Gauss ou de Weber”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 110, (1890), pp. 313-315; **and** “Note sur l’État Actuel de la Théorie de la Lune”, *Bulletin Astronomique* (Paris), Volume 8, (1891); **and** *Mécanique Céleste (Traité de Mécanique Céleste)*, Volume 4, Chapter 28, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1896); **and** “Confrontation des Observations avec la Théorie de la Gravitation”, *Mécanique Céleste (Traité de Mécanique Céleste)*, Volume 4, Chapter 29, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1896), especially p. 529.

2735. R. Lehmann-Filhés, “Über die Bewegung der Planeten unter der Annahme einer sich nicht momentan fortpflanzenden Schwerkraft”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 110, (1884), col. 209-210; **and** “Über die Säkularstörungen der Länge des Mondes unter der Annahme einer sich nicht momentan fortpflanzenden Schwerkraft”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Volume 25, (1895), pp. 371-422.

2736. M. Lévy, “Sur l’Application des Lois Électrodynamiques au Mouvement des Planètes”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 110, (1890), pp. 545-551; **and** “Sur les Diverse Théories de l’Électricité”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 110, (1890), pp. 740-742; **and** “Observations sur le Principe des Aires”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 119, (1894), pp. 718-721.

2737. A. Hall, “A Suggestion in the Theory of Mercury”, *The Astronomical Journal*, Volume 14, (1894), pp. 49-51; **and** “Note on the Masses of Mercury, Venus and Earth”, *The Astronomical Journal*, Volume 24, (1905), p. 164.

2738. P. Drude, “Ueber Fernwirkungen”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 62, (1897), pp. 693, I-XLIX; **and** *Lehrbuch der Optik*, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1900); translated into English *The Theory of Optics*, Longmans, Green and Co., London, New York, Toronto, (1902), see especially pp. 457-482; **and** “Zur Elektronentheorie der Metalle. I & II”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 1, (1900), pp. 566-613; Volume 3, (1900), pp. 369-402; **and** “Optische Eigenschaften und Elektronentheorie, I & II”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 14, (1904), pp. 677-725, 936-961; **and** “Die Natur des Lichtes” in A. Winkelmann, *Handbuch der Optik*, Volume 6, Second Edition, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1906), pp. 1120-1387; **and** *Physik des Aethers auf elektromagnetischer Grundlage*, F. Enke, Stuttgart, (1894), Posthumous Second Revised Edition, W. König, (1912).

2739. P. Gerber, “Die räumliche und zeitliche Ausbreitung der Gravitation”, *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik*, Leipzig, Volume 43, (1898), pp. 93-104; **and** *Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation*, Programmabhandlung des städtischen Realgymnasiums zu Stargard in Pommerania, (1902); reprinted “Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 52, (1917), pp. 415-441. Einstein stated, “[. . .]Gerber, who has given the correct formula for the perihelion motion of Mercury before I did [quoted in G. E. Tauber, *Albert Einstein’s Theory of General Relativity*, Crown, New York, (1979), p. 98].” Seeliger attacked Gehrcke and Gerber: H. v. Seeliger, “Bemerkung zu P. Gerbers Aufsatz ‘Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation’”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 53, (1917), pp. 31-32; **and** “Weiters Bemerkungen zur ‘Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation’”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 54, (1917), pp. 38-40; **and** “Bemerkung zu dem Aufsätze des Herrn Gehrcke ‘Über den Äther’”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 20, (1918), p. 262.

For counter-argument, see: E. Gehrcke, “Zur Kritik und Geschichte der neueren Gravitationstheorien”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 51, (1916), pp. 119-124; **and** *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 52, (1917), p. 415; **and** “Über den Äther”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 20, (1918), pp. 165-169; **and** “Zur Diskussion über den Äther”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 21, (1919), pp. 67-68; Gehrcke’s articles are reprinted in *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 40-48.

For further discussion, see also: L. Silberstein, “The Motion of Mercury Deduced from the Classical Theory of Relativity”, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, (1917), pp. 503-510; **and** S. Oppenheim, “Zur Frage nach der

Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 53, (1917), pp. 163-168; **and** L. C. Glaser, “Zur Erörterung über die Relativitätstheorie”, *Tägliche Rundschau*, (16 August 1920); **and** P. Weyland, *Tägliche Rundschau*, (6, 14, and 16 August 1920); **and** J. Riem, “Das Relativitätsgesetz”, *Deutsche Zeitung* (Berlin), Number 286, (26 June 1920); **and** “Gegen den Einstein Rummel!”, *Umschau*, Volume 24, (1920), pp. 583-584; **and** “Amerika über Einstein”, *Deutsche Zeitung*, (1 July 1921 evening edition); **and** “Zu Einsteins Amerikafahrt. Stimmen amerikanischer Blätter und die Antwort Reuterdahls”, *Deutsche Zeitung*, (13 September 1921); **and** “Ein amerikanisches Weltanschauungsbuch”, *Der Reichsbote* (Berlin), Number 463, (4 October 1921); **and** “Um Einsteins Relativitätstheorie”, *Deutsche Zeitung*, (18 November 1921); **and** “Die astronomischen Beweismittel der Relativitätstheorie”, *Hellweg Westdeutsche Wochenschrift für Deutsche Kunst*, Volume 1, (1921), pp. 314-316; **and** “Keine Bestätigung der Relativitätstheorie”, *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, Volume 36, (1921), p. 420; **and** “Lenards gewichtige Stimme gegen die Relativitätstheorie”, *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, Volume 36, (1921), p. 551; **and** “Neues zur Relativitätstheorie”, *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, Volume 37, (1922), pp. 13-14; **and** “Beobachtungstatsachen zur Relativitätstheorie”, *Umschau*, Volume 27, (1923), pp. 328-329; **and** M. v. Laue, “Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation. Bemerkungen zur gleichnamigen Abhandlungen von P. Gerber”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 53, (1917), pp. 214-216; **and** *Tägliche Rundschau*, (August 11, 1920); **and** “Historisch-Kritisches über die Perihelbewegung des Mercur”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 8, (1920), pp. 735-736; **and** P. Lenard’s analysis in, “Über die Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahls von seiner geradlinigen Bewegung durch die Attraktion eines Weltkörpers, an welchem er nahe vorbeigeht; von J. Soldner, 1801”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 65, (1921), pp. 593-604; **and** *Über Äther und Uräther*, Second Edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1922); **and**, the later the edition, the better, *Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation*, Third Enlarged Edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1921); **and** A. Einstein, “Meine Antwort”, *Berliner Tageblatt und Handels-Zeitung*, (August 27, 1920); English translation quoted in G. E. Tauber, *Albert Einstein’s Theory of General Relativity*, Crown, New York, (1979), pp. 97-99; **and** G. v. Gleich, “Die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie und das Merkurperihel”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 72, (1923), pp. 221-235; **and** “Zur Kritik der Relativitätstheorie vom mathematisch-physikalischen Standpunkt aus”, *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Volume 25, (1924), pp. 230-246; **and** “Die Vieldeutigkeit in der Relativitätstheorie”, *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Volume 25, (1924), pp. 329-334; **and** *Einsteins Relativitätstheorien und Physikalische Wirklichkeit*, Barth, Leipzig, (1930); **and** A. Reuterdahl, “Einstein and the New Science”, *Bi-Monthly Journal of the College of St. Thomas*, Volume 11, Number 3, (July, 1921); **and** “The Origin of Einsteinism”, *The New York Times*, Section 7, (12 August 1923), p. 8. Reply to F. D. Bond’s response, “Reuterdahl and the Einstein Theory”, *The New York Times*, Section 7, (15 July 1923), p. 8. Response to A. Reuterdahl, “Einstein’s Predecessors”, *The New York Times*, Section 8, (3 June 1923), p. 8. Which was a reply to F. D. Bond, “Relating to Relativity”, *The New York Times*, Section 9, (13 May 1923), p. 8. Which was a response to H. A. Houghton, “A Newtonian Duplication?”, *The New York Times*, Section 1, Part 1, (21 April 1923), p. 10; **and** “Der Einsteinismus \ Seine Trugschlüsse und Täuschungen”, *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, (1931), p. 45; *See also*: J. T. Blankart, “Relativity of Interdependence; Reuterdahl’s Theory Contrasted with Einstein’s”, *Catholic World*, Volume 112, (February, 1921), pp. 588-610; **and** T. J. J. See, “Prof. See Attacks German Scientist, Asserting That His Doctrine Is 122 Years Old”, *The New York Times*, (13 April 1923), p. 5; **and** “Einstein a Second Dr. Cook?”, *The San Francisco Journal*, (13 May 1923), pp. 1, 6; **and** (20 May 1923), p. 1; “Einstein a Trickster?”, *The San Francisco Journal*, (27 May 1923); response

by R. Trumpler, "Historical Note on the Problem of Light Deflection in the Sun's Gravitational Field", *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 1496, (1923), pp. 161-163; reply by See, "Soldner, Foucault and Einstein", *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, (1923), p. 372; rejoinder by L. P. Eisenhart, "Soldner and Einstein", *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 1512, (1923), pp. 516-517; rebuttal by A. Reuterdaahl, "The Einstein Film and the Debacle of Einsteinism", *The Dearborn Independent*, (22 March 1924), p. 15; **and** T. J. J. See, "New Theory of the Ether", *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 217, (1923), pp. 193-283; **and** "Is the Einstein Theory a Crazy Vagary?", *The Literary Digest*, (2 June 1923), pp. 29-30; **and** R. Morgan, "Einstein Theory Declared Colossal Humbug by U.S. Naval Astronomer", *The Dearborn Independent*, (21 July 1923), p. 14; **and** "Prof. See Attacks German Scientist Asserting that his Doctrine is 122 Years Old", *The New York Times*, Section 1, (13 April 1923), p. 5; **and** "Einstein Geometry Called Careless", *The San Francisco Journal*, (14 October 1924); **and** "Is Einstein's Arithmetic Off?", *The Literary Digest*, Volume 83, Number 6, (8 November 1924), pp. 20-21; **and** "Navy Scientist Claims Einstein Theory Error", *The Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, (13 October 1924). Ironically, Reuterdaahl accused See of plagiarizing his exposure of Einstein's plagiarism in America, first recognized by Gehrcke and Lenard in Germany! "Reuterdaahl Says See Takes Credit for Work of Others", *The Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, (14 October 1924); **and** "A Scientist Yields to Temptation", *The Minneapolis Journal*, (2 February 1925); **and** "Prof. See declares Einstein in Error. Naval Astronomer Says Eclipse Observations Fully Confirm Newton's Gravitation Theory. Says German began Wrong. A Mistake in Mathematics is Charged, with 'Curved Space' Idea to Hide it." *The New York Times*, (14 October 1924), p. 14; responses by Eisenhart, Eddington and Dyson, *The New York Times*, (16 October 1924), p. 12; **and** "Captain See vs. Doctor Einstein", *Scientific American*, Volume 138, (February 1925), p. 128; **and** T. J. J. See, *Researches in Non-Euclidian Geometry and the Theory of Relativity: A Systematic Study of Twenty Fallacies in the Geometry of Riemann, Including the So-Called Curvature of Space and Radius of World Curvature, and of Eighty Errors in the Physical Theories of Einstein and Eddington, Showing the Complete Collapse of the Theory of Relativity*, United States Naval Observatory Publication: Mare Island, Calif. : Naval Observatory, (1925); **and** "See Says Einstein has Changed Front. Navy Mathematician Quotes German Opposing Field Theory in 1911. Holds it is not New. Declares he himself Anticipated by Seven Years Relation of Electrodynamics to Gravitation", *The New York Times*, Section 2, (24 February 1929), p. 4. See refers to his works: *Electrodynamic Wave-Theory of Physical Forces*, Thos. P. Nichols, Boston, London, Paris, (1917); **and** *New Theory of the Aether*, Inhaber Georg Oheim, Kiel, (1922). *See also*: "New Theory of the Ether", *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 217, (1923), pp. 193-283; **and** T. Vahlen, "Die Paradoxien der relativen Mechanik", *Deutsche Mathematik*, Volume 3, (1942), p. 25; **and** N. T. Roseveare, *Mercury's Perihelion from Le Verrier to Einstein*, Oxford University Press, (1982), pp. 78, 115, 137-146; **and** P. Beckmann, *Einstein Plus Two*, The Golem Press, Boulder, Colorado, (1987), pp. 170-175 (Cf. T. Bethel, "A Challenge to Einstein", *National Review*, Volume 42, (5 November 1990), pp. 69-71.).

2740. H. A. Lorentz, "Considerations on Gravitation", *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 2, (1900), pp. 559-574; **and** *Abhandlungen über theoretische Physik*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1907), Numbers 14, 17-20; **and** "Alte und neue Fragen der Physik", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 1234-1257; *reprinted, in part, as*: "Das Relativitätsprinzip und seine Anwendung auf einige besondere physikalische Erscheinungen", *Das Relativitätsprinzip: eine Sammlung von Abhandlungen*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1913), pp. 74-89; **and** "La Gravitation", *Scientia*, Volume 16, (1914), pp. 28-59; **and** *Het Relativiteitsbeginsel; drie Voordrachten Gehouden in*

Teyler's Stiftung, Erven Loosjes, Haarlem, (1913); *Archives du Musée Teyler*, Series 3, Volume 2, (1914), pp. 1-60; German translation: *Das Relativitätsprinzip. Drei Vorlesungen gehalten in Teylers Stiftung zu Haarlem*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, Berlin, (1914/1920); **and** "Het beginsel van Hamilton in Einstein's Theorie der Zwaartekracht", *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 23, (1915), pp. 1073-1089; English translation, "On Hamilton's Principle in Einstein's Theory of Gravitation", *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 19, (1916/1917), pp. 751-765; **and** "Over Einstein's Theorie der Zwaartekracht. I, II, & III", *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 24, (1916), pp. 1389-1402, 1759-1774; Volume 25, (1916), pp. 468-486; English translation, "On Einstein's Theory of Gravitation. I, II & III", *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 19, (1917), pp. 1341-1354, 1354-1369; Volume 20, (1917), pp. 2-19; **and** "Dutch Colleague Explains Einstein", *The New York Times*, (21 December 1919), p. 1.

2741. J. Zenneck, "Gravitation", *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen*, Volume 5, Part 1, Article 2, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1903), pp. 25-67.

2742. S. Oppenheim, *Die bahn des periodischen Kometen 1886 IV (Brooks)*, K. K. Hof-buchlandlung W. Frick, Wien, (1891); **and** "Zur Frage nach der Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation", *Jahresbericht über das K K Akademische Gymnasium in Wien für das Schuljahr 1894/95*, Wien, (1895), pp. 3-28; see Höfler's response: *Vierteljahrsberichte des Wiener Vereins zur Förderung des physikalischen und chemischen Unterrichtes*, Volume 1, Number 3, (1896), pp. 103-105; **and** *Kritik des Newton'schen Gravitationsgesetzes; mit einem Beitrag: Gravitation und Relativitätstheorie von F. Kottler*, Deutsche Staatsrealschule in Karolinenthal, Prag, (1903); **and** *Das astronomische Weltbild im Wandel der Zeit*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1906/multiple later editions); **and** *Die gleichgewichtsfiguren rotierender Flüssigkeitsmassen und die Gestalt der Himmelskörper*, A. Haase, Prag, (1907); **and** *Probleme der modernen Astronomie*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1911); **and** *Über die Eigenbewegungen der Fixsterne; Kritik der Zweischwarmhypothese*, Wien, (1912); **and** "Zur Frage nach der Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 53, (1917), pp. 163-168; **and** *Statistische Untersuchungen über die Bewegung der kleinen Planeten*, (1921); **and** *Astronomie*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, Berlin, (1921); **and** *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen*, Volume 6, Part 2, Chapter 22. **See also:** H. Gylden, *Hülfsstafeln zur Berechnung der Hauptungleichheiten in den absoluten Bewegungstheorien der kleinen Planeten. Unter Mitwirkung von Dr. S. Oppenheim Hrsg. von Hugo Gylden*, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1896).

2743. H. Poincaré, "Non-Euclidean Geometry", *Nature*, Volume 45, (February 25, 1892), pp. 404-407; **and** "La Mesure de la Gravité et la Géodésie", *Bulletin Astronomique* (Paris), Volume 18, (1901), pp. 5-39; **and** *Figures d'Équilibre d'une Masse Fluide : Leçons Professées à la Sorbonne en 1900*, C. Naud, Paris, (1902); **and** *La Science et l'Hypothèse*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1902); translated into English *Science and Hypothesis*, Dover, New York, (1952), which appears in *The Foundations of Science*; translated into German with substantial notations by F. and L. Lindemann, *Wissenschaft und Hypothese*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1904); **and** "Sur la Dynamique de l'Électron", *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L'Académie des sciences*, Volume 140, (1905), pp. 1504-1508; reprinted *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 489-493; English translations appear in: G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, "Intimations of Relativity before

Einstein”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (December, 1983), pp. 343-354, at pp. 350-353; and, translated by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 7-14; **and** “Sur la Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Rendiconti del Circolo matimatico di Palermo*, Volume 21, (1906, submitted 23 July 1905), pp. 129-176; reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume IX, pp. 494-550; redacted English translation by H. M. Schwartz, “Poincaré’s Rendiconti Paper on Relativity”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 39, (November, 1971), pp. 1287-1294; Volume 40, (June, 1972), pp. 862-872; Volume 40, (September, 1972), pp. 1282-1287; and English translation by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 15-78; **and** “La Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 19, (1908), pp. 386-402; reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume IX, pp. 551-586; English translation: “The New Mechanics”, *Science and Method*, Book III, which is also reprinted in *Foundations of Science*; **and** “The Future of Mathematics”, *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution Showing the Operations, Expenditures, and Conditions of the Institution for the Year Ending June 30, 1909*, (U.S.) Government Printing Office, Washington, (1910), pp. 123-140; **and** *Science et Méthode*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1908); translated in English as *Science and Method*, numerous editions; *Science and Method* is also reprinted in *Foundations of Science*; **and** “La Mécanique Nouvelle”, *Comptes Rendus des Sessions de l’Association Française pour l’Avancement des Sciences*, Conférence de Lille, Paris, (1909), pp. 38-48; *La Revue Scientifique*, Volume 47, (1909), pp. 170-177; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 18-76 URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

and 28 April 1909 Lecture in Göttingen: “La Mécanique Nouvelle”, *Sechs Vorträge über der reinen Mathematik und mathematischen Physik auf Einladung der Wolfskehl-Kommission der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften gehalten zu Göttingen vom 22.-28. April 1909*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1910), pp. 51-58; “The New Mechanics”, *The Monist*, Volume 23, (1913), pp. 385-395; **13 October 1910 Lecture in Berlin:** “Die neue Mechanik”, *Himmel und Erde*, Volume 23, (1911), pp. 97-116; *Die neue Mechanik*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1911); **and** “Sur la Théorie des Quanta”, *Journal de Physique*, Volume 2, (1911), pp. 5-34; **and** “Les Limites de la Loi de Newton”, *Bulletin Astronomique*, Volume 17, (1953), pp. 121-269; from the notes taken by Henri Vergne of Poincaré’s Sorbonne lectures (1906-1907); **and** *Dernières Pensées*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1913); translated in English as *Mathematics and Science: Last Essays*, Dover, New York, (1963).

2744. R. Moody, Jr., “Albert Einstein: Plagiarist of the Century”, *Infinite Energy*, Volume 10, Number 59, (2005), pp. 34-38, at 35.

2745. A. Einstein quoted in G. E. Tauber, *Albert Einstein’s Theory of General Relativity*, Crown, New York, (1979), p. 98.

2746. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), pp. 24-25.

2747. P. Drude, “Ueber Fernwirkungen”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 62, (1897), pp. 693, I-XLIX.

2748. P. Gerber, *Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation*, Programmabhandlung des städtischen Realgymnasiums zu Stargard in Pommerania, (1902); reprinted “Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 52, (1917), pp. 415-441.

2749. P. Gerber, “Die räumliche und zeitliche Ausbreitung der Gravitation”, *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik*, Volume 43, (1898), pp. 93-104, at 103.

2750. A. Einstein, “Erklärung der Perihelbewegung des Merkur aus der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (1915), pp. 831-839, at 838-839.

2751. H. A. Lorentz, “Considerations on Gravitation”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 2, (1900), pp. 559-574.

2752. R. Mewes, “Eine Ableitung der Grundformen der Relativitätstheorie”, *Zeitschrift für Sauerstoff- und Stickstoff-Industrie*, Volume 12, (1920), p. 6; **and** “Lenards und Reuterdahls Stellungnahmen zur Relativitätstheorie” *Zeitschrift für Sauerstoff- und Stickstoff-Industrie*, Volume 13, Number 17/18, (September, 1921), pp. 77-78; **and** *Wissenschaftliche Begründung der Raum-Zeitlehre oder Relativitätstheorie (1884-1894) mit einem geschichtlichen Anhang*, Rudolf Mewes, Berlin, (1920/1921); **and** *Raumzeitlehre oder Relativitätstheorie in Geistes- und Naturwissenschaft und Werkkunst*, (1884); reprinted in *Gesammelte Arbeiten*, Rudolf Mewes, Berlin, (1920); **See also**: “Unterschiede zwischen den Relativitätstheorien von Mewes (1892-1893) und Lorentz (1895)”, *Zeitschrift für Sauerstoff- und Stickstoff-Industrie*, Volume 11, (1919), pp. 70, 75-76. **See also**: “Lights all Askew in the Heavens”, *The New York Times*, (9 November 1919).

2753. J. K. F. Zöllner, *Über die Natur der Cometen. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theorie der Erkenntnis*, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1872); **and** *Principien einer elektrodynamischen Theorie der Materie*, Leipzig, (1876); reviewed by C. Stumpf, *Philosophische Monatshefte*, Volume 14, pp. 13-30; **and** “On Space of Four Dimensions”, *Quarterly Journal of Science*, New Series, Volume 8, (April, 1878), pp. 227-237; **and** *Van Nostrand's Eclectic Engineering Magazine*, Volume 19, p. 83; **and** Zöllner, *Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen*, L. Staackmann, Leipzig, (1878-1881); partial English translation by C. C. Massey, *Transcendental Physics: An Account of Experimental Investigations from the Scientific Treatises of Johann Carl Friedrich Zollner*, W. H. Harrison, London, (1880), and Colby & Rich, Boston, (1881); and Arno Press, New York, (1976); reviewed by P. G. Tait, *Nature*, (28 March 1878), pp. 420-422; **and** *Das Skalen-Photometer: ein neues Instrument zur mechanischen Messung des Lichtes; nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte und Theorie der mechansichen Photometrie ; mit. . . einem Nachtrag zum dritten Bande der “Wissenschaftlichen Abhandlungen” über die “Geschichte der vierten Dimension” und die “hypnotischen Versuche des Hrn. Professor Weinhold etc.”*, Staackmann, Leipzig, (1879); **and** *Die transcendente Physik und die sogenannte Philosophie; eine deutsche Antwort auf eine “sogenannte wissenschaftliche Frage”*, L. Staackmann, Leipzig, (1879); **and** *Zur Aufklärung des Deutschen Volkes über Inhalt und Aufgabe der Wissenschaftlichen Abhandlungen von F. Zöllner*, Staackmann, Leipzig, (1880); **and** J. K. F. Zöllner, *Erklärung der universellen Gravitation aus den statischen Wirkungen der Elektrizität und die allgemeine Bedeutung des Weber'schen Gesetzes, von Friedrich Zöllner... Mit Beiträgen von Wilhelm Weber nebst einem vollständigen Abdruck der Originalabhandlung: Sur les Forces qui Régissent la Constitution Intérieure des Corps Aperçu pour Servir à la Détermination de la Cause et des Lois de l'Action Moléculaire, par O. F. Mossotti. Mit dem Bildnisse Newton's in Stahlstich*, L. Staackmann, Leipzig, (1882); **and** *Kepler und die unsichtbare Welt: eine Hieroglyphe*, L. Staackmann, Leipzig, (1882); **See also**: C. Meinel, “Karl

Friedrich Zöllner und die Wissenschaftskultur der Gründerzeit: Eine Fallstudie zur Genese konservativer Zivilisationskritik”, *Berliner Beiträge zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Technik*, Volume 13, Sigma/ERS-Verlag, Berlin, (1991).

2754. O. F. Mossotti, *Sur les Forces qui Régissent la Constitution Intérieure des Corps Aperçu pour Servir à la Détermination de la Cause et des Lois de l’Action Moléculaire*, par O. F. Mossotti, De l’Imprimerie Royale, Turin, (1836); appears in Zöllner’s *Erklärung der universellen Gravitation aus den statischen Wirkungen der Elektrizität und die allgemeine Bedeutung des Weber’schen Gesetzes*, von Friedrich Zöllner... Mit Beiträgen von Wilhelm Weber nebst einem vollständigen Abdruck der Originalabhandlung: *Sur les Forces qui Régissent la Constitution Intérieure des Corps Aperçu pour Servir à la Détermination de la Cause et des Lois de l’Action Moléculaire*, par O. F. Mossotti. Mit dem Bildnisse Newton’s in Stahlstich, L. Staackmann, Leipzig, (1882); English translation: “On the Forces which Regulate the Internal Constitution of Bodies”, *Scientific Memoirs, Selected from the Transactions of Foreign Academies of Science and Learned Societies, and from Foreign Journals*, Volume 1, (1837), pp. 448-469; reprinted by Johnson Reprint Corp., New York, (1966).

2755. A. Hall, “A Suggestion in the Theory of Mercury”, *The Astronomical Journal*, Volume 14, (1894), pp. 49-51; and “Note on the Masses of Mercury, Venus and Earth”, *The Astronomical Journal*, Volume 24, (1905), p. 164.

2756. R. Lehmann-Filhés, “Über die Bewegung der Planeten unter der Annahme einer sich nicht momentan fortpflanzenden Schwerkraft”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 110, (1884), col. 209-210; and “Über die Säkularstörungen der Länge des Mondes unter der Annahme einer sich nicht momentan fortpflanzenden Schwerkraft”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Volume 25, (1895), pp. 371-422.

2757. J. Zenneck, “Gravitation”, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen*, Volume 5, Part 2, Article 2, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1903), pp. 25-67, at 48.

2758. H. A. Lorentz, “Alte und neue Fragen der Physik”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 1234-1257; reprinted, in part, as: “Das Relativitätsprinzip und seine Anwendung auf einige besondere physikalische Erscheinungen”, *Das Relativitätsprinzip: eine Sammlung von Abhandlungen*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1913), pp. 74-89, at 79-81.

2759. H. Poincaré, “Sur la Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Rendiconti del Circolo matimatico di Palermo*, Volume 21, (1906, submitted 23 July 1905), pp. 129-176; reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume IX, pp. 494-550; English translation by H. M. Schwartz, “Poincaré’s Rendiconti Paper on Relativity”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 39, (November, 1971), pp. 1287-1294; Volume 40, (June, 1972), pp. 862-872; Volume 40, (September, 1972), pp. 1282-1287; and English translation by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 15-78.

2760. A. Einstein, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 2, (1914), p. 1018; reprinted *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 11.

2761. H. A. Lorentz, *Het Relativiteitsbeginsel; drie Voordrachten Gehouden in Teyler’s Stifting*, Erven Loosjes, Haarlem, (1913); *Archives du Musée Teyler*, Series 3, Volume 2, (1914), pp. 1-60; German translation: *Das Relativitätsprinzip. Drei Vorlesungen gehalten in Teylers Stifting zu Haarlem*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, Berlin, (1914/1920), pp. 9, 19-20.

2762. H. Poincaré, “Sur la Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 140, (1905), pp. 1504-1508; reprinted *Œuvres*

de Henri Poincaré, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 489-493; English translation by G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, "Intimations of Relativity before Einstein", *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (December, 1983), pp. 343-354, at 352; an alternative English translation by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov appears in: *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 7-14.

2763. H. Poincaré, "Les Limites de la Loi de Newton", *Bulletin Astronomique*, Volume 17, (1953), pp. 121-269.

2764. H. Poincaré, "La Dynamique de l'Électron", *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 19, (1908), pp. 386-402; republished *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 551-586, at 580; English translation: "The New Mechanics", *Science and Method*, Book III, which is reprinted in *Foundations of Science*.

2765. H. Poincaré, "The New Mechanics", *The Monist*, Volume 23, (1913), pp. 385-395, at 394.

2766. A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein: A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), p. 461.

2767. R. Gans, *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik*, Volume 28, Number 20, (1904), p. 1068.

2768. *Die Fortschritte der Physik im Jahre 1904*, Volume 60, Part 2, (1904), p.45.

2769. E. Bose, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 5, Number 20, (1904), p. 644.

2770. J. Zenneck, "Gravitation", *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen*, Volume 5, Part 1, Article 2, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1903), pp. 25-67, at 49-51.

2771. S. Oppenheim, *Kritik der Newtonschen Gravitationsgesetzes*, A. Haase, (1903) [Separatabdruck aus dem Jahresberichte der Staats-Realschule Karolinenthal für das Schuljahr 1902-03.], pp. 56-60.

2772. S. Oppenheim, "Zur Frage nach der Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 53, (1917), pp. 163-168. The article:

Herr Prof. Gehrke hat in dieser Zeitschrift, Bd. 52. p. 415, 1917, einen Neudruck der Abhandlung von P. G e r b e r veranlaßt, in welcher es diesem gelang durch Aufstellung einer Beziehung zwischen der Lichtgeschwindigkeit und der Gravitation die anomale Perihelbewegung des Merkur quantitativ voll zu erklären. Er selbst macht hierzu die Bemerkung: ob und inwieweit sich die Theorie G e r b e r s mit den bekannten elektromagnetischen Grundgleichungen zu einer einheitlichen Theorie verschmelzen lasse, ist eine schwierige Frage, die noch der Lösung harret.

Es sei nun auch mir gestattet, auf diese Untersuchung G e r b e r s nochmals zurückzukommen, durch Wiederabdruck einer von mir im Jahre 1903 an ihr geübten Kritik. Sie erschien als eine Programmabhandlung unter dem Titel: „Kritik des N e w t o n s c h e n Gravitationsgesetzes“ (Programm der K. K. Deutschen Staatsrealschule in Karolinenthal-Prag, 1903) und lautet wörtlich wie folgt:

“§ 31: Die Analogie, welche zwischen dem N e w t o n s c h e n und dem C o u l o m b s c h e n Gesetze der Anziehung zweier elektrischer oder magnetischer Teilchen besteht, führt zu einer dritten Art, den Einfluß der Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation auf die Bewegung der Planeten zu untersuchen. Nach der älteren elektrodynamischen Theorie kann man nämlich das W e b e r s c h e oder R i e m a n n s c h e Gesetz der Wechselwirkung zweier bewegter elektrischer Teilchen als eine Erweiterung des C o u l o m b s c h e n Gesetzes betrachten, die dahin zielt, die elektrodynamischen Kräfte aus der nicht instantanen, sondern in ähnlicher Weise wie beim Lichte mit der Zeit sich

fortpflanzenden Wirkung der statischen Elektrizität abzuleiten. Es liegt dieser Anschauung bekanntlich ein Gedanke zugrunde, den zuerst G a u ß [Footnote: G a u ß Werke. Bd. 5. p. 627. Nachlaß: „Aus einem Briefe von G a u ß an W. W e b e r“ aus dem Jahre 1845.] ausgesprochen hat und R i e m a n n [Footnote: B. R i e m a n n, „Ein Beitrag zur Elektrodynamik“ in den Ges. Abh. 1858.], sowie mit mehr Erfolg C. N e u m a n n [Footnote: C. N e u m a n n, „Prinzipien der Elektrodynamik“. Festschrift zum Jubiläum der Universität in Bonn. 1868. Siehe auch die Kritik von C l a u s i u s „Über die von G a u ß angeregte neue Auffassung der elektrodynamischen Erscheinungen“. Ann. d. Phys. 135. 1868; ferner C. N e u m a n n, Allgemeine Untersuchungen über das N e w t o n s c h e Prinzip der Fernwirkungen. Leipzig 1896. Besonders Kap. VIII „über das H a m i l t o n s c h e Prinzip und das effektive Potential“.] haben eine solche Ableitung versucht.

Die Voraussetzung, von der C. N e u m a n n ausgeht, ist die, daß das Potential der gegenseitigen Anziehung zweier Teilchen (m_1 und m_2) das für ruhende Punkte durch $\chi^2 m_1 m_2 / r$ gegeben ist, einiger Zeit bedarf, um von m_1 zu m_2 zu gelangen und daher dort nicht zur Zeit t , sondern etwas später ankommt, ebenso wie das zur Zeit t in m_1 angekommene und von m_2 ausgesandte Potential von dort etwas früher ausging. Beiden Fällen entspricht eine Vergrößerung des Potentials im Verhältnis von $r : r - \Delta r$, wo Δr von der Zeitdifferenz abhängig ist, die das Potential zu seiner Fortpflanzung benötigt. Das Anziehungspotential ist daher

$$P = \frac{\chi^2 m_1 m_2}{r - \Delta r} = \frac{\chi^2 m_1 m_2}{r (1 - \Delta r / r)}$$

und stimmt nach gehöriger Entwicklung, durch die es in

$$P = \frac{\chi^2 m_1 m_2}{r} \left[1 + \frac{1}{c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 \right],$$

(worin c die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation oder der elektrischen Anziehung bedeutet) formal mit dem W e b e r s c h e n Gesetz überein.

„Man kann, wie dies G e r b e r getan hat, die Rechnung C. N e u m a n n s dadurch verallgemeinern, d. h. den Ausdruck für das Potential noch um eine zweite zu bestimmende Konstante erweitern, daß man

$$P = \frac{\chi^2 m_1 m_2}{r \left(1 - \frac{\Delta r}{r} \right)^\lambda}$$

setzt. Man erhält so (die Rechnung ganz im Sinne C. N e u m a n n s durchführend)

$$P = \frac{\chi^2 m_1 m_2}{r} \left[1 + \frac{\lambda(\lambda + 1)}{1 \cdot 2 \cdot c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 \right]$$

als ein neues, dem W e b e r schen Gesetze analoges Fernkraftgesetz, das zwei Konstanten enthält, die sich den Beobachtungen anpassen können. Die Berechnung der Bewegung der Planeten unter der Annahme, daß an Stelle des N e w t o n schen Gesetzes dieses erweiterte tritt, führt zu dem Resultate, daß säkularen Störungen die Länge des Perihels sowie die mittlere Länge unterworfen sind, daß aber bloß die erstere ausschlaggebend ist, indem die letztere das Quadrat der Exzentrizität als Faktor erhält und daher wegen der Kleinheit dieser stets unmerklich bleibt. Die säkulare Störung in der Länge des Perihels ist

$$\Delta\pi = \frac{\lambda(\lambda+1)}{1 \cdot 2} \cdot \frac{n^3 a^2}{c^2}$$

(worin n die mittlere tägliche Bewegung und a die Bahnachse des Planeten bedeuten) und muß, soll sie die Anomalie in der Bewegung des Merkur beseitigen, die Gleichung

$$\frac{\lambda(\lambda+1)}{1 \cdot 2} \cdot \frac{n^3 a^2}{c^2} = 41,25''$$

erfüllen. Die aus dem W e b e r schen Gesetze allein ($\lambda = 1$) resultierende Perihelstörung unter der Annahme, daß die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation, c , identisch ist mit der des Lichtes ($300\,000 \text{ km/sek}$) beträgt $13,65''$. Es bleibt daher für λ die Gleichung

$$\frac{\lambda(\lambda+1)}{1 \cdot 2} = \frac{41,25}{13,65} = 3$$

aus der die zwei Werte $\lambda_1 = 2$ und $\lambda_2 = -3$ folgen. Wie man sieht, läßt sich unter der Annahme, daß das Potential der anziehenden Kraft zweier bewegter Teilchen durch den Ausdruck

$$P = \frac{\chi^2 m_1 m_2}{r} \left[1 + \frac{3}{c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 \right]$$

gegeben ist, indem c als die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation identisch angenommen werden kann mit der des Lichtes, der Widerspruch in der Bewegungstheorie des Planeten Merkur vollständig lösen. Auch für die anderen Planeten folgen, wie die nachstehenden Zahlen es zeigen, Differenzen, die noch, etwa den Planeten Venus ausgenommen, innerhalb der möglichen Beobachtungsfehler liegen:

Planet Merkur	$\Delta\pi = 13,65''$ für $\lambda = 1$,	$\Delta\pi = 40,95''$ für $\lambda = 2$
” Venus	286	858
” Erde	127	381
” Mars	44	132

” Jupiter

2

6

„Das Grundgesetz, welches R i e m a n n für das W e b e r sche substituiert, lautet:

$$P = \frac{\chi^2 m_1 m_2}{r} \left[1 - \left\{ \frac{1}{c^2} \left(\frac{dx}{dt} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{dy}{dt} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{dz}{dt} \right)^2 \right\} \right].?$$

Auch unter Zugrundelegung dieses ergibt sich für die Bewegung der Planeten um die Sonne nur eine Störung, die merklich werden kann, nämlich in der Länge des Perihels. Dieselbe ist doppelt so groß als die aus dem W e b e r schen sich ergebende, so daß, wenn man nach einem Vorschlag von L é v y [*Footnote*: L é v y, Sur l'application des lois électrodynamiques au mouvement des planètes. Compt. rend. Paris 1890.] beide unter Einführung einer erst zu bestimmenden Konstante λ zu einem vereinigt in der Form:

$$P = P_{\text{Weber}} + \lambda (P_{\text{Riemann}} - P_{\text{Weber}}),$$

d. h.

$$P = \frac{\chi^2 m_1 m_2}{r} \left[1 - \frac{1}{c^2} \left\{ (1 - \lambda) \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 + \lambda \left[\left(\frac{dx}{dt} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{dy}{dt} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{dz}{dt} \right)^2 \right] \right\} \right]$$

man eine Perihelstörung von der Größe

$$13,65'' + \lambda (27,30'' - 13,65'') = 13,65 (1 + \lambda)$$

erhält. Soll sie gleich sein $41,25''$, so wird $\lambda = 2$ und die Gesetze

$$P_1 = \frac{\chi^2 m_1 m_2}{r} \left[1 + \frac{1}{c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 - \frac{2}{c^2} \left\{ \left(\frac{dx}{dt} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{dy}{dt} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{dz}{dt} \right)^2 \right\} \right],$$

ebenso wie

$$P_2 = \frac{\chi^2 m_1 m_2}{r} \left[1 + \frac{3}{c^2} \left(\frac{dr}{dt} \right)^2 \right]$$

beseitigen, das N e w t o n sche Gesetz substituierend, mindestens eine der bisher in den Bewegungen der Planeten konstatierten Unregelmäßigkeiten, die im Perihel des Merkur, unter der gewiß einfachen Annahme, daß die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation der des Lichtes an Größe gleich ist, ohne gar zu große Schwierigkeiten in den Bewegungen der anderen Planeten hervorzurufen. Es muß jedoch hervorgehoben werden, daß dieses

einziges Ergebnis, so zutreffend es sein mag, nicht genügt, um die volle Substitution des Newtonschen Gesetzes durch eines P_1 oder P_2 nach allen Richtungen hin zu rechtfertigen. Zunächst bleibt nämlich, wie man sich leicht überzeugen kann, die Schwierigkeit bestehen, die nach von Seelig in der Ausdehnung ihrer Gültigkeit auf den unendlichen Raum liegt, andererseits müßte auch noch die Bewegung sehr sonnennaher Kometen untersucht werden, hauptsächlich was periodische Störungen anlangt, um eine endgültige Entscheidung zu treffen.“

Man sieht, daß die Aufgabe, die sich P. Gerber stellte, im wesentlichen nur darin bestand, einen physikalisch plausiblen Grund für die Verallgemeinerung des einfachen C. Neumannschen Ansatzes für das retardierte Potential

$$P = \frac{\chi^2 m_1 m_2}{r \left(1 - \frac{\Delta r}{r} \right)}$$

in

$$P = \frac{\chi^2 m_1 m_2}{r \left(1 - \frac{\Delta r}{r} \right)^2}$$

(siehe p. 18 seiner Programmabhandlung) zu finden. Inwieweit die Begründung, wie er sie durchführt, stichhaltig ist und die Physiker befriedigt, darüber enthalte ich mich jeder Entscheidung.

Nur eine Bemerkung sei mir noch gestattet. Sie zielt dahin, daß die beiden eben erwähnten Ausdrücke P_1 (nach Gerber) und P_2 (nach Lévy) die Zahl der von Wiechert in seiner Mitteilung „Perihelbewegung des Merkur und allgemeine Mechanik“, Götting. Nachr. 1916, p. 125, aufgestellten Gesetze, die geeignet sind, das Newtonsche Gesetz soweit zu verallgemeinern, daß dadurch die anomale Perihelbewegung des Merkur erklärt wird, um zwei vergrößern, wenn auch das Prinzip der Erweiterung in beiden Fällen ein anderes ist. Hier das Prinzip der Relativität von Raum und Zeit — bei Gerber und Lévy aber das der Retardation des Potentials im Sinne einer Art von Aberration, bei der aber die Glieder erster Ordnung in der Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation wegfallen, weil sie nichts zum effektiven Potential beitragen.

2773. E. Mach, *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, LaSalle, Illinois, (1960), p. 235.

2774. E. Mach, *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwicklung*, fifth improved and enlarged edition, F. A. Brockhaus, (1904), p. 201. The same passage appears in the seventh edition of Mach's work (1912) at pages 185-186.

2775. G. W. de Tunzelmann, *A Treatise on Electrical Theory and the Problem of the Universe. Considered from the Physical Point of View, with Mathematical Appendices*, Charles Griffin, London, (1910), pp. 597-598.

2776. E. Gehrcke, “Die Grenzen der Relativität”, *Die Umschau*, Number 24, (1922), pp. 381-382; **and** *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie; kulturhistorisch-psychologische Dokumente*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924); **and** *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924); which republishes the following articles by Gehrcke: “Bemerkung über die Grenzen des Relativitätsprinzips”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen*

Gesellschaft, Volume 13, (1911), pp. 665-669; **and** “Nochmals über die Grenzen des Relativitätsprinzips”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 13, (1911), pp. 990-1000; **and** “Notiz zu einer Abhandlung von Herrn F. Grünbaum”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 14, (1912), p. 294; **and** “Über den Sinn der absoluten Bewegung von Körpern”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Volume 12, (1912), pp. 209-222; **and** “Die gegen Relativitätstheorie erhobenen Einwände”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 1, Number 3, (17 January 1913), pp. 62-66; **and** “Einwände gegen die Relativitätstheorie”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 1, Number 7, (14 February 1913), p. 170; **and** “Über die Koordinatensysteme der Mechanik”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 15, (1913), pp. 260-266; **and** “Die erkenntnistheoretischen Grundlagen der verschiedenen, physikalischen Relativitätstheorien”, *Kant-Studien*, Volume 19, (1914), pp. 481-487; **and** “Zur Kritik und Geschichte der neueren Gravitationstheorien”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 51, (1916), pp. 119-124; **and** “Über den Äther”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 20, (1918), pp. 165-169; **and** “Zur Diskussion über den Äther”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 21, (1919), pp. 67-68; **and** “Berichtigung zum Dialog der Relativitätstheorien”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 7, (1919), pp. 147-148; **and** “Die Astrophysik in relativistischer Beleuchtung”, *Zeitschrift für physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 32, (1919), pp. 205-206; **and** “Was beweisen die Beobachtungen über die Richtigkeit der Relativitätstheorie?”, *Zeitschrift für technische Physik*, Volume 1, (1920), p. 123; **and** *Die Relativitätstheorie eine wissenschaftliche Massensuggestion*, Arbeitsgemeinschaft Deutscher Naturforscher zur Erhaltung reiner Wissenschaft, Berlin, (1920); **and** “Die Stellung der Mathematik zur Relativitätstheorie”, *Beiträge zur Philosophie des Deutschen Idealismus*, Volume 2, (1921), pp. 13-19; **and** “Die Relativitätstheorie auf dem Naturforschertage in Nauheim”, *Umschau, Wochenschrift über die Fortschritte in Wissenschaften und Technik*, Volume 25, (1921), p. 99; **and** “Zur Relativitätsfrage”, *Die Umschau*, Volume 25, (1921), p. 227; **and** “Über das Uhrenparadoxon in der Relativitätstheorie”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 9, (1921), p. 482; **and** “Die Erörterung des Uhrenparadoxons in der Relativitätstheorie”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 9, (1921), p. 550; **and** “Schwerkraft und Relativitätstheorie”, *Zeitschrift für technische Physik*, Volume 2, (1921), pp. 194-195; **and** “Zur Frage der Relativitätstheorie”, *Kosmos, Sonderheft über die Relativitätstheorie*, (Special Edition on the Theory of Relativity), (1921), pp. 296-298; **and** “Die Gegensätze zwischen der Aethertheorie und Relativitätstheorie und ihre experimentelle Prüfung”, *Zeitschrift für technische Physik*, Volume 4, (1923), pp. 292-299.

Gehrcke published introductions in: S. Mohorovičić, *Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie und ihr mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Charakter*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1923); **and** in M. Palágyi, *Zur Weltmechanik, Beiträge zur Metaphysik der Physik von Melchior Palágyi, mit einem Geleitwort von Ernst Gehrcke*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1925). Excerpts from *Die Relativitätstheorie eine wissenschaftliche Massensuggestion*, Arbeitsgemeinschaft Deutscher Naturforscher zur Erhaltung reiner Wissenschaft, Berlin, (1920), appear in *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, (1931), 85-86, and there is a bibliography of sorts at page 76.

2777. See: “The Einstein-Besso Manuscript on the Motion of the Perihelion of Mercury”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 4, Document 14.

2778. M. Besso letter to Einstein of 5 December 1916, translated by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 283, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 271.

- 2779.** F. Adler letter to Einstein of 23 March 1917, translated by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 316, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 308.
- 2780.** A. Einstein quoted in G. E. Tauber, *Albert Einstein's Theory of General Relativity*, Crown, New York, (1979), p. 98.
- 2781.** M. Planck, "Das Prinzip der Relativität und die Grundgleichungen der Mechanik", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 8, (1906), pp. 136-141; "Die Kaufmannschen Messungen der Ablenkbarkeit der β -Strahlen in ihrer Bedeutung für die Dynamik der Elektronen", *Physikalische Zeitschrift* Volume 7, (1906), pp. 753-759, with a discussion on pp. 759-761.
- 2782.** W. Kaufmann, "Über die Konstitution des Elektrons", *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1905), pp. 949-956, especially p. 954; and "Über die Konstitution des Elektrons", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 19, (1906), pp. 487-553; "Nachtrag zu der Abhandlung: 'Über die Konstitution des Elektrons'", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 20, (1906), pp. 639-640.
- 2783.** A. Einstein, "Über die vom Relativitätsprinzip geforderte Trägheit der Energie", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 23, (1907), pp. 371-384, at 373.
- 2784.** Hr. Waldeyer, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1915), p. 803.
- 2785.** Letter from M. Born to D. Hilbert of 23 November 1915, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen, Cod. Ms. D. Hilbert 40 A: Nr. 11; the relevant part of which is reproduced in D. Wuensch, „zwei wirkliche Kerle“: *Neues zur Entdeckung der Gravitationsgleichungen der Allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie durch Albert Einstein und David Hilbert*, Termessos, Göttingen, (2005), pp. 73-74.
- 2786.** A. Einstein, "Erklärung der Perihelbewegung des Merkur aus der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie", *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (1915), pp. 831-839, at 834; reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 24; English translation by B. Doyle, *A Source Book in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 1900-1975*, Harvard University Press, (1979), which is reproduced in *The Collected Papers*.
- 2787.** A. Einstein to D. Hilbert 18 November 1915, English translation by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 148, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 148.
- 2788.** Hr. Waldeyer, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1915), p. 843.
- 2789.** A. Einstein to A. Sommerfeld of 28 November 1915, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 153, Princeton University Press, (1998).
- 2790.** A. Einstein to M. Besso of 3 January 1916, English translation by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 178, Princeton University Press, (1998), pp. 171-172, at 172.
- 2791.** R. C. Tolman, *Relativity Thermodynamics and Cosmology*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, pp. 271-272. Special thanks to Prof. Winterberg for informing me of this important reference.
- 2792.** A. Moszkowski, *Einstein: The Searcher*, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1921), pp. 4-5.
- 2793.** A. Einstein, English translation by B. Doyle, "Explanation of the Perihelion Motion of Mercury from the General Theory of Relativity", *A Source Book in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 1900-1975*, Harvard University Press, (1979), as reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 24, Princeton University Press, (1997), pp. 112-116, at 114. As early as 26 February 1916, Emil Wiechert stated, " α is a constant,

- which plays a fundamental role in the Einstein theory[.]” “ α ist eine Konstante, welche in der Einsteinschen Theorie eine grundlegende Rolle spielt[.]” E. Wiechert, “Perihelbewegung des Merkur und die allgemeine Mechanik”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (26 February 1916), pp. 124-141, at 137; republished, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 17, (1916), pp. 442-448.
- 2794.** A. Einstein, English translation by B. Doyle, “Explanation of the Perihelion Motion of Mercury from the General Theory of Relativity”, *A Source Book in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 1900-1975*, Harvard University Press, (1979), as reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 24, Princeton University Press, (1997), pp. 112-116, at 116.
- 2795.** A. Einstein, translation by B. Doyle, “Explanation of the Perihelion Motion of Mercury from the General Theory of Relativity”, *A Source Book in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 1900-1975*, Harvard University Press, (1979), as reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 24, Princeton University Press, (1997), pp. 112-116, at 114.
- 2796.** A. Einstein, translation by B. Doyle, “Explanation of the Perihelion Motion of Mercury from the General Theory of Relativity”, *A Source Book in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 1900-1975*, Harvard University Press, (1979), as reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 24, Princeton University Press, (1997), pp. 112-116, at 115.
- 2797.** Cf. W. Pauli, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, New York, (1958), p. 168. H. Weyl, *Space-Time-Matter*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 258.
- 2798.** Schwarzschild noted that Einstein’s α was problematic. See the letter from K. Schwarzschild to A. Einstein of 22 December 1915, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8a, Document 169.
- 2799.** C. L. Poor, “Planetary Motions and the Einstein Theories”, *Scientific American Monthly*, Volume 3, (June, 1921), pp. 484-486; **and** “Alternative to Einstein: How Dr. Poor Would Save Newton’s Law and the Classical Time and Space Concept”, *Scientific American*, Volume 124, (11 June 1921), p. 468; **and** “Motions of the Planets and the Relativity Theory”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 54, (8 July 1921), pp. 30-34; **and** “Test for Eclipse Plates”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 57, (25 May 1923), pp. 613-614; **and** C. L. Poor and A. Henderson, “Is Einstein Wrong? A Debate”, *Forum*, Volumes 71 & 72, (June/July, 1924), pp. 705-715, 13-21; replies *Forum*, Volume 72, (August 1924), pp. 277-281; **and** C. L. Poor, “Relativity and the Motion of Mercury”, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, Volume 29, (15 July 1925), pp. 285-319; **and** “The Deflection of Light as Observed at Total Solar Eclipses”, *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, Volume 20, (1930), pp. 173-211; **and** “What Einstein Really Did”, *Scribner’s Magazine*, Volume 88, (July-December, 1930), pp. 527-538; discussion follows in *Commonweal*, Volume 13, (24 December 1930, 7 January 1931, 11 February 1931), pp. 203-204, 271-272, 412-413. **See also:** “Alternative to Einstein; How Dr. Poor would Save Newton’s Law and the Classical Time and Space Concept”, *Scientific American*, Volume 124, (11 June 1921), p. 468.
- 2800.** C. L. Poor, “What Einstein Really Did”, *Scribner’s Magazine*, Volume 88, (July-December 1930), pp. 527-538, at 531, 532, 538.
- 2801.** Courtesy of the Department of Special Collections, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN.
- 2802.** Courtesy of the Department of Special Collections, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN.

2803. E. Guillaume, *La Théorie de la Relativité: Résumé des conférences faites à l'Université de Lausanne au semestre d'été 1920*, F. Rouge, Lausanne, (1921), pp. 37-38.

2804. S. Mohorovičić, *Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie und ihr mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Charakter*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1923), p. 41.

2805. P. Gerber, "Die räumliche und zeitliche Ausbreitung der Gravitation", *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik*, Volume 43, (1898), pp. 93-104; **and** *Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation*, Programmabhandlung des städtischen Realgymnasiums zu Stargard in Pommerania, (1902); reprinted "Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 52, (1917), pp. 415-441. Einstein stated, "[. . .]Gerber, who has given the correct formula for the perihelion motion of Mercury before I did [quoted in G. E. Tauber, *Albert Einstein's Theory of General Relativity*, Crown, New York, (1979), p. 98]." Seeliger attacked Gehrcke and Gerber: H. v. Seeliger, "Bemerkung zu P. Gerbers Aufsatz 'Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation'", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 53, (1917), pp. 31-32; "Weiters Bemerkungen zur 'Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation'", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 54, (1917), pp. 38-40; **and** "Bemerkung zu dem Aufsätze des Herrn Gehrcke 'Über den Äther'", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 20, (1918), p. 262.

For counter-argument, see: E. Gehrcke, "Zur Kritik und Geschichte der neueren Gravitationstheorien", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 51, (1916), pp. 119-124; **and** *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 52, (1917), p. 415; **and** "Über den Äther", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 20, (1918), pp. 165-169; **and** "Zur Diskussion über den Äther", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 21, (1919), pp. 67-68; Gehrcke's articles are reprinted in *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 40-48.

For further discussion, see also: L. Silberstein, "The Motion of Mercury Deduced from the Classical Theory of Relativity", *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, (1917), pp. 503-510; **and** S. Oppenheim, "Zur Frage nach der Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 53, (1917), pp. 163-168; **and** L. C. Glaser, "Zur Erörterung über die Relativitätstheorie", *Tägliche Rundschau*, (16 August 1920); **and** P. Weyland, *Tägliche Rundschau*, (6, 14, and 16 August 1920); **and** J. Riem, "Das Relativitätsgesetz", *Deutsche Zeitung* (Berlin), Number 286, (26 June 1920); **and** "Gegen den Einstein Rummel!", *Umschau*, Volume 24, (1920), pp. 583-584; **and** "Amerika über Einstein", *Deutsche Zeitung*, (1 July 1921 evening edition); **and** "Zu Einsteins Amerikafahrt. Stimmen amerikanischer Blätter und die Antwort Reuterdahls", *Deutsche Zeitung*, (13 September 1921); **and** "Ein amerikanisches Weltanschauungsbuch", *Der Reichsbote* (Berlin), Number 463, (4 October 1921); **and** "Um Einsteins Relativitätstheorie", *Deutsche Zeitung*, (18 November 1921); **and** "Die astronomischen Beweismittel der Relativitätstheorie", *Hellweg Westdeutsche Wochenschrift für Deutsche Kunst*, Volume 1, (1921), pp. 314-316; **and** "Keine Bestätigung der Relativitätstheorie", *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, Volume 36, (1921), p. 420; **and** "Lenards gewichtige Stimme gegen die Relativitätstheorie", *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, Volume 36, (1921), p. 551; **and** "Neues zur Relativitätstheorie", *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, Volume 37, (1922), pp. 13-14; **and** "Beobachtungstatsachen zur Relativitätstheorie", *Umschau*, Volume 27, (1923), pp. 328-329; **and** M. v. Laue, "Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation. Bemerkungen zur gleichnamigen Abhandlungen von P. Gerber", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 53, (1917), pp. 214-216; **and** *Tägliche Rundschau*, (11 August 1920); **and** "Historisch-Kritisches über die

Perihelbewegung des Mercur”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 8, (1920), pp. 735-736; **and** P. Lenard’s analysis in, “Über die Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahls von seiner geradlinigen Bewegung durch die Attraktion eines Weltkörpers, an welchem er nahe vorbeigeht; von J. Soldner, 1801”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 65, (1921), pp. 593-604; **and** *Über Äther und Uräther*, Second Edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1922); **and**, the later the edition, the better, *Über Relativitätssprinzip, Äther, Gravitation*, third enlarged edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1921); **and** A. Einstein, “Meine Antwort”, *Berliner Tageblatt und Handels-Zeitung*, (August 27, 1920); English translation quoted in G. E. Tauber, *Albert Einstein’s Theory of General Relativity*, Crown, New York, (1979), pp. 97-99; **and** G. v. Gleich, “Die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie und das Merkurperihel”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 72, (1923), pp.221-235; **and** “Zur Kritik der Relativitätstheorie vom mathematisch-physikalischen Standpunkt aus”, *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Volume 25, (1924), pp. 230-246; **and** “Die Vieldeutigkeit in der Relativitätstheorie”, *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Volume 25, (1924), pp. 329-334; **and** *Einsteins Relativitätstheorien und Physikalische Wirklichkeit*, Barth, Leipzig, (1930); **and** A. Reuterdahl, “Einstein and the New Science”, *Bi-Monthly Journal of the College of St. Thomas*, Volume 11, Number 3, (July, 1921); **and** “The Origin of Einsteinism”, *The New York Times*, Section 7, (12 August 1923), p. 8. Reply to F. D. Bond’s response, “Reuterdahl and the Einstein Theory”, *The New York Times*, Section 7, (15 July 1923), p. 8. Response to A. Reuterdahl, “Einstein’s Predecessors”, *The New York Times*, Section 8, (3 June 1923), p. 8. Which was a reply to F. D. Bond, “Relating to Relativity”, *The New York Times*, Section 9, (13 May 1923), p. 8. Which was a response to H. A. Houghton, “A Newtonian Duplication?”, *The New York Times*, Section 1, Part 1, (21 April 1923), p. 10; **and** “Der Einsteinismus \ Seine Trugschlüsse und Täuschungen”, *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, (1931), p. 45; *See also*: J. T. Blankart, “Relativity of Interdependence; Reuterdahl’s Theory Contrasted with Einstein’s”, *Catholic World*, Volume 112, (February, 1921), pp. 588-610; **and** T. J. J. See, “Prof. See Attacks German Scientist, Asserting That His Doctrine Is 122 Years Old”, *The New York Times*, (13 April 1923), p. 5; **and** “Einstein a Second Dr. Cook?”, *The San Francisco Journal*, (13 May 1923), pp. 1, 6; **and** (20 May 1923), p. 1; “Einstein a Trickster?”, *The San Francisco Journal*, (27 May 1923); response by R. Trumpler, “Historical Note on the Problem of Light Deflection in the Sun’s Gravitational Field”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 1496, (1923), pp. 161-163; reply by See, “Soldner, Foucault and Einstein”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, (1923), p. 372; rejoinder by L. P. Eisenhart, “Soldner and Einstein”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 1512, (1923), pp. 516-517; rebuttal by A. Reuterdahl, “The Einstein Film and the Debacle of Einsteinism”, *The Dearborn Independent*, (22 March 1924), p. 15; **and** “New Theory of the Ether”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 217, (1923), pp. 193-283; **and** “Is the Einstein Theory a Crazy Vagary?”, *The Literary Digest*, (2 June 1923), pp. 29-30; **and** R. Morgan, “Einstein Theory Declared Colossal Humbug by U.S. Naval Astronomer”, *The Dearborn Independent*, (21 July 1923), p. 14; **and** “Prof. See Attacks German Scientist Asserting that his Doctrine is 122 Years Old”, *The New York Times*, Section 1, (13 April 1923), p. 5; **and** “Einstein Geometry Called Careless”, *The San Francisco Journal*, (14 October 1924); **and** “Is Einstein’s Arithmetic Off?”, *The Literary Digest*, Volume 83, Number 6, (8 November 1924), pp. 20-21; **and** “Navy Scientist Claims Einstein Theory Error”, *The Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, (13 October 1924). Ironically, Reuterdahl accused See of plagiarizing his exposure of Einstein’s plagiarism in America, first recognized by Gehrcke and Lenard in Germany! “Reuterdahl Says See Takes Credit for Work of Others”, *The Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, (14 October 1924); **and** “A Scientist Yields to Temptation”, *The Minneapolis Journal*, (2 February 1925); **and** “Prof. See declares Einstein in Error. Naval Astronomer Says Eclipse Observations Fully Confirm Newton’s

Gravitation Theory. Says German began Wrong. A Mistake in Mathematics is Charged, with 'Curved Space' Idea to Hide it." *The New York Times*, (14 October 1924), p. 14; responses by Eisenhart, Eddington and Dyson, *The New York Times*, (16 October 1924), p. 12; **and** "Captain See vs. Doctor Einstein", *Scientific American*, Volume 138, (February 1925), p. 128; **and** T. J. J. See, *Researches in Non-Euclidian Geometry and the Theory of Relativity: A Systematic Study of Twenty Fallacies in the Geometry of Riemann, Including the So-Called Curvature of Space and Radius of World Curvature, and of Eighty Errors in the Physical Theories of Einstein and Eddington, Showing the Complete Collapse of the Theory of Relativity*, United States Naval Observatory Publication: Mare Island, Calif. : Naval Observatory,(1925); **and** "See Says Einstein has Changed Front. Navy Mathematician Quotes German Opposing Field Theory in 1911. Holds it is not New. Declares he himself Anticipated by Seven Years Relation of Electrodynamics to Gravitation", *The New York Times*, Section 2, (24 February 1929), p. 4. See refers to his works: *Electrodynamic Wave-Theory of Physical Forces*, Thos. P. Nichols, Boston, London, Paris, (1917); **and** *New Theory of the Aether*, Inhaber Georg Oheim, Kiel, (1922). *See also*: "New Theory of the Ether", *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 217, (1923), pp. 193-283; **and** N. T. Roseveare, *Mercury's Perihelion from Le Verrier to Einstein*, Oxford University Press, (1982), pp. 78, 115, 137-146; **and** P. Beckmann, *Einstein Plus Two*, The Golem Press, Boulder, Colorado, (1987), pp. 170-175 (*Cf.* T. Bethel, "A Challenge to Einstein", *National Review*, Volume 42, (5 November 1990), pp. 69-71.).

2806. H. S. Slusher and F. Ramirez, *The Motion of Mercury's Perihelion: A Reevaluation of the Problem and Its Implications for Cosmology and Cosmogony*, Institute for Creation Research, El Cajon, California, (1984). R. Nedvěď, "Mercury's Anomaly and the Stability of Newtonian Bisystems", *Physics Essays*, Volume 7, Number 3, (1994), pp. 374-384.

2807. L. Silberstein, "The Motion of Mercury Deduced from the Classical Theory of Relativity", *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, (1917), pp. 503-510, at 503-504.

2808. *Private Communication*

2809. See the letter from K. Schwarzschild to A. Einstein of 22 December 1915, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8a, Document 169. See also. K. Schwarzschild, "Über das Gravitationsfeld eines Massenpunktes nach der Einsteinschen Theorie", *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1916), pp. 189-196; **and** "Über das Gravitationsfeld einer Kugel aus inkompressibler Flüssigkeit nach der Einsteinschen Theorie", *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1916), pp. 424-434; **and** "Zur Quantenhypothese", *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1916), pp. 548-568. *Cf.* W. Pauli, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, New York, (1958), p. 164.

2810. *See*: A. Fowler, *The Observatory*, Volume 42, (1919), p. 297; Volume 43, Number 548, (1920), pp. 33-45. *See also*: J. J. Thomson, "Joint Eclipse Meeting of the Royal Society and the Royal Astronomical Society", *The Observatory*, Volume 42, (1919), pp. 389-398. **See also**: C. L. Poor, "The Deflection of Light as Observed at Total Solar Eclipses", *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, Volume 20, (1930), pp. 173-211; **and** "What Einstein Really Did", *Scribner's Magazine*, Volume 88, (July-December, 1930), pp. 527-538; discussion follows in *Commonweal*, Volume 13, (24 December 1930, 7 January 1931, 11 February 1931), pp. 203-204, 271-272, 412-413. **See also**: S. H. Guggenheimer, *The Einstein Theory Explained and Analyzed*, Macmillan, New York, (1920), pp. 298-299. **See also**: D. Sciama, G. J. Whitrow, Ed., *Einstein: The Man and His Achievement*, Dover, New York, (1973), pp. 39-40. **See also**: A. M. MacRobert, "Beating the Sky", *Sky and Telescope*,

Volume 89, (1995), pp. 40-43. **See also:** J. Maddox, “More Precise Solar-Limb Light-Bending”, *Nature*, Volume 377, (1995), pp. 11. **See also:** C. Couture and P. Marmet, “Relativistic Reflection of Light Near the Sun Using Radio Signals and Visible Light”, *Physics Essays*, Volume 12, (1999), pp. 162-173.

2811. F. W. Dyson, “On the opportunity afforded by the eclipse of 1919 May 29 of verifying Einstein’s Theory of Gravitation”, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 77, (1917), p. 445; **and** “Joint Eclipse Meeting of the Royal Society and the Royal Astronomical Society, 1919, November 6”, *The Observatory*, Volume 42, Number 545, (1919), pp. 389-398; **and** F. W. Dyson, C. A. Davidson, and A. S. Eddington, “Determination of the deflection of light by the Sun’s gravitational field, from observations made at the total eclipse of May 29, 1919”, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A*, Volume 220, (1920), pp. 291-333; *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution Showing the Operations, Expenditures, and Conditions of the Institution for the Year Ending June 30, 1919*, (U.S.) Government Printing Office, Washington, (1921), pp. 133-176.

2812. A. Einstein translated by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 5, Document 468, Princeton University Press, (1995), p. 351.

2813. *See:* J. Eisenstaedt, “De l’Influence de la Gravitation sur la Propagation de la Lumière en Théorie Newtonienne. L’Archéologie des Trous Noirs”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 42, (1991), pp. 315-386.

2814. J. G. v. Soldner, “Ueber die Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahls von seiner geradlinigen Bewegung, durch die Attraktion eines Weltkörpers, an welchem er nahe vorbei geht”, [*Berliner*] *Astronomisches Jahrbuch für das Jahr 1804*, pp. 161-172; reprinted in the relevant part with P. Lenard’s analysis in, “Über die Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahls von seiner geradlinigen Bewegung durch die Attraktion eines Weltkörpers, an welchem er nahe vorbeigeht; von J. Soldner, 1801”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 65, (1921), pp. 593-604; English translation in S. L. Jaki, “Johann Georg von Soldner and the Gravitational Bending of Light, with an English Translation of His Essay on It Published in 1801”, *Foundations of Physics*, Volume 8, (1978), pp. 927-950; critical response by M. v. Laue, “Erwiderung auf Hrn. Lenards Vorbemerkungen zur Soldnerschen Arbeit von 1801”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 66, (1921), pp. 283-284. Soldner followed up Newton’s query in the *Opticks*, “QUERY 1. Do not bodies act upon light at a distance, and by their action bend its rays; and is not this action (*cæteris paribus*) strongest at the least distance?” **See also:** P. Lenard, *Über Äther und Uräther*, second edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1922). **See also:** E. Gehrcke, “Zur Frage der Relativitätstheorie”, *Kosmos*, Special Edition on the Theory of Relativity, (1921), pp. 296-298; **and** “Die Gegensätze zwischen der Aethertheorie und Relativitätstheorie und ihre experimentelle Prüfung”, *Zeitschrift für technische Physik*, Volume 4, (1923), pp. 292-299; abstracts: *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 219, Number 5248, (1923), pp. 266-267; **and** *Univerzum*, Volume 1, (1923), pp. 261-263; **and** E. Gehrcke, *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Berlin, Hermann Meusser, (1924), pp. 82, 92-94. **See also:** *Frankfurter Zeitung*, Morning Edition, (6 November 1921), p. 1 and (18 November 1921), as cited by the editors of *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, (2002), p. 112. **See also:** T. J. J. See, “Einstein a Second Dr. Cook?”, “Einstein a Trickster?”, *The San Francisco Journal*, (13 May 1923), pp. 1, 6; (20 May 1923), p. 1; (27 May 1923); response by R. Trumpler, “Historical Note on the Problem of Light Deflection in the Sun’s Gravitational Field”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 1496, (1923), pp. 161-163; reply by See, “Soldner, Foucault and Einstein”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, (1923), p. 372; response by L. P. Eisenhart, “Soldner and Einstein”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 1512, (1923), pp. 516-517; rebuttal by A. Reuterdaahl, “The Einstein Film and the Debacle of

Einsteinism”, *The Dearborn Independent*, (22 March 1924), p. 15. **See also:** J. Eisenstaedt, “De l’Influence de la Gravitation sur la Propagation de la Lumière en Théorie Newtonienne. L’Archéologie des Trous Noirs”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 42, (1991), pp. 315-386. **See also:** A. F. Zakharov, *Astronomical and Astrophysical Transactions*, Volume 5, (1994), p. 85.

2815. Sir Edmund Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume II, Philosophical Library Inc., New York, (1954), p. 180.

2816. A. Einstein, “Über das Relativitätsprinzip und die aus demselben gezogenen Folgerungen”, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 4, (1908), pp. 411-462, at 461-462.

2817. *See:* J. Eisenstaedt, “De l’Influence de la Gravitation sur la Propagation de la Lumière en Théorie Newtonienne. L’Archéologie des Trous Noirs”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 42, (1991), pp. 315-386.

2818. A. Einstein, “On the Influence of Gravitation on the Propagation of Light”, *The Theory of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 108; which is an English translation by W. Perrett and G. B. Jeffrey of “Über den Einfluß der Schwerkraft auf die Ausbreitung des Lichtes”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 35, (1911), pp. 898-908, at 908.

2819. A. Einstein, “Erklärung der Perihelbewegung des Merkur aus der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (1915), pp. 831-839, at 834; reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 24; English translation by B. Doyle, *A Source Book in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 1900-1975*, Harvard University Press, (1979), which is reproduced in *The Collected Papers*.

2820. F. J. Müller, *Johann Georg von Soldner, Geodät*, Kastner & Callwey, München, (1914), pp. 46-47. Special thanks to Kathryn M. Neal of San Diego State University for supplying me with a copy of this work!

2821. A. Einstein, translated by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 5, Document 468, Princeton University Press, (1995), p. 351.

2822. The attribution to Renn is from J. Eisenstaedt, “De l’Influence de la Gravitation sur la Propagation de la Lumière en Théorie Newtonienne. L’Archéologie des Trous Noirs”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 42, (1991), pp. 315-386, at 378, 385; which cites: F. Rosenberger, *Isaac Newton und seine physikalischen Principien*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1895), pp. 315-316. Rosenberger’s book was well-known and is cited in P. Drude, “Ueber Fernwirkungen”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 62, (1897), pp. 693, I-XLIX, at VIII. Rosenberger’s book is also cited in L. Lange, “Das Inertialsystem vor dem Forum der Naturforschung”, *Philosophische Studien*, Volume 20, (1902), pp. 1-71, at 64, 69, and in Mach’s *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwicklung*, fifth improved and enlarged edition, F. A. Brockhaus, (1904), pp. 197, 206. The same passages appear in the third edition of Mach’s work (1897) at pages 184, 190, and the seventh edition at pages 181 and 190.

2823. A. Bernstein, *Naturwissenschaftliche Volksbücher*, third edition, Volume 18, Franz Dunker, Berlin, (1869), pp. 37-38. *See:* J. Renn and R. Schulmann, Editors, *Albert Einstein/Mileva Marić The Love Letters*, Princeton University Press, (1992), pp. xxiii, 45, 94, note 14. *See also:* F. Gregory, “The Mysteries and Wonders of Natural Science: Bernstein’s *Naturwissenschaftliche Volksbücher* and the Adolescent Einstein”, in J. Stachel and D. Howard, Editors, *Einstein: The Formative Years 1879-1909*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2000), pp. 23-41. *See also:* J. Eisenstaedt, “De l’Influence de la Gravitation sur la Propagation de la Lumière en Théorie Newtonienne. L’Archéologie des Trous Noirs”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 42, (1991), pp. 315-386, at 371-375, 378, 383, and 385.

- 2824.** A. Moszkowski, *Einstein: The Searcher*, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1921), p. 225.
- 2825.** A. Einstein quoted in P. A. Schilpp, *Albert Einstein als Philosoph und Naturforscher*, W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, (1955), p. 5.
- 2826.** M. Winteler-Einstein, English translation by A. Beck, “Albert Einstein—A Biographical Sketch”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987), pp. xv-xxii, at xxi.
- 2827.** S. Guggenheimer, *The Einstein Theory Explained and Analyzed*, Macmillan, New York, (1925), pp. 296-302.
- 2828.** C. L. Poor, “What Einstein Really Did”, *Scribner’s Magazine*, Volume 88, (July-December 1930), pp. 527-538, at 534.
- 2829.** A. Einstein, translated by R. W. Lawson, *Relativity: The Special and the General Theory*, Appendix 3, Part B, Methuen, New York, (1920), p. 153.
- 2830.** A. Einstein in the Czech version of *Relativity: The Special and the General Theory* English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 42, Note 4, Princeton University Press, (1997), p. 418.
- 2831.** See: P. Lenard, *Über Äther und Uräther*, second edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1922), p. 64. Lenard cites: S. D. Poisson, *Traité de Mécanique*, Second Edition, Bachelier, Paris, (1833).
- 2832.** S. L. Jaki, “Johann Georg von Soldner and the Gravitational Bending of Light, with an English Translation of His Essay on It Published in 1801”, *Foundations of Physics*, Volume 8, (1978), pp. 927-950.
- 2833.** J. Eisenstaedt, “De l’Influence de la Gravitation sur la Propagation de la Lumière en Théorie Newtonienne. L’Archéologie des Trous Noirs”, *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 42, (1991), pp. 315-386.
- 2834.** E. E. Slosson, “The Most Sensational Discovery of Science: The Weight of Light”, *The Independent*, Volume 100, (29 November 1919), pp. 136.
- 2835.** R. Trumpler, “Historical Note on the Problem of Light Deflection in the Sun’s Gravitational Field”, *Science*, Volume 58, Number 1496, (31 August 1923), pp. 161-163, at 161.
- 2836.** Courtesy of the Department of Special Collections, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN.
- 2837.** S. L. Jaki, “Johann Georg von Soldner and the Gravitational Bending of Light, with an English Translation of His Essay on It Published in 1801”, *Foundations of Physics*, Volume 8, (1978), pp. 927-950, at 947.
- 2838.** A. Eddington, *Report on the Relativity Theory of Gravitation*, second edition, Fleetway Press, London (1920), pp. 54-56; citation by Jaki.
- 2839.** H. H. Turner in the introduction of the English translation of Freundlich’s *The Foundations of Einstein’s Theory of Gravitation*, Methuen & Co. Ltd., London, (1924), p. xiii.
- 2840.** A. Reuterdaahl, “The Einstein Film and the Debacle of Einsteinism”, *The Dearborn Independent*, (22 March 1924), p. 15.
- 2841.** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, Toronto, New York, Melbourne, (1982), pp. 199-200.
- 2842.** Letter from R. de Villamil to A. Reuterdaahl of August 14th, 1925/1926???, Department of Special Collections, O’Shaughnessy-Frey Library, University of St. Thomas, Minnesota, pp. 2-3.
- 2843.** Courtesy of the Department of Special Collections, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, MN.

2844. E. Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1960), pp. 151-152.

2845. S. Newcomb, "On the Definition of the Terms Energy and Work", *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 27, (1889), pp. 115-117. **See also:** J. R. Schütz, "Das Prinzip der absoluten Erhaltung der Energie", *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, (1897), pp. 110-123. **See also:** G. F. Helm, *Die Energetik nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Veit, Leipzig, (1898), p. 362.

2846. S. T. Preston, *Physics of the Ether*, E. & F. N. Spon, London, (1875), p. 115; **and** "The Ether and its Functions", *Nature*, Volume 27, (19 April 1883), p. 579.

2847. J. J. Thomson, "On the Electric and Magnetic Effects Produced by the Motion of Electrified Bodies", *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 11, (1881), pp. 227-229; **and** *A Treatise on the Motion of Vortex Rings*, Macmillan, London, (1883); **and** *Elements of the Mathematical Theory of Electricity and Magnetism*, Cambridge University Press, (1895); **and** *The Elements of the Four Inner Planets and the Fundamental Constants of Astronomy*, (Supplement to the American ephemeris and nautical almanac for 1897), (U.S.) Government Printing Office, Washington, (1895); **and** "Cathode Rays", *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 44, (1897), pp. 293-316; **and** "On the Masses of the Ions in Gases at Low Pressures", *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 48, (1899), pp. 547-567; **and** "Über die Masse der Träger der negativen Elektrisierung in Gasen von niederen Drucken", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 1, (1899-1900), pp. 20-22; **and** "On Bodies Smaller than Atoms", *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution for the Year ending June 30, 1901*, (1902), pp. 231-243 [*Popular Science Monthly*, (August, 1901)]; **and** *Electricity and Matter*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, (1904); translated into German, *Elektrizität und Materie*, F. Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1904); Ives notes, cf. E. Cunningham, *The Principle of Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, (1914), p. 189.

2848. H. Poincaré, "La Théorie de Lorentz at le Principe de Réaction", *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Series 2, Volume 5, *Recueil de travaux offerts par les auteurs à H. A. Lorentz, professeur de physique à l'université de Leiden, à l'occasion du 25^{me} anniversaire de son doctorate le 11 décembre 1900*, Nijhoff, The Hague, (1900), pp. 252-278; reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume 9, pp. 464-488.

2849. O. De Pretto, "Ipostesi dell'etere nella vita dell'universo", *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, Volume 63, Part 2, (February, 1904), pp. 439-500. **See:** U. Bartocci, "Albert Einstein e Olinto De Pretto: la vera storia della formula più famosa del mondo / Umberto Bartocci ; con una nota biografica a cura di Bianca Maria Bonicelli e il testo integrale dell'opera di Olinto De Pretto, 'Ipotesi dell'etere nella vita dell'universo'", Andromeda, Bologna, (1999).

2850. F. Hasenöhr, "Zur Theorie der Strahlung in bewegten Körpern", *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 113, (1904), pp. 1039-1055; **and** "Zur Theorie der Strahlung in bewegten Körpern", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 15, (1904), pp. 344-370; *corrected:* Series 4, Volume 16, (1905), pp. 589-592; **and** *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 116, (1907), pp. 1391; **and** "Über die Umwandlung kinetischer Energie in Strahlung", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 10, (1909), pp. 829-830; **and** "Bericht über die Trägheit der Energie", *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 6, (1909), pp. 485-502; **and** "Über die Widerstand, welchen die Bewegung kleiner Körperchen in einem mit Hohlraumstrahlung erfüllten Raume erleidet", *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen*

Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 119, (1910), pp. 1327-1349; **and** “Die Erhaltung der Energie und die Vermehrung der Entropie”, in E. Warburg, *Die Kultur der Gegenwart: Ihre Entwicklung und ihre Ziele*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1915), pp. 661-691. Cf. P. Lenard’s analysis in, “Über die Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahls von seiner geradlinigen Bewegung durch die Attraktion eines Weltkörpers, an welchem er nahe vorbeigeht; von J. Soldner, 1801”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 65, (1921), pp. 593-604; **and** E. Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), pp. 51-54; **and** M. Born, “Physics and Relativity”, *Physics in my Generation*, second revised edition, Springer, New York, (1969), pp. 105-106.

2851. M. Planck, “Das Prinzip der Relativität und die Grundgleichungen der Mechanik”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 8, (1906), pp. 136-141; **and** “Die Kaufmannschen Messungen der Ablenkbarkeit der β -Strahlen in ihrer Bedeutung für die Dynamik der Elektronen”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 7, (1906), pp. 753-759, with a discussion on pp. 759-761; **and** “Zur Dynamik bewegter Systeme”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, Volume 13, (June, 1907), pp. 542-570, especially 542 and 544; reprinted *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 26, (1908), pp. 1-34; reprinted *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 2, F. Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 176-209; **and** “Bemerkungen zum Prinzip der Aktion und Reaktion in der allgemeinen Dynamik”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 10, (1908), pp. 728-731; **and** “Bemerkungen zum Prinzip der Aktion und Reaktion in der allgemeinen Dynamik (With a Discussion with Minkowski)”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 9, Number 23, (November 15, 1908), pp. 828-830. **See also:** R. v. Eötvös, “A Föld Vonzása Különböző Anyagokra”, *Akadémiai Értesítő*, Volume 2, (1890), pp. 108-110; German translation, “Über die Anziehung der Erde auf verschiedene Substanzen”, *Mathematische und naturwissenschaftliche Berichte aus Ungarn*, Volume 8, (1890), pp. 65-68; response, W. Hess, *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 15, (1891), pp. 688-689; **and** R. v. Eötvös, “Untersuchung über Gravitation und Erdmagnetismus”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 3, Volume 59, (1896), pp. 354-400; **and** “Beszéd a kolozsvári Bolyai-emlékünnepen”, *Akadémiai Értesítő*, (1903), p. 110; **and** “Bericht über die Verhandlungen der fünfzehnten allgemeinen Konferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung abgehalten vom 20. bis 28. September 1906 in Budapest”, *Verhandlungen der vom 20. bis 28. September 1906 in Budapest abgehaltenen fünfzehnten allgemeinen Konferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1908), pp. 55-108; **and** *Über geodetischen Arbeiten in Ungarn, besonders über Beobachtungen mit der Drehwaage*, Hornyánszky, Budapest, (1909); **and** “Bericht über Geodätische Arbeiten in Ungarn, besonders über Beobachtungen mit der Drehwaage”, *Verhandlungen der vom 21. Bis 29. September 1909 in London und Cambridge abgehaltenen sechzehnten allgemeinen Konferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1910), pp. 319-350; **and** “Über Arbeiten mit der Drehwaage: Ausgeführt im Auftrage der Königlichen Ungarischen Regierung in den Jahren 1908-1911”, *Verhandlungen der vom in Hamburg abgehaltenen siebzehnten allgemeinen Konferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1912), pp. 427-438; **and** Eötvös, Pekár, Fekete, *Trans. XVI. Allgemeine Konferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, (1909); *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (1909), *geschäftliche Mitteilungen*, p. 37; **and** “Beiträge zur Gesetze der Proportionalität von Trägheit und Gravität”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 68, (1922), pp. 11-16; **and** D. Pekár, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 7, (1919), p. 327. **Confer:** H. E. Ives, “Derivation of the Mass-Energy Relation”, *Journal of*

the Optical Society of America, Volume 42, Number 8, (August, 1952), pp. 540-543; reprinted R. Hazelett and D. Turner Editors, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers, a Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair Company, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979), pp. 182-185. **See also:** E. Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), pp. 151-152. **See also:** G. B. Brown, "What is Wrong with Relativity?", *Bulletin of the Institute of Physics and the Physical Society*, Volume 18, Number 3, (March, 1967), p. 71. **See also:** A. Einstein, "Über das Relativitätsprinzip und die aus demselben gezogenen Folgerung", *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 4, (1907), pp. 411-462; **and** "Über den Einfluß der Schwerkraft auf die Ausbreitung des Lichtes", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 35, (1911), pp. 898-908.

2852. Galileo, *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, (1967); **and** *Dialogues Concerning Two New Sciences*, Dover, New York, (1954).

2853. C. Huygens, *Christiani Hugenii Zulichemii Opera mechanica, geometrica astronomica et miscellanea quatuor voluminibus contexta : quæ collegit disposuit, ex schedis authoris emendavit, ordinavit, auxit atque illustravit Guilielmus Jacobus's Gravesande*, Gravesande, Willem Jacob's Lugduni Batavorum : Apud Gerardum Potvliet, Henricum van der Deyster, Philippum Bonk et Cornelium de Pecker, (1751). Cf. R. Taton, "The Beginnings of Modern Science, from 1450 to 1800", *History of Science*, Volume 2, Basic Books, New York, (1964-1966).

2854. I. Newton, *Principia*, Book I, Definitions I, II and III; **and** Book II, Section VI, Proposition XXIV, Theorem XIX; **and** Book III, Proposition VI, Theorem VI.

2855. R. J. Boscovich, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, (1966).

2856. A. Schopenhauer, *The World as Will and Idea*, Volume 1, first Book, Section 4, seventh edition, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., London, (1907), pp. 10-13.

2857. E. Mach, *Die Geschichte und die Wurzel des Satzes von der Erhaltung der Arbeit*, J. G. Calve, Prag, (1872); English translation by P. E. B. Jourdain, *History and Root of the Principle of the Conservation of Energy*, Open Court, Chicago, 1911; **and** *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwicklung historisch-kritisch dargestellt*, F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig, (1883 and multiple revised editions, thereafter); translated into English as *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, La Salle, (numerous editions).

2858. A. Bolliger, *Anti-Kant oder Elemente der Logik, der Physik und der Ethik*, Felix Schneider, Basel, (1882), esp. pp. 336-354.

2859. F. J. K. Geissler, *Eine mögliche Wesenserklärung für Raum, Zeit, das Unendliche und die Kausalität, nebst einem Grundwort zur Metaphysik der Möglichkeiten*, Gutenberg, Berlin, (1900); **and** "Ringgenberg Schluss mit der Einstein-Irrung!", H. Israel, et al, Editors, *Hundert Autoren Gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, (1931), pp. 10-12.

2860. F. W. Bessel, "Untersuchungen des Teiles planetarischer Störungen, welche aus der Bewegung der Sonne entstehen", *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1824); reprinted *Abhandlungen von Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel*, In Three Volumes, Volume 1, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1875-1876), p. 84; **and** "Bestimmung der Masse des Jupiter", *Astronomische Untersuchungen*, In Two Volumes, Gebrüder Bornträger, Königsberg, Volume 2, (1841-1842); *Abhandlungen von Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel*, Volume 3, p. 348. M. Jammer, *Concepts of Mass*, cites: F. W. Bessel, "Studies on the Length of the Seconds Pendulum", *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1824); **and** "Experiments on the Force with which the Earth Attracts Different Kinds of Bodies", *Abhandlungen der*

Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, (1830); and F. W. Bessel, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 25, (1832), pp. 1-14; and Volume 26, (1833), pp. 401-411; and *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 10, (1833), pp. 97-108.

2861. J. S. Stas, *Nouvelles recherches sur les lois des proportions chimiques: sur les poids atomiques et leurs rapports mutuels*, M. Hayez, Bruxelles, (1865), pp. 151, 171, 189 and 190; German translation by L. Aronstein, *Untersuchungen über die Gesetze der chemischen Proportionen, über die Atomgewichte und ihre gegenseitigen Verhältnisse*, Quandt & Händel, Leipzig, (1867).

2862. R. v. Eötvös, “A Föld Vonzása Különböző Anyagokra”, *Akadémiai Értesítő*, Volume 2, (1890), pp. 108-110; German translation, “Über die Anziehung der Erde auf verschiedene Substanzen”, *Mathematische und naturwissenschaftliche Berichte aus Ungarn*, Volume 8, (1890), pp. 65-68; response, W. Hess, *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 15, (1891), pp. 688-689; and R. v. Eötvös, “Untersuchung über Gravitation und Erdmagnetismus”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 3, Volume 59, (1896), pp. 354-400; and “Beszéd a kolozsvári Bolyai-emlékűnnepen”, *Akadémiai Értesítő*, (1903), p. 110; and “Bericht über die Verhandlungen der fünfzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung abgehalten vom 20. bis 28. September 1906 in Budapest”, *Verhandlungen der vom 20. bis 28. September 1906 in Budapest abgehaltenen fünfzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1908), pp. 55-108; and *Über geodetischen Arbeiten in Ungarn, besonders über Beobachtungen mit der Drehwaage*, Hornyánszky, Budapest, (1909); and “Bericht über Geodätische Arbeiten in Ungarn, besonders über Beobachtungen mit der Drehwaage”, *Verhandlungen der vom 21. Bis 29. September 1909 in London und Cambridge abgehaltenen sechzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1910), pp. 319-350; and “Über Arbeiten mit der Drehwaage: Ausgeführt im Auftrage der Königlichen Ungarischen Regierung in den Jahren 1908-1911”, *Verhandlungen der vom in Hamburg abgehaltenen siebzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1912), pp. 427-438; and Eötvös, Pekár, Fekete, *Trans. XVI. Allgemeine Konferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, (1909); *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (1909), *geschäftliche Mitteilungen*, p. 37; and “Beiträge zur Gesetze der Proportionalität von Trägheit und Gravität”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 68, (1922), pp. 11-16; and D. Pekár, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 7, (1919), p. 327.

2863. D. Kreichgauer, “Einige Versuche über die Schwere”, *Verhandlungen der physikalische Gesellschaft zu Berlin*, Volume 10, (1891), pp. 13-16.

2864. H. Landolt, “Untersuchungen über etwaige Änderungen des Gesamtgewichtes chemisch sich umsetzender Körper”, *Zeitschrift für physikalische Chemie*, Volume 12, (1893), pp. 1-34; “Untersuchungen über dir fraglichen Änderungen des Gesamtgewichtes chemisch sich umsetzender Körper. Zweite Mitteilung”, *Zeitschrift für physikalische Chemie*, Volume 55, (1906), pp. 589-621; “Untersuchungen über dir fraglichen Änderungen des Gesamtgewichtes chemisch sich umsetzender Körper. Dritte Mitteilung”, *Zeitschrift für physikalische Chemie*, Volume 64, (1908), pp. 581-614.

2865. A. Heydweiller, “Ueber Gewichtänderungen bei chemischer und physikalischer Umsetzung”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 4, Number 5, (1901), pp. 394-420; and “Bemerkungen zu Gewichtänderungen bei chemischer und physikalischer Umsetzung”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 3, (1902), pp. 425-426.

2866. Confer: P. Volkmann, *Einführung in das Studium der theoretischen Physik*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1900), pp. 74-77. E. Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., London, (1953), pp. 151-152. F.

Kottler, “Gravitation und Relativitätstheorie”, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen*, Volume 6, Part 2, Chapter 22a, pp. 159-237, at 188.

2867. A. Einstein, “Das Prinzip von der Erhaltung der Schwerpunktsbewegung und die Trägheit der Energie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 20, (1906), pp. 627-633, at 627.

2868. A. Einstein, “Zum gegenwärtigen Stand des Strahlungsproblems”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 10, Number 6, (1909), pp. 185-1193; and “Über die Entwicklung unserer Anschauungen über das Wesen und die Konstitution der Strahlung”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 7, (1909), pp. 482-500; reprinted *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 10, (1909), pp. 817-825.

2869. Confer: E. Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), pp. 52-53.

2870. G. N. Lewis, “A Revision of the Fundamental Laws of Matter and Energy”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 16, (1908), pp. 707-717; **and** G. N. Lewis and R. C. Tolman, “The Principle of Relativity and Non-Newtonian Mechanics”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 18, (1909), p. 510-523; **and** G. N. Lewis, “A Revision of the Fundamental Laws of Matter and Energy”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 16, (1908), pp. 707-717; **and** R. C. Tolman, “Non-Newtonian Mechanics, the Mass of a Moving Body”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 23, (1912), pp. 375-380; **and** E. B. Wilson and G. N. Lewis, “The Space-Time Manifold of Relativity: The Non-Euclidean Geometry of Mechanics and Electrodynamics”, *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Volume 48, Number 11, (November, 1912), pp. 389-507.

2871. G. B. Brown, “What is Wrong with Relativity?”, *Bulletin of the Institute of Physics and the Physical Society*, Volume 18, Number 3, (March, 1967), p. 71; citing G. N. Lewis, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 18, (1909), pp. 517-527.

2872. L. A. P. Rougier, *Philosophy and the New Physics*, English translation by M. Masius, P. Blakiston’s Son & Co., Philadelphia, (1921); *La Matérialisation de L’Énergie*, Gauthier-Villars, (1921).

2873. M. Jammer, *Concepts of Mass in Classical and Modern Physics*, Dover, New York, (1961).

2874. A. Einstein, “Über das Relativitätsprinzip und die aus demselben gezogenen Folgerung”, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 4, (1908), pp. 411-462, at 414.

2875. M. Planck, “Zur Dynamik bewegter Systeme”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, Volume 13, (13 June 1907), pp. 541-570, at 544-546.

2876. See: P. Langevin, “Le Physicien”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 20, Number 5, (September, 1913), pp. 675-718. **See also:** H. A. Lorentz, “Deux mémoires de Henri Poincaré sur la physique mathématique”, *Acta Mathematica*, Volume 38, (1921), pp. 293-308; reprinted in *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 683-695; **and** Volume 11, (1956), pp. 247-261. **See also:** C. Nordmann, *Einstein et l’univers*, (1921), translated by J. McCabe as *Einstein and the Universe*, Henry Holt & Co., New York, (1922), pp. 10-11, 16. **See also:** W. Pauli, “Relativitätstheorie”, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen*, Volume 5, Part 2, Chapter 19, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1921), pp. 539-775; English translation by G. Field, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, London, Edinburgh, New York, Toronto, Sydney, Paris, Braunschweig, (1958). **See also:** H. Thirring, “Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper und spezielle Relativitätstheorie”, *Handbuch der Physik*, Volume 12 (“Theorien der Elektrizität

Elektrostatik”), Springer, Berlin, (1927), pp. 245-348, especially 264, 270, 275, 283. **See also:** S. Guggenheimer, *The Einstein Theory Explained and Analyzed*, Macmillan, New York, (1929). **See also:** J. Mackaye, *The Dynamic Universe*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1931). **See also:** J. Le Roux, “Le Problème de la Relativité d’Après les Idées de Poincaré”, *Bulletin de la Société Scientifique de Bretagne*, Volume 14, (1937), pp. 3-10. **See also:** Sir Edmund Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Philosophical Library Inc., New York, (1954), especially pp. 27-77; **and** “Albert Einstein”, *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the Royal Society*, Volume 1, (1955), pp. 37-67. **See also:** G. H. Keswani, “Origin and Concept of Relativity, Parts I, II & III”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 15, Number 60, (February, 1965), pp. 286-306; Volume 16, Number 61, (May, 1965), pp.19-32; Volume 16, Number 64, (February, 1966), pp. 273-294; **and** Volume 17, Number 2, (August, 1966), pp. 149- 152; Volume 17, Number 3, (November, 1966), pp. 234-236. **See also:** G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, “Intimations of Relativity before Einstein”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (December, 1983), pp. 343-354. **See also:** G. B. Brown, “What is Wrong with Relativity?”, *Bulletin of the Institute of Physics and the Physical Society*, Volume 18, Number 3, (March, 1967), pp. 71-77. **See also:** C. Cuvaj, “Henri Poincaré’s Mathematical Contributions to Relativity and the Poincaré Stresses”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 36, (1968), pp. 1109-1111. **See also:** C. Giannoni, “Einstein and the Lorentz-Poincaré Theory of Relativity”, *PSA: Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*, Volume 1970, (1970), pp. 575-589. JSTOR link:

<<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0270-8647%281970%291970%3C575%3AEATLTO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Z>>

See also: H. M. Schwartz, “Poincaré’s Rendiconti Paper on Relativity”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 39, (November, 1971), pp. 1287-1294; Volume 40, (June, 1972), pp. 862-872; Volume 40, (September, 1972), pp. 1282-1287. **See also:** J. Mehra, *Einstein, Hilbert, and the Theory of Gravitation*, Reidel, Dordrecht, Netherlands, (1974). **See also:** W. Kantor, *Relativistic Propagation of Light*, Coronado Press, Lawrence, Kansas, (1976). **See also:** R. McCormach, “Editor’s Forward”, *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences*, Volume 7, (1976), pp. xi-xxxv. **See also:** H. Ives, D. Turner, J. J. Callahan, R. Hazelett, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers*, Devin-Adair Co., Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979). **See also:** J. Leveugle, “Henri Poincaré et la Relativité”, *La Jaune et la Rouge*, Volume 494, (April, 1994), pp. 29-51; **and** *La Relativité, Poincaré et Einstein, Planck, Hilbert: Histoire véridique de la Théorie de la Relativité*, L’Harmattan, Paris, (2004). **See also:** A. A. Logunov, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995); **and** *The Theory of Gravity*, Nauka, Moscow, (2001). **See also:** E. Gianetto, “The Rise of Special Relativity: Henri Poincaré’s Works before Einstein”, *ATTI DEL XVIII CONGRESSO DI STORIA DELLA FISICA E DELL’ASTRONOMICA*, pp. 172-207; URL:

<<http://www.brera.unimi.it/Atti-Como-98/Gianetto.pdf>>

See also: S. G. Bernatosian, *Vorovstvo i obman v nauke*, Erudit, St. Petersburg, (1998), ISBN: 5749800059 . **See also:** U. Bartocci, *Albert Einstein e Olinto De Pretto: La vera storia della formula piu famosa del mondo*, Societa Editrice Andromeda, Bologna, (1999). **See also:** Jean-Paul Auffray, *Einstein et Poincaré: sur les Traces de la Relativité*, Le Pommier, Paris, (1999).

2877. J. Verne, *De la terre à la lune; trajet direct en 97 heures*, Bibliothèque d'éducation et de récréation, J. Hetzel, 18, rue Jacob, Paris, (1865). English translation by L. Mercier and E. E. King, *From the Earth to the Moon direct in ninety-seven hours and twenty minutes, and a trip round it*, Scribner, Armstrong, New York, (1874).

2878. E. E. Slosson, *Easy Lessons in Einstein*, Harcourt, Brace and Howe, (1921), pp. 79-80.

2879. *The New York Times*, (3 December 1919), p. 19.

2880. A. Einstein, translated by Y. A. Ono, "How I Created the Theory of Relativity", *Physics Today*, Volume 35, Number 8, (August, 1982), p. 47.

2881. A. Einstein, translated by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 31, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 135-136.

2882. A. Einstein, translated by R. W. Lawson, "The Equality of the Inertial and Gravitational Mass as an Argument for the General Postulate of Relativity", *Relativity: The Special and the General Theory*, Chapter 20, Methuen, New York, (1920), pp. 78-83. See also: "Zum gegenwärtigen Stande des Gravitationsproblems", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 14, Section 4, (1913), pp. 1249-1262.

2883. G. Méliès, *Faust and Marguerite*, (1897); **and** *The Moon at Arm's Length = La Lune a un Mètre*, (1898); **and** *Summoning the Spirits = Evocation Spirite*, (1899) **and** *Joan of Arc = Jeann d'Arc*, (1900); **and** *The Chrysalis and the Butterfly = Le Chrysalide et le Papillon*, (1901); **and** *The Human Fly = L'Homme-Mouche*, (1902); **and** *Impossible Balance = L'Équilibre*, (1902); **and** *The Infernal Cake Walk = Le Cake-Walk Infernal*, (1903); **and** *The Infernal Boiling Point = Le Chaudon Infernal*, (1903); **and** *Kingdom of the Fairies = La Royaume des Fées*, (1903); **and** *the Legend of Rip Van Winkle = Le Légend de Rip Van Winkle*, (1905); **and** *The Frozen Policeman = L'Agent Gelé*, (1908). **See also:** J. Mény, *The Magic of Méliès a film by Jaques Mény*, Facets Video, Arte Video, Silent Era Collection, (1997/2001). The films of Méliès and of those early film makers who copied him, appear to have influenced *Monty Python's Flying Circus*, as did Peter Sellers' *Crazy People / The Goon Show*.

2884. A. Reuter Dahl, *Einstein and the New Science*, (reprinted from, *The Bi-Monthly Journal of the College of St. Thomas*, (St. Paul, Minnesota), Volume 9, Number 3, (July, 1921)) p. 4.

2885. "Kinertia" aka Robert Stevenson, "Do Bodies Fall?", *Harper's Weekly*, Volume 59, (August 29-November 7, 1914), pp. 210, 234, 254, 285-286, 309-310, 332-334, 357-359, 382-383, 405-407, 429-430, 453-454. On 27 June 1903, "Kinertia" filed an article with the Royal Prussian Academy in Berlin, which allegedly was mentioned in the *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1904). Cf.: A. Reuter Dahl, "'Kinertia' Versus Einstein", *The Dearborn Independent*, (30 April 1921); **and** "Einstein and the New Science", *Bi-Monthly Journal of the College of St. Thomas*, Volume 11, Number 3, (July, 1921).

2886. A. Einstein quoted in "Einstein, Too, Is Puzzled; It's at Public Interest", *The Chicago Tribune*, (4 April 1921), p. 6.

2887. A. Einstein and M. Grossmann, *Entwurf einer verallgemeinerten Relativitätstheorie und einer Theorie der Gravitation. I. Physikalischer Teil, von Albert Einstein; II. Mathematischer Teil, von Marcel Grossmann*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1913); reprinted in *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik*, Volume 62, (1914), pp. 225-259. A. Einstein, "Zum gegenwärtigen Stande des Gravitationsproblems", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 14, (1913), pp. 1249-1262.

2888. P. Frank quoted and translated in P. Carus, "The Principle of Relativity", *The Monist*, Volume 22, (1912), pp. 188-229, at 211-219. Carus cites, "'Gibt es eine absolute Bewegung?'" Lecture delivered December 4, 1909, at the University of Vienna before the

Philosophical Society. *Wissenschaftliche Beilage*, 1910.”

2889. R. J. Boscovich, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, (1966). **Confer:** H. V. Gill, *Roger Boscovich, S. J. (1711-1787) Forerunner of Modern Physical Theories*, M. H. Gill and Son, LTD., Dublin, (1941).

2890. R. J. Boscovich, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, (1966), pp. 203-205.

2891. A. Schopenhauer, English translation by R. B. Haldane and J. Kemp, *The World as Will and Idea*, Volume 1, Book 1, Section 4.

2892. E. Mach, *History and Root of the Principle of the Conservation of Energy*, Open Court, Chicago, (1911), pp. 76-58.

2893. Fechner quoted in H. Vaihinger's, *Philosophy of the 'As if'*, Barnes & Noble, Inc., New York, (1966), p. 215; translated by C. K. Ogden.

2894. H. A. Lorentz, quoted by H. B. G. Casimir, “The Influence of Lorentz’ Ideas on Modern Physics”, in G. L. De Haas-Lorentz, Ed., *H. A. Lorentz: Impressions of His Life and Work*, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, (1957), p. 171.

2895. F. W. Frankland, “On the Simplest Continuous Manifoldness of Two Dimensions and of Finite Extent”, *Nature*, Volume 15, Number 389, (12 April 1877), pp. 515-517.

2896. F. W. Frankland, “The Doctrine of Mind-Stuff”, *Mind*, Volume 6, Number 21, (January, 1881), pp. 116-120, at 118-119.

2897. W. K. Clifford, “On the Nature of Things-in-Themselves”, *Mind*, Volume 3, Number 9, (January, 1878), pp. 57-67, at 65, 67. Clifford’s article in “Mind” was apparently quite thought provoking, see: J. T. Lingard, “The Rule of Three in Metaphysics” (in Notes and Discussions), *Mind*, Volume 3, Number 12, (October, 1878), pp. 571-572. J. Royce, “‘Mind-Stuff’ and Reality”, *Mind*, Volume 6, Number 23, (July, 1881), pp. 365-377. T. Whittaker, “‘Mind-Stuff’ from the Historical Point of View”, *Mind*, Volume 6, Number 24, (October, 1881), pp. 498-513. F. W. Frankland, “Prof. Royce on ‘Mind-Stuff’ and Reality” (in Notes and Discussions), *Mind*, Volume 7, Number 25, (January, 1882), pp. 110-114.

2898. E. Cunningham, *The Principle of Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, (1914), p. 87.

2899. A. S. Eddington, “The Meaning of Matter and the Laws of Nature According to the Theory of Relativity”, *Mind*, New Series, Volume 29, Number 114, (April, 1920) pp. 145-158, at 145.

2900. R. B. Braithwaite, “Professor Eddington’s Gifford Lectures”, *Mind*, New Series, Volume 38, Number 152, (October, 1929), pp. 409-435, at 410.

2901. A. S. Eddington, *The Nature of the Physical World*, Macmillan, New York, (1929), p. 278; for the Gifford lectures of 1927.

2902. A. Bolliger, *Anti-Kant oder Elemente der Logik, der Physik und der Ethik*, Felix Schneider, Basel, (1882), esp. pp. 336-354. W. W. R. Ball, “A Hypothesis Relating to the Nature of the Ether and Gravity”, *Messenger of Mathematics*, Series 2, Volume 21, (1891), pp. 20-24.

2903. B. Russell, “The Abolition of ‘Force’”, *The ABC of Relativity*, Chapter 13, The New American Library, (1958), pp. 123-130.

2904. J. B. Stallo, “The Concepts and Theories of Modern Physics”, Volume 38, *International Scientific Series*, D. A. Appleton and Company, New York, (1881); reprinted Volume 42, *The International Scientific Series*, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., London, (1882), pp. 166-168. Reprinted, edited by P. W. Bridgman, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (1960), pp. 185-188.

2905. See for example the many works of Marc Seguin and M. F. de Boucheporn, and *The Correlation and Conservation of Forces*, D. Appleton, New York, (1867); W. B. Taylor,

“Kinetic Theories of Gravitation”, *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution*, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, (1877), pp. 205-282.

2906. D. Hilbert, “Die Grundlagen der Physik, (Erste Mitteilung.) Vorgelegt in der Sitzung vom 20. November 1915.”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1915), pp. 395-407, at 407. **See also:** “Die Grundlagen der Physik, (Zweite Mitteilung.)”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1917), pp. 53-76; **and** “Die Grundlagen der Physik”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 92, (1924), pp. 1-32.

2907. T. H. Pasley, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy on Mechanical Principles Divested of all Immaterial Chymical Properties, Showing for the First Time the Physical Cause of Continuous Motion*, Whittaker & Co., London, (1836).

2908. M. Faraday, “On the Possible Relation of Gravity to Electricity”, *Experimental Researches in Electricity*, various editions, Twenty-Fourth Series, Section 30, paragraph 2702-2716, originally read 28 November 1850.

2909. A. Secchi, *L'Unità della Forze Fisiche: Saggio di Filosofia Naturale*, Multiple Improved and Enlarged Editions; French translation: *L'Unité des Forces Physiques. Essai de Philosophie Naturelle*, F. Savy, Paris, (1874), German translation: *Die Einheit der Naturkräfte: ein Beitrag zur Naturphilosophie*, P. Froberg, Leipzig, (1875).

2910. A. Anderssohn, *Die Mechanik der Gravitation*, Breslau, (1874); **and** *Zur Loesung des Problems ueber Sitz und Wesen der Anziehung*, Breslau, (1874); **and** *Die Theorie vom Massendruck aus der Ferne in ihren Umrissen dargestellt*, Breslau, (1880); **and** *Physikalische Prinzipien der Naturlehre*, G. Schwetschke, Halle, (1894). **See also:** G. Hoffmann, *Die Anderssohn'sche Drucktheorie und ihre Bedeutung für die einheitliche Erklärung der physischen Erscheinung*, G. Schwetschke, Halle, (1892).

2911. P. Spiller, *Die Urkraft des Weltalls nach ihrem Wesen und Wirken auf allen Naturgebieten*, G. Gerstmann, Berlin, (1876); **and** *Die Entstehung der Welt und die Einheit der Naturkräfte. Populäre Kosmogenie*, J. Imme, Berlin, (1871); **and** *Das Phantom der Imponderabilien in der Physik*, Posen, (1858).

2912. J. G. Vogt, *Die kraft: real-monistische Weltanschauung*, Haupt & Tischler, Leipzig, (1878); **and** *Physiologisch-optisches Experiment; die Identität correspondirender Netzhautstellen, die mechanische Umkehrung der Netzhautbilder, etc. endgültig erweisend*, Haupt & Tischler, Leipzig, (1878); **and** *Das Wesen der Elektrizität und des Magnetismus auf Grund eines einheitlichen Substanzbegriffes*, Ernst Wiest, Leipzig, (1891); **and** *Das Empfindungsprinzip und das Protoplasma auf Grund eines einheitlichen Substanzbegriffes*, Ernst Wiest, Leipzig, (1891); *Die Menschwerdung*, Leipzig, (1892); *Entstehen und Vergehen der Welt als kosmischer Kreisprozess. Auf Grund des pyknotischen Substanzbegriffes*, E. Wiest Nachf, Leipzig, (1901); **and** *Der absolute Monismus; eine mechanistische Weltanschauung auf Grund des pyknotischen Substanzbegriffes*, Thüringische Verlags-anstalt Hildburghausen, (1912).

2913. E. Haeckel, *Die Welträthsel: Gemeinverständliche Studien über Monistische Philosophie*, Emil Strauß, Bonn, (1899), pp. 243-316, and especially pp. 261-267, and 282-284; English translation by Joseph McCabe, *The Riddle of the Universe: At the Close of the Nineteenth Century*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1900).

2914. E. Jahr, *Die Urkraft oder Gravitation, Licht, Wärme, Magnetismus, Elektrizität, chemische Kraft etc. sind sekundäre Erscheinungen der Urkraft der Welt*, Otto Enslin, Berlin, (1899).

2915. W. Sutherland, “The Electric Origin of Gravitation and Terrestrial Magnetism”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 8, (1904), pp. 685-692; **and** “On the Cause of

the Earth's Magnetism and Gravitation", *Terrestrial Magnetism and Atmospheric Electricity*, Volume 9, (1904), pp. 167-172.

2916. T. J. J. See, "New Theory of the Ether", *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 217, (1923), pp. 193-283. See attempts to unify electromagnetism and gravitation in many similar works.

2917. E. Wiechert, "Perihelbewegung und die allgemeine Mechanik", *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, (1916), pp. 124-141; republished, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 17, (1916), pp. 442-448; **and** "Die Gravitation als elektrodynamische Erscheinung", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 63, (1920), p. 301; *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 211, Number 5054, (1920), col. 275; *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1920), pp. 101-108; **and** "Der Äther im Weltbild der Physik", *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, (1921), pp. 29-70; **and** *Der Äther im Weltbild der Physik*, Weidmann, Berlin, 1921. A bibliography of Wiechert's works is found in "Zum Gedenken Emil Wiecherts anlässlich der 100. Wiederkehr seines Geburtstages", *Veröffentlichungen des Institutes für Bodendynamik und Erdbebenforschung in Jena*, Number 72, (1962), pp. 5-21.

2918. J. F. Herbart, *Joh. Fr. Herbart's sämtliche Werke in chronologischer Reihenfolge / hrsg. von Karl Kehrbach und Otto Flugel*, In 19 Volumes, H. Beyer, Langensalza (1887-1912).

2919. O. F. Mossotti, *Sur les Forces qui Régissent la Constitution Intérieure des Corps Aperçu pour Servir à la Détermination de la Cause et des Lois de l'Action Moléculaire*, par O. F. Mossotti, De l'Imprimerie Royale, Turin, (1836); appears in Zöllner's *Erklärung der universellen Gravitation aus den statischen Wirkungen der Elektrizität und die allgemeine Bedeutung des Weber'schen Gesetzes*, von Friedrich Zöllner... Mit Beiträgen von Wilhelm Weber nebst einem vollständigen Abdruck der Originalabhandlung: *Sur les Forces qui Régissent la Constitution Intérieure des Corps Aperçu pour Servir à la Détermination de la Cause et des Lois de l'Action Moléculaire*, par O. F. Mossotti. Mit dem Bildnisse Newton's in Stahlstich, L. Staackmann, Leipzig, (1882); English translation: "On the Forces which Regulate the Internal Constitution of Bodies", *Scientific Memoirs, Selected from the Transactions of Foreign Academies of Science and Learned Societies, and from Foreign Journals*, Volume 1, (1837), pp. 448-469; reprinted by Johnson Reprint Corp., New York, (1966).

2920. E. A. Poe, *Eureka: A Prose Poem*, Geo. P. Putnam, New York, (1848). The editors of *The Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, Volume 5, A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, (1884), p. 150; state that, "The theories of the universe propounded in 'Eureka' had, it appears, been under consideration with Poe for a year or more previous to the publication of that Essay." The *Works* also republish portions of a relevant letter of February, 1848, under the heading "A PREDICTION" which appears immediately after *Eureka*.

2921. E. K. Dühring, *Kritische Geschichte der allgemeinen Principien der Mechanik*, Chapter 4, Theobald Grieben, Berlin, (1873); **and** *Neue Grundgesetze zur rationellen Physik und Chemie*, Volume 1, Chapter 1, Fues's Verlag (R. Reisland), Leipzig, (1878/1886), pp. 1-34; **and** *Robert Mayer, der Galilei des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, E. Schmeitzner, Chemnitz, (1880-1895).

2922. E. Mach, "Zur Theorie der Pulswellenzeichner", *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 47, (1863), pp. 43-48; **and** "Zur Theorie des Gehörorgans", *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der*

Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 48; unaltered reprint, *Zur Theorie des Gehororgans*, J. G. Calve, Prag, (1872); **and** “Untersuchungen über den Zeitsinn des Ohres”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 51, (1865), pp. 133-150; *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik vormals Fichte-Ulricische Zeitschrift*, (1866); **and** *Zwei populäre Vorträge über Optik*, Leuschner & Lubensky, Graz, (1867); **and** “Mach’s Vorlesungs-Apparate”, *Repertorium für Experimental-Physik, für physikalische Technik, mathematische & astronomische Instrumentenkunde*, Volume 4, (1868), pp. 8-9; **and** *Die Geschichte und die Wurzel des Satzes von der Erhaltung der Arbeit*, J. G. Calve, Prag, (1872); English translation by P. E. B. Jourdain, *History and Root of the Principle of the Conservation of Energy*, Open Court, Chicago, 1911; **and** “Resultate einer Untersuchung zur Geschichte der Physik”, *Lotos. Zeitschrift für Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 23, (1873), pp. 189-191; **and** *Grundlinien der Lehre von den Bewegungsempfindungen*, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1875); **and** “Neue Versuche zur Prüfung der Doppler’schen Theorie der Ton- und Farbenänderung durch Bewegung”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 77, (1878), pp. 299-310; **and** *Die ökonomische Natur der physikalischen Forschung*, Wien, (1882); **and** *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwicklung historisch-kritisch dargestellt*, F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig, (1883 and multiple revised editions, thereafter); translated into English as *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, La Salle, (numerous editions); **and** *Über Umbildung und Anpassung im naturwissenschaftlichen Denken*, Wien, (1884); **and** *Beiträge zur Analyse der Empfindungen*, G. Fischer, Jena, (1886); English translation by C. M. Williams, *Contributions to the Analysis of the Sensations*, Open Court, Chicago, (1897); **and** *Der relative Bildungswert der philologischen und der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Unterrichtsfächer*, Prag, (1886); **and** “Über den Unterricht in der Wärmelehre”, *Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 1, (1887), pp. 3-7; **and** “Über das psychologische und logische Moment im naturwissenschaftlichen Unterricht”, *Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 4, (1890), pp. 1-5; **and** “Some Questions of Psycho-Physics”, *The Monist*, Volume 1, (1891), pp. 394-400; **and** *Populär-wissenschaftliche Vorlesungen*, fourth expanded edition, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1896/1910); English translation of initial lectures by T. McCormack, *Popular Scientific Lectures*, Open Court, Chicago, (1895); **and** *Die Principien der Wärmehre: Historisch-kritisch entwickelt*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1896); *Principles of the Theory of Heat: Historically and Critically Elucidated*, Dordrecht, Boston, (1986); **and** “Über Gedankenexperimente.” *Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 10, (1896), pp. 1-5; **and** “On the Stereoscopic Application of Roentgen’s Rays”, *The Monist*, Volume 6, (1896), pp. 321-323; **and** “Durchsicht-Stereoskopbilder mit Röntgenstrahlen”, *Zeitschrift für Elektrotechnik*, Volume 14, (1896), pp. 359-361; **and** “The Notion of a Continuum”, *The Open Court*, Volume 14, (1900), pp. 409-414; **and** *Erkenntnis und Irrtum: Skizzen zur Psychologie der Forschung*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1905); **and** *Space and Geometry in the Light of Physiological, Psychological and Physical Inquiry*, English translation by T. J. McCormack, Open Court, Chicago, (1906); **and** “Die Leitgedanken meiner naturwissenschaftlichen Erkenntnislehre und ihre Aufnahme durch die Zeitgenossen”, *Scientia: Revista di Scienza*, Volume 7, Number 14, (1910), p. 2; *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 599-606; **and** *Die Analyse der Empfindungen und das Verhältnis des Physischen zum Psychischen*, sixth expanded edition, G. Fischer, Jena, (1911); English translation by C. M. Williams, *The Analysis of Sensations, and the Relation of the Physical to the Psychical*, Open Court,

Chicago, (1914); **and** *Kultur und Mechanik*, Stuttgart, (1915); **and** *Die Leitgedanken meiner naturwissenschaftlichen Erkenntnislehre und ihre Aufnahme durch die Zeitgenossen. Sinnliche Elemente und naturwissenschaftliche Begriffe*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1919); **and** *Die Prinzipien der physikalischen Optik: Historisch und erkenntnispsychologisch entwickelt*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1921); *The Principles of Physical Optics: An Historical and Philosophical Treatment*, English translated by John S. Anderson, Methuen & Co., London, (1926).

2923. A. Bolliger, *Anti-Kant oder Elemente der Logik, der Physik und der Ethik*, Felix Schneider, Basel, (1882), esp. pp. 336-354.

2924. J. B. Stallo, *General Principles of the Philosophy of Nature*, W. M. Crosby and H. P. Nichols, Boston, (1848); "The Concepts and Theories of Modern Physics", Volume 38, *International Scientific Series*, D. A. Appleton and Company, New York, (1881); reprinted Volume 42, *The International Scientific Series*, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., London, (1882); Edited by P. W. Bridgman, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (1960); **and** *Reden, Abhandlungen und Briefe*, E. Steiger & Co., New York, (1893).

2925. F. J. K. Geissler, *Eine mögliche Wesenserklärung für Raum, Zeit, das Unendliche und die Kausalität, nebst einem Grundwort zur Metaphysik der Möglichkeiten*, Gutenberg, Berlin, (1900); **and** "Ringgenberg Schluss mit der Einstein-Irrung!", H. Israel, et al, Editors, *Hundert Autoren Gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, (1931), pp. 10-12.

2926. E. Noble, "The Relational Element in Monism", *The Monist*, Volume 15, Number 3, (1905), pp. 321-337. Cf. *The New York Times*, 28 March 1921, p. 8.

2927. D. Hilbert, "Die Grundlagen der Physik, (Erste Mitteilung.) Vorgelegt in der Sitzung vom 20. November 1915.", *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1915), pp. 395-407; **and** "Die Grundlagen der Physik, (Zweite Mitteilung.)", *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1917), pp. 53-76; **and** "Die Grundlagen der Physik", *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 92, (1924), pp. 1-32.

2928. H. A. Lorentz, "Considerations on Gravitation", *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 2, (1900), pp. 559-574; **and** *Abhandlungen über theoretische Physik*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1907), Numbers 14, 17-20; **and** "Alte und neue Fragen der Physik", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 1234-1257; reprinted, in part, as: "Das Relativitätsprinzip und seine Anwendung auf einige besondere physikalische Erscheinungen", *Das Relativitätsprinzip: eine Sammlung von Abhandlungen*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1913), pp. 74-89; **and** "La Gravitation", *Scientia*, Volume 16, (1914), pp. 28-59; **and** *Het Relativiteitsbeginsel; drie Voordrachten Gehouden in Teyler's Stifting*, Erven Loosjes, Haarlem, (1913); *Archives du Musée Teyler*, Series 3, Volume 2, (1914), pp. 1-60; German translation: *Das Relativitätsprinzip. Drei Vorlesungen gehalten in Teylers Stifting zu Haarlem*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, Berlin, (1914/1920); **and** "Het beginsel van Hamilton in Einstein's Theorie der Zwaartekracht", *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 23, (1915), pp. 1073-1089; English translation, "On Hamilton's Principle in Einstein's Theory of Gravitation", *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 19, (1916/1917), pp. 751-765; **and** "Over Einstein's Theorie der Zwaartekracht. I, II, & III", *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 24, (1916), pp. 1389-1402, 1759-1774; Volume 25, (1916), pp. 468-486; English translation, "On Einstein's Theory of Gravitation. I, II & III", *Proceedings of the Royal*

Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam, Volume 19, (1917), pp. 1341-1354, 1354-1369; Volume 20, (1917), pp. 2-19; **and** “Dutch Colleague Explains Einstein”, *The New York Times*, (21 December 1919), p. 1.

2929. J. Ishiwara, “Zur Theorie der Gravitation”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 13, (1912), p. 1189; **and** *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 9, (1912), p. 560; **and** “Grundlagen einer relativistischen elektromagnetischen Gravitationstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 15, (1914), p. 294; **and** “Zur relativistischen Theorie der Gravitation”, *Science Reports. First Series*, Volume 4, Tohoku Imperial University, Sendai, Japan, (1914), pp. 111-160; **and** *Tokyo Sugaki Butsuri Gakkai: Proceedings. Kizi*, Series 2, Volume 8, Number 4, p. 106; **and** *Proceedings of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Tokyo*, Volume 8, (1915), p. 318.

2930. T. de Donder, *Bulletins de l'Academie Royale de Belgique (Classe des Sciences)*, (1909), p. 66; (1911), p. 3; (1912), p. 3; **and** “Les Équations Différentielles du Champ Gravifique d'Einstein Créé par un Champ Électromagnétique de Maxwell-Lorentz”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 25, (1916), pp. 153-156; **and** “Théorie du Champ Électromagnétique de Maxwell-Lorentz et du Champ Gravifique d'Einstein”, *Archives du Musée Teyler*, Volume 3, (1917), pp. 80-179; **and** “Sur les Équations Différentielle du Champ Gravifique”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 26, (1917/1918), pp. 101-104; **and** T. de Donder and O. de Ketelaere, “Sur le Champ Électromagnétique de Maxwell-Lorentz et le Champ de Gravitation d'Einstein”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L'Académie des sciences*, Volume 159, (1914), pp. 23-26. *See also:* E. Gehrcke, “Die Grenzen der Relativität”, *Die Umschau*, Number 24, (1922), pp. 381-382.

2931. G. Nordström, “Grunddragen af Elektricitetsteoriernas Utveckling”, *Teknikern*, (1906), p. 16; **and** “Überführungszahl konzentrierter Kalilauge”, *Zeitschrift für Elektrochemie und angewandte physikalische Chemie*, Volume 13, (1907), p. 35; **and** *Die Energiegleichung für das elektromagnetische Feld bewegter Körper*, Väitöskirja, Helsinki, (1908); **and** “Über die Ableitung des Satzes vom retardierten Potential”, *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar, A, Matematik och Naturvetenskaper*, Volume 51, Number 6, (1909); **and** “Rum och tid enligt Einstein och Minkowski”, *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar, A, Matematik och Naturvetenskaper*, Volume 52, Number 6, (1909); **and** “Zur Elektrodynamik Minkowskis”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 10, (1909), p. 681; **and** “Zur elektromagnetischen Mechanik”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), p. 440; **and** “Zur Relativitätsmechanik deformierbarer Körper”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 12, (1912), p. 854; **and** “Till den Elementära Teorin för Snurran”, *Teknikern*, Volume 22, (1912), p. 141; **and** “Relativitätsprinzip und Gravitation”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 13, (November, 1912), pp. 1126-1129; **and** “Träge und schwere Masse in der Relativitätsmechanik”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 40, (April, 1913), pp. 856-878; **and** “Zur Theorie der Gravitation vom Standpunkt des Relativitätsprinzips”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 42, (October, 1913), pp. 533-554; **and** “Die Fallgesetze und Planetenbewegung in der Relativitätstheorie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 43, (1914), pp. 1101-1110; **and** “Über den Energiesatz in der Gravitationstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 15, (1914), p. 375; **and** “Über die Möglichkeit das elektromagnetische Feld und das Gravitationsfeld zu vereinigen”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 15, (1914), p. 504; **and** “Zur Elektrizitäts- und Gravitationstheorie”, *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar, A, Matematik och Naturvetenskaper*, Volume 57, Number 4, (1914); **and** “R. C. Tolmans ‘Prinzip der Ähnlichkeit’ und die Gravitation”,

Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar, A, Matematik och Naturvetenskaper, Volume 57, Number 22, (1914/1915); **and** “Über eine mögliche Grundlage einer Theorie der Materie”, *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar, A, Matematik och Naturvetenskaper*, Volume 57, Number 28, (1915); **and** “Die Mechanik deformierbarer Körper und die Gravitation”, *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar, A, Matematik och Naturvetenskaper*, Volume 58, Number 20, (1916); **and** “Undersökning av Källvattens Radioaktivitet”, *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar, A, Matematik och Naturvetenskaper*, Volume 59, Number 4, (1916); **and** “Die Mechanik der Continua in der Gravitationstheorie von Einstein”, *Handelingen van het Nederlandsch Natuur- en Geneeskundig Congres*, Volume 16, (1917); **and** “De Gravitatiethorie van Einstein en de Mechanica der Continua van Herglotz”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 25, (1916/1917), pp. 836-843; English version, “Einstein’s Theory of Gravitation and Herglotz’s Mechanics of Continua”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Section of Sciences, Proceedings*, Volume 19, (1916/1917), pp. 884-891; **and** *Teorien för Elektriciteten, i Korthet Framställd*, A. Bonnier, Stockholm, (1917); **and** “Iets Over de Massa van een Stoffelijk Stelsel Volgens de Gravitatiethorie van Einstein”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 26, (1917/1918), pp. 1093-1108; English version, “On the Mass of a Material System According to the Gravitation Theory of Einstein”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Section of Sciences, Proceedings*, Volume 20, (1917/1918), pp. 1076-1091; **and** “Een an Ander Over de Energie van het Zwaartekrachtsveld Volgens de Theorie van Einstein”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 26, (1917/1918), pp. 1201-1208; English version, “On the Energy of the Gravitation Field in Einstein’s Theory”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Section of Sciences, Proceedings*, Volume 20, (1917/1918), pp. 1238-1245; **and** “Berekening voor eenige Bijzondere Gevallen Volgens de Gravitatiethorie van Einstein”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 26, (1917/1918), pp. 1577-1589; English version, “Calculations of some Special Cases in Einstein’s Theory of Gravitation”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Section of Sciences, Proceedings*, Volume 21, (1918/1919), pp. 68-79; **and** “Opmerking over het Niet-uitstralen van een Overeenkomstig Kwantenvoorwaarden Bewegende Elektrische Lading”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 28, (1919); “Note on the Circumstance that an Electric Charge Moving in Accordance with Quantum Conditions does not Radiate”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Section of Sciences, Proceedings*, Volume 22, (1920), p. 145; **and** “Eräitä relativiteettiperiaatteen seurauksia”, *Teknillinen Aikakauslehti*, Volume 11, (1920), p. 325; **and** *Grunderna av den Tekniska Termodynamiken*, Helsingfors, (1922); **and** “Über das Prinzip von Hamilton für materielle Körper in der allgemeiner Relativitätstheorie”, *Commentationes physico-mathematicae Societas Scientiarum Fennica*, Volume 1, (1923), p. 33; **and** “Über die kanonischen Bewegungsgleichungen des Elektrons in einem beliebigen elektromagnetischen Felde”, *Commentationes physico-mathematicae Societas Scientiarum Fennica*, Volume 1, (1923), p. 43.

2932. H. Weyl, *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, Volume 2, (1918), p. 384; **and** *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (1918), p. 465; **and** *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 59,

(1919), p. 101; **and** “Über die Neue Grundlagenkrise der Mathematik”, *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, Volume 10, (1921), pp. 39-79; **and** *Space-Time-Matter*, Dover, New York, (1952). Cf. W. Pauli, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, New York, (1958), pp. 192-202. **2933.** H. Thirring, “Über die Wirkung rotierender ferner Massen in der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 19, (1918), pp. 33-39; **and** *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 19, (1918), p. 204; **and** “Atombau und Kristallsymmetrie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 21, (1920), pp. 281-288; **and** “Berichtigung zu meiner Arbeit: ‘Über die Wirkung rotierender Massen in der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie’”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), p. 29. **See also:** H. Thirring and J. Lense, “Über den Einfluß der Eigenrotation der Zentralkörper auf die Bewegung der Planeten und Monde nach der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 19, (1918), pp. 156-163.

2934. T. Kaluza, “Zur Unitätsproblem der Physik”, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, Volume 54, (1921), pp. 966-972; **and** “Über den Energieinhalt der Atomkerne”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 23, (1922), pp. 474-476; **and** “Zur Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 25, (1924), pp. 604-606. **See also:** O. Klein, “Quantentheorie und fünfdimensionale Relativitätstheorie”, *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Volume 37, (1926), pp. 895-906; **and** “The Atomicity of Electricity as a Quantum Theory Law”, *Nature*, Volume 118, (9 October 1926), p. 516; **and** “Sur L’Article de M. L. De Broglie ‘L’Univers a Cinq Dimensions et la Mécanique Ondulatoire’”, *Le Journal de Physique et le Radium*, Series 6, Volume 8, (April, 1927), pp. 242-243; **and** “Zur fünfdimensionale Darstellung der Relativitätstheorie”, *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Volume 46, (1927), pp. 188-208; **and** “Meson Fields and Nuclear Interaction”, *Arkiv för Matematik, Astronomi och Fysik*, Volume 34, Number 1, (1947), pp. 1-19; **and** “Generalizations of Einstein’s Theory of Gravitation Considered from the Point of View of Quantum Field theory”, *Helvetica Physica Acta*, Supplement 4, (1956), pp. 58-71. **Confer:** E. T. Whittaker, *A History of Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Thomas Nelson and Sons, London, (1953), pp. 190-191. **See also:** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, New York, Oxford University Press, (1982), pp. 329-334.

2935. M. Faraday, “On the Possible Relation of Gravity to Electricity”, *Experimental Researches in Electricity*, various editions, Twenty-Fourth Series, Section 30, paragraphs 2702-2717, originally read 28 November 1850, written 19 July 1850.

2936. A. Schopenhauer, *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung: vier Bücher, nebst einem Anhang, der die Kritik der Kantischen Philosophie enthält*, F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig, (1819); English translation by E. F. J. Payne in A. Schopenhauer, *The World as Will and Representation*, Volume 2, Dover, New York, (1969), pp. 309-310. **See also:** B. Magee, *The Philosophy of Schopenhauer*, Oxford University Press, (1983), pp. 110-113.

2937. E. A. Poe, *Eureka: A Prose Poem*, Geo. P. Putnam, New York, (1848), p. 37. The editors of *The Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, Volume 5, A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, (1884), p. 150; state that, “The theories of the universe propounded in ‘Eureka’ had, it appears, been under consideration with Poe for a year or more previous to the publication of that Essay.” The *Works* also republish portions of a relevant letter of February, 1848, under the heading “A PREDICTION” which appears immediately after *Eureka*.

2938. M. Faraday, “On the Magnetization of Light and the Illumination of Magnetic Lines of Force”, reprinted in *Experimental Researches in Electricity*, Dover, New York, (1965), §§ 2146-2242.

2939. E. Bulwer-Lytton, *Rienzi: The Pilgrims of the Rhine; The Coming Race*, Brainard, New York, Continental Press, New York, (1848); and *Rienzi, Two Volumes in One; The Pilgrims of the Rhine; the Coming Race*, Boston, Dana Estes & Co., 1848; here quoted from:

The Pilgrims of the Rhine to which is Prefixed The Ideal World. The Coming Race, Chapter 9, Estes and Lauriat, (1892), p. 271; which appears to be a reprint of: *The Pilgrims of the Rhine. The Coming Race*, Dana Estes & Co., Boston, (1849).

2940. M. Faraday, “On the Possible Relation of Gravity to Electricity”, reprinted in *Experimental Researches in Electricity*, Dover, New York, (1965), §§ 2702-2717.

2941. M. Faraday, “Thoughts on Ray-vibrations”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 3, Volume 28, Number 188, (May, 1846), pp. 345-350; reprinted in *Experimental Researches in Electricity*, Three Volumes Bound as Two, Volume 3, Dover, New York, (1965), pp. 447-452. *See also*: “A Speculation Touching Electric Conduction and the Nature of Matter”, *London, Edinburgh and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, Volume 24, (1844), p. 136; reprinted in *Experimental Researches in Electricity*, Volume 2, p. 284; reprinted in *Great Books of the Western World*, Volume 45, Encyclopedia Britannica, Chicago, (1952), pp. 850-855.

2942. W. K. Clifford, *Lectures and Essays*, Volume I, Macmillan, London, (1879), p. 85; *See also*: *The Common Sense of the Exact Sciences*, Edited by K. Pearson, D. Appleton, New York, Macmillan, London, (1885), especially Chapter 4, “Position”, Section 1, “All Position is Relative”, pp. 147-149.

2943. K. Pearson in W. K. Clifford, *The Common Sense of the Exact Sciences*, D. Appleton, New York, (1894), pp. 225-226.

2944. W. K. Clifford, “On the Space Theory of Matter”, *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, (1866/1876), Volume 2, 157-158; reprinted in *The World of Mathematics*, Volume 1, Simon & Schuster, New York, (1956), pp. 568-569; reprinted in Clifford’s *Mathematical Papers*, Macmillan, London, (1882), pp. 21-22. *See also*: W. K. Clifford, “The Postulates of the Science of Space”, *The Philosophy of the Pure Sciences*, In Four Parts: Part I, “Statement of the Question”; Part II, “Knowledge and Feeling”; **Part III, “The Postulates of the Science of Space”, *The Contemporary Review*, Volume 25, (1874), pp. 360-376—reprinted in *Lectures and Essays*, Volume 1, pp.295-323—reprinted in *The World of Mathematics*, Volume 1, Simon & Schuster, New York, (1956), pp. 552-567**; Part IV, “The Universal Statements of Arithmetic”; all four Parts reprinted in *The Humboldt Library*, Number 86, (December, 1886), pp. 12-49 [208-245]. *See also*: *The Common Sense of the Exact Sciences*, Edited by K. Pearson, D. Appleton, New York, Macmillan, London, (1885), especially Chapter 4, “Position”, Section 1, “All Position is Relative” and Section 19, “On the Bending of Space”.

2945. J. C. Maxwell, *Matter and Motion*, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London, (1876), p. 20.

2946. W. K. Clifford, *The Common Sense of the Exact Sciences*, Dover, New York, (1955), pp. 193-194, 201-204.

2947. H. More, *A COLLECTION Of Several Philosophical Writings OF Dr. HENRY MORE, Fellow of Christ’s-College in Cambridge*, Joseph Downing, London, (1712); which contains: *AN ANTIDOTE AGAINST ATHEISM: OR, An Appeal to the Natural Faculties of the Mind of Man, Whether there be not a GOD*, The Fourth Edition corrected and enlarged: WITH AN APPENDIX Thereunto annexed, “An Appendix to the foregoing Antidote,” Chapter 7, Section 6, pp. 199-201, at 201.

2948. I. Newton, *Principia*, Definition 8, Scholium; and “De Gravitatione”, *Unpublished Scientific Papers of Isaac Newton*, Cambridge University Press, (1962), p. 104.

2949. S. Clarke, *A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God : More Particularly in Answer to Mr. Hobbs, Spinoza and Their Followers*, Proposition 3, W. Botham, for J. Knapton, London, (1705), pp. 27-74.

- 2950.** C. Neumann, “The Principles of the Galilean-Newtonian Theory”, *Science in Context*, Volume 6, (1993), pp. 355-368, at 366; which is an English translation of: C. Neumann, *Ueber die Principien der Galilei-Newton’schen Theorie*, Endnote 8, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1870), p.27. Max Born, following Ernst Mach’s logic, contradicted Neumann’s conclusion. See: M. Born, “Raum, Zeit und Schwerkraft”, *Frankfurter Zeitung und Handelsblatt*, (23 September 1919), Erstens Morgenblatt.
- 2951.** W. Krause, “A Critical Note Concerning Conventional Container Space Concepts”, in J. P. Wesley, Editor, *Progress in Space-Time Physics 1987*, Benjamin Wesley, Blumberg, West Germany, (1987), p. 53.
- 2952.** I. Newton, *Principia*, Volume 1, Definitions, Scholium, Section 4, University of California Press, Berkeley, pp. 10-12. According to Newton, he wrote his *Principia* in an attempt to find God’s body.
- 2953.** I. Newton, *The Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*, Volume 1, Benjamin Motte, London, (1729), pp. 15-16.
- 2954.** G. Berkeley, *De motu; sive, de motus principio & natura, et de causa communicationis motuum. Auctore G. B., Jacobi Tonson, Londini, (1721)*. Translation by A. A. Luce, in *Works*, 9 Volumes, T. Nelson, London, New York, (1948-1957); as reproduced in *Berkeley’s Philosophical Writings*, Collier Books, New York, (1965), pp. 269-270. This is a brief quote capturing some of the many things Berkeley wrote, which Mach and, after him, Einstein would repeat without an attribution.
- 2955.** R. J. Boscovich, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, (1966), p. 203.
- 2956.** E. Mach, translated by T. J. McCormack, *The Science of Mechanics*, second revised and enlarged edition, Open Court, Chicago, (1902), pp. 542-543.
- 2957.** H. Lotze, *Metaphysik, drei Bücher der Ontologie, Kosmologie und Psychologie*, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1879); English translation by B. Bosanquet, *Metaphysic: In Three Books, Ontology, Cosmology, and Psychology*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, (1884), pp. 358-359.
- 2958.** J. Henry, “The Atomic Constitution of Matter”, *Scientific Writings of Joseph Henry*, Volume 1, Smithsonian Institution Reports, Washington, (1886), p. 257; as quoted in J. C. Fernald, Ed., *Scientific Sidelights*, Number 2117, Funk & Wagnalls Company, London, New York, (1903), p. 432.
- 2959.** E. Brücke, “On Gravitation and the Conservation of Force”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 4, Volume 15, Number 98, (February, 1858), p. 81-90, at 87-88; English translation of Brücke’s 1857 article for the *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), which was a reaction to Faraday’s lecture of 27 February 1857.
- 2960.** G. S. Fullerton, “The Doctrine of Space and Time: V. The Real World in Space and Time”, *The Philosophical Review*, Volume 10, Number 6, (November, 1901), pp. 583-600, at 593-595.
- 2961.** D. M. Y. Sommerville, *The Elements of Non-Euclidean Geometry*, G. Bell, London, (1914), p. 201.
- 2962.** D. M. Y. Sommerville, *The Elements of Non-Euclidean Geometry*, G. Bell, London, (1914), pp. 209-210.
- 2963.** A. Einstein to K. Schwarzschild, J. Stachel and M. Klein, Editors, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8a, Document 181, Princeton University Press, (1989), p. 241.
- 2964.** A. Einstein, “Raum, Äther und Feld in der Physik”, English translation by E. S. Brightman appearing in the same volume, “Space, Ether and the Field in Physics”, *Forum Philosophicum*, Volume 1, Number 2, (December, 1930), pp. 173-184, at 184. Einstein made

a very similar statement reproduced in *The New York Times*, (17 June 1930), p. 3.

2965. A. Einstein, “Professor Einstein’s Address at the University of Nottingham”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 71, Number 1850, (June 13, 1930) pp. 608-610, at 610.

2966. W. James, *The Principles of Psychology*, Volume 1, Dover, New York, (1950), p. 283.

2967. L. Lange, “Über die wissenschaftliche Fassung der Galilei’schen Beharrungsgesetzes”, *Philosophische Studien*, Volume 2, (1885), pp. 266-297, 539-545; **and** “Ueber das Beharrungsgesetz”, *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, mathematisch-physische Classe*, Volume 37, (1885), pp. 333-351; **and** *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Bewegungsbegriffes und ihr voraussichtliches Endergebniss. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Kritik der mechanischen Principien von Ludwig Lange*, Wilhelm Engelmann, Leipzig, (1886); **and** “Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Bewegungsbegriffes und ihr voraussichtliches Endergebniss”, *Philosophische Studien*, Volume 3, (1886), pp. 337-419, 643-691.

2968. L. Lange, “Das Inertialsystem vor dem Forum der Naturforschung: Kritisches und Antikritisches”, *Philosophische Studien*, Volume 20, (1902), pp. 1-71; issued as a book: *Das Inertialsystem vor dem Forum der Naturforschung*, Wilhelm Engelmann, Leipzig, (1902).

2969. L. Lange, “Mein Verhältnis zu Einstein’s Weltbild” (“My Relationship to Einstein’s Conception of the World”), *Psychiatrisch-neurologische Wochenschrift*, Volume 24, (1922), pp. 116, 154-156, 168-172, 179-182, 188-190, 201-207.

For references to Lange, and analysis of his work, see: B. Thüring, “Fundamental-System und Inertial-System”, *Methodos; rivista trimestrale di metodologia e di logica simbolica*, Volume 2, (1950), pp. 263-283; **and** *Die Gravitation und die philosophischen Grundlagen der Physik*, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin, (1967), pp. 75-77, 234-240. **See also:** M. v. Laue, “Dr. Ludwig Lange”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 35, Number 7, (1948), pp. 193-196. **See also:** E. Mach, *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, (1960), pp. 291-297. **See also:** E. Gehrcke, *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 17, 30-34; **and** “Über den Sinn der Absoluten Bewegung von Körpern”, *Sitzungsberichten der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Volume 12, (1912), pp. 209-222; **and** “Über die Koordinatensystem der Mechanik”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 15, (1913), pp. 260-266. **See also:** A. Müller, “Das Problem des absoluten Raumes und seine Beziehung zum allgemeinen Raumproblem”, *Die Wissenschaft*, Volume 39, Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, (1911). **See also:** H. Seeliger, “Kritisches Referat über Lange’s Arbeiten”, *Vierteljahrsschrift der Astronomischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 22, (1886), pp. 252-259; **and** “Über die sogenannte absolute Bewegung”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, (1906), Volume 36, pp. 85-137.

For Lange’s immediate predecessors, see: C. Neumann, *Ueber die Principien der Galilei-Newton’schen Theorie*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1870); English translation, “The Principles of the Galilean-Newtonian Theory”, *Science in Context*, Volume 6, (1993), pp. 355-368. **See also:** W. Thomson and P. G. Tait, *Treatise on Natural Philosophy*, Volume 1, Part 1, §§§ 245, 249, 267, Cambridge University Press, (1879). **See also:** H. Streintz, *Die physikalischen Grundlagen der Mechanik*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1883). **See also:** J. Thomson, “On the Law of Inertia; the Principle of Chronometry; and the Principle of Absolute Clinural Rest, and of Absolute Rotation”, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, Volume 12, (November 1883-July 1884), pp. 568-578; **and** “A Problem on Point-motions for Which a Reference-frame Can So Exist as to Have the Motions of the Points, Relative to It, Rectilinear and Mutually Proportional”, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, Volume 12, (November 1883-July 1884), pp. 730-742. **See also:** P.

G. Tait, "Note on Reference Frames", *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, Volume 12, (November 1883-July 1884), pp. 743-745.

2970. G. Berkeley, *De motu; sive, de motus principio & natura, et de causa communicationis motuum. Auctore G. B.*, Sections 53-66, Jacobi Tonson, Londini, (1721). Translation by A. A. Luce, in *Works*, 9 Volumes, T. Nelson, London, New York, (1948-1957); as reproduced in *Berkeley's Philosophical Writings*, "De Motu", Collier Books, New York, (1965), pp. 266-270.

2971. E. Budde, *Allgemeine Mechanik der Punkte und starren Systeme*, In Two Volumes, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1890-1891).

2972. A. Einstein to K. Schwarzschild 9 January 1916, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8a, Document 181, Paragraph "2)".

2973. K. Schwarzschild to A. Einstein 6 February 1916, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8a, Document 188.

2974. W. de Sitter, "On the Bearing of the Principle of Relativity on Gravitational Astronomy", *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 71, (March, 1911), pp. 388-415, at 409. K. Schwarzschild, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8a, Document 188, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 258. M. Schlick, *Space and Time in Contemporary Physics*, Oxford University Press, (1920), p. 38. M. v. Laue, *Die Relativitätstheorie*, Volume 1, "Das Relativitätsprinzip der Lorentztransformation", fourth enlarged edition, Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, (1921), p. 7.

2975. M. v. Laue, *Das Relativitätsprinzip*, Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, (1911), § 6.

2976. *Einstein's 1912 Manuscript on the Special Theory of Relativity: A Facsimile*, George Braziller, Inc., (1996), pp. 73, 79, 91.

2977. E. Gehrcke, "Über den Sinn der Absoluten Bewegung von Körpern", *Sitzungsberichten der Königlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Volume 12, (1912), pp. 209-222; and "Über die Koordinatensystem der Mechanik", *Verhandlung der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 15, (1913), pp. 260-266.

2978. See for example: A. Einstein to E. Mach, translated by A. Beck, "relative to the fixed stars ('Restsystem')", *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 5, Document 448, Princeton University Press, (1995), p. 340. A. Einstein, "The law of the transmission of light in empty space in connection with the principle of relativity with reference to uniform movement[.]" from, "Space, Ether and Field in Physics", *Forum Philosophicum*, Volume 1, Number 2, (December, 1930), p. 182.

2979. J. Laub, "Zur Optik der bewegten Körper", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 23, (1907), pp. 738-744.

2980. H. Strasser, *Die Transformationsformeln von Lorentz und die „Transformationsformeln“ der Einsteinschen speziellen Relativitätstheorie*, Ernst Bircher Aktiengesellschaft, Bern, Leipzig, (1924).

2981. H. Minkowski, "Space and Time", *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 83.

2982. P. Langevin, "L'Évolution de l'Espace et du Temps", *Scientia*, Volume 10, (1911), pp. 31-54.

2983. A. Einstein, "Relativitäts-Theorie", *Vierteljahrsschrift der Naturforschenden Gesellschaft in Zürich, Sitzungsberichte*, Volume 56, (1911), pp. VI-VII; English translation by Anna Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 3, Princeton University Press, (1993), pp. 355-356.

2984. H. Dingle, *Science at the Crossroads*, Martin Brian & O'Keeffe, London, p. 249.

2985. E. V. Huntington, “A New Approach to the Theory of Relativity”, *Festschrift Heinrich Weber zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 5. März 1912 / gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1912), pp. 147-169; reprinted “A New Approach to the Theory of Relativity”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 23, Number 136, (April, 1912), pp. 494-513. **See also:** S. Mohorovičić, “Äther, Materie, Gravitation und Relativitätstheorie”, *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Volume 18, Number 1, (1923), pp. 34-63, at 34. **See also:** H. Ives in, D. Turner and R. Hazelett, *The EINSTEIN Myth and the Ives Papers: A Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979). **See also:** L. Jánossy, “Über die physikalische Interpretation der Lorentz-Transformation”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 6, Volume 11, (1953), pp. 293-322; **and** *Theory of Relativity Based on Physical Reality*, Akademiai Kiadó, Budapest, (1971). **See also:** G. Builder, “Ether and Relativity”, *Australian Journal of Physics*, Volume 11, (1958), pp. 279-; **and** “The Constancy of the Velocity of Light,” *Australian Journal of Physics*, Volume 11, (1958), pp. 457-480; abridged form reprinted with bibliography in: *Speculations in Science and Technology*, Volume 2, (1971), p. 422. **See also:** S. J. Prokhovnic, *The Logic of Special Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, (1967); **and** *Light in Einstein’s Universe: The Role of Energy in Cosmology and Relativity*, Dordrecht, Boston, D. Reidel Pub. Co., (1985). **See also:** K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, In Two Volumes, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, Austria, (1958/1962). **See also:** J. A. Winnie, “The Twin-Rod Thought Experiment,” *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 40, (1972), pp. 1091-1094. M.F. Podlaha, “Length Contraction and Time Dilation in the Special Theory of Relativity—Real or Apparent Phenomena?”, *Indian Journal of Theoretical Physics*, Volume 25, (1975), pp. 74-75. **See also:** M. Ruderfer, “Introduction to Ives’ ‘Derivation of the Lorentz Transformations’”, *Speculations in Science and Technology*, Volume 2, (1979), p. 243. **See also:** D. Lorenz, “Über die Realität der FitzGerald-Lorentz Kontraktion”, *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Wissenschaftstheorie*, Volume 13/2, (1982), pp. 308-312. **See also:** D. Dieks, “The ‘Reality’ of the Lorentz Contraction,” *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Wissenschaftstheorie*, Volume 115/2, (1984), p. 341. **See also:** F. Winterberg, *The Planck Aether Hypothesis*, Gauss Press, Reno, Nevada, (2002), pp. 141-148.

2986. E. V. Huntington, “A New Approach to the Theory of Relativity”, *Festschrift Heinrich Weber zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 5. März 1912 / gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1912), pp. 147-169; reprinted “A New Approach to the Theory of Relativity”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 23, Number 136, (April, 1912), pp. 494-513. **See also:** S. Mohorovičić, “Äther, Materie, Gravitation und Relativitätstheorie”, *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Volume 18, Number 1, (1923), pp. 34-63, at 34. **See also:** H. Ives in, D. Turner and R. Hazelett, *The EINSTEIN Myth and the Ives Papers: A Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979). **See also:** L. Jánossy, “Über die physikalische Interpretation der Lorentz-Transformation”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 6, Volume 11, (1953), pp. 293-322; **and** *Theory of Relativity Based on Physical Reality*, Akademiai Kiadó, Budapest, (1971). **See also:** G. Builder, “Ether and Relativity”, *Australian Journal of Physics*, Volume 11, (1958), pp. 279-; **and** “The Constancy of the Velocity of Light,” *Australian Journal of Physics*, Volume 11, (1958), pp. 457-480; abridged form reprinted with bibliography in: *Speculations in Science and Technology*, Volume 2, (1971), p. 422. **See also:** S. J. Prokhovnic, *The Logic of Special Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, (1967); **and** *Light in Einstein’s Universe: The Role of Energy in Cosmology and Relativity*, Dordrecht, Boston, D. Reidel Pub. Co., (1985). **See also:** K. Sapper, Editor, *Kritik und Fortbildung der Relativitätstheorie*, In Two Volumes, Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz, Austria, (1958/1962). **See also:** J. A. Winnie, “The Twin-Rod Thought Experiment,” *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 40, (1972),

pp. 1091-1094. M.F. Podlaha, "Length Contraction and Time Dilation in the Special Theory of Relativity—Real or Apparent Phenomena?", *Indian Journal of Theoretical Physics*, Volume 25, (1975), pp. 74-75. **See also:** M. Ruderfer, "Introduction to Ives' 'Derivation of the Lorentz Transformations'", *Speculations in Science and Technology*, Volume 2, (1979), p. 243. **See also:** D. Lorenz, "Über die Realität der FitzGerald-Lorentz Kontraktion", *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Wissenschaftstheorie*, Volume 13/2, (1982), pp. 308-312. **See also:** D. Dieks, "The 'Reality' of the Lorentz Contraction," *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Wissenschaftstheorie*, Volume 115/2, (1984), p. 341. **See also:** F. Winterberg, *The Planck Aether Hypothesis*, Gauss Press, Reno, Nevada, (2002), pp. 141-148.

2987. F. Winterberg, *The Planck Aether Hypothesis: An Attempt for a Finitistic Non-Archimedean Theory of Elementary Particles*, Carl Friedrich Gauss Academy of Science Press, Reno, Nevada, (2002), pp. 144-145.

2988. L. Jánossy, "Über die physikalische Interpretation der Lorentz-Transformation", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 6, Volume 11, (1953), pp. 293-322, at 306-307. **See also:** L. Jánossy, *Theory of Relativity Based on Physical Reality*, Akademiai Kiadó, Budapest, (1971).

2989. A. Einstein, "Die Relativitäts-Theorie", *Vierteljahrsschrift der Naturforschenden Gesellschaft in Zürich*, Volume 56, (1911), pp. 1-14, at 12; English translation by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 3, Document 17, Princeton University Press, (1993), pp. 340-350, at 349.

2990. A. Einstein quoted in E. Gehrcke, "Zur Diskussion der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie", *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), p. 35.

2991. E. Gehrcke, "Die erkenntnistheoretischen Grundlagen der verschiedenen physikalischen Relativitätstheorien", *Kant-Studien*, Volume 19, (1914), pp. 481-487, at 486; republished in *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 35-40, at 38.

2992. H. A. Lorentz, Volume 5, Part 2, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1904), "Maxwells elektromagnetische Theorie" (submitted June, 1903), Chapter 13, pp. 63-144, and "Weiterbildung der Maxwellschen Theorie, Elektronentheorie" (submitted December, 1903), Chapter 14, pp. 145-280, *Encyclopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen*; **and** "Electromagnetische Verschijnselen in een Stelsel dat Zich met Willekeurige Snelheid, Kleiner dan die van Het Licht, Beweegt", *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 12, (23 April 1904), pp. 986-1009; translated into English, "Electromagnetic Phenomena in a System Moving with any Velocity Smaller than that of Light", *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam (Noninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam)*, Volume 6, (27 May 1904), pp. 809-831; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 5, pp. 172-197; a redacted and shortened version appears in *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), pp. 11-34; a German translation from the English, "Elektromagnetische Erscheinung in einem System, das sich mit beliebiger, die des Lichtes nicht erreichender Geschwindigkeit bewegt," appears in *Das Relativitätsprinzip: eine Sammlung von Abhandlungen*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1913), pp. 6-26. **See also:** H. Poincaré, "Sur la Dynamique de l'Électron", *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L'Académie des sciences*, Volume 140, (1905), pp. 1504-1508; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 77-81 URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

reprinted *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 489-493; English translations appear in: G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, “Intimations of Relativity before Einstein”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (December, 1983), pp. 343-354, at pp. 350-353; **and**, translated by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 7-14; **and** “Sur la Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Rendiconti del Circolo matimatico di Palermo*, Volume 21, (1906, submitted 23 July 1905), pp. 129-176; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 18-76 URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume 9, pp. 494-550; redacted English translation by H. M. Schwartz with modern notation, “Poincaré’s Rendiconti Paper on Relativity”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 39, (November, 1971), pp. 1287-1294; Volume 40, (June, 1972), pp. 862-872; Volume 40, (September, 1972), pp. 1282-1287; English translation by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov with modern notation, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 15-78; **and** “La Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 19, (1908), pp. 386-402; reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume 9, pp. 551-586; English translation: “The New Mechanics”, *Science and Method*, Book III, which is reprinted in *Foundations of Science*. **See also:** H. Minkowski, *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952); **and** *The Principle of Relativity; Original Papers by A. Einstein and H. Minkowski, Tr. into English by M. N. Saha and S. N. Bose. . . with a Historical Introduction by P. C. Mahalanobis*, University of Calcutta, Calcutta, (1920). **See also:** P. Frank, “Die Stellung des Relativitätsprinzips im System der Mechanik und der Elektrodynamik”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, Volume 118, (1909), pp. 373-446.

2993. E. Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), p. 159. G. H. Keswani, “Origin and Concept of Relativity, Parts I, II & III”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 15, Number 60, (February, 1965), pp. 286-306; Volume 16, Number 61, (May, 1965), pp.19-32; Volume 16, Number 64, (February, 1966), pp. 273-294, at 278.

2994. E. Kretschmann, “Eine Theorie der Schwerkraft im Rahmen der ursprünglichen Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie”, *Inaugural Dissertation*, Berlin, (1914); **and** “Über die prinzipielle Bestimmbarkeit der berechtigten Bezugssysteme beliebiger Relativitätstheorien”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 48, (1915), pp. 907-942, 943-; **and** “Über den physikalischen Sinn der Relativitäts-Postulat, A. Einsteins neue und seine ursprüngliche Relativitätstheorie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 53, (1917), pp. 575-614. **See also:** D. Howard and J. Norton, “Out of the Labyrinth? Einstein, Hertz, and the Göttingen Answer to the Hole Argument”, J. Earman, *et al.* Editors, *The Attraction of Gravitation. New Studies in the History of General Relativity*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (1993), pp. 30-62, especially 53-55.

2995. D. Overbye, *Einstein in Love: A Scientific Romance*, Viking, New York, (2001), pp. 296-297. Overbye refers to: Note “40” Letter from A. Einstein to P. Ehrenfest of 26 December 1915, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 173,

Princeton University Press, (1998), pp. 167-168, at 167. Note “41” Letter from A. Einstein to M. Besso of 3 January 1916, from J. Stachel, “Einstein and the Rigidly Rotating Disk”, in D. Howard and J. Stachel, Editors, *Einstein and the History of General Relativity*, Volume 1, Birkhäuser, Boston, (1989). *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 30, Princeton University Press, (1998), pp. 171-172, at 172. Note “42” A. Einstein, “Die Grundlagen der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 49, Number 7, (1916), pp. 769-822; as reproduced in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 30, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 153.

2996. D. van Delft, “Albert Einstein in Leiden”, *Physics Today*, Volume 59, Number 4, (April, 2006), pp. 57-62, at 61-62.

2997. D. van Delft, “Albert Einstein in Leiden”, *Physics Today*, Volume 59, Number 4, (April, 2006), pp. 57-62, at 60.

2998. A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, (1982), p. 333. Pais cites: “[E20]” *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1927), p. 26. “[K3]” O. Klein, “Quantentheorie und fünfdimensionale Relativitätstheorie”, *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Volume 37, (1926), pp. 895-906. **See also:** T. Kaluza, “Zur Unitätsproblem der Physik”, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, Volume 54, (1921), pp. 966-972; **and** “Über den Energieinhalt der Atomkerne”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 23, (1922), pp. 474-476; **and** “Zur Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 25, (1924), pp. 604-606. **See also:** O. Klein, “Quantentheorie und fünfdimensionale Relativitätstheorie”, *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Volume 37, (1926), pp. 895-906; **and** “The Atomicity of Electricity as a Quantum Theory Law”, *Nature*, Volume 118, (9 October 1926), p. 516; **and** “Sur L’Article de M. L. De Broglie ‘L’Univers a Cinq Dimensions et la Mécanique Ondulatoire’”, *Le Journal de Physique et le Radium*, Series 6, Volume 8, (April, 1927), pp. 242-243; **and** “Zur fünfdimensionale Darstellung der Relativitätstheorie”, *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Volume 46, (1927), pp. 188-208; **and** “Meson Fields and Nuclear Interaction”, *Arkiv för Matematik, Astronomi och Fysik*, Volume 34, Number 1, (1947), pp. 1-19; **and** “Generalizations of Einstein’s Theory of Gravitation Considered from the Point of View of Quantum Field theory”, *Helvetica Physica Acta*, Supplement 4, (1956), pp. 58-71. **Confer:** E. T. Whittaker, *A History of Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Thomas Nelson and Sons, London, (1953), pp. 190-191. **See also:** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, New York, Oxford University Press, (1982), pp. 329-334.

2999. V. Varičak, “Primjedbe o jednoj interpretaciji geometrije Lobačevskoga”, *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, Volume 154, (1903), pp. 81-131; **and** “O transformacijama u ravnini Lobačevskoga” *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, Volume 165, (1906), pp. 50-80; **and** “Općena jednadzba pravca u hiperbolnoj ravnini”, *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, Volume 167, (1906), pp. 167-188; **and** “Bemerkung zu einem Punkte in der Festrede L. Schlesingers über Johann Bolyai”, *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 16, (1907), pp. 320-321; **and** “Prvi osnivači neeuclidiske geometrije”, *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, Volume 169, (1908), pp. 110-194; **and** “Beiträge zur nichteuclidischen Geometrie”, *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 17, (1908), pp. 70-83; **and** “Anwendung der Lobatschefskijschen Geometrie in der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 93-96; **and** “Die Relativtheorie und die Lobatschefskijsche Geometrie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 287-294; **and** “Die Reflexion des Lichtes an bewegten Spiegeln”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 586-587; **and** “Zum Ehrenfestschen Paradoxon”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 12, (1911), pp. 169-170; **and** “Интерпретација теорије релативности у геометрији Лобачевскога”, *Glas, Srpska*

Kraljevska Akademija, Volume 83, (1911), pp. 211-255; **and** *Glas, Srpska Kraljevska Akademija*, Volume 88, (1911); **and** “Über die nichteuklidische Interpretation der Relativitätstheorie”, *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 21, (1912), pp. 103-127; **and** *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, (1914), p. 46; (1915), pp. 86, 101; (1916), p. 79; (1918), p. 1; (1919), p. 100; **and** “O teoriji relativnosti”, *Ljetopis Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti*, Volume 33, (1919), pp. 73-94; **and** *Darstellung der Relativitätstheorie im 3-dimensionalen Lobatschewskischen Raume*, Vasić, Zagreb, (1924).

3000. L. Silberstein, “General Relativity without the Equivalence Hypothesis”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 36, (July, 1918), pp. 94-128.

3001. F. Kottler, “Über die Raumzeitlinien der Minkowski’schen Welt”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 121, (1912), pp. 1659-1759; **and** “Relativitätsprinzip und beschleunigte Bewegung”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 44, (1914), pp. 701-748; **and** “Fallende Bezugssysteme vom Standpunkt des Relativitätsprinzip”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 45, (1914), pp. 481-516; **and** “Beschleunigungsrelative Bewegungen und die konforme Gruppe der Minkowski’schen Welt”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 125, (1916), pp. 899-919; **and** “Über Einsteins Äquivalenzhypothese und die Gravitation”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 50, (1916), pp. 955-972; **and** “Über die physikalischen Grundlagen der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 56, (1918), pp. 401-462; **and** F. Kottler, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen*, Volume 6, Part 2, Chapter 22a, pp. 159-237; **and** “Newton’sches Gesetz und Metrik”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 131, (1922), p. 1-14; **and** “Maxwell’schen Gleichungen und Metrik”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 131, (1922), pp. 119-146.

3002. H. Bateman, “On General Relativity”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 37, (1919), pp. 219-223, at 219. **See also:** H. Bateman, “The Conformal Transformations of a Space of Four Dimensions and their Applications to Geometrical Optics”, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 7, (1909), pp. 70-89; **and** *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 18, (1909), p. 890; **and** “The Transformation of the Electrodynamical Equations”, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 8, (1910), pp. 223-264, 375, 469; **and** “The Physical Aspects of Time”, *Memoirs and Proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society*, Volume 54, (1910), pp. 1-13; **and** *American Journal of Mathematics*, Volume 34, (1912), p. 325; **and** *The Mathematical Analysis of Electrical and Optical Wave-Motion on the Basis of Maxwell’s Equations*, Cambridge University Press, (1915); **and** “The Electromagnetic Vectors”, *The Physical Review*, Volume 12, Number 6, (December, 1918), pp. 459-481; **and** *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 21, (1920), p. 256. **Confer:** E. Whittaker, *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the Royal Society*, Volume 1, (1955), pp. 44-45; **and** *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), pp. 8, 64, 76, 94, 154-156, 195. **See also:** W. Pauli, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, New York, (1958), pp. 81, 96, 199. **See also:** E. Bessel-Hagen, “Über der Erhaltungssätze der Elektrodynamik”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 84, (1921), pp. 258-276. **See also:** F. D. Murnaghan, “The Absolute Significance of Maxwell’s Equations”, *The Physical Review*, Volume 17, Number 2, (February, 1921), pp. 73-88. **See also:** G.

Kowalewski, “Über die Batemansche Transformationsgruppe”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, Volume 157, Number 3, (1927), pp. 193-197.

3003. A. Einstein, “Über Friedrich Kottlers Abhandlung ‘Über Einsteins Äquivalenzhypothese und die Gravitation’”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 51, (1916), pp. 639-642, at 639; English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 40, Princeton University Press, (1997), p. 237.

3004. A. Einstein, “Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 49, Number 7, (1916), pp. 769-822, at 773; **and** “Zum gegenwärtigen Stande des Gravitationsproblems”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 14, (1913), pp. 1249-1262.

3005. H. Reichenbach, *The Philosophy of Space & Time*, Dover, New York, (1958), p. 225.

3006. E. Wiechert, “Perihelbewegung des Merkur und die allgemeine Mechanik”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (26 February 1916), pp. 124-141, at 126; republished, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 17, (1916), pp. 442-448.

3007. H. Weyl, *Space-Time-Matter*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 225.

3008. A. Einstein, “On the Present State of the Problem of Gravitation”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 4, Document 17, Princeton University Press, (1996), pp. 200, 208.

3009. A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 58, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 238-240, at 239.

3010. M. Born, “Physics and Relativity”, *Physics in my Generation*, second revised edition, Springer, New York, (1969), pp. 107-108.

3011. S. Clarke, “A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God”, *The Works of Samuel Clarke, D. D. Late Rector of St James’s Westminster*, Volume 2, Third Sermon, John and Paul Knapton, London, (1738), pp. 531-532.

3012. I. Newton, *The Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*, Volume 2, Benjamin Motte, London, (1729), pp. 80-82.

3013. I. Newton, *The Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*, Volume 2, Benjamin Motte, London, (1729), pp. 220-225.

3014. J. E. Turner, “Some Philosophical Aspects of Scientific Relativity”, *The Journal of Philosophy*, Volume 18, Number 8, (14 April 1921), pp. 210-216.

3015. Lucretius, *On the Nature of the Universe*, Penguin, London, (1951).

3016. G. Galilei, *Dialogues Concerning Two New Sciences*, Dover, New York, (1954), pp. 166-167.

3017. A. Schuster, *The Progress of Physics during 33 years (1875-1908) Four Lectures delivered to the University of Calcutta during March 1908*, Cambridge University Press, (1911), pp. 114-117.

3018. A. Einstein quoted in M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 149.

3019. Banesh Hoffmann with the collaboration of Helen Dukas, *Albert Einstein, Creator and Rebel*, The New American Library, New York, (1972), p. 257.

3020. A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, Toronto, Melbourne, (1982), p. 467.

3021. *The New York Times*, (10 November 1919), p. 17. E. E. Slossen, *Easy Lessons in Einstein*, Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, (1921), p. vii; **and** H. A. Lorentz, *The Einstein Theory of Relativity*, Brentano’s, New York, (1920), p. 5.

3022. R. J. Boscovich, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, (1966), Back Cover.

- 3023.** D. Brian, *Einstein, A Life*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, (1996), p. 61.
- 3024.** J. Stachel, Ed., *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Princeton University Press, (1989), p. 255, Ref. 13.
- 3025.** Letter from A. Einstein to M. Marić of 28 December 1901, English translation by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Document 131, Princeton University Press, (1987), pp. 189-190.
- 3026.** M. Born, *Physics in my Generation*, 2nd rev. ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, (1969), p. 101.
- 3027.** D. Hilbert, “Die Grundlagen der Physik, (Erste Mitteilung.) Vorgelegt in der Sitzung vom 20. November 1915.”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1915), pp. 395-407.
- 3028.** Sir William Dampier, *A History of Science and its Relations with Philosophy & Religion*, Cambridge University Press, (1936), p. 427.
- 3029.** H. Poincaré, URL:

<http://gallica.bnf.fr/metacata.idq?Bgc=&Mod=&CiRestriction=%28@_Auteur%20henri%26poincare%29&RPT=>

“Non-Euclidean Geometry”, *Nature*, Volume 45, (February 25, 1892), pp. 404-407; **and** “La Mesure de la Gravité et la Géodésie”, *Bulletin Astronomique* (Paris), Volume 18, (1901), pp. 5-39; **and** *Figures d'Équilibre d'une Masse Fluide : Leçons Professées à la Sorbonne en 1900*, C. Naud, Paris, (1902); **and** *La Science et l'Hypothèse*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1902); translated into English *Science and Hypothesis*, Dover, New York, (1952), which appears in *The Foundations of Science*; translated into German with substantial notations by Ferdinand and Lisbeth Lindemann, *Wissenschaft und Hypothese*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1904); **and** “Sur la Dynamique de l'Électron”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L'Académie des sciences*, Volume 140, (1905), pp. 1504-1508; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 77-81 URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

reprinted *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 489-493; English translations appear in: G. H. Keswani and C. W. Kilmister, “Intimations of Relativity before Einstein”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 34, Number 4, (December, 1983), pp. 343-354, at pp. 350-353; **and**, translated by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 7-14; **and** “Sur la Dynamique de l'Électron”, *Rendiconti del Circolo matimatico di Palermo*, Volume 21, (1906, submitted July 23rd, 1905), pp. 129-176; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 18-76 URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume IX, pp. 494-550; redacted English translation by H. M. Schwartz with modern notation, “Poincaré’s Rendiconti Paper on Relativity”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 39, (November, 1971), pp. 1287-1294; Volume 40, (June, 1972), pp. 862-

872; Volume 40, (September, 1972), pp. 1282-1287; English translation by G. Pontecorvo with extensive commentary by A. A. Logunov with modern notation, *On the Articles by Henri Poincaré ON THE DYNAMICS OF THE ELECTRON*, Publishing Department of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, (1995), pp. 15-78; **and** “La Dynamique de l’Électron”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 19, (1908), pp. 386-402; reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume IX, pp. 551-586; English translation: “The New Mechanics”, *Science and Method*, Book III, which is reprinted in *Foundations of Science*; **and** “The Future of Mathematics”, *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution Showing the Operations, Expenditures, and Conditions of the Institution for the Year Ending June 30, 1909*, (U.S.) Government Printing Office, Washington, (1910), pp. 123-140; **and** *Science et Méthode*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1908); translated in English as *Science and Method*, numerous editions; *Science and Method* is also reprinted in *Foundations of Science*; **and** “La Mécanique Nouvelle”, *Comptes Rendus des Sessions de l’Association Française pour l’Avancement des Sciences*, Conférence de Lille, Paris, (1909), pp. 38-48; *La Revue Scientifique*, Volume 47, (1909), pp. 170-177; reprinted in H. Poincaré, *La Mécanique Nouvelle: Conférence, Mémoire et Note sur la Théorie de la Relativité / Introduction de Édouard Guillaume*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1924), pp. 18-76 URL:

<<http://gallica.bnf.fr/scripts/ConsultationTout.exe?E=0&O=N029067>>

and 28 April 1909 Lecture in Göttingen: “La Mécanique Nouvelle”, *Sechs Vorträge über der reinen Mathematik und mathematischen Physik auf Einladung der Wolfskehl-Kommission der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften gehalten zu Göttingen vom 22.-28. April 1909*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1910), pp. 51-58; “The New Mechanics”, *The Monist*, Volume 23, (1913), pp. 385-395; **13 October 1910 Lecture in Berlin:** “Die neue Mechanik”, *Himmel und Erde*, Volume 23, (1911), pp. 97-116; *Die neue Mechanik*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1911); **and** “Sur la Théorie des Quanta”, *Journal de Physique*, Volume 2, (1911), pp. 5-34; **and** “Les Limites de la Loi de Newton”, *Bulletin Astronomique*, Volume 17, (1953), pp. 121-269; from the notes taken by Henri Vergne of Poincaré’s Sorbonne lectures (1906-1907); **and** *Dernières Pensées*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1913); translated in English as *Mathematics and Science: Last Essays*, Dover, New York, (1963).

3030. See: A. P. Youshkevitch and B. A. Rosenfeld, *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, “al-Khayyāmī”.

3031. See: S. H. Nasr, *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, “al-Tūsī”; **and** E. S. Kennedy, *The Exact Sciences in Iran Under the Seljuqs and Mongols*, p. 664.

3032. G. Saccheri, *Euclides ab omni naevo vindicatus: Sive conatus geometricus quo stabiliuntur prima ipsa universae geometriae principia*, Milan, (1733); English translation by G. B. Halsted, *Girolamo Saccheri’s Euclides vindicatus, ed. and tr. by George Bruce Halsted*, Open Court, Chicago, (1920); Italian translation with notes by G. Boccardini *L’Euclide emendato del p. Gerolamo Saccheri*, U. Hoepli, Milano, (1904); German translation, of book I, by P. Stäckel and F. Engel, *Die Theorie der Parallellinien von Euclid bis auf Gauss: Eine Urkundensammlung zur Vorgeschichte der nichteuclidischen Geometrie*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1895), pp. 31-136. **See also:** D. J. Struik, *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, “Saccheri”.

3033. C. F. Gauss, *Theoria motus corporum coelestium in sectionibus conicis solem ambientium*, F. Perthes I. H. Besser, Hamburg, (1809); reprinted in *Carl Friedrich Gauss Werke*, Volume 9, Book 1, First Section, B. G. Teubner, (1906), p. 14; **and** “Über ein neues allgemeines Grundgesetz der Mechanik”, *Carl Friedrich Gauss Werke*, Volume 5, B. G.

Teubner, pp. 25-28, especially p. 28; and *Carl Friedrich Gauss Werke*, B. G. Teubner, Volume 4, p. 215; Volume 5, p. 629; and *Briefwechsel zwischen C.F. Gauss und H.C. Schumacher*, Volume 2, C.A.F. Peters, G. Esch, Altona, (1860-1865), pp. 268-271; reprinted in *Briefwechsel mit Schumacher*, G. Olms, Hildesheim, New York, (1975); and W. Sartorius von Waltershausen, *Gauss zum Gedächtnis*, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1856), p. 17, 81; and P. Stäckel, “Mitteilungen aus dem Briefwechsel von Gauss und W. Bolyai”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1897), pp. 1-12; and P. Stäckel and F. Engels, “Gauss, die beiden Bolyai und die nichteuklidische Geometrie”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 49, (1897), pp. 149-206; and F. Engel and P. Stäckel, *Die Theorie der Parallelinien von Euklid bis auf Gauß*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1895); and *Urkunden zur Geschichte der nichteuklidischen Geometrie*, Leipzig, (1899); and *Briefwechsel zwischen Carl Friedrich Gauss und Wolfgang Bolyai. Herausgegeben von Franz Schmidt und Paul Stackel*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1899).

3034. J. Bolyai, “Appendix scientiam spatii absolute veram exhibens: a veritate aut falsitate Axiomatis XI Euclidei (a priori haud unquam decidenda) indepentum. Auctore Johanne Bolyai de eadem, Geometrarum in Exercitu Caesareo Regio Austriaco Castrensi Captaneo”, János Appendix to his father’s, Farkas (Wolfgang) Bolyai’s, *Tentamen Juventutem studiosam in elementa Matheseos purae, elementaris ac sublimioris, methodo intuitiva, evidentiisque huic propria, introducendi, cum appendice triplici*, In Two Volumes, Maros-Vásárhelyini, (1832/1833); English translation by G. B. Halsted, *Geometrical Researches on the Theory of Parallels*, University of Texas, Austin, (1891), reprinted in R. Bonola, *Non-Euclidean geometry; a critical and historical study of its developments. Authorized English translation with additional appendices by H. S. Carslaw. With an introd. by Federigo Enriques. With a suppl. containing the George Bruce Halsted translations of The science of absolute space, by John Bolyai, The theory of parallels, by Nicholas Lobachevski*, Dover, New York, (1955); Italian translation by G. Battaglini, “Sulla scienza dello spazio assolutamente vera, ed indipendente dalla verita o dalla falsita dell’assioma XI di Euclide: per Giovanni Bolyai”, *Giornale di Matematiche*, Volume 6, (1868), pp. 97-115; French translation by J. Hoüel, *La Science Absolue de l’Espace independante de la verité ou de la fausseté de l’Axiome XI d’Euclide (que l’on ne pourra jamais établir a priori); par Jean Bolyai: précédé d’une Notice sur la Vie et les Travaux de W. Et J. Bolyai, par M. Fr. Schmidt*, Paris, (1868); German translation by J. Frischauf, *Absolute Geometrie, nach J. Bolyai*, Leipzig, (1872). **W. Bolyai**, *Kurzer Grundriss eines Versuches, I. die Arithmetik, durch zweckmässig construirte Begriffe, von eingebildeten und unendlich-kleinen Grössen gereinigt, anschaulich und logisch-streng darzustellen: II. In der Geometrie, die Begriffe der geraden Linie, der Ebene, des Winkels allgemein, der winkellosen Formen, und der Krümmen, der verschiedenen Arten der Gleichheit u. dgl. nicht nur scharf zu bestimmen, sondern auch ihr Sein in Raume zu beweisen: und da die Frage, ob zwei von der dritten geschnittene Geraden, wenn die Summa der inneren Winkel nicht = 2R, sich schneiden oder nicht?, niemand an der Erde ohne ein Axiom (wie Euclid das XI) aufzustellen, beantworten wird; die davon unabhängige Geometrie abzusondern, und eine auf die Ja Antwort, andere auf das Nein so zu bauen, dass die Formeln der letzten auf ein. Wink auch in der ersten gültig seien.*, Maros-Vásárhely., 1851. **See also:** P. Stäckel and F. Engels, “Gauss, die beiden Bolyai und die nichteuklidische Geometrie”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 49, (1897), pp. 149-206; and Magyar Királyi Ferenc József Tudományegyetem, *Libellus post saeculum quam Ioannes Bolyai de Bolya anno MDCCCII A.D. XVIII kalendas ianuarias Claudiopoli natus est ad celebrandam memoriam eius immortalis. Ex consilio Ordinis mathematicorum et naturae scrutatorum Regiae litterarum universitatis hungaricae Francisco-Josephinae claudiopolitanae editus*, Claudiopoli [typis Societatis franklinianae budapestinensis], 1902.

3035. N. Lobatschewsky, “O nachalakh Geometrii”, *Kazanskii Viestnik*, (July and August, 1829/1830), pp. 571-636; **and** “О началахъ Геометрии”, *Казанский вѣстникъ*, (1829 и 1830 июль и августъ), стр. 571- 636; **and** “Neue Anfangsgruende der Geometrie, mit einer vollständigen Theorie der Parallelen”, *Gelehrte Schriften der Universität Kasan*, 1836-38; **and** “Application de la Geometrie Imaginaire à quelques Integrales”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelle’s Journal)*, (1836); **and** “Noviya nachala Geometrii”, *Ucheniya Zapiski Imperatorskago Kazanskago Universiteta*, (1835), Volume 3; (1836), Volume 2 and 3; (1837), Volume 1; **and** “Новыя начала Геометрии”, *Ученыя записки Казань*, (1835), книжка. III; (1836), кн. II и III. (1837), кн. I; **and** “Geometrie Imaginaire”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelle’s Journal B)*, Volume 17, (1837), pp. 295-320; **and** *Geometrische Untersuchung zur Theorie der Parallellinien*, Berlin, (1840); French translation by J. Hoüel, *Études Géométriques sur la Theorie des Paralleles, par Lobatchewsky; suivi d’un extrait de la correspondance de Guass et de Schumacher*, Paris, (1866); **and** *Pangéométrie, ou precis de geometrie fondée sur une theorie generale et rigoureuse des paralleles*, Imprimerie de l’Université, Kazan, (1855); German translation, *Pangeometrie*, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1902), *Ostwald’s Klassiker Nr. 130*; Italian translation by G. Battaglini, *Giornale di Matematiche*, Volume 5, (September/October, 1867), pp. 273-320; **and** *Geometrische Untersuchungen zur Theorie der Parallellinien* (Геометрические исследования по теории параллельных линии), Berlin, (1840); reprinted Mayer & Müller, (1887); English translation by G. B. Halsted, *Geometrical Researches on the Theory of Parallels*, University of Texas, Austin, (1891), reprinted in R. Bonola, *Non-Euclidean geometry; a critical and historical study of its developments. Authorized English translation with additional appendices by H. S. Carslaw. With an introd. by Federigo Enriques. With a suppl. containing the George Bruce Halsted translations of The science of absolute space, by John Bolyai, The theory of parallels, by Nicholas Lobachevski*, Dover, New York, (1955); **and** *Nicolai Ivanovich Lobachevsky; address pronounced at the commemorative meeting of the Imperial University of Kasan, Oct. 22, 1893. Translated from the Russian, with a preface, by G.B. Halsted*, Neomonic Series, Number 1, Austin, Texas, (1894).

3036. B. Riemann, *Schwere, Elektrizität und Magnetismus, nach den Vorlesungen von B. Riemann*, C. Rumpler, Hannover, (1875), p. 326; **and** *Ueber die Hypothesen, welche der Geometrie zu Grunde liegen*, Dieterichschen Buchhandlung, Göttingen, (1867); “Ueber die Hypothesen, welche der Geometrie zu Grunde liegen (Habilitationsschrift von 10 Juni 1854)”, *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, Volume 13, (1868), pp. 133-150; English translation by W. K. Clifford, “On the Hypotheses which Lie at the Bases of Geometry”, *Nature*, Volume 8, Number 183, (May 1, 1873), pp. 14-17; Volume 8, Number 184, (May 8, 1873), pp. 36-37; French translation by J. Hoüel, “Sur les Hypotheses qui Servent de Fondement a la Geometrie, Memoire Posthume de B. Riemann”, *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*, Series 2, Volume 3, Number 4, (1870), pp. 309-327; **and** “Ein Beitrag zur Elektrodynamik”, *Bernhard Riemann’s gesammelte mathematische Werke und wissenschaftlicher Nachlass*, (1867), p. 270; **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 131, (1867), p. 237; *Bernhard Riemann’s Gesammelte mathematische Werke und wissenschaftlicher Nachlass*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1892), p. 288, *see also* p. 526; reprinted by Dover, New York, (1953); *Philosophical Magazine*, 34, (1867), p. 368; **and** “Neue mathematische Principien der Naturphilosophie”, *Bernhard Riemann’s Gesammelte mathematische Werke und wissenschaftlicher Nachlass*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1892), pp. 528-532; reprinted by Dover, New York, (1953). For an analysis of this paper and additional relevant references, *see*: D. Laugwitz, *Bernhard Riemann 1826-1866 Turning Points in the Conception of Mathematics*, Birkhäuser, Boston,

Basel, Berlin, (1999), pp. 281-287.

3037. J. C. Becker, *Abhandlungen aus dem Grenzgebiete der Mathematik und Philosophie*, F. Schulthess, Zürich, (1870); recension of the Abhandlungen see: *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik*, Volume 15, p. 93. J. C. Becker, “Ueber die neuesten Untersuchungen in Betreff unserer Anschauungen vom Raume”, *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik*, Volume 17, (1872), pp. 314-332; **and** *Die Elemente der Geometrie auf neuer Grundlage streng Deduktiv dargestellt*, Berlin, (1877).

3038. E. Beltrami, “Risoluzione del Problema di Riportare i Punti di una Superficie Sopra un Piano in Modo che le Linee Geodetiche Vengano Rappresentate da Linee Rette”, *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*, Volume 7, (1866), pp. 185-204; **and** “Teoria Fondamentali Degli Spazii di Curvatura Costante”, *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*, Series 2, Volume 2, (1868), pp. 232-255; reprinted in *Opere*, Volume 1, pp. 406-429; French translation by J. Hoüel, *Annales Scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure*, Volume 6, (1869), pp. 347-375; **and** “Saggio di Interpretazione della Geometria non-Euclidea”, *Giornale di Matematiche*, Volume 6, (1868), pp. 284-312; reprinted in *Opere*, Volume 1, pp. 374-405; French translation by J. Hoüel, *Annales Scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure*, Volume 6, (1869), pp. 251-288; **and** “Teorema di Geometria Pseudosferica”, *Giornale di Matematiche*, Volume 10, (1872), p. 53; **and** “Sulla Superficie di Rotazione che Serve di Tipo alle Superficie Pseudosuperficie”, *Giornale di Matematiche*, Volume 10, (1872), pp. 147-159; **and** “Un precursore italiano di Legendre e di Lobatschewsky”, *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Rendiconti. Classe di Scienze Fisiche, Matematiche e Naturali*, Series 4, Volume 5, Number 1, (1889), pp. 441-448; reprinted in *Opere*, Volume Volume 4, pp. 348-355; **and** *Opere Matematiche di Eugenio Beltrami*, In Four Volumes, U. Hoepli, Milan, (1902-1920); *especially*: Volume 2, pp. 394-409; Volume 3, pp.383-407; Volume 4, pp. 356-361.

3039. E. Betti, “Sopra gli Spazi di un Numero Qualunque di Dimensioni”, *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*, Series 2, Volume 4, (1870), pp. 140-158.

3040. C. Flye-Ste. Marie, *Études Analytiques sur la Théorie des Parallèles*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1871).

3041. A. Genocchi, *Dei Primi Principii della Meccanica e della Geometria in Relazione al Postulato d'Euclide*. Firenze, 1869. Accademia da XL in Modena, serie III, tomo II, parte I.

3042. H. L. F. v. Helmholtz, *Über die Erhaltung der Kraft*, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1847); English translation by J. Tyndall, *Scientific Memoirs. Natural Philosophy*, Volume 7, (1853), pp. 114-162; **and** “On the Interaction of Natural Forces”, *The Correlation and Conservation of Forces*, D. Appleton, New York, (1867), pp. 211-347; **and** “Ueber die Thatsachen die der Geometrie zu liegen”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, Volume 9, (3 June 1868), pp. 193-221; **and** “Sur les Faits qui Servent de Base à la Geometrie”, *Mémoires de la Société des Sciences Physique et Naturelle de Bordeaux*, (1868); **and** “Ueber die Bewegungsgleichungen der Elektrizität für ruhende leitende Körper”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelle's Journal)*, Volume 72, (1870), pp. 57-129; **and** “Ueber die theorie der Elektrodynamik”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, Volume 72, pp. 57-129; English translation *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 44, (1872), pp. 530-537; **and** *Journal für die reine und ungewandte Mathematik*, Volume 75, (1873), p. 35; **and** “On the Origin and Meaning of Geometrical Axioms. Part I”, *Mind*, Volume 1, Number 3, (July, 1876), pp. 301-321; “On the Origin and Meaning of Geometrical Axioms. Part II”, *Mind*, Volume 3, Number 10, (April, 1878), pp. 212-225; “Über den Ursprung und die Bedeutung der geometrischen Axiome”, *Vorträge und Reden*, Volume 2, F. Vieweg u. Sohn,

Braunschweig, (1884), pp. 1-34. Responses by W. S. Jevons, *Nature*, Volume 4, p. 481; and J. L. Tupper, *Nature*, Volume 5, p. 202. Reply by Helmholtz, *Academy*, Volume 3, p. 52.

3043. S. Lie, “Ueber diejenige Theorie eines Raumes mit beliebig vielen Dimensionen, die der Krümmungs-Theorie des gewöhnlichen Raumes entspricht”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1871), pp. 191-209; and “Zur Theorie eines Raumes von n Dimensionen”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1871), pp. 535-557; and “Ueber Gruppen von Transformationen”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1874), pp. 529-542; and “Begründung einer Invarianten-Theorie der Berührungs-Transformationen”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 8, (1875), pp. 215-313; and “Theorie der Transformationsgruppen I.”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 16, (1880), pp. 441-528; and “Untersuchungen über geodätische Curven”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 20, (1882), pp. 357-454; and “Classification und Integration von gewöhnlichen Differentialgleichungen zwischen xy , die eine Gruppe von Transformationen gestatten (Dated March, 1883)”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 32, (1888), pp. 213-281; and “Ueber Differentialinvarianten”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 24, (1884) pp. 537-578; and “Allgemeine Untersuchungen über Differentialgleichungen, die eine continuirliche, endliche Gruppe gestatten”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 25, (1885), pp. 71-151; and *Theorie der Transformationsgruppen*, Volume 3, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1893).

3044. R. Lipschitz, “Untersuchungen in Betreff die ganzen homogenen Functionen von n Differentialen”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, Volume 70, pp. 71-102; Volume 72, pp. 1-56. See also: *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (January, 1869), pp. 44-53; and R. Lipschitz, “Beitrag zur Theorie der Krümmung”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, Volume 71, p. 239; and *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématique*, Volume 4, (1873), pp. 97-110, 142-157; and “Entwicklung einiger Eigenschaften der quadratischen Formen von n Differentialen”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, Volume 71, pp. 274-287, 288-295; *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématique*, Volume 4, (1873), pp. 297-307; Volume 5, pp. 308-314; and “Untersuchung eines Problems der Variationsrechnung”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, Volume 74, pp. 116-171; *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématique*, Volume 4, pp. 212-224, 297-320; and “Extension of the Planet-problem to a Space of n Dimensions and of Constant Integral Curvature”, *The Quarterly Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, Volume 12, (1871), pp. 349-370.

3045. L. Schläfli, “Nota alla Memoria del Sig. Beltrami Sugli Spazie dela Curvatura Costante”, *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*, Series 2, Volume 5, (1870), pp. 178-193; and E. Beltrami, “Osservazione sulla Precedente Memoria del Sig. Prof. Schläfli”, , *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*, Series 2, Volume 5, (1870), pp. 194-198.

3046. A. Einstein’s letter to Felix Klein of 26 March 1917 translated by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 319, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 311.

3047. M. Abraham, “Dynamik des Elektrons”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1902), pp. 20-41; and “Prinzipien der Dynamik des Elektrons”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 4, (1902), pp. 57-62; and “Prinzipien der Dynamik des Elektrons”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 10, (1903), pp. 105-179; and “Der Lichtdruck auf einen bewegten Spiegel und das Gesetz der schwarzen Strahlung”, *Festschrift Ludwig Boltzmann gewidmet zum sechzigsten geburtstage 20. februar 1904. Mit einem Portrait, 101 Abbildungen im Text und*

2 Tafeln, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1904), pp. 85-93; **and** “Die Grundhypothesen der Elektronentheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 5, (1904), pp. 576-579; **and** “Zur Theorie der Strahlung und des Strahlungsdruckes”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 14, (1904), pp. 236-287; **and** *Theorie der Elektrizität: Elektromagnetische Theorie der Strahlung*, In Two Volumes, B.G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1904/1905); **and** M. Abraham and A. Föppl, *Theorie der Elektrizität/Einführung in die Maxwellsche Theorie der Elektrizität*, B.G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1907); **and** M. Abraham, “Geometrische Grundbegriffe”, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, 4, 3, 14, pp. 3-47, especially p. 28; **and** *Elektromagnetische Theorie der Strahlung*, Second Edition, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1908); **and** “Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Körper”, *Rendiconti del Circolo Matimatico di Palermo*, Volume 28, (1909), pp. 1-28; **and** “Die Bewegungsgleichungen eines Massenteilchens in der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 527-531; **and** “Sull’Elettrodinamica di Minkowski. Vettori e Tensori di Quattro Dimensioni”, *Rendiconti del Circolo matimatico di Palermo*, Volume 30, (1910), pp. 33-46; **and** “Sulla Teorie della Gravitazione”, *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Rendiconti. Classe di Scienze Fisiche, Matematiche e Naturali*, Volume 20, (December, 1911), p. 678; Volume 21, (1912), p. 27; German version: “Zur Theorie der Gravitation”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 13, (1912), pp. 1-4; **and** “Sulla Legge Elementare della Gravitazione”, *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Rendiconti. Classe di Scienze Fisiche, Matematiche e Naturali*, Volume 21, (1912), p. 94; German version: “Das Elementargesetz der Gravitation”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 13, (1912), pp. 4-5; **and** “Sulla Conservazione dell’Energia e della Materia nel Campo Gravitazionale”, *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Rendiconti. Classe di Scienze Fisiche, Matematiche e Naturali*, Volume 21, (1912), p. 432; German version: “Die Erhaltung der Energie und der Materie im Schwerkraftfelde”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 13, (1912), pp. 311-314; **and** “Sulla Caduta Libera”, *Rendiconti della Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere*, Series 2, Volume 45, (1912), p. 290; German version: “Der freie Fall”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 13, (1912), pp. 310-311; **and** “Sulle Onde Luminose e Gravitazionale”, *Il Nuovo Cimento*, Series 6, Volume 3, (1912), p. 211; **and** “Una Nuova Teoria della Gravitazione”, *Il Nuovo Cimento*, Series 6, Volume 4, (December, 1912), p. 459; “Eine neue Gravitationstheorie”, *Archiv der Mathematik und Physik*, Series 3, Volume 20, (1912), pp. 193-209; **and** “Berichtigung”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 13, (1912), pp. 176; **and** “Das Gravitationsfeld” *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 13, (1912), pp. 739-797; **and** “Relativität und Gravitation. Erwiderung auf eine Bemerkung des Hrn. A. Einstein” *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 38, (1912), pp. 1056-1058; **and** “Nochmals Relativität und Gravitation. Bemerkungen zu A. Einsteins Erwiderung”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 39, (1912), pp. 444-448; **and** “Die neue Mechanik”, *Scientia*, Volume 15, (1914), pp. 8-27; **and** “Sur le Problème de la Relativité”, *Scientia*, Volume 16, (1914), pp. 101-103; **and** “Neuere Gravitationstheorien”, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 11, (1915), pp. 470-520.

3048. A. Anderssohn, *Die Mechanik der Gravitation*, Breslau, (1874); **and** *Zur Loesung des Problems ueber Sitz und Wesen der Anziehung*, Breslau, (1874); **and** *Die Theorie vom Massendruck aus der Ferne in ihren Umrissen dargestellt*, Breslau, (1880); **and** *Physikalische Prinzipien der Naturlehre*, G. Schwetschke, Halle, (1894). **See also:** G. Hoffmann, *Die Anderssohn’sche Drucktheorie und ihre Bedeutung für die einheitliche Erklärung der physischen Erscheinung*, G. Schwetschke, Halle, (1892).

3049. E. Anding, “Über Koordinaten und Zeit”, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, 6, 2, 1, Leipzig, (1905), pp. 3-15; French translation by H. Bourget, “Système de Référence et Mesure du Temps”, *Encyclopédie des Sciences Mathématiques*

Pures et Appliquées Publiée sous les Auspices des Académies des Sciences de Göttingue, de Leipzig, de Munich, et de Vienne avec la Collaboration de Nombreux Savants. Édition Française Rédigée et Publiée d'Après l'Édition Allemande sous la Direction de Jules Molk. . . . , Tome VII, Volume I, Part VII-1, Gauthier-Villars, Paris.

3050. R. Avenarius, *Ueber die beiden ersten Phasen des Spinozischen Pantheismus und das Verhältniss der zweiten zur dritten Phase. Nebst einem Anhang: Ueber Reihenfolge und Abfassungszeit der älteren Schriften Spinoza's*, E. Avenarius, Leipzig, (1868); **and** *Philosophie als Denken der Welt gemäss dem Princip des kleinsten Kraftmasses. Prolegomena zu einer Kritik der reinen Erfahrung*, Feus, Leipzig, (1876); **and** *Kritik der reinen Erfahrung*, Volumes 1 & 2, Feus, Leipzig, (1888, 1890); **and** *Der menschliche Weltbegriff*, O. R. Reiland, Leipzig, (1891).

3051. O. Backlund, *Zur theorie des Encke'schen Cometen*, St.-Pétersbourg, (1881); **and** *Comet Encke, 1865-1885*, Eggers & cie, St.-Pétersbourg, (1886); **and** "Sur la Masse de la Planète Mercure et sur l'Accélération du Mouvement moyen de Comète d'Encke", *Bulletin Astronomique* (Paris), Volume 11, (1894); **and** *La Comète d'Encke*, Académie Impériale des Sciences, St.-Pétersbourg, (1911); **and** A. V. Backlund, "Zusammenstellung einer Theorie der klassischen Dynamik und der neuen Gravitationstheorie von Einstein", *Arkiv för Matematik, astonomie, och Fysik*, Volume 14, Number 11, p. 64.

3052. Refer to James E. Beichler, "Twist Til' We Tear the House Down", *YGGDRASIL: The Journal for Paraphysics*, URL:

<<http://members.aol.com/jebco1st/Paraphysics/issue1.htm>>

Ball's works include: R. S. Ball, "On the Small Oscillations of a Rigid Body about a Fixed Point under the Action of any Forces, and, more Particularly, when Gravity is the only Force acting", *The Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, Volume 24, (1870), pp. 593-627; **and** *Experimental Mechanics*, Macmillan, London, New York, (1871); **and** "Non-Euclidean Geometry", *Hermathena*, (Dublin), Volume 3, (1879), pp. 500-541; **and** "Notes on Non-Euclidean Geometry", *Report of the Fiftieth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, Volume 50, (1880), pp. 476-477; **and** "The Distance of Stars", *Royal Institution of Great Britain. Notices of the Proceedings*, Volume 9, (1879/1882), pp. 514-519; **and** "On the Elucidation of a Question in Kinematics by the Aid of Non-Euclidean Space", *Report of the Fifty-First Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, Volume 51, (1881), pp. 535-536; **and** "Certain Problems in the Dynamics of a Rigid System Moving in Elliptic Space", *The Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, Volume 28, (1881), pp. 159-184; **and** "Notes on the Kinematics and Dynamics of a Rigid System in Elliptic Space", *The Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, Volume 4, (1884), pp. 252- 258; **and** "Measurement", an article for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Ninth Edition; **and** "Note on the Character of the Linear Transformation which Corresponds to the Displacement of a Rigid System in Elliptical Space", *The Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, Volume 4, (1885), pp. 532-537; **and** *Dynamics and the Modern Geometry: A New Chapter in the Theory of Screws*, Royal Irish Academy, Dublin, (1887); **and** "A Dynamical Parable", *Nature*, Volume 36, (September 1, 1887), pp. 424-429; **and** "The Twelfth and Concluding Memoir on the 'Theory of Screws', with a Summary of the Twelve Memoirs", *The Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, Volume 31, (1897), pp. 143-196; reprinted *The Twelfth and Concluding Memoir on the Theory of Screws; with a Summary*, Royal Irish Academy, Dublin, (1898); **and** "On the Theory of Content", *The Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, Volume 29, (1887), pp. 123-182; **and** *The Elements of Astronomy*, Macmillan, London, New York, (1900); **and** *A Treatise on the Theory of Screws*, Cambridge

University Press, (1900); **and** *A Treatise on Spherical Astronomy*, Cambridge University Press, (1908). **See also:** *Reminiscences and letters of Sir Robert Ball / ed. by his son W. Valentine Ball*, Little, Brown, Boston, (1915).

3053. W. W. R. Ball, “A Hypothesis Relating to the Nature of the Ether and Gravity”, *Messenger of Mathematics*, Series 2, Volume 21, (1891), pp. 20-24.

3054. R. Baltzer, *Elements of Mathematics*, Dresden, (1866); **and** “Ueber die Hypothesen der Parallelen theorie”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, Volume 83, p. 372; *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, mathematisch-physische Classe*, Volume 20, (1868), pp. 95-96.

3055. H. Bateman, “The Conformal Transformations of a Space of Four Dimensions and their Applications to Geometrical Optics”, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 7, (1909), pp. 70-89; **and** *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 18, (1909), p. 890; **and** “The Transformation of the Electrodynamical Equations”, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 8, (1910), pp. 223-264, 375, 469; **and** “The Physical Aspects of Time”, *Memoirs and Proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society*, Volume 54, (1910), pp. 1-13; **and** *American Journal of Mathematics*, Volume 34, (1912), p. 325; **and** *The Mathematical Analysis of Electrical and Optical Wave-Motion on the Basis of Maxwell's Equations*, Cambridge University Press, (1915); **and** “The Electromagnetic Vectors”, *The Physical Review*, Volume 12, Number 6, (December, 1918), pp. 459-481; **and** “On General Relativity”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 37, (1919), pp. 219-223 [Bateman refers, without citation, in this article to: F. Kottler's, “Über die Raumzeitlinien der Minkowski'schen Welt”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 121, (1912), pp. 1659-1759]; **and** Bateman, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 21, (1920), p. 256. **Confer:** E. Whittaker, *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the Royal Society*, Volume 1, (1955), pp. 44-45; **and** *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), pp. 8, 64, 76, 94, 154-156, 195. **See also:** W. Pauli, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, New York, (1958), pp. 81, 96, 199. **See also:** E. Bessel-Hagen, “Über der Erhaltungssätze der Elektrodynamik”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 84, (1921), pp. 258-276. **See also:** F. D. Murnaghan, “The Absolute Significance of Maxwell's Equations”, *The Physical Review*, Volume 17, Number 2, (February, 1921), pp. 73-88. **See also:** G. Kowalewski, “Über die Batemansche Transformationsgruppe”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, Volume 157, Number 3, (1927), pp. 193-197.

3056. G. Battaglini, “Sulla Geometria Immaginary di Lobatchewsky”, *Giornale di Matematiche*, Volume 5, (1867), pp. 217-231.

3057. J. J. Baumann, *Die Lehren von Raum, Zeit und Mathematik in der neueren Philosophie*, Volume 2, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1868), pp. 658 ff.

3058. J. Bauschinger, *Untersuchungen über die Bewegung der Planeten Merkur*, München, (1884); “Zur Frage über die Bewegung der Mercurperihels”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 109, (1884), cols. 27-32; **and** *Encyclopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, 6, 2, 17; **and** *Die Bahnbestimmung der Himmelskörper*, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1906/1928).

3059. R. Beez, “Ueber das Krümmungsmaass von Mannigfaltigkeiten höherer Ordnung”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 7, (1874), pp. 387-395; **and** “Ueber conforme Abbildung von Mannigfaltigkeiten höherer Ordnung”, *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik*, Volume 20, Number 4, (1875), pp. 253-270; **and** “Zur Theorie des Krümmungsmasses von Mannigfaltigkeiten höherer Ordnung”, *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik*, Volume 20, (1875), pp. 423-444; Volume 21, Number 6, (1876), pp. 373-401; **and** *Ueber die Euklidische*

und nicht-Euklidische Geometrie, Gymnasialprogramm, Nr. 514, Moritz Wieprecht, Plauen, (1888).

3060. M. Behacker, “Der frei Fall und die Planetenbewegung in Nordströms Gravitationstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 14, (1913), pp. 989-992.

3061. See: C. K. Ogden, *Bentham’s Theory of Fictions*, K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., (1932).

3062. G. Berkeley, *The Principles of Human Knowledge*; **and** *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*.

3063. J. Bertrand, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 77, (1873), p. 846.

3064. F. W. Bessel, “Untersuchungen des Teiles planetarischer Störungen, welche aus der Bewegung der Sonne entstehen”, *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1824); reprinted *Abhandlungen von Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel*, In Three Volumes, Volume 1, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1875-1876), p. 84; “Bemerkungen über die Mögliche Unzulänglichkeit der die Anziehung allein berücksichtigenden Theorie der Kometen”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 13, (1840), col. 345; reprinted *Abhandlungen von Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel*, In Three Volumes, Volume 1, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1875-1876), p. 80; **and** “Bestimmung der Achsen des elliptischen Rotationssphäroids, welches den vorhandenen Messungen von Meridianbögen der Erde am meisten entspricht”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 14, (1837), col. 333; Volume 19, (1841), col. 97. Jammer, *Concepts of Mass*, cites: “Studies on the Length of the Seconds Pendulum”, *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1824); **and** “Experiments on the Force with which the Earth Attracts Different Kinds of Bodies”, *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1830); **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 25, (1832), pp. 1-14; **and** Volume 26, (1833), pp. 401-411; **and** *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 10, (1833), cols. 97-108.

3065. L. de Boisbaudran, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 69, (September 20, 1869), pp. 703-704.

3066. C. Fabry and H. Boisson, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 148, (1909), pp. 688-690.

3067. E. Du Bois-Reymond, *Über die Grenzen Naturerkenntnis/Die sieben Welträtsel*, Multiple Editions. **See also:** E. Dreher, *Ueber das Causalitätsprincip der Naturerscheinungen mit bezugnahme auf Du Bois-Reymonds rede: “Die sieben Welträthsel”*, F. Dummler, Berlin, (1890).

3068. A. Bolliger, *Anti-Kant oder Elemente der Logik, der Physik und der Ethik*, Felix Schneider, Basel, (1882), esp. pp. 336-354.

3069. G. Le Bon, *L’Évolution de la Matière*, 12th Edition, E. Flammarion, Paris, (ca. 1905); English translation, *The Evolution of Matter*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1907); **and** *L’Évolution des Forces; avec 42 Figures Photographiées au Laboratoire de l’Auteur*, E. Flammarion, Paris, (1907); English translation, *The Evolution of Forces*, D. Appleton, New York, (1908).

3070. R. J. Boscovich, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, (1966); Latin/English version, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy, Put Forward and Explained by Roger Joseph Boscovich*, Open Court, Chicago, London, (1922); *Philosophiae naturalis Theoria, redacta ad unicam legem virium de natura existentium*, Wien, (1759), Venetis, (1769); **and** *The Catholic Encyclopedia* lists: *The Sunspots* (1736); *The Transit of Mercury* (1737); *The Aurora Borealis* (1738); *The Application of the Telescope in Astronomical Studies* (1739); *The Figure of the Earth* (1739); *The Motion of*

the heavenly Bodies in an unresisting Medium (1740); *The Various Effects of Gravity* (1741); *The Aberration of the Fixed Stars* (1742). **Confer:** H. V. Gill, *Roger Boscovich, S. J. (1711-1787) Forerunner of Modern Physical Theories*, M. H. Gill and Son, LTD., Dublin, (1941). A fine article, with bibliography, is found in the *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, “BOŠKOVIĆ, RUDJER J.”, by Zeljko Marković.

3071. K. F. Bottlinger, “Die Gravitationstheorie und die Bewegung des Mondes”, Inaugural Dissertation, München, (1912); **and** “Die Erklärung der Empirische Glieder der Mondbewegung durch die Annahme einer extinction der Gravitation im Erdinnern”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 191, (1912), cols. 147-150; **and** “Zur Frage nach der Absorption der Gravitation”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, (1914), pp. 223-229; **and** “Die astronomischen Prüfungsmöglichkeiten der Relativitätstheorie”, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 17, (1920), pp. 146-161.

3072. F. de Bouchepon, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 29, (July 30, 1849), pp. 108-112; **and** *Principe Générale de la Philosophie Naturelle*, Paris, (1853).

3073. R. Bresch, *Der Chemismus, Magnetismus und Diamagnetismus im Lichte mehrdimensionaler Raumschauung*, Leipzig, (1882).

3074. A. v. Brill, *Das Relativitätsprinzip: Eine Einführung in die Theorie*, Second Edition, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1914).

3075. M. Brillouin, “Propos Sceptiques au Sujet du Principe de Relativité”, *Scientia*, Volume 13, (1913), pp. 10-26; **and** *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 44, (1914), p. 203.

3076. E. W. Brown, “On the Mean Motions of the Lunar Perigee and Node”, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 57, (1897), pp. 332-341, 566; **and** “On the Verification of the Newtonian Law”, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 63, (1903), pp. 396-397; **and** “On the Degree of Accuracy of the New Lunar Theory”, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 64, (1904), p. 530; **and** “On the Effects of Certain Magnetic and Gravitational Forces on the Motion of the Moon”, *American Journal of Science*, Volume 29, (1910), pp. 529-539.

3077. E. Brücke, “On Gravitation and the Conservation of Force”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 4, Volume 15, Number 98, (February, 1858), p. 81-90.

3078. M. Brückner, “Über die sogen. vierdimensionalen Raum”, *Allgemein-verständliche naturwissenschaftliche Abhandlungen*, Volume 1, (1888).

3079. H. Bruns, *Die Figur der Erde. Ein Beitrag zur europäischen Gradmessung*, P. Stankiewicz, Berlin, (1878); Veröffentlichung des Königlich preussischen geodätischen Institutes.

3080. A. H. Bucherer, “Über den Einfluß der Erdbewegung auf die Intensität des Lichtes”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 11, (1903), pp. 270-283; **and** *Mathematische Einführung in die Elektronentheorie*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1904); **and** “Das deformierte Elektron und die Theorie des Elektromagnetismus”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 6, (1905), pp. 833-834; **and** *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 6, (1908), p. 688; **and** “Messungen an Becquerelstrahlen. Die experimentelle Bestätigung der Lorentz-Einsteinschen Theorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 9, Number 22, (November 1, 1908), pp. 755-762; **and** *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 28, (1909), p. 513; **and** *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 29, (1909), p. 1063; **and** Bucherer, Woltz, Bestelmeyer, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 30, (1909), pp. 166, 373, 974; **and** Bestelmeyer, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 22, (1907), p. 429; Volume 32, (1910), p. 231; **and** Bucherer, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 37, (1912), p. 597; **and** “Gravitation und Quantentheorie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 68,

(1922), pp. 545-550.

3081. A. Buchheim, “A Memoir on Biquaternions”, *American Journal of Mathematics*, Volume 7, (1884), pp. 293-326; **and** “On Clifford’s Theory of Groups”, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Volume 17, (November 12, 1885), pp. 80-106; **and** “On the Theory of Screws in Elliptic Space”, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Volume 15, (January 10, 1884), pp. 83-98; Volume 16, (November 13, 1884), pp. 15-27; Volume 17, (June 10, 1886), pp. 240-254; Volume 18, (November 11, 1886), pp. 88-96.

3082. E. Budde, *Zur Kosmologie der Gegenwart*, Bonn, (1872); **and** *Lehrbuch der Physik für höhere Lehranstalten*, Wiegandt, Hempel & Parey, Berlin, (1879); **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 9, (1880), p. 261; Volume 10, (1880), p. 553; **and** *De statu sphaeroidali*; **and** *Naturwissenschaftliche Plaudereien*, Berlin, G. Reimer, (1898/1906); **and** *Allgemeine Mechanik der Punkte und starren Systeme*, In Two Volumes, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1890-1891); **and** *Energie und Recht, eine physikalisch-juristische Studie*, C. Heymann, Berlin, (1902); **and** *Tensoren und Dyaden im dreidimensionalen Raum; ein Lehrbuch von E. Budde*, F. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, (1914).

3083. C. V. Burton, “A Modified Theory of Gravitation”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 17, (1909), pp. 71-113.

3084. B. Caldonazzo, “Traiettorie dei Raggi Luminosi e dei Punti Materiali nel Campo Gravitazionale” *Il Nuovo Cimento*, Series 6, Volume 5, (1913), pp. 267-300.

3085. J. Camille, “Essai sur la Geometrie à n Dimensions”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 75, (1872), pp. 1614-1617; *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France*, Volume 3, pp. 104ff.; Volume 4, p. 92; **and** “Sur la Theorie des Courbes dans l’Espace à n Dimensions”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 79, (1874), p. 795; **and** “Généralisation du Théorème d’Euler sur la Courbure des Surfaces dans l’Espace à $m+k$ Dimensions”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 79, (1874), p. 909.

3086. G. Cantor, “Ein Beitrag zur Mannigfaltigkeitslehre”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, Volume 84, (1878), pp. 119-133, 242-258; **and** “Ueber einen Satz aus der Theorie der stetigen Mannigfaltigkeiten”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1879), pp. 127-134; **and** “Zur Theorie der zahlentheoretischen Functionen”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1880), pp. 161-169; **and** “Ueber unendliche, lineare Punktmannich-faltigkeiten”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 15, (1879), pp. 1-7; Volume 17, (1880), pp. 355-358; Volume 20, (1882), pp. 113-121; Volume 21, (1883), pp. 51-58; Volume 23, (1884), pp. 453-488; “Grundlagen einer allgemeinen Mannigfaltigkeitslehre”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 21, (1883), pp.545-591; French translation of parts 1-4, “Sur les Ensembles Infinis et Linéaires de Points”, *Acta Mathematica*, Volume 2, (1883), pp. 349-380; **and** “Mitteilungen zur Lehre vom Transfiniten, I & II”, *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, Volume 91, (1887), pp. 81-125; Volume 92, (1888), pp. 240-265. G. Frege, “Zur Lehre vom Transfiniten. Gesammelte Abhandlungen aus der Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Philosophische Kritik. Erste Abteilung., Halle a. S., 1890, C. E. M. Pfeffer (Robert Stricker)”, *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, Volume 100, (1892), pp. 269-272. G. Cantor, “Beiträge zur Begründung der transfiniten Mengenlehre”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 46, (1895), pp. 481-512; Volume 49, (1897), pp. 207-246; **and** *Gesammelte Abhandlungen mathematischen und philosophischen Inhalts*, Springer, Berlin, (1932).

3087. A. Cayley, “Chapters in the Analytical Geometry of (n) Dimensions”, *The Cambridge Mathematical Journal*, Volume 4, (1845), pp. 119-127; **and** “A Sixth Memoir upon

Quantics”, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, Volume 149, (1859); reprinted in *Collected Papers*, Volume 2; **and** “Note on Lobatchewsky’s Imaginary Geometry”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 29, (1865), pp. 231-233; **and** “A Memoir on Abstract Geometry”, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, Volume 160, (1870), pp. 51-63; **and** “on the Rational Transformation Between Two Spaces”, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Volume 3, (1869-71), pp. 127-180; **and** “Note on the Theory of Invariants”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 3, (1871), pp. 268-271; **and** “On the Superlines of a quadratic Surface in Five Dimensional Space”, *The Quarterly Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, Volume 12, (1871-2), pp. 176-180; **and** “On a Theorem in Covariants”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 5, (1872), pp. 625-629; **and** “On the Non-Euclidean Geometry”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 5, (1872), pp. 630-634; **and** “A Theorem on Groups”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 13, (1878), pp. 561-565; “On the Finite Groups of Linear Transformations of a Variable”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 16, (1880), pp. 260-263; corrected pp. 439-440; **and** *Presidential Address Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, Southport Meeting, London, (1883), pp. 3-37; **and** *The Collected Mathematical Papers of Arthur Cayley*, Volume 11, Cambridge University Press, (1889-1897), pp. 429-459.

3088. J. Challis, “Mathematical Theory of Attractive Forces”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 18, (November, 1859), p. 334; **and** “A Theory of the Force of Gravity”, *Philosophical Magazine*, series 4, Volume 8, (1859), pp. 442-451; **and** *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 19, (1860), pp. 89-91; **and** “On the Planet within the Orbit of Mercury”, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Volume 1, Number 15, (1861), pp. 219-222; **and** *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 23, (1862), pp. 319-320; **and** “A Theory of the Zodiacal Light”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 4, Volume 25, (1863), pp. 117-125, 183-189; **and** *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 25, (1863), p. 465; **and** *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 26, (1863), p. 284; **and** “On the Fundamental Ideas of Matter and Force in Theoretical Physics”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 4, Volume 31, (June, 1866), p. 467; **and** *Notes on the Principles of Pure and Applied Calculation*; **and** *Applications of Mathematical Principles to Theories of the Physical Forces*, Deighton, Cambridge Bell and Co., Bell and Daldy, London, (1869), pp. XLV, 437, 456, 459, 463, 489, 499; **and** “On the Hydrodynamical Theory of Attractive and Repulsive Forces”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 44, (September, 1872), pp. 203-204, 209; *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 2, (1876), p. 191.

3089. E. S. Chapin, *The Correlation and Conservation of Gravitation and Heat, and Some Effects of these Forces on the Solar System*, Lewis J. Powers & Brother, Springfield, Massachusetts, (1867).

3090. C. V. Charlier, “Wie eine unendliche Welt aufgebaut sein kann”, *Meddelande Från Lunds Astronomiska Observatorium*, Series 2, Number 38, (1908), p. 22.

3091. P. E. Chase, *Experiments upon the Mechanical Polarization of Magnetic Needles, under the Influence of Fluid Currents or :Lines of Force*”, Philadelphia, (1865); **and** *Numerical Relations of Gravity and Magnetism*, Philadelphia, (1865); **and** *On some General Connotations of Magnetism*, Philadelphia, (1868).

3092. E. B. Christoffel, *Allgemeine Theorie der geodätischen Dreiecke*, Vogt, Berlin, (1869); **and** “Über die Transformation der homogenen Differentialausdrücke zweiten Grades”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, Volume 70, (1869), pp. 46-70; **and** “Über ein betreffendes Theorem”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, Volume 70, (1870), pp. 241-245.

3093. R. Clausius, “Ueber die mittlere Länge der Wege, welche bei der Molecularbewegung gasförmiger Körper von den einzelnen Molecülen zurückgelegt werden; nebst einigen

anderen Bemerkungen über die mechanische Wärmetheorie”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 15, (1858), pp. 239-258; **and** “Ueber die Concentration von Wärmelichstrahlen und die Grenzen ihrer Wirkung”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 1, (1864), pp. 1-44; **and** “Über ein neues Grundgesetz der Elektrodynamik”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 150, (1875), p. 657; **and** “Ableitung eines neuen elektrodynamischen Grundgesetzes”, *Journal für die reine und ungewandte Mathematik*, Volume 82, (1877), pp. 85-130; *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 10, (1880), p. 255; **and** *Die mechanische Wärmetheorie*, Multiple Editions.

3094. W. K. Clifford, “On the Aims and Instruments of Scientific Thought”, *Macmillan’s Magazine*, Volume 27, (October, 1872), pp. 499-512; reprinted in *Lectures and Essays*, Volume 1, pp. 124-157; **and** “The Unreasonable”, *Nature*, Volume 7, (February 13, 1873), p. 282; **and** B. Riemann, translated by W. K. Clifford, “On the Hypotheses which Lie at the Bases of Geometry”, *Nature*, Volume 8, Number 183, (May 1, 1873), pp. 14-17; Volume 8, Number 184, (May 8, 1873), pp. 36-37; **and** “Preliminary Sketch of Biquaternions”, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, (1873), pp. 381-395; reprinted in *Mathematical Papers*, pp. 181-200; **and** W. K. Clifford, *The Philosophy of the Pure Sciences*, In Four Parts: Part I, “Statement of the Question”; Part II, “Knowledge and Feeling”; **Part III, “The Postulates of the Science of Space”, *The Contemporary Review*, Volume 25, (1874), pp. 360-376—reprinted in *Lectures and Essays*, Volume 1, pp.295-323—reprinted in *The World of Mathematics*, Volume 1, Simon & Schuster, New York, (1956), pp. 552-567**; Part IV, “The Universal Statements of Arithmetic”; all four Parts reprinted in *The Humboldt Library*, Number 86, (December, 1886), pp. 12-49 [208-245]; **and** “On Probability”, *Educational Times*; **and** “The Unseen Universe”, *Fortnightly Review*, (January/June 1875), Volume 17, pp. 776-793; reprinted in *The Humboldt Library*, Number 86, (December, 1886), pp. 1-12 [197-208]; reprinted in *Lectures and Essays*, Volume 1, pp.228-253; which article is a review of B. Stewart and P. G. Tait’s *The Unseen Universe: Or, Physical Speculations on a Future State*, Macmillan, New York, (1875). W. K. Clifford, “On the Space Theory of Matter”, *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, (1866/1876), Volume 2, 157-158; reprinted in *The World of Mathematics*, Volume 1, Simon & Schuster, New York, (1956), pp. 568-569; reprinted in Clifford’s *Mathematical Papers*, pp. 21-22; **and** “Applications of Grassmann’s Extensive Algebra”, *American Journal of Mathematics*, Volume 1, (1878), pp. 350-358; reprinted in *Mathematical Papers*, pp. 266-276; **and** *Elements of Dynamic; an Introduction to the Study of Motion and Rest in Solid and Fluid Bodies*, Macmillan, London, (1878); *Elements of Dynamic, Book IV and Appendix*, Macmillan, London, (1878); **and** “On the Classification of Loci”, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A*, Volume 169, (1878, part 2), pp. 663-681; reprinted in *Mathematical Papers*, pp. 305-331; **and** “On the Nature of Things-in-Themselves”, *Mind*, Volume 3, (1878), pp. 57-67; reprinted in *Lectures and Essays*, Volume 2, pp.71-88; **and** *Lectures and Essays*, In Two Volumes, Macmillan, London, (1879); **and** “Energy and Force”, *Nature*, Volume 22, (June 10, 1880), pp. 122-124; **and** *Mathematical Papers*, Macmillan, London, (1882); **and** *The Common Sense of the Exact Sciences*, Edited by K. Pearson, D. Appleton, New York, Macmillan, London, (1885), especially Chapter 4, “Position”, Section 1, “All Position is Relative”; **and** Section 19, “On the Bending of Space”;

3095. F. Cohn, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, 6, 2, 2.

E. Cohn, “Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Systeme”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (November, 1904), pp. 1294-1303; **and** “Zur Elektrodynamik

bewegter Systeme. II”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (December, 1904), pp. 1404-1416; **and** “Ueber die Gleichungen des elektromagnetischen Feldes für bewegte Körper”, *Annalen der Physik*, 7, (1902), pp. 29-56. “(Aus den Nachrichten d. Gesellsch. D. Wissensch. zu Göttingen, 1901, Heft 1; Sitzung vom 11. Mai 1901. Mit einer Aenderung p. 31.)”; **and** “Über die Gleichungen der Elektrodynamik für bewegte Körper”, *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Series 2, Volume 5, (1900), pp. 516-523; **and** “Physikalisches über Raum und Zeit”, *Himmel und Erde*, Volume 23, (1911), pp. 117ff.; *Physikalisches über Raum und Zeit*, Multiple Editions, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (Nach einem im Naturwissenschaftlichmedizinischen Verein zu Strassburg am 11. Februar 1910 gehaltenen Vortrag).

3096. H. Cox, “Homogeneous Coordinates in Imaginary Geometry and their Applications to Systems of Forces”, *Quarterly Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, Volume 18, (1881), pp. 178-215; **and** “On the Application of Grassmann’s Ausdehnungslehre to Different Kinds of Uniform Space”, *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Volume 13, (1882, part 2), pp. 69-143.

3097. L. Couturat, “Note sur la Géométrie non-Euclidienne et la Relativité de l’Espace”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 1, (1893), p. 302.

3098. J. Croll, “On Certain Hypothetical Elements in the Theory of Gravitation”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 4, Volume 34, (December, 1867), p. 450; **and** “On the Transformation of Gravity”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 2, (October, 1876), p. 241.

3099. W. Crookes, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, Volume 164, (1874), p. 527; **and** *Quarterly Journal of Science*, Volume 5, (July, 1875), p. 351; **and** “The Mechanical Action of Light”, *Quarterly Journal of Science*, Volume 6, (1876), p. 254.

3100. A. W. Conway, “Relativity”, *Edinburgh Mathematical Tracts*, Number 3, London, (1913); reprinted G. Bell and Sons, London, (1915).

3101. C. Cranz, “Gemeinverständliches über die sogenannte vierte Dimension”, *Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge*, New Series, Volume 5, Number 112/113, (1890), pp. 567-636; **and** “Die vierte Dimension in der Astronomie”, *Himmel und Erde*, Volume 4, (1891), pp. 55-73.

3102. E. Cunningham, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 8, (1910), p. 77-98; **and** *The Principle of Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, (1914, enlarged 1922); **and** *Relativity and the Electron Theory*, Longmans, Green and Co., London, New York, (1915); *Relativity and the Electron Theory and Gravitation*, Longmans, Green and Co., London, New York, (1921).

3103. T. De Donder, *Bulletins de l’Academie Royale de Belgique (Classe des Sciences)*, (1909), p. 66; (1911), p. 3; (1912), p. 3; **and** “Les Équations Différentielles du Champ Gravifique d’Einstein Créé par un Champ Électromagnétique de Maxwell-Lorentz”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 25, (1916), pp. 153-156; **and** “Théorie du Champ Électromagnétique de Maxwell-Lorentz et du Champ Gravifique d’Einstein”, *Archives du Musée Teyler*, Volume 3, (1917), pp. 80-179; **and** “Sur les Équations Différentielle du Champ Gravifique”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 26, (1917/1918), pp. 101-104; **and** T. De Donder and O. De Ketelaere, “Sur le Champ Électromagnétique de Maxwell-Lorentz et le Champ de Gravitation d’Einstein”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 159, (1914), pp. 23-26. *See also*: E. Gehrcke, “Die Grenzen der Relativität”, *Die Umschau*,

Number 24, (1922), pp. 381-382.

3104. J. Droste, “On the Field of a Single Centre in Einstein’s Theory of Gravitation”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 17, (1914), pp. 998-1011; **and** “The Field of Moving Centers in Einstein’s Theory of Gravitation”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 19, (1916), pp. 447-475; **and** “The Field of a Single Center in Einstein’s Theory of Gravitation and the Motion of a Particle in that Field”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 19, (1916), pp. 197-218; **and** *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 25, (1916), p. 163.

3105. P. Drude, “Ueber Fernwirkungen”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 62, (1897), pp. 693, I-XLIX; **and** *Lehrbuch der Optik*, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1900); translated into English *The Theory of Optics*, Longmans, Green and Co., London, New York, Toronto, (1902), *see especially* pp. 457-482; **and** “Zur Elektronentheorie der Metalle. I & II”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 1, (1900), pp. 566-613; Volume 3, (1900), pp. 369-402; **and** “Optische Eigenschaften und Elektronentheorie, I & II”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 14, (1904), pp. 677-725, 936-961; **and** “Die Natur des Lichtes” in A. Winkelmann, *Handbuch der Optik*, Volume 6, Second Edition, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1906), pp. 1120-1387; **and** *Physik des Aethers auf elektromagnetischer Grundlage*, F. Enke, Stuttgart, (1894), Posthumous Second Revised Edition, W. König, (1912).

3106. P. M. M. Duhem, *La Théorie Physique : Son Objet, sa Structure*, Second Edition Revised and Enlarged, M. Rivière, Paris, (1914); English Translation, *The Aim and Structure of Physical Theory*, Princeton University Press, (1954); German Translation of First Edition, *Ziel und Struktur der physikalischen Theorien, von Pierre Duhem . Autorisierte Übersetzung von Friedrich Adler. Mit einem Vorwort von Ernst Mach*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1908); **and** *Sozein ta Phainomena, Essai sur la Notion de Théorie Physique de Platon à Galilée*; English translation by E. Doland and C. Maschler, *To Save the phenomena, an Essay on the Idea of Physical Theory from Plato to Galileo*, University of Chicago Press, (1969); **and** *Evolution de la Mécanique*, English translation by M. Cole, *The Evolution of Mechanics*, Sijthoff & Noordhoff, Alphen aan den Rijn, Germantown, Maryland, (1980).

3107. E. K. Dühring, *Kritische Geschichte der allgemeinen Principien der Mechanik*, Multiple Editions; **and** *Neue Grundgesetze zur rationellen Physik und Chemie*, Fues’s Verlag (R. Reisland), Leipzig, (1878-1886); **and** *Robert Mayer, der Galilei des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, E. Schmeitzner, Chemnitz, (1880-1895).

3108. P. Ehrenfest, “Zur Planckschen Strahlungstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 7, (1906), pp. 528-532; **and** “Die Translation deformierbarer Elektronen und der Flächensatz”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 23, (1907), pp. 204-205; **and** “Gleichförmige Rotation starrer Körper und Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 10, (1909), p. 918; **and** “Zu Herrn v. Ignatowskys Behandlung der Bornschen Starrheitsdefinition I & II”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 1127-1129; Volume 12, (1911), pp. 412-413; **and** “Welche Züge der Lichtquantenhypothese spielen in der Theorie der Wärmestrahlung eine wesentliche Rolle?”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 36, (1911), pp. 91-118; **and** “Zur Frage der Entbehrlichkeit des Lichtäthers”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 13, (1912), pp. 317-319; **and** “Bemerkung Betreffs der spezifischen Wärme zweiatomiger Gase”, *Verhandlungen der Deutsche Physikalische Gesellschaft*, Volume 15, (1913), pp. 451-457; **and** *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 15, (1913), p. 1187; **and** *Zur Krise der Lichtaether-hypothese*, Springer, Berlin, (1913); **and** “Een Mechanisch Theorema van Boltzmann en Zijne Betrekking Tot de Quantentheorie”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te*

Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen, Volume 22, (1913/1914), pp. 586-593; English translation, “A Mechanical Theorem of Boltzmann and Its Relation to the Theory of Energy Quanta”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 16, (1913/1914), pp. 591-597; **and** “Zum Boltzmannschen Entropie-Wahrscheinlichkeits-Theorem I”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 15, (1914), pp. 657-663; **and** “Over Adiabatische Veranderingen van een Stelsel in Verband de Theorie de Quanten”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 25, (1916/1917), pp. 412-433; English translation “On Adiabatic Changes of a System in Connection with the Quantum Theory”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 19, (1916/1917), pp. 576-597; German translation, “Adiabatische Invarianten und Quantentheorie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 51, (1916), pp. 327-352; **and**, with Trkal, “Afleiding van het Dissociatie-evenwicht uit de Theorie der Quanta en een Daarop Gebaseerde Berekening van de Chemische Constanten”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 28, (1919/1920), pp. 906-929; English translation, “Deduction of the Dissociation-Equilibrium from the Theory of Quanta and a Calculation of the Chemical Constant Based on This”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 23, (1920/1921), pp. 162-183. P. Ehrenfest and T. Ehrenfest, “Bemerkung zur Theorie der Entropiezunahme in der ‘Statischen Mechanik’ von W. Gibbs”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Abteilung IIa*, Volume 115, (1906), pp. 89-98; **and** “Begriffliche Grundlagen der statischen Auffassung in der Mechanik”, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, Volume 4, Part 4, pp. 1-90.

3109. C. d. Engelmeyer, “Sur l’Origine Sensorielle des Notions Mécanique”, *Revue Philosophique de la France et de l’Étranger*, Volume 39, (1895), pp. 511-517.

3110. R. v. Eötvös, “A Föld Vonzása Különböző Anyagokra”, *Akadémiai Értesítő*, Volume 2, (1890), pp. 108-110; German translation, “Über die Anziehung der Erde auf verschiedene Substanzen”, *Mathematische und naturwissenschaftliche Berichte aus Ungarn*, Volume 8, (1890), pp. 65-68; response, W. Hess, *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 15, (1891), p. 688-689; **and** R. v. Eötvös, “Untersuchung über Gravitation und Erdmagnetismus”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 3, Volume 59, (1896), pp. 354-400; **and** “Beszéd a kolozsvári Bolyai-emlékűnnepekn”, *Akadémiai Értesítő*, (1903), p. 110; **and** “Bericht über die Verhandlungen der fünfzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung abgehalten vom 20. bis 28. September 1906 in Budapest”, *Verhandlungen der vom 20. bis 28. September 1906 in Budapest abgehaltenen fünfzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1908), pp. 55-108; **and** *Über geodetischen Arbeiten in Ungarn, besonders über Beobachtungen mit der Drehwaage*, Hornyánszky, Budapest, (1909); **and** “Bericht über Geodätische Arbeiten in Ungarn, besonders über Beobachtungen mit der Drehwaage”, *Verhandlungen der vom 21. Bis 29. September 1909 in London und Cambridge abgehaltenen sechzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1910), pp. 319-350; **and** “Über Arbeiten mit der Drehwaage: Ausgeführt im Auftrage der Königlichen Ungarischen Regierung in den Jahren 1908-1911”, *Verhandlungen der vom in Hamburg abgehaltenen siebzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1912), pp. 427-438; **and** Eötvös, Pekár, Fekete, *Trans. XVI. Allgemeine Konferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, (1909); *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (1909), *geschäftliche Mitteilungen*, p. 37; **and** “Beiträge zur Gesetze der Proportionalität von Trägheit und Gravität”, *Annalen der Physik*,

Series 4, Volume 68, (1922), pp. 11-16; **and** D. Pekár, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 7, (1919), p. 327.

3111. J. Epstein, *Die logischen Prinzipien der Zeitmessung*, Berlin, Leipzig, (1887).

3112. B. Erdmann, *Die Axiome der Geometrie, eine philosophische Untersuchung der Riemann-Helmholtz'schen Raumtheorie*, L. Voss, Leipzig, (1877).

3113. Escherich, "Die Geometrie auf den Flächen constanter negativer Krümmung", *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 69.

3114. J. Evershed, *Kodaikanal Observatory Bulletins*, Number 36, (1914); **and** *Kodaikanal Observatory Bulletins*, Number 41, (1918); **and**, with T. Royds, Number 39, (1916).

3115. M. Faraday, "A Speculation Touching Electric Conduction and the Nature of Matter", *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 24, (1844), p. 136; **and** "Thoughts on Ray-vibrations", *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 3, Volume 28, Number 188, (May, 1846), pp. 345-350; reprinted in *Experimental Researches in Electricity*, Three Volumes Bound as Two, Volume 3, Dover, New York, (1965), pp. 447-452; **and** "On the Magnetization of Light and the Illumination of Magnetic Lines of Force", *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, (1846), p. 1; reprinted in *Experimental Researches in Electricity*, Series 19, Section 26, Paragraphs 2146-2242; **and** "On the Possible Relation of Gravity to Electricity", *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, Volume 141, (1851), pp. 1-6; reprinted in *Experimental Researches in Electricity*, Series 24, Section 30, Paragraphs 2702-2717; **and** "On Lines of Magnetic Force; their Definite Character; **and** their Distribution within a Magnet and through Space", *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, (1852), p. 1; reprinted in *Experimental Researches in Electricity*, Series 28, Section 34, Paragraphs 3070-3176; **and** "On the Physical Lines of Magnetic Force", *Royal Institution Proceedings*, (June 11, 1852); reprinted in *Experimental Researches in Electricity*, Volume 3, p. 438; reprinted in *A Source Book in Physics*, W. F. Magie, Editor, McGraw-Hill, New York, London, (1935), pp. 506-511; **and** *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 13, (1857), p. 228. **See also:** E. Brücke, "On Gravitation and the Conservation of Force", *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 4, Volume 15, Number 98, (February, 1858), p. 81-90, at 87-88; English translation of Brücke's 1857 article for the *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), which was a reaction to Faraday's lecture before the Royal Institution on February 27th, 1857.

3116. G. T. Fechner, (under the pseudonym "Dr. Mises"), "Der Raum hat vier Dimensionen", *Vier Paradoxa*, Chapter 2, L. Voss, Leipzig, (1846), pp. 17-40; reprinted with changes and an addendum, *Kleine Schriften*, Chapter 5, Breitkopf and Härtel, Leipzig, (1875), pp. 254-276. **See also:** G. T. Fechner, *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, mathematisch-physische Classe*, Volume 2, 1850; **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 64, (185), p. 337; **and** *Elemente der Psychophysik*, Breitkopf und Hartel, Leipzig, (1860); **and** *Ueber die physikalische und philosophische Atomenlehre*, Second, Enlarged, Edition, H. Mendelssohn, Leipzig, (1864); **and** *Revision der Hauptpunkte der Psychophysik*, Breitkopf und Hartel, Leipzig, (1882); **and** *Philosophische Studien*, Volume 3, (1884), p. 1; **and** *Abhandlungen der mathematisch-physische Classe der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Volume 22, (1884), p. 3.

3117. R. A. Fessenden, "Nature of Electricity and Magnetism", *Physical Review*, (January, 1900); "Inertia and Gravitation", *Science*, New Series, Volume 12, (31 August 1900), pp. 325-328; **and** "Determination of the Nature and Velocity of Gravitation", *Science*, New Series, Volume 12, (16 November 1900), pp. 740-745; response by W. S. Franklin, *Science*,

New Series, Volume 12, (7 December 1900), pp. 887-890; reply by Fessenden, *Science*, New Series, Volume 13, (4 January 1901), pp. 28-31; *Electrical World and Science*, 1891 and 1892.

3118. W. Fiedler, *Die Elemente der neueren Geometrie und der Algebra der binären Formen*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1862); **and** *Vierteljahrsschrift der Naturforschenden Gesellschaft in Zürich*, Volume 15, (1871), p. 2; **and** *Analytische Geometrie der Kegelschnitte mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der neuen Methoden nach George Salmon*, B.G. Teubner, Leipzig, 1888-98.

3119. G. F. FitzGerald, *The Scientific Writings of the Late George Francis Fitzgerald, Collected and Ed. with a Historical Introduction by Joseph Larmor*, Hodges, Figgis, & Co., Ltd., Dublin, Longmans, Green, & Co., London, (1902), p. 313. **See also:** W. C. Dampier, *A History of Science and its Relations with Philosophy and Religion*, Cambridge University Press, (1932), p. 424. **See also:** E. Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), pp. 157-158.

3120. A. Föppl, *Einführung in die maxwell'sche Theorie der Elektrizität : mit einem einleitenden Abschnitte über das rechnen mit Vectorgrößen in der Physik*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1894); **and** "Ueber eine mögliche Erweiterung des Newton'schen Gravitations Gesetzes", *Sitzungsberichte der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Volume 27, (1897), pp. 6, 93-99; **and** *Vorlesungen über technische Mechanik*, in 6 Volumes, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1900-1910); **and** "Über einen Kreisversuch zur Messung der Umdrehungsgeschwindigkeit der Erde", *Sitzungsberichte der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Volume 34, (1904), pp. 5-28; **and** "Über absolute und relative Bewegung", *Sitzungsberichte der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Volume 34, (1904), pp. 383-395.

3121. W. Frahm, *Habilitationsschrift*, Tübingen, (1873); "Ueber die Erzeugung der Curven dritter Classe und vierter Ordnung", *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik*, Volume 18, (1873), pp. 363-386.

3122. de Francesco, "Alcuni Problemi di Meccanica in uno Spazio di Curvature Constante", *Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze Fisiche e Matematiche di Napoli*, Series 2, Volume 10, (1900).

3123. P. Frank, "Relativitätstheorie und Elektronentheorie in ihrer Anwendung zur Ableitung der Grundgleichungen für die elektromagnetischen Vorgänge in bewegten ponderablen Körpern", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 27, (1908), 1059-1065; **and** "Die Stellung des Relativitätsprinzips im System der Mechanik und der Elektrodynamik", *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 118, (1909), pp. 373-446; **and** "Das Relativitätsprinzip und die Darstellung der physikalischen Erscheinungen im vierdimensionalen Raum", *Annalen der Naturphilosophie*, Volume 10, (1911), pp. 129-161.

3124. F. W. Frankland, "On the Simplest Continuous Manifoldness of Two Dimensions and of Finite Extent", *Nature*, Volume 15, Number 389, (12 April 1877), pp. 515-517. **See also:** C. J. Moore, *Nature*, Volume 15, Number 391, (26 April 1877), p. 547. F. W. Frankland, "The Doctrine of Mind-Stuff", *Mind*, Volume 6, Number 21, (January, 1881), pp. 116-120.

3125. G. Frege, *Ueber eine geometrische Darstellung der imaginären Gebilde in der Ebene*, Inaugural-Dissertation der philosophischen Facultät zu Göttingen zur Erlangung der Doctorwürde vorgelegt von G. Frege aus Wismar. A. Neuenhahn, Jena, (1873); **and** "Ueber die wissenschaftliche Berechtigung einer Begriffsschrift", *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und*

philosophische Kritik, Volume 81, (1882), pp. 48-56; **and** “Ueber das Trägheitsgesetz”, *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, Volume 98, (1891), pp. 145-161; **and** “Über Sinn und Bedeutung”, *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, Volume 100, (1892), pp. 25-50; **and** “Ueber Begriff und Gegenstand”, *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie*, Volume 16, (1892), pp. 192-205; **and** “Über die Grundlagen der Geometrie” *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 12, (1903), pp. 319-324, 368-375; Volume 15, (1906) 293-309, 377-403, 423-430. Many of Frege’s articles are reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, G. Olms, Hildesheim, (1967).

3126. E. Freundlich, “Über einen Versuch, die von A. Einstein vermutete Ablenkung des Lichtes in Gravitationsfeldern zu prüfen”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 193, (1913), cols. 369-372; **and** “Zur Frage der Konstanz der Lichtgeschwindigkeit”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 14, (1913), pp. 835-838; **and** “Über die Verschiebung der Sonnenlinien nach dem roten Ende auf Grund der Hypothesen von Einstein und Nordström”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 15, (1914), pp. 369-371; **and** “Über die Verschiebung der Sonnenlinien nach dem roten Ende des Spektrums auf Grund der Äquivalenzhypothese von Einstein”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 198, (1914), cols. 265-270; **and** “Über die Gravitationsverschiebung der Spektrallinien bei Fixsternen”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 16, (1915), pp. 115-117; **and** *Beobachtungs-Ergebnisse der Königlichen Sternwarte zu Berlin*, Number 15, (1915), p. 77; **and** “Über die Erklärung der Anomalien im Planetensystem durch die Gravitationswirkung interplanetarer Massen”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 201, (1915), cols. 49-56; **and** “Über die Gravitationsverschiebung der Spektrallinien bei Fixsternen”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 202, (1915), cols. 17-24; **and** “Über die Gravitationsverschiebung der Spektrallinien bei Fixsternen”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 202, (1916), cols. 17-24; **and** *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 202, (1916), col. 147; **and** “Die Grundlagen der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 4, (1916), pp. 363-372, 386-392; **and** *Die Grundlagen der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie*, Multiple Revised and Enlarged Editions; **and** “Über die singulären Stellen der Lösungen des n -Körper-Problems”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1918), pp. 168-188; **and** “Zur Prüfung der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 7, (1919), pp. 629-636, 696; **and** “Über die Gravitationsverschiebung der Spektrallinien bei Fixsternen. II. Mitteilung”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 20, (1919), pp. 561-570.

3127. H. Fricke, *Über die innere Reibung des Lichtäthers als Ursache der magnetischen Erscheinungen*, Heckners Verlag, Wolfenbüttel, (1909); *Eine neue und einfache Deutung der Schwerkraft*, Heckners Verlag, Wolfenbüttel, (1919); **and** *Die neue Erklärung der Schwerkraft*, Heckners Verlag, Wolfenbüttel, (1920); **and** *Der Fehler in Einsteins Gravitationstheorie*, Heckner, Wolfenbüttel, (1920); **and** “Eine neue und anschauliche Erklärung der Physik des Äthers”, *Annalen für Gewerbe und Bauwesen*, Volume 86, (1920), pp. 95-96; **and** “Wind und Wetter als Feldwirkung der Schwerkraft”, *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, (13 February 1921); **and** “Klassische Mechanik, Relativitätstheorie oder Ätherphysik”, *Astronomische Zeitschrift*, (March, 1921), pp. 31-34; **and** *Welträtforschung; ein Aufbauprogramm nach dem Umsturz in der Physik*, Rudolf Borkmann, (1939). *See also*: A. Einstein, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 8, (1920), pp. 1010-1011.

3128. B. and I. Friedlaender, *Absolute oder Relative Bewegung?*, Leonhard Simion, Berlin, (1896).

3129. H. Fritsch, *Theorie der Newton’schen Gravitation und des Mariotte’schen Gesetzes*, Königsberg, (1874); **and** *Die Newtonschen Zentralkräfte abgeleitet aus Bewegungen undurchdringlicher Massen*, Hartung’sche Buchdr., Königsberg, (1905).

3130. G. H. Funcke, *Grundlagen der Raumwissenschaft*, C. Rümpler, Hannover, (1875).

3131. R. Gans, *Einführung in die Vektoranalysis mit Anwendungen auf die mathematische Physik*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1905); “Gravitation und Elektromagnetismus”, *Physikalisch Zeitschrift*, Volume 6, (1905), pp. 803-805; **and** *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 14, (1905), pp. 578-581; **and** “Zur Elektrodynamik in bewegten Medien”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 16, (1905), pp. 516-534; **and** “Über das Biot-Savartsche Gesetz”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 12, (1911), pp. 806-811; “Ist die Gravitation elektromagnetischen Ursprungs?”, *Festschrift Heinrich Weber zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstag am 5. März 1912 / gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1912), pp. 75-94; **and** *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 49, (1916), p. 149.

3132. E. Gehrcke, “Die Grenzen der Relativität”, *Die Umschau*, Number 24, (1922), pp. 381-382; **and** *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie; kulturhistorisch-psychologische Dokumente*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924); **and** *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924); which republishes the following articles by Gehrcke: “Bemerkung über die Grenzen des Relativitätsprinzips”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 13, (1911), pp. 665-669; **and** “Nochmals über die Grenzen des Relativitätsprinzips”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 13, (1911), pp. 990-1000; **and** “Notiz zu einer Abhandlung von Herrn F. Grünbaum”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 14, (1912), p. 294; **and** “Über den Sinn der absoluten Bewegung von Körpern”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Volume 12, (1912), pp. 209-222; **and** “Die gegen Relativitätstheorie erhobenen Einwände”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 1, Number 3, (17 January 1913), pp. 62-66; **and** “Einwände gegen die Relativitätstheorie”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 1, Number 7, (14 February 1913), p. 170; **and** “Über die Koordinatensysteme der Mechanik”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 15, (1913), pp. 260-266; **and** “Die erkenntnistheoretischen Grundlagen der verschiedenen, physikalischen Relativitätstheorien”, *Kant-Studien*, Volume 19, (1914), pp. 481-487; **and** “Zur Kritik und Geschichte der neueren Gravitationstheorien”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 51, (1916), pp. 119-124; **and** “Über den Äther”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 20, (1918), pp. 165-169; **and** “Zur Diskussion über den Äther”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 21, (1919), pp. 67-68; **and** “Berichtigung zum Dialog der Relativitätstheorien”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 7, (1919), pp. 147-148; **and** “Die Astrophysik in relativistischer Beleuchtung”, *Zeitschrift für physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 32, (1919), pp. 205-206; **and** “Was beweisen die Beobachtungen über die Richtigkeit der Relativitätstheorie?”, *Zeitschrift für technische Physik*, Volume 1, (1920), p. 123; **and** *Die Relativitätstheorie eine wissenschaftliche Massensuggestion*, Arbeitsgemeinschaft Deutscher Naturforscher zur Erhaltung reiner Wissenschaft, Berlin, (1920); **and** “Die Stellung der Mathematik zur Relativitätstheorie”, *Beiträge zur Philosophie des Deutschen Idealismus*, Volume 2, (1921), pp. 13-19; **and** “Die Relativitätstheorie auf dem Naturforschertage in Nauheim”, *Umschau, Wochenschrift über die Fortschritte in Wissenschaften und Technik*, Volume 25, (1921), p. 99; **and** “Zur Relativitätsfrage”, *Die Umschau*, Volume 25, (1921), p. 227; **and** “Über das Uhrenparadoxon in der Relativitätstheorie”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 9, (1921), p. 482; **and** “Die Erörterung des Uhrenparadoxons in der Relativitätstheorie”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 9, (1921), p. 550; **and** “Schwerkraft und Relativitätstheorie”, *Zeitschrift für technische Physik*, Volume 2, (1921), pp. 194-195; **and** “Zur Frage der Relativitätstheorie”, *Kosmos, Sonderheft über die Relativitätstheorie*, (Special Edition on the Theory of Relativity), (1921), pp. 296-298; **and** “Die Gegensätze zwischen der Aethertheorie und

Relativitätstheorie und ihre experimentelle Prüfung”, *Zeitschrift für technische Physik*, Volume 4, (1923), pp. 292-299. Gehrcke published introductions in: S. Mohorovičić, *Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie und ihr mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Charakter*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1923); **and** in M. Palágyi, *Zur Weltmechanik, Beiträge zur Metaphysik der Physik von Melchior Palágyi, mit einem Geleitwort von Ernst Gehrcke*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1925). Excerpts from *Die Relativitätstheorie eine wissenschaftliche Massensuggestion*, Arbeitsgemeinschaft Deutscher Naturforscher zur Erhaltung reiner Wissenschaft, Berlin, (1920), appear in *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, (1931), 85-86, and there is a bibliography of sorts at page 76.

3133. F. J. K. Geissler, *Eine mögliche Wesenserklärung für Raum, Zeit, das Unendliche und die Kausalität, nebst einem Grundwort zur Metaphysik der Möglichkeiten*, Gutenberg, Berlin, (1900); **and** “Ringgenberg Schluss mit der Einstein-Irrung!”, H. Israel, *et al*, Eds., *Hundert Autoren Gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, (1931), pp. 10-12.

3134. P. Gerber, “Die räumliche und zeitliche Ausbreitung der Gravitation”, *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik*, Leipzig, Volume 43, (1898), pp. 93-104; **and** *Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation*, Programmabhandlung des städtischen Realgymnasiums zu Stargard in Pommerania, (1902); reprinted “Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 52, (1917), pp. 415-441. Einstein stated, “...Gerber, who has given the correct formula for the perihelion motion of Mercury before I did [quoted in G. E. Tauber, *Albert Einstein’s Theory of General Relativity*, Crown, New York, (1979), p. 98].” Seeliger attacked Gehrcke and Gerber: H. v. Seeliger, “Bemerkung zu P. Gerbers Aufsatz ‘Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation’”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 53, (1917), pp. 31-32; “Weiters Bemerkungen zur ‘Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation’”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 54, (1917), pp. 38-40; **and** “Bemerkung zu dem Aufsätze des Herrn Gehrcke ‘Über den Äther’”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 20, (1918), p. 262.

For counter-argument, see: E. Gehrcke, “Zur Kritik und Geschichte der neueren Gravitationstheorien”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 51, (1916), pp. 119-124; **and** *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 52, (1917), p. 415; **and** “Über den Äther”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 20, (1918), pp. 165-169; **and** “Zur Diskussion über den Äther”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 21, (1919), pp. 67-68; Gehrcke’s articles are reprinted in *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 40-48.

For further Discussion, see also: S. Oppenheim, “Zur Frage nach der Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 53, (1917), pp. 163-168; **and** L. C. Glaser, “Zur Erörterung über die Relativitätstheorie”, *Tägliche Rundschau*, (16 August 1920); **and** P. Weyland, *Tägliche Rundschau*, (6, 14, and 16 August 1920); **and** J. Riem, “Das Relativitätsgesetz”, *Deutsche Zeitung* (Berlin), Number 286, (26 June 1920); **and** “Gegen den Einstein Rummel!”, *Umschau*, Volume 24, (1920), pp. 583-584; “Amerika über Einstein”, *Deutsche Zeitung*, (1 July 1921 evening edition); **and** “Zu Einsteins Amerikafahrt. Stimmen amerikanischer Blätter und die Antwort Reuterdahls.” *Deutsche Zeitung*, (13 September 1921); **and** “Ein amerikanisches Weltanschauungsbuch”, *Der Reichsbote* (Berlin), Number 463, (4 October 1921); **and** “Um Einsteins Relativitätstheorie”, *Deutsche Zeitung*, (18 November 1921); **and** “Die astronomischen Beweismittel der Relativitätstheorie”, *Hellweg Westdeutsche Wochenschrift für Deutsche Kunst*, Volume 1, (1921), pp. 314-316; **and** “Keine Bestätigung der Relativitätstheorie”, *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, Volume 36, (1921), p. 420; **and** “Lenards gewichtige

Stimme gegen die Relativitätstheorie”, *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, Volume 36, (1921), p. 551; “Neues zur Relativitätstheorie”, *Naturwissenschaftliche Wochenschrift*, Volume 37, (1922), pp. 13-14; “Beobachtungstatsachen zur Relativitätstheorie”, *Umschau*, Volume 27, (1923), pp. 328-329; **and** M. v. Laue, “Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation. Bemerkungen zur gleichnamigen Abhandlungen von P. Gerber”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 53, (1917), pp. 214-216; **and** *Tägliche Rundschau*, (August 11, 1920); **and** “Historisch-Kritisches über die Perihelbewegung des Mercur”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 8, (1920), pp. 735-736; **and** P. Lenard’s analysis in, “Über die Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahls von seiner geradlinigen Bewegung durch die Attraktion eines Weltkörpers, an welchem er nahe vorbeigeht; von J. Soldner, 1801”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 65, (1921), pp. 593-604; **and** *Über Äther und Uräther*, Second Edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1922); **and**, the later the edition, the better, *Über Relativitätsprinzip, Äther, Gravitation*, Third Enlarged Edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1921); **and** A. Einstein, “Meine Antwort”, *Berliner Tageblatt und Handels-Zeitung*, (August 27, 1920); English translation quoted in G. E. Tauber, *Albert Einstein’s Theory of General Relativity*, Crown, New York, (1979), pp. 97-99; **and** G. v. Gleich, “Die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie und das Merkurperihel”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 72, (1923), pp.221-235; **and** “Zur Kritik der Relativitätstheorie vom mathematisch-physikalischen Standpunkt aus”, *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Volume 25, (1924), pp. 230-246; **and** “Die Vieldeutigkeit in der Relativitätstheorie”, *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Volume 25, (1924), pp. 329-334; **and** *Einsteins Relativitätstheorien und Physikalische Wirklichkeit*, Barth, Leipzig, (1930); **and** A. Reuterdahl, “Einstein and the New Science”, *Bi-Monthly Journal of the College of St. Thomas*, Volume 11, Number 3, (July, 1921); **and** “The Origin of Einsteinism”, *The New York Times*, Section 7, (12 August 1923), p. 8. Reply to F. D. Bond’s response, “Reuterdahl and the Einstein Theory”, *The New York Times*, Section 7, (15 July 1923), p. 8. Response to A. Reuterdahl, “Einstein’s Predecessors”, *The New York Times*, Section 8, (3 June 1923), p. 8. Which was a reply to F. D. Bond, “Relating to Relativity”, *The New York Times*, Section 9, (13 May 1923), p. 8. Which was a response to H. A. Houghton, “A Newtonian Duplication?”, *The New York Times*, Section 1, Part 1, (21 April 1923), p. 10; **and** “Der Einsteinismus \ Seine Trugschlüsse und Täuschungen”, *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, (1931), p. 45; *See also*: J. T. Blankart, “Relativity of Interdependence; Reuterdahl’s Theory Contrasted with Einstein’s”, *Catholic World*, Volume 112, (February, 1921), pp. 588-610; **and** T. J. J. See, “Prof. See Attacks German Scientist, Asserting That His Doctrine Is 122 Years Old”, *The New York Times*, (13 April 1923), p. 5; **and** “Einstein a Second Dr. Cook?”, *The San Francisco Journal*, (13 May 1923), pp. 1, 6; **and** (20 May 1923), p. 1; “Einstein a Trickster?”, *The San Francisco Journal*, (27 May 1923); response by R. Trumpler, “Historical Note on the Problem of Light Deflection in the Sun’s Gravitational Field”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 1496, (1923), pp. 161-163; reply by See, “Soldner, Foucault and Einstein”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, (1923), p. 372; rejoinder by L. P. Eisenhart, “Soldner and Einstein”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 1512, (1923), pp. 516-517; rebuttal by A. Reuterdahl, “The Einstein Film and the Debacle of Einsteinism”, *The Dearborn Independent*, (22 March 1924), p. 15; **and** “New Theory of the Ether”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 217, (1923), pp. 193-283; **and** “Is the Einstein Theory a Crazy Vagary?”, *The Literary Digest*, (2 June 1923), pp. 29-30; **and** R. Morgan, “Einstein Theory Declared Colossal Humbug by U.S. Naval Astronomer”, *The Dearborn Independent*, (21 July 1923), p. 14; **and** “Prof. See Attacks German Scientist Asserting that his Doctrine is 122 Years Old”, *The New York Times*, Section 1, (13 April 1923), p. 5; **and** “Einstein Geometry Called Careless”, *The San Francisco Journal*, (14 October 1924); **and** “Is Einstein’s Arithmetic Off?”, *The Literary Digest*, Volume 83, Number 6, (8 November 1924), pp. 20-21; **and**

“Navy Scientist Claims Einstein Theory Error”, *The Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, (13 October 1924). Ironically, Reuterdaahl accused See of Plagiarizing his exposure of Einstein’s plagiarism in America, first recognized by Gehrcke and Lenard in Germany! “Reuterdaahl Says See Takes Credit for Work of Others”, *The Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, (14 October 1924); **and** “A Scientist Yields to Temptation”, *The Minneapolis Journal*, (2 February 1925); **and** “Prof. See declares Einstein in Error. Naval Astronomer Says Eclipse Observations Fully Confirm Newton’s Gravitation Theory. Says German began Wrong. A Mistake in Mathematics is Charged, with ‘Curved Space’ Idea to Hide it.” *The New York Times*, (14 October 1924), p. 14; responses by Eisenhart, Eddington and Dyson, *The New York Times*, (16 October 1924), p. 12; **and** “Captain See vs. Doctor Einstein”, *Scientific American*, Volume 138, (February 1925), p. 128; **and** *Researches in Non-Euclidian Geometry and the Theory of Relativity: A Systematic Study of Twenty Fallacies in the Geometry of Riemann, Including the So-Called Curvature of Space and Radius of World Curvature, and of Eighty Errors in the Physical Theories of Einstein and Eddington, Showing the Complete Collapse of the Theory of Relativity*, United States Naval Observatory Publication: Mare Island, Calif. : Naval Observatory,(1925); **and** “See Says Einstein has Changed Front. Navy Mathematician Quotes German Opposing Field Theory in 1911. Holds it is not New. Declares he himself Anticipated by Seven Years Relation of Electrodynamics to Gravitation”, *The New York Times*, Section 2, (24 February 1929), p. 4. See refers to his works: *Electrodynamic Wave-Theory of Physical Forces*, Thos. P. Nichols, Boston, London, Paris, (1917); **and** *New Theory of the Aether*, Inhaber Georg Oheim, Kiel, (1922). *See also*: “New Theory of the Ether”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 217, (1923), pp. 193-283; **and** T. Vahlen, “Die Paradoxien der relativen Mechanik”, *Deutsche Mathematik*, Volume 3, (1942), p. 25; **and** N. T. Roseveare, *Mercury’s Perihelion from Le Verrier to Einstein*, Oxford University Press, (1982), pp. 78, 115, 137-146; **and** P. Beckmann, *Einstein Plus Two*, The Golem Press, Boulder, Colorado, (1987), pp. 170-175 (Cf. T. Bethel, “A Challenge to Einstein”, *National Review*, Volume 42, (5 November 1990), pp. 69-71.).

3135. J. S. S. Glennie, “On the Principles of the Science of Motion”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 21, (January, 1861), pp. 41-45; **and** “On the Principles of Energetics”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 21, (April, 1861), p. 276; *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 21, (May, 1861), pp. 351-352; *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 22, (July, 1861), p. 62.

3136. H. Gyldén, *Versuch einer mathematischen Theorie zur Erklärung des Lichtwechsels der veränderlichen Sterne / von Hugo Gyldén*, Finska Vetenskaps-Societeten, Helsingfors. Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae, Volume 11, Helsingforsiae, (1880); **and** *Traité Analytique des Orbites Absolues des Huit Planètes Principales*, F. & G. Beijer, Stockholm, (1893); **and** *Hülftafeln zur Berechnung der Hauptungleichheiten in den absoluten Bewegungstheorien der kleinen Planeten. Unter Mitwirkung von Dr. S. Oppenheim Hrsg. von Hugo Gyldén*, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1896).

3137. H. Grassmann, *Die lineale Ausdehnungslehre*, O. Wigand, Leipzig, (1844/1878); **and** *Die Ausdehnungslehre*, T. C. F. Enslin, Berlin, (1862).

3138. G. Green, “Mathematical Investigations Concerning the Laws of the Equilibrium of Fluids, Analogous to the Electric Fluid”, *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, (1833); *Mathematical Papers of the Late George Green*, Macmillan, London, (1871), p. 123.

3139. [M. Grossmann?] A. Einstein, “Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 49, Number 7, (1916), p.769: “In conclusion, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my friend, the mathematician Grossman, who, through his help, not only spared me the study of the relevant mathematical literature, but also

assisted me in the search for the field equations for gravity.” “Endlich sei an dieser Stelle dankbar meines Freundes, des Mathematikers Grossmann, gedacht, der mir durch seine Hilfe nicht nur das Studium der einschlägigen mathematischen Literatur ersparte, sondern mich auch beim Suchen nach den Feldgleichungen der Gravitation unterstützte.”; **and** M. Grossmann, “Mathematische Begriffsbildung zur Gravitationstheorie”, *Vierteljahrsschrift der Naturforschenden Gesellschaft in Zürich*, Volume 58, (1913), pp. 291-237; **and** A. Einstein and M. Grossmann, *Entwurf einer verallgemeinerten Relativitätstheorie und einer Theorie der Gravitation. I. Physikalischer Teil, von Albert Einstein; II. Mathematischer Teil, von Marcel Grossmann*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1913); reprinted in *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik*, Volume 62, (1914), pp. 225-259; **and** “Définitions Méthodes et Problèmes Mathématiques Relatifs à la Théorie de la Gravitation”, *Archives des Sciences Physiques et Naturelles*, Series 4, Volume 37, (January-June, 1914), pp. 13-19; **and** A. Einstein and M. Grossmann, “Kovarianzeigenschaften der Feldgleichungen der auf die verallgemeinerte Relativitätstheorie gegründeten Gravitationstheorie”, *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik*, Volume 63, (1914), pp. 215-225.

3140. S. Günther, *Ziele und resultate der neueren mathematisch-historischen Forschung*, E. Besold, Erlangen, (1876); **and** *Handbuch der mathematischen Geographie*, J. Engelhorn, Stuttgart, (1890), p. 758 Notes; **and** *Handbuch der Geophysik*, Volume 1, Second Edition, F. Enke, Stuttgart, (1897), p. 283.

3141. F. Guthrie, “On Approach Caused by Vibration”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 39, (1870), p. 309; Volume 40, (November, 1870), pp. 345-354.

3142. J. Guyot, *Eléments de Physique Générale*, Paris, (1832).

3143. W. Gyllenberg, *Meddelande Från Lunds Astronomiska Observatorium*, Series 2, Number 13, (1915).

3144. E. Haeckel, *Die Welträthsel: Gemeinverständliche Studien über Monistische Philosophie*, Emil Strauß, Bonn, (1899), pp. 243-316, and especially pp. 261-267, and 282-284; English translation by Joseph McCabe, *The Riddle of the Universe: At the Close of the Nineteenth Century*, Harper & Brothers, New York, (1900). G. W. De Tunzelmann ridiculed Haeckel in *A Treatise on Electrical Theory and the Problem of the Universe. Considered from the Physical Point of View, with Mathematical Appendices*, Appendix Q, Charles Griffin, London, (1910), pp. 617-625.

3145. A. Hall, “A Suggestion in the Theory of Mercury”, *The Astronomical Journal*, Volume 14, (1894), pp. 49-51; **and** “Note on the Masses of Mercury, Venus and Earth”, *The Astronomical Journal*, Volume 24, (1905), p. 164.

3146. G. Halphen, “Reserches de Géométrie à n Dimensions”, *Bulletin de la Société Mathématique de France*, Volume 2, pp. 34-52.

3147. E. Härdtl, “Zur Frage nach der Perihelbewegung des Planeten Merkur”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, Volume 103, (1894).

3148. R. Hargreaves, “Integral Forms and Their Connexion with Physical Equations”, *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Volume 21, (1908), pp. 107-122. See also: H. Bateman, “The Electromagnetic Vectors”, *The Physical Review*, Volume 12, Number 6, (December, 1918), pp. 459-481.

3149. W. Harkness, “On the Solar Parallax and its Related Constants”, *Washington Observations for 1885*, (U.S.) Government Printing Office, Washington, (1891).

3150. P. Harzer, *Die säkularen Veränderungen der Bahnen der grossen Planeten*, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1895); **and** “Über die Mitführung des Lichtes in Glas und die Aberration”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 198, (1914), cols. 377-392; **and** “Bemerkungen zu meinem Artikel in Nr. 4748 im Zusammenhange mit den vorstehenden Bemerkungen des

Herrn Einstein”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 199, (1914), cols. 9-12.

3151. F. Hasenöhr, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 107, (1898), p. 1015; **and** “Zur Theorie der Strahlung in bewegten Körpern”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 113,(1904), pp. 1039-1055; **and** “Zur Theorie der Strahlung in bewegten Körpern”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 15, (1904), pp. 344-370; *corrected*: Series 4, Volume 16, (1905), pp. 589-592; **and** *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 116, (1907), p. 1391ff. *especially* p. 1400; **and** “Über die Umwandlung kinetischer Energie in Strahlung”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 10, (1909), pp. 829-830; **and** “Bericht über die Trägheit der Energie”, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 6, (1909), pp. 485-502; **and** “Über die Widerstand, welchen die Bewegung kleiner Körperchen in einem mit Hohlraumstrahlung erfüllten Raume erleidet”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 119, (1910), pp. 1327-1349; **and** “Die Erhaltung der Energie und die Vermehrung der Entropie”, in E. Warburg, *Die Kultur der Gegenwart: Ihre Entwicklung und ihre Ziele*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1915), pp. 661-691.

3152. J. F. Hayford, *Geodesy. The Figure of the Earth and Isostasy from Measurements in the United States*, (U.S.) Government Printing Office, Washington, (1909); **and** *Geodesy. Supplementary Investigation in 1909 of the Figure of the Earth and Isostasy*, (U.S.) Government Printing Office, Washington, (1910); **and** *Geodesy. The Effect of Topography and Isostatic Compensation upon the Intensity of Gravity*, (U.S.) Government Printing Office, Washington, (1912). With W. Bowie, *Effect of Topography and Isostatic Compensation upon the Intensity of Gravity*, (U.S.) Government Printing Office, Washington, (1912).

3153. R. S. Heath, “On the Dynamics of a Rigid Body in Elliptic Space”, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, Volume 175, (1884), pp. 281-324.

3154. O. Heaviside, “The Electromagnetic Effects of a Moving Charge”, *The Electrician*, Volume 22, (1888), pp. 147-148; **and** “On the Electromagnetic Effects due to the Motion of Electricity Through a Dielectric”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 27, (1889), pp. 324-339; **and** “On the Forces, Stresses and Fluxes of Energy in the Electromagnetic Field”, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, Volume 183A, (1892), p. 423; **and** “A Gravitational and Electromagnetic Analogy”, *The Electrician*, Volume 31, (1893), pp. 281-282, 359; **and** *The Electrician*, Volume 45, (1900), pp. 636, 881.

3155. O. Hecker, *Beobachtungen an Horizontalpendeln über die Deformation des Erdkörpers unter dem einfluss von sonne und mond*, P. Stankiewicz, Berlin, (1907), Veröffentlichung der Königlich preussischen geodätischen Institutes, New Series, Number 32.

3156. F. Helmert, *Die mathematischen und physikalischen Theorieen der Höhere Geodäsie*, In Two Volumes, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1880-1884); *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, 6, 1, 7; **and** “Über die Genauigkeit der Dimensionen des Hayford’schen Erdellipsoids”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1911); **and** “Neue Formeln für den Verlauf der Schwerkraft im Meeresniveau beim Festland”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1915), p. 676.

3157. J. v. Hepperger, “Über die fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen*

Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 97, (1888), pp. 337-362.

3158. J. Herapath, “On the Physical Properties of Gases”, *Annals of Philosophy*, Volume 8, (July, 1816), pp. 58-59; “A Mathematical Enquiry into the Causes, Laws, and Principle Phenomena of Heat, Gases, Gravitation, &c.”, *Annals of Philosophy*, Volume 17, New Series, Volume 1, p. 276; **and** *Mathematical Physics: or, The Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy: with a Development of the Causes of Heat, Gaseous Elasticity, Gravitation, and other Great Phenomena of Nature*, In Two Volumes, Whittaker and Co., London, (1847).

3159. J. F. Herbart, *Joh. Fr. Herbart's sämtliche Werke in chronologischer Reihenfolge / hrsg. von Karl Kehrbach und Otto Flugel*, In 19 Volumes, H. Beyer, Langensalza (1887-1912).

3160. G. Herglotz, “Über den vom Standpunkt des Relativitätsprinzips aus als ‘starr’ zu bezeichnenden Körper”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 31, (1910), pp. 393-415; Volume 36, (1911), p. 493.

3161. P. Hertz, “Die bewegung eines Elektrons unter dem Einflusse einer longitudinal wirkenden Kraft”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1906), pp. 229ff.

3162. J. C. V. Hoffmann, “Resultate der Nicht-Euklidischen oder Pangeometrie”, *Zeitschrift für mathematischen und naturwissenschaftlichen Unterricht*, Volume 4, pp. 416-417.

3163. A. Höfler, “Einige Bemerkungen über das C.S.G.-System im Unterricht”, *Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 11, (1898), p. 79; **and** *Studien zur gegenwärtigen Philosophie der Mechanik: Als Nachwort zu: Kant's Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Naturwissenschaft*, C. E. M. Pfeffer, Leipzig, (1900); **and** *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Naturwissenschaft*, C. E. M. Pfeffer, Leipzig, (1900), p. 76; from *Veröffentlichungen der philosophischen Gesellschaft an der Universität zu Wien*, Volume 3 (a), (1900); **and** “Studien zur gegenwärtigen Philosophie der Mechanik”, *Veröffentlichungen der philosophischen Gesellschaft an der Universität zu Wien*, Volume 3 (b), (1900); **and** “Zur gegenwärtigen Naturphilosophie”, *Sonderhefte der Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 1, Number 2, (1904); **and** *Zur gegenwärtigen Naturphilosophie*, J. Springer, Berlin, (1904); **and** his response to Poincaré's *Science and Hypothesis: Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 18, Number 1, (January, 1905), pp. 55-56; **and** his response to Neißer's *Ptolemäus oder Kopernikus? Eine Studie über die Bewegung der Erde und über den Begriff der Bewegung*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1907); *Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 21, Number 1, (January, 1908), p. 61; **and** his response to Holzmüller's *Elementare kosmische Betrachtungen über das Sonnensystem und Wiederlegung der von Kant und Laplace aufgestellten Hypothesen über dessen Entstehungsgeschichte*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1906); *Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht* Volume 21, Number 1, (January, 1908), pp. 61-64; **and** “Zur Geschichte und Wurzel der Machschen Philosophie”, *Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 23, Number 1, (January, 1910); **and** “Relativitätstheorie und Erkenntnistheorie”, *Zeitschrift für den Physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 35, Number 2, (March, 1922), pp. 88-90.

3164. W. Hofmann, *Kritische Beleuchtung der beiden Grundbegriffe der Mechanik: Bewegung und Trägheit und daraus gezogene Folgerungen betreffs der Achsendrehung der Erde und des Foucault'schen Pendelversuches*, M. Kuppitsch Witwe, Leipzig, Wien, (1904).

3165. G. Holzmüller, “Über die Anwendung der Jacobi-Hamilton'schen Principis und das Weber'sche Gesetz”, *Zeitschrift für Mathematik und Physik*, Volume 15, (1870), pp. 69-91;

and *Elementare kosmische Betrachtungen über das Sonnensystem und Wiederlegung der von Kant und Laplace aufgestellten Hypothesen über dessen Entstehungsgeschichte*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1906).

3166. F. W. H. A. v. Humboldt, *Ansichten der Natur, mit wissenschaftlichen Erläuterungen*, J. G. Cotta, Tübingen, (1808), English translation by Mrs. Sabine, *Aspects of nature, in different lands and different climates; with scientific elucidations*, Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, London, (1849 reprinted many times); **and** *Kosmos: Entwurf einer physischen Weltbeschreibung*, Stuttgart, Tübingen, J. G. Cotta, (1845-1862), Philadelphia, Tübingen, (1844); English translation: *Cosmos: a sketch of a physical description of the universe / by Alexander von Humboldt. Translated under the superintendence of Lieut.-Col. Edward Sabine*, Four Volumes in Five, Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, London, (1846 reprinted many times).

3167. D. Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*; **and** *A Treatise of Human Nature*. **See also:** P. F. Linke, *D. Humes Lehre vom Wissen; ein Beitrag zur Relationstheorie im Anschluß an Locke und Hume*, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1901). **See also:** A. Einstein, "Ernst Mach", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 17, Number 7, (1 April 1916), p. 102.

3168. J. Hundhausen, *Zum Begriff der Kraft. Vortrag, gehalten am 8. Februar 1887 im Wissenschaftlichen Verein zu Hamm von Dr. Johannes Hundhausen*, Griebisch & Müller, Hamm, (1887).

3169. E. V. Huntington, "A New Approach to the Theory of Relativity", *Festschrift Heinrich Weber zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstag am 5. März 1912 / gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1912), pp. 147-169; reprinted "A New Approach to the Theory of Relativity", *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 23, Number 136, (April, 1912), pp. 494-513; **and** *Earth and Sun: An Hypothesis of Weather and Sunspots*, Yale University Press, (1923).

3170. E. Hupka, "Beitrag zur Kenntnis der trägen Masse bewegter Elektronen", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 31, (1910), pp. 169-204; **and** *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 33, (1910), p. 400.

3171. W. Ignatowsky, "Der starre Körper und das Relativitätsprinzip", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 31, (1910), pp. 607-630; **and** "Zur Elastizitätstheorie vom Standpunkte des Relativitätsprinzips", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 12, (1911), pp. 164-169, 441.

3172. C. Isenkrahe, *Das Räthsel von der Schwerkraft. Kritik der bisherigen Lösungen des Gravitationsproblems und Versuch einer neuen auf rein mechanischer Grundlage*, Braunschweig, F. Vieweg, (1879); **and** *Das Verfahren der Funktionswiederholung: seine geometrische Veranschaulichung und algebraische Anwendung*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1897); **and** *Zum Problem der Evidenz. Was bedeutet, was leistet sie?*, J. Kösel, Kempten, München, (1917); *Untersuchungen über das Endliche und das Unendliche: mit Ausblicken auf die philosophische Apologetik*, A. Marcus & E. Webers, Bonn, (1920); **and** *Zur Elementaranalyse der Relativitätstheorie*, F. Vieweg, Braunschweig, (1921).

3173. J. Ishiwara, "Zur Theorie der Gravitation", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 13, (1912), p. 1189; **and** *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 9, (1912), p. 560; **and** "Grundlagen einer relativistischen elektromagnetischen Gravitationstheorie", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 15, (1914), p. 294; **and** "Zur relativistischen Theorie der Gravitation", *Science Reports. First Series*, Volume 4, Tohoku Imperial University, Sendai, Japan, (1914), pp. 111-160; **and** *Tokyo Sugaki Butsuri Gakkai: Proceedings. Kizi*, Series 2, Volume 8, Number 4, p. 106; **and** *Proceedings of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Tokyo*, Volume 8, (1915), p. 318.

3174. C. G. J. Jacobi, "De binis quibuslibet functionibus homogeneis", *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelle's Journal)*, Volume 12, (1834), pp. 1-69.

- 3175.** G. O. James, “Relation of the Inertial and Empirical Trihedron on a Gravitational System”, *Astronomical Journal*, Volume 27, (1913), p. 77.
- 3176.** G. Jaumann, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 121, (1912), p. 95; **and** *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 15, (1914), p. 159.
- 3177.** L. E. Jewell, “The Coincidence of Solar and Metallic Lines: A Study of the Appearance of Lines in the Spectra of the Electric Arc and the Sun”, *The Astrophysical Journal*, Volume 3, (1896), p. 89-113; response: E. Bouty, *Journal de Physique*, Volume 6, (1897), pp. 84-85.
- 3178.** P. Johannesson, *Das Beharrungsgesetz*, Programm des Sophien-Realgymnasiums, Geartners Verlag, Berlin, (1896).
- 3179.** W. H. Julius, “Bemerkungen über einige Grundsätze der Elektrizitätslehre”, *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Series 2, Volume 5, (1900), p. 497; **and** *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 2, (1901), p. 348; **and** *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 3, (1902), p. 154; **and** *Le Radium*, Volume 7, (1910), p. 281; *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Volume 6, (1922), p. 92; **and**, with P. H. van Cittert, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 29, (1920), *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Volume 5, (1921), p. 296.
- 3180.** I. Kant, “Der Hauptfrage”, *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik, die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können*, Part 2, Section 38, Johann Friedrich Hartknoch, Riga, (1783); English translation in *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*, Part 2, Section 38, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, New York, (1950), pp. 67-69; **and** “Regions in Space” and “Inaugural Dissertation”, §§ 14, 15”, *Kant’s Inaugural Dissertation and Early Writings on Space*, Open Court, Chicago, (1929).
- 3181.** W. K. J. Killing, “Die Mechanik in den nicht-Euklidischen Raumformen”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelle’s Journal)*, Volume 98, (1884), pp. 1-48; *Die nichteuklidischen Raumformen in analytischer Behandlung*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1885); **and** “Die Zusammensetzung der stetigen endlichen Transformationsgruppen”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 31, (1888), pp. 252-290; **and** “Clifford-Klein’sche Raumformen”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 39, (1891), pp. 257-278.
- 3182.** “Kinertia” aka Robert Stevenson, “Do Bodies Fall?”, *Harper’s Weekly*, Volume 59, (August 29-November 7, 1914), pp. 210, 234, 254, 285-286, 309-310, 332-334, 357-359, 382-383, 405-407, 429-430, 453-454; **and** *Harper’s Weekly*, (1866); On 27 June 1903, “Kinertia” filed an article with the Royal Prussian Academy in Berlin, which was mentioned in the *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1904). *See also*: A. Reuterdahl, “‘Kinertia’ Versus Einstein”, *The Dearborn Independent*, (30 April 1921); **and** “Einstein and the New Science”, *Bi-Monthly Journal of the College of St. Thomas*, Volume 11, Number 3, (July, 1921).
- 3183.** G. Kirchhoff, “Ueber den Durchgang eines elektrischen Stromes durch eine Ebene, insbesondere durch eine kreisförmige”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 64, (1845), pp. 497-514; *Monatsberichte der Königlich Preussische Akademie des Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1859), p. 662; “Ueber das Verhältniss zwischen dem Emissionsvermögen und dem Absorptionsvermögen der Körper für Wärme und Licht”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 109, (1860), pp. 275-301; “Untersuchung über das Sonnenspectrum”, *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1861), p. 77; *Vorlesungen über mathematische Physik*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1876 and multiple later editions); *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1882); *Vorlesungen über die Theorie der Wärme*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1894).

3184. F. Klein, "Ueber die sogenannte Nicht-Euklidische Geometrie", *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 4, (1871), pp. 573-625, Volume 6 (1873), pp. 112-145; Volume 7, (1874), pp. 531-537; **and** "Ueber die sogenannte Nicht-Euklidische Geometrie", *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1871), pp. 419-433; **and** *Ueber neuere geometrische Forschungen*, Erlangen, (1872); **and** "Zur Nicht-Euklidische Geometrie", *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 37, (1890), pp. 544-572; **and** *Nicht-Euklidische Geometrie*, Göttingen, Second Printing, (1893), Part IIB, p. 206; **and** *The Evanston colloquium: lectures on mathematics delivered from Aug. 28 to Sept. 9, 1893 before members of the Congress of mathematics held in connection with the World's fair in Chicago at Northwestern university, Evanston, Ill., by Felix Klein. Reported by Alexander Ziwet. Pub. for H.S. White and A. Ziwet*, Macmillan, New York, London, (1894), pp. 89-90; **and** *Riemannsche Flächen*, B.G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1906); **and** "Über die geometrischen Grundlagen der Lorentzgruppe", *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 19, (1910), pp. 281-300; **and** *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 12, (1911), pp. 17-27; **and** "Zu Hilberts erster Note über die Grundlagen der Physik", *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1917), pp. 469-482; **and** "Über die Differenzialgesetze für die Erhaltung von Impuls und Energie in der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie", *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1918), pp. 171-189; **and** "Über die Integralform der Erhaltungssätze und die Theorie der räumlich-geschlossenen Welt", *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1918), pp. 394-423; **and** "Bemerkungen über die Beziehungen des de Sitter'schen Koordinatensystems B zu der allgemeinen Welt konstanter positiver Krümmung", *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 27, (1918/1919), pp. 394-423; **and** *Gesammelte mathematische Abhandlungen*, Springer, Berlin, (1921-1923); **and** *Vorlesungen über die Entwicklung der Mathematik im 19. Jahrhundert*, Springer, Berlin, (1927); **and** *Vorlesungen über die nicht-euklidische Geometrie*, Springer, Berlin, (1928).

3185. H. Kleinpeter, "Raum und Zeitbegriff der Mathematik und Mechanik", *Archiv für systematische Philosophie*, Volume 4, pp. 32-43; **and** "Zur Formulierung des Trägheitsgesetzes", *Archiv für systematische Philosophie*, New Series, Volume 6, (1900), pp. 461-469; **and** *Erkenntnislehre und Naturwissenschaft in ihrer Wechselwirkung*, (Aus d. 25. Jahresbericht der deutschen Landesoberrealschule in Prossnitz i. Mähren.), (1900); **and** "Zur Einführung der Grundbegriffe der Mechanik", *Zeitschrift für Rechtswesen*, Volume 29, (1904), see Höfler's response: *Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 17, Number 5, (September, 1904), pp. 300-303; **and** "Über Volkmanns 'Postulate, Hypothesen und Naturgesetze'", *Annalen der Naturphilosophie*, Volume 1, (1902), see Höfler's response *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik*, Volume 28, 1904, pp. 4-5; **and** "Zur Einführung der Grundbegriffe der Mechanik" (1904); "Über den Begriff der Kraft" (1904); see Höfler's responses: *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik*, Volumes 29 and 30, (1905, 1906), pp. 8-9; **and** *Die Erkenntnistheorie der Naturforschung der Gegenwart, unter Zugrundelegung der Anschauungen von Mach, Stallo, Clifford, Kirchhoff, Hertz, Pearson und Ostwald*, J.A. Barth, Leipzig, (1905); see Höfler's response: *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik*, Volumes 29 and 30, (1905, 1906), pp. 9-10; **and** *Der Phänomenalismus, eine naturwissenschaftliche Weltanschauung*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1913).

3186. J. Kober, "On Infinity and the New Geometry", *Zeitschrift für mathematischen und naturwissenschaftlichen Unterricht*, (1872).

3187. J. König, “Ueber eine reale Abbildung der s. g. Nicht-Euklidischen Geometrie”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1872), pp. 157-164; **and** “Ueber eine Eigenschaft der Potenzreihen”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 23, (1884), pp. 447-449; **and** “Ueber die Integration der Hamilton’schen Systeme und der partiellen Differentialgleichung erster Ordnung”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 23, (1884), pp. 504-519; **and** “Ueber eine neue Interpretation der Fundamentalgleichungen der Dynamik”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 31, (1888), pp. 1-42; **and** “Ueber die neueren Versuche zu einer einwurfsfreien Grundlegung der Mechanik”, *Verhandlungen der physikalische Gesellschaft zu Berlin*, Volume 5, (1886), p. 73ff.

3188. F. Kottler and S. Oppenheim, *Kritik des Newton’schen Gravitationsgesetzes; mit einem Beitrag: Gravitation und Relativitätstheorie von F. Kottler*, Deutsche Staatsrealschule in Karolinenthal, Prag, (1903); **and** F. Kottler, “Über die Raumzeitlinien der Minkowski’schen Welt”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 121, (1912), pp. 1659-1759; **and** “Relativitätsprinzip und beschleunigte Bewegung”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 44, (1914), pp. 701-748; **and** “Fallende Bezugssysteme vom Standpunkt des Relativitätsprinzip”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 45, (1914), pp. 481-516; **and** “Beschleunigungsrelative Bewegungen und die konforme Gruppe der Minkowski’schen Welt”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 125, (1916), pp. 899-919; **and** “Über Einsteins Äquivalenzhypothese und die Gravitation”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 50, (1916), pp. 955-972; **and** “Über die physikalischen Grundlagen der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 56, (1918), pp. 401-462; **and** F. Kottler, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, Volume 6, Part 2, Article 22a, pp. 159-237; **and** “Newton’sches Gesetz und Metrik”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 131, (1922), p. 1-14; **and** “Maxwell’schen Gleichungen und Metrik”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 131, (1922), pp. 119-146.

3189. E. Kretschmann, “Eine Theorie der Schwerkraft im Rahmen der ursprünglichen Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie”, *Inaugural Dissertation*, Berlin, (1914); **and** “Über die prinzipielle Bestimmbarkeit der berechtigten Bezugssysteme beliebiger Relativitätstheorien”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 48, (1915), pp. 907-942, 943-; **and** “Über den physikalischen Sinn der Relativitäts-Postulat, A. Einsteins neue und seine ursprüngliche Relativitätstheorie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 53, (1917), pp. 575-614. Cf. D. Howard and J. Norton, “Out of the Labyrinth? Einstein, Hertz, and the Göttingen Answer to the Hole Argument”, J. Earman, et al. Editors, *The Attraction of Gravitation. New Studies in the History of General Relativity*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (1993), pp. 30-62.

3190. L. Kronecker, “Ueber Systeme von Functionen mehrerer Variablen”, *Monatsberichte der Königlich Preussische Akademie des Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, Part 1, (March, 1869); Part 2, (August, 1869).

3191. G. Lamé, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 14, (January 3, 1842), p. 37; **and** *Leçons sur la Théorie Mathématique de l’Élasticité des Corps Solides*, Bachelier, Paris, (1852), Lesson 1, p. 2; Lesson 24, Section 131, pp. 327-328, Section 134, 332-335.

3192. E. Lamla, “Über die Hydrodynamik des Relativitätsprinzip”, *Dissertation*, Berlin, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 37, (1912), p. 772.

3193. F. A. Lange, *Logische Studien: Ein Beitrag zur Neubegründung der formalen Logik und der Erkenntnistheorie*, J. Baedeker, Iserlohn, (1877).

3194. Lange introduced the term “Inertialsystem” and defined the concept: L. Lange, “Über die wissenschaftliche Fassung der Galilei’schen Beharrungsgesetzes”, *Philosophische Studien*, Volume 2, (1885), pp. 266-297, 539-545; **and** “Ueber das Beharrungsgesetz”, *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, mathematisch-physische Classe*, Volume 37, (1885), pp. 333-351; **and** *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Bewegungsbegriffes und ihr voraussichtliches Endergebniss. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Kritik der mechanischen Principien von Ludwig Lange*, Wilhelm Engelmann, Leipzig, (1886); **and** “Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Bewegungsbegriffes und ihr voraussichtliches Endergebniss”, *Philosophische Studien*, Volume 3, (1886), pp. 337-419, 643-691; **and** “Das Inertialsystem vor dem Forum der Naturforschung: Kritisches und Antikritisches”, *Philosophische Studien*, Volume 20, (1902), pp. 1-71; **and** *Das Inertialsystem vor dem Forum der Naturforschung*, Wilhelm Engelmann, Leipzig, (1902); **and** “Mein Verhältnis zu Einstein’s Weltbild” (“My Relationship to Einstein’s Conception of the World”), *Psychiatrisch-neurologische Wochenschrift*, Volume 24, (1922), pp. 116, 154-156, 168-172, 179-182, 188-190, 201-207.

For references to Lange, and analysis of his work, see: B. Thüring, “Fundamental-System und Inertial-System”, *Methodos; rivista trimestrale di metodologia e di logica simbolica*, Volume 2, (1950), pp. 263-283; **and** *Die Gravitation und die philosophischen Grundlagen der Physik*, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin, (1967), pp. 75-77, 234-240. **See also:** M. v. Laue, “Dr. Ludwig Lange”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 35, Number 7, (1948), pp. 193-196. **See also:** E. Mach, *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, (1960), pp. 291-297. **See also:** E. Gehrcke, *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 17, 30-34; **and** “Über den Sinn der Absoluten Bewegung von Körpern”, *Sitzungsberichten der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Volume 12, (1912), pp. 209-222; **and** “Über die Koordinatensystem der Mechanik”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 15, (1913), pp. 260-266. **See also:** H. Seeliger, “Kritisches Referat über Lange’s Arbeiten”, *Vierteljahrsschrift der Astronomischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 22, (1886), pp. 252-259; **and** “Über die sogenannte absolute Bewegung”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, (1906), Volume 36, pp. 85-137.

For Lange’s immediate predecessors, see: C. Neumann, *Ueber die Principien der Galilei-Newton’schen Theorie*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1870); “The Principles of the Galilean-Newtonian Theory”, *Science in Context*, Volume 6, (1993), pp. 355-368. **See also:** William Thomson and P. G. Tait, *Treatise on Natural Philosophy*, Volume 1, Part 1, §§§ 245, 249, 267, Cambridge University Press, (1879). **See also:** H. Streintz, *Die physikalischen Grundlagen der Mechanik*, B.G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1883). **See also:** James Thomson, “On the Law of Inertia; the Principle of Chronometry; and the Principle of Absolute Clinural Rest, and of Absolute Rotation”, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, Volume 12, (November 1883-July 1884), pp. 568-578; **and** “A Problem on Point-motions for Which a Reference-frame Can So Exist as to Have the Motions of the Points, Relative to It, Rectilinear and Mutually Proportional”, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, Volume 12, (November 1883-July 1884), pp. 730-742. **See also:** P. G. Tait, “Note on Reference Frames”, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, Volume 12, (November 1883-July 1884), pp. 743-745.

3195. P. S. Laplace, *Mécanique Céleste (Traité de Mécanique Céleste)*.

3196. J. Larmor, “A Dynamical Theory of the Electric and Luminiferous Medium”, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A*, Volume 185, (1894), pp. 719-

822; Volume 186, (1895), pp. 695-743; Volume 188, (1897), pp. 205-300; **and** “Dynamical Theory of the Ether I & II”, *Nature*, Volume 49, (11 January 1894), pp. 260-262; **and** (18 January 1894), pp. 280-283; **and** *Aether and Matter*, Cambridge University Press, (1900); **and** “On the Influence of Convection on Optical Rotary Polarization”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 4, (September, 1902), pp. 367-370; **and** “On the Intensity of the Natural Radiation from Moving Bodies and its Mechanical Reaction”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 7, (May, 1904), pp. 578-586; **and** “On the Ascertained Absence of Effects of Motion through the Æther, in Relation to the Constitution of Matter, and the FitzGerald-Lorentz Hypothesis”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 7, (June, 1904), pp. 621-625; **and** “Æther and Absolute Motion”, *Nature*, Volume 76, (18 July 1907), pp. 269-270; **and** *Nature*, Volume 97, (1916), pp. 321, 421; **and** *Nature*, Volume 99, (1917), pp. 44-45; **and** “Essence of Physical Relativity”, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Volume 4, (November, 1918).

3197. W. Lehmann, “Anfrage an die praktischen Astronomen wegen eines theoretischen Bedenkens die Beobachtungen Saturns gegen die Zeit seiner Quadrature betreffend”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 55, (1861), cols. 1, 65; **and** “Exakte Berechnung der Gauß’schen Konstanten k ”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 56, (1862), col. 321.

3198. R. Lehmann-Filhés, “Über die Bewegung der Planeten unter der Annahme einer sich nicht momentan fortpflanzenden Schwerkraft”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 110, (1884), col. 209-210; **and** “Über die Säkularstörungen der Länge des Mondes unter der Annahme einer sich nicht momentan fortpflanzenden Schwerkraft”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Volume 25, (1895), pp. 371-422.

3199. J. Lense, “Das Newton’sche Gesetz in nicht-euklidischen Räumen”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 126, (1917), pp. 1037-1063; **and** *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 206, (1918), col. 117; **and**, with H. Thirring, “Über den Einfluß der Eigenrotation der Zentralkörper auf die Bewegung der Planeten und Monde nach der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 19, (1918), pp. 156-163; **and** H. Thirring, “Über die Wirkung rotierender ferner Massen in der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 19, (1918), pp. 33-39.

3200. P. Leray, through Faye, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 69, (September 6, 1869), pp. 616-620.

3201. E. Le Roy and G. Vincent, “Sur la Méthode Mathématique”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 2, (1894), pp. 505-539, 676-708; **and** “Sur l’Idée de Nombre”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 4, (1896), pp. 738-755; **and** E. Le Roy, “Science et Philosophie”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 7, (1899), pp. 375-425, 503-562, 708-731; Volume 8, (1900), pp. 37-72; **and** “La Science Positive et les Philosophies de la Liberté”, *Bibliothèque du Congrès International de Philosophie*, Volume 1, A. Colin, Paris, (1900), pp. 313-341; **and** “Réponse à M. Couturat”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 8, (1900), pp. 223-233; **and** “Un Positivisme Nouveau”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 9, (1901), pp. 138-153; **and** “Sur Quelques Objections Adressées à la Nouvelle Philosophie”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 9, (1901), pp. 407-432; **and** “Sur la Logique de l’Invention”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 13, (1905), pp. 193-223; **and** “Qu’est-ce qu’un Dogme?”, *La Quinzaine*, Volume 63, (1905), pp. 495-526; **and** “Sur la Notion de Dogme. Réponse à M. l’Abbé Wehrlé”, *Revue Biblique*, Volume 3, (1906), pp. 9-38; **and** *Dogme et Critique*, Bloud, Paris, (1907); **and** *Une Philosophie Nouvelle*, Henri Bergson, F. Alcan, Paris, (1912); **and** “Qu’est-ce que la Philosophie?”, *Revue Bleue*, Volume 60, (1922), pp.

713-718; **and** “Les Principes Fondamentaux de l’Analyse Mathématique”, *Revue des Cours et Conférences*, Volume 25, (1923/24), pp. 385-393, 512-521, 592-601, 692-707; **and** *La Pensée Intuitive*, Boivin & Cie, Paris, (1929/1930); **and** “Continu et Discontinu dans la Matière. Le Problème du Morcelage”, *Cahiers de la Nouvelle Journée*, Paris, (1929); **and** “Ce que la Microphysique Apporte ou Suggère à la Philosophie”, *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Volume 42, (1935), pp. 151-184, 319-355; **and** “Physique et Philosophie. A Propos de quelques Paradoxes”, *Volume Jubilaire en l’Honneur de Monsieur Marcel Brillouin*, Paris, (1935); **and** “Les Paradoxes de la Relativité sur le Temps”, *Revue Philosophique*, Volume 123, (1937), pp. 10-47, 195-245; **and** “Un Enquête sur quelques Traits Majeurs de la Philosophie Bergsonnienne”, *Archives de Philosophie*, Volume 17, (1947), pp. 7-21; “Hommage à Henri Bergson”, *La Nef*, Number 32, (1947), pp. 47-50; **and** “Henri Poincaré et la Critique des Sciences”, *Congrès International de Philosophie des Sciences*, Paris, (1949); **and** *La Pensée Mathématique Pure*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, (1960).

3202. G. Ricci and T. Levi-Civita, “Méthodes de Calcul Différentiel Absolu et leurs Applications”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 54, (1901), pp. 125-201; **and** T. Levi-Civita, “Sulla Espressione Analitica Spettante al Tensore Gravitazionale nella Teoria di Einstein”, *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Rendiconti. Classe di scienze fisiche, matematiche e naturali* (Roma), Volume 26, I Semestre, (1917), pp. 381-391; **and** *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Rendiconti. Classe di scienze fisiche, matematiche e naturali* (Roma), Volume 26, I Semestre, (1917), p. 458; “Nozione di Parallelismo...”, *Rendiconti del Circolo matimatico di Palermo*, (1917), p. 173; *Revista d’Ottica e Meccanica*, Volume 1, (1920), p. 199. *See also*: “G. Ricci and T. Levi-Civita cited as Originators of ‘Tensor Analysis’, Making it Possible for Einstein to Develop His Theories”, *The New York Times*, (2 September 1936), p. 1.

3203. M. Lévy, “Sur l’Application des Lois Électrodynamiques au Mouvement des Planètes”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 110, (1890), pp. 545-551; **and** “Sur les Diverse Théories de l’Électricité”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 110, (1890), pp. 740-742; **and** “Observations sur le Principe des Aires”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 119, (1894), pp. 718-721.

3204. G. H. Lewes, *Problems of Life and Mind*, Series 1, Volume 2, Trübner & Co., London, (1875).

3205. H. Liebmann, *Nichteuklidische Geometrie*, G. J. Göschen, Leipzig, (1905/1912/1923), Sammlung Schubert 49, Numerous Editions; **and** “Die Kegelschnitte und die Planetenbewegung im nichteuklidischen Raum”, *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, mathematisch-physische Classe*, Volume 54, (1902), pp. 393-423; **and** “Über die Zweideutigkeit des Potentials im elliptischen gegenüber dem im sphärischen Raume”, *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, mathematisch-physische Classe*, Volume 54, (1902).

3206. A. Liénard, “Champ électrique et magnétique produit par une charge concentrée en un point et animée d’un mouvement quelconque / La Théorie de Lorentz et celle de Larmor”, *L’Éclairage Électrique*, Volume 16, (1898), pp. 5, 53, 106, 320-334, 360-365.

3207. O. Liman, Inaugural Dissertation, Halle, (1886).

3208. F. A. Lindemann, “Ueber unendlich kleine Bewegungen und über Kraftsysteme bei allgemeiner projectivischer Massbestimmung”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 7, (1874), pp. 56-144; **and** “Über Molekular-Physik. Versuch einer einheitlichen dynamischen Behandlung der physikalische und chemischen Kräfte”, *Schriften der*

Physikalisch-ökonomischen Gesellschaft zu Königsberg, Volume 29, (1888), pp. 31-81; **and** the notations by Ferdinand and Lisbeth Lindemann in their German translation, *Wissenschaft und Hypothese*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1904), of Poincaré's *La Science et l'Hypothèse*; **and** F. A. Lindemann and A. Magnus, "Über die Abhängigkeit der spezifischen Wärme fester Körper von der Temperatur", *Zeitschrift für Elektrochemie und angewandte physikalische Chemie*, Volume 16, (1910), pp. 269-279; **and** F. A. Lindemann, "Über die Berechnung molekularer Eigenfrequenzen", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 609-612; **and** F. A. Lindemann and W. Nernst, "Spezifische Wärme und Quantentheorie", *Zeitschrift für Elektrochemie und angewandte physikalische Chemie*, Volume 17, (1911), pp. 817-827; **and** F. A. Lindemann and W. Nernst, "Untersuchungen über die spezifische Wärme bei tiefen Temperaturen", *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1911), pp. 494-501; **and** *Nature*, Volume 95, (1915), pp. 203-204, 372; **and** F. A. Lindemann, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 77, (1916), p. 140; **and** F. A. Lindemann, *The Observatory*, Volume 41, (1918), p. 323; **and** F. A. Lindemann and C. V. Burton, *Nature*, Volume 98, (1917), p. 349.

3209. J. Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*.

3210. H. A. Lorentz, "Considerations on Gravitation", *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 2, (1900), pp. 559-574; **and** *Abhandlungen über theoretische Physik*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1907), Numbers 14, 17-20; **and** "Alte und neue Fragen der Physik", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 1234-1257; *reprinted, in part, as*: "Das Relativitätsprinzip und seine Anwendung auf einige besondere physikalische Erscheinungen", *Das Relativitätsprinzip: eine Sammlung von Abhandlungen*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1913), pp. 74-89; **and** "La Gravitation", *Scientia*, Volume 16, (1914), pp. 28-59; **and** *Het Relativiteitsbeginsel; drie Voordrachten Gehouden in Teyler's Stifting*, Erven Loosjes, Haarlem, (1913); *Archives du Musée Teyler*, Series 3, Volume 2, (1914), pp. 1-60; German translation: *Das Relativitätsprinzip. Drei Vorlesungen gehalten in Teylers Stifting zu Haarlem*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, Berlin, (1914/1920); **and** "Het beginsel van Hamilton in Einstein's Theorie der Zwaartekracht", *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 23, (1915), pp. 1073-1089; English translation, "On Hamilton's Principle in Einstein's Theory of Gravitation", *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 19, (1916/1917), pp. 751-765; **and** "Over Einstein's Theorie der Zwaartekracht. I, II, & III", *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 24, (1916), pp. 1389-1402, 1759-1774; Volume 25, (1916), pp. 468-486; English translation, "On Einstein's Theory of Gravitation. I, II & III", *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 19, (1917), pp. 1341-1354, 1354-1369; Volume 20, (1917), pp. 2-19; **and** "Dutch Colleague Explains Einstein", *The New York Times*, (21 December 1919), p. 1.

3211. H. Lotze, *Metaphysik*, Weidmann, Leipzig, (1841), *Metaphysik, drei Bücher der Ontologie, Kosmologie und Psychologie*, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1879); English translation by B. Bosanquet, *Metaphysic: In Three Books, Ontology, Cosmology, and Psychology*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, (1884); **and** *Mikrokosmos : Ideen zur Naturgeschichte und Geschichte der Menschheit: Versuch einer Anthropologie*, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1885-1896); English translation by E. Hamilton and E. E. C. Jones, *Microcosmos: An Essay Concerning Man and His Relation to the World*, Scribner & Welford, New York, (1885); Italian translation, *Microcosmo. Idee sulla Storia Naturale e sulla Storia dell'Umanità. Saggio d'Antropologia*, Mattei, Speroni & c., Pavia, (1911-1916).

- 3212.** A. E. H. Love, *Nature*, Volume 51, (1894), pp. 105, 153, 198; *see also*: p. 271.
- 3213.** J. G. MacGregor, “On the Fundamental Hypotheses of Abstract Dynamics”, *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, Volume 10, (1892), p. 3; **and** “On the Hypotheses of Dynamics”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 36, (1893), pp. 233-264; “On the Definition of Work Done”, *Proceedings and Transactions of the Nova Scotian Institute of Science*, Series 2, Volume 1, pp. 460-464.
- 3214.** E. Mach, “Zur Theorie der Pulswellenzeichner”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 47, (1863), pp. 43-48; **and** “Zur Theorie des Gehororgans”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 48; unaltered reprint, *Zur Theorie des Gehororgans*, J. G. Calve, Prag, (1872); **and** “Untersuchungen über den Zeitsinn des Ohres”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 51, (1865), pp. 133-150; *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik vormals Fichte-Ulricische Zeitschrift*, (1866); **and** *Zwei populäre Vorträge über Optik*, Leuschner & Lubensky, Graz, (1867); **and** “Mach’s Vorlesungs-Apparate”, *Repertorium für Experimental-Physik, für physikalische Technik, mathematische & astronomische Instrumentenkunde*, Volume 4, (1868), pp. 8-9; **and** *Die Geschichte und die Wurzel des Satzes von der Erhaltung der Arbeit*, J. G. Calve, Prag, (1872); English translation by Philip E. B. Jourdain, *History and Root of the Principle of the Conservation of Energy*, Open Court, Chicago, 1911; **and** “Resultate einer Untersuchung zur Geschichte der Physik”, *Lotos. Zeitschrift für Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 23, (1873), pp. 189-191; **and** *Grundlinien der Lehre von den Bewegungsempfindungen*, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1875); **and** “Neue Versuche zur Prüfung der Doppler’schen Theorie der Ton- und Farbenänderung durch Bewegung”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 77, (1878), pp. 299-310; **and** *Die ökonomische Natur der physikalischen Forschung*, Wien, (1882); **and** *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwicklung historisch-kritisch dargestellt*, F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig, (1883 and multiple revised editions, thereafter); Translated into English as *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, La Salle, (numerous editions); **and** *Über Umbildung und Anpassung im naturwissenschaftlichen Denken*, Wien, (1884); **and** *Beiträge zur Analyse der Empfindungen*, G. Fischer, Jena, (1886); English translation by C. M. Williams, *Contributions to the Analysis of the Sensations*, Open Court, Chicago, (1897); **and** *Der relative Bildungswert der philologischen und der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Unterrichtsfächer*, Prag, (1886); **and** “Über den Unterricht in der Wärmelehre”, *Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 1, (1887), pp. 3-7; **and** “Über das psychologische und logische Moment im naturwissenschaftlichen Unterricht”, *Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 4, (1890), pp. 1-5; **and** “Some Questions of Psycho-Physics”, *The Monist*, Volume 1, (1891), pp. 394-400; **and** *Populär-wissenschaftliche Vorlesungen*, 4th Expanded Edition, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1896/1910); English translation of initial lectures by Thomas McCormack, *Popular Scientific Lectures*, Open Court, Chicago, (1895); **and** *Die Principien der Wärmelehre: Historisch-kritisch entwickelt*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1896); *Principles of the theory of heat: historically and critically elucidated*, Dordrecht, Boston, (1986); **and** “Über Gedankenexperimente.” *Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 10, (1896), pp. 1-5; **and** “On the Stereoscopic Application of Roentgen’s Rays”, *The Monist*, Volume 6, (1896), pp. 321-323; **and** “Durchsicht-Stereoskopbilder mit Röntgenstrahlen.” *Zeitschrift für Elektrotechnik*, Volume

14, (1896), pp. 359-361; **and** “The Notion of a Continuum”, *The Open Court*, Volume 14, (1900), pp. 409-414; **and** *Erkenntnis und Irrtum: Skizzen zur Psychologie der Forschung*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1905); **and** *Space and Geometry in the Light of Physiological, Psychological and Physical Inquiry*, English translation by Thomas J. McCormack, Open Court, Chicago, (1906); **and** “Die Leitgedanken meiner naturwissenschaftlichen Erkenntnislehre und ihre Aufnahme durch die Zeitgenossen”, *Scientia: Revista di Scienza*, Volume 7, Number 14, (1910), p. 2; *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 599-606; **and** *Die Analyse der Empfindungen und das Verhältnis des Physischen zum Psychischen*, 6th Expanded Edition, G. Fischer, Jena, (1911); English translation by C.M. Williams, *The Analysis of Sensations, and the Relation of the Physical to the Psychical*, Open Court, Chicago, (1914); **and** *Kultur und Mechanik*, Stuttgart, (1915); **and** *Die Leitgedanken meiner naturwissenschaftlichen Erkenntnislehre und ihre Aufnahme durch die Zeitgenossen. Sinnliche Elemente und naturwissenschaftliche Begriffe*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1919); **and** *Die Prinzipien der physikalischen Optik: Historisch und erkenntnispsychologisch entwickelt*, J.A. Barth, Leipzig, (1921); *The Principles of Physical Optics: An Historical and Philosophical Treatment*, English translated by John S. Anderson, Methuen & Co., London, (1926).

3215. J. R. Mayer, *Annalen der Chemie und Pharmacie*, Volume 42, (1842), p. 233; English translation, “Remarks on the Forces of Inorganic Nature”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 4, Volume 24, (1862), p. 371; **and** “Remarks on the Forces of Inorganic Nature”, “On Celestial Dynamics”, and “Remarks on the Mechanical Equivalent of Heat”, *The Correlation and Conservation of Forces*, D. Appleton, New York, (1867), pp. 251-355; **and** *Die Mechanik der Wärme in gesammelten Schriften*, J. G. Cotta, Stuttgart, (1893); **and** *Kleinere Schriften und Briefe von Robert Mayer*, J. G. Cotta, Stuttgart, (1893); **and** “Die Mechanik der Wärme”, *Ostwald’s Klassiker Nr. 180*, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1911). *See also*: E. K. Dühring, *Kritische Geschichte der allgemeinen Principien der Mechanik*, Multiple Editions; **and** *Neue Grundgesetze zur rationalen Physik und Chemie*, Fues’s Verlag (R. Reisland), Leipzig, (1878-1886); **and** *Robert Mayer, der Galilei des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, E. Schmeitzner, Chemnitz, (1880-1895).

3216. Mehler, “Ueber die Benutzung einer vierfachen Mannigfaltigkeit zur Ableitung orthogonaler Flächensysteme”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, Volume 84, (1877), pp. 219-230.

3217. R. Mehmke, “Ueber die Bestimmung von Trägheitsmomenten mit Hülfe Grassmann’scher Methoden”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 23, (1884), pp. 143-151; **and** “Ueber die darstellende Geometrie der Räume von vier und mehr Dimensionen, mit Anwendungen auf die graphische Mechanik, die graphische Lösung von Systemen numerischer Gleichungen und auf Chemie”, *Mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Mitteilungen* (Stuttgart, Württemberg), Series 2, Volume 6, (1904), pp. 44-54; **and** “Über Trägheitsmomente und Momente beliebiger Ordnung in Räumen beliebig hoher Stufe”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 13, (1905), pp. 630-634; English translation, “On Moments of Inertia and Moments of an Arbitrary Order in Spaces of Arbitrary High Rank”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 7, (1905), pp. 595-599.

3218. R. Mewes, “Das Wesen der Materie und des Naturerkennens”, *Zeitschrift für Luftschiffahrt*, Volume 8, Number 7, (1889), pp. 158-162, at 160. *See also*: “Über die Ableitung des Weberschen Grundgesetzes aus dem Dopplerschen Prinzip”, *Physik des Äthers*, Part 1, (1892), pp. 1-3, Part 2, (1894), pp. 13-16, 18-19, 33. These are reprinted in part in “Wissenschaftliche Begründung der Raumzeitlehre oder Relativitätstheorie (1884-

1894) mit einem geschichtlichen Anhang”, *Gesammelte Arbeiten von Rudolf Mewes*, Volume 1, Rudolf Mewes, Berlin, (1920), pp. 25-33, 36-47; **and** *Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Schwerkraftstrahlen und deren Wirkungsgesetze*, Fischer’s Technologischer Verlag, second edition, (1896); **and** “Eine Ableitung der Grundformen der Relativitätstheorie”, *Zeitschrift für Sauerstoff- und Stickstoff-Industrie*, Volume 12, (1920), p. 6; **and** “Lenards und Reuterdahls Stellungnahmen zur Relativitätstheorie” *Zeitschrift für Sauerstoff- und Stickstoff-Industrie*, Volume 13, Number 17/18, (September, 1921), pp. 77-78; **and** *Wissenschaftliche Begründung der Raum-Zeitlehre oder Relativitätstheorie (1884-1894) mit einem geschichtlichen Anhang*, Rudolf Mewes, Berlin, (1920/1921). **See also:** “Unterschiede zwischen den Relativitätstheorien von Mewes (1892-1893) und Lorentz (1895)”, *Zeitschrift für Sauerstoff- und Stickstoff-Industrie*, Volume 11, (1919), pp. 70, 75-76. **See also:** “Lights all Askew in the Heavens”, *The New York Times*, (9 November 1919).

3219. G. Mie, “Entwurf einer allgemeinen Theorie der Energieübertragung”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 107, (1898), pp. 1113-1182; **and** “Grundlagen einer Theorie der Materie. I”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 37, (1912), pp. 511-534; **and** “Grundlagen einer Theorie der Materie. II”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 39, (1913), pp. 1-40; **and** “Grundlagen einer Theorie der Materie. III”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 40, (1913), p. 1-66, especially 25-63; **and** “Bemerkungen zu der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 15, (1914), pp. 115-122, 169-176, 263; **and** *Arbeiten aus den Gebieten der Physik, Mathematik, Chemie. Festschrift Julius Elster und Hans Geitel zum sechzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern. Mit 149 Abbildungen im Text und auf Tafeln sowie 5 Taellen.*, F. Vieweg, Braunschweig, (1915), pp. 251-268.

3220. H. Minkowski, “Das Relativitätsprinzip”, Lecture of 5 November 1907, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 47, (1915), pp. 927-938; **and** “Relativitätsprinzip”, *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 24, (1915), pp. 1241-1244; **and** “Die Grundgleichungen für die elektromagnetischen Vorgänge in bewegten Körpern”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1908), pp. 53-111; reprinted *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 68, (1910), pp. 472-525; reprinted *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, Volume 2, D. Hilbert, Editor, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1911), pp. 352-404; **and** “Raum und Zeit”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 10, (1909), pp. 104-111; reprinted *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, Volume 2, D. Hilbert, Editor, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1911), pp. 431-444; **and** “Raum und Zeit”, With notes by A. Sommerfeld, *Das Relativitätsprinzip: eine Sammlung von Abhandlungen*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1913), pp. 56-73; **and** “Eine Ableitung der Grundgleichungen für die elektromagnetischen Vorgänge in bewegten Körpern vom Standpunkte der Elektronentheorie”, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 68, (1910), pp. 526-551; reprinted *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, Volume 2, D. Hilbert, Editor, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1911), pp. 405-430; **and** *Zwei Abhandlungen über die Grundgleichungen der Elektrodynamik*, Berlin, Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, (1910). English translations of some of Minkowski’s works are found in: *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952); **and** *The Principle of Relativity; Original Papers by A. Einstein and H. Minkowski, Tr. into English by M. N. Saha and S. N. Bose. . . with a Historical Introduction by P. C. Mahalanobis*, University of Calcutta, Calcutta, (1920).

3221. O. F. Mossotti, *Sur les Forces qui Régissent la Constitution Intérieure des Corps Aperçu pour Servir à la Détermination de la Cause et des Lois de l’Action Moléculaire*, par O.F. Mossotti, De l’Imprimerie Royale, Turin, (1836); appears in Zöllner’s *Erklärung der universellen Gravitation aus den statischen Wirkungen der Elektrizität und die allgemeine*

Bedeutung des Weber'schen Gesetzes, von Friedrich Zöllner... Mit Beiträgen von Wilhelm Weber nebst einem vollständigen Abdruck der Originalabhandlung: Sur les Forces qui Régissent la Constitution Intérieure des Corps Aperçu pour Servir à la Détermination de la Cause et des Lois de l'Action Moléculaire, par O.F. Mossotti. Mit dem Bildnisse Newton's in Stahlstich, L. Staackmann, Leipzig, (1882); English translation: "On the Forces which Regulate the Internal Constitution of Bodies", *Scientific Memoirs, Selected from the Transactions of Foreign Academies of Science and Learned Societies, and from Foreign Journals*, Volume 1, (1837), pp. 448-469; reprinted by Johnson Reprint Corp., New York, (1966).

3222. Most, *Neue Darlegung der absoluten Geometrie und Mechanik mit Berücksichtigung der Frage nach den Grenzen des Weltraums*, Programmabhandlung, Koblenz, (1883).

3223. K. v. Mosengeil, Dissertation, Berlin, (1906); **and** "Theorie der stationären Strahlung in einem gleichförmig bewegten Hohlraum", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 22, (1907), pp. 867-904. Mosengeil was Planck's student. **See also:** *Theorie der Elektrizität*, Volume 2, Second Edition, p. 44.

3224. A. Müller, "Das Problem des absoluten Raumes und seine Beziehung zum allgemeinen Raumproblem", *Die Wissenschaft*, Volume 39, Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, (1911).

3225. A. Nagy, "Sulla Recente Questione Intorno alle Dimensioni dello Spazio", *Rivista Italiana di Filosofia*, Volume 5, (1890), pp. 120-151; **and** "Über das Jevons-Clifford'sche Problem", *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, Volume 5, (1894), pp. 331-345.

3226. C. Neumann, *Das Dirichlet'sche Princip in seiner Anwendung auf die Riemann'schen Flächen*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1865); **and** *Principien der Elektrodynamik*, Bonn University Festschrift, (1868); **and** "Resultate einer Untersuchung über die Principien der Elektrodynamik", *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1868), pp. 223-235; **and** Discussion with Clausius, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 135, (1868); **and** *Ueber die Principien der Galilei-Newton'schen Theorie*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1870); "The Principles of the Galilean-Newtonian Theory", *Science in Context*, Volume 6, (1993), pp. 355-368; **and** *Abhandlungen der mathematisch-physische Classe der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Volume 26, (1874), p. 97; **and** "Über die den Kräften elektrodynamischen Ursprungs zuzuschreibenden Elementargesetze", *Abhandlungen der mathematisch-physische Classe der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Volume 10, (1874), pp. 417-524; **and** *Untersuchungen über das logarithmische und Newton'sche Potential*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1877); **and** "Ausdehnung der Kepler'schen Gesetze auf den Fall, dass die Bewegung auf einer Kugeloberfläche stattfindet", *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Volume 38, (1886), pp. 1-2; **and** *Allgemeine Untersuchungen über das Newton'sche Princip der Fernwirkungen mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die elektrischen Wirkungen*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1896), Pauli cites p. 1, in particular; Oppenheim cites Chapter 8. Whittaker cites: *Festschrift Ludwig Boltzmann gewidmet zum sechzigsten geburtstage 20. februar 1904. Mit einem Portrait, 101 Abbildungen im Text und 2 Tafeln*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1904), p. 252; **and** Mach cites: *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, 1910, III.

3227. S. Newcomb, "On the Supposed intra-Mercurial Planets", *The Astronomical Journal*, Volume 6, (1860), pp. 162-163; **and** "Über Dr. Lehmann's Neubestimmung der Gauß'schen Konstanten", *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 57, (1862), col. 65; **and** "On Hansen's Theory of the Physical Constitution of the Moon", *American Journal of Science*, Series 2,

Volume 46, (1868), pp. 376-378; **and** “On the Lunar Equation in the Heliocentric Motion of the Earth”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 132, Number 3155, cols.11-12; **and** “Elementary Theorems Relating to the Geometry of a Space of Three Dimensions and of Uniform Positive Curvature in the Fourth Dimension”, *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelle’s/Borchardt’s Journal)*, Volume 83, (1877), pp. 293-299; **and** “Note on a Class of Transformations Which Surfaces May Undergo in Space of More than Three Dimensions”, *American Journal of Mathematics*, Volume 1, (1878), pp. 1-4; **and** “Discussion and Results of Observations on Transits of Mercury from 1677-1881”, *Astronomical Papers Prepared for the Use of the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac*, Washington, Volume 1, (1882), pp. 363-487; **and** “A Generalized Theory of the Combination of Observations so as to Obtain the Best Result”, *American Journal of Mathematics*, Volume 8, (1886), pp. 343-366; **and** “On the Fundamental Concepts of Physics”, *Bulletin of the Washington Philosophical Society*, Volume 11, (1888/1891), pp. 514-515; **and** “Modern Mathematical Thought”, *Bulletin of the New York Mathematical Society*, Volume 3, Number 4, (January, 1894), pp. 95-107; **and** “On the Elements of (33) Polyhmnia and the Mass of Jupiter”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 136, (1894), col. 130; **and** “The Elements of the Four Inner Planets and the Fundamental Constants of Astronomy”, *Supplement to the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac for 1897*, Washington, (U.S.) Government Printing Office, (1895); **and** *Astronomical Papers Prepared for the Use of the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac*, Volume 6, (U.S.) Government Printing Office, Washington, (1898); **and** “The Philosophy of Hyperspace”, *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 4, Number 5, (February, 1898), pp. 187-195; *Science*, Volume 7, (1898), pp. 1-7; **and** “Is the Airship Coming?”, *McClure’s Magazine*, Volume 17, (September, 1901), pp. 432-435; **and** “The Fairyland of Geometry”, *Harper’s Magazine*, Volume 104, Number 620, (January, 1902), pp. 249-252; **and** *Reminiscences of an Astronomer*, Harper, London, (1903); **and** “On the Position of the Galactic and other Principal Planes Toward which the Stars Tend to Crowd”, *Carnegie Institute of Washington Contributions to Stellar Statistics*, Number 10, (1904); **and** “An Observation of the Zodiacal Light to the North of the Sun”, *The Astronomical Journal*, Volume 25, (1905), pp. 209-212; **and** *Sidelights on Astronomy*, New York, (1906); **and** “A Search for Fluctuations in the Sun’s Thermal Radiation Through Their Influence on Terrestrial Temperature”, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, New Series, Volume 21, (1908), pp. 309-387; **and** “La Théorie du Mouvement de la Lune”, *Revue Générale des Sciences Pures et Appliquées*, Volume 19, (1908), pp. 686-691; **and**, “Mercury”, *The Encyclopædia Britannica*, Eleventh Edition, Volume 18, (1910-1911), p. 155; **and** “Researches in the Motion of the Moon”, *Astronomical Papers Prepared for the Use of the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac*, Volume 9, (U.S.) Government Printing Office, Washington, (1912); **See also:** E. Grossmann, “Die Bewegung des Mercurperihels nach Arbeiten Newcombs”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 214, (1921), cols. 41-54; **and** F. E. Brasch, “Einstein’s Appreciation of Simon Newcomb”, *Science*, Volume 69, pp. 248-249.

For a bibliography of Newcomb’s works, see: R. C. Archibald, *Biographical Memoirs. National Academy of Sciences*, Volume 17, (1924), pp. 19-69.

3228. E. Noble, “The Relational Element in Monism”, *The Monist*, Volume 15, Number 3, (1905), pp. 321-337. *See also:* *The New York Times*, 28 May 1921, p. 8.

3229. E. Noether, “Invariante Variationsprobleme”, *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, (1918), pp. 235-257; English translation by M. A. Tavel appears in “Invariant Variation Problems”, *Transport Theory and Statistical Mechanics*, Volume 1, Number 3, (1971), pp. 183-207 (This was

republished on the internet).

3230. F. Noether, “Zur Kinematik des starren Körpers in der Relativtheorie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 31, (1910), pp. 919-944.

3231. M. Noether, “Zur Theorie der algebraischen Functionen mehrerer complexer Variablen”, *Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1869).

3232. G. Nordström, “Grunddragen af Elektricitetsteoriernas Utveckling”, *Teknikern*, (1906), p. 16; **and** “Überführungszahl konzentrierter Kalilauge”, *Zeitschrift für Electrochemie und angewandte physikalische Chemie*, Volume 13, (1907), p. 35; **and** *Die Energiegleichung für das elektromagnetische Feld bewegter Körper*, Väitöskirja, Helsinki, (1908); **and** “Über die Ableitung des Satzes vom retardierten Potential”, *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar, A, Matematik och Naturvetenskaper*, Volume 51, Number 6, (1909); **and** “Rum och tid enligt Einstein och Minkowski”, *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar, A, Matematik och Naturvetenskaper*, Volume 52, Number 6, (1909); **and** “Zur Elektrodynamik Minkowskis”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 10, (1909), p. 681; **and** “Zur elektromagnetischen Mechanik”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), p. 440; **and** “Zur Relativitätsmechanik deformierbarer Körper”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 12, (1912), p. 854; **and** “Till den Elementära Teorin för Snurran”, *Teknikern*, Volume 22, (1912), p. 141; **and** “Relativitätsprinzip und Gravitation”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 13, (November, 1912), pp. 1126-1129; **and** “Träge und schwere Masse in der Relativitätsmechanik”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 40, (April, 1913), pp. 856-878; **and** “Zur Theorie der Gravitation vom Standpunkt des Relativitätsprinzips”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 42, (October, 1913), pp. 533-554; **and** “Die Fallgesetze und Planetenbewegung in der Relativitätstheorie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 43, (1914), pp. 1101-1110; **and** “Über den Energiesatz in der Gravitationstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 15, (1914), p. 375; **and** “Über die Möglichkeit das elektromagnetische Feld und das Gravitationsfeld zu vereinigen”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 15, (1914), p. 504; **and** “Zur Elektrizitäts- und Gravitationstheorie”, *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar, A, Matematik och Naturvetenskaper*, Volume 57, Number 4, (1914); **and** “R. C. Tolmans ‘Prinzip der Ähnlichkeit’ und die Gravitation”, *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar, A, Matematik och Naturvetenskaper*, Volume 57, Number 22, (1914/1915); **and** “Über eine mögliche Grundlage einer Theorie der Materie”, *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar, A, Matematik och Naturvetenskaper*, Volume 57, Number 28, (1915); **and** “Die Mechanik deformierbarer Körper und die Gravitation”, *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar, A, Matematik och Naturvetenskaper*, Volume 58, Number 20, (1916); **and** “Undersökning av Källvattens Radioaktivitet”, *Öfversigt af Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar, A, Matematik och Naturvetenskaper*, Volume 59, Number 4, (1916); **and** “Die Mechanik der Continua in der Gravitationstheorie von Einstein”, *Handelingen van het Nederlandsch Natuur- en Geneeskundig Congres*, Volume 16, (1917); **and** “De Gravitatiethorie van Einstein en de Mechanica der Continua van Herglotz”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 25, (1916/1917), pp. 836-843; English version, “Einstein’s Theory of Gravitation and Herglotz’s Mechanics of Continua”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Section of Sciences, Proceedings*, Volume 19, (1916/1917), pp. 884-891; **and** *Teorien för Elektriciteten, i Korshet Framställd*, A. Bonnier, Stockholm, (1917); **and** “Iets Over de Massa van een Stoffelijk Stelsel Volgens de Gravitatiethorie van Einstein”, *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 26,

(1917/1918), pp. 1093-1108; English version, "On the Mass of a Material System According to the Gravitation Theory of Einstein", *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Section of Sciences, Proceedings*, Volume 20, (1917/1918), pp. 1076-1091; **and** "Een an Ander Over de Energie van het Zwaartekrachtsveld Volgens de Theorie van Einstein", *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 26, (1917/1918), pp. 1201-1208; English version, "On the Energy of the Gravitation Field in Einstein's Theory", *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Section of Sciences, Proceedings*, Volume 20, (1917/1918), pp. 1238-1245; **and** "Berekening voor eenige Bijzondere Gevallen Volgens de Gravitatiethorie van Einstein", *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 26, (1917/1918), pp. 1577-1589; English version, "Calculations of some Special Cases in Einstein's Theory of Gravitation", *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Section of Sciences, Proceedings*, Volume 21, (1918/1919), pp. 68-79; **and** "Opmerking over het Niet-uitstralen van een Overeenkomstig Kwantenvoorwaarden Bewegende Elektrische Lading", *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 28, (1919); "Note on the Circumstance that an Electric Charge Moving in Accordance with Quantum Conditions does not Radiate", *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Section of Sciences, Proceedings*, Volume 22, (1920), p. 145; **and** "Eräitä relativiteettiperiaatteen seurauksia", *Teknillinen Aikakauslehti*, Volume 11, (1920), p. 325; **and** *Grunderna av den Tekniska Termodynamiken*, Helsingfors, (1922); **and** "Über das Prinzip von Hamilton für materielle Körper in der allgemeiner Relativitätstheorie", *Commentationes physico-mathematicae Societas Scientiarum Fennica*, Volume 1, (1923), p. 33; **and** "Über die kanonischen Bewegungsgleichungen des Elektrons in einem beliebigen elektromagnetischen Felde", *Commentationes physico-mathematicae Societas Scientiarum Fennica*, Volume 1, (1923), p. 43.

3233. S. Oppenheim, *Die bahn des periodischen kometen 1886 IV (Brooks)*, K. K. Hof-buchlandlung W. Frick, Wien, (1891); **and** "Zur Frage nach der Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation", *Jahresbericht über das K K Akademische Gymnasium in Wien für das Schuljahr 1894/95*, Wien, (1895), pp. 3-28; see Höfler's response: *Vierteljahrsberichte des Wiener Vereins zur Förderung des physikalischen und chemischen Unterrichtes*, Volume 1, Number 3, (1896), pp. 103-105; **and** *Kritik des Newton'schen Gravitationsgesetzes; mit einem Beitrag: Gravitation und Relativitätstheorie von F. Kottler*, Deutsche Staatsrealschule in Karolinenthal, Prag, (1903); **and** *Das astronomische Weltbild im Wandel der Zeit*, B.G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1906/multiple later editions); **and** *Die gleichgewichtsfiguren rotierender Flüssigkeitsmassen und die Gestalt der Himmelskörper*, A. Haase, Prag, (1907); **and** *Probleme der Modernen Astronomie*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1911); **and** *Über die Eigenbewegungen der Fixsterne; Kritik der Zweischwarmhypothese*, Wien, (1912); **and** "Zur Frage nach der Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 53, (1917), pp. 163-168; **and** *Statistische Untersuchungen über die Bewegung der kleinen Planeten*, (1921); **and** *Astronomie*, B.G. Teubner, Leipzig, Berlin, (1921); **and** *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, 6, 2, 22. **See also:** H. Gylden, *Hülfsstafeln zur Berechnung der Hauptungleichheiten in den absoluten Bewegungstheorien der kleinen Planeten. Unter Mitwirkung von Dr. S. Oppenheim Hrsg. von Hugo Gylden*, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1896).

3234. T. Oppolzer, *Lehrbuch zur Bahnbestimmung der Kometen und Planeten*, Multiple Editions; **and** "Elements des Vulcans", *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 94, cols. 97-99, 303-304. **See also:** W. Klinkerfues, *Theoretische Astronomie*, Third Enlarged and Improved

Edition, F. Vieweg, Braunschweig, (1912).

3235. E. D'Ovidio, "Studio sulla Geometria Proiettiva", *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*, Series 2, Volume 6, 72-101.

3236. G. Pavanini, "Prime Conseguenze d'una Recente Teoria della Gravitazione", *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Rendiconti. Classe di Scienze Fisiche, Matematiche e Naturali*, Series 5, Volume 21, Number 2, (1912), pp. 648-655; **and** "Prime Conseguenze d'una Recente Teoria della Gravitazione. Le Disuguaglianze Secolari", *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Rendiconti. Classe di Scienze Fisiche, Matematiche e Naturali*, Series 5, Volume 22, Number 1, 369-376.

3237. T. H. Pasley, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy on Mechanical Principles Divested of all Immaterial Chymical Properties, Showing for the First Time the Physical Cause of Continuous Motion*, Whittaker & Co., London, (1836).

3238. K. Pearson, "On the Motion of Spherical and Ellipsoidal Bodies in Fluid Media", *Quarterly Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, Volume 20, (1885), pp. 60-80, 184-211; **and** "On a Certain Atomic Hypothesis", *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Volume 14, (1889), pp. 71-120; **and** "On a Certain Atomic Hypothesis", *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, Volume 20, (1888), pp. 38-63; **and** "Ether Squirts", *American Journal of Mathematics*, Volume 13, (1891), 309-362; **and** *The Grammar of Science*, Second Edition, Adam and Charles Black, London, (1900), throughout, but especially pp. 533-537; **and** the Third Edition of *The Grammar of Science*, (1911), throughout, but especially pp. 355-387.

3239. J. Petzoldt, "Maxima, Minima und Oekonomie", *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie*, (1890), reprinted Altenburg, (1891); **and** "Das Gesetz der Eindeutigkeit", *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie*, (1894), p. 196; **and** *Einführung in die Philosophie der reinen Erfahrung*; Volume 1, "Die Bestimmtheit der Seele", (1900); Volume 2, "Auf dem Wege zum Dauernden", B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1904); **and** *Das Weltproblem von positivistischem Standpunkte aus*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1906); **and** "Die Gebiete der absoluten and der relativen Bewegung", *Annalen der Naturphilosophie*, Volume 7, (1908), pp. 29-62; **and** *Das Weltproblem vom Standpunkte des relativistischen Positivismus aus, historisch-kritisch dargestellt*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (multiple editions); **and** "Naturwissenschaft", an article in *Handwörterbuch der Naturwissenschaften*, (1912), §§ 31-34; **and** *Zeitschrift für positivistische Philosophie*, Volume 1, Number 1, (November, 1912); **and** "Die Relativitätstheorie im erkenntnistheoretischen Zusammenhange des relativistischen Positivismus", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 14, (1912), p. 1055; **and** "Die Relativitätstheorie der Physik", *Zeitschrift für positivistische Philosophie*, Volume 2, (1914), 1-56; **and** "Verbieht die Relativitätstheorie, Raum und Zeit als etwas Wirkliches zu denken?", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 20, (1918), pp. 189-201; Volume 21, (1918), p. 495; **and** "Die Unmöglichkeit mechanischer Modelle zur Veranschaulichung der Relativitätstheorie", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, (1919); **and** "Mechanistische Naturauffassung und Relativitätstheorie", *Annalen der Philosophie*, (1920); **and** "Kausalität und Relativitätstheorie", *Zeitschrift für Physik*, Volume 1, (1920), p. 467; **and** *Die Stellung der Relativitätstheorie in der geistigen Entwicklung der Menschheit*, Sibyllen, Dresden, (1921). **See also:** E. Mach, *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwicklung*, 8th ed. F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig, (1921), Appendix: "Das Verhältnis der Mach'schen Gedankenwelt zur Relativitätstheorie" by Joseph Petzoldt, pp. 490-517.

3240. M. Planck, "Das Prinzip der Relativität und die Grundgleichungen der Mechanik", *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 8, (1906), pp. 136-141;

and “Die Kaufmannschen Messungen der Ablenkbarkeit der β -Strahlen in ihrer Bedeutung für die Dynamik der Elektronen”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift* Volume 7, (1906), pp. 753-759, with a discussion on pp. 759-761; **and** “Zur Dynamik bewegter Systeme”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, Volume 13, (June, 1907), 542-570, especially 542 and 544; reprinted *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 26, (1908), pp. 1-34; reprinted *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 2, F. Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 176-209; **and** “Bemerkungen zum Prinzip der Aktion und Reaktion in der allgemeinen Dynamik”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 10, (1908), pp. 728-731; **and** “Bemerkungen zum Prinzip der Aktion und Reaktion in der allgemeinen Dynamik (With a Discussion with Minkowski)”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 9, Number 23, (November 15, 1908), pp. 828-830; **and** “Gleichförmiger Rotation und Lorentz-Kontraktion”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), p. 294; **and** “Erwiderung”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (1914), pp. 742-744.

3241. E. A. Poe, *Eureka: A Prose Poem*, Geo. P. Putnam, New York, (1848). The editors of *The Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, Volume 5, A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, (1884), p. 150; state that, “The theories of the universe propounded in ‘Eureka’ had, it appears, been under consideration with Poe for a year or more previous to the publication of that Essay.” The *Works* also republish portions of a relevant letter of February, 1848, under the heading “A PREDICTION” which appears immediately after *Eureka*.

3242. J. H. Poynting, “On the Transfer of Energy in the Electromagnetic Field,” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, Volume 175, Part 2, (1885), pp. 343-361; “On the Determination of the Mean Density of the Earth and the Gravitation Constant by Means of the Common Balance”, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, Volume 182, (1892), pp. 565-656; **and** “Recent Studies in Gravitation”, *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution for the Year ending June 30, 1901*, (1902), pp. 199-214; **and** “Radiation in the Solar System: Its Effect on Temperature and Its Pressure on Small Bodies”, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, Volume 202, (1903), pp. 525-552.

3243. S. T. Preston, *Physics of the Ether*, London, New York, E. & F. N. Spon, (1875); **and** “On the Direct Conversion of Dynamic Force into Electricity”, *Philosophical Magazine*, (July 1871), pp. 53-55; **and** “Mode of the Propagation of Sound, and the Physical Conduction Determining its Velocity on the Basis of the Kinetic Theory of Gases”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 3, Number 20, (June, 1877), pp. 441-453; **and** “On the Nature of what is Commonly Termed a ‘Vacuum’”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 4, Number 23, (August, 1877), pp. 110-114; **and** “On some Dynamical Conditions applicable to Le Sage’s Theory of Gravitation”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 4, Number 24, (September, 1877), pp. 206-213; Number 26, (November, 1877), pp. 365-375; **and** *Nature*, (November 8, 1877), p. 31; **and** “On the Diffusion of Matter in Relation to the Second Law of Thermodynamics”, *Nature*, (November 8, 1877), pp. 31-32; **and** “On a Means for Converting the Heat-Motion Possessed by Matter at Normal Temperature into Work”, *Nature*, (January 10, 1878), pp. 202-204; **and** “On the Equilibrium of Pressure in Gases”, *Philosophical Magazine*, p. 77; **and** “Application of the Kinetic Theory of Gases to Gravitation”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 5, (February, 1878), pp. 117-127; **and** “The Age of the Sun’s Heat in Relation to Geological Evidence”, *Nature*, (March 28, 1878), pp. 423-424; **and** “The Bearing of the Kinetic Theory of Gravitation on the Phenomena of ‘Cohesion’ and ‘Chemical Action,’ together with the Important Connected Inferences Regarding the Existence of Stores of Motion in Space”, *Philosophical Magazine*,

Series 5, Volume 5, Number 31, (April, 1878), pp. 297-311; **and** “On the Availability of Normal-Temperature Heat-Energy”, *Nature*, (May 23, 1878), pp. 92-93; **and** “On the View of the Propagation of Sound Demanded by the Acceptance of the Kinetic Theory of Gases”, *Nature*, (July 4, 1878), pp. 253-255; **and** “On the Possibility of Explaining Past Changes in the Universe by Causes in Present Operation”, *Quarterly Journal of Science*, (July, 1878); **and** “On Diffusion as a Means for Converting Normal-Temperature Heat into Work”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 6, Number 38, (November, 1878), p. 400; **and** “The Motion of a Luminous Source as a Test of the Undulatory Theory of Light”, *Nature*, (December 26, 1878), pp. 178-180; **and** “A Consideration Regarding the Proper Motion of the Sun in Space”, *Philosophical Magazine*, (November, 1878), pp. 393-394; **and** “On the Possibility of Explaining the Continuance of Life in the Universe Consistent with the Tendency to Temperature-Equilibrium”, *Nature*, (March 20, 1879), pp. 460-464; **and** “On the Possibility of Accounting for the Continuance of Recurring Changes in the Universe, Consistently with the Tendency to Temperature-Equilibrium”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, (August, 1879, November, 1880); pp. 152-163; **and** “On a Mode of Explaining the Transverse Vibrations of Light”, *Nature*, (January 15, 1880), pp. 256-259; **and** “A Psychological Aspect of the Vortex-Atom Theory”, *Nature*, (February 5, 1880), p. 323; **and** “A Suggestion in Regard to Crystallization, on the Hypothesis that Molecules are not Infinitely Hard”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 9, Number 56, (April, 1880), pp. 267-271; **and** “On Method in Causal Research”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 9, Number 57, (May, 1880), pp. 356-367; January and March, 1881; **and** “On a Point Relating to Brain Dynamics”, *Nature*, (May 13, 1880), pp. 29-30; Responses by G. Romanes, *Nature*, Volume 22, p. 75, and W. C. Ley, *Nature*, Volume 22, (June 10, 1880), p. 121; Reply by Preston, *Nature*, (June 10, 1880), p. 121; **and** “On the Physical Aspects of the Vortex-Atom Theory”, *Nature*, (May 20, 1880), pp. 56-59; **and** “Vortex Atoms”, *Nature*, Volume 22, (June 10, 1880), pp. 121-122; **and** “A Question Regarding One of the Physical Premises upon which the Finality of Universal Change is Based”, *Philosophical Magazine*, (November, 1880), pp. 338-342; **and** “Evolution and Female Education”, *Nature*, (September 23, 1880), pp. 485-486; Revised, *Original essays. I. On the social relations of the sexes. II. Science and sectarian religion. III. On the scientific basis of personal responsibility, with a reprint from an essay on “Evolution and female education,” revised from Nature, September 23, 1880*, Williams and Norgate, London, Edinburgh, (1884); **and** “On Some Points Relating to the Dynamics of ‘Radiant Matter’”, *Nature*, Volume 23, (March 17, 1881), pp. 461-464; **and** “Action at a Distance”, *Philosophical Magazine*, (May, 1881); **and** “The Ether and its Functions”, *Nature*, Volume 27, (19 April 1883), p. 579; **and** “On some Apparent Contradictions at the Foundation of Knowledge”, *Nature*, Volume 37, (5 January 1888), pp. 221-222; **and** *Ueber das gegenseitige Verhältniss einiger zur dynamischen Erklärung der Gravitation aufgestellte Hypothesen*, Inaugural Dissertation (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München), J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1894); **and** “Comparative Review of some Dynamical Theories of Gravitation”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 39, (1895), pp. 145-159.

3244. E. Pringsheim, with O. Lummer, “Die Vertheilung der Energie im Spectrum des schwarzen Körpers und des blanken Platins”, *Verhandlungen der Deutsche Physikalische Gesellschaft*, Volume 1, (1899), pp. 215-230; **and** “Über die Jeans-Lorentzsche Strahlungsformel”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 9, (1908), pp. 459-450; **and** E. Pringsheim, *Vorlesungen über die Physik der Sonne*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1910), p. 278 ff.

3245. F. Reich, “Fallversuch über die Umdrehung der Erde”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 29, (1833), pp. 494-501.

3246. H. Reissner, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 50, (1916), p. 106; **and** “Über die Relativität der Beschleunigungen in der Mechanik”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 15, (1914), pp. 371-375; **and** “Über eine Möglichkeit die Gravitation als unmittelbare Folge der Relativität der Trägheit abzuleiten”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 16, (1915), pp. 179-185.

3247. W. Ritz, “Recherches Critiques sur l’Électrodynamique Générale”, *Annales de Chimie et de Physique*, Volume 13, (1908), pp. 145-275; **and** “Über die Grundlagen der Elektrodynamik und die Theorie der Schwarzen Strahlung” *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 9, (1908), pp. 903-907; **and** “Die Gravitation”, *Scientia*, Volume 5, (1909), pp. 241-255.

3248. F. Rosenberger, *Isaac Newton und seine physikalischen Principien*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1895).

3249. A. Rysának, “Versuch einer dynamischen Erklärung der Gravitation”, *Repertorium der Physik*, Volume 24, (1888), pp. 90-114.

3250. G. L. Le Sage, read by P. Prevost to the Berlin Academy in 1782, “Lucrèce Neutonien”, *Nouveaux Mémoires de l’Académie royale des Sciences et Belles-Lettres de Berlin*, Year 1782, (Berlin, 1784), pp. 404-427; reprinted in *Notice de la Vie et des Écrits de George-Louis Le Sage*, Chez J. J. Paschoud, Genève, (1805), pp. 561-604; English translation by C. G. Abbot with an introduction by S. P. Langley appears in: “The Le Sage Theory of Gravitation”, *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution Showing the Operations, Expenditures, and Condition of the Institution for the Year Ending June 30, 1898*, (U.S.) Government Printing Office, Washington, (1899), pp. 139-160; **and** “Loi qui contient, malgré sa simplicité, toutes les attractions et répulsions”, *Journal des Savants*, (April, 1764). W. Thomson, S. Tolver Preston, H. A. Lorentz, and J. J. Thomson, among many others, pursued Le Sage’s shadow theory of ultramundane particles. Maxwell and Poincaré opposed it, on the basis that it would result in excessive heat accumulation.

3251. É. Saigey (under the pen name, “Edgar Saveney”), *Revue de Deux Mondes*, Volume 66, (November 1, 1866), pp. 148-149; **and** *Revue de Deux Mondes*, Volume 66, (December 15, 1866), pp. 922-923.

3252. C. E. St. John, *Communications to the National Academy of Sciences/Carnegie Institution of Washington, Mount Wilson Solar Observatory*, Volume 3, Number 46, (July, 1917), pp. 450-452; **and** “The Principle of Generalized Relativity and the Displacement of the Fraunhofer Lines toward the Red”, *Communications to the National Academy of Sciences/Carnegie Institution of Washington, Mount Wilson Solar Observatory*, Volume 7, Number 138; **and** *The Astrophysical Journal*, Volume 46, (1917), p. 249.

3253. F. Saleta, *Exposé Sommaire de l’Idée d’Espace au Point de Vue Positif*, Paris, (1872); **and** *Principes de Logique Positive; ou, Traité de Scepticisme Positif*, Baillière, Paris, (1873).

3254. G. Salmon, *A Treatise on Conic Sections*, Multiple Editions; **and** *A Treatise on the Higher Plane Curves, Intended as a Sequel to A Treatise on Conic Sections*; **and** *Lessons Introductory to the Modern Higher Algebra*, Second Edition, Hodges, Smith, Dublin, (1866), pp. 212ff; **and** *Extension of Chasles’ Theory of Characteristics to Surfaces*; **and** “On the Degree of the surface Reciprocal to a Given One”, *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, Volume 23, (1859), pp. 461-488.

3255. W. Scheibner, “Ueber die formale Bedeutung des Hamilton’schen Princip und das Weber’sche Gesetz”, *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Volume 49, (1897), pp. 578-607. M. v. Laue cites Scheibner in, J. K. F. Zöllner, *Über die Natur der Cometen. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theorie der Erkenntnis*, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1872), p. 334.

3256. E. Schering, “Erweiterung des Gauss’schen Fundamentalsatzes für Dreiecke in stetig gekrümmten Flächen”, *Nachrichten von der Königlich Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*

und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen, (1868), pp. 389-391; **and** “Die Schwerkraft im Gaussischen Raum”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (July 13, 1870), pp. 311-321; **and** “Linien, Flächen und höhere Gebilde in mehrfach ausgedehnten Gausschen und Riemannschen Räumen”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1873), pp. 13-21; **and** “Die Schwerkraft in mehrfach ausgedehnten Gaussischen und Riemannschen Räumen”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (February 26, 1873), pp. 149-159, 177; **and** “Hamilton-Jacobische Theorie für Kräfte, deren Maass von der Bewegung der Körper anhängt”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1873), pp. 744-753; **and** “Hamilton-Jacobsche Theorie für Kräfte, deren Maass von der Bewegung der Körper abhängt”, *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Mathematische Classe*, Volume 18, (1873), pp. 3-54; **and** “Verallgemeinerung der Poisson- Jacobischen Störungsformeln”, *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Mathematische Classe*, Volume 19, (1874), pp. 3-38.

3257. V. Schlegel, “Die Elemente der vierdimensionalen Geometrie”, *Jahresbericht des Vereins für Naturkunde zu Zwickau*, (1893), pp. 1-61; **and** “Theorie der homogenen zusammengesetzten Raumgebilde”, *Nova Acta Leopoldina*, Volume 44.

3258. G. A. Schott, “On the Electron Theory of Matter and the Explanation of Fine Spectrum Lines and of Gravitation”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 12, (1906), pp. 21-29; **and** *Electromagnetic Radiation and the Mechanical Reactions Arising from It*, Cambridge University Press, (1912).

3259. Schramm, *Die allgemeine Bewegung und Materie*, Wien, (1872).

3260. L. Schulhof, “Les Comètes Periodiques, l’État Actuel de leurs Théories”, *Bulletin Astronomiques* (Paris), Volume 15, (1898).

3261. A. Schuster, “A Holiday Dream”, *Nature*, Volume 58, (1898), p. 367; **and** *Nature*, Volume 58, (1898), p. 618.

3262. J. R. Schütz, “Prinzip der absoluten Erhaltung der Energie”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1897), pp. 110-123.

3263. K. Schwarzschild, “Die Poincarésche Theorie des Gleichgewichts einer homogenen rotierenden Flüssigkeitsmasse”, *Neue Annalen der Königlichen Sternwarte zu Bogenhausen bei München*, Volume 3, (1897), pp. 231-299; **and** “Ueber eine Classe periodischer Lösungen des Dreikörperproblems”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 147, (1898), cols. 17-24; **and** “Ueber weitere Classen periodischer Lösungen des Dreikörperproblems”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 147, (1898), cols. 289-298; **and** “Ueber Abweichungen vom Reciprocitätsgesetzes für Bromsilbergelatine”, *Photographische Correspondenz*, Volume 36, (1899), pp. 109-112; English translation, “On the Derivations from the Law of Reciprocity for Bromide of Silver Gelatine”, *The Astrophysical Journal*, Volume 11, (1900), pp. 89-91; **and** “Die Bestimmung von Sternhelligkeiten aus extrafocalen photographischen Aufnahmen”, *Publicationen der von Kuffner’schen Sternwarte in Wien*, Volume 5, (1900), b3-b23; **and** “Über das zulässige Krümmungsmaß des Raumes”, *Vierteljahrsschrift der Astronomischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 35, (1900); **and** “Der Druck des Lichtes auf kleine Kugeln und die Arrhenius’sche Theorie der Cometenschweife”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Volume 31, (1901), pp. 293-338; **and** “Zur Elektrodynamik: I. Zwei Formen des Principis der Action in der Elektronentheorie. II. Die elementare elektrodynamische

Kraft. III. Über die Bewegung des Elektrons”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, (1903), pp. 126-131, 132-141, 245-278; **and** “Untersuchungen zu geometrischen Optik. I. Einleitung in die Fehler Theorie optischer Instrumente auf Grund des Eikonalbegriffs. II. Theorie der Spiegelteleskope. III. Ueber die astrophotographischen Objektive”, *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, Volume 4, Number 1, (1905), pp. 3-31; Number 2, (1905), pp. 3-28; Number 4, (1905), pp. 3-54; **and** “Ueber das Gleichgewicht der Sonnenatmosphäre”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, (1906), pp. 41-63; **and** “Ueber die Eigenbewegungen der Fixsterne”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, (1907), pp. 614-632; **and** “Ueber die Bestimmung von Vertex und Apex nach der Ellipsoidhypothese aus einer geringeren Anzahl beobachteter Eigenbewegungen”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, (1908), pp. 191-200; **and** “Über Diffusion und Absorption in der Sonnenatmosphäre”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1914), pp. 1183-1200; **and** *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1914), p. 1201-1213; **and** “Über das Gravitationsfeld eines Massenpunktes nach der Einsteinschen Theorie”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1916), pp. 189-196; **and** “Über das Gravitationsfeld einer Kugel aus inkompressibler Flüssigkeit nach der Einsteinschen Theorie”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1916), pp. 424-434; **and** “Zur Quantenhypothese”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1916), pp. 548-568.

3264. W. Schweydar, *Untersuchungen über die Gezeiten der festen Erde und die hypothetische Magmaschicht*, B.G. Teubner in Leipzig, Potsdam, (1912), Veröffentlichung des Königlich preussischen geodätischen Institutes, New Series, Number, 54; **and** *Harmonische Analyse der Lotstörungen durch Sonne und Mond*, B.G. Teubner in Leipzig, Potsdam, (1914), Veröffentlichung des Königlich preussischen geodätischen Institutes, New Series, Number 59; **and** “Beobachtungen der Änderung der Intensität der Schwerkraft durch den Mond”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1914); **and** *Theorie der Deformation der Erde durch Flutkräfte*, B.G. Teubner in Leipzig, Potsdam, (1916), Veröffentlichung der Königlich preussischen geodätischen Institutes, New Series, Number 66; **and** *Lotschwankung und Deformation der Erde durch Flutkräfte, gemessen mit zwei Horizontalpendeln im Bergwerk in 189 Meter tiefe bei Freiberg*, P. Stankiewicz, Berlin, (1921), Zentralbureau der Internationalen Erdmessung, New Series, Number 38.

3265. A. Secchi, *L'Unità della Forze Fisiche: Saggio di Filosofia Naturale*, Multiple Improved and Enlarged Editions; French translation: *L'Unité des Forces Physiques. Essai de Philosophie Naturelle*, F. Savy, Paris, (1874), German translation: *Die Einheit der Naturkräfte: ein Beitrag zur Naturphilosophie*, P. Froberg, Leipzig, (1875).

3266. T. J. J. See, “Einstein’s Theory of Gravitation”, *The Observatory*, Volume 39, (1916), pp. 511-512; **See also:** “Prof. See Attacks German Scientist, Asserting That His Doctrine Is 122 Years Old”, *The New York Times*, (13 April 1923), p. 5; **and** “Einstein a Second Dr. Cook?”, *The San Francisco Journal*, (13 May 1923), pp. 1, 6; **and** (20 May 1923), p. 1; “Einstein a Trickster?”, *The San Francisco Journal*, (27 May 1923); response by R. Trumpler, “Historical Note on the Problem of Light Deflection in the Sun’s Gravitational Field”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 1496, (1923), pp. 161-163; reply by See, “Soldner, Foucault and Einstein”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, (1923), p. 372; rejoinder

by L. P. Eisenhart, "Soldner and Einstein", *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 1512, (1923), pp. 516-517; rebuttal by A. Reuterdaahl, "The Einstein Film and the Debacle of Einsteinism", *The Dearborn Independent*, (22 March 1924), p. 15; **and** T. J. J. See, "New Theory of the Ether", *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 217, (1923), pp. 193-283. **See also**: "Is the Einstein Theory a Crazy Vagary?", *The Literary Digest*, (2 June 1923), pp. 29-30. **See also**: R. Morgan, "Einstein Theory Declared Colossal Humbug by U.S. Naval Astronomer", *The Dearborn Independent*, (21 July 1923), p. 14. **See also**: "Prof. See Attacks German Scientist Asserting that his Doctrine is 122 Years Old", *The New York Times*, Section 1, (13 April 1923), p. 5; **and** "Einstein Geometry Called Careless", *The San Francisco Journal*, (14 October 1924); **and** T. J. J. See, "Is Einstein's Arithmetic Off?", *The Literary Digest*, Volume 83, Number 6, (8 November 1924), pp. 20-21. **See also**: "Navy Scientist Claims Einstein Theory Error", *The Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, (13 October 1924). Ironically, Reuterdaahl accused See of Plagiarizing his exposure of Einstein's plagiarism in America, first recognized by Gehrcke and Lenard in Germany! "Reuterdaahl Says See Takes Credit for Work of Others", *The Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, (14 October 1924); **and** "A Scientist Yields to Temptation", *The Minneapolis Journal*, (2 February 1925). **See also**: "Prof. See declares Einstein in Error. Naval Astronomer Says Eclipse Observations Fully Confirm Newton's Gravitation Theory. Says German began Wrong. A Mistake in Mathematics is Charged, with 'Curved Space' Idea to Hide it." *The New York Times*, (14 October 1924), p. 14; responses by Eisenhart, Eddington and Dyson, *The New York Times*, (16 October 1924), p. 12; **See also**: "Captain See vs. Doctor Einstein", *Scientific American*, Volume 138, (February 1925), p. 128; **and** T. J. J. See, *Researches in Non-Euclidian Geometry and the Theory of Relativity: A Systematic Study of Twenty Fallacies in the Geometry of Riemann, Including the So-Called Curvature of Space and Radius of World Curvature, and of Eighty Errors in the Physical Theories of Einstein and Eddington, Showing the Complete Collapse of the Theory of Relativity*, United States Naval Observatory Publication: Mare Island, Calif. : Naval Observatory,(1925). **See also**: "See Says Einstein has Changed Front. Navy Mathematician Quotes German Opposing Field Theory in 1911. Holds it is not New. Declares he himself Anticipated by Seven Years Relation of Electrodynamics to Gravitation", *The New York Times*, Section 2, (24 February 1929), p. 4. See refers to his works: *Electrodynamic Wave-Theory of Physical Forces*, Thos. P. Nichols, Boston, London, Paris, (1917); **and** *New Theory of the Aether*, Inhaber Georg Oheim, Kiel, (1922). **See also**: "New Theory of the Ether", *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 217, (1923), pp. 193-283.

3267. C. Seegers, *De motu perturbationibusque planetarum secundum logem electrodynamica Weberianam solem ambientum*, Inaugural Dissertation, Göttingen, (1864)..

3268. H. Seeliger, "Kritisches Referat über Lange's Arbeiten", *Vierteljahrsschrift der Astronomischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 22, (1886), pp. 252-259; **and** "Zur Theorie der Beleuchtung der grossen Planeten, insbesondere des Saturns", *Abhandlungen der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Volume 16, (1887), pp. 403-516; **and** *Sitzungsberichte der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Volume 19, (1889), p. 19; **and** "Über Zussamenstöße und Teilungen planetarischer Massen", *Abhandlungen der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Volume 17, (1891); **and** "Theorie der Beleuchtung staubförmiger Massen, insbesondere des Saturnringes", *Abhandlungen der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Volume 18, (1893), pp. 1-72; **and** "Über das Newton'sche Gravitationsgesetz",

Astronomische Nachrichten, Volume 137, (1895), cols. 129-136; **and** *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 137, (1895), cols. 137, 138; Volume 138, (1895), cols. 51-54, 255-258; **and** “Über das Newton’sche Gravitationsgesetz”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Volume 26, (1896), pp. 373-400; **and** “Über kosmische Staubmassen und das Zodiakallicht”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Volume 31, (1901); **and** “Über die sogenannte absolute Bewegung”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, (1906), Volume 36, pp. 85-137; **and** “Das Zodiakallicht und die empirischen Glieder in der Bewegung der innern Planeten”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematische-physikalische Classe der Königlich Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Volume 36, (1906), pp. 595-622; *Vierteljahrsschrift der Astronomischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 41, (1906); **and** “Sur d’Application des lois de la Nature à l’Univers”, *Scientia*, Volume 6 (Supplement), (1909), pp. 89-107; **and** “Über den Einfluss des Lichtdruckes auf die Bewegung planetarischer Körper”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 187, (1911), p. 417; **and**; “Bemerkungen über die sogenannte absolute Bewegung, Raum und Zeit”, *Vierteljahrsschrift der Astronomischen Gesellschaft*, (1913); **and** “Über die Anomalien in der Bewegung der innern Planeten”, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 201, (1915), cols. 273-280; **and** *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 202, (1916), col. 83; **and** “Bemerkung zu P. Gerbers Aufsatz ‘Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation’”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 53, (1917), pp. 31-32; **and** “Weiters Bemerkungen zur ‘Die Fortpflanzungsgeschwindigkeit der Gravitation’”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 54, (1917), pp. 38-40; **and** “Bemerkung zu dem Aufsätze des Herrn Gehrcke ‘Über den Äther’”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 20, (1918), p. 262. A bibliography of Seeliger’s works appears in H. Kienle, *Vierteljahrsschrift der Astronomischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 60, (1925), pp. 18-23.

3269. Cf. *The Correlation and Conservation of Forces*, D. Appleton, New York, (1867), pp. 4, 76-82; W. B. Taylor, “Kinetic Theories of Gravitation”, *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution*, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, (1877), pp. 237-240.

3270. H. Servus, Inaugural Dissertation, Halle, (1885).

3271. L. Silberstein, *Vectorial Mechanics*, London, Macmillan, (1913); **and** *The Theory of Relativity*, Macmillan, London, (1914); **and** “The Motion of Mercury Deduced from the Classical Theory of Relativity”, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, (1917), pp. 503-510; **and** “General Relativity without the Equivalence Hypothesis”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 36, (July, 1918), pp. 94-128.

3272. W. de Sitter, “On the Bearing of the Principle of Relativity on Gravitational Astronomy”, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 71, (1911), pp. 388-415, 524, 603, 716; **and** “Absorption of Gravitation”, *The Observatory*, Volume 35, (1912), p. 387; **and** “The Absorption of Gravity and the Longitude of the Moon”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 21, (1912); **and** “Some Problems of Astronomy. VII. The Secular Variation of the Elements of the Four Inner Planets”, *The Observatory*, Volume 36, (1913), pp. 296-303; **and** “Ein astronomischer Beweis für die Konstanz der Lichtgeschwindigkeit”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 14, (1913), p. 429; **and** “Über die Genauigkeit, innerhalb welcher die Unabhängigkeit der Lichtgeschwindigkeit von der Bewegung der Quelle behauptet werden kann”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 14, (1913), p. 1267; **and** “On Absorption of Gravitation and the Moon’s Longitude”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 15,

(1913), pp. 808-839; **and** *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 15, (1913), p. 1297; **and** “On the Constancy of the Velocity of Light”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 16, (1913), p. 395; **and** “Ein astronomisches Beweis für die Konstanz der Lichtgeschwindigkeit”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 14, (1913), p. 429; **and** “Über die Genauigkeit, innerhalb welcher die Unabhängigkeit der Lichtgeschwindigkeit von der Bewegung der Quelle behauptet werden kann”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 14, (1913), p. 1267; **and** “Remarks on M. Woltjer’s Paper concerning Seeliger’s Hypothesis”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 17, (1914), pp. 33-37; a response to: J. Woltjer, “On Seeliger’s Hypothesis about the Anomalies in the Motion of the Four Inner Planets,” *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 17, (1914), pp. 23-33; **and** *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 22, (1914), p. 1239; **and** , *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 17, (1915), p. 1309; **and** “Proposal for a New Method of Determining the Constant of Aberration ”, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 75, (1915), pp. 458-464; **and** “The Figure of the Earth”, *The Observatory*, Volume 38,(1915), p. 397; **and** *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 25, (1916), p. 232; **and** “Planetary Motion and the Motion of the Moon According to Einstein’s Theory”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 19, (1916), pp. 367-381; **and** “The Longitude of Jupiter’s Satellites, derived from Photographic Plates taken at the Cape Observatory in the Year 1913”, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 76, (1916), pp. 448-468; **and** “Space, Time, and Gravitation”, *The Observatory*, Volume 39,(1916), p. 412; **and** “De Relativiteit der Rotatie in de Theorie van Einstein” *Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Wis en Natuurkundige Afdeeling, Verslagen van de Gewone Vergaderingen*, Volume 25, (1916), pp. 499-504; English translation in “On the Relativity of Rotation in Einstein’s Theory”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 19, (1916), pp. 527-532; **and** “On Einstein’s Theory of Gravitation and its Astronomical Consequences”, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 76, (1916), pp. 699-728; Volume 77, (1916), pp. 155-183; Volume 78, (1917), pp. 3-28; **and** “The Motion of the Perihelion on the Classical Theory of Relativity ”, *The Observatory*, Volume 40,(1917), p. 302; **and** “On the Relativity of Inertia: Remarks Concerning Einstein’s Latest Hypothesis”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 19, (1917), p. 1217-1255; **and** *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 20, (1917), p. 229; **and** “Further Remarks on the Solutions of the Field Equations of Einstein’s Theory of Gravitation”, *Proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Amsterdam*, Volume 20, (1918), pp. 1309-1312; **and** “On the Einstein Terms in the Motion of the Lunar Perigee and Node”, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 81,(1920), p. 102. **See also:** Gill, Sir David & W.H. Finlay, *Determination of the Mass of Jupiter and Elements of the Orbits of its Satellites from Observations Made with the Cape Helimeter, reduced and discussed by W. de Sitter*, H.M. Stationery Off., Edinburgh, (1915).

3273. J. G. v. Soldner, “Ueber die Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahls von seiner geradlinigen Bewegung, durch die Attraktion eines Weltkörpers, an welchem er nahe vorbei geht”, [*Berliner*] *Astronomisches Jahrbuch für das Jahr 1804*, pp. 161-172; reprinted in the relevant part with P. Lenard’s analysis in, “Über die Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahls von seiner geradlinigen Bewegung durch die Attraktion eines Weltkörpers, an welchem er nahe vorbeigeht; von J. Soldner, 1801”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 65, (1921), pp. 593-604;

English translation in S. L. Jaki, "Johann Georg von Soldner and the Gravitational Bending of Light, with an English Translation of His Essay on It Published in 1801", *Foundations of Physics*, Volume 8, (1978), p. 927-950; critical response by M. v. Laue, "Erwiderung auf Hrn. Lenards Vorbemerkungen zur Soldnerschen Arbeit von 1801", *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 66, (1921), pp. 283-284. Soldner followed up Newton's query in the *Opticks*, "QUERY 1. Do not bodies act upon light at a distance, and by their action bend its rays; **and** is not this action (*cæteris paribus*) strongest at the least distance?" **See also:** P. Lenard, *Über Äther und Uräther*, Second Edition, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1922). **See also:** E. Gehrcke, "Zur Frage der Relativitätstheorie", *Kosmos*, Special Edition on the Theory of Relativity, (1921), pp. 296-298; **and** "Die Gegensätze zwischen der Aethertheorie und Relativitätstheorie und ihre experimentelle Prüfung", *Zeitschrift für technische Physik*, Volume 4, (1923), pp. 292-299; abstracts: *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 219, Number 5248, (1923), pp. 266-267; **and** *Univerzum*, Volume 1, (1923), pp. 261-263; **and** E. Gehrcke, *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Berlin, Hermann Meusser, (1924), pp. 82, 92-94. **See also:** *Frankfurter Zeitung*, Morning Edition, (6 November 1921), p. 1 and (18 November 1921), as cited by the editors of *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, (2002), p. 112. **See also:** T. J. J. See, "Einstein a Second Dr. Cook?", "Einstein a Trickster?", *The San Francisco Journal*, (13 May 1923), pp. 1, 6; (20 May 1923), p. 1; (27 May 1923); response by R. Trumpler, "Historical Note on the Problem of Light Deflection in the Sun's Gravitational Field", *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 1496, (1923), pp. 161-163; reply by See, "Soldner, Foucault and Einstein", *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, (1923), p. 372; response by L. P. Eisenhart, "Soldner and Einstein", *Science*, New Series, Volume 58, Number 1512, (1923), pp. 516-517; rebuttal by A. Reuterdaahl, "The Einstein Film and the Debacle of Einsteinism", *The Dearborn Independent*, (22 March 1924), p. 15. **See also:** J. Eisenstaedt, "De l'Influence de la Gravitation sur la Propagation de la Lumière en Théorie Newtonienne. L'Archéologie des Trous Noirs", *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 42, (1991), 315-386. **See also:** A. F. Zakharov, *Astronomical and Astrophysical Transactions*, Volume 5, (1994), p. 85.

3274. A. Sommerfeld, "Ein Einwand gegen die Relativtheorie der Elektrodynamik und seine Beseitigung", *Verhandlungen der Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Ärzte*, Volume 79, (1907), pp. 36-37; **and** "Über die Zusammensetzung der Geschwindigkeiten in der Relativtheorie", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 10, (1909), p. 828; **and** "Zur Relativitätstheorie. I. Vierdimensionale Vektoralgebra. II. Vierdimensionale Vektoranalysis", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 32, (1910), pp. 749-776; Volume 33, (1910), pp. 649-689; **and** notations in *Das Relativitätsprinzip: eine Sammlung von Abhandlungen*, B. G. Teubner, Berlin, Leipzig, (1913).

3275. J. Somoff translated from Russian to German by A. Ziwet, *Theoretische Mechanik*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1878-1879), esp. Volume 2, p. 155.

3276. A. Souchon, *Traité d'Astronomie Pratique*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1883); **and** *Traité d'Astronomie Théorique Contenant l'Exposition du Calcul des Perturbations Planétaires et Lunaires et son Application à l'Explication et à la Formation des Tables Astronomiques avec une Introd. Historique et de Nombreux Exemples Numériques*, G. Carré, Paris, (1891); S. Oppenheim notes: *See especially the historic introduction.*

3277. P. Spiller, *Die Urkraft des Weltalls nach ihrem Wesen und Wirken auf allen Naturgebieten*, G. Gerstmann, Berlin, (1876); **and** *Die Entstehung der Welt und die Einheit der Naturkräfte. Populäre Kosmogenie*, J. Imme, Berlin, (1871); **and** *Das Phantom der Imponderabilien in der Physik*, Posen, (1858).

3278. W. Spottiswoode, "Sur la Representation des Figures de Géométrie à n Dimensions par les Figures Correlatives de Géométrie Ordinaire", *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des*

séances de L'Académie des sciences, Volume 71, pp. 875-877; **and** “Nouveau Exemples de la Representation, par des Figures de Géométrie, des Conceptions Analytiques de Géométrie à n Dimensions”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L'Académie des sciences*, Volume 81, pp. 961-963; **and** Address to the British Association at Dublin. August 14th, 1878.

3279. H. Stahl, *Ueber die Massfunctionen der analytischen Geometrie*, Berlin, (1873).

3280. J. B. Stallo, *General Principles of the Philosophy of Nature*, WM. Crosby and H. P. Nichols, Boston, (1848); “The Concepts and Theories of Modern Physics”, Volume 38, *International Scientific Series*, D. A. Appleton and Company, New York, (1881); *reprinted* Volume 42, *The International Scientific Series*, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., London, (1882); Edited by P. W. Bridgman, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, (1960); *Reden, Abhandlungen und Briefe*, E. Steiger & Co., New York, (1893).

3281. Stolz, “Das letzte Axiom der Geometrie” *Berichte des Naturwissenschaftlich-medizinischen Vereins in Innsbruck*, Volume 15, pp. 25-34.

3282. H. Streintz, *Die physikalischen Grundlagen der Mechanik*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1883).

3283. A. Stroh, “On Attraction and Repulsion due to Sonorous Vibrations and a comparison of the Phenomena with those of Magnetism”, *Journal of the Society of Telegraph Engineers and of Electricians*, Volume 11, (1882), pp. 192-228, 293-300.

3284. H. Thirring, “Über die Wirkung rotierender ferner Massen in der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 19, (1918), pp. 33-39; **and** *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 19, (1918), p. 204; **and** “Atombau und Kristallsymmetrie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 21, (1920), pp. 281-288; **and** “Berichtigung zu meiner Arbeit: ‘Über die Wirkung rotierender Massen in der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie’”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 22, (1921), p. 29. **See also:** H. Thirring and J. Lense, “Über den Einfluß der Eigenrotation der Zentralkörper auf die Bewegung der Planeten und Monde nach der Einsteinschen Gravitationstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 19, (1918), pp. 156-163.

3285. J. de Tilly, “Etudes de Méchanique Abstraite”, *Mémoires Publiés par l'Académie Royale de Belgique*, Volume 21, (1868); **and** “Report on a Letter from Genocchi to Quetelet”, *Bulletins de l'Académie Royale des Sciences, des lettres et des beaux-arts de Belgique* (Bruxelles), Series 2, Volume 36, pp. 124-139; **and** “Essai sur les Principes Fondamentaux de la Géométrie et de la Mécanique”, Bordeaux, (1878); **and** “Sur les Notions de Force, d'Accélération et d'Énergie en Mécanique”, *Bulletins de l'Académie Royale des Sciences, des lettres et des beaux-arts de Belgique* (Bruxelles), Series 3, Volume 16, (1887), pp. 975-1020; **and** “Essai de Géométrie Analytique Générale”, *Mémoires Couronnés Publiés par l'Académie Royale de Belgique*, Volume 41, (1892-93); **and** “Sur Divers Points de la Philosophie des Sciences Mathématiques”, *Classe des sciences de l'Académie Royale de Belgique*, (1901).

3286. F. Tisserand, “Sur le Mouvement des Planètes Autour du Soleil d'après la Loi Électrodynamique de Weber”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L'Académie des sciences*, Volume 75, (1872), pp. 760-763; **and** “Notice sur les Planètes intra-Mercurielles”, *Annuaire pour l'an / présente au Roi par le Bureau des Longitudes*, (1882), pp. 729-772; **and** “Résumé des Tentatives Faites Jusqu'ici pour Déterminer la Parallaxe du Soliel”, *Annales de l'Observatoire Nationale de Paris. Mémoires*, Volume 16, (1882); **and** “Sur le Mouvement des Planètes, en Supposant l'Attraction Représentée par l'une des Lois Électrodynamiques de Gauss ou de Weber”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L'Académie des sciences*, Volume 110, (1890), pp. 313-315; **and** “Note sur l'État Actuel de

la Théorie de la Lune”, *Bulletin Astronomique* (Paris), Volume 8, (1891); **and** *Mécanique Céleste (Traité de Mécanique Céleste)*, Volume 4, Chapter 28, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1896), p. 499; **and** “Confrontation des Observations avec la Théorie de la Gravitation”, *Mécanique Céleste (Traité de Mécanique Céleste)*, Volume 4, Chapter 29, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1896), especially p. 529.

3287. G.W. de Tunzelmann, *A Treatise on Electrical Theory and the Problem of the Universe. Considered from the Physical Point of View, with Mathematical Appendices*, C. Griffin, London, (1910); **and** “Physical Relativity Hypotheses Old and New”, *Science Progress*, Volume 13, (1918/1919), pp. 474-482; **and** “The General Theory of Relativity and Einstein’s Theory of Gravitation”, *Science Progress*, Volume 13, (1918/1919), pp. 652-657.

3288. H. Vaihinger, *Die Philosophie des Als Ob, System der theoretischen, praktischen und religiösen Fiktionen der Menschheit auf Grund eines idealistischen Positivismus. Mit einem Anhang über Kant und Nietzsche*, Reuther & Reichard, Berlin, (1911); English translation by C. K. Ogden, *The Philosophy of ‘As If’*, Harcourt, Brace & Company, Inc., New York, (1925); reprinted Routledge & K. Paul, London, (1965).

3289. V. Varičak, “Primjedbe o jednoj interpretaciji geometrije Lobačevskoga”, *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, Volume 154, (1903), pp. 81-131; **and** “O transformacijama u ravnini Lobačevskoga” *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, Volume 165, (1906), pp. 50-80; **and** “Opcéna jednadzba pravca u hiperbolnoj ravnini”, *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, Volume 167, (1906), pp. 167-188; **and** “Bemerkung zu einem Punkte in der Festrede L. Schlesingers über Johann Bolyai”, *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 16, (1907), pp. 320-321; **and** “Prvi osnivači neeuclidiske geometrije”, *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, Volume 169, (1908), pp. 110-194; **and** “Beiträge zur nichteuclidischen Geometrie”, *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 17, (1908), pp. 70-83; **and** “Anwendung der Lobatschefskijschen Geometrie in der Relativitätstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 93-96; **and** “Die Relativtheorie und die Lobatschefskijsche Geometrie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 287-294; **and** “Die Reflexion des Lichtes an bewegten Spiegeln”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 11, (1910), pp. 586-587; **and** “Zum Ehrenfest’schen Paradoxon”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 12, (1911), pp. 169-170; **and** “Интерпретација теорије релативности у геометрији Лобачевскова”, *Glas, Srpska Kraljevska Akademija*, Volume 83, (1911), pp. 211-255; **and** *Glas, Srpska Kraljevska Akademija*, Volume 88, (1911); **and** “Über die nichteuclidische Interpretation der Relativitätstheorie”, *Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung*, Volume 21, (1912), pp. 103-127; **and** *Rad Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti*, (1914), p. 46; (1915), pp. 86, 101; (1916), p. 79; (1918), p. 1; (1919), p. 100; **and** “O teoriji relativnosti”, *Ljetopis Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti*, Volume 33, (1919), pp. 73-94; **and** *Darstellung der Relativitätstheorie im 3-dimensionalen Lobatschefskijschen Raume*, Vasić, Zagreb, (1924).

3290. U. J. J. Le Verrier, “Nouvelles Recherches sur les Mouvement des Planètes”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 29, (1849), pp. 1-3; **and** *Annales de l’Observatoire Impérial de Paris*, Volume 1, (1855), p. 189; **and** “Théorie du Mouvement de Mercure”, *Annales de l’Observatoire Impérial de Paris*, Volume 5, (1859), pp. 1-196; **and** “Lettre de M. Le Verrier à M. Faye sur la Théorie de Mercure et sur le Mouvement du Périhélie de cette Planète”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 59, (1859), pp. 379-383; **and** “Théorie du Mouvement de Venus”, *Annales de l’Observatoire Impérial de Paris. Mémoires*, Volume 6, (1860); **and** *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 21, (1861), p. 193; **and**

Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L'Académie des sciences, Volume 75, (1872), p. 165; **and** “Examen des Observations q'on à Diverse Époques comme Pouvent Appartenir aux Passages d'une Planète intra-Mercurielle devant le Disque du Soleil”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L'Académie des sciences*, Volume 83, (1876), pp. 583-589, 621-624, 647-650, 719-723. A bibliography of Le Verrier's works is found in *Centenaire de la naissance de U. J. J. Le Verrier*, Paris, (1911).

3291. E. Vicaire, “Sur la Loi de l'Attraction Astronomique et sur les Masses des Divers Corps du Système Soliare”, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L'Académie des sciences*, Volume 74, (1874), pp. 790-794; **and** “Sur le Principe de l'Inertie et sur la Notion du Mouvement Absolu en Mécanique”, *Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles*, Volume 18A, (1894), pp. 37-98; **and** “Sur la Réalité de l'Espace et le Mouvement Absolu”, *Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles*, Volume 18B, pp. 283-310; E. Vicaire, “Sur la Réalité de l'Espace”, *Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles*, Volume 19A, pp. 113-116; **and** “Observations sur une Note de M. Mansion”, *Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles*, Volume 20A, pp. 8-19; E. Vicaire, “Sur la Nature et sur les Principes de la Mécanique Rationelle”, *Bulletin de la Société Philomatique de Paris*, Series 8, Volume 8, (1896), pp. 19-20; **and** “Sur la Nécessité du Mouvement Absolu en Mécanique”, *Bulletin de la Société Philomatique de Paris*, Series 8, Volume 8, (1896), pp. 20-22. P. Mansion, “Sur l'Inutilité de la Considération de l'Espace dit Réel, en Mécanique”, *Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles*, Volume 19A, pp. 56-58; **and** “Réponse”, *Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles*, Volume 20A, pp. 19-20, 56; **and** *Sur les Principes Fondamentaux de la Géométrie, de la Mécanique et de l'Astronomie*, Paris (1898); **and** “Analyse des Recherches du P. Saccheri S.J. sur le Postulatum d'Euclide”, *Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles*, Volume 14B, (1889/1890), pp. 46-59; **and** “Gauss contre Kant sur la géométrie non-euclidienne”, *Bericht über den III. Internationalen Kongress für Philosophie zu Heidelberg, 1. bis 5. September 1908*, C. Winter, Heidelberg, (1909). E. Goedseels, “Note”, *Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles*, Volume 20A, pp. 20 f.

3292. J. G. Vogt, *Die kraft: real-monistische Weltanschauung*, Haupt & Tischler, Leipzig, (1878); **and** *Physiologisch-optisches Experiment; die Identität correspondirender Netzhautstellen, die mechanische Umkehrung der Netzhautbilder, etc. endgültig erweisend*, Haupt & Tischler, Leipzig, (1878); **and** *Das Wesen der Elektrizität und des Magnetismus auf Grund eines einheitlichen Substanzbegriffes*, Ernst Wiest, Leipzig, (1891); **and** *Das Empfindungsprinzip und das Protoplasma auf Grund eines einheitlichen Substanzbegriffes*, Ernst Wiest, Leipzig, (1891); *Die Menschwerdung*, Leipzig, (1892); *Entstehen und Vergehen der Welt als kosmischer Kreisprozess. Auf Grund des pyknotischen Substanzbegriffes*, E. Wiest Nachf, Leipzig, (1901); **and** *Der absolute Monismus; eine mechanistische Weltanschauung auf Grund des pyknotischen Substanzbegriffes*, Thüringische Verlags-anstalt Hildburghausen, 1912.

3293. W. Voigt, “Ueber das Doppler'sche Princip”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1887), pp. 41-51; reprinted *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 16, Number 20, (October 15, 1915), pp. 381-386; English translation, as well as very useful commentary, are found in A. Ernst and Jong-Ping Hsu (W. Kern is credited with assisting in the translation), “First Proposal of the Universal Speed of Light by Voigt in 1887”, *Chinese Journal of Physics* (The Physical Society of the Republic of China), Volume 39, Number 3, (June, 2001), pp. 211-230; URL's:

<<http://psroc.phys.ntu.edu.tw/cjp/v39/211/211.htm>>

<<http://psroc.phys.ntu.edu.tw/cjp/v39/211.pdf>>

See also: W. Voigt, "Theorie des Lichtes für bewegte Medien", *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1887), pp. 177-238; **and** *Die fundamentalen physikalischen Eigenschaften der Krystalle in elementarer Darstellung*, Veit, Leipzig, (1898), pp. 20 ff. **See also:** S. Bochner, "The Significance for Some Basic Mathematical Conceptions for Physics", *Isis*, Volume 54, (1963), pp. 179-205, at 193. **See also:** W. Voigt, *Elementare Mechanik als Einleitung in das Studium der theoretischen Physik*, second revised edition, Veit, Leipzig, (1901), especially pp. 10-26.

3294. P. Volkmann, *Erkenntnistheoretische Grundzüge der Naturwissenschaften und ihre Beziehungen zum Geistesleben der Gegenwart*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1896); Second Edition, (1910); **and** "Über Newton's 'Philosophiae naturalis principia mathematica' und ihre Bedeutung für die Gegenwart", *Schriften der Physikalisch-ökonomischen Gesellschaft zu Königsberg*, (1898); **and** *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, (1898), pp. 917-918; **and** *Einführung in das Studium der theoretischen Physik, insbesondere in das der analytischen Mechanik. Mit einer Einleitung in die Theorie der physikalischen Erkenntnis*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1900); **and** "Über die Fragen der Existenz, Eindeutigkeit und Vieldeutigkeit", *Annalen der Naturphilosophie*, Volume 1, (1902), see Höfler's response: *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik*, Volume 28, (1904), pp. 3-4.

3295. V. Volterra, *Il Nuovo Cimento*, Series 3, Volume 29, pp. 53, 147; **and** "Sul Flusso di Energia Meccanica", *Il Nuovo Cimento*, Series 4, Volume 10, (1899), p. 337; "Sulle Funzioni Coniugate", *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Rendiconti. Classe di Scienze Fisiche, Matematiche e Naturali*, Volume 5, (1889), pp. 599-611; **and** "Henri Poincaré", a lecture delivered at the inauguration of The Rice Institute, *The Book of the Opening of the Rice Institute*, Volume 3, Houston, Texas, (1912), p. 920; reprinted in: *The Rice Institute Pamphlets*, Volume 1, Number 2, (May, 1915), pp. 153-154; reprinted in: *Saggi scientifici*, N. Zanichelli, Bologna, (1920), pp. 119-157.

3296. A. Voss, "Zur Theorie der Krümmung der Flächen", *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 39, (1891), pp. 179-256; **and** "Die Principien der rationellen Mechanik", *Encyclopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, 4, 1, (1901), pp. 3-121.

3297. F. Wacker, "Über Gravitation und Elektromagnetismus", *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 7, (1906), pp. 300-302; **and** "Ueber Gravitation und Elektromagnetismus", *Inaugural Dissertation*, Tübingen, (1909).

3298. J. J. Waterston, "On the Integral of Gravitation, and its Consequences with Reference to the Measure and Transfer, or Communication of Force", *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 15, (May, 1858), p. 329.

3299. H. Weber, *Die partiellen Differentialgleichungen der mathematischen Physik nach Riemanns Vorlesungen*, F. Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1900-1901), esp. Volume 1, Section 156.

3300. L. Weber, *Ueber das Galilei'sche Princip*, Kiel, (1891).

3301. W. Weber, "Elektrodynamische Massbestimmungen über ein allgemeines Grundgesetz der elektrischen Wirkung", *Abhandlungen der mathematisch-physische Classe der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, (1846), pp. 209-378; reprinted in *Werke*, Volume 3, pp. 25-214; **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 73, (1848), pp. 193-240; reprinted in *Wilhelm Weber's Werke, hrsg. von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, In Six Volumes, J. Springer, Berlin, (1892-94), Volume 3, p. 215ff.; English translation in *Scientific Memoirs, Selected from the Transactions of Foreign Academies of Science and Learned Societies, and from Foreign Journals*, Volume 5, (1852),

pp. 489-529; **and** *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Volume 1, (1847), p. 346; *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 73, (1848), p. 241; English translation in *Scientific Memoirs, Selected from the Transactions of Foreign Academies of Science and Learned Societies, and from Foreign Journals*, Volume 5, (1852), p. 477; **and** *Abhandlungen der mathematisch-physische Classe der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, (1852), p. 483; *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 87, p. 145; English translation in *Scientific Memoirs, Selected from the Transactions of Foreign Academies of Science and Learned Societies, and from Foreign Journals*, (1853), p. 163; **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 99, (1856), p. 10; **and** W. Weber and R. Kohlrausch, “Elektrodynamische Massbestimmungen insbesondere Zuruckfahung der Stromintensitäts-Messung auf mechanisches Mass”, *Abhandlungen der mathematisch-physische Classe der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Volume 5, (1857), p. 265; **and** W. Weber “Elektrodynamische Massbestimmungen insbesondere über das Prinzip der Erhaltung der Energie”, *Abhandlungen der mathematisch-physische Classe der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Volume 10, (1873), pp. 1-61; reprinted in *Werke*, Volume 4, pp. 247-299; English translation in *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 43, (1872), pp. 1, 119; **and** “Ueber die Bewegung der Elektrizität in Körpern von molekularer Konstitution”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 156, (1875), pp. 1-61; reprinted in *Werke*, Volume 4, pp. 312-357.

3302. H. Weissenborn, “Ueber die neueren Ansichten vom Raum und von den geometrischen Axiomen”, *Vierteljahrschrift für Wissenschaftliche Philosophie*, Volume 2, Number 2, (1878), pp. 222-239.

3303. E. Wiechert, “Über die Bedeutung des Weltäthers”, *Sitzungsberichte der physikalisch-ökonomischen Gesellschaft zu Königsberg in Pr.*, Volume 35, (1894), pp. 4-11; **and** “Ueber die Grundlagen der Electrodynamik”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 3, Volume 59, (1896), pp. 283-323; **and** “Über die Massenverteilung im Innern der Erde”, *Nachrichten von der Königlich Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1897); **and** *Schriften der Physikalisch-ökonomischen Gesellschaft zu Königsberg*, Volume 38, (January, 1897), p. 1; **and** “Electrodynamische Elementargesetze”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 4, p. 676; *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Series 2, Volume 5, (1900), p. 549; **and** “Bemerkungen zur Bewegung der Elektronen bei Ueberlichtgeschwindigkeit”, *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, (1905), pp. 75-82; **and** *Nachrichten von der Königlich Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1910), p. 101; **and** *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 12, (1911), pp. 689, 737; **and** “Die Mechanik im Rahmen der allgemeinen Physik”, in E. Warburg, *Die Kultur der Gegenwart: Ihre Entwicklung und ihre Ziele*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1915), pp. 3-78; **and** “Perihelbewegung und die allgemeine Mechanik”, *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, (1916), pp. 124-141; republished, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 17, (1916), pp. 442-448; **and** “Die Gravitation als elektrodynamische Erscheinung”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 63, (1920), p. 301; *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 211, Number 5054, (1920), col. 275; *Nachrichten von der Königlich Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1920), pp. 101-108; **and** “Der Äther im Weltbild der Physik”, *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, (1921), pp. 29-70; **and** *Der Äther im Weltbild der Physik*, Weidmann, Berlin, 1921. A bibliography of Wiechert's works is found in “Zum Gedenken Emil Wiecherts anlässlich der 100. Wiederkehr seines

Geburtstages”, *Veröffentlichungen des Institutes für Bodendynamik und Erdbebenforschung in Jena*, Number 72, (1962), pp. 5-21.

3304. A. Wilkens, “Zur Elektronentheorie”, *Vierteljahrsschrift der Astronomischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 39, (1904), pp. 209-212; **and** *Untersuchungen über Poincaré’sche periodische Lösungen des Problems der drei Körper*, C. Schaidt, Kiel, (1905); **and** “Zur Gravitationstheorie”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 7, (1906), pp. 846-850.

3305. E. B. Wilson, “The So-Called Foundations of Geometry”, *Archiv der Mathematik und Physik*, Series 3, Volume 6, (1904), pp. 104-122; **and** “The Revolution of a Dark Particle about a Luminous Centre”, *Annals of Mathematics*, (1907), p. 134; **and** G. N. Lewis, “A Revision of the Fundamental Laws of Matter and Energy”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 16, (1908), pp. 707-717; **and** G. N. Lewis and R. C. Tolman, “The Principle of Relativity and Non-Newtonian Mechanics”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 18, (1909), p. 510-523; **and** G. N. Lewis, “A Revision of the Fundamental Laws of Matter and Energy”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 16, (1908), pp. 707-717; **and** R. C. Tolman, “Non-Newtonian Mechanics, the Mass of a Moving Body”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 23, (1912), pp. 375-380; *The Theory of the Relativity of Motion*, University of California at Berkeley Press, (1917); **and** E. B. Wilson and G. N. Lewis, “The Space-Time Manifold of Relativity: The Non-Euclidean Geometry of Mechanics and Electrodynamics”, *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Volume 48, Number 11, (November, 1912), pp. 389-507; **and** E. B. Wilson, “Differential Geometry of Two-Dimensional Spaces in Hyperspace”, *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Volume 52, (1916), pp. 270-386.

3306. T. Wulf, “Zur Mach’schen Massendefinition”, *Zeitschrift für den physikalischen und chemischen Unterricht*, Volume 12, (1899), pp. 205-208.

3307. W. Wundt, “Ueber die physikalischen Axiome (Lecture)”, *Festschrift des historischen-philosophischen Vereins zu Heidelberg*, (1886).

3308. Zalewski, *Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de L’Académie des sciences*, Volume 30, (1850), p. 485; Volume 31, (1850), p. 225; Volume 35, (1852), pp. 49, 95.

3309. L. Zehnder, *Die Mechanik des Weltalls*, Freiburg, Leipzig, Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, (1897); **and** *Die Entstehung des Lebens, aus mechanische Grundlagen Entwickelt*, J. C. B. Mohr, Freiburg, (1899-1900).

3310. J. Zenneck, “Gravitation”, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften*, Volume 5, Part 1, Article 2, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1903), pp. 25-67.

3311. J. H. (Johann Heinrich, b. 1857, also J. Henri) Ziegler, Ziegler delivered a much talked about lecture in Switzerland, *Die Universelle Weltformel und ihre Bedeutung für die wahre Erkenntnis aller Dinge*, (1902). Ziegler directly accused Einstein of plagiarizing his works, and Ziegler’s accusations were well covered in the press. Ziegler’s works include: *Die universelle Weltformel und ihre Bedeutung für die wahre Erkenntnis aller Dinge*, 1 Vortrag, Kommissionsverlag Art. Institut Orell Füßli, Zürich, (1902); **and** *Die universelle Weltformel und ihre Bedeutung für die wahre Erkenntnis aller Dinge*, 2 Vortrag, Kommissionsverlag Art. Institut Orell Füßli, Zürich, (1903); **and** *Die wahre Einheit von Religion und Wissenschaft. Vier Abhandlungen von J.H. Ziegler*, 1. Ueber die wahre Bedeutung das Begriffs Natur. 2. Ueber das wahre Wesen der sogenannten Schwerkraft. 3. Ueber der wahre System der chemischen Elemente. 4. Ueber der Sonnengott von Sippar, Kommissionsverlag Art. Institut Orell Füßli, Zürich, (1904); **and** *Die wahre Ursache der hellen Lichtstrahlung des Radiums*, Kommissionsverlag Art. Institut Orell Füßli, Zürich, (1904); Second Improved Edition (1905); “Der Begriff ‘Natur’.”, *Neues Winterthurer Tagblatt*, (27 September 1906); **and** *Konstitution und Komplementät der Elemente*, A. Francke, Bern, (1908); **and** *Die Struktur der Materie und das Welträtsel*, Kommissionsverlag R. Friedländer & Sohn, Berlin,

(1908); **and** *La Vérité Absolue et les Vérités Relatives. Solution des Problèmes de la Radio-activité et de l'Electricité*, A. Kundig, Genève, E. Pinat, Paris, (1910); **and** *Die Umwälzung in den Grundanschauungen der Naturwissenschaft: acht kritische Betrachtungen*, F. Semminger, Bern, (1914); „*Das Ding an sich*“ und das Ende der sog. Relativitätstheorie, Weltformel-Verlag, Zürich, (1923); **and** *Der grosse Welt- und Selbstbetrug der Physiker; ein Dokument aus der Gegenwart für die Zukunft*, Weltformel-Verlag, Zürich, (1931). **Confer:** A. Reuterdahl, “Einstein and the New Science”, *Bi-Monthly Journal of the College of St. Thomas*, Volume 11, Number 3, (July, 1921). G. Bergmann, “J. H. Ziegler’s Neuschöpfung verlorener, uralter Weltweisheit”, *Neues Winterthurer Tagblatt*, (17 February 1917). “Im Kampf um die Heimat”, *Schweizerische Republikanische Blätter*, (11 May 1921); **and** “Dr. J. H. Ziegler”, *Züricher Chronik*, (Date not known). “F. H.”, “Das Weltbild der Zukunft”, *Luzerner Neueste Nachrichten*, (9 April 1921). “G.”, “Professor Einsteins „Triumphzug“ durch Amerika”, *Luzerner Neueste Nachrichten*, (22 April 1921). I. E. G. Hirzel, “Albertus Maximus und die Blamage der Schulweisheit”, *Luzerner Neueste Nachrichten*, (20 September 1921); **and** “Ostwald, Relativitätstheorie und Farbenlehre an der Leipziger Zentenarfeier. Ein Vergleich mit Zieglers Urlichtlehre”, *Neues Winterthurer Tageblatt*, Number 285-290, (October, 1922); **and** “Albertus Maximus und die Blamage der Schulweisheit”, *Neue Züricher Nachrichten*, (19 September 1923).

3312. J. K. F. Zöllner, *Über die Natur der Cometen. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theorie der Erkenntnis*, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1872); **and** *Principien einer elektrodynamischen Theorie der Materie*, Leipzig, (1876); reviewed by C. Stumpf, *Philosophische Monatshefte*, Volume 14, pp. 13-30; **and** “On Space of Four Dimensions”, *Quarterly Journal of Science*, New Series, Volume 8, (April, 1878), pp. 227-237; **and** *Van Nostrand’s Eclectic Engineering Magazine*, Volume 19, p. 83; **and** *Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen*, L. Staackmann, Leipzig, (1878-1881); partial English translation by C. C. Massey, *Transcendental Physics: An Account of Experimental Investigations from the Scientific Treatises of Johann Carl Friedrich Zollner*, W. H. Harrison, London, (1880), and Colby & Rich, Boston, (1881); **and** Arno Press, New York, (1976); reviewed by P. G. Tait, *Nature*, (28 March 1878), pp. 420-422; **and** *Das Skalen-Photometer: ein neues Instrument zur mechanischen Messung des Lichtes; nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte und Theorie der mechanischen Photometrie ; mit. . . einem Nachtrag zum dritten Bande der “Wissenschaftlichen Abhandlungen” über die “Geschichte der vierten Dimension” und die “hypnotischen Versuche des Hrn. Professor Weinhold etc.”*, Staackmann, Leipzig, (1879); **and** *Die transcendente Physik und die sogenannte Philosophie; eine deutsche Antwort auf eine “sogenannte wissenschaftliche Frage”*, L. Staackmann, Leipzig, (1879); **and** *Zur Aufklärung des Deutschen Volkes über Inhalt und Aufgabe der Wissenschaftlichen Abhandlungen von F. Zöllner*, Staackmann, Leipzig, (1880); **and** J. K. F. Zöllner, *Erklärung der universellen Gravitation aus den statischen Wirkungen der Elektrizität und die allgemeine Bedeutung des Weber’schen Gesetzes, von Friedrich Zöllner... Mit Beiträgen von Wilhelm Weber nebst einem vollständigen Abdruck der Originalabhandlung: Sur les Forces qui Régissent la Constitution Intérieure des Corps Aperçu pour Servir à la Détermination de la Cause et des Lois de l’Action Moléculaire, par O.F. Mossotti. Mit dem Bildnisse Newton’s in Stahlstich*, L. Staackmann, Leipzig, (1882); **and** *Kepler und die unsichtbare Welt: eine Hieroglyphe*, L. Staackmann, Leipzig, (1882); **See also:** C. Meinel, “Karl Friedrich Zöllner und die Wissenschaftskultur der Gründerzeit: Eine Fallstudie zur Genese konservativer Zivilisationskritik”, *Berliner Beiträge zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Technik*, Volume 13, Sigma/ERS-Verlag, Berlin, (1991).

3313. A. Einstein, “Zur affinen Feldtheorie”, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1923), pp. 137-140. English translation, “Theory of the

Affine Field”, *Nature*, Volume 112, pp. 448-449. *See also*: “Zur einheitlichen Feldtheorie”, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1929), pp. 2-7.

3314. M. Zackheim, *Einstein's Daughter, The Search for Lieserl*, Riverhead Books, New York, (1999), p. 69.

3315. H. Dukas and B. Hoffmann, *Albert Einstein, The Human Side*, Princeton University Press, (1979), p. 38.

3316. H. A. Houghton, Letter to the Editor, “A Newtonian Duplication? Einstein’s Triumph a Long Distance Ahead, Says Dr. Houghton.” *The New York Times*, Section 1, Part 1, (21 April 1923), p. 10.

3317. H. Minkowski, “Space and Time”, *The Principle of Relativity*, Dover, New York, (1952), pp. 81, 83, 88. *See also*: A. Sommerfeld, “Zur Relativitätstheorie. I. Vierdimensionale Vektoralgebra. II. Vierdimensionale Vektoranalysis”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 32, (1910), pp. 749-776; Volume 33, (1910), pp. 649-689.

3318. S. Alexander, *Space, Time, and Deity*, Volume I, Macmillan, London, (1920), p. 346.

3319. M. Planck *quoted in*: A. Reiser (Rudolf Kayser), *Albert Einstein, a Biographical Portrait*, Albert & Charles Boni, New York, (1930), p. 104.

3320. M. Planck, *Scientific Autobiography, and Other Papers*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1949), pp. 46-48.

3321. B. Russell, *The ABC of Relativity*, The New American Library, New York, (1959), pp. 62-63.

3322. E. Cunningham, *The Principle of Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, (1914), pp. 8, 90.

3323. C. Nordmann, *Einstein and the Universe*, Henry Holt and Company, New York, (1922), pp.204-205.

3324. M. Palágyi, *Die Relativitätstheorie in der modernen Physik*, reprinted in: *Zur Weltmechanik*, Johann Ambrosius Barth, Leipzig, (1925), p. 36.

3325. A. Einstein *quoted in* E. Gehrcke, “Zur Diskussion der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie”, *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), p. 35.

3326. E. Gehrcke, “Die erkenntnistheoretischen Grundlagen der verschiedenen physikalischen Relativitätstheorien”, *Kant-Studien*, Volume 19, (1914), pp. 481-487, at 486; republished in *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 35-40, at 38.

3327. A. Einstein, *The Meaning of Relativity*, Princeton Science Library Ed., (1988), pp. 30-31.

3328. A. Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown Publishers, Inc., (1954), p. 282.

3329. A. Einstein translated by I. H. Brose, “Professor Einstein’s Address at the University of Nottingham”, *Science*, New Series, Volume 71, Number 1850, (13 June 1930), pp. 608-610, at 609.

3330. E. Wiechert, “Der Äther im Weltbild der Physik”, *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, (1921), pp. 29-70.

E. Kretschmann, “Über den physikalischen Sinn der Relativitäts-Postulat, A. Einsteins neue und seine ursprüngliche Relativitätstheorie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 53, (1917), pp. 575-614.

3331. S. Mohorovičić, *Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie und ihr mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Charakter*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1923), p. 64.

3332. J. E. Turner, “Some Philosophical Aspects of Scientific Relativity”, *The Journal of Philosophy*, Volume 18, Number 8, (14 April 1921), pp. 210-216. Turner cites: A. S. Eddington, “The Meaning of Matter and the Laws of Nature According to the Theory of

- Relativity”, *Mind*, New Series, Volume 29, Number 114, (April, 1920), pp. 145-158.
- 3333.** W. Kantor, *Relativistic Propagation of Light*, Coronado Press, Lawrence, Kansas, (1976), p. 22.
- 3334.** *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Volume 7, The Macmillan Company & The Free Press, New York, (1967), p. 133.
- 3335.** C. Kacser, “Relativity, Special Theory”, *Encyclopedia of Physics*, 2nd Ed., VCH Publishers, Inc., New York-Weinheim-Cambridge-Basel, (1991), p. 1052.
- 3336.** J. N. Goldberg, “Space-Time”, *Encyclopedia of Physics*, 2nd Ed., VCH Publishers, Inc., New York-Weinheim-Cambridge-Basel, (1991), p. 1159.
- 3337.** A. A. Logunov, *The Theory of Gravity*, Nauka, Moscow, (2001), pp. 71-72.
- 3338.** R. Resnick, *Introduction to Special Relativity*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, London, Sidney, (1968), pp. 92-93.
- 3339.** R. J. Bosovich, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, (1966), pp. 203-205.
- 3340.** J. B. Stallo, “The Concepts and Theories of Modern Physics”, *The International Scientific Series*, Volume XLII, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., (1882), p. 206.
- 3341.** E. Mach, translated by T. J. McCormack, *The Science of Mechanics*, second revised and enlarged edition, Open Court, Chicago, (1902), pp. 542-543.
- 3342.** See: A. Einstein to M. Besso (6 January 1948) in A. I. Miller, *Albert Einstein’s Special Theory of Relativity, Emergence (1905) and Early Interpretation (1905-1911)*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., (1981), p. 189. F. Adler’s letter of 9 March 1917 translated by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 307, Princeton University Press, (1998), pp. 294-295.
- 3343.** See: A. Einstein to M. Marić, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Document 136, Princeton University Press, (1987).
- 3344.** H. Spencer, *First Principles of a New System of Philosophy*, Second American Edition, D. Appleton and Company, New York, (1874), p. 68.
- 3345.** G. W. Leibnitz, *A Collection of PAPERS, Which passed between the late Learned Mr. LEIBNITZ, AND Dr. CLARKE, In the Years 1715 and 1716. Relating to the PRINCIPLES OF Natural Philosophy and Religion. Mr. LEIBNITZ’S Third Paper.*, James Knapton, London, (1717), BEING An Answer to Dr. CLARKE’S Second Reply.
- 3346.** See: R. P. Richardson, “Relativity and Its Precursors”, *The Monist*, Volume 39, (1929), pp. 126-152; and F. Haiser, “Das Relativitätsprinzip”, *Politisch-anthropologische Revue*, Volume 19, (1920/1921), pp. 495-502; and O. Zettl, “Die Idee der Relativität”, *Der Weg*, Volume 1, (1924/1925), pp. 220-224, 249-254.
- 3347.** Fechner quoted in H. Vaihinger’s, *Philosophy of the ‘As if’*, Barnes & Noble, Inc., New York, (1966), p. 215; translated by C. K. Ogden.
- 3348.** G. W. Leibnitz, S. Clarke, *Collection of PAPERS, Which passed between the late Learned Mr. LEIBNITZ, and Dr. CLARKE, In the Years 1715 and 1716. Relating to the PRINCIPLES OF Natural Philosophy and Religion*, James Knapton, London, (1717), pp. 5-7, 15, 365.
- 3349.** Cf. D. Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Book 1, Part 4, Section 2. For a contrasting opinion, see: H. L. Mansel, *Metaphysics or the Philosophy of Consciousness Phenomenal and Real*, Second Edition, Adam and Charles Black, Edinburgh, (1866), pp. 363-365.
- 3350.** D. Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Book 1, Part 2, Section 3.
- 3351.** J. W. Dunne, *An Experiment in Time*, Macmillan, New York, (1927). Cf. R. v.B. Rucker, *Geometry, Relativity and the Fourth Dimension*, Dover, New York, (1977), p. 123.
- 3352.** T. H. Green, “Can there be a Natural Science of Man? [In Three Parts]”, *Mind*, Volume 7, Number 25, (January, 1882), pp. 1-29; Volume 7, Number 26, (April, 1882), pp. 161-185;

and T. H. Green and A. C. Bradley, "Can there be a Natural Science of Man?", *Mind*, Volume 7, Number 27, (July, 1882), pp. 321-348. T. H. Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, (1883). **Criticisms are found in:** S. Pringle-Pattison, Hegelianism and Personality, W. Blackwood, Edinburgh, London, (1887); **and** E. B. McGilvary, "The Eternal Consciousness", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 10, Number 40, (October, 1901), pp. 479-497.

3353. Quoted in S. Clarke, *A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God And Other Writings*, Edited by Ezio Vailati, Cambridge University Press, (1998), p. 33.

3354. S. Clarke, "A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God", Proposition 5, *The Works of Samuel Clarke, D. D. Late Rector of St James's Westminster*, Volume 2, Third Sermon, John and Paul Knapton, London, (1738), pp. 539-540.

3355. D. Hartley, "Of the Being and Attributes of God, and of Natural Religion", *Observations on Man, His Frame, His Duty, and His Expectations in Two Parts*, Volume 2, Chapter 1, Printed by S. Richardson for James Leake and Wm. Frederick, booksellers in Bath and sold by Charles Hitch and Stephen Austen, booksellers in London, London, (1749), pp. 5-70, at 28.

3356. G. Teichmüller, *Die wirkliche und die scheinbare Welt: neue Grundlegung der Metaphysik*, W. Koenner, Breslau, (1882).

3357. H. A. Lorentz, *Theory of Electrons*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1909), p. 11; reprinted Dover, New York, (1952). *See also:* pp. 30-31.

3358. E. Montgomery, "Space and Touch, I, II & III", *Mind*, Volume 10, (1885), pp. 227-244, 377-398, and 512-531, at 529.

3359. B. Bosanquet, translator, H. Lotze, *Metaphysic in Three Books Ontology, Cosmology, and Psychology*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, (1884), pp. 268-269. Lotze's work provoked much debate. *See:* B. Bosanquet, S. H. Hodgson, G. E. Moore, "In What Sense, if any, do Past and Future Time Exist?", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 6, Number 22, (April, 1897), pp. 228-240. *See also:* V. Welby, "Time as Derivative", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 16, Number 63, (July, 1907), pp. 383-400, at 400. *See also:* V. Welby, "Mr. McTaggart on the 'Unreality of Time'", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 18, Number 70, (April, 1909), pp. 326-328; **and** J. E. McTaggart, "The Unreality of Time", *Mind*, New Series, Volume 17, Number 68, (October, 1908), pp. 457-474.

3360. *Cf.* A. Moszkowski, *Einstein: The Searcher*, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1921), pp. 32-33. "Atom Energy Hope is Spiked by Einstein", *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, (29 December 1934), Second News Section. "Einstein Mss Given to War Loan Drive", *The New York Times*, (2 February 1944), p. 14.

3361. *See:* H. E. Ives, "Derivation of the Mass-Energy Relation", *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, Volume 42, Number 8, (August, 1952), pp. 540-543; reprinted R. Hazelett and D. Turner Editors, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers, a Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair Company, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979), pp. 182-185.

3362. A. Einstein quoted in R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, The World Publishing Company, (1971), p. 261; referencing A. Einstein to A. Sommerfeld, in A. Hermann. *Briefwechsel. 60 Briefe aus dem goldenen Zeitalter der modernen Physik*, Schwabe & Co., Basel, Stuttgart, (1968), p. 69.

3363. R. S. Shankland, "Conversations with Albert Einstein", *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 56. Also see Einstein's letters to Zangger of late December, 1919, and of January, 1920, in which he discusses the cult surrounding him.

- 3364.** A. Einstein, “On Receiving the One World Award”, *Out of My Later Years*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1950); here quoted from: *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), pp. 146-147.
- 3365.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 32, *see also*: pp. 110, 116-117.
- 3366.** Letter from A. Einstein to M. Besso of 12 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 207, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 178-179, at 178.
- 3367.** C. Huyghens, “Rèles du Mouvement dans la Rencontre des Corps”, *Journal des Sçavans*, (1669); reprinted in Huyghens’ *Œuvre*, Volume 16; **and** *De Motu Corporum ex Percussione*, *Œuvre*, Volume 16; German translation in F. Hausdorff, translator, annotator, *Über die Bewegung der Körper durch den Stoss / Über die Centrifugalkraft*, Ostwald’s Klassiker der exakten Wissenschaften, Nr. 138, Wilhelm Engelmann, Leipzig, (1903). *See: Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, “Huygens”. G. W. Leibnitz, *Die Philosophischen Schriften von Leibniz*, Weidmann, Berlin, (1875-1890), Volume 3, pp. 45-47, 52-54, 59-60; Volume 4, pp. 381-384, 442-443; **and** *Leibnizens mathematischen Schriften*, H. W. Schmidt, Berlin, (1848-1863), Volume 6, pp. 117-124, 216, 227-231, 239, 243-248, 287-292, 345-367, 437-441, 488-493. *See*: N. Jolley, Editor, *The Cambridge Companion to Leibniz*, Cambridge University Press, (1995); C. Mercer and R. C. Sleight, Jr., “The laws of motion”, Chapter 4, Section 4.3, pp. 309-321.
- 3368.** Aristotle, *Physics*, Book 7, Chapter 5. R. Des Cartes, *Principles of Philosophy*, Part 2, Article 36. I. Newton, *Principia*, Book 1, Definitions, Definition 2.
- 3369.** “Energy”, as a term for Leibnitz’ *vis viva*, was perhaps introduced into the English language by Thomas Young, *A Course of Lectures on Natural Philosophy and the Mechanical Arts*, Volume 1, Taylor and Walton, London, (1845), p. 59.
- 3370.** G. G. Coriolis, *Du Calcul de l’Effet des Machines, ou Considérations sur l’Emploi des Moteurs*, Paris, (1829). Coriolis used the term “*force vive*”. First use of the term “kinetic energy” in English is perhaps by Thomson and Tait, *Good Words*, (October, 1862).
- 3371.** English translation by C. G. Abbot with an introduction by S. P. Langley appears in: “The Le Sage Theory of Gravitation”, *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution Showing the Operations, Expenditures, and Condition of the Institution for the Year Ending June 30, 1898*, (U.S.) Government Printing Office, Washington, (1899), pp. 139-160, at 150.
- 3372.** S. T. Preston, *Physics of the Ether*, E. & F. N. Spon, London, (1875), p. 115; In addition to this book, see also his many works in *Nature* and in the *Philosophical Magazine*.
- 3373.** S. T. Preston, “The Ether and its Functions”, *Nature*, Volume 27, (19 April 1883), p. 579.
- 3374.** A. Einstein, translated by A. Beck, “On the Development of our Views Concerning the Nature and Constitution of Radiation”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Document 60, Princeton University Press, (1989), pp. 379-394, at 386.
- 3375.** J. E. Boodin, “Energy and Reality I: Is Experience Self-Supporting?”, *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, Volume 5, Number 14, (2 July 1908), pp. 365-375; **and especially** “Energy and Reality II. The Definition of Energy”, *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, Volume 5, Number 15, (16 July 1908), pp. 393-406.
- 3376.** J. E. Boodin, “Energy and Reality II. The Definition of Energy”, *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, Volume 5, Number 15, (16 July 1908), pp. 393-406, at 404-405, at 398.

3377. Mileva Einstein-Marity and Albert Einstein, “Ist die Trägheit eines Körpers von seinem Energieinhalt abhängig?”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 18, (1905), p. 641.

3378. A. W. Pflüger, *Das Einsteinsche Relativitäts-Prinzip gemeinverständlich dargestellt*, F. Cohn, Bonn, (1920).

3379. A. Pflüger, *Das Einsteinsche Relativitätsprinzip gemeinverständlich dargestellt*, Third Edition, Friedrich Cohen, Bonn, (1920), pp. 17-18.

3380. Cf. G. Bear in H. G. Wells, *The Last War, Introduction by Greg Bear*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, Nebraska, (2001), pp. xix-xx.

3381. A. Einstein, “Atomic War or Peace”, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), p. 118.

3382. F. Soddy, “The Wider Aspects of the Discovery of Atomic Disintegration”, *Atomic Digest*, Volume 2, Number 3, (1954), pp. 3-17. *The Wider Aspects of the Discovery of Atomic Disintegration*, New World Public, St. Stephens House, Westminster S. W. I., (1954). German translation in: “Die Relativitätstheorie ist ein anmassender Schwindel, und ein Schritt zurueck in das Reich der Fantasie”, *Wissen im Werden*, Volume 3, Number 3, (1959), p. 115.

3383. F. Soddy, *The Interpretation of Radium Being the Substance of Six Free Popular Experimental Lectures Delivered at the University of Glasgow, 1908*, John Murray, London, (1909), pp. 223-250.

3384. S. Newcomb, “On the Definition of the Terms Energy and Work”, *Philosophical Magazine*, 5, 27, (1889), pp. 115-117. **See also:** J. R. Schütz, “Das Prinzip der absoluten Erhaltung der Energie”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, (1897), pp. 110-123. **See also:** G. F. Helm, *Die Energetik nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Veit, Leipzig, (1898), p. 362.

3385. J. J. Thomson, “On the Electric and Magnetic Effects Produced by the Motion of Electrified Bodies”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 11, (1881), pp. 227-229; **and** *A Treatise on the Motion of Vortex Rings*, Macmillan, London, (1883); **and** *Elements of the Mathematical Theory of Electricity and Magnetism*, Cambridge University Press, (1895); **and** *The Elements of the Four Inner Planets and the Fundamental Constants of Astronomy*, (Supplement to the American ephemeris and nautical almanac for 1897), (U.S.) Government Printing Office, Washington, (1895); **and** “Cathode Rays”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 44, (1897), pp. 293-316; **and** “On the Masses of the Ions in Gases at Low Pressures”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 5, Volume 48, (1899), pp. 547-567; **and** “Über die Masse der Träger der negativen Elektrisierung in Gasen von niederen Drucken”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 1, (1899-1900), pp. 20-22; **and** “On Bodies Smaller than Atoms”, *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution for the Year ending June 30, 1901*, (1902), pp. 231-243 [*Popular Science Monthly*, (August, 1901)]; **and** *Electricity and Matter*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1904); translated into German, *Elektrizität und Materie*, F. Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1904); Ives notes, cf. E. Cunningham, *The Principle of Relativity*, Cambridge University Press, (1914), p. 189.

3386. H. Poincaré, “La Théorie de Lorentz at le Principe de Réaction”, *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Series 2, Volume 5, *Recueil de travaux offerts par les auteurs à H. A. Lorentz, professeur de physique à l’université de Leiden, à l’occasion du 25^{me} anniversaire de son doctorate le 11 décembre 1900*, Nijhoff, The Hague, (1900), pp. 252-278; reprinted *Œuvres*, Volume IX, p. 464-488.

3387. O. De Pretto, “Ipostesi dell’etere nella vita dell’universo”, *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, Volume 63, Part 2, (February, 1904), pp. 439-500. **See:** U. Bartocci, “*Albert Einstein e Olinto De Pretto: la vera storia della formula più famosa del*

mondo / Umberto Bartocci ; con una nota biografica a cura di Bianca Maria Bonicelli e il testo integrale dell'opera di Olinto De Pretto, 'Ipotesi dell'etere nella vita dell'universo' , Andromeda, Bologna, (1999).

3388. F. Hasenöhr, “Zur Theorie der Strahlung in bewegten Körpern”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 113, (1904), pp. 1039-1055; **and** “Zur Theorie der Strahlung in bewegten Körpern”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 15, (1904), pp. 344-370; *corrected*: Series 4, Volume 16, (1905), pp. 589-592; **and** *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 116, (1907), pp. 1391; **and** “Über die Umwandlung kinetischer Energie in Strahlung”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 10, (1909), pp. 829-830; **and** “Bericht über die Trägheit der Energie”, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 6, (1909), pp. 485-502; **and** “Über die Widerstand, welchen die Bewegung kleiner Körperchen in einem mit Hohlraumstrahlung erfüllten Raume erleidet”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* (Wiener Sitzungsberichte), Volume 119, (1910), pp. 1327-1349; **and** “Die Erhaltung der Energie und die Vermehrung der Entropie”, in E. Warburg, *Die Kultur der Gegenwart: Ihre Entwicklung und ihre Ziele*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1915), pp. 661-691. *Cf.* P. Lenard’s analysis in, “Über die Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahls von seiner geradlinigen Bewegung durch die Attraktion eines Weltkörpers, an welchem er nahe vorbeigeht; von J. Soldner, 1801”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 65, (1921), pp. 593-604; **and** E. Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), pp. 51-54; **and** M. Born, “Physics and Relativity”, *Physics in my Generation*, 2nd rev. ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, (1969), pp. 105-106. **See also:** A. Einstein, “Zum gegenwärtigen Stand des Strahlungsproblems”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 10, Number 6, (1909), pp. 185-1193; **and** “Über die Entwicklung unserer Anschauungen über das Wesen und die Konstitution der Strahlung”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 7, (1909), pp. 482-500; reprinted *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 10, (1909), pp. 817-825.

3389. M. Planck, “Das Prinzip der Relativität und die Grundgleichungen der Mechanik”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 8, (1906), pp. 136-141; **and** “Die Kaufmannschen Messungen der Ablenkbarkeit der β -Strahlen in ihrer Bedeutung für die Dynamik der Elektronen”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift* Volume 7, (1906), pp. 753-759, with a discussion on pp. 759-761; **and** “Zur Dynamik bewegter Systeme”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, Volume 13, (June, 1907), 542-570, especially 542 and 544; reprinted *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 26, (1908), pp. 1-34; reprinted *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 2, F. Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 176-209; **and** “Bemerkungen zum Prinzip der Aktion und Reaktion in der allgemeinen Dynamik”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 10, (1908), pp. 728-731; **and** “Bemerkungen zum Prinzip der Aktion und Reaktion in der allgemeinen Dynamik (With a Discussion with Minkowski)”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 9, Number 23, (November 15, 1908), pp. 828-830. **See also:** R. v. Eötvös, “A Föld Vonzása Különböző Anyagokra”, *Akadémiai Értésítő*, Volume 2, (1890), pp. 108-110; German translation, “Über die Anziehung der Erde auf verschiedene Substanzen”, *Mathematische und naturwissenschaftliche Berichte aus Ungarn*, Volume 8, (1890), pp. 65-68; response, W. Hess, *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 15, (1891), p. 688-689; **and** R. v. Eötvös, “Untersuchung über Gravitation und

Erdmagnetismus”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 3, Volume 59, (1896), pp. 354-400; **and** “Beszéd a kolozsvári Bolyai-emlékűnnepen”, *Akadémiai Értesítő*, (1903), p. 110; **and** “Bericht über die Verhandlungen der fünfzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung abgehalten vom 20. bis 28. September 1906 in Budapest”, *Verhandlungen der vom 20. bis 28. September 1906 in Budapest abgehaltenen fünfzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1908), pp. 55-108; **and** *Über geodetischen Arbeiten in Ungarn, besonders über Beobachtungen mit der Drehwaage*, Hornyánszky, Budapest, (1909); **and** “Bericht über Geodätische Arbeiten in Ungarn, besonders über Beobachtungen mit der Drehwaage”, *Verhandlungen der vom 21. Bis 29. September 1909 in London und Cambridge abgehaltenen sechzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1910), pp. 319-350; **and** “Über Arbeiten mit der Drehwaage: Ausgeführt im Auftrage der Königlichen Ungarischen Regierung in den Jahren 1908-1911”, *Verhandlungen der vom in Hamburg abgehaltenen siebzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1912), pp. 427-438; **and** Eötvös, Pekár, Fekete, *Trans. XVI. Allgemeine Konferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, (1909); *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (1909), *geschäftliche Mitteilungen*, p. 37; **and** “Beiträge zur Gesetze der Proportionalität von Trägheit und Gravität”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 68, (1922), pp. 11-16; **and** D. Pekár, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 7, (1919), p. 327. **Confer:** H. E. Ives, “Derivation of the Mass-Energy Relation”, *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, Volume 42, Number 8, (August, 1952), pp. 540-543; reprinted R. Hazelett and D. Turner Editors, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers, a Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair Company, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979), pp. 182-185. **See also:** E. Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume II, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), pp. 151-152. **See also:** G. B. Brown, “What is Wrong with Relativity?”, *Bulletin of the Institute of Physics and the Physical Society*, Volume 18, Number 3, (March, 1967), p. 71. **See also:** A. Einstein, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 4, (1907), pp. 411-462; *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 35, (1911), pp. 898-908.

3390. Galileo, *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, (1967); **and** *Dialogues Concerning Two New Sciences*, Dover, New York, (1954).

3391. C. Huygens, *Christiani Hugenii Zulichemii Opera mechanica, geometrica astronomica et miscellanea quatuor voluminibus contexta : quæ collegit disposuit, ex schedis authoris emendavit, ordinavit, auxit atque illustravit Guilielmus Jacobus’s Gravesande*, Gravesande, Willem Jacob’s Lugduni Batavorum : Apud Gerardum Potvliet, Henricum van der Deyster, Philippum Bonk et Cornelium de Pecker, (1751). Cf. R. Taton, “The Beginnings of Modern Science, from 1450 to 1800”, *History of Science*, Volume 2, Basic Books, New York, (1964-1966).

3392. I. Newton, *Principia*, Book I, Definitions I, II and III; **and** Book II, Section VI, Proposition XXIV, Theorem XIX; **and** Book III, Proposition VI, Theorem VI.

3393. R. J. Boscovich, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, (1966).

3394. A. Schopenhauer, *The World as Will and Idea*, Volume 1, first Book, Section 4, seventh edition, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., London, (1907), pp. 10-13.

3395. E. Mach, *Die Geschichte und die Wurzel des Satzes von der Erhaltung der Arbeit*, J. G. Calve, Prag, (1872); English translation by P. E. B. Jourdain, *History and Root of the Principle of the Conservation of Energy*, Open Court, Chicago, 1911; **and** *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwicklung historisch-kritisch dargestellt*, F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig, (1883 and

multiple revised editions, thereafter); translated into English as *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, La Salle, (numerous editions).

3396. A. Bolliger, *Anti-Kant oder Elemente der Logik, der Physik und der Ethik*, Felix Schneider, Basel, (1882), esp. pp. 336-354.

3397. F. J. K. Geissler, *Eine mögliche Wesenserklärung für Raum, Zeit, das Unendliche und die Kausalität, nebst einem Grundwort zur Metaphysik der Möglichkeiten*, Gutenberg, Berlin, (1900); **and** “Ringgenberg Schluss mit der Einstein-Irrung!”, H. Israel, *et al*, Editors, *Hundert Autoren Gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, (1931), pp. 10-12.

3398. F. W. Bessel, “Untersuchungen des Teiles planetarischer Störungen, welche aus der Bewegung der Sonne entstehen”, *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1824); reprinted *Abhandlungen von Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel*, In Three Volumes, Volume 1, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1875-1876), p. 84; **and** “Bestimmung der Masse des Jupiter”, *Astronomische Untersuchungen*, In Two Volumes, Gebrüder Bornträger, Königsberg, Volume 2, (1841-1842); *Abhandlungen von Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel*, Volume 3, p. 348. M. Jammer, *Concepts of Mass*, cites: F. W. Bessel, “Studies on the Length of the Seconds Pendulum”, *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1824); **and** “Experiments on the Force with which the Earth Attracts Different Kinds of Bodies”, *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1830); **and** F. W. Bessel, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 25, (1832), pp. 1-14; **and** Volume 26, (1833), pp. 401-411; **and** *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 10, (1833), pp. 97-108.

3399. J. S. Stas, *Nouvelles recherches sur les lois des proportions chimiques: sur les poids atomiques et leurs rapports mutuels*, M. Hayez, Bruxelles, (1865), pp. 151, 171, 189 and 190; German translation by L. Aronstein, *Untersuchungen über die Gesetze der chemischen Proportionen, über die Atomgewichte und ihre gegenseitigen Verhältnisse*, Quandt & Händel, Leipzig, (1867).

3400. R. v. Eötvös, “A Föld Vonzása Különböző Anyagokra”, *Akadémiai Értesítő*, Volume 2, (1890), pp. 108-110; German translation, “Über die Anziehung der Erde auf verschiedene Substanzen”, *Mathematische und naturwissenschaftliche Berichte aus Ungarn*, Volume 8, (1890), pp. 65-68; response, W. Hess, *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 15, (1891), pp. 688-689; **and** R. v. Eötvös, “Untersuchung über Gravitation und Erdmagnetismus”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 3, Volume 59, (1896), pp. 354-400; **and** “Beszéd a kolozsvári Bolyai-emlékűnnepen”, *Akadémiai Értesítő*, (1903), p. 110; **and** “Bericht über die Verhandlungen der fünfzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung abgehalten vom 20. bis 28. September 1906 in Budapest”, *Verhandlungen der vom 20. bis 28. September 1906 in Budapest abgehaltenen fünfzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1908), pp. 55-108; **and** *Über geodetischen Arbeiten in Ungarn, besonders über Beobachtungen mit der Drehwaage*, Hornyánszky, Budapest, (1909); **and** “Bericht über Geodätische Arbeiten in Ungarn, besonders über Beobachtungen mit der Drehwaage”, *Verhandlungen der vom 21. Bis 29. September 1909 in London und Cambridge abgehaltenen sechzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1910), pp. 319-350; **and** “Über Arbeiten mit der Drehwaage: Ausgeführt im Auftrage der Königlichen Ungarischen Regierung in den Jahren 1908-1911”, *Verhandlungen der vom in Hamburg abgehaltenen siebzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1912), pp. 427-438; **and** Eötvös, Pekár, Fekete, *Trans. XVI. Allgemeine Konferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, (1909); *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (1909), *geschäftliche Mitteilungen*, p. 37; **and** “Beiträge zur Gesetze der Proportionalität von Trägheit und Gravität”, *Annalen der Physik*,

Series 4, Volume 68, (1922), pp. 11-16; **and** D. Pekár, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 7, (1919), p. 327.

3401. D. Kreichgauer, “Einige Versuche über die Schwere”, *Verhandlungen der physikalische Gesellschaft zu Berlin*, Volume 10, (1891), pp. 13-16.

3402. H. Landolt, “Untersuchungen über etwaige Änderungen des Gesamtgewichtes chemisch sich umsetzender Körper”, *Zeitschrift für physikalische Chemie*, Volume 12, (1893), pp. 1-34; “Untersuchungen über dir fraglichen Änderungen des Gesamtgewichtes chemisch sich umsetzender Körper. Zweite Mitteilung”, *Zeitschrift für physikalische Chemie*, Volume 55, (1906), pp. 589-621; “Untersuchungen über dir fraglichen Änderungen des Gesamtgewichtes chemisch sich umsetzender Körper. Dritte Mitteilung”, *Zeitschrift für physikalische Chemie*, Volume 64, (1908), pp. 581-614.

3403. A. Heydweiller, “Ueber Gewichtänderungen bei chemischer und physikalischer Umsetzung”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 4, Number 5, (1901), pp. 394-420; **and** “Bemerkungen zu Gewichtänderungen bei chemischer und physikalischer Umsetzung”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 3, (1902), pp. 425-426.

3404. Confer: P. Volkmann, *Einführung in das Studium der theoretischen Physik*, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1900), pp. 74-77. E. Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., London, (1953), pp. 151-152. F. Kottler, “Gravitation und Relativitätstheorie”, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen*, Volume 6, Part 2, Chapter 22a, pp. 159-237, at 188.

3405. A. Einstein, “Das Prinzip von der Erhaltung der Schwerpunktsbewegung und die Trägheit der Energie”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 20, (1906), pp. 627-633, at 627.

3406. Confer: E. Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume II, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), pp. 52-53.

3407. G. N. Lewis, “A Revision of the Fundamental Laws of Matter and Energy”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 16, (1908), pp. 707-717; **and** G. N. Lewis and R. C. Tolman, “The Principle of Relativity and Non-Newtonian Mechanics”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 18, (1909), p. 510-523; **and** G. N. Lewis, “A Revision of the Fundamental Laws of Matter and Energy”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 16, (1908), pp. 707-717; **and** R. C. Tolman, “Non-Newtonian Mechanics, the Mass of a Moving Body”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 23, (1912), pp. 375-380; **and** E. B. Wilson and G. N. Lewis, “The Space-Time Manifold of Relativity: The Non-Euclidean Geometry of Mechanics and Electrodynamics”, *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Volume 48, Number 11, (November, 1912), pp. 389-507.

3408. G. B. Brown, “What is Wrong with Relativity?”, *Bulletin of the Institute of Physics and the Physical Society*, Volume 18, Number 3, (March, 1967), p. 71; citing G. N. Lewis, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 18, (1909), pp. 517-527.

3409. L. A. P. Rougier, *Philosophy and the New Physics*, English translation by M. Masius, P. Blakiston’s Son & Co., Philadelphia, (1921); *La Matérialisation de L’Énergie*, Gauthier-Villars, (1921).

3410. M. Jammer, *Concepts of Mass in Classical and Modern Physics*, Dover, New York, (1961).

3411. H. Poincaré, St. Louis lecture from September of 1904, *La Revue des Idées*, 80, (November 15, 1905); “L’État Actuel et l’Avenir de la Physique Mathématique”, *Bulletin des Sciences Mathématique*, Series 2, Volume 28, (1904), p. 302-324; English translation, “The Principles of Mathematical Physics”, *The Monist*, Volume 15, Number 1, (January, 1905), p. 15.

- 3412.** A. Bain, *Logic*, Volume II, Longmans Green and Co., London, (1870), pp. 225, 389.
- 3413.** O. Heaviside, "On the Electromagnetic Effects Due to the Motion of Electrification through a Dielectric", *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 27, (1889), pp. 324-339, at 332.
- 3414.** A. Schopenhauer, *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung: vier Bücher, nebst einem Anhang, der die Kritik der Kantischen Philosophie enthält*, F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig, (1819); English translation by E. F. J. Payne in A. Schopenhauer, *The World as Will and Representation*, Volume 2, Dover, New York, (1969), pp. 309-310. **See also:** B. Magee, *The Philosophy of Schopenhauer*, Oxford University Press, (1983), pp. 110-113.
- 3415.** W. Caldwell, *Schopenhauer's System in Its Philosophical Significance*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, (1896), p. 61.
- 3416.** H. F. John, "Stephen Moulton Babcock", *The World's Work*, Volume 6, Number 3, (July, 1903), pp. 3687-3689.
- 3417.** F. Soddy, *Radio-activity: An Elementary Treatise, from the Standpoint of the Disintegration Theory*, "The Electrician" printing & publishing company, ltd., London, (1904), p. 180; excerpt substantially had from R. Hazelett and D. Turner Editors, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers, a Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair Company, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979), p. 186.
- 3418.** A. E. Dolbear, *Matter, Ether and Motion*, C. J. Peters & Son, Boston, Second Edition, (1894), p. 345.
- 3419.** O. Lodge quoted in A. Reuter Dahl, *Scientific Theism Versus Materialism*, The Devin-Adair Company, New York, (1920), p. 285.
- 3420.** R. J. Boscovich, *A Theory of Natural Philosophy*, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, (1966), p. 21.
- 3421.** J. Toland, "Motion Essential to Matter; an Answer to Some Remarks by a Nobel Friend on the Confutation of Spinoza.", *Letters to Serena*, Letter V, B. Lintot, London, (1704); reproduced F. Fromann, Stuttgart, (1964) and Garland, New York, (1976).
- 3422.** Aristotle, *The Metaphysics*, translated by J. H. McMahon, Prometheus Books, New York, (1991), p. 192, Book IX, Chapter 8, 1050b.
- 3423.** H. E. Ives, "Derivation of the Mass-Energy Relation", *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, Volume 42, Number 8, (August, 1952), pp. 540-543; reprinted R. Hazelett and D. Turner Editors, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers, a Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair Company, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979), pp. 182-185. **See also:** J. Riseman and I. G. Young, "Mass-Energy Relationship", and H. E. Ives, "Note on 'Mass-Energy Relationship,'" *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, Volume 43, Number 7, (July, 1953) pp. 618-619; reprinted R. Hazelett and D. Turner Editors, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers, a Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair Company, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979), pp. 187, 231. **See also:** M. Jammer, *Concepts of Mass in Classical and Modern Physics*, Dover, New York, (1997), pp. 176-177. L. S. Swenson, Jr., *Genesis of Relativity*, Burt Franklin & Co., New York, (1979), pp. 202-203.
- 3424.** M. Jammer, *Concepts of Mass in Classical and Modern Physics*, Dover, New York, (1997), pp. 178-179. Jammer notes, "that Einstein proved the equivalence of mass and energy also in the following [later] articles[. . .]"
- 3425.** L. S. Swenson, Jr., *Genesis of Relativity: Einstein in Context*, Burt Franklin & Co., Inc., New York, (1979), p. 203.
- 3426.** *Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (1984), p. 1199.
- 3427.** *Encyclopedia International*, Grolier Incorporated, New York, (1966), Volume 15, p. 358.

3428. J. Stachel, Ed., *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Princeton University Press, (1989). pp. xxiv-xxv.

3429. *Encyclopedia International*, Grolier Incorporated, New York, (1966), Volume 14, p. 446.

3430. *Encyclopedia International*, Grolier Incorporated, New York, (1966), Volume 11, pp. 82-83.

3431. R. S. Shankland, "Conversations with Albert Einstein", *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 56. Also see Einstein's letters to Zangger of late December, 1919, and of January, 1920, in which he discusses the cult surrounding him.

3432. A. Einstein, "On Receiving the One World Award", *Out of My Later Years*, Philosophical Library, New York, (1950); here quoted from: *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), pp. 146-147.

3433. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 32, *see also*: pp. 110, 116-117.

3434. *See*: A. Fowler, *The Observatory*, Volume 42, (1919), p. 297; Volume 43, Number 548, (1920), pp. 33-45. *See also*: J. J. Thomson, "Joint Eclipse Meeting of the Royal Society and the Royal Astronomical Society", *The Observatory*, Volume 42, (1919), pp. 389-398. *See also*: C. L. Poor, "The Deflection of Light as Observed at Total Solar Eclipses", *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, Volume 20, (1930), pp. 173-211; **and** "What Einstein Really Did", *Scribner's Magazine*, Volume 88, (July-December, 1930), pp. 527-538; discussion follows in *Commonweal*, Volume 13, (24 December 1930, 7 January 1931, 11 February 1931), pp. 203-204, 271-272, 412-413. *See also*: S. H. Guggenheimer, *The Einstein Theory Explained and Analyzed*, Macmillan, New York, (1920), pp. 298-299. *See also*: D. Sciama, G. J. Whitrow, Ed., *Einstein: The Man and His Achievement*, Dover, New York, (1973), pp. 39-40. *See also*: A. M. MacRobert, "Beating the Sky", *Sky and Telescope*, Volume 89, (1995), pp. 40-43. *See also*: J. Maddox, "More Precise Solar-Limb Light-Bending", *Nature*, Volume 377, (1995), p. 11. *See also*: C. Couture and P. Marmet, "Relativistic Reflection of Light Near the Sun Using Radio Signals and Visible Light", *Physics Essays*, Volume 12, (1999), pp. 162-173.

3435. F. W. Dyson, "On the opportunity afforded by the eclipse of 1919 May 29 of verifying Einstein's Theory of Gravitation", *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, Volume 77, (1917), p. 445; **and** "Joint Eclipse Meeting of the Royal Society and the Royal Astronomical Society, 1919, November 6", *The Observatory*, Volume 42, Number 545, (1919), pp. 389-398; **and** F. W. Dyson, C. A. Davidson, and A. S. Eddington, "Determination of the deflection of light by the Sun's gravitational field, from observations made at the total eclipse of May 29, 1919", *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A*, Volume 220, (1920), pp. 291-333; *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution Showing the Operations, Expenditures, and Conditions of the Institution for the Year Ending June 30, 1919*, (U.S.) Government Printing Office, Washington, (1921), pp. 133-176.

3436. D. Brian, *Einstein, A Life*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, (1996), pp. 316-317.

3437. A. Einstein, "On the Abolition of the Threat of War", *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), pp. 165-166, at 165. An alternative translation appears in: S. Hook, "My Running Debate With Einstein", *Commentary*, Volume 74, Number 1, (July, 1982), pp. 37-52, at 49.

3438. A. F. Joffe, *Vstrechi s fizikami, moi vospominaniia o zarubezhnykh fizikah*, Gosudarstvenoye Izdatelstvo Fiziko-Matematicheskoi Literatury, Moscow, (1962), pp. 91-92. А. Ф. Иоффе, Встречи с физиками, мои воспоминания о зарубежных физиках,

- Государственное Издательство Физико-Математической Литературы, Москва, (1962), стр. 91-92. Special thanks to my wife Kristina for her assistance in the translation.
- 3439.** J. Stachel, *Einstein from 'B' to 'Z'*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (2002), p. 79, note 41.
- 3440.** See: *The New York Times*, (7 December 1930), p. 11.
- 3441.** H. Dukas and B. Hoffmann, *Albert Einstein: The Human Side*, Princeton University Press, (1979), p. 55.
- 3442.** A. Einstein, "Atomic War or Peace?", *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), pp. 121, 123.
- 3443.** E. Gehrcke, *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), p. 2.
- 3444.** H. A. Lorentz, *The Theory of Electrons*, Dover, New York, (1952), p. 230.
- 3445.** D. Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, Section VII, Parts I & II.
- 3446.** E. Mach, "The Economy of Science", *The Science of Mechanics*, Open Court, LaSalle, Illinois, (1960), pp. 577-595.
- 3447.** W. Hamilton, *Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform*, Second Enlarged Edition, Longman, Brown, Green and Longman's, London, (1853), pp. 628-631; quoted in K. Pearson's *Grammar of Science*, Appendix, Note III.
- 3448.** A. Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown Publishers, Inc., (1954), p. 293.
- 3449.** A. Einstein, quoted in *Contemporary Quotations*, Compiled by J. B. Simpson, Thomas Y. Cromwell Company, New York, (1964), p. 189.
- 3450.** A. Einstein, quoted in *Contemporary Quotations*, Compiled by J. B. Simpson, Thomas Y. Cromwell Company, New York, (1964), p. 262.
- 3451.** A. F. Joffe, *Vstrechi s fizikami, moi vospominaniia o zarubezhnykh fizikah*, Gosudarstvenoye Izdatelstvo Fiziko-Matematicheskoi Literatury, Moscow, (1962), p. 92. A. Ф. Иоффе, Встречи с физиками, мои воспоминания о зарубежных физиках, Государственное Издательство Физико-Математической Литературы, Москва, (1962), стр. 92. Special thanks to my wife Kristina for her assistance in the translation.
- 3452.** A. Einstein, "Zum Relativitäts-Problem", *Scientia*, Volume 15, (1914), pp. 337-348, at 344-346; **and** "Die formale Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie" *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1914), pp. 1030-1085, at 1031-1032; **and** "Die Grundlange der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 49, (1916), pp. 769-822, at 771-772; **and** "Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist", *Library of Living Philosophers*, P. A. Schilpp, Evanston, Illinois, (1949), p. 18-21.
- 3453.** E. Mach, *Die Principien der physikalischen Optik*, (1921), pp. viii-ix; *The Principles of Physical Optics*, (1926), pp. vii-vii; **and** *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwicklung*, 8th ed. F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig, (1921), Appendix: "Das Verhältnis der Mach'schen Gedankenwelt zur Relativitätstheorie" by Joseph Petzoldt, pp. 490-517; **and** *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwicklung*, 9th ed. F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig, (1933), Forward by Dr. Ludwig Mach, pp. XVIII-XX. **See also:** John Blackmore, Klaus Hentschel, Editors, *Ernst Mach als Aussenseiter*, Willhelm Braumüller, Wien, (1985), pp. 134-138. **Confer:** H. Dingler, *Physik und Hypothese: Versuch einer induktiven Wissenschaftslehre*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1921), p. viii.
- 3454.** T. K. Oesterreich, *Friedrich Ueberwegs Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, Part 4, E. S. Mittler & Sohn, Berlin, (1923), p. 396. The reference to Petzoldt is: E. Mach, *Die Mechanik in ihrer Entwicklung*, 8th ed. F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig, (1921), Appendix: "Das Verhältnis der Mach'schen Gedankenwelt zur Relativitätstheorie" by Joseph Petzoldt, pp. 490-517.

- 3455.** A. Einstein, “Ernst Mach”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 17, Number 7, (April 1, 1916), pp. 101-104. **See also:** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 5, Documents 448, 467, and 495. **See also:** John Blackmore, Klaus Hentschel, Editors, *Ernst Mach als Aussenseiter*, Willhelm Braumüller, Wien, (1985).
- 3456.** “La Théorie de la Relativité. Discussion”, *Bulletin de la Société Française de Philosophie*, Volume 22, (1922), pp. 91-113, at 112.
- 3457.** R. Olson, *The Emergence of the Social Sciences, 1642-1792*, Twayne Publishers, New York, (1993), pp. 94-95.
- 3458.** I. Newton, *The Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*, Volume 2, Benjamin Motte, London, (1729), pp. 202-205.
- 3459.** K. Pearson, *The Grammar of Science*, Second Revised and Enlarged Edition, Adam and Charles Black, London, (1900).
- 3460.** H. Poincaré, *Dernières Pensées*, Flammarion, Paris, (1913); English translation *Mathematics and Science: Last Essays*, Dover, New York, (1963), pp. 22-23.
- 3461.** H. Poincaré, *Science and Hypothesis*, quoted in *The Foundations of Science*, The Science Press, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, (1946), p. 46.
- 3462.** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, Toronto, Melbourne, (1982), p. 133-134.
- 3463.** S. Goldberg, “Henri Poincare and Einstein’s Theory of Relativity”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 35, (1967), pp. 934-944; **and** “The Lorentz Theory of Electrons and Einstein’s Theory of Relativity”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 35, (1969), pp. 982-994; **and** “Poincare’s Silence and Einstein’s Relativity: The Role of Theory and Experiment in Poincaré’s Physics”, *The British Journal for the History of Science*, Volume 5, Number 17, (1970), pp. 73-84; **and** *Understanding Relativity*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Stuttgart, (1984).
- 3464.** A. Einstein, *The Meaning of Relativity*, Third Edition, Princeton University Press, (1956), pp. 2-3. Also found in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 71.
- 3465.** J. C. Maxwell, *Matter and Motion*, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London, (1876), p. 20.
- 3466.** W. K. Clifford, *The Common Sense of the Exact Sciences*, Dover, New York, (1955), pp. 193-194.
- 3467.** A. Einstein, *Relativity, the Special and the General Theory*, Crown Publishers, Inc., New York, (1961), App. V, p. 140-141.
- 3468.** A. Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown Publishers, Inc., New York, (1954), p. 307.
- 3469.** A. Einstein and I. Infeld, *The Evolution of Physics*, Simon & Schuster, New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore, (1966), p. 31.
- 3470.** A. Einstein, translated by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 3, Document 18, Princeton University Press, (1993), p. 357.
- 3471.** A. Einstein, “On the Method of Theoretical Physics”, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown, New York, (1954), p. 271.
- 3472.** Letter from F. Paschen to A. Einstein of 13 January 1920, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 259, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 216.
- 3473.** A. Einstein, *Ideas and Opinions*, Crown Publishers, Inc., New York, (1954), p. 307.
- 3474.** A. Einstein, quoted in A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, Toronto, Melbourne, (1982), p. 131.
- 3475.** F. Bacon, *Francisci de Verulamio, summi Angliae cancellarii, Instauratio magna*, Joannem Billium, London, (1620). German translation, *Franz Bacon’s neues Organ der*

Wissenschaften, F.A. Brockhaus, Leipzig, (1830).

3476. R. Boyle, *Some Considerations Touching the Usefulness of Experimental Natural Philosophy. Propos'd in a Familiar Discourse to a Friend, by Way of Invitation to the Study of It*. R. Davis, Oxford, (1664).

3477. J. F. W. Herschel, A preliminary discourse on the study of natural philosophy, Longman and J. Taylor, London, (1830); German translation, *Ueber das Studium der Naturwissenschaft*, Vandehoeck u. Ruprecht, Göttingen, (1836); French translation, *Discours sur l'Étude de la Philosophie Naturelle*, Paulin, Paris, (1834).

3478. W. Thomson, P. G. Tait, *Elements of Natural Philosophy*, Cambridge University Press, (1879).

3479. D. Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, Multiple Editions; **and** *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Multiple Editions.

3480. W. S. Jevons, *The Principles of Science*, 2nd Ed., Macmillan, London, (1877), pp. 11-12.

3481. W. S. Jevons, *The Principles of Science*, 2nd Ed., Macmillan, London, (1877), p. 595.

3482. N. De Manhar, *Zohar: Bereshith—Genesis: An Expository Translation from Hebrew*, Third Revised Edition, Wizards Bookshelf, San Diego, (1995), p. 174.

3483. W. S. Jevons, *The Principles of Science*, 2nd Ed., Macmillan, London, (1877), p. 621.

3484. E. Mach, *History and Root of the Principle of the Conservation of Energy*, Open Court, Chicago, (1911), p. 60.

3485. H. P. Robertson, “Postulate versus Observation in the Special Theory of Relativity”, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, Volume 21, Number 3, (1949), pp. 378-382.

3486. R. A. Millikan, “Albert Einstein on His Seventieth Birthday”, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, Volume 21, Number 3, (July, 1949), pp. 343-345, at 343.

3487. H. P. Robertson, “Postulate versus Observation in the Special Theory of Relativity”, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, Volume 21, Number 3, (1949), pp. 378-382, at 378.

3488. W. S. Jevons, *The Principles of Science*, 2nd Ed., Macmillan, London, (1877), p. 121.

3489. A. Einstein, Translated by A. Engel, “Induction and Deduction”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 28, (2002), p. 109.

3490. Letter from A. Einstein to P. Ehrenfest of 4 December 1919, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 189, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 161-163, at 161.

3491. F. Kleinschrod, “Das Lebensproblem und das Positivitätsprinzip in Zeit und Raum und das Einsteinsche Relativitätsprinzip in Raum und Zeit”, *Frankfurter Zeitgemäße Broschuren*, Volume 40, Number 1-3, Breer & Thiemann, Hamm, Westphalen, (October-December, 1920), pp. 17, 47.

3492. H. E. Ives, “Derivation of the Mass-Energy Relation”, *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, Volume 42, Number 8, (August, 1952), pp. 540-543; reprinted R. Hazelett and D. Turner Editors, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers, a Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair Company, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979), pp. 182-185. *See also:* J. Riseman and I. G. Young, “Mass-Energy Relationship”, and H. E. Ives, “Note on ‘Mass-Energy Relationship,’” *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, Volume 43, Number 7, (July, 1953) pp. 618-619; reprinted R. Hazelett and D. Turner Editors, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers, a Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair Company, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979), pp. 187, 231. *See also:* M. Jammer, *Concepts of Mass in Classical and Modern Physics*, Dover, New York, (1997), pp. 176-177. L. S. Swenson, Jr., *Genesis of Relativity*, Burt Franklin & Co., New York, (1979), pp. 202-203.

3493. Galileo, *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems*, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, (1967); **and** *Dialogues Concerning Two New*

Sciences, Dover, New York, (1954).

3494. C. Huygens, *Christiani Hugenii Zulichemii Opera mechanica, geometrica astronomica et miscellanea quatuor voluminibus contexta : quæ collegit disposuit, ex schedis authoris emendavit, ordinavit, auxit atque illustravit Guilielmus Jacobus's Gravesande*, Gravesande, Willem Jacob's Lugduni Batavorum : Apud Gerardum Potvliet, Henricum van der Deyster, Philippum Bonk et Cornelium de Pecker, (1751). Cf. R. Taton, "The Beginnings of Modern Science, from 1450 to 1800", *History of Science*, Volume 2, Basic Books, New York, (1964-1966).

3495. I. Newton, *Principia*, Book I, Definitions I, II and III; **and** Book II, Section VI, Proposition XXIV, Theorem XIX; **and** Book III, Proposition VI, Theorem VI.

3496. F. W. Bessel, "Untersuchungen des Teiles planetarischer Störungen, welche aus der Bewegung der Sonne entstehen", *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1824); reprinted *Abhandlungen von Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel*, In Three Volumes, Volume 1, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1875-1876), p. 84; **and** "Bestimmung der Masse des Jupiter", *Astronomische Untersuchungen*, In Two Volumes, Gebrüder Bornträger, Königsberg, Volume 2, (1841-1842); *Abhandlungen von Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel*, Volume 3, p. 348. M. Jammer, *Concepts of Mass*, cites: F. W. Bessel, "Studies on the Length of the Seconds Pendulum", *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1824); **and** "Experiments on the Force with which the Earth Attracts Different Kinds of Bodies", *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1830); **and** F. W. Bessel, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 25, (1832), pp. 1-14; **and** Volume 26, (1833), pp. 401-411; **and** *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 10, (1833), pp. 97-108.

3497. J. S. Stas, *Nouvelles recherches sur les lois des proportions chimiques: sur les poids atomiques et leurs rapports mutuels*, M. Hayez, Bruxelles, (1865), pp. 151, 171, 189 and 190; German translation by L. Aronstein, *Untersuchungen über die Gesetze der chemischen Proportionen, über die Atomgewichte und ihre gegenseitigen Verhältnisse*, Quandt & Händel, Leipzig, (1867).

3498. R. v. Eötvös, "A Föld Vonzása Különböző Anyagokra", *Akadémiai Értesítő*, Volume 2, (1890), pp. 108-110; German translation, "Über die Anziehung der Erde auf verschiedene Substanzen", *Mathematische und naturwissenschaftliche Berichte aus Ungarn*, Volume 8, (1890), pp. 65-68; response, W. Hess, *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 15, (1891), pp. 688-689; **and** R. v. Eötvös, "Untersuchung über Gravitation und Erdmagnetismus", *Annalen der Physik*, Series 3, Volume 59, (1896), pp. 354-400; **and** "Beszéd a kolozsvári Bolyai-emlékünnepen", *Akadémiai Értesítő*, (1903), p. 110; **and** "Bericht über die Verhandlungen der fünfzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung abgehalten vom 20. bis 28. September 1906 in Budapest", *Verhandlungen der vom 20. bis 28. September 1906 in Budapest abgehaltenen fünfzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1908), pp. 55-108; **and** *Über geodetischen Arbeiten in Ungarn, besonders über Beobachtungen mit der Drehwaage*, Hornyánszky, Budapest, (1909); **and** "Bericht über Geodätische Arbeiten in Ungarn, besonders über Beobachtungen mit der Drehwaage", *Verhandlungen der vom 21. Bis 29. September 1909 in London und Cambridge abgehaltenen sechzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1910), pp. 319-350; **and** "Über Arbeiten mit der Drehwaage: Ausgeführt im Auftrage der Königlichen Ungarischen Regierung in den Jahren 1908-1911", *Verhandlungen der vom in Hamburg abgehaltenen siebzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1912), pp. 427-438; **and** Eötvös, Pekár, Fekete, *Trans. XVI. Allgemeine Konferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, (1909); *Nachrichten von der Königlichen*

Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen (1909), *geschäftliche Mitteilungen*, p. 37; **and** “Beiträge zur Gesetze der Proportionalität von Trägheit und Gravität”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 68, (1922), pp. 11-16; **and** D. Pekár, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 7, (1919), p. 327.

3499. D. Kreichgauer, “Einige Versuche über die Schwere”, *Verhandlungen der physikalische Gesellschaft zu Berlin*, Volume 10, (1891), pp. 13-16.

3500. H. Landolt, “Untersuchungen über etwaige Änderungen des Gesamtgewichtes chemisch sich umsetzender Körper”, *Zeitschrift für physikalische Chemie*, Volume 12, (1893), pp. 1-34; “Untersuchungen über dir fraglichen Änderungen des Gesamtgewichtes chemisch sich umsetzender Körper. Zweite Mitteilung”, *Zeitschrift für physikalische Chemie*, Volume 55, (1906), pp. 589-621; “Untersuchungen über dir fraglichen Änderungen des Gesamtgewichtes chemisch sich umsetzender Körper. Dritte Mitteilung”, *Zeitschrift für physikalische Chemie*, Volume 64, (1908), pp. 581-614.

3501. A. Heydweiller, “Ueber Gewichtänderungen bei chemischer und physikalischer Umsetzung”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 4, Number 5, (1901), pp. 394-420; **and** “Bemerkungen zu Gewichtänderungen bei chemischer und physikalischer Umsetzung”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 3, (1902), pp. 425-426.

3502. M. Planck, “Das Prinzip der Relativität und die Grundgleichungen der Mechanik”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 8, (1906), pp. 136-141; **and** “Die Kaufmannschen Messungen der Ablenkbarkeit der β -Strahlen in ihrer Bedeutung für die Dynamik der Elektronen”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift* Volume 7, (1906), pp. 753-759, with a discussion on pp. 759-761; **and** “Zur Dynamik bewegter Systeme”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, Volume 13, (June, 1907), 542-570, especially 542 and 544; reprinted *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 26, (1908), pp. 1-34; reprinted *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 2, F. Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 176-209; **and** “Bemerkungen zum Prinzip der Aktion und Reaktion in der allgemeinen Dynamik”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 10, (1908), pp. 728-731; **and** “Bemerkungen zum Prinzip der Aktion und Reaktion in der allgemeinen Dynamik (With a Discussion with Minkowski)”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 9, Number 23, (November 15, 1908), pp. 828-830. **See also:** R. v. Eötvös, “A Föld Vonzása Különböző Anyagokra”, *Akadémiai Értesítő*, Volume 2, (1890), pp. 108-110; German translation, “Über die Anziehung der Erde auf verschiedene Substanzen”, *Mathematische und naturwissenschaftliche Berichte aus Ungarn*, Volume 8, (1890), pp. 65-68; response, W. Hess, *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 15, (1891), p. 688-689; **and** R. v. Eötvös, “Untersuchung über Gravitation und Erdmagnetismus”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 3, Volume 59, (1896), pp. 354-400; **and** “Beszéd a kolozsvári Bolyai-emlékünnepen”, *Akadémiai Értesítő*, (1903), p. 110; **and** “Bericht über die Verhandlungen der fünfzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung abgehalten vom 20. bis 28. September 1906 in Budapest”, *Verhandlungen der vom 20. bis 28. September 1906 in Budapest abgehaltenen fünfzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1908), pp. 55-108; **and** *Über geodetischen Arbeiten in Ungarn, besonders über Beobachtungen mit der Drehwaage*, Hornyánszky, Budapest, (1909); **and** “Bericht über Geodätische Arbeiten in Ungarn, besonders über Beobachtungen mit der Drehwaage”, *Verhandlungen der vom 21. Bis 29. September 1909 in London und Cambridge abgehaltenen sechzehnten allgemeinen Conferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1910), pp. 319-350; **and** “Über Arbeiten mit der Drehwaage: Ausgeführt im Auftrage der Königlichen Ungarischen Regierung in den Jahren 1908-1911”, *Verhandlungen der vom in Hamburg*

abgehaltenen siebzehnten allgemeinen Konferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung, Part 1, G. Reimer, Berlin, (1912), pp. 427-438; **and** Eötvös, Pekár, Fekete, *Trans. XVI. Allgemeine Konferenz der Internationalen Erdmessung*, (1909); *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (1909), *geschäftliche Mitteilungen*, p. 37; **and** “Beiträge zur Gesetze der Proportionalität von Trägheit und Gravität”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 68, (1922), pp. 11-16; **and** D. Pekár, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 7, (1919), p. 327. **Confer:** H. E. Ives, “Derivation of the Mass-Energy Relation”, *Journal of the Optical Society of America*, Volume 42, Number 8, (August, 1952), pp. 540-543; reprinted R. Hazelett and D. Turner Editors, *The Einstein Myth and the Ives Papers, a Counter-Revolution in Physics*, Devin-Adair Company, Old Greenwich, Connecticut, (1979), pp. 182-185. **See also:** E. Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 2, Philosophical Library, New York, (1954), pp. 151-152. **See also:** G. B. Brown, “What is Wrong with Relativity?”, *Bulletin of the Institute of Physics and the Physical Society*, Volume 18, Number 3, (March, 1967), p. 71. **See also:** A. Einstein, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 4, (1907), pp. 411-462; *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 35, (1911), pp. 898-908. **See also:** I. Newton, *Principia*, Book I, Definitions I, II and III; **and** Book II, Section VI, Proposition XXIV, Theorem XIX; **and** Book III, Proposition VI, Theorem VI. **See also:** F. W. Bessel, “Untersuchungen des Teiles planetarischer Störungen, welche aus der Bewegung der Sonne entstehen”, *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1824); reprinted *Abhandlungen von Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel*, In Three Volumes, Volume 1, W. Engelmann, Leipzig, (1875-1876), p. 84; **and** “Bestimmung der Masse des Jupiter”, *Astronomische Untersuchungen*, In Two Volumes, Gebrüder Bornträger, Königsberg, Volume 2, (1841-1842); *Abhandlungen von Friedrich Wilhelm Bessel*, Volume 3, p. 348. M. Jammer, *Concepts of Mass*, cites: “Studies on the Length of the Seconds Pendulum”, *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1824); **and** “Experiments on the Force with which the Earth Attracts Different Kinds of Bodies”, *Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1830); **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 25, (1832), pp. 1-14; **and** Volume 26, (1833), pp. 401-411; **and** *Astronomische Nachrichten*, Volume 10, (1833), cols. 97-108.

3503. G. E. Tauber, *Albert Einstein's Theory of General Relativity*, Crown, New York, (1979), p. 49.

3504. A. Einstein, “Über Friedrich Kottlers Abhandlung ‘Über Einsteins Äquivalenzhypothese und die Gravitation’”, *Annalen der Physik*, Volume 51, (1916), pp. 639-642, at 639; English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 6, Document 40, Princeton University Press, (1997), p. 237.

3505. A. Einstein, “On the Present State of the Problem of Gravitation”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 4, Document 17, Princeton University Press, (1996), pp. 200, 208.

3506. A. Einstein, English translation by A. Engel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 58, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 238-240, at 238-239.

3507. D. Hilbert, “Die Grundlagen der Physik, (Erste Mitteilung.) Vorgelegt in der Sitzung vom 20. November 1915.”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1915), pp. 395-407.

3508. A. Einstein, “Dialog über Einwände gegen die Relativitätstheorie”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 6, Number 48, (29 November 1918), pp. 697-702; English translation by A. Engel appears in *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 13, Princeton University Press, (2002), pp. 66-75.

- 3509.** See: Galileo Galilei, *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems*, Includes forward by A. Einstein, University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, (1967); and *Dialogues Concerning Two New Sciences*, Dover, New York, (1954).
- 3510.** Cf. E. Gehrcke, “Über das Uhrenparadoxon in der Relativitätstheorie”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 9, (1921), p. 482; republished *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 75-76.
- 3511.** A. Einstein quoted in G. E. Tauber, *Albert Einstein's Theory of General Relativity*, Crown, New York, (1979), p. 98.
- 3512.** Cf. C. J. Bjerknes, “Einstein's Irrational Ontology of Redundancy—The Special Theory of Relativity and Its Many Fallacies of *Petitio Principii*”, *Episteme* (University of Perugia, Italy), Number 6, Part II, (21 December 2002), pp. 75-82.
- 3513.** H. Goenner, “The Reaction to Relativity Theory. I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920”, *Science in Context*, Volume 6, Number 1, (1993), pp. 107-133, at 115.
- 3514.** A. Einstein quoted in G. E. Tauber, *Albert Einstein's Theory of General Relativity*, Crown, New York, (1979), p. 108.
- 3515.** E. H. Rhodes, “The Scientific Conception of the Measurement of Time”, *Mind*, Volume 10, Number 39, (July, 1885), pp. 347-362. M. Sachs, “On the Mach Principle and Relative Space-Time (in Discussions)”, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Volume 23, Number 2, (May, 1972), pp. 117-119. K. L. Manders, “On the Space-Time Ontology of Physical Theories”, *Philosophy of Science*, Volume 49, Number 4, (December, 1982), pp. 575-590.
- 3516.** Cf. W. Del-Negro, “Zum Streit über den philosophischen Sinn der Einsteinschen Relativitätstheorie”, *Archiv für systematische Philosophie*, New Series, Volume 27, (1924), 103 ff.; “Relativitätstheorie und Wahrheitsproblem”, *Archiv für systematische Philosophie und Soziologie*, New Series, Volume 28, (1925), 126 ff.; H. Israel, et al, Eds., “Die Fragwürdigkeit der Relativitätstheorie”, *Hundert Autoren Gegen Einstein*, R. Voigtländer, Leipzig, (1931), p. 7.
- 3517.** See: D. H. Fischer, *Historian's Fallacies, Toward a Logic of Historical Thought*, Harper & Row, New York, Evanston, (1970).
- 3518.** Emil Cohn stated the principle of relativity and discussed its heuristic value, and addressed Fresnel's coefficient of drag, the relativistic Doppler Effect and aberration. Furthermore, he stated that the æther was superfluous, in agreement with Mill, Ostwald, Bucherer, Poincaré, and (much later) the Einsteins, etc. See: *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Vol II, Princeton University Press, (1989), pp. 260-261, and p. 307, note 6. E. Cohn, “Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Systeme”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (November, 1904), pp. 1294-1303; and “Zur Elektrodynamik bewegter Systeme. II”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Sitzung der physikalisch-mathematischen Classe*, (December, 1904), pp. 1404-1416; and “Ueber die Gleichungen des elektromagnetischen Feldes für bewegte Körper”, *Annalen der Physik*, 7, (1902), pp. 29-56. “(Aus den Nachrichten d. Gesellsch. D. Wissensch. zu Göttingen, 1901, Heft 1; Sitzung vom 11. Mai 1901. Mit einer Aenderung p. 31.)”; and “Über die Gleichungen der Elektrodynamik für bewegte Körper”, *Archives Néerlandaises des Sciences Exactes et Naturelles*, Series 2, Volume 5, (1900), pp. 516-523.
- 3519.** R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 56. See also: “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 41, Number 1, (1973), pp. 895-901.

3520. G. G. Stokes, “On the Aberration of Light”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 3, Volume 27, (1845), pp. 9-15; reprinted in *Mathematical and Physical Papers*, In Five Volumes, Volume 1, Cambridge University Press, (1880-1905), p. 134; **and** “On Fresnel’s Theory of the Aberration of Light”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 3, Volume 28, (1846), pp. 76-81. **See also:** F. Fresnel, *Annales de Chimie et de Physique*, Series 2, Volume 9, (1818), pp. 57-66.

3521. A. A. Michelson, “The relative motion of the Earth and the Luminiferous ether”, *American Journal of Science*, Volume 22, (1881), pp. 128-129. **See also:** G. F. Barker, *An Account of Progress in Physics and Chemistry in the Year 1881*, from the Smithsonian Report for 1881, Government Printing Office, Washington, (1883), pp. 29-30. **See also:** A. A. Michelson and E. W. Morley, “On the Relative Motion of the Earth and the Luminiferous Ether”, *American Journal of Science*, Volume 34, (1887), p. 333. **See also:** A. A. Michelson, *Studies in Optics*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, (1928), pp. 156-166. Michelson also asserted that there could be no theory of electrodynamics, sans an æther. **See:** S. Goldberg, *Understanding Relativity*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Stuttgart, (1984), p. 259.

3522. *Physics Today*, Volume 35, Number 8, (August, 1982), p. 46.

3523. A. Einstein, translated by A. Beck, “On the Development of our Views Concerning the Nature and Constitution of Radiation”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Document 60, Princeton University Press, (1989), pp. 379-394, at 383.

3524. R. S. Shankland, “The Michelson-Morley Experiment”, *Scientific American*, Volume 211, Number 5, (1964), pp. 107-114, at 114.

3525. R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57; **and** “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 41, Number 1, (1973), pp. 895-901; **and** “Comment on ‘Conversations with Albert Einstein. II’”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 43, Number 5, (May, 1975), p. 464; **and** “Michelson-Morley Experiment”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 32, Number 1, (January, 1964), pp. 16-35; **and** “The Michelson-Morley Experiment”, *Scientific American*, Volume 211, Number 5, (1964), pp. 107-114.

3526. A. Henderson, A. W. Hobbs, J. W. Lasley, Jr., *The Theory of Relativity*, University of North Carolina Press, Oxford University Press, (1924), pp. 5-9. H. Reichenbach, *The Philosophy of Space and Time*, Dover, USA, (1958), pp. 195-202.

3527. R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 54.

3528. The first quote is from the first edition, E. F. Taylor and J. A. Wheeler, *Spacetime Physics*, W. H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, London, (1966), p. 14; **and** those which follow after are from E. F. Taylor and J. A. Wheeler, *Spacetime Physics*, Second Edition, W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, (1992), p. 86.

3529. M. Zackheim, *Einstein’s Daughter, The Search for Lieserl*, Riverhead Books, New York, (1999). This work provides numerous insights into Mileva’s and Albert’s lives. **See also:** G. J. Whitrow, *Einstein, the Man and His Achievement*, Dover, New York, (1973), pp. 21-22.

3530. D. Trbuhović-Gjurić, *Im Schatten Albert Einsteins, Das tragische Leben der Mileva Einstein-Marić*, Paul Haupt, Bern, (1983). **See also:** D. Krstic, Matica Srpska (Novi Sad), *Collected Papers. Natural Sciences*, Volume 40, (1971), p. 190, note 2; **and** “The Wishes of Dr. Einstein”, *Dnevnik* (Novi Sad), Volume 28, Number 9963, (1974), p. 9; **and** “The Education of Mileva Marić-Einstein, the First Woman Theoretical Physicist, at the Royal Classical High School in Zagreb at the End of the 19th Century”, *Collected Papers on History of Education* (Zagreb), Volume 9, (1975), p. 111; **and** “The First Woman

Theoretical Physicist”, *Dnevnik* (Novi Sad), Volume 30, VIII/21, (1976); **and** *Mileva and Albert Einstein: Love and Joint Scientific Work*, Diodakta, (1976); and D. Krstic, “Mileva Einstein-Marić”, in E. R. Einstein, *Hans Albert Einstein: Reminiscences of His Life and Our Life Together*, Appendix A, Iowa Institute of Hydraulic Research, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, (1991), pp. 85-99, 111-112. **See also:** T. Pappas, *Mathematical Scandals*, Wide World Publishing/Tetra, San Carlos, California, (1997), pp. 121-129. **See also:** M. Maurer, “Weil nicht sein kann, was nicht sein darf. . . ‘DIE ELTERN’ ODER ‘DER VATER’ DER RELATIVITÄTSTHEORIE? Zum Streit über den Anteil von Mileva Marić an der Entstehung der Relativitätstheorie”, *PCnews*, Number 48 (Nummer 48), Volume 11 (Jahrgang 11), Part 3 (Heft 3), Vienna, (June, 1996), pp. 20-27; reprinted from *Dokumentation des 18. Bundesweiten Kongresses von Frauen in Naturwissenschaft und Technik vom 28.-31.*, Birgit Kanngießer, Bremen, (May, 1992), not dated, pp. 276-295; an earlier version appeared, co-authored by P. Seibert, *Wechselwirkung*, Volume 14, Number 54, Aachen, (April, 1992), pp. 50-52 (Part 1); Volume 14, Number 55, (June, 1992), pp. 51-53 (Part 2). URL:

<http://rli.at/Seiten/kooperat/maric1.htm>

See also: E. H. Walker, “Did Einstein Espouse his Spouses Ideas?”, *Physics Today*, Volume 42, Number 2, (February, 1989), pp. 9, 11; **and** “Mileva Marić’s Relativistic Role”, *Physics Today*, Volume 44, Number 2, (February, 1991), pp. 122-124; **and** “Ms. Einstein”, *AAAS [American Association for the Advancement of Science] Annual Meeting Abstracts for 1990*, (February 15-20, 1990), p. 141; **and** “Ms. Einstein”, *The Baltimore Sun*, (30 March 1990), p. 11A. **See also:** S. Troemel-Ploetz, “Mileva Einstein-Marić: The Woman Who did Einstein’s Mathematics”, *Women’s Studies International Forum*, Volume 13, Number 5, (1990), pp. 415-432; *Index on Censorship*, Volume 19, Number 9, (October, 1990), pp. 33-36. **See also:** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1982), p. 47. **See also:** W. Sullivan, “Einstein Letters Tell of Anguished Love Affair”, *The New York Times*, (3 May 1987), pp. 1, 38. **See also:** “Did Einstein’s Wife Contribute to His Theories?”, *The New York Times*, (27 March 1990), Section C, p. 5. **See also:** S. L. Garfinkel, “First Wife’s Role in Einstein’s Work Debated”, *The Christian Science Monitor*, (27 February 1990), p. 13. **See also:** D. Overbye, “Einstein in Love”, *Time*, Volume 135, Number 18, (30 April 1990), p. 108; **and** *Einstein in Love: A Scientific Romance*, Viking, New York, (2000). **See also:** “Was the First Mrs Einstein a Genius, too?”, *New Scientist*, Number 1706, (3 March 1990), p. 25. **See also:** A. Gabor, *Einstein’s Wife: Work and Marriage in the Lives of Five Great Twentieth-Century Women*, Viking, New York, (1995). **See also:** J. Haag, “Einstein-Marić, Mileva”, *Women in World History: A Biographical Encyclopedia*, Volume 5, Yorkin Publications, (2000), pp. 77-81. **See also:** M. Zackheim, *Einstein’s Daughter: The Search for Lieserl*, Riverhead Books, Penguin Putnam, New York, (1999). **See also:** Television Documentary, *Einstein’s Wife: The Life of Mileva Maric-Einstein*, URL:

<http://www.pbs.org/opb/einsteinswife/>

For counter-argument, see: J. Stachel, “Albert Einstein and Mileva Marić: A Collaboration that Failed to Develop”, found in *Creative Couples in the Sciences*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, New Jersey, (1996), pp. 207-219; **and** Stachel’s reply to Walker, *Physics Today*, Volume 42, Number 2, (February, 1989), pp. 11, 13. **See also:** A. Fölsing, “Keine ‘Mutter der Relativitätstheorie’”, *Die Zeit*, Number 47, (16 November 1990), p. 94. **See also:** A. Pais, *Einstein Lived Here*, Oxford University Press, New York,

(1994), pp. 14-16.

For the Einstein's correspondence, see: J. Stachel, Editor, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987); English translations by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987). **See also:** J. Renn and R. Schulmann, Editors, *Albert Einstein/Mileva Maric: The Love Letters*, Princeton University Press, (1992). **See also:** M. Popović, *In Albert's Shadow: The Life and Letters of Mileva Maric, Einstein's First Wife*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, (2003).

3531. T. Pappas, *Mathematical Scandals*, Wide World Publishing/Tetra, San Carlos, California, (1997), pp. 121-129. **See also:** D. Truhović-Gjurić, *Im Schatten Albert Einsteins, Das tragische Leben der Mileva Einstein-Marić*, 5th Ed., Verlag Paul Haupt, Bern-Stuttgart-Wien, (1993), p. 97. **See also:** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1982), p. 47; **and** *Einstein Lived Here*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1994), pp. 14-16. **See also:** J. Stachel, Ed., *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987), pp. 282 and 330, letters from Albert to Mileva, "How happy and proud I will be, when we two together have victoriously led our work on relative motion to an end!" "Wie glücklich und stolz werde ich sein, wenn wir beide zusammen unsere Arbeit über die Relativbewegung siegreich zu Ende geführt haben!" and "As my dear wife, we will want to engage in a quite diligent scientific collaboration, so that we don't become old Philistines, isn't it so?" "Bis Du mein liebe Weiberl bist, wollen wir recht eifrig zusammen wissenschaftlich arbeiten, daß wir keine alten Philistersleut werden, gellst."

3532. A. F. Joffe (*also:* Ioffe), "In Remembrance of Albert Einstein", *Uspekhi fizicheskikh nauk*, Volume 57, Number 2, (1955), p. 187. А. Ф. Иоффе, Памяти Альберта Эйнштейна, Успехи физических наук, 57, 2, (1955), стр. 187. Special thanks to my wife, Kristina, for her assistance in the translation. I initially found this reference in Pais' work of 1994, and he credited Robert Schulmann with it, but did not give a date. I later discovered that Evan Harris Walker had cited it in "Mileva Marić's Relativistic Role", *Physics Today*, Volume 44, Number 2, (1991), pp. 122-124, at 123.

3533. D. Truhović-Gjurić, *Im Schatten Albert Einsteins, Das tragische Leben der Mileva Einstein-Marić*, Paul Haupt, Bern & Stuttgart, (1983).

3534. Refer to the preface of *Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein* translated by: H. Goenner, "The Reaction to Relativity Theory in Germany, III: 'A Hundred Authors against Einstein'", in J. Earman, M. Janssen, J. D. Norton, Eds., *The Attraction of Gravitation: New Studies in the History of General Relativity*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (1993), p. 251.

3535. A. v. Brunn, quoted in: K. Hentschel, Ed., A. Hentschel, Ed. Ass. and Trans., *Physics and National Socialism: An Anthology of Primary Sources*, Birkhäuser, Basel, Boston, Berlin, (1996), p. 11.

3536. S. Mohorovicic, *Die Einsteinsche Relativitätstheorie und ihr mathematischer, physikalischer und philosophischer Charakter*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Leipzig, (1923), pp. 52-53.

3537. J. Stark, *Die gegenwärtige Krisis in der Deutschen Physik*, Johann Ambrosius Barth, Leipzig, (1922), p. 16. H. Goenner, "The Reaction to Relativity Theory in Germany, III: 'A Hundred Authors against Einstein'", *The Attraction of Gravitation: New Studies in the History of General Relativity*, Birkhäuser, Boston, Basel, Berlin, (1993), p. 250.

3538. A. Einstein, "Meine Antwort", *Berliner Tageblatt und Handels-Zeitung*, (August 27, 1920).

3539. E. Gehrcke, *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924); **and** *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924).

3540. M. Maurer. Her papers include: “Weil nicht sein kann, was nicht sein darf. . . ‘DIE ELTERN’ ODER ‘DER VATER’ DER RELATIVITÄTSTHEORIE? Zum Streit über den Anteil von Mileva Maric an der Entstehung der Relativitätstheorie”, *PCnews*, Number 48 (Nummer 48), Volume 11 (Jahrgang 11), Part 3 (Heft 3), Vienna, (June, 1996), pp. 20-27; reprinted from *Dokumentation des 18. Bundesweiten Kongresses von Frauen in Naturwissenschaft und Technik vom 28.-31*, Birgit Kanngießer, Bremen, (May, 1992), pp. 276-295; an earlier version appeared, co-authored by P. Seibert, *Wechselwirkung*, Volume 14, Number 54, Aachen, (April, 1992), pp. 50-52 (Part 1); Volume 14, Number 55, (June, 1992), pp. 51-53 (Part 2).

3541. D. S. Danin, *Neizbezhnost strannogo mira*, Molodaia Gvardiia, Moscow, (1962), p. 57. Д. Данин, Неизбежность странного мира, Молодая Гвардия, Москва, (1962), стр. 57. I became aware of this quotation through the work of Margarete Maurer. Her papers include: “Weil nicht sein kann, was nicht sein darf. . . ‘DIE ELTERN’ ODER ‘DER VATER’ DER RELATIVITÄTSTHEORIE? Zum Streit über den Anteil von Mileva Marić an der Entstehung der Relativitätstheorie”, *PCnews*, Number 48 (Nummer 48), Volume 11 (Jahrgang 11), Part 3 (Heft 3), Vienna, (June, 1996), pp. 20-27; reprinted from *Dokumentation des 18. Bundesweiten Kongresses von Frauen in Naturwissenschaft und Technik vom 28.-31*, Birgit Kanngießer, Bremen, (May, 1992), pp. 276-295; an earlier version appeared, co-authored by P. Seibert, *Wechselwirkung*, Volume 14, Number 54, Aachen, (April, 1992), pp. 50-52 (Part 1); Volume 14, Number 55, (June, 1992), pp. 51-53 (Part 2).URL:

<<http://rli.at/Seiten/kooperat/maric1.htm>>

3542. D. Trbuhović-Gjurić, *Im Schatten Albert Einsteins, Das tragische Leben der Mileva Einstein-Marić*, Paul Haupt, Bern & Stuttgart, (1983), p. 79.

3543. A. F. Joffe, *Vstrechi s fizikami, moi vospominaniia o zarubezhnykh fizikah*, Gosudarstvenoye Izdatelstvo Fiziko-Matematitsheskoj Literatury, Moscow, (1960), pp. 19-20. А. Ф. Иоффе, Встречи с физиками, мои воспоминания о зарубежных физиках, Государственное Издательство Физико-Математической Литературы, Москва, (1960), стр. 19-20. Special thanks to my wife Kristina for her assistance in the translation. **See also:** Letter from A. Joffe to W. Röntgen of August-September, 1906, in: A. Joffe, *O fizike i fizikakh: stat’i, vystupleniia, pis’ma*, Izd-vo “Nauka,” Leningradskoe otd-nie, Leningrad, (1985), pp. 521-522. А. Ф. Иоффе, О Физике и Физиках: Статьи, выступления, письма, Изд-во «Наука», Ленинградское отд-ние, Ленинград, (1985), стр. 521-522.

3544. A. F. Joffe, *Vstrechi s fizikami, moi vospominaniia o zarubezhnykh fizikah*, Gosudarstvenoye Izdatelstvo Fiziko-Matematitsheskoj Literatury, Moscow, (1962), pp. 86-87. А. Ф. Иоффе, Встречи с физиками, мои воспоминания о зарубежных физиках, Государственное Издательство Физико-Математической Литературы, Москва, (1962), стр. 86-87. Special thanks to my wife Kristina for her assistance in the translation.

3545. A. Moszkowski, *Einstein: The Searcher*, E. P. Dutton, New York, (1921), p. 229.

3546. A. Moszkowski, *Einstein Einblicke in seine Gedankenwelt Gemeinverständliche Betrachtungen über die Relativitätstheorie und ein neues Weltsystem Entwickelt aus Gesprächen mit Einstein*, Hoffman und Campe, Hamburg, (1921), p. 226.

3547. *The New York Times*, (3 April 1921), pp. 1, 13, at 13.

3548. L. Infeld, *Quest—An Autobiography*, Chelsea, New York, (1980), p. 258.

3549. P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), pp. 24-25.

- 3550.** P. Micelmore, *Einstein: Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, New York, (1962), pp. 35, 36, 45, 46, 59-60, 67.
- 3551.** A. Pais, *Einstein Lived Here*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1994), p. 15. **See also:** A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein, A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), pp. 315, 375.
- 3552.** R. W. Clarck, *Einstein, the Life and Times*, World Publishing Company, USA, (1971), p. 122.
- 3553.** A. Reiser (Rudolf Kayser), *Albert Einstein, a Biographical Portrait*, Albert & Charles Boni, New York, (1930), p. 51.
- 3554.** D. Brian, *Einstein, A Life*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, (1996), pp. 1, 3.
- 3555.** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, (1982), pp. 67-68.
- 3556.** J. Stachel, Ed., *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987), p. 282, letter from Albert to Mileva.
- 3557.** A. Einstein, translated by A. Beck, "Relativity and Gravitation: Reply to a Comment by M. Abraham", *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 4, Document 8, (1996), p. 131.
- 3558.** A. Einstein, "Elementary Derivation of the Equivalence of Mass and Energy", *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, Series 2, Volume 41, (1935), pp. 223-230, at 223.
- 3559.** H. A. Lorentz, "Théorie Simplifiée des Phénomènes Électriques et Optiques dans des Corps en Mouvement", *Verslagen der Zittingen de Wis- en Natuurkundige Afdeeling der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen* (Amsterdam), Volume 7, (1899), p. 507; reprinted *Collected Papers*, Volume 5, pp. 139-155; "Vereenvoudigde theorie der electriche en optische verschijnselen in lichamen die zich bewegen", *Verslagen van de gewone vergaderingen der wis- en natuurkundige afdeeling, Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam*, Volume 7, (1899), pp. 507-522; English translation, "Simplified Theory of Electrical and Optical Phenomena in Moving Bodies", *Proceedings of the Section of Sciences, Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam*, Volume 1, (1899), pp. 427-442; reprinted in K. F. Schaffner, *Nineteenth Century Aether Theories*, Pergamon Press, New York, Oxford, (1972), pp. 255-273.
- 3560.** J. Larmor, *Aether and Matter*, Cambridge University Press, (1900).
- 3561.** R. S. Shankland, "Michelson-Morley Experiment", *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 32, Number 1, (January, 1964), pp. 16-35, at 34.
- 3562.** P. Drude, *Lehrbuch der Optik*, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1900); translated into English *The Theory of Optics*, Longmans, Green and Co., London, New York, Toronto, (1902), see especially pp. 457-482. On Einstein's ownership of this work, see: *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Princeton University Press, (1989), pp. 135-136, footnote 13.
- 3563.** J. Stachel, Ed., *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987), p. 330, letter from Albert to Mileva.
- 3564.** E. H. Walker, "Did Einstein Espouse his Spouses Ideas?", *Physics Today*, Volume 42, Number 2, (February, 1989), pp. 9, 11; **and** "Mileva Marić's Relativistic Role", *Physics Today*, Volume 44, Number 2, (February, 1991), pp. 122-124.
- 3565.** D. Brian, *Einstein, A Life*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, (1996), p. 33. **See also:** *The Collected Papers of Alber Einstein*, Volume I, Princeton University Press, (1987), pp. 59, 220-221, 230, 235, 258, 267, 273, 292, 300, 318-320.
- 3566.** T. Pappas, *Mathematical Scandals*, Wide World Publishing/Tetra, San Carlos, California, p. 127.
- 3567.** S. Troemel-Ploetz, "Mileva Einstein-Marić: The Woman Who did Einstein's Mathematics", *Women's Studies International Forum*, Volume 13, Number 5, (1990), pp. 415-432; **and** *Index on Censorship*, Volume 19, Number 9, (October, 1990), pp. 33-36.

- 3568.** Cf. J. Stachel, *et al.*, Editors, “Einstein’s Reviews for the *Beiblätter zu den Annalen der Physik*”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Princeton University Press, (1989), pp. 109-111.
- 3569.** R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 50.
- 3570.** A. Einstein, English translation by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 5, Document 499, Princeton University Press, (1995), pp. 373-374, at 374.
- 3571.** P. Michelmore, *Einstein: Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, New York, (1962), p. 35.
- 3572.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), pp. 1, 2, 18. F. Klein to W. Pauli, *Wissenschaftlicher Briefwechsel mit Bohr, Einstein, Heisenberg, u.a. = Scientific correspondence with Bohr, Einstein, Heisenberg, a.o.*, Document 10, Springer, New York, (1979), p. 27.
- 3573.** C. Nordmann, *L’illustration*, (15 April 1922).
- 3574.** *Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger*, (23 March 1921). E. Gehrcke, *Die Massensuggestion der Relativitätstheorie*, and *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), p. 74.
- 3575.** Quoted in R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, World Publishing, New York, (1971), pp. 286-287. Clark cites: C. Nordmann, *L’Illustration*, (15 April 1922).
- 3576.** A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein: A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), p. 333.
- 3577.** P. Halsman, *Einstein: A Centenary Volume*, Harvard University Press, (1980), p. 27.
- 3578.** P. Michelmore, *Einstein: Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, New York, (1962), p. 75.
- 3579.** F. Klein, “Über die Integralform der Erhaltungssätze und die Theorie der räumlich geschlossenen Welt”, *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-physikalische Klasse*, (1918), pp. 394-423.
- 3580.** Letter from F. Klein to W. Pauli of 8 March 1921, in: *Wissenschaftlicher Briefwechsel mit Bohr, Einstein, Heisenberg, u.a. = Scientific correspondence with Bohr, Einstein, Heisenberg, a.o.*, Document 10, Springer, New York, (1979), pp. 27-28, at 27. **See also:** Letter from A. Einstein to F. Klein of 14 April 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 22, Princeton University Press, (2004).
- 3581.** J. Plesch quoted in R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, The World Publishing Company, (1971), p. 348.
- 3582.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), pp. 8-9.
- 3583.** “Expert on Writing Amazes Einstein”, *The New York Times*, (23 February 1930), p. 53.
- 3584.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 114. A. E. Dolbear, *Matter, Ether, and Motion*, Second Revised and Enlarged Edition, Lee and Shepard, Boston, (1894), pp. 354-395.
- 3585.** D. Brian, *Einstein: A Life*, J. Wiley, New York, (1996), pp. 215-216.
- 3586.** U. Sinclair, *Mental Radio*, Thomas, Springfield, Illinois, (1930).
- 3587.** D. Brian, *Einstein: A Life*, J. Wiley, New York, (1996), p. 216.
- 3588.** D. Brian, *Einstein: A Life*, J. Wiley, New York, (1996), p. 216. Brian cites: M. C. Sinclair, *Southern Belle*, Crown, New York, (1957), p. 340.
- 3589.** D. Brian, *Einstein: A Life*, J. Wiley, New York, (1996), p. 216. Brian cites: “”Millionaires Offered \$ to sit Next and Violin Offered”, *Outlook and Independent*, (24 December 1930).
- 3590.** P. Michelmore, *Einstein: Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, New York, (1962), p. 52.
- 3591.** R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 52.

- 3592.** P. Micheltore, *Einstein: Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, New York, (1962), p. 48. G. J. Whitrow, Editor, *Einstein: The Man and his Achievement*, Dover, New York, (1967), p. 19.
- 3593.** M. Zackheim, *Einstein's Daughter, The Search for Lieserl*, Riverhead Books, (1999), p. 100.
- 3594.** Carl Seelig, *Albert Einstein*, Europa Verlag, Zürich, (1960), p. 130.
- 3595.** A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein, A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), p. 243.
- 3596.** S. Walter, "Minkowski, Mathematicians, and the Mathematical Theory of Relativity", in H. Goenner, et al., Editors, *The Expanding Worlds of General Relativity*, Birkhauser, Boston, (1999), pp. 45-86.
- 3597.** M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 1; **and** "Physics and Relativity", *Physics in my Generation*, 2nd rev. ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, (1969), p. 101. A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein: A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), p. 243.
- 3598.** M. Born, *My Life: Recollections of a Nobel Laureate*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, (1975), p. 131.
- 3599.** Letter from A. Einstein to P. Ehrenfest of 2 February 1920, A. Hentschel, translator, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 294, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 246-247, at 246.
- 3600.** Letter from P. Ehrenfest to A. Einstein of 8 February 1920, A. Hentschel, translator, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 303, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 251-254, at 252.
- 3601.** A. Einstein, translated by A. Beck, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987), p. 16.
- 3602.** A. M. Hentschel, Translator, A. Einstein to P. Hertz, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 111, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 122.
- 3603.** A. Einstein's letter to F. Klein of 26 March 1917 translated by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 319, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 311.
- 3604.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992).
- 3605.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), pp. 24, 95. "Einstein Sees Boston; Fails on Edison Test", *The New York Times*, (18 May 1921), p. 15.
- 3606.** T. Sauer, "The Relativity of Discovery: Hilbert's First Note on the Foundations of Physics", *Archive for History of Exact Sciences*, Volume 53, Number 6, (1999), pp. 529-575, at 539.
- 3607.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), pp. 24-25.
- 3608.** *See*: H. Goenner, "The Reaction to Relativity Theory. I: The Anti-Einstein Campaign in Germany in 1920", *Science in Context*, Volume 6, Number 1, (1993), pp. 107-133, at 111.
- 3609.** *See*: "Einstein Ignores Capt. See", *The New York Times*, (18 October 1924), p. 17.
- 3610.** "Challenges Prof. Einstein: St. Paul Professor Asserts Relativity Theory Was Advanced in 1866", *The New York Times*, (10 April 1921), p. 21. **See also**: "Einstein Charged with Plagiarism", *New York American*, (11 April 1921). **See also**: "Einstein Refuses to Debate Theory", *New York American*, (12 April 1921).
- 3611.** *See*: *The New York Times*, (4 April 1922), p. 21.
- 3612.** "Cardinal Doubts Einstein", *The New York Times*, (8 April 1929), p. 4. **See also**: "Einstein Ignores Cardinal", *The New York Times*, (9 April 1929), p. 10. **See also**: "Cardinal

Opposes Einstein”, *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, (8 April 1929), p. 33. **See also:** “Cardinal Hits at Einstein Theory”, *The Minneapolis Journal*, (8 April 1929). **See also:** “Cardinal Gives Further Views on Einstein”, *Boston Evening American*, (12 April 1929). **See also:** “Cardinal Warns Against Destructive Theories”, *The Pilot* [Roman Catholic Newspaper, Boston], (13 April 1929), pp. 1-2. **See also:** “Vatican Paper Praises Critic of Dr. Einstein”, *The Minneapolis Morning Journal*, (24 May 1929).

3613. *See:* M. Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge*, University of Chicago Press, (1958), p. 13; **and** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, (1982), pp. 113-114; **and** W. Broad and N. Wade, *Betrayers of the Truth: Fraud and Deceit in the Halls of Science*, Simon & Schuster, New York, (1982), p. 139.

3614. *See:* *The New York Times*, (24 February 1936), p. 7.

3615. R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57; **and** “Conversations with Albert Einstein. II”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 41, Number 7, (July, 1973), pp. 895-901.

3616. R. S. Shankland, “Conversations with Albert Einstein”, *American Journal of Physics*, Volume 31, Number 1, (January, 1963), pp. 47-57, at 54.

3617. A. Einstein quoted in R. W. Clark, *Einstein: The Life and Times*, The World Publishing Company, (1971), p. 261; referencing A. Einstein to A. Sommerfeld, in A. Hermann. *Briefwechsel. 60 Briefe aus dem goldenen Zeitalter der modernen Physik*, Schwabe & Co., Basel, Stuttgart, (1968), p. 69.

3618. J. Stachel, Ed., *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Princeton University Press, (1989), p. 44. **See also:** A. Fölsing, *Albert Einstein, A Biography*, Viking, New York, (1997), p. 108-110.

3619. R. Brown, “A brief Account of Microscopical Observations made in the Months of June, July, and August, 1827, on the Particles contained in the Pollen of Plants; **and** on the general Existence of active Molecules in Organic and Inorganic Bodies”, *Philosophical Magazine*, New Series, Volume 4, (1828), pp. 161-173; “Additional Remarks on Active Molecules”, *Philosophical Magazine*, New Series, Volume 6, (1829), pp. 161-166. **See also:** Louis-Georges Gouy, “Note sur le Mouvement Brownien”, *Journal de Physique Théorique et Appliquée*, Volume 7, (1888), pp. 561-564. **See also:** W. Nernst, “Zur Kinetik der in Lösung befindlichen Körper. I. Theorie der Diffusion”, *Zeitschrift für physikalische Chemie, Stöchiometrie und Verwandtschaftslehre*, Volume 2, Number 9, (September, 1888), pp. 613-637; **and** “Die elektromotorische Wirksamkeit der Ionen”, *Zeitschrift für physikalische Chemie, Stöchiometrie und Verwandtschaftslehre*, Volume 4, (1889), pp. 129-181; **and** *Theoretische Chemie vom Standpunkte der Avogadro'schen Regel und der Thermodynamik*, Second Edition, Ferdinand Enke, Stuttgart, (1898). **See also:** L. Bachelier, “Théorie de la Speculation”, *Annales de l'École Normale Supérieure*, (1900), pp. 21-86; reprinted: *Théorie de la Spéculation*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, (1900). **See also:** W. Sutherland, “A Dynamical Theory of Diffusion for Non-Electrolytes and the Molecular Mass of Albumin”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Series 6, Volume 9, (1905), pp. 781-785. **Confer:** J. Leveugle, *Poincaré et la Relativité : Question sur la Science*, (2002), ISBN: 2-9518876-1-2, pp. 249-268; **and** *La Relativité, Poincaré et Einstein, Planck, Hilbert: Histoire véridique de la Théorie de la Relativité*, L'Harmattan, Paris, (2004). **See also:** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, (1982), pp. 88-107.

3620. *Einstein's predecessors include:* E. Becquerel, *La Lumière: Ses Causes et Ses Effets: 2 : Effets de la Lumière*, Volume 2, Librairie de Firmin Didot frères, Paris, (1868), p. 122. **See also:** G. R. Kirchhoff, “Ueber das Verhältniss zwischen dem Emissionsvermögen und dem Absorptionsvermögen der Körper für Wärme und Licht”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 109, (1860), pp. 275-301; republished in: *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, J.

A. Barth, Leipzig, (1882), pp. 571-598. **See also:** L. Boltzmann, “Analytischer Beweis des 2. Hauptsatzes der mechanischen Wärmetheorie aus den Sätzen über das Gleichgewicht der lebendigen Kraft”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Zweite Abtheilung*, Volume 63, (1871), pp. 712-732; republished in: *Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen*, Volume 1, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1909), pp. 288-308; **and** “Über die Beziehung zwischen dem zweiten Hauptsatz der mechanischen Wärmetheorie und der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung, respective den Sätzen über das Wärmegleichgewicht”, *Sitzungsberichte der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Zweite Abtheilung*, Volume 76, (1877), pp. 373-435; republished in: *Wissenschaftliche Abhandlungen*, Volume 2, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1909), pp. 164-223; **and** *Vorlesungen über Gastheorie*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1896). **See also:** H. F. Weber, “Die specifischen Wärmen der Elemente Kohlenstoff, Bor und Silicium”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 4, (1875), pp. 367-423, 553-582; **and** “Die Entwicklung der Lichtemission glühender fester Körper”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1887), pp. 491-504; **and** “Untersuchungen über die Strahlung fester Körper”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1888), pp. 933-957. **See also:** H. R. Hertz, “Über sehr schnelle electriche Schwingungen”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 31, (1887), pp. 421-449; English translation in: *Electric Waves, Being Researches on the Propagation of Electric Action with Finite Velocity Through Space*, London, New York, Macmillan, (1893), p. 29ff.; **and** “Über einen Einfluß des ultravioletten Lichtes auf die electriche Entladung”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 31, (1887), pp. 983-1000; English translation in: *Electric Waves, Being Researches on the Propagation of Electric Action with Finite Velocity Through Space*, London, New York, Macmillan, (1893), p. 63ff.; **and** *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1887), pp. 487ff.; **and** “Über die Einwirkung einer geradlinigen electriche Schwingung auf eine benachbarte Strombahn”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 34, (1888), pp. 155-171; **and** “Über die Ausbreitungsgeschwindigkeit der electrodynamischen Wirkungen”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 34, (1888), pp. 551-569; **and** “Über electrodynamische Wellen im Luftraume und deren Reflexion”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 34, (1888), pp. 609-623; **and** “Ueber die Grundgleichungen der Electrodynamic für ruhende Körper”, *Nachrichten von der Königlich Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften und der Georg-Augusts-Universität zu Göttingen*, (1890), pp. 106-149; reprinted *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 40, (1890), pp. 577-624; reprinted *Untersuchung über die Ausbreitung der Elektrischen Kraft*, Johann Ambrosius Barth, Leipzig, (1892), pp. 208-255; translated into English by D. E. Jones, as: “On the Fundamental Equations of Electromagnetics for Bodies at Rest”, *Electric Waves, Being Researches on the Propagation of Electric Action with Finite Velocity Through Space*, London, New York, Macmillan, (1893), pp. 195-239; **and** “Ueber die Grundgleichungen der Electrodynamic für bewegte Körper”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 41, (1890), pp. 369-399; reprinted *Untersuchung über die Ausbreitung der Elektrischen Kraft*, Johann Ambrosius Barth, Leipzig, (1892), pp. 256-285; translated into English by D. E. Jones, as: “On the Fundamental Equations of Electromagnetics for Bodies in Motion”, *Electric Waves, Being Researches on the Propagation of Electric Action with Finite Velocity Through Space*, London, New York, Macmillan, (1893), pp. 241-268.; **and** “Über den Durchgang der Kathodenstrahlen durch dünne Metallschichten”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 45, (1892), pp. 28-32. **See also:** J. H. Van’t Hoff, “Die Rolle des osmotischen Druckes in der Analogie zwischen Lösungen und Gasen”, *Zeitschrift für physikalische Chemie, Stöchiometrie und Verwandtschaftslehre*, Volume 1, (1887), pp. 481-

508. **See also:** W. Hallwachs, “Über den Einfluss des Lichtes auf electrostatisch geladene Körper”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 33, (1888), pp. 301-312. **See also:** H. Ebert and E. Wiedemann, “Über den Einfluss des Lichtes auf die electricen Entladungen”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 33, (1888), pp. 241-264. **See also:** A. Righi, “Di alcuni nuovi fenomeni elettrici provocati dalle radiazioni — Nota V”, *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei*, Volume 4, Number 2, (1888), pp. 16-19. **See also:** M. A. Stoletow, “Suite des Recherches Actino-Électriques”, *Comptes Rendus Hebdomadaires des Séances de L’Académie des Sciences*, Volume 107, (1888), pp. 91-92. **See also:** P. Lenard and M. Wolf, “Zerstäuben der Körper durch das ultraviolette Licht”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 37, (1889), pp. 443-456. **See also:** J. Elster and H. Geitel, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 38, (1889), pp. 40, 497; **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 39, (1890), p. 332; **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 41, (1890), p. 161; **and** “Über den hemmenden Einfluss des Magnetismus auf lichtelectrische Entladungen in verdünntenn Gasen”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 41, (1890), pp. 166-176; **and** “Über die durch Sonnenlicht bewirkte electriche Zerstreuung von mineralischen Oberflächen”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 44, (1891), pp. 722-736; **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 52, (1894), p. 433; **and** *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 55, (1895), p. 684; **and** “Über die angebliche Zerstreuung positiver Electricität der Licht”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 57, (1895), pp. 24-33. **See also:** W. Wien, “Eine neue Beziehung der Strahlung schwarzer Körper zum zweiten Hauptsatz der Wärmetheorie”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1893), pp. 55-62; **and** “Temperatur und Entropie der Strahlung”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 52, (1894), pp. 132-165; **and** “Ueber die Energievertheilung im Emissionsspectrum eines schwarzen Körpers”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 58, (1896), pp. 662-669. **See also:** E. Branly, “Déperdition des Deux Électricités par les Rayons très Réfrangibles”, *Comptes Rendus Hebdomadaires des Séances de L’Académie des Sciences*, Volume 114, (1892), pp. 68-70. **See also:** O. E. Meyer, *Die kinetische Theorie der Gase*, Multiple Editions. **See also:** O. Knoblauch, “Ueber die Fluorescenz von Lösungen”, *Annalen der Physik und Chemie*, Volume 54, (1895), pp. 193-220. **See also:** J. J. Thomson, “On Cathode Rays”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 44, (1897), pp. 293-316; **and** “On the Charge of Electricity Carried by the Ions Produced by Roentgen Rays”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 46, (1898), pp. 528-545; **and** “On the Masses of the Ions in a Gas at Low Pressure”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 48, (1899), pp. 547-567; **and** *Les Discharges Électriques dans les Gaz*, Paris, (1900), p. 56; **and** *Electricity and Matter*, Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York, (1904); translated into German, *Elektrizität und Materie*, F. Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1904); **and** “On the Emission of Negative Corpuscles by the Alkali Metals”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 10, (1905), pp. 584-590. **See also:** E. Rutherford, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Volume 9, (1898), p. 401. **See also:** O. Lummer and E. Pringsheim, “Die Vertheilung der Energie im Spectrum des schwarzen Körpers und des blanken Platins”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 1, (1899), pp. 215-230. **See also:** M. Planck, “Über irreversible Strahlungsvorgänge. Vierte Mittheilung”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1898), pp. 449-476; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 532-559; **and** “Über irreversible Strahlungsvorgänge. Fünfte Mittheilung”, *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, (1899), pp. 440-480; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 560-600; **and** “Ueber irreversible Strahlungsvorgänge”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 1,

(1900), pp. 69-122; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 614-667; **and** “Entropie und Temperatur strahlender Wärme”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 1, (1900), pp. 719-737; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 668-686; **and** “Ueber eine Verbesserung der Wien’schen Spectralgleichung”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 2, (1900), pp. 202-204; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp.687-689; **and** “Kritik zweier Sätze des Hrn. W. Wien”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 3, (1900), pp. 764-766; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 695-697; **and** “Zur Theorie des Gesetzes der Energieverteilung im Normalspectrum”, *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, Volume 2, (1900), pp. 237-245; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 698-706; **and** “Ueber das Gesetz der Energieverteilung im Normalspectrum”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 4, (1901), pp. 553-563; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 717-727; **and** “Ueber die Elementarquanta der Materie und der Elektrizität”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 4, (1901), pp. 564-566; reprinted in: *Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge*, Volume 1, Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, Braunschweig, (1958), pp. 728-730. **See also:** E. Merritt and O. M. Stewart, “The Development of Cathode Rays by Ultraviolet Light”, *Physical Review*, Volume 11, (1900), pp. 230-250. **See also:** P. Drude, *Lehrbuch der Optik*, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, (1900); translated into English *The Theory of Optics*, Longmans, Green and Co., London, New York, Toronto, (1902); **and** “Zur Elektronentheorie der Metalle. I & II”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 1, (1900), pp. 566-613; Volume 3, (1900), pp. 369-402; **and** “Optische Eigenschaften und Elektronentheorie, I & II”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 14, (1904), pp. 677-725, 936-961; **and** “Die Natur des Lichtes” in A. Winkelmann, *Handbuch der Optik*, Volume 6, Second Edition, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1906), pp. 1120-1387; **and** *Physik des Aethers auf elektromagnetischer Grundlage*, F. Enke, Stuttgart, (1894), Posthumous Second Revised Edition, W. König, (1912). **See also:** Lord Rayleigh, “Remarks upon the Law of Complete Radiation”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 49, (1900), pp. 539-540; republished in: *Scientific Papers*, Volume 4, Dover, New York, (1964), pp. 483-485; **and** “The Dynamical Theory of Gases and of Radiation”, *Nature*, Volume 72, (1905), pp. 54-55; republished in: *Scientific Papers*, Volume 5, Dover, New York, (1964), pp. 248-252; **and** “The Constant of Radiation as Calculated from Molecular Data”, *Nature*, Volume 72, (1905), pp. 243-244; republished in: *Scientific Papers*, Volume 5, Dover, New York, (1964), p. 253. **See also:** P. Lenard, “Ueber Wirkungen des ultravioletten Lichtes auf gasförmige Körper”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 1, (1900), pp. 486-507; **and** “Erzeugung von Kathodenstrahlen durch ultraviolettes Licht”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 2, (1900), pp. 359-375; **and** “Ueber die Elektrizitätszerstreuung in ultraviolet durchstrahlter Luft”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 3, (1900), pp. 298-319; **and** “Ueber die lichtelektrische Wirkung”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 8, (1902), pp. 149-198; **and** “Über die Beobachtung langsamer Kathodenstrahlen mit Hilfe der Phosphoreszenz und über Sekundärentstehung von Kathodenstrahlen”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 12, (1903), pp. 449-490. **See also:** F. Paschen, “Ueber das Strahlungsgesetz des schwarzen Körpers”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 4, (1901), pp. 277-298; **and** “Ueber das Strahlungsgesetz des schwarzen Körpers. Entgegnung auf Ausführungen der Herren O. Lummer und E. Pringsheim”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 6, (1901), pp. 646-658. **See also:** H. Rubens and F. Kurlbaum, “Anwendung der

Methode der Reststrahlen zur Prüfung des Strahlungsgesetzes”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 4, (1901), pp. 649-666. **See also:** J. Stark, *Die Elektrizität in Gasen*, J. A. Barth, Leipzig, (1902). **See also:** E. R. Ladenburg, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 12, (1903), pp. 558. **See also:** E. v. Schweidler, “Die lichtelektrischen Erscheinungen”, *Jahrbuch der Radioaktivität und Elektronik*, Volume 1, (1904), pp. 358-400. **See also:** J. H. Jeans, “On the Partition of Energy between Matter and Aether”, *Philosophical Magazine*, Volume 10, (1905), pp. 91-98; **and** “The Dynamical Theory of Gases and of Radiation”, *Nature*, Volume 72, (1905), pp. 101-102; **and** “A Comparison between Two Theories of Radiation”, *Nature*, (1905), pp. 293-294.

On the history of the origin and derivation of the formulas and concepts, see: P. Ehrenfest, “Welche Züge der Lichtquantenhypothese spielen in der Theorie der Wärmestrahlung eine wesentliche Rolle?”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 36, Number 11, (1911), pp. 91-118. **See also:** A. Joffé, “Zur Theorie der Strahlungserscheinungen”, *Annalen der Physik*, Series 4, Volume 36, Number 13, (1911), pp. 534-552. **See also:** L. Natanson, “Über die statistische Theorie der Strahlung. (On the Statistical Theory of Radiation.)”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 12, Number 16, (15 August 1911), pp. 659-666. **See also:** G. Krutkow, “Aus der Annahme unabhängiger Lichtquanten folgt die W i e n sche Strahlungsformel”, *Physikalische Zeitschrift*, Volume 15, Number 3, (1 February 1914), pp. 133-136. **See also:** F. Hund, “Die Strahlung heisse Körper”, *Einführung in die theoretische Physik*, Volume 4 “Theorie der Wärme”, *Especially* Sections 66 and 67, Bibliographisches Institut, Leipzig, (1950), pp. 309-315; **and** F. Hund, “Die Strahlung heisse Körper”, *Einführung in die theoretische Physik*, Volume 4, “Theorie der Wärme”, *Especially* Sections 66 and 67, Bibliographisches Institut, Leipzig, (1950), pp. 309-315; **and** “Lichtteichen”, *Einführung in die theoretische Physik*, Volume 5 “Atom- und Quantentheorie”, Section 36, Bibliographisches Institut, Leipzig, (1950), pp. 166-169; **and** F. Hund, *The History of Quantum Theory*, Barnes & Noble Books, New York, (1974). **See also:** E. T. Whittaker, *A History of the Theories of Aether and Electricity*, Volume 1, Chapter 11, pp. 356-357; Volume 2, Chapter 3, Thomas Nelson and Sons, London, (1951/1953). **See also:** A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Chapter 19, Oxford University Press, (1982), pp. 364-388. **See also:** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 2, Document 14, Princeton University Press, (1989), pp. 134-169. **See also:** S. Galdabini, G. Giuliani and N. Robotti, *Photoelectricity Within Classical Physics: from the Photocurrents of Edmond Becquerel to the First Measure of the Electron Charge*, URL:

<<http://fiscavolta.unipv.it/percorsi/pdf/napesi.pdf>>

3621. P. Michelsmore, *Einstein: Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, New York, (1962), pp. 122-123.

3622. E. H. Walker in the PBS documentary, *Einstein’s Wife: The Life of Mileva Maric Einstein*, (2003). URL:

<<http://www.pbs.org/opb/einsteinswife/index.htm>>.

3623. I. Wallace, *The Writing of One Novel*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (1968), pp. 18-19.

3624. *See also:* *Svenska Dagbladet*, (29 April 1922) and (19 October 1924); **and** *Nya Dagligt Allehanda*, (5 January 1924).

3625. A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, (1982), p. 153.

3626. See: W. Wien, “Die Bedeutung Henri Poincaré’s für die Physik”, *Acta Mathematica*, Volume 38, (Article dated March 9th, 1915, *published 1921!*), pp. 289-291; reprinted in *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 11, (1956), pp. 243-246. The next article after this one is H. A. Lorentz, “Deux Mémoires de Henri Poincaré sur la Physique Mathématique”, *Acta Mathematica*, Volume 38, (1921!), pp. 293-308; reprinted in *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 683-695; **and** Volume 11, (1956), pp. 247-261. Pauli also wrote in 1921. One can only wonder what implications these articles held for Einstein’s Nobel Prize, and the fact that it was *not* awarded for “the theory of relativity”.

3627. E. Gehrcke, *Annalen der Physik*, 51, (1916), pp. 119-124; **and** *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, 20, (1918), pp. 165-169; **and** *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, 21, (1919), pp. 67-68; **and** *Zeitschrift für technische Physik*, 1, (1920), p. 123; **and** “Die Relativitätstheorie, eine wissenschaftliche Massensuggestion”, Lecture Delivered in the Berlin Philharmonic on August 24th, 1920, published in E. Gehrcke, *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 54-68. E. Gehrcke, From “Kosmos”, Special Edition on the Theory of Relativity, (1921), pp. 296-298.

3628. See: W. Broad and N. Wade, *Betrayers of the Truth: Fraud and Deceit in the Halls of Science*, Simon & Schuster, New York, (1982), pp. 23, 33-36, 213, 227-228.

3629. “Divorce Decree”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 6, Princeton University Press, (2004).

3630. M. Zackheim, *Einstein’s Daughter, The Search for Lieserl*, Riverhead Books, New York, (1999), p. 170.

3631. A. Einstein, quoted in *Contemporary Quotations*, Compiled by J. B. Simpson, Thomas Y. Cromwell Company, New York, (1964), p. 300.

3632. See: A. Einstein to J. Stark, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 5, Document 85, Princeton University Press, (1995). A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 413, Princeton University Press, (1998). A. Einstein, “Dialog über Einwände gegen die Relativitätstheorie”, *Die Naturwissenschaften*, Volume 6, Number 48, (1918), pp. 697-702; *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 13, Princeton University Press, (2002). A. Einstein, “Meine Antwort”, *Berliner Tageblatt und Handels-Zeitung*, (27 August 1920); English translation quoted in G. E. Tauber, *Albert Einstein’s Theory of General Relativity*, Crown, New York, (1979), pp. 97-99; **and** *Physics and National Socialism: An Anthology of Primary Sources*, Birkhäuser, Basel, Boston, Berlin, (1996), pp. 1-5; **and** *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 7, Document 45, Princeton University Press, (2002).

3633. I. B. Cohen, *Einstein, A Centenary Volume*, Harvard University Press, (1980), p. 41.

3634. From: Desanka Truhović-Gjurić, *Im Schatten Albert Einsteins, Das tragische Leben der Mileva Einstein-Marić*, Paul Haupt, Bern & Stuttgart, (1983), p. 75. Mileva to her father.

3635. Michele Zackheim, *Einstein’s Daughter, the Search for Lieserl*, Riverhead Books, Penguin Putnam, New York, (1999), p. 69.

3636. A. Einstein, quoted in *The Expanded Quotable Einstein*, collected and edited by A. Calaprice, Princeton University Press, (2000), pp. 306-307.

3637. R. Highfield and P. Carter, *The Private Lives of Albert Einstein*, St. Martin’s Press, New York, (1993), pp. 153-154. The authors propose the possibility of “an innocent explanation” for Mileva’s condition, but their suggestion is unpersuasive.

3638. G. J. Whitrow, Editor, *Einstein: The Man and his Achievement*, Dover, New York, (1967), p. 21.

3639. M. Zackheim, *Einstein’s Daughter, the Search for Lieserl*, Riverhead Books, Penguin Putnam, New York, (1999).

- 3640.** M. Winteler-Einstein, English translation by A. Beck, “Albert Einstein—A Biographical Sketch”, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Princeton University Press, (1987), pp. xv-xxii, at xviii.
- 3641.** P. Micheltore, *Einstein, Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, New York, (1962), p. 43. M. Marić to H. Savić, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 1, Document 125, Princeton University Press, (1987).
- 3642.** Michele Zackheim, *Einstein’s Daughter, the Search for Lieserl*, Riverhead Books, Penguin Putnam, New York, (1999), p. 244.
- 3643.** “Deposition in Divorce Proceedings” English translation by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 676, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 713. *See also:* M. Zackheim, *Einstein’s Daughter, the Search for Lieserl*, Riverhead Books, Penguin Putnam, New York, (1999), pp. 78-79.
- 3644.** M. White and J. Gribbin, *Einstein, A Life in Science*, Plume, New York, (1995), p. 123.
- 3645.** *See:* A. Einstein to Ilse Einstein, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 536, Princeton University Press, (1998); **and** Ilse Einstein to Georg Nikolai, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 545, Princeton University Press, (1998).
- 3646.** Ilse Einstein to Georg Nikolai, English translation by A. M. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 545, Princeton University Press, (1998), p. 565. *See also:* D. Overbye, *Einstein in Love: A Scientific Romance*, Viking, New York, (2000), pp. 343, 404, note 22. *See also:* A. Einstein to Ilse Einstein, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 536, Princeton University Press, (1998).
- 3647.** D. Overbye, *Einstein in Love: A Scientific Romance*, Viking, New York, (2000), pp. 343, 404, note 22. *See:* A. Einstein to Ilse Einstein, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 536, Princeton University Press, (1998); **and** Ilse Einstein to Georg Nikolai, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 8, Document 545, Princeton University Press, (1998).
- 3648.** A. Einstein, English translation by I. Born in M. Born, *The Born-Einstein Letters*, Walker and Company, New York, (1971), p. 8.
- 3649.** P. Frank, *Einstein: His Life and Times*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, (1947), p. 293.
- 3650.** R. Highfield and P. Carter, *The Private Lives of Albert Einstein*, St. Martin’s Press, New York, (1993), p. 148.
- 3651.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, “Einstein’s Roving Eye”, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), pp. 127-135.
- 3652.** P. Micheltore, *Einstein, Profile of the Man*, Dodd, Mead, New York, (1962), p. 22.
- 3653.** E. R. Einstein, *Hans Albert Einstein: Reminiscences of His Life and Our Life Together*, Iowa Institute of Hydraulic Research, University of Iowa, Iowa City, (1991), pp. 98.
- 3654.** A. Reuterdaahl, “Einstein and the Nobel Premium”, *The Dearborn Independent*, (6 January 1923).
- 3655.** <http://nobelprize.org/physics/laureates/1921/>
- 3656.** E. Gehrcke, *Annalen der Physik*, 51, (1916), pp. 119-124; **and** *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, 20, (1918), pp. 165-169; **and** *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft*, 21, (1919), pp. 67-68; **and** *Zeitschrift für technische Physik*, 1, (1920), p. 123; **and** “Die Relativitätstheorie, eine wissenschaftliche Massensuggestion”, Lecture Delivered in the Berlin Philharmonic on August 24th, 1920, published in E. Gehrcke, *Kritik der Relativitätstheorie*, Hermann Meusser, Berlin, (1924), pp. 54-68; **and** “Kosmos”, Special Edition on the Theory of Relativity, (1921), pp. 296-298.

3657. S. Walter, “Minkowski, Mathematicians, and the Mathematical Theory of Relativity”, in H. Goenner, et al., Editors, *The Expanding Worlds of General Relativity*, Birkhäuser, Boston, (1999), pp. 45-86.

3658. A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, New York, (1982), p. 171. Letter from G. Mittag-Leffler to A. Einstein of 16 December 1919, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 218, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 308-309, 611.

3659. W. Pauli, “Relativitätstheorie”, *Encyklopädie der mathematischen Wissenschaften mit Einschluss ihrer Anwendungen*, Volume 5, Part 2, Chapter 19, B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1921), pp. 539-775; English translation by G. Field, *Theory of Relativity*, Pergamon Press, London, Edinburgh, New York, Toronto, Sydney, Paris, Braunschweig, (1958).

3660. See also: *Svenska Dagbladet*, (29 April 1922) and (19 October 1924); and *Nya Dagligt Allehanda*, (5 January 1924).

3661. I. Wallace, *The Writing of One Novel*, Simon and Schuster, New York, (1968), pp. 18-19.

3662. “Diskussionen om relativitetsteorien. En amerikansk professor, som gjør krav paa af være teoriens skaber. En udtalelse af professor Einstein”, *Aftenposten*, (18 June 1920). See also: “Relativitetsteorien og dens mænd. Professor Arvid Reuterdaahl udgiver en bog om sin teori af 1902.” *Aftenposten*, (Friday Morning, 10 September 1920).

3663. <http://nobelprize.org/physics/laureates/1923/>

3664. A. Reuterdaahl, “Einstein and the Nobel Premium”, *The Dearborn Independent*, (6 January 1923).

3665. See: W. Broad and N. Wade, *Betrayers of the Truth: Fraud and Deceit in the Halls of Science*, Simon & Schuster, New York, (1982), pp. 23, 33-36, 213, 227-228.

3666. R. A. Millikan, *The Electron, Its Isolation and Measurement and the Determination of Some of Its Properties*, University of Chicago Press, (1917), pp. 222-238.

3667. R. A. Millikan, “Albert Einstein on His Seventieth Birthday”, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, Volume 21, Number 3, (July, 1949), pp. 343-347, at 344.

3668. R. M. Friedman, “Nobel Physics Prize in Perspective”, *Nature*, Volume 292, (27 August 1981), pp. 793-798; and “Quantum Theory and the Nobel Prize”, *Physics World*, Volume 15, Number 8, (August, 2002), pp. 33-38.

3669. A. Pais, *Subtle is the Lord*, Oxford University Press, (1982), p. 153.

3670. See: W. Wien, “Die Bedeutung Henri Poincaré’s für die Physik”, *Acta Mathematica*, Volume 38, (Article dated March 9th, 1915, *published 1921!*), pp. 289-291; reprinted in *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 11, (1956), pp. 243-246. The next article after this one is H. A. Lorentz, “Deux Mémoires de Henri Poincaré sur la Physique Mathématique”, *Acta Mathematica*, Volume 38, (1921!), pp. 293-308; reprinted in *Œuvres de Henri Poincaré*, Volume 9, Gautier-Villars, Paris, (1954), pp. 683-695; and Volume 11, (1956), pp. 247-261. Pauli also wrote in 1921. One can only wonder what implications these articles held for Einstein’s Nobel Prize, and the fact that it was *not* awarded for “the theory of relativity”.

3671. <http://nobelprize.org/physics/laureates/1921/>

3672. <<http://nobelprize.org/physics/laureates/1921/>>

3673. <<http://nobelprize.org/physics/laureates/1923/>>

3674. H. Kragh, “Max Planck: The Reluctant Revolutionary”, *Physics World*, Volume 13, Number 12, (December, 2000), pp. 31-35. T. S. Kuhn, “Einstein’s Critique of Planck”, in H. Woolf, Editor, *Some Strangeness in the Proportion: A Centennial Symposium to Celebrate the Achievements of Albert Einstein*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, Massachusetts, (1980), pp. 186-191. A. Hermann, *Der Weg in das Atomzeitalter: Physik wird Weltgeschichte*, Moos, München, (1986).

- 3675.** *Svenska Dagbladet*, (19 October 1924). **See also:** *Nya Dagligt Allehanda*, (5 January 1924).
- 3676.** P. A. Bucky, Einstein, and A. G. Weakland, *The Private Albert Einstein*, Andrews and McMeel, Kansas City, (1992), p. 58.
- 3677.** J. Toland, *Letters to Serena*, Letter V, B. Lintot, London, (1704); reproduced F. Fromann, Stuttgart, (1964) and Garland, New York, (1976).
- 3678.** E. K. Dühring, *Die Judenfrage als Racen-, Sitten- und Culturfrage: mit einer weltgeschichtlichen Antwort*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, (1881); English translation by A. Jacob, *Eugen Dühring on the Jews*, Nineteen Eighty Four Press, Brighton, England, (1997), p. 101.
- 3679.** “David of Dinant”, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Volume 4, Robert Appleton Company, New York, (1908), p. 645.
- 3680.** M. Samuel, “Diaries of Theodor Herzl”, in: M. W. Weisgal, *Theodor Herzl: A Memorial*, The New Palestine, New York, (1929), pp. 125-180, at 129. T. Herzl, English translation by H. Zohn, R. Patai, Editor, *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, Volume 1, Herzl Press, New York, (1960), pp. 4, 111.
- 3681.** E. K. Dühring, *Die Judenfrage als Racen-, Sitten- und Culturfrage: mit einer weltgeschichtlichen Antwort*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, (1881); English translation by A. Jacob, *Eugen Dühring on the Jews*, Nineteen Eighty Four Press, Brighton, England, (1997), p. 115. **See also:** E. K. Dühring, *Die Ueberschätzung Lessing's und Dessen Anwaltschaft für die Juden*, H. Reuther, Karlsruhe, (1881).
- 3682.** Letter from P. Ehrenfest to A. Einstein of 8 February 1920, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 303, Princeton University Press, (2004), pp. 251-254, at 253-254.
- 3683.** Letter from A. Einstein to H. A. Lorentz of 19 January 1920, English translation by A. Hentschel, *The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein*, Volume 9, Document 265, Princeton University Press, (2004), p. 220.